A machine learning approach for automating review of a RxNorm medication mapping pipeline output

Matthias Hüser[1], John Doole[1], Vinicius Pinho[1], Hossein Rouhizadeh[2], Douglas Teodoro[2], Ahson Saiyed[1], and Matvey B. Palchuk[1]

[1]TriNetX LLC, 100 Cambridgepark Dr #501, 02140 Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States
[2]Department of Radiology and Medical Informatics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, 4 rue Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

April 6, 2025

Abstract

Medication mapping to standardized terminologies is an important prerequisite for performing analytics on a federated EHR network. TriNetX LLC operates the largest such network in the world. Here we report on a novel pipeline, called `RxEmbed`, for the mapping and binding of local medication descriptions to RxNorm ingredient codes, using LLMs, and automated mapping review using machine learning. Performance of `RxEmbed` was assessed in a public data set from France as well as 6 Healthcare Organizations from the TriNetX federated EHR network across the United States and Brazil. On the public data set, `RxEmbed` outperformed two recently reported LLM-based baselines in terms of recall, and precision of generated mappings. In TriNetX network data, `RxEmbed` obtained RxNorm mapping recalls of 84-93 %, at a precision of 99.5-100 %. We built and evaluated a LLM-based medication mapping pipeline, that binds local medication descriptions from EHR systems to RxNorm ingredient codes. The high precision of the pipeline output implies very limited need for human review of the generated mappings.

1 Introduction

Background

In the context of a federated electronic health record (EHR)-derived clinical data network, such as the one operated by TriNetX LLC [11, 15], it is of key importance to harmonize medication information to a common standard, so that data can be queried for cohort identification [19] and research. Faced with a large number of sites that are added to the network continuously, it is desirable to partially automate the task of code mapping, such as medications to a standard terminology using their descriptions. Beyond this specific need at TriNetX, the task of harmonizing medication data to a common standard is encountered in a variety of settings in the community. With the advent of large language models, such as GPT4o [2] or Llama [16], it is an open question how to leverage them for automating the mapping of medications, and the review of such mappings.

Objective

We address the task of mapping local medication codes and associated descriptions to RxNorm [10], focusing specifically on ingredient codes. When codes are already delivered in a standard commercial or national terminology, mapping by code is preferable, and subsequently re-using the resulting mapping across the sites using the same terminology. However, mapping by code is not always possible as many sites use local coding systems. In these cases, we focused on the task of *mapping by description*, where a Natural Language Processing (NLP) approach–such as the one proposed here–is required. A key challenge is the need for extensive manual review that is typically required after generating candidate mappings [21].

2 Related work

Medical concept extraction and normalization (MCN) [19] is a classical task in the field of NLP for clinical content. For generating RxNorm bindings, most proposed toolkits use regular expression and dictionary matching approaches [8, 14, 17, 18]. In a recent MCN challenge, combinations of dictionary matching, word embeddings, cosine distance, and retrieve-and-rank techniques [4, 7] were used. Large language models have been previously used independently to assign standard codes to clinical narratives in German [1] or related tasks such as clinical phenotyping [6]. To our knowledge, a pipeline for mapping descriptions specifically to RxNorm ingredient codes with both LLM and machine learning components has not been reported in the literature, although some more general frameworks recently appeared [9]. Recent studies found that the use of LLMs for MCN is not as straightforward as expected and faces several limitations. One example is fragility to substitutions of generics with brand names, when the model has to recognize brand and generic drug names as equivalent [5]. In a recent work a high sensitivity of LLMs to surface-level text variations, such as minor wording and formatting change was shown [13].

3 Methods



Figure 1: Overview of the components of the `RxEmbed` pipeline and the data flow through the pipeline from the local medication descriptions to the generated RxNorm mappings.

Input and outputs of the pipeline

Local medication codes and the associated descriptions, provided by a healthcare organization (HCO), are given as input to the pipeline. Since the codes themselves carry no semantic meaning, the pipeline relies on the descriptions to generate candidate mappings to RxNorm ingredient codes. The output of the pipeline is a set of proposed mappings of local codes to RxNorm ingredient codes. These mappings can then be used to harmonize medication data from the respective HCO and be included in the TriNetX platform.

Partial translation of medication descriptions

A partial translation step is performed only if the descriptions are not in English, which is the canonical language for the pipeline. For partial translation, we use `GPT4o` with a custom prompt. Hereby the model is instructed to leave untranslatable tokens such as medication brand names or numeric specifications unmodified.

