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Abstract  Objective: Understanding the effect of a given intervention on the patient’s health outcome is one of the key elements in providing optimal patient care. This study presents a methodology for automatic identification of outcomes-related information in medical text and evaluates its potential in satisfying clinical information needs related to health care outcomes.

Design: An annotation scheme based on an evidence-based medicine model for critical appraisal of evidence was developed and used to annotate 633 MEDLINE citations. Textual, structural, and meta-information features essential to outcome identification were learned from the created collection and used to develop an automatic system. Accuracy of automatic outcome identification was assessed in an intrinsic evaluation and in an extrinsic evaluation, in which ranking of MEDLINE search results obtained using PubMed Clinical Queries relied on identified outcome statements.

Measurements: The accuracy and positive predictive value of outcome identification were calculated. Effectiveness of the outcome-based ranking was measured using mean average precision and precision at rank 10.

Results: Automatic outcome identification achieved 88% to 93% accuracy. The positive predictive value of individual sentences identified as outcomes ranged from 30% to 37%. Outcome-based ranking improved retrieval accuracy, tripling mean average precision and achieving 389% improvement in precision at rank 10.

Conclusion: Preliminary results in outcome-based document ranking show potential validity of the evidence-based medicine-model approach in timely delivery of information critical to clinical decision support at the point of service.


Introduction

Objective
To better satisfy clinical information needs related to health care outcomes, we set out to develop a methodology for automatic identification of outcomes-related information in medical text. If outcomes information can be identified, it may serve as one of the indicators of clinical orientation of the text, and be presented to clinicians as a starting point for decision making. In this article, we propose outcome identification as a method for guiding medical domain-specific search for relevant information.

Motivation
Scientific literature is a well-established source of information for professionals who need to stay current in their fields. The amount of information published in many fields makes the exhaustive coverage of information not only impractical, but practically impossible.1 Not surprisingly, automatic methods that help these professionals find relevant information without evaluating every publication remain the focus of research in many text-related tasks. In the medical domain, in addition to improvements in information access, automatic methods have the potential to enable evidence-based practice.2

To provide optimal patient care, a clinician needs just-in-time access to the best available evidence in the context of the patient’s individual condition. One of the key elements in using current best evidence while making decisions about the care of individual patients is an understanding of the effect of a given intervention on the patient’s health outcome and quality of life.3 However, the well-documented difficulty clinicians have dealing with the sheer volume of medical literature4–7 may prevent them from accessing knowledge about health outcomes at the time the information is required. When information about health care outcomes is not known, a physician’s ability to provide optimal patient care may be compromised.

The task of identifying outcomes-related information is two-fold: determine the minimal amount of the text required to understand the health outcome implications of the research paper, and then identify these text units in clinical texts. The latter essentially can be viewed as text classification. We addressed the first part of the task, studying how much information is required and what level of granularity is sufficient to estimate potential clinical validity of a publication using health outcome information.8 These experiments lead us to select passages in article abstracts as units appropriate for the outcome identification task. Our approach to the second
part of the task as a classification problem utilizes well-known text categorization techniques as the baseline, and improves the initial result using an ensemble of classifiers.

The classification task and evaluation of the classification results require a “truth set”—a collection of documents with passages annotated as outcome statements. Unlike medical literature classification tasks that can use existing resources, our task required creation of the test collection of annotated article abstracts. We selected MEDLINE as the most likely source to be used by a practitioner. Our choice is based on results of studies that show MEDLINE to be a primary source for questions pertaining to treatment, and the database most frequently searched by clinicians. Moreover, in a study by Hersh et al., all users that used MEDLINE searches with domain elements. Purcell et al. captured the complex structure of the documents. Medical articles combine rhetorical roles of the sentences reflect the domain-dependency of a sentence and section structure, in addition to the text nontextual features as, for example, absolute or relative location of a sentence and section structure, in addition to the text of the sentence in assignment of rhetorical status to sentences for the purpose of summarization of scientific articles. Rhetorical roles of the sentences reflect the domain-dependent structure of the documents. Medical articles combine the generic structure of scientific articles with the specific domain elements. Purcell et al. captured the complex structure of medical articles in three hierarchical context models for medical document representation, and identified a number of outcome-oriented elements including experimental findings, reviewed outcomes, and relevant outcomes. In view of these findings, we incorporate the discourse structure of the abstracts of medical articles as one of the classifiers in our ensemble.

