Combining Token Classification With Large Language Model Revision for Age-Friendly 4M Entity Recognition From Nursing Home Text Messages: Development and Evaluation Study

Authors:

- Philip Amewudah, Institute for Data Science and Informatics, University of Missouri, Columbia, Columbia, USA
- Dr. Mihail Popescu, Department of Biomedical Informatics, Biostatistics and Medical Epidemiology, University of Missouri School of Medicine, Columbia, USA
- Dr. Matthew S. Farmer, School of Nursing, University of Missouri, Columbia, Columbia, USA
- Dr. Kimberly R. Powell, Sinclair School of Nursing, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, USA

Corresponding Author:
Philip Amewudah
University of Missouri, Columbia
Institute of Data Science and Informatics
22 Heinkel Building
Columbia, MO 65211
pagd2@umsystem.edu
+15043468405

ORCID IDs
Philip Amewudah (PA): 0000-0003-3411-6143
Mihail Popescu (MP): 0000-0002-6145-8096
Matthew S. Farmer (MF): 0000-0003-0989-2968
Kimberly R. Powell (KP): 0000-0002-6144-1438

Abstract

Background: Secure text messages (TMs) exchanged among interdisciplinary care teams in nursing homes (NHs) contain clinical information that aligns with the Age-Friendly Health Systems 4Ms: What **M**atters, **M**edication, **M**entation, and **M**obility, yet, this information is not captured in any structured form, making it unavailable for systematic monitoring or quality reporting. Automatically extracting 4M information accurately and efficiently from these messages could enable several downstream applications within long term care settings. This task, however, is challenging because of the fragmented syntax, brevity, abbreviations, and informality of TMs.

Objective: This study aimed to develop and evaluate a multi-stage 4M Entity Recognition (4M-ER) pipeline that combines a fine-tuned token classifier with large language model (LLM) revision, using only locally deployed open-source models, to improve 4M information extraction from clinical TMs.

Methods: We used an expert-annotated dataset of 1,169 TMs collected from interdisciplinary teams across 16 Midwest NHs. The pipeline first identifies candidate text spans using a fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT token classifier. A semantic similarity retriever then selects in-context exemplars to guide an LLM revision in which the LLM (Gemma, Phi, Qwen, or Mistral) performs boundary correction, label evaluation, and selective acceptance or rejection of candidate spans. Baselines for comparison included single-stage zero-shot LLMs, single-stage fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT, and a fine-tuned LLM (Gemma) from a prior study. Ablation studies assessed the contribution of each pipeline stage and the effect of message filtering. Robustness was evaluated across 5 repeated runs.

Results: The 4M-ER pipeline outperformed the previously fine-tuned Gemma LLM across all 4M domains, achieving F_1 (entity type) improvements of +2 to +11 percentage points without any additional fine-tuning and at roughly half the GPU memory (12 vs 24 GB). It also improved upon single-stage fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT in Mobility, Mentation, and What Matters (+0.02 to +0.05 F_1). Error analysis showed that LLM revision reduced false positives by 25% to 35% by correcting misclassifications caused by conversational ambiguity, while the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT's high recall captured subtle entities that the fine-tuned Gemma missed. Silver data augmentation further improved the hardest domains, raising What Matters F_1 from 0.59 to 0.67 and Mobility from 0.64 to 0.67. Ablation studies confirmed that restricting LLMs to revision only yielded optimal accuracy and efficiency.

Conclusions: The 4M-ER pipeline enables accurate and scalable extraction of 4M entities from clinical TMs by combining fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT with LLM revision using only locally deployed open-source models. The structured 4M data produced by the pipeline can support 4M taxonomy and ontology construction, as demonstrated in the prior work, and provides a foundation for downstream applications including real-time clinical surveillance, compliance with emerging age-friendly quality measures, and predictive modeling in long-term care settings.