Description category prediction

Based on our observation that a sizable proportion of the local descriptions do not actually refer to medications, but durable medical equipment, nutritional supplements or vaccines, we developed a multi-category classifier, that predicts the entity type denoted by the description. As machine learning features we use OpenAI `text-embedding-small` embeddings of the input descriptions (dimension 128). Data sets of local descriptions from TriNetX's HCO network with examples of each category were hand-curated, providing the labels for machine learning. A gradient-boosting multi-category classifier is trained using `LightGBM` to place each new medication descriptions into one of the 5 classes:

- Strategic medication: A medication of key importance, such as drugs that appear frequently in cohort definitions, recently approved medications, and others.
- Other medication: All other medications.
- Fluid/Nutrition: Intravenous fluids and nutritional supplements and solutions, which have low relevance for patient cohort identification.
- Device/Procedure: Durable medical equipment or devices, potentially related to medication administration.
- Vaccines.

For the purpose of mapping to RxNorm, we focused on the first two categories. If a description is assigned to either 'Fluid/Nutrition', 'Device/Procedure' or 'Vaccine', these concepts are marked and handled via separate mechanism, outside of the scope of this pipeline.

Semantic entity extraction

Medication entity extraction aims to extract entities from local descriptions which are candidates for binding to RxNorm ingredient codes. Separate prompts are passed to `GPT4o` and used to extract comma-separated lists of (1) ingredient tokens, as well as (2) medication brand name tokens from the input description.

Expansion of brand name tokens to ingredients

As some medication descriptions might only contain brand names and lack explicit mentions of ingredients, in this step, a `GPT4o` prompt is used to expand brand name into ingredients. As context, we also pass the name of the country, from which the medication description originates as an argument to the prompt. To increase robustness and minimize LLM hallucinations, we use a second `GPT4o` prompt, that validates that predicted ingredients are indeed contained in a medication of the given brand. In some countries, hand-curated datasets are available that map medication brand names to their corresponding ingredients. For these countries, in addition to the `GPT4o`-based strategy, we created a nearest neighbour search index of brand names using OpenAI `text-embedding-small` embeddings, and when encountering a brand token, search in this index. If the retrieved brand name has a normalized Damerau-Levenshtein distance [3] of less than 0.5, the list of predicted ingredients is extended with this set.

Binding of search terms to RxNorm ingredient codes

Voting ensemble approach. For binding of brand name tokens and extracted ingredients, which could be a token of the original string, or an ingredient predicted in the expansion step, we use four different sources of RxNorm mappings, which are combined in a voting approach: historical mappings, RxNorm's Approximate Term API, Averbis text analysis pipeline, and nearest neighbor search using RxNorm embeddings.

Historical mappings. Historical mappings refers to the continuously evolving proprietary mappings database of local medication codes to RxNorm. Note that these mappings can be generated by this pipeline, but can also be generated by other means, such as mapping with code conversion tables supplied by the HCOs or using national terminology mappings and other methods. The descriptions of historical mappings are embedded using OpenAI `text-embedding-small` to vectors of dimension 128. We use the translated description to perform a nearest neighbor search in the set of historical mappings, on which a Open AI-based `text-embedding-small` index has been pre-computed. The five nearest neighbors are returned and accepted if the normalized Daverau-Levenshtein distance [3] of the description of the historical mapping and the search description is less than 0.5.

Approximate Term API. A local version of the Approximate Term API endpoint of RxNav [20] is used as a source for RxNorm code bindings. Extracted ingredient tokens and predicted ingredients are used as input `terms` to the API endpoint. Returned candidates are scanned in descending order of Approximate Term API match score, and the top candidate with term type of ingredient (`IN`), precise ingredient (`PIN`), or multi-ingredient (`MIN`) is used as a tentative match. `PIN` and `MIN` terms are subsequently normalized to `IN` terms. We compute the normalized Damerau-Levenshtein distance [3] between the target string, i.e., an ingredient description and the RxCUI description, and reject all tentative matches with a distance greater than 0.5.

Averbis text analysis pipeline. Another component is a proprietary text analysis pipeline provided by the Averbis (Averbis GmbH, Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany) Health Discovery NLP solution [12]. As input to the pipeline only the search term, either a brand name token, or an extracted ingredient is passed. We compute the normalized Damerau-Levenshtein distance [3] between the target string and the RxCUI description, and reject all tentative matches with a distance greater than 0.5.