Identification of outcome statements in the so-called secondary sources, i.e., in the key treatment recommendations on important clinical topics compiled by experts, was undertaken by Niu and Hirst. Their approach starts with the identification of the cue words indicative of outcome statements in a sentence. Once the cue word is identified, the boundaries of the statement are determined using rules based on the part of speech of the cue word. It has not been determined whether the resulting statements can serve as elementary units sufficient for understanding the health outcome implications in medical articles and their abstracts. It has been observed that providing users with information within its context is preferable to mere presentation of the fact. This observation is in concert with the success of the systems that provide summaries of literature personalized to an individual patient history, or that formulate queries using a patient’s information.

Classification methods have been successfully applied to medical text in the past. Ensembles of classifiers were particularly successful, and consistently outperformed single classifiers in medical text categorization, e.g., in assigning ICD9 codes to patient discharge summaries, and in assigning Heart Disease categories to MEDLINE abstracts. An explanation of better performance of the ensemble methods is given in the overview of methods for combining classifiers with the goal of improving classification results. Once the decision to combine classifiers is made, some consideration should be given to selecting a promising method. We implemented the stacking method developed and tested on several datasets from the repository of machine learning because it is recommended for the cases where base classifiers are disparate in nature. The text classification method closest to the stacking method used in our experiments is a probabilistic method of combining classifiers shown to be successful on news-wire text.

Methods
The supervised machine learning approach to outcome classification task and evaluation of the classification results depend on the availability of test collections of documents. We developed a collection of 633 MEDLINE citations, in 592 of which we identified and annotated passages containing outcome statements. The collection was divided into a training set used to develop an automatic outcome identification methodology, and a test set used for intrinsic evaluation of the automatic outcome classification. The intrinsic evaluation pursued two goals. First, establish the validity of the developed outcome identification methods. Second, verify that the methods are generic enough to be applied independent of a clinical scenario, potentially generating four major types of questions within the context of major clinical tasks: etiology, diagnosis, therapy, and prognosis. In addition to the intrinsic evaluation, we conducted an extrinsic evaluation of our method in an information retrieval task, in which PubMed retrieval results were ranked based on the results of the final selection of the outcome passage.

Outcome Identification and the Intrinsic Evaluation
The Test Collection for Machine Learning and Intrinsic Evaluation
Our test collection consists of five sets of MEDLINE citations created emulating different types of user behaviors. The search strategies used to query PubMed are presented in Appendix 1. Our goal was to annotate succinct patient health outcome statements in the abstracts of the citations. We used
the MeSH scope notes to define the outcome as “...the results or consequences of management and procedures used in combating disease...,” and the Problem-Intervention-Comparison-Outcome (PICCO) framework developed to help physicians create successful strategies for searching medical literature to identify outcomes as a components of the PICCO framework.  The initial set (Set 1) was generated using three disease categories: rheumatoid arthritis, migraine, and breast cancer.  Core clinical journals were searched for a 1-year time period using search strategies developed by the HEDGES Study Team. A set of 356 retrieved citations was narrowed to 275 citations after eliminating studies (1) evaluating patient questionnaires, rating scales, and the like; (2) outside of the disease categories; (3) without abstracts; and (4) not dealing with treatment outcomes.  The registered nurse (RN) author, a clinical nurse specialist with more than 20 years of experience, annotated the 275 abstracts identifying sentences containing health outcomes. On average, 2.25 sentences per abstract were annotated as outcome statements.

The same search strategies were then applied to obtain the second set of citations (Set 2) focusing on three chronic diseases: pulmonary tuberculosis, renal hypertension, and asthma.  The RN annotated on average 1.9 sentences per abstract as outcome statements. The second annotator, a medical student, on average annotated 4.3 sentences per abstract as outcome statements in this set. The second annotator, a medical student, on average annotated 4.3 sentences per abstract as outcome statements, 83% of the statements identified as outcomes by the RN were also marked as such by the student. Because of this large difference in the size of the annotated passages, agreement between the annotators was only fair (kappa = 0.42). Analysis of the disagreements showed that the medical student tended to include disease-oriented outcomes in the abstract and statistical information in support of the outcome in addition to the patient outcome statements (Table 1).

