Effectiveness of Lexico-syntactic Pattern Matching for Ontology Enrichment with Clinical Documents
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Summary
Objective: To evaluate the effectiveness of a lexico-syntactic pattern (LSP) matching method for ontology enrichment using clinical documents.

Methods: Two domains were separately studied using the same methodology. We used radiology documents to enrich RadLex and pathology documents to enrich National Cancer Institute Thesaurus (NCIT). Several known LSPs were used for semantic knowledge extraction. We first retrieved all sentences that contained LSPs across two large clinical repositories, and examined the frequency of the LSPs. From this set, we randomly sampled LSP instances which were examined by human judges. We used a two-step method to determine the utility of these patterns for enrichment. In the first step, domain experts annotated medically meaningful terms (MMTs) from each sentence within the LSP. In the second step, RadLex and NCIT curators evaluated how many of these MMTs could be added to the resource. To quantify the utility of this LSP method, we defined two evaluation metrics: suggestion rate (SR) and acceptance rate (AR). We used these measures to estimate the yield of concepts and relationships, for each of the two domains.

Results: For NCIT, the concept SR was 24%, and the relationship SR was 65%. The concept AR was 21%, and the relationship AR was 14%. For RadLex, the concept SR was 37%, and the relationship SR was 55%. The concept AR was 11%, and the relationship AR was 44%.

Conclusion: The LSP matching method is an effective method for concept and concept relationship discovery in biomedical domains.

1. Introduction

The development of biomedical ontologies represents a key advance of biomedical informatics during the past two decades [1–3]. Biomedical ontologies provide the foundation for system interoperability such as HL7 on the Reference Information Model [4]; are important elements of decision support systems [5–7], support clinical information retrieval [8, 9]; and, are needed for natural language processing (NLP) tasks such as information extraction [10], anaphora resolution [11, 12], and question answering [13]. Despite the critical role of ontologies in biomedicine, there remain many barriers to their widespread use. One well-known problem, termed the “knowledge acquisition bottleneck”, is the extraordinary manual effort that is required to create and maintain these resources [14–16]. The fields of knowledge acquisition, ontology learning, and ontology learning from text provide methods for automated and semi-automated ontology enrichment, which may help reduce the burden of populating ontologies.

Knowledge acquisition is a broad field that encompasses the tasks of acquiring and structuring knowledge from a wide range of resources, including experts. Semi-automated and fully automated methods for knowledge acquisition use data that can be derived from structured data sources (e.g. databases), semi-structured sources (e.g. web pages), or completely unstructured sources (e.g. free text). Knowledge acquisition methods can be used to populate many kinds of knowledge representations. Ontology learning represents a subfield of knowledge acquisition that is specifically interested in extraction of ontological concepts and relationships from knowledge-rich resources. Ontology learning from text defines a more specific task that focuses exclusively on extraction of ontological elements from unstructured sources.

There are two major advantages of ontology learning from text in biomedical domain. First, the biomedical literature is an important mechanism for reporting new discoveries in biomedical science. MEDLINE, the largest and most widely used biomedical literature repository, contains ap-
approximately 16 million journal articles, and
2000 to 4000 new articles are added each
day [17]. For several decades, researchers have
used MEDLINE for the purpose of
knowledge extraction [18–20]. Clinical
documents provide a second document re-
source, representing more medically
related domain knowledge, and they have be-
come increasingly available in electronic
formats. These documents have been util-
ized for many knowledge-based systems
such as bio-surveillance systems [21, 22].
Second, and more importantly, there is a
direct connection between text and ontol-
ogy because terms found in texts are lin-
guistic representations or labels for con-
cepts and relationships in an ontology
[23–25]. There is increasing interest in the
use of ontology learning from text to popu-
late, maintain and update an ontology [26,
27]. New concepts are often documented
first within text, and the direct connection
between text and ontology has made lit-
erature and documents preferable when
choosing learning resources.