RxNorm embedding and nearest neighbor search. A library of RxCUI ingredient code description embeddings is pre-computed with the OpenAI `text-embedding-small` model (embedding dimension of 128). For each input description string, a nearest neighbor search is performed to identify the closest neighbor in the index of embedded RxCUI descriptions. Like the previous method, the normalized Damerau-Levenshtein distance [3] between the target string and the RxCUI description is computed. Tentative matches with a distance of greater than 0.5 are rejected.

Pre-review of ingredient mappings with GPT4o

Mappings proposed by at least one of the mapping sources in the voting ensemble are pre-reviewed by a `GPT4o` prompt to evaluate their medical plausibility. We pass the (potentially) translated local description of the medication, the description of generated RxCUI ingredient code, the country where the medication observation originated, as well as the *evidence score*. The evidence score is between 1 and 4 and refers to the number of mapping sources (Approximate Term API, Averbis text analysis pipeline, Historical mapping, RxNorm embedding nearest neighbor search) that produced the same mapping. Given this information, the prompt requests `GPT4o` to output a score between 0 and 10, where higher scores should denote a higher likelihood of mapping correctness.

Prediction of human review using OpenAI Embeddings and LightGBM

A key component of our pipeline is a probabilistic classifier, that assesses whether a mapping of a local description to a RxCUI description is correct. For machine learning, we create a feature vector by stacking two 128 dimensional embeddings, one of the local description and one of the RxCUI description, generated using an OpenAI-based `text-embedding-small` model, and combine it with 7 additional features: 4 binary indicator variables that represent which of the 4 methods in the voting

ensemble agreed on the mapping, the `GPT4o`-based pre-review score, the ingredient count (the number of ingredient mappings that were produced for a given local description), as well as a categorical variable of the country from which the medication description originated. The machine learning labels were provided by human review of a set of generated mappings ($n = 2551$ from 2 HCOs in Brazil, $n = 9621$ from 2 HCO in the United States, each evaluated by two Medical Informatics experts from Brazil, and the USA, respectively), assigning a label of 1 if the RxCUI mapping is correct, and 0 if it is incorrect. Finally a LightGBM-based binary classifier was trained to return the probability that a tentative mapping is correct. These probabilities were post-hoc calibrated using isotonic regression. We consider RxNorm mappings with a predicted probability of 1 to be correct in the final output of our pipeline, because we wanted to maximize precision of the mappings.

Evaluation metrics

We define recall as the proportion of local medication codes which have a correct RxNorm ingredient (IN) CUI mapping in the output of the pipeline. If `MIN` ingredient codes are in the gold standard (evaluation on the public data set), the definition of recall requires all related `IN` codes to be produced. Precision is defined as the proportion of generated mappings that are correct. The F1-score is the harmonic mean of the recall and precision.

4 Results

Performance in public Med-UCD data set from France

To evaluate the performance of our pipeline, we compare its output with the Med-UCD (French Unite Commune de Dispensation) data set, as preprocessed by Rouhizadeh et al. [13]. Med-UCD contains local medication descriptions that are assigned to the correct RxNorm ingredient code. If the term type of this code is `MIN` we require the models to either produce the exact `MIN` code or all of the related `IN` RxCUIs, for defining the evaluation metric recall. 10 example descriptions from the data set are displayed in Table 1. We compare against the two best performing models benchmarked by Rouhizadeh et al. [13] (Table 2). To achieve a fair comparison between all methods, we exclude samples in the data set with an exact match in a lookup database, such as UMLS for the baselines or RxNorm description/Historical DB for `RxEmbed`. This yielded 2,612 unique evaluation terms.

Medication description	**RxNorm Code**	**RxNorm Desc**
zolmitriptan, zomig 2,5mg cpr nsfp	135775	zolmitriptan
metformine, metformine isd 850mg cpr	6809	metformin
betamethasone, celestene 4 mg sol inj	1514	betamethasone
abacavir/lam myp600/300mg cp	614534	abacavir / lamivudine
silodosine, urorec 4 mg gelule	720825	silodosin
iode, ultravist 18.5g sol inj	27781	iopromide
fluticasone, avamys 27,5 microg/pulv susp nasale	705022	fluticasone furoate
potassium, potassium chl mrm 15% inj 10ml nsfp	8591	potassium chloride
memantine, memantine bga 20 mg cpr	6719	memantine
losartan, cozaar 2,5 mg/ml pdr et sol buv	52175	losartan