Before using the outcome statements as the reference standard and presumed to provide little help with clinical decision making. The evidence presented in an abstract and the Problem-Intervention-Comparison-Outcome (PICCO) framework developed to help physicians create successful strategies for searching medical literature to identify outcomes as a components of the PICCO framework.  The initial set (Set 1) was generated using three disease categories: rheumatoid arthritis, migraine, and breast cancer.  Core clinical journals were searched for a 1-year time period using search strategies developed by the HEDGES Study Team. A set of 356 retrieved citations was narrowed to 275 citations after eliminating studies (1) evaluating patient questionnaires, rating scales, and the like; (2) outside of the disease categories; (3) without abstracts; and (4) not dealing with treatment outcomes.  The registered nurse (RN) author, a clinical nurse specialist with more than 20 years of experience, annotated the 275 abstracts identifying sentences containing health outcomes. On average, 2.25 sentences per abstract were annotated as outcome statements.

The same search strategies were then applied to obtain the second set of citations (Set 2) focusing on three chronic diseases: pulmonary tuberculosis, renal hypertension, and asthma.  The RN annotated on average 1.9 sentences per abstract as outcome statements. The second annotator, a medical student, on average annotated 4.3 sentences per abstract as outcome statements in this set. The second annotator, a medical student, on average annotated 4.3 sentences per abstract as outcome statements, 83% of the statements identified as outcomes by the RN were also marked as such by the student. Because of this large difference in the size of the annotated passages, agreement between the annotators was only fair (kappa = 0.42). Analysis of the disagreements showed that the medical student tended to include disease-oriented outcomes in the abstract and statistical information in support of the outcome in addition to the patient outcome statements (Table 1).

To provide guidance for annotators and promote consistency among them, we reviewed our annotation scheme and came to consensus for sets 4 and 5. Before using the outcome statements as the reference standard and presumed to provide little help with clinical decision making.

**Table 1** Scheme for Annotation of Clinically Relevant Elements in MEDLINE Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Material that informs and may place the current study in perspective, e.g., work that preceded the current; information about disease prevalence, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>The group of individual persons, objects, or items comprising the study’s sample, or from which the sample was taken for statistical measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>The act of interfering with a condition to modify it or with a process to change its course (includes prevention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Data collected about the results of the intervention demonstrating its effect (includes prevention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>The sentence(s) that best summarizes the consequences of an intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supposition</td>
<td>An assumption or conclusion that goes beyond the evidence presented in an abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Any sentence not falling into one of the other categories and presumed to provide little help with clinical decision making,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2** Five Sets of MEDLINE Citations That Form the Test Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Search Topic</th>
<th>Annotators</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>With Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis, migraine, breast cancer</td>
<td>RN1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exercise-induced asthma, renal hypertension, tuberculosis</td>
<td>RN1, medical student</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Immunization</td>
<td>RN1, RN2, MD, PhD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>RN1, RN2, MD, PhD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Treatment Outcome</td>
<td>MD, PhD</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[mh]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the likelihood or probability that each sentence belongs to an outcome statement. In this section, we first present the final split of the collection into the test and training sets based on our preliminary experiments with the readily available machine learning toolkits\textsuperscript{35,36} and traditional random splits of the collection.\textsuperscript{37} Then we describe how each classifier works, the choice of classifiers, and features used in classification. The last part of this section presents methods used to combine classifiers.

From our collection of 592 citations with annotated outcome statements, we chose to use the 275 abstracts of Set 1 as our training set, leaving 317 citations with outcome statements and 41 without (358 total) for testing. The choice was made after experimenting with the sizes of the sets following recommendations that the test set size should be 5% to 10% of the collection size.\textsuperscript{37} We conducted the preliminary experiments using the WEKA toolkit\textsuperscript{35} as follows: 10 iterations of randomly selecting from 633 citations and setting aside 60 as the test set and another 60 citations as the verification set and using the rest for training. In these experiments, the relatively large training set did not improve the classification results over the results obtained using Set 1 for training and Set 2 for testing. Furthermore, the small size of the test set prevented testing the system’s performance for each of the four clinical tasks. In the subsequent experiments we settled on the 275 citations as the training set sufficient to maintain the performance achieved in the preliminary experiments.