The biomedical research community
has a long history of actively seeking and
utilizing multiple methods for automatic
extraction of semantic knowledge from
free text within the disciplines of natural
language processing (NLP), artificial in-
telligence (AI), and computational lin-
guistics (CL). These methods include:
1) linguistic or symbolic methods [28–31];
2) corpus or statistical methods [32–34];
and 3) hybrid methods [35–37]. In previ-
ous work, we reviewed methods and sys-
tems that are applicable to ontology learn-
ing in biomedicine [38]. The long-term
goal of our work is to investigate all of these
classes of methods for use in our newly de-
veloped semi-automated ontology enrich-
ment platform, Ontology Development
and Information Extraction (ODIE) [39,
40]. As a first step towards this long-term
goal, we explored the use of lexico-syntactic
patterns (LSPs) for extracting related con-
cepts and relationships between concepts
from text. LSPs are surface-relational
markers that exist in natural language.
For example, in the phrase “systemic granulo-
matous diseases such as Crohn’s disease or
sarcoidosis”, the LSP “such as” can help us
infer that “systemic granulomatous dis-
ases” is a hyponym of “Crohn’s disease”
and “sarcoidosis”. The objective of the
present study is to evaluate the effectiveness
of using the LSP matching method for
medical domain ontology enrichment
using clinical reports.

2. Background

Hearst [31] was the first to explore the LSP
matching method for ontology learning of
conceptual relationships. Hearst hypothe-
sized that syntactic regularities within a
specialized corpus reflect domain knowl-
edge. For example, from the sentence “... works by authors such as Herrick,
Goldsmith, and Shakespeare”, the LSP “NP1 such as NP” suggests a hyponymic
relationship between the noun phrase
“authors” and the noun phrases “Herrick”,
“Goldsmith”, and “Shakespeare”. Hearst
searched for a set of predefined LSPs that
indicated some relationship such as hypo-
nym/hyponym in the text of the Grolier’s
American Academic Encyclopaedia. In this
8.6 million word encyclopedia, she found
7067 sentences that contained the pattern
such as. Out of these, 330 relationships
were found. The advantages of this method
as summarized by Hearst are: 1) It does not
require an extensive knowledge base. 2) A
single, specially expressed instance of a re-
lation is all that is required for this
method. And 3) It can be applied to a wide
range of texts. Additionally, the LSP
method has the advantage of learning both
concepts and relationships at the same
time. However, a notable drawback of this
method, identified by Hearst, is the low
recall.

Many researchers have followed in
Hearst’s footsteps, further refining the LSP
method for concept and relationship dis-
covery. Mukherjea and Sahay [41] explored
how to combine a world wide web (WWW)
search engine and Hearst patterns for bio-
medical relationship discovery. The assump-
tion was that if a biological term be-
longs to a particular class, there should be
a large number of Hearst patterns contain-
ing that term and that class on the WWW.
For example, malaria is a disease, so the
phrase “diseases including malaria” should
occur frequently on web pages. They first
queried Google web search engine with
hand-crafted LSPs. Then, they used the
BioAnnotator system they developed to
identify biomedical terms. If the total
number of patterns containing the term
exceeded a predefined threshold, the term
was defined as a member of the class. For
evaluation, they randomly selected 100
UMLS terms belonging to ten classes of
UMLS. They achieved 87.5% precision,
70.2% recall and 77.9% F-score when using
25 as the threshold.

Berland [42], Sundblad [43], and Girju
[13] extended the LSP method for part-
whole relationship discovery. Berland com-
bined the LSP method with statistical
methods and applied the hybrid method to
a very large corpus. The output of the
method was an ordered list of possible
parts for a list of six seed whole objects. Ber-
land achieved 55% accuracy.

Fiszman et al. [44] have shown that non-
lexically cued appositive pattern can be
used to improve SemRep’s overall accuracy
by providing more specific semantic pre-
dictions. For example, given a sentence
“market authorization has been granted in
France for pilocarpine, an old parasym-
pathomimetric agent, in the treatment of
xerostomia”, the appositive pattern cap-
tured the hypernymic position “Pilio-
carpine-ISA-Parasympathomimetic Agents”
over “Parasympathomimetic Agents-
TREATS-Xerostomia” could be inferred.
Using LSP increased SemRep’s recall by 7% (39–46%) and precision by 1% (77–78%).