Keywords: Natural Language Processing; Named Entity Recognition; Text Messaging; Large Language Models; Age-Friendly Health Systems; Nursing Homes; Long-Term Care; Information Extraction; Nursing Informatics

Introduction

Nursing home care teams generate a continuous stream of clinically relevant information through secure text messages (TMs), yet almost none of it is captured in a form that can be monitored, aggregated, or reported, to the best of our knowledge. These TMs, exchanged through encrypted mobile platforms that support asynchronous coordination among nurses, physicians, therapists, and other staff [1,2], contain real-time observations about symptom changes, medication issues, cognitive status, mobility concerns, and resident or family preferences [3]. Much of this content maps directly to the 4M Age-Friendly Health Systems (AFHS) framework, which organizes care around 4 domains: What **M**atters, **M**edication, **M**entation, and **M**obility [4,5]. The 4M framework has been widely adopted in nursing homes (NHs) and other long-term care (LTC) settings to guide clinical decision-making and quality improvement [6,7].

The problem is not that this 4M information is absent from care team communication; it is that the information is scattered across large volumes of conversational text and disappears after being read by the immediate recipient. No current system aggregates a resident's 4M status across messages or makes this information available for compliance reporting under emerging quality measures such as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Age-Friendly Hospital Measure. Automated extraction [8,9] could transform these informal communications into structured data that supports real-time clinical surveillance, care coordination and other downstream task like 4M taxonomy and ontology construction, as demonstrated in prior work [10]. However, the brevity, informality, and fragmented syntax of TMs make extraction challenging, requiring advanced Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques [11].

NLP methods for clinical information extraction have advanced substantially in recent years. Named Entity Recognition (NER), the task of identifying and classifying clinical concepts in text, has become a foundational technique [12], and transformer-based architectures, particularly Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) and its domain-specific variants like Bio-ClinicalBERT, have achieved state-of-the-art NER performance on medical corpora [13–15]. More recently, large language models (LLMs) have shown significant promise for clinical extraction tasks [16]. Agrawal et al [17] demonstrated that few-shot LLM prompting can extract spans and relations from clinical notes, Hu et al [18] found that open-source LLMs achieve accuracy comparable to transformer encoders with greater contextual reasoning, and Guevara et al [19] used an LLM to identify social determinants of health from electronic health record (EHR) narratives. A particularly relevant line of work has explored using LLMs not as standalone extractors but as correctors that refine encoder outputs. Sivarajkumar et al [20] proposed a 2-stage pipeline in which an LLM corrector applies domain rules to finalize cardiovascular event extractions, and Sreenivas et al [21] showed that coupling a retrieval-augmented LLM with a fine-tuned BERT extractor improved clinical NER by correcting span boundaries and resolving ambiguous entities. These studies establish the feasibility of encoder-LLM pipelines for clinical extraction, but none have applied this approach to the 4M framework.

Regarding 4M-specific extraction, most studies have targeted individual domains rather than all 4Ms collectively: medication change events from clinical notes [14], cognitive concerns and delirium indicators [22,23], and individual Mobility and What Matters concepts [24,25]. While the prior work by Farmer et al [10] and Powell et al [26]

explored joint identification of 4M entities from clinical TMs, their approaches face limitations related to the high computational cost of LLM fine-tuning and performance variability with traditional classification methods [27]. No other existing approach jointly extracts all 4Ms from conversational TMs using a more computationally efficient framework.

To address this gap, this study introduces the 4M Entity Recognition (4M-ER) pipeline, a multi-stage framework designed to extract all 4M entities from clinical TMs accurately and efficiently. The key idea is to pair a high-recall encoder with LLM-based revision: the encoder identifies candidate entities from each message, a semantic retriever selects in-context exemplars from training annotations to guide the LLM, and the LLM reviews, refines, and finalizes the extracted entities. A message filtering strategy passes only TMs with candidate spans to the LLM, reducing computational overhead. We evaluate the 4M-ER pipeline against 3 baselines (zero-shot LLMs, standalone fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT, and a fine-tuned Gemma LLM from prior work [10]), conduct ablation studies to isolate the contribution of each pipeline stage, and assess computational efficiency and robustness across repeated runs. The goal is a framework that can convert the 4M information already flowing through NH communication channels into structured data suitable for clinical surveillance, quality reporting, data standardization and predictive modeling.