In these experiments, a Naïve Bayes classifier outperformed both a linear SVM and a decision-tree classifier in identifying outcome statements, and was selected as the baseline classifier for further experiments. In additional preliminary experiments, we used the state-of-art Naïve Bayes classifier provided with the MALLET toolkit\textsuperscript{36} This Naïve Bayes classifier achieved 100% recall and 27% precision, prompting us to create a coordinated ensemble of classifiers, i.e., train complementary classifiers, then classify sentences in each citation using (1) linear interpolation with ad hoc weights assigned based on intuition and (2) a weighted sum of the classifiers combined in optimum way using stacking.\textsuperscript{29} The six base classifiers in this ensemble are: a rule-based classifier, a Naïve Bayes classifier, an n-gram–based classifier, a position classifier, a document length classifier, and a semantic classifier. The rules for the rule-based classifier were created manually by the RN author. The remaining classifiers were trained on the 275 citations from the annotated collection described above.

Outcome identification starts with a classification of each sentence in the abstract as an outcome statement or not. Each of the base classifiers described below generates either a likelihood estimate, or a probability that the sentence belongs to the outcome. The rule-based, Naïve Bayes, and n-gram–based classifiers treat each sentence disregarding the context of the abstract. The position classifier and the semantic classifier use the abstract structure and context, and the document length classifier operates solely on the number of sentences in the abstract.

The rule-based classifier estimates likelihood of the sentence to be an outcome based on cue phrases such as “significantly greater,” “well tolerated,” and “adverse events.” The strength of evidence provided by cue phrases is measured by the ratio of the cumulative score for found phrases to maximal possible score. For example, the following sentence: “The dropout rate due to adverse events was 12.4% in the moxonidine and 9.8% in the nitrendipine group” is segmented into eight phrases during MetaMap\textsuperscript{38} processing, so the maximal possible score is set to 8, and the two phrases “dropout rate” and “adverse events” contribute 1 point each to the cumulative score, which results in a likelihood estimate of 0.25 for the sentence.

The Naïve Bayes classifier treats each sentence as a bag of words and generates the probability of the sentence to be an outcome statement, rather than a binary decision with respect to the class of the sentence being an outcome or not. The n-gram–based classifier generates the probability in a manner different from the Naïve Bayes classifier: whereas the probability assigned by the Naïve Bayes classifier is based on probabilities of all words encountered during training, the n-gram–based classifier uses only features that are strong positive predictors of outcomes. These features were selected as uni- and bi-grams by first identifying the most informative features using information gain measure,\textsuperscript{39} then selecting only positive outcome predictors using odds ratio,\textsuperscript{40} and finally by a manual revision by the RN author (during which the topic-specific terms, such as rheumatoid arthritis, one of the three diseases used to retrieve the training documents, were removed from the feature set to ensure generality of the features). As an example, consider the terms “superior” and “placebo controlled.” Both have a high information gain value, but “superior” also has a high positive odds ratio value and is selected as a feature for the n-gram classifier, as opposed to “placebo controlled” that has a high negative odds ratio, and is therefore discarded.

The position classifier is based on the discourse structure of the abstract and the relative position of the sentence in the abstract. As can be seen in Figure 2, the likelihood estimate that a sentence contains an outcome statement is very high for the last 3 sentences of the abstract. This is also true for the sentences in the results and the conclusions sections of the structured abstracts. Of the 275 citations used for training, 22 (2.5%) were not structured. In the rest, the outcome statements were found in conclusions in 63.6% of the structured abstracts, in the results section of another 36%, and in the interventions section of 1 abstract.