In this study, we sought to determine the
utility of the LSP matching approach for
extracting concepts from free-text clinical
documents, a rich electronic resource. We
first determined the frequency of known
LSPs in two large clinical corpora, and then
studied the yield of new concepts. We
further examined the utility of this method
for relationship extraction by characteriz-
ing the types of relationships expressed in
each pattern, along with their prevalence.
During the course of this research, we also
refined a methodology and set of metrics
that can be used to estimate the value of
various approaches to ontology learning
from text.
Fig. 1  Overall study methodology. The sizes of corpora in this figure have been rounded. SPRs: surgical pathology reports, RRs: radiology reports, POS: part-of-speech, LSP: lexico-syntactic-pattern, MMTs: medically meaningful terms
3. Research Questions

1. What is the prevalence and distribution of known LSPs in clinical corpora?
2. What is the value of the LSP matching method for biomedical ontology enrichment using clinical documents?

4. Methods

An overview of the methods used in this study is provided in flowchart form in Figure 1.

4.1 Lexico-syntactic Patterns (LSPs)

We first identified a set of LSPs for use in this study. The set of LSPs included those identified by Hearst [31] and Berland [42], supplemented by some from our own manual inspection of clinical documents. Table 1 lists LSPs used in this study and provides example sentences that contain patterns observed in the corpora.

4.2 Clinical Corpora

We used two clinical document types as ontology learning resources – surgical pathology reports and radiology reports. The corpus of surgical pathology reports included a total of 852,764 documents. The corpus of radiology reports included a total of 209,997 documents. Both corpora were obtained from clinical information systems of the University Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC), which includes a total of 18 hospitals. Both corpora were de-identified to meet the requirements of HIPAA “safe harbor” [45]. Use of the clinical corpora was approved by the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board (IRB# PRO07070252).

4.3 Targeted Biomedical Knowledge Resources

We selected two biomedical knowledge resources in active development that had the potential to benefit from ontology enrichment using clinical text. The National Cancer Institute Thesaurus (NCIT) [46] is a description logic-based ontology sponsored by the National Cancer Institute. It includes more than 75,000 key biomedical concepts in over 20 categories, including Disease, Abnormal Cell, Molecular Abnormality, Organism, Biological Process, etc. RadLex [47] is a lexicon for the uniform indexing and retrieval of radiology information resources, sponsored by the Radiology Society of North American (RSNA). It includes over 11,000 concepts in 12 categories, including Imaging Observation, Procedure, Characteristic, Treatment, etc. RadLex has previously been used to derive an application ontology for radiologic reporting, and seems likely to evolve into a formal ontology.

4.4 Extraction of Sentences Containing LSPs

Free-text pathology and radiology reports were processed in two steps (Fig. 1). First, we tagged Parts-Of-Speech (POS) using a maximum entropy POS tagger that we had previously retrained with pathology reports [48]. Second, we used regular expressions over POS tags to extract all of the LSPs shown in Table 1. For example, in the sentence “Compatible with benign eccrine neoplasia, such as nodular hidroadenoma, atypical pneumonia, bronchial wall thickening”, the expression “atypical pneumonia” is a noun phrase (NP) and will match the LSP: NP0 such as {NP1,*} or other NP. This sentence will be extracted for presentation to the domain experts. The output was a list of all sentences containing LSPs for each corpus. Processing was performed using the GATE platform [49].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSP Category</th>
<th>LSP</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearst</td>
<td>NP0 such as (NP1, NP2, ... and/or) NPn</td>
<td>Compatible with benign eccrine neoplasia, such as nodular hidroadenoma Such atypical pneumonia as mycoplasma or viral pneumonitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Such NP0 as (NP1,)*{or</td>
<td>and} NPn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP1, NP2)*{or</td>
<td>and} other NPn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP3,4) including (NP1,)*{or</td>
<td>and} NP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>NP2[a.k.a.</td>
<td>aka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP2 so called (NP1,)*{or</td>
<td>and} NPn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berland</td>
<td>Part NN in PREP (the</td>
<td>a) DET mods [JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part NN-PL of PREP (the</td>
<td>a) DET mods [JJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Lexico-syntactic patterns with examples from corpora. NP: noun phrase, NN: noun, PREP: preposition, DET: determiner, JJ: adjective, NN-PL: noun plural form, mods: modifiers. Regular expression notation: (x): x is optional, xly: either x or y, x*: zero or more of repetition of x.
4.5 LSP Frequencies and Distributions