Methods

Dataset and Annotation

From a corpus of TMs exchanged through a HIPAA-compliant communication platform [1] used for resident care coordination among interdisciplinary NH teams, 1,169 messages were selected and annotated as the ground truth for this study under a University of Missouri IRB-approved protocol. These are the same TMs used in the previous study on automatic 4M taxonomy development [10], reused here with the same annotation protocol for pipeline development and evaluation. Messages averaged approximately 17 words (SD 22.5) and reflected typical real-time clinical coordination in long-term care. For algorithm development, the dataset was first split into ~75% for training and validation and ~25% for testing (Table 1). Out of the training-validation set, ~15% was set aside for validation.

Table 1. Distribution of the ground truth dataset. Values represent the number (%) of messages containing at least 1 entity of the specified type.

	Training-Validation dataset (n=860)	Testing dataset (n=309)
Medication	144 (16.7%)	97 (31.4%)
Mentation	48 (5.6%)	27 (8.7%)
Mobility	55 (6.4%)	30 (9.7%)
What Matters	147 (17.1%)	65 (21.0%)
At least one 4M	290 (33.7%)	162 (52.4%)

A 4M annotation scheme aligned with the AFHS definitions was used to create the ground truth. Each TM was annotated by 2 clinical researchers with expertise in gerontology and nursing informatics for 1 or more of the following entity types:

Figure 1. Overview of the 4M-ER pipeline. The system integrates (1) a fine-tuned token classifier for high-recall candidate span identification, (2) a semantic retriever that selects in-context exemplar spans from training annotations, and (3) an LLM revision prompt that performs boundary correction, label evaluation, and final acceptance or rejection of spans. The example message (right) shows how initial spans from the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT are refined into final 4M entities after LLM revision. TM: text message; ICL: in-context learning.



- What Matters: references to patient or family goals, preferences, or care priorities.
- Medication: mentions of specific drugs, doses, routes, or administration concerns.
- Mentation: indicators of mood, cognition, delirium, or mental status.
- Mobility: descriptions of movement, transfers, falls, or ambulation capability.

Each message could contain multiple entities across 4M domains. For example, the TM *"Still in bed with periods of restlessness. Irregular heartbeat continues. Responding to verbal and verbal stimuli at this time"* was annotated with the entities ("responding", Mentation), ("verbal stimuli", Mentation), ("restlessness", Mobility), and ("in bed", Mobility). After independent annotation, discrepancies were reviewed collaboratively and resolved through discussion. For instance, in the message *"She is a DNR. She has DX of HTN and other symbolic dysfunction,"* Annotator A labeled "symbolic dysfunction" as

Mentation whereas Annotator B did not; following discussion, both agreed to include it under Mentation.
Cohen κ was computed for each 4M domain across the training and validation TMs (n=860). Disagreements occurred in 28 Medication, 25 Mentation, 40 Mobility, and 93 What Matters instances, yielding almost perfect agreement for Medication (κ=0.89) and substantial agreement for Mentation (κ=0.73), Mobility (κ=0.61), and What Matters (κ=0.62), based on the Landis and Koch interpretive scale.
In the training-validation set, 16.7% of TMs contained Medication mentions, 17.1% contained What Matters, 5.6% contained Mentation, and 6.4% contained Mobility; 33.7% of training-validation messages contained at least 1 entity, while the test set had a higher 4M concentration (52.4%). Before processing, TMs were cleaned by removing nonstandard elements such as emojis and unknown characters. Stop words were retained to preserve the semantic meaning of extracted information spans.

The 4M-ER Pipeline

The 4M-ER pipeline comprises 3 sequential stages: (1) a fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT model performs token-level classification to identify candidate 4M entities, (2) a semantic retriever selects in-context exemplars from the ground truth annotations, and (3) an LLM reviser reviews and refines the candidate entities using these exemplars to produce the final 4M entities. An overview is shown in Figure 1.