The document length classifier returns a smoothed probability that a document of given length (in the number of sentences) contains an outcome statement. For example, the probability that a 3-sentence-long abstract contains an outcome statement...
is 0.2, and the probability to find an outcome statement in an 11- to 14-sentence-long abstract is 0.95. Implementation of this classifier is motivated by the observed difference between the lengths of abstracts in which the outcome statements were found, and were not found. The average length of the former is 11.7 sentences, whereas the length of the latter is 7.95 sentences on average. We use the document length classifier with the understanding that it is meaningless when identifying sentences containing outcomes within the document, but will boost our confidence when selecting documents most likely to contain outcome statements.

The semantic classifier generates the maximum likelihood estimate of a given sentence being an outcome statement based on the presence of UMLS concepts belonging to semantic groups highly associated with outcomes, such as therapeutic procedure or pharmacologic substance. Identification of the semantic groups is based on mappings of the semantic types to the groups. The underlying identification of the UMLS concepts and semantic types associated with these concepts is achieved using MetaMap. The semantic classifier is global, i.e., it takes into consideration the previously seen content of an abstract temporarily stored during its sequential processing. For example, if the problem and interventions identified in a sentence using MetaMap processing correspond to those named in the title and the objectives section of the abstract, the likelihood estimate that the sentence is an outcome statement increases.

The probabilities and likelihood estimates of being an outcome statement (assigned to the sentence by the base classifiers) are then combined by the meta-classifier using ad hoc weights selected based on our intuitions about the prediction of the base classifier. We also experimented with optimum combination of weights using confidence values generated by the base classifiers and stacking—the version of least squares linear regression adapted for classification tasks. This multiple linear regression (MLR) meta-classifier, which has been shown to outperform other methods of combining classifiers, can be described by the following equation:

\[ MLR(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_k P_k(x) \]

\( P_k(x) \) is the probability that sentence \( x \) belongs to an outcome statement, as determined by classifier \( k \) (for classifiers that do not return actual probabilities, we use likelihood estimates). To predict the class of a sentence, the probabilities generated by \( K \) classifiers are combined using the coefficients \((\alpha_0, ..., \alpha_K)\). The coefficients’ values are determined in the training stage as follows: probabilities predicted by base classifiers for each sentence are represented as a \( KN \) matrix \( A \), where \( N \) is the number of sentences in the training set, and \( K \) is the number of classifiers. The reference set class assignments for each sentence are stored in a vector \( b \), and the coefficients’ values are found by calculating the vector \( \alpha \) that minimizes \( ||Ax - b|| \). The coefficients were found using singular value decomposition (SVD), as provided in the JAMA basic linear algebra package released by NIST.

**Intrinsic Evaluation Methodology**

We evaluated automatic outcome identification using 2 different ways to combine base classifiers—ad hoc and stacking—for each of the 4 main physician’s tasks: etiology, diagnosis, therapy, and prognosis. Abstracts in the test set fell into task categories as follows: 37 abstracts pertain to etiology, 57 to diagnosis, 153 abstracts to therapy, and 111 to prognosis. Citations were assigned to categories based on search strategies developed for searching MEDLINE® and Users’ Guides to Evidence-based Medicine® (EBM) as follows: citations containing etiology and cohort studies in their major MeSH headings were assigned to the etiology category. Citations containing the diagnosis MeSH heading were assigned to the diagnosis task. Citations indexed with therapy and therapeutic use headings fell into the therapy category. Citations indexed with MeSH headings follow-up studies, quality of life, and mortality as major topics were assigned to the prognosis category.

The output of each of the outcome meta-classifiers for a single abstract is a list of sentences ranked in descending order by the confidence score assigned to the sentence. Based on the observation that annotators typically marked 2 to 3 sentences in each abstract as outcomes, we evaluated the performance of our meta-classifiers at cutoffs of 2 and 3 sentences. In addition, we evaluated accuracy of selecting just 1 sentence, as a possible help in rapid assessment of a citation’s relevance to a clinical task. Motivated by the general expectation that patient outcome statements are typically found in the conclusion section of a structured abstract and toward the end of an unstructured abstract, we compared our outcome classifiers to a baseline of returning 1, 2, or 3 final sentences of an abstract (baselines 1 through 3, respectively, in Table 3).

**Extrinsic Evaluation of Automatic Outcome Identification**

The ultimate measure of success of our outcome identification method is its performance in a real-life task. For a preliminary evaluation in a real-life information retrieval task, we carried out automatic outcome-based ranking of 1,312 MEDLINE citations.