For each LSP, we calculated the number of documents and sentences that contained the LSP. Because many sentences contained the same terms and LSPs, we also calculated the number of sentences containing unique LSPs. Frequency data enabled us to compute the potential yield of concepts and relationships within a corpus if the rate at which LSPs provide useful information for ontology or lexicon curators is known. Additionally, we used frequency data to determine the sample number for each LSP that was provided to human judges. For LSPs with more than 50 unique instances, we sampled 50 instances. For LSPs with 25 to 50 unique instances, we included all instances. We excluded LSPs with fewer than 25 unique instances.

4.6 Evaluation of Ontology Suggestions

We developed a two-step process to determine the value of suggestions generated with the LSP approach. The evaluation approach relies on manual annotations, assuming that automated methods using POS and noun-phrase identification can later be used to approximate the results of the human annotation.

In Step 1, domain experts examined each sentence containing an LSP and identified the medically meaningful terms (MMTs) before and after the LSPs. From the manual annotations, we can evaluate the maximum yield we could expect from applying LSPs to each corpus when we can assume that all the MMTs are correctly extracted. Manually identified MMTs from Step 1 were used as input to Step 2, in which we evaluated the value of the MMTs for ontology enrichment. The use of human annotations of MMTs, for the evaluation of Step 2, permitted us to more accurately determine the true value of ontology enrichment without confounding the evaluation with possibly incorrect MMTs.

In Step 2, NCIT and RadLex curators determined if the MMT was already present in the knowledge resource and, if not, whether it should be added. Next, they judged whether there was a relationship between the paired MMTs. If there was a relationship, they annotated the type of relationship and indicated if this relationship already existed in the ontology. If it did not exist, they determined if it should be added. Finally, if it should not be added, they provided a reason why it should not be added. We restricted the relationship types to synonym, hypernym, meronym and other (if the relationship does not fall into any of the three predetermined relationships). These judgments required not only domain knowledge but also in-depth understanding about a knowledge resource’s structure and content.

4.6.1 Step 1: Identify the Medically Meaningful Terms from Extracted Sentences

Domain experts included two resident pathologists (second and third year) and two resident radiologists (second and fourth year). Each group was presented with a sample of LSP-containing sentences from the pathology or radiology corpus, respectively. Domain experts were asked to annotate the MMTs, before and after the LSP, that could stand alone. For example, in the following text “Abnormal slightly high T2 signal seen in the porta hepatis which may be secondary to an underlying malignancy such as Klatskin tumor or gall bladder carcinoma”, the bold and italic term “such as” is the LSP. Domain experts would annotate “malignancy” as the MMT before the LSP and “Klatskin tumor” and “gall bladder carcinoma” as the MMTs after the LSP. The final product of the annotation was a table of paired MMTs from each sentence. When multiple terms were annotated before or after the LSP, we created a separate term-pair for each combination. All annotation was performed using Microsoft Excel. Domain experts were given a spreadsheet containing the sentences extracted with bolded LSPs. They annotated the MMTs before and after the LSP by copying and pasting them into a second and third column.