Stage 1: Candidate Entity Extraction With Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT

The first stage used Bio-ClinicalBERT [28,29], a bidirectional transformer pretrained on biomedical and clinical corpora, fine-tuned on the ground truth dataset for 4M entity recognition. Input messages were tokenized with WordPiece encoding, and each token was labeled using the BIO (Begin, Inside, Outside) tagging scheme: B-XXX marks the beginning of a 4M entity, I-XXX its continuation, and O tokens outside any entity, where XXX denotes the 4M category (Medication, Mentation, Mobility, or What Matters). Because WordPiece splits some words into subword tokens (eg, “restlessness” becomes [‘restless’, ‘##ness’]), subword tokens were aligned with their parent word’s BIO label to ensure consistent annotation. Fine-tuning hyperparameters included a learning rate of 1×10^{-5}, batch size of 2, and up to 20 epochs, with the best model selected based on recall performance on the validation dataset.
During inference, only messages containing at least 1 predicted 4M entity were passed forward for LLM revision. This filtering strategy reduced the number of messages requiring LLM review, as most TMs do not contain any 4M entity (Table 1).

Stage 2: In-Context Exemplar Retrieval

After the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT proposes candidate spans, a semantic retriever links each candidate to exemplar spans drawn from the training annotations. Candidates and exemplars are embedded using the same sentence-level encoder (all-MiniLM-L6-v2 [30]), and cosine similarity is computed to rank exemplars within each candidate’s 4M label set. Each candidate is embedded as the text span plus a short left and right context window. Exemplars are stored as minimal tuples (label, span text, start, end) with metadata structured to prevent test leakage. For each candidate, the retriever returns the top 3 exemplars ranked by similarity, with exact-match duplicates removed.

Textbox 1. LLM revision prompt for the 4M-ER pipeline.

```
You are the FINAL span reviser. Choose the best set of spans from ALL_CANDIDATES using the
SIMILAR GOLD EXAMPLES as guide. Think step by step.
IMPORTANT:
- You MUST keep all ANCHOR spans unless an anchor is clearly mislabeled or contradicted by
MESSAGE.
- If an ANCHOR span is mislabeled, assign the correct label.
- Please Combine immediately adjacent spans with the same label into one span.
- Final spans MUST be exact substrings of MESSAGE. No invention.
OVERLAP & DEDUP
- Duplicates are defined ONLY as OVERLAPPING spans (IoU>0.5). Do NOT drop repeated
mentions at different positions.
- No two candidates with origin='tagger' are duplicates.
- ONLY treat spans as duplicates if they overlap (IoU>0.5). If two spans are duplicates prefer
origin='tagger' and the minimal complete span.
LABEL SPANS DEFINITION:
{4M Definitions}
SIMILAR GOLD EXAMPLE SPANS:
{ICL Examples}
Return JSON ONLY and END with <END_JSON>:
{"final_spans": [ {"label": "what_matters|medication|mentation|mobility", "span": [start, end]}" ] }
ALL_CANDIDATES:
{Initial Spans from Token Classifier and LLM}
ANCHORS (high-confidence tagger spans to keep):
{High Confidence spans from Token Classifier}
MESSAGE:
"""{message}"""
```

Retrieved items are formatted as span-text-and-label pairs and injected into the revision prompt alongside the candidate list.

Stage 3: LLM Revision

In the final stage, decoder-based LLMs contextualize and refine the candidate spans. 4 instruction-tuned models deployable on local GPUs were evaluated: Gemma-2-9B-IT (approximately 9 billion parameters) [31], Phi-3-Medium-4K-Instruct (approximately 14 billion parameters) [32], Qwen-2.5-14B-Instruct (approximately 14 billion parameters) [33,34], and Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 (approximately 12 billion parameters) [35]. Each model received the original TM, the candidate spans from the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT, and the retrieved in-context exemplars.

A structured prompt (Textbox 1) instructed the LLM to review all candidate spans and determine the final set of entities. High-confidence spans (those with an average token-level classification probability from the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT >0.9) were retained unless clearly mislabeled or contradicted by the message context. Mislabeled spans were corrected rather than discarded, adjacent same-label spans were merged, and duplicates were removed. The LLM output a JSON record containing entity type, text span, start and end indices, and confidence score.

All LLMs were run locally using 4-bit quantization to conserve GPU memory. Greedy decoding (selecting the single most probable token at each generation step) was used for all revision steps to ensure deterministic, schema-conformant outputs. Stochastic sampling methods (eg, temperature scaling, top-p sampling) were avoided to minimize output variance and hallucinated entity boundaries. Due to the clinical content of the data, only locally deployable open-source models were permitted by our Institutional Review Board (see Ethical Considerations).