**The Test Collection for Extrinsic Evaluation**

The 1,312 citations were retrieved to answer clinical inquiries for five disorders using the sensitive and therapy-oriented Clinical Query available in PubMed. A family practitioner provided relevance judgments for 40 citations retrieved for each of the disorders.

**Extrinsic Evaluation Methodology**

For the purposes of this experiment, an outcome statement consisted of the three top-ranking sentences generated by the stacking outcome meta-classifier. The confidence score of the top-ranking sentence was assigned to the whole outcome statement. The ranking of the citations started with an initial filter that discarded potentially irrelevant citations if the disorder automatically identified in the outcome was not the same as in the query. The remaining citations were ranked according to the sum of the outcome confidence score and the score of the potential strength of evidence presented in the citation. The potential strength of evidence score was determined according to the principles defined in the Strength of Recommendations Taxonomy. The strength of evidence score was based on MeSH headings, such as publication type; publication in a core clinical journal having therapy as a major topic; and recent publication.

We evaluated the efficiency of the outcome-based ranking of the citations using mean average precision, and precision at rank 10, two of the measures developed at NIST to evaluate
retrieval systems that return ranked lists of documents. Mean average precision for multiple topics (five disorders in our case) has recall and precision components. It is the mean of the average precision scores for each of the topics. The average precision score for a single topic is computed by averaging the precision after each relevant document is retrieved. We computed the percent improvement in precision at rank 10 as the difference in mean of relevant documents in the top 10 after and before the outcome-based reranking divided by the mean of relevant documents in the top 10 before reranking.

**Results**

**Intrinsic Evaluation**

**Upper Bound for Outcome Identification**

The upper bound for outcome identification was established using the interannotator agreement (Cohen’s kappa) on a sentence-by-sentence basis, i.e., whether the experts agreed on each sentence annotated as an outcome by at least one of them. Table 4 presents kappa values for the subsets of the collection described in the methods section. Two registered nurses, 1 medical student, 1 PhD, and 1 MD participated in the annotation of the collection. The RNs, the PhD, and the MD also had an opportunity to reconcile the differences in annotation for sets 4 and 5, which permitted measuring the intra-annotator reliability. For intra-annotator reliability, the original judgments made by a reviewer were compared with the consensus annotation. The intra-annotator consistency in annotating outcomes in Set 4 was excellent for clinicians (kappa ranging from 0.93 to 0.99) and good for the PhD (kappa = 0.81). Overall, clinicians had fewer difficulties with annotation: the intra-annotator consistency on all elements presented in Table 1 was 0.8, 0.9, and 0.92 for clinicians; whereas it was 0.73 for the PhD. On the fifth set, the intra-annotator consistency was 0.84 for the PhD and 0.91 for the MD.

The performance of the system was compared with that of the reviewers by computing kappa between the system and the combined reference standard of the human annotations (kappa = 0.67).

**Accuracy of the Automatic Outcome Identification**

The results of outcome identification are shown in Table 3, where numbers 1 through 3 indicate the sentence cutoffs in selecting sentences with top scores assigned by the outcome classifiers. In the evaluation, the prediction of the outcome classifier was considered correct if the sentences it returned intersected with sentences annotated as outcomes in the reference standard. We selected this lenient evaluation because of the importance of pointing the physician in the right direction, even if the results are only partially relevant. To complete the picture, we present the positive predictive value (computed as the ratio of true positive outcome sentences identified by the system to the sum of the true and false positive outcome sentences) of the top three sentences output by the stacking classifier in Table 5.