Domain experts were trained to perform the annotation using a modification of an existing annotation guideline for manual annotation of clinical conditions from emergency department reports developed by Chapman et al. [50]. On a development set, we used a Delphi method with repeated training until the F measure exceeded the threshold of 0.9, as depicted in Figure 2. Subsequently, expert annotators were given the final sample to annotate, which consisted of 50 unique sentences for each LSP.
4.6.2 Step 2: Determine the Value of Concepts and Conceptual Relationships Obtained from MMTs

Domain expert annotations resulted in a list of paired MMTs for pathology and a similar list for radiology. We then invited two experienced curators to judge the MMTs produced by the domain experts in Step 1. One ontology curator, a pathologist who is currently curating the National Cancer Institute Thesaurus, evaluated the term list obtained from the surgical pathology corpus. The other curator, a radiologist who is currently curating RadLex, evaluated the term list obtained from the radiology corpus.

For each term in a term-pair, curators judged:
1. Is the term already represented in the resource (possibly as a synonym)?
2. If not, should a new concept based on this term be added to the resource?
3. If not, what is the reason for which it should not be added?

For each pair of terms, ontology curators also judged:
4. If there is a relationship between the two terms, what is the relationship? We restricted the choices to synonym, hypernym/hyponym, meronym, and other.
5. Does this relationship exist in the resource?
6. If not, should the relationship be added to the resource?
7. If no new relationship should be added, what is the reason for which it should not be added?

The classical measure of precision is not entirely adequate in summarizing the resulting data since it does not capture the two-step process we anticipate using for suggesting new ontological elements. Therefore, we defined more specific evaluation metrics to quantify efficacy for the two discrete steps.

### Table 2

Frequencies of various LSPs in the pathology and radiology corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSP</th>
<th>Surgical pathology reports</th>
<th>Radiology reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># sentences</td>
<td># sentences containing unique LSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP such as NP</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP including NP</td>
<td>6291</td>
<td>4952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP other NP</td>
<td>6940</td>
<td>2251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP also called NP</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP aka NP</td>
<td>5396</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP in the NP</td>
<td>47,124</td>
<td>23,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP of the NP</td>
<td>246,798</td>
<td>70,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312,695</td>
<td>101,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

Number of medically meaningful terms (MMTs) extracted by the LSP method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSP</th>
<th>Surgical pathology reports</th>
<th>Radiology reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preceding the LSP</td>
<td>Following the LSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio (# of MMTs/# of instances of LSP)</td>
<td>Ratio (# of MMTs/# of instances of LSP)</td>
<td>Ratio (# of MMTs/# of instances of LSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP such as NP, NP</td>
<td>1.04 (52/50)</td>
<td>1.88 (94/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP including NP, NP</td>
<td>0.98 (49/50)</td>
<td>1.62 (81/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP other NP, NP</td>
<td>1.0 (50/50)</td>
<td>1.06 (53/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP also called NP, NP</td>
<td>0.95 (35/37)</td>
<td>0.97 (36/37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP aka NP, NP</td>
<td>0.96 (47/50)</td>
<td>1.18 (59/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP in NP</td>
<td>1.0 (50/50)</td>
<td>1.0 (50/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP of NP</td>
<td>1.0 (50/50)</td>
<td>1.0 (50/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.99 (333/337)</td>
<td>1.26 (423/337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # MMT per LSP</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concept Suggestion Rate (CSR):
CSR = # of MMTs that were not in the ontology/Total # of MMTs extracted by enrichment method

This metric indicates the percentage of terms, extracted using the enrichment method, that are new concept candidates and would be presented to the curator for a given target ontology.

Concept Acceptance Rate (CAR):
CAR = # of MMTs that should be included as new concept, instance, or synonym in the ontology/Total # of MMTs extracted by the enrichment method

This metric indicates the percentage of terms, extracted using the enrichment method, that would be added to the relevant ontology (these may represent new concepts or new instances).

Relationship Suggestion Rate (RSR):
RSR = # of relationships that were not in the ontology/Total number of relationships extracted by the enrichment method

This metric indicates the percentage of term relationships, extracted using the enrichment method that are candidates for a new concept relationship and would be presented to the curator for a given target ontology.

Relationship Acceptance rate (RAR):
RAR = # of relationships that should be included in the ontology/Total # of relationships extracted by the enrichment method

This metric indicates the percentage of concept relationships extracted using the enrichment method that would be added to the relevant ontology.