Baselines

3 baselines were used for comparison: (1) single-stage zero-shot prompting of each LLM for 4M extraction, using the prompt in Textbox A1 (Multimedia Appendix 1); (2) single-stage fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT without LLM revision; and (3) a fine-tuned Gemma model used as a single-stage generative extractor from the previous study [10].

Ablation Studies

Ablation studies assessed the contribution of each pipeline component by varying (1) the role of the LLM (initial span generation vs revision only), (2) inclusion or exclusion of an optional zero-shot LLM discovery step, and (3) the effect of message filtering based on the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT outputs. In the discovery step, the LLM could propose additional candidate spans beyond those identified by the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT using the zero-shot prompt in Textbox A1 (Multimedia Appendix 1).

Silver Data Augmentation

To evaluate whether the 4M-ER pipeline's performance could be improved with additional training data, we developed a silver labeling pipeline to generate weakly labeled examples from unlabeled TMs. The pipeline operates in 3 stages: (1) candidate extraction, where an LLM extractor (gpt-oss:20b, run locally via Ollama [36]), a deterministic lexical matcher, and the gold-trained fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT model independently propose candidate 4M spans; (2) adjudication, where the LLM classifies each candidate span as a valid 4M entity or not with a confidence score and evidence quote; and (3) skeptic review, where the LLM pass attempts to finally reject ambiguous labels. Only spans that maintained high confidence through both adjudication (≥0.75) and skeptic review (≥0.80) were retained, prioritizing precision over recall in the silver labels. This process produced additional 2,502 labeled messages from the TMs corpus, each filtered to contain at least 1 annotated entity.

Analysis of the silver dataset revealed a strong skew toward Medication entities (72.6% of entity tokens vs 61.7% in the gold data), with underrepresentation of Mentation, Mobility, and What Matters. To address this imbalance, we further filtered the silver dataset to retain only TMs where Medication entities comprised less than 50% of entity tokens. This reduced the silver training set from 2,502 to 636 examples, enriching the remaining data for underrepresented domains. The pre-trained Bio-ClinicalBERT was then fine-tuned using a 2-phase curriculum approach: Phase 1 fine-tuned the model on the filtered silver data for 5 epochs (learning rate 2×10^{-5}), and Phase 2 continued fine-tuning from the best Phase 1 checkpoint under the same fine-tuning configuration used for the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT in the stage 1 of the 4M-ER pipeline. Full details of the silver labeling pipeline and distribution analysis are provided in Multimedia Appendix 1.

Evaluation Metrics

Performance was evaluated using the entity-type (ent_type) metric for NER-related tasks [37]. This metric evaluates whether the predicted label matches the ground truth category while tolerating small variations in span boundaries, which are common in short, conversational text where precise boundary agreement is often impractical. A prediction is considered correct if the label matches the ground truth, regardless of whether the span boundaries are exact. For example, the predicted Mobility entity "wheelchair" is considered correct relative to the ground truth "uses wheelchair" (same label, overlapping span), whereas "going to church" predicted as What Matters is incorrect relative to "attending" (semantically different span). A detailed comparison of ent_type against strict, exact, and partial match metrics is provided in Table A1 (Multimedia Appendix 1). F_1 scores (harmonic mean of precision and recall) for ent_type matches were computed and used as the major metric for evaluation.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted under a University of Missouri IRB-approved protocol. The dataset consisted of deidentified secure TMs collected through a HIPAA-compliant communication platform. Due to the clinical content of the data, the IRB restricted the use of closed-source commercial models (eg, ChatGPT [38] or Claude [39]); accordingly, only locally deployable open-source models were used for all experiments. No direct patient contact or intervention was involved, and all analyses were performed on previously collected and deidentified data.

Implementation Environment

All experiments were run on a workstation with an NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU (24 GB VRAM), Intel i9 processor, and 128 GB RAM. The key software dependencies were Python (version 3.10.18), Torch (version 2.4.1), Transformers (version 4.56.2) for Bio-ClinicalBERT fine-tunings and LLM deployment of the 4M-ER pipeline, Nervaluate (version 0.2.0) for evaluation and Ollama (version 0.18.1) for LLM calling during the silver label creation. Runtime and memory efficiency were measured for each LLM configuration on the test set (6533 word tokens; mean 21.1 tokens per message). A random seed of 66 was fixed for reproducibility.