**Extrinsic Evaluation: Outcome-based Ranking of Retrieval Results**

Using mean average precision (map)—a measure frequently used in official NIST evaluations—we obtained a three-fold

---

Table 3 - Percent of Correctly Identified Outcome Statements at Three Cutoff Levels for Each Major Clinical Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Meta-Classifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule-based</td>
<td>Stacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiology</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prognosis</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 4 - Interannotator Agreement for Outcome Only Annotation (Outcome) and Annotation of All Clinically Relevant Elements (All Elements) in Outcome Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Annotators</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>All Annotators</th>
<th>Clinicians</th>
<th>Best Pairwise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RN1, MS</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RN1, RN2, PhD, MD</td>
<td>All elements</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RN1, RN2, PhD, MD</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RN1, RN2, PhD, MD</td>
<td>All elements</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RN1, RN2, PhD, MD</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PhD, MD</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
improvement (map = 0.4131) over the presentation order of the citations in PubMed retrieval results (map = 0.1425). We consider the number of relevant documents displayed at the top of a ranked list, measured as precision at rank 10, to be a more meaningful measure for point-of-service information delivery. Number of relevant documents in the first 10 of the PubMed retrieval results and after the re-ranking is shown in Table 6 along with the total number of the retrieved citations. A 389% improvement was achieved in precision at rank 10.

**Discussion**

In this study of the automatic outcome identification, we obtained encouraging results. In the intrinsic evaluation of the outcome classifiers, the automatic classification achieves results that approach human agreement (kappa value between the truth set and the system = 0.67 compared with kappa ranging from 0.8 to 0.94 in the upper bound established based on the outcome identification by clinicians). The systems also improve over the baseline at the three-sentence cutoff level. Similar to observations of Mendonça and Cimino, the best performance is achieved for therapy and the worst for etiology. The stacking method that combines the base classifiers in an optimum way outperforms the one based on manually crafted rules in all cases but therapy. The success of the manual rules for therapy is understandable because the rules were created using 275 therapy-oriented citations that constitute the training set. The number of false positives in the highly ranked sentences may be reduced (at the cost of reducing sensitivity) by establishing high threshold, and marking as out-

---

**Table 5** - Positive Predictive Value of the Stacking Meta-Classifier for Each Major Clinical Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Etiology</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Prognosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 6** - Number of Relevant Documents in the First 10 of the PubMed Retrieval Results (PM), and after the EBM Model-Based Reranking (EBM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Back Pain</th>
<th>Obesity</th>
<th>Osteoporosis</th>
<th>Panic Disorder</th>
<th>Warts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant in 10</td>
<td>PM 3 EBM 10</td>
<td>PM 0 EBM 7</td>
<td>PM 1 EBM 9</td>
<td>PM 5 EBM 9</td>
<td>PM 0 EBM 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision at rank 10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total retrieved</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another limitation of the study is using PubMed Clinical Queries as the baseline system in the extrinsic evaluation. Although the retrieval results are among the best currently available to clinicians, one of the state-of-art search engines that rank retrieval results will be used as a baseline in our future experiments. Another technical limitation is introduced by the base semantic classifier: identification of semantic types in retrieval results takes time, which means the processing needs to be done off-line either in advance, for interactive information retrieval and question answering systems, or after the search in a summarization system that will provide digests of the searches asynchronously. At present, we are implementing a prototype EBM-based system that generates overviews of PubMed retrieval results. Once the system is implemented, it will be evaluated for its capability to facilitate clinical question answering similar to experiments presented in.14 We plan to use outcome statements appraised by the users in these experiments for improvement of the outcome identification system.

Conclusions
This research presents a new EBM-based approach to processing and understanding MEDLINE citations used to meet clinicians’ just-in-time information needs. The potential usefulness of a citation in a clinical setting is approximated using the presence of an outcome statement in the citation. We took a micro-level approach, i.e., finding specific outcome statements by evaluating each sentence in medical text, since our previous research using a macro-level approach, i.e., classifying a text as a whole to determine the presence of an outcome statement, showed only moderate associations between perceived clinical value of a citation and features that characterize the whole citation.8 Good agreement between annotators in identifying the outcome statements on the micro-level, i.e., annotating each sentence in the citation as belonging to one of the EBM model fields, motivated our in-depth study and implementation of the automatic methods for outcome identification. The development of an annotation scheme, a collection of MEDLINE citations annotated at the sentence level, and identification of essential textual, structural, and meta-information features for automatic classification of outcome sentences permitted the development of automatic outcome identification methods. The automated system combines domain knowledge and modern statistical methods to achieve performance in outcomes identification approaching that attained by human annotators. Our preliminary results in outcome-based document ranking show the potential validity of the EBM-based approach in delivering information critical to clinical decision support in a timely manner.
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