Table 1: Example of 10 pairs of local medication description, RxNorm codes and their descriptions randomly sampled from the French Med-UCD data set (n=2,612)

Performance on TriNetX HCOs from the United States

From TriNetX's network of HCOs in the US, we have selected 3 HCOs, each from a different census region of the country. They were selected because their medication data was not represented by a standard terminology where we could perform a code-to-code mapping, and required to be mapped by drug name. Each organization had unique subjective characteristics in their medication descriptions, and differed regarding their mix of brand and generic medications, number of tokens, and string length. Example descriptions from the data set are displayed in Table 4. We applied `RxEmbed` to

Model	F1-score	Recall (Sample size)	Precision (Sample size)
RxEmbed (ours)	**90.9** %	**88.9** % (n=2612)	**92.9** % (n=2566)
e5 (Baseline [13])	83.3 %	83.3 % (n=2612)	83.3 % (n=2612)
BioMistral (Baseline [13])	84.9 %	84.9 % (n=2612)	84.9 % (n=2612)

Table 2: Performance of `RxEmbed` in the public dataset Med-UCD for generating RxNorm ingredient mappings, compared with two baselines, as described by Rouhizadeh et al. [13]. Proposed mappings were evaluated by comparing against the gold standard RxNorm mappings contained in the data set. Sample size refers to the number of local descriptions, for recall, and the number of mappings, for precision, that were assessed.

the local descriptions originating from each HCO. The resulting mappings were then reviewed by an expert in medical informatics and pharmacology from the United States, and then evaluated for recall and precision, as defined above (Table 3).

HCO	F1-score	Recall (Sample size)	Precision (Sample size)
HCO US 1	95.2 %	91.2 % (n=944)	99.6 % (n=515)
HCO US 2	93.0 %	87.4 % (n=534)	99.3 % (n=610)
HCO US 3	95.7 %	92.6 % (n=1,000)	99.1 % (n=461)

Table 3: Performance of `RxEmbed` in the TriNetX data set of medication description/codes gathered from 3 HCOs in the United States. The mappings were manually reviewed to assess recall/precision. Sample size refers to the number of local descriptions, for recall, and the number of mappings, for precision, that were assessed.

Medication description	HCO
HYDROCODONE-APAP-DIETARY PROD 5-500 MG PO MISC	US 1
AMINOPHYLLINE MAINTENANCE INFUSION	US 1
FENTANYL/BUPIVACAINE EPIDURAL INFUSION/100ML	US 1
METHYLPREDNISOLONE SODIUM SUCC INFUSION (SPINAL CORD INJURY PROTOCOL)	US 2
CLINDAMYCIN/TOBRAMYCIN SULFATE 300-80 MG/1000 ML NASAL IRRIGATION (COMPOUNDED)	US 2
MORPHINE SULFATE (PF) 1 MG/ML NEUROAXIAL PERI-PROCEDURAL	US 2
chlorpheniramine/dextromethorp/phenylephrine 2 mg-10 mg-5 mg/5 mL oral liquid	US 3
SEROquel XR 300 mg oral tablet, extended release:::Seroquel XR 300 mg oral tablet, extended release	US 3
Eloctate with Fc Fusion Protein (obsolete) recombinant intravenous powder for injection (obsolete1)	US 3
DEXCLORFENIRAMINA 2MG/5ML 120ML XPE	Brazil 1
INSULINA REGULAR HUMANA 100UI/ML INJ 10ML	Brazil 1
ONDANSETRONA 4MG/2ML INJ	Brazil 1
ABRAXANE FA 100 MG	Brazil 2
FAULDFLUOR 2.500MG/50ML - FA	Brazil 2
PROGRAF CAP 1 MG (R)	Brazil 2
DIPIRONA SODICA 500MG/ML AMPOLA 2ML	Brazil 3
TRAMAL 100MG AMP 2ML	Brazil 3
CLEXANE 40MG INJ. SERINGA 04ML (MAV)	Brazil 3

Table 4: Example of local medication descriptions from the 3 selected HCOs in TriNetX's network in the US, and the 3 selected HCOs in TriNetX's network in Brazil.