Results

What the Pipeline Produces: A Clinical Example

Before presenting quantitative results, we illustrate what the 4M-ER pipeline produces on a real TM from the test set:

"98.8, 154/92, 90, 18, 97% RA Res has had a condition change A&ox2 to speech clear able to make needs and wants known. leaning to the left side Perla hand grasps equal. Lcta resp even and unlabored no cough or SOB noted at this time. Res is unable to assist with standing we are having to use a sit to stand this am LLE NOTED weakness. Please advise"

The 4M-ER pipeline extracted the following entities: ("A&ox2 to speech clear", Mentation), ("wants known", What Matters), ("leaning to", Mobility), ("unable to assist with standing", Mobility), ("use a sit to stand", Mobility), ("weakness", Mobility). The gold standard annotations for this message were: ("A&Ox2", Mentation), ("leaning to the

left side", Mobility), ("unable to assist with standing", Mobility), ("sit to stand", Mobility), ("LLE noted weakness", Mobility).

Table 2. Extraction performance across 4M domains for all model configurations. Values are presented as precision / recall / F_1 (ent_type). Bold indicates the best F_1 per domain.

Configuration	Medication	Mentation	Mobility	What Matters
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT	0.77 / 0.83 / **0.80**	0.62 / 0.70 / 0.66	0.63 / 0.55 / 0.59	0.46 / 0.69 / 0.55
Gemma (Zero Shot)	0.36 / 0.47 / 0.41	0.07 / 0.20 / 0.10	0.08 / 0.08 / 0.08	0.10 / 0.19 / 0.13
Phi (Zero Shot)	0.34 / 0.23 / 0.27	0.16 / 0.23 / 0.19	0.15 / 0.08 / 0.11	0.28 / 0.17 / 0.22
Qwen (Zero Shot)	0.44 / 0.34 / 0.39	0.15 / 0.18 / 0.16	0.19 / 0.14 / 0.16	0.11 / 0.21 / 0.14
Mistral (Zero Shot)	0.38 / 0.36 / 0.37	0.07 / 0.18 / 0.10	0.12 / 0.12 / 0.12	0.08 / 0.20 / 0.12
4M-ER +[a] Gemma	0.80 / 0.80 / **0.80**	0.69 / 0.68 / 0.68	0.76 / 0.51 / 0.61	0.53 / 0.67 / **0.59**
4M-ER + Phi	0.79 / 0.77 / 0.78	0.72 / 0.65 / 0.68	0.81 / 0.53 / **0.64**	0.53 / 0.63 / 0.57
4M-ER + Qwen	0.79 / 0.80 / 0.79	0.71 / 0.68 / **0.69**	0.81 / 0.51 / 0.63	0.51 / 0.66 / 0.58
4M-ER + Mistral	0.79 / 0.80 / 0.79	0.69 / 0.60 / 0.64	0.70 / 0.53 / 0.60	0.49 / 0.69 / 0.57
Fine-tuned Gemma[b] [10]	0.82 / 0.74 / 0.78	0.62 / 0.67 / 0.64	0.69 / 0.46 / 0.55	0.46 / 0.52 / 0.48

[a]4M-ER configurations use fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT for candidate extraction followed by the named LLM for revision
[b]Fine-tuned Gemma is a single-stage generative extractor from prior work, not a 4M-ER configuration.

The pipeline correctly identified the mentation assessment, the mobility concerns, and the patient's expressed preferences. It also shows realistic boundary differences: "leaning to" rather than "leaning to the left side," and "weakness" as a separate span rather than "LLE noted weakness." These partial matches are scored as correct under the ent_type metric (see Methods), because the 4M category is right even when the span boundary is approximate.