Additionally, we defined two measures that combine this information to provide an estimate of the total number of concepts or relationships extracted from a given corpus using the LSP matching method.

Table 4  Comparison of new concept suggestion rate and acceptance rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSP</th>
<th>Surgical pathology reports</th>
<th>Radiology reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP such as NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>37% (52/140)</td>
<td>31% (43/140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP including NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>32% (61/189)</td>
<td>32% (60/189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP other NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>16% (18/113)</td>
<td>16% (18/113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP also called NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>14% (10/74)</td>
<td>10% (7/74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP aka NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>31% (37/119)</td>
<td>31% (37/119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP in NP₁</td>
<td>12% (12/100)</td>
<td>6% (6/100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP of NP₁</td>
<td>11% (11/98)</td>
<td>6% (6/98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>24% (201/833)</td>
<td>21% (177/833)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5  Distribution of semantic relationships extracted using the LSP matching method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>LSP</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Hyponym</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Meronym</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Pathology Reports</td>
<td>NP such as NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>37% (24/65)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2% (1/65)</td>
<td>57% (37/65)</td>
<td>5% (3/65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP including NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>10% (11/114)</td>
<td>1% (1/114)</td>
<td>6% (7/114)</td>
<td>78% (89/114)</td>
<td>5% (6/114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP other NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>39% (24/61)</td>
<td>0% (0/61)</td>
<td>2% (1/61)</td>
<td>46% (28/61)</td>
<td>8% (5/61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP also called NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>22% (9/41)</td>
<td>20% (8/41)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37% (15/41)</td>
<td>10% (4/41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP aka NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>10% (6/59)</td>
<td>44% (26/59)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39% (23/59)</td>
<td>5% (3/59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP in NP₁</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100% (45/45)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP of NP₁</td>
<td>5% (2/44)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18% (8/44)</td>
<td>61% (27/44)</td>
<td>16% (7/44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18% (76/429)</td>
<td>8% (35/429)</td>
<td>4% (17/429)</td>
<td>62% (264/429)</td>
<td>7% (28/429)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology Reports</td>
<td>NP such as NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>72% (26/36)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28% (10/36)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP including NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>39% (7/18)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11% (2/19)</td>
<td>33% (6/18)</td>
<td>17% (3/18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP other NP₁, NP₂</td>
<td>76% (16/21)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24% (5/21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP in NP₁</td>
<td>4% (1/26)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12% (3/26)</td>
<td>42% (11/26)</td>
<td>42% (11/26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>40% (51/128)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4% (5/128)</td>
<td>21% (27/128)</td>
<td>35% (45/128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results

Table 2 shows the frequency of seven LSPs across the radiology and pathology corpora. Sentences that contained any LSP were extracted. The data are shown as LSPs per sentence and per unique sentence. The overall frequency of patterns appearing in the corpora was low. Although it is not possible to determine how accurate the LSPs are in extracting all relevant instances, the method is expected to perform well in this regard because it is based on string matching. We have not observed false negatives during manual inspection of sample documents from the corpus. Nevertheless, there are factors that could affect the accuracy of results: 1) the POS tagging error; and 2) it is possible that some instances of the LSP are missed due to misspellings and other typographical errors. The POS tagger was trained with pathology corpus and achieved 93% POS tagging accuracy and the tagging accuracy was 91% when used to tag the radiology reports.

Table 3 shows the number of meaningful terms (MMTs) that could be identified by domain experts in a sample of sentences obtained from each corpus. The total number of sentences used for each LSP is shown in Table 2. For each LSP, there was at least one MMT preceding the LSP and more than one MMT following the LSP. Thus, multiple MMTs can be extracted from a sentence that contained a single LSP.