Performance on TriNetX HCOs from Brazil

From TriNetX's network of HCOs in Brazil, we have selected 3 HCOs, a general cancer center from the Northeast Region, a general hospital from the Southeast region, and a Hospital Network/Chain over 10 units. The nature of the local medication descriptions differed slightly. Whereas HCO Brazil 1 had mainly drug names and oncology compounds, HCO Brazil 2 used mostly product/brand names. Finally, HCO Brazil 3 contained a mixture of the above. Example descriptions from the data set are displayed in Table 4. We applied `RxEmbed` to local descriptions originating from each HCO. The resulting mappings were then reviewed by an expert in medical informatics and pharmacology from Brazil and evaluated in terms of recall and precision, as defined above (Table 5).

HCO	F1-score	Recall (Sample size)	Precision (Sample size)
HCO Brazil 1	95.3 %	91.5 % (n=961)	99.5 % (n=402)
HCO Brazil 2	91.9 %	85.0 % (n=1245)	100.0 % (n=303)
HCO Brazil 3	91.1 %	84.0 % (n=2000)	99.5 % (n=428)

Table 5: Performance of `RxEmbed` in the TriNetX data set of medication description/codes gathered from 3 HCOs in Brazil. The mappings were manually reviewed to assess recall/precision. Sample size refers to the number of local descriptions, for recall, and the number of mappings, for precision, that were assessed.

5 Discussion

We built and evaluated a novel LLM-based medication mapping pipeline, which we call `RxEmbed`, that binds local medication descriptions from EHR systems to RxNorm ingredient codes. Such an approach has to be used when the coding systems used to represent medication data are not directly mappable to standard terminologies such as RxNorm by code. Harmonizing all medication data to a uniform standard, in this case RxNorm, is crucial for a seamless operation of a global federated network of EHR data such as TriNetX.

Our pipeline supports entity extraction from medication descriptions, binding to RxNorm ingredient codes, fulfilling a critical operational need for scalable, automated mapping review. This ML-based automation is the novel component of the pipeline. It reduces the manual effort required to review the output of a mapping pipeline, which can be very resource-intensive when mapping tens of thousands of distinct medication concepts.

When comparing the performance of the pipeline between medication data in English (USA) and Portuguese (Brazil), it is apparent that while recall is quite high in all 6 evaluated sites, the recall for US sites (87-93 %) is slightly higher than the recall for Brazilian sites (84-92 %). This could be due to various factors: (1) translation from Portuguese to English has to be performed, which could introduce errors; (2) increased difficulty when recognizing Brazilian brand names, both in large language models, and for NLP methods such as Approximate Term API and Averbis' HealthDiscovery; and (3) the target terminology RxNorm being US-centric, which favors the use of the pipeline for drugs on US market. The precision, as evaluated by hand-reviewing generated mappings for internal TriNetX data, was very close to 100 % for our pipeline, but was slightly reduced (93 %) for the French Med-UCD data set. This is likely due in part to characteristics of the Med-UCD dataset, which, as we noted, may occasionally miss appropriate IN codes in the gold standard, since each description is linked to only one RxCUI.

This work has some limitations. Certain experiments were performed with proprietary TriNetX data from US and Brazil. However, we also obtained results on the mapping of the public data set Med-UCD from France, which allowed us to compare the recall/precision performance of our pipeline to other models and approaches. Ultimately, performance was assessed for data from three different countries in three different languages. In future work, the pipeline should also be assessed for data from other countries, including, for example, Japan and Taiwan, where obtaining the correct, information-preserving translation of native descriptions is challenging.

6 Conclusion

We built and evaluated a LLM-based medication mapping pipeline, that binds local medication descriptions from EHR systems to RxNorm ingredient codes. The high precision of the pipeline output implies very limited need for human review of the generated mappings.

References

[1] Akhila Abdulnazar, Roland Roller, Stefan Schulz, and Markus Kreuzthaler. Large language models for clinical text cleansing enhance medical concept normalization. *IEEE Access*, 2024.

[2] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.

[3] Eric Brill and Robert C Moore. An improved error model for noisy channel spelling correction. In *Proceedings of the 38th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 286–293, 2000.

[4] Long Chen, Wenbo Fu, Yu Gu, Zhiyong Sun, Haodan Li, Enyu Li, Li Jiang, Yuan Gao, and Yang Huang. Clinical concept normalization with a hybrid natural language processing system combining multilevel matching and machine learning ranking. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(10):1576–1584, 2020.