Extraction Performance

Table 2 summarizes precision, recall, and F_1 (ent_type) across all configurations and 4M domains based on performances on the test dataset. The table reveals 3 key patterns.
First, zero-shot LLMs failed across the board, averaging only 0.23 F_1. Without domain-specific training, these models frequently produced overgeneralized outputs or misinterpreted clinical abbreviations, confirming that general-purpose LLMs alone are insufficient for 4M entity recognition in conversational TMs.
Second, LLM revision is primarily a precision mechanism (Table 2). The most dramatic gain was in Mobility, where precision increased from 0.63 (fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT

Figure 2. Ablation studies of varying LLM roles and message filtering strategies. The rightmost configuration (token classifier initial spans + LLM revision) is the main 4M-ER pipeline.



alone) to 0.81 (Phi and Qwen configurations). This means that when the pipeline flagged a Mobility entity, it was correct 81% of the time compared with 63% without revision. For Mentation, precision rose from 0.62 to 0.72 (Phi). For What Matters, precision improved from 0.46 to 0.53. In practical terms, these gains mean fewer false alerts if the pipeline were used in a clinical monitoring context. Recall remained stable across configurations, indicating that LLM revision improves the reliability of extracted entities without sacrificing the encoder's ability to detect them. For Medication, precision was already relatively high (0.77) and improved to 0.80 (Gemma configuration), likely because medication entities (drug names, doses) have well-defined lexical boundaries that benefit less from contextual revision.

Third, the 4M-ER pipeline matched or exceeded the fine-tuned Gemma LLM from prior work [10] across all domains, without any additional model fine-tuning (Table 2). The fine-tuned Gemma required full model training on the same dataset; the 4M-ER pipeline used Gemma only at inference time. Despite this, the Gemma-based pipeline configuration alone achieved F_1 of 0.80, 0.68, 0.61, and 0.59 compared with the fine-tuned Gemma's 0.78, 0.64, 0.55, and 0.48, representing improvements of +2 to +11 percentage points across domains. The pipeline also showed higher recall than the fine-tuned Gemma in every domain, reflecting the advantage of the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT's high-recall extraction as the first pipeline stage.

Finally, different LLM revisers showed domain-specific strengths. Gemma performed best for Medication (F_1 0.80, precision 0.80) and What Matters (F_1 0.59, precision 0.53), Qwen for Mentation (F_1 0.69, precision 0.71), and Phi for Mobility (F_1 0.64, precision 0.81). No single LLM reviser dominated across all 4 domains, suggesting that the choice of reviser interacts with the linguistic characteristics of each domain and that an adaptive routing strategy could yield further gains.

Ablation Analysis

Ablation experiments tested which components of the pipeline contribute most to performance (Figure 2). 2 findings stand out. First, restricting LLMs to revision only (rather than also generating initial spans) yielded the best balance of accuracy and efficiency. When LLMs were used for both span generation and revision, performance did not improve and sometimes degraded, suggesting that the encoder's high-recall extraction is a better starting point than LLM-generated candidates. Second, filtering messages to pass only those with preliminary fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT spans to the

LLM improved both efficiency and accuracy: Mentation F_1 increased from 0.62 to 0.64, and Mobility from 0.59 to 0.63. Together, these results confirm that the LLM functions optimally as a selective refinement stage applied to a high-recall encoder output, not as a general-purpose extractor.

Error Analysis

To understand what the 4M-ER pipeline gets right that the baselines miss, and where it still fails, we examined specific error patterns across model configurations (Tables 3, 4, and 5).

Table 3. False-positive counts by 4M domain across model configurations. The 4M-ER pipeline produces substantially fewer false positives than the standalone fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT and the fine-tuned Gemma baseline.

Configuration	Count of FP Spans			
	Medication	Mentation	Mobility	What Matters
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT	38	9	16	69
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Gemma revision	33	6	10	50
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Mistral revision	31	6	12	61
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Phi revision	31	5	9	46
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Qwen revision	31	5	10	52
Fine-tuned Gemma (LLM from prior study)	21	12	13	53

FP: predicted entity with no matching ground truth entity of the same label

Table 4. False-negative counts by 4M domain across model configurations. The 4M-ER pipeline reduces false negatives relative to the fine-tuned Gemma model for nearly all labels.