Table 4 shows the new concept suggestion rate and the new concept acceptance rate as determined by the curators. For NCIT, the concept suggestion rates ranged from 37% for the pattern “NP such as NP1, NP2” to 11% for the pattern “NP of NP1,” with an average of 24% over seven patterns. For RadLex, the suggestion rates were higher, ranging from 52% for the pattern “NP such as NP1, NP2,” to 18% for the pattern “NP in NP1,” with an average of 37% over five patterns. However, nearly all the terms suggested would be accepted into the NCIT. The concept suggestion rate and concept acceptance rate were nearly equal.

In contrast, for RadLex, the majority of terms suggested would not be accepted into the terminology as judged by the curator.

One of the advantages of the LSP matching method is that the extracted terms preceding and following the LSP are expected to be semantically related. In our study, curators evaluated the semantic relationships between the pairs of MMTs and we calculated the distribution of each type of relationship based on the curator annotation (Table 5).

Table 6 shows the new relationship suggestion rate and the new relationship acceptance rate as determined by the curators. For NCIT, on average, the relationship suggestion rate was 64%, and the relationship acceptance rate was 14%. For RadLex, on average, the relationship suggestion rate was 55%, and the relationship acceptance rate was 44%.

Using the metrics estimated concept yield (ECY) and estimated relationship yield (ERY) for both pathology corpus and radiology corpus, we estimated that as many as 15,000 (for radiology corpus) to 16,000 (for pathology corpus) new concepts, instances or synonyms could be added, and perhaps as many as 2000 (for pathology corpus) to 5000 (for radiology corpus) new relationships could be added. We also explored reasons why some of the suggested relationships would not be added into the corresponding resource. The top three reasons were: 1) the relationships between classes of concepts are not modeled in the ontology (60%) (e.g. NCIT does not support relationships between anatomic concepts, procedure concepts, and findings); 2) the relationship between two concepts is too general or vague to be included (20%) (e.g. the relationship between “complication” and “Primary biliary cirrhosis” was considered to be too general); and 3) there is no relationship between the two extracted concepts (10%).
On the positive side, the method can be expected to produce many suggestions for new concepts, instances, synonyms and relationships. Several factors contribute to this finding. First, each instance of a pattern that appeared in the text resulted in extraction of more than two MMTs per sentence. Second, for both corpora tested, at least one quarter of the terms that could be extracted were not associated with corresponding concepts in the existing knowledge resource. With regard to acceptance, the results were mixed. For the pathology corpus, nearly all of these terms were accepted by the curator as useful concepts for the ontology. For the radiology corpus, less than one third of the suggested concepts were accepted by the curator as useful.

In many cases, the scope and structure of the knowledge resource was the limiting factor in concept acceptance. Using this approach, more than half of the relationships identified in the text corpora were not present in either resource. However, curators rated these relationships for acceptance quite differently between NCIT and RadLex, with a much lower overall acceptance rate for NCIT when compared with RadLex. The low relationship acceptance rate for NCIT was mainly due to the fact that many relationships in the text were not within the scope of the ontology. For example, relationships between findings and disease are not defined in the NCIT but these relationships are plentiful in the corpus. In future work, syntactic information derived from concepts and conceptual relationships in the ontology could be used to further constrain suggestions. Selecting candidate concepts based on the type of relationships modeled in the ontology might increase the acceptance rate by limiting suggestions that are clearly not modeled in the ontology.

The value of the LSP matching method also depends on how frequently these patterns exist in a domain corpus given that these patterns are likely to extract more meaningful medical terms. However, quantity is not the only measure. Our study showed that distributions of LSPs are heterogeneous. Some LSPs have higher frequencies than others and these proportions differed across the two corpora we studied. Importantly, some of the patterns can be highly effective because a single specifically expressed instance of a relationship was all that was required for new semantic knowledge extraction. For example, even though “NP_aka_NP” was a low frequency pattern, from a single instance of the “NP_aka_NP”, “Schwannoma (aka neurilemmoma)” we can extract a correct synonym relationship between schwannoma and neurilemmoma. The frequencies of patterns in two different types of clinical documents were different and some of the patterns either did not exist or had very low frequency (e.g. “NP_aka_NP” and “NP_so called_NP” in radiology reports). Furthermore, the frequency of the patterns in the corpus does not guarantee the high suggestion rate since the top three patterns based on suggestion rates are “NP such as NP1, NP2”, “NP including NP1, NP2,” and “NP other NP1, NP2,” for both corpora. Yet these three patterns have relatively low frequencies in both corpora.