[5] Jack Gallifant, Shan Chen, Pedro Moreira, Nikolaj Munch, Mingye Gao, Jackson Pond, Leo Anthony Celi, Hugo Aerts, Thomas Hartvigsen, and Danielle Bitterman. Language models are surprisingly fragile to drug names in biomedical benchmarks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12066*, 2024.

[6] Tudor Groza, Harry Caufield, Dylan Gration, Gareth Baynam, Melissa A Haendel, Peter N Robinson, Christopher J Mungall, and Justin T Reese. An evaluation of gpt models for phenotype concept recognition. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 24(1):30, 2024.

[7] Sam Henry, Yanshan Wang, Feichen Shen, and Ozlem Uzuner. The 2019 national natural language processing (nlp) clinical challenges (n2c2)/open health nlp (ohnlp) shared task on clinical concept normalization for clinical records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA*, 27(10):1529–1537, 2020.

[8] Min Jiang, Yonghui Wu, Anushi Shah, Priyanka Priyanka, Joshua C Denny, and Hua Xu. Extracting and standardizing medication information in clinical text–the medex-uima system. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings*, 2014:37, 2014.

[9] João Matos, Jack Gallifant, Jian Pei, and A Ian Wong. Ehrmonize: A framework for medical concept abstraction from electronic health records using large language models. In *International Workshop on Applications of Medical AI*, pages 210–220. Springer, 2024.

[10] Stuart J Nelson, Kelly Zeng, John Kilbourne, Tammy Powell, and Robin Moore. Normalized names for clinical drugs: Rxnorm at 6 years. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 18(4):441–448, 2011.

[11] Matvey B Palchuk, Jack W London, David Perez-Rey, Zuzanna J Drebert, Jessamine P Winer-Jones, Courtney N Thompson, John Esposito, and Brecht Claerhout. A global federated real-world data and analytics platform for research. *JAMIA open*, 6(2):ooad035, 2023.

[12] Roman Michael Pokora, Lucian Le Cornet, Philipp Daumke, Peter Mildenberger, Hajo Zeeb, and Maria Blettner. Validation of semantic analyses of unstructured medical data for research purposes. *Das Gesundheitswesen*, 82(S 02):S158–S164, 2020.

[13] Hossein Rouhizadeh, Anthony Yazdani, Boya Zhang, David Vicente Alvarez, Matthias Hüser, Alexandre Vanobberghen, Rui Yang, Irene Li, Andreas Walter, and Douglas Teodoro. Large language models struggle to encode medical concepts — a multilingual benchmarking and comparative analysis. *medRxiv*, 2025.

[14] Sunghwan Sohn, Cheryl Clark, Scott R Halgrim, Sean P Murphy, Christopher G Chute, and Hongfang Liu. Medxn: an open source medication extraction and normalization tool for clinical text. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 21(5):858–865, 2014.

[15] Umit Topaloglu and Matvey B Palchuk. Using a federated network of real-world data to optimize clinical trials operations. *JCO clinical cancer informatics*, 2:1–10, 2018.

[16] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.

[17] Riley Waters, Sarah Malecki, Sharan Lail, Denise Mak, Sudipta Saha, Hae Young Jung, Mohammed Arshad Imrit, Fahad Razak, and Amol A Verma. Automated identification of unstandardized medication data: a scalable and flexible data standardization pipeline using rxnorm on gemini multicenter hospital data. *JAMIA open*, 6(3):ooad062, 2023.

[18] Hannah L Weeks, Cole Beck, Elizabeth McNeer, Michael L Williams, Cosmin A Bejan, Joshua C Denny, and Leena Choi. medextractr: A targeted, customizable approach to medication extraction from electronic health records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(3):407–418, 2020.

[19] Hua Xu, Dina Demner Fushman, Na Hong, and Kalpana Raja. Medical concept normalization. In *Natural Language Processing in Biomedicine: A Practical Guide*, pages 137–164. Springer, 2024.

[20] Kelly Zeng, Olivier Bodenreider, John Kilbourne, and Stuart J Nelson. Rxnav: a web service for standard drug information. In *AMIA annual symposium proceedings*, volume 2006, page 1156, 2006.

[21] Li Zhou, Joseph M Plasek, Lisa M Mahoney, Frank Y Chang, Dana DiMaggio, and Roberto A Rocha. Mapping partners master drug dictionary to rxnorm using an nlp-based approach. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 45(4):626–633, 2012.