Configuration	Counts of FN Spans			
	Medication	Mentation	Mobility	What Matters
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT	26	12	22	26
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Gemma revision	30	13	24	28
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Mistral revision	31	14	24	27
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Phi revision	34	14	23	32
Fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT + Qwen revision	30	13	24	29
Fine-tuned Gemma (LLM from prior study)	44	16	32	43

FN: ground truth entity with no matching prediction of the same label

Table 5. Sample predicted annotations and gold annotations. Pipeline annotations are from 4M-ER + Gemma revision configuration.

(1)	**Message**	Need #### chart brought to DNS office
	Gold Annotation	()
	Baseline Annotation [a]	(‘***what matters***: DNS’)
	Pipeline Annotation	()
(2)	**Message**	Range of motion performed limited on LLE due to pain. Resident cries out in pain during assessment. Difficulty with mobility. Slightly bearing weight. Unsteady. Still complaining of pain tearful and facial grimacing. No PRN pain reliever order. Concerned about pain for this resident. Can we have a Tylenol order? Also would you like further x Ray testing to rule out the femur?
	Gold Annotation	(‘***what matters***: pain’, ‘***what matters***: cries out in pain during assessment’, ‘***what matters***: complaining of pain’, ‘***what matters***: tearful’, ‘***medication***: Tylenol’)
	Baseline Annotation [a]	(‘***mobility***: Range of motion’, ***what matters***: pain’, ***what matters***: cries out in pain’, ***mobility***: mobility’, ***mobility***: bearing weight. Unsteady’, ‘***what matters***: complaining of pain tearful’, ‘***mentation***: facial grimacing’, ‘***medication***: PRN’, ‘***what matters***: pain’, ‘***medication***: reliever’, ‘***what matters***: pain’, ‘***medication***: Tylenol’)
	Pipeline Annotation	(‘***what matters***: pain’, ‘***what matters***: cries out in pain’, ‘***mobility***: mobility’, ‘***mobility***: bearing weight. Unsteady’, ‘***what matters***: complaining of pain tearful’, ***what matters***: pain’, ***what matters***: pain’, ***medication***: Tylenol’)
(3)	**Message**	#### saw pt. encourange to use stand up lift. pt refuses hoyer 2x assist if pt refuses stand up lift. pt and regular staff state pt does well w/ 2 person transfer. tiffany
	Gold Annotation	(‘***what matters***: pt refuses hoyer’, ‘**what matters**: refuses’, ‘***mobility***: stand up lift’, ‘***mobility***: 2 person transfer’)
	Baseline Annotation [b]	(‘***mobility***: stand up lift’, ‘***mobility***: hoyer’, ‘***mobility***: 2 person transfer’)
	Pipeline Annotation	(‘**what matters**: pt’, ‘***mobility***: stand up lift’, ‘***what matters***: pt refuses’, ‘***mobility***: hoyer’, ‘***what matters***: pt refuses’, ‘***mobility***: stand up lift’, ‘***what matters***: regular’, ‘***what matters***: pt does well’, ‘***mobility***: 2 person transfer’)
(4)	**Message**	Spoke with #### with Dr #### office. Dr gave orders to Dc her equalizer boot. Does not want a repeat X-ray.
	Gold Annotation	(‘***mobility***: equalizer boot’, ‘***mobility***: X-ray’)
	Baseline Annotation [b]	()
	Pipeline Annotation	(‘***mobility***: equalizer boot’)
(5)	**Message**	pt family here on visit, noticed pt is not responding as normal, slurring in speech and really has no energy, vs taken, 98.6,88,18,131/85, family wants pt to be sent out to make sure that tumors have not effected him in any new way
	Gold Annotation	(‘***what matters***: family here on visit’, ‘***what matters***: family wants pt to be sent out’, ‘***mentation***: not responding’, ‘***mentation***: slurring in speech’, ‘***mentation***: has no energy’)
	Baseline Annotation [b]	(‘***what matters***: family’, ***what matters***: wants pt to be sent out’, ***mentation***: not responding as normal’, ***mentation***: slurring in speech’, ***mobility***: no energy’)
	Pipeline Annotation	(‘***what matters***: family’, ‘***mentation***: pt is not responding as normal, slurring in speech’, ‘***mentation***: energy’, ‘***what