To determine the overall value of the LSP pattern set as a method of semantic extraction, we computed an estimate of the yield of concepts and relationships for each corpus. For a large corpus, the yield of concepts and relationships could be quite substantial.

On the negative side, in contrast to Hearst’s paper, our results suggest that there is little information in the LSP that can accurately predict the semantic relationship between the concepts in the LSP, at least in the two domains studied. The distribution of relationships extracted with the LSP method was heterogeneous. Of the three named relationship types that curators evaluated (hyponym, meronym, and synonym), the most frequent relationship extracted with “NP such as NP,” “NP including NP” or “NP other NP” patterns was hypernym/hyponym, and the most frequent relationship extracted using “NP_aka_NP” was synonym. In many cases, the relationship was determined to be of some other type. In some cases, there was no identifiable relationship between the meaningful medical terms extracted. Thus, we will not be able to use the LSP as an indicator of the type of relationship expressed between the entities. However, because LSP extracts terms in pairs, if one of the terms extracted by the LSP method is already in the ontology, it could be informative in determining a general position in the hierarchy for a concept based on the complementary term. This could be a very useful feature for a semi-automated ontology learning platform where a human curator is required to determine the type of relationship between two terms.

Another limitation of this method, pointed out by previous research, is low recall. It is likely that many candidate concepts in the corpus never appear in any pattern. Attempts to improve the recall of the LSP method have focused on three major approaches. The first approach is to use additional syntactic features such as noun coordination information in combination with LSPs. For example, consider the following sentence containing a coordination structure: “In the ovine brain, GnRH neurons do not contain type II glucocorticoid (GR), progesterone (PR), or α estrogen (ERz) receptors.” If “ERz” is a steroid receptor in the ontology, the assumption that coordinated concepts are related permits defining “GR” and “PR” also as steroid receptors. Caraballo [28] and Cederberg [29] used this approach to obtain additional related pairs of terms.

The second approach is to use machine learning method by learning new patterns with either seed terms Riloff [51], Downey [30] or seed patterns Xu [52] in an iterative bootstrapping process. Finally, a third approach combines pattern and co-occurrence information to learn new patterns. As an example of this approach, Pantel et al. [53] used the minimal edit distance algorithm for pattern learning.

A final limitation of the LSP method is that it focuses on the use of simple English patterns rather than domain-specific patterns. The pattern-learning approaches discussed above have been applied to specific corpora to learn domain-specific extraction patterns [51, 54]. For example, Embarek and Ferret [55] discovered many medically related patterns using Pantel’s algorithm and used these patterns to discover semantic relationships in the medical domain. Patterns discovered this way showed good results when they were evaluated using a medical corpus of the EQueR evaluation campaign for question-answering systems in French. We believe that fu-
ture enhancements that build on the work of Riloff [51], Snow [54], and other investigators [28, 29] could reduce the limitations of the LSP method for ontology enrichment in biomedicine.

In summary, we conclude that lexico-syntactic pattern matching is an effective, but limited method for concept and relationship discovery in clinical corpora. We view this method as complementary to other enrichment methods. It seems likely that approaches combining multiple methods of concept discovery (including LSP) will prove most useful for semi-automated enrichment of biomedicale ontologies.

7. Limitations

One limitation of our study was that we did not specifically determine the percentage of MMTs that represented synonyms of existing ontology concepts as opposed to unrecognized new concepts. This would be an important extension of our current findings. It would help us to separate out the proportion of extracted elements that provide information for the various ontology learning tasks (e.g. synonym, concept and relationship extraction). In designing the present study, we elected to exclude this determination. We reasoned that the human annotation of MMTs essentially eliminated uninformative extraction. Future evaluations of automated LSP extraction will provide a more appropriate setting for assessing the relative value of LSP matching across the ontology learning tasks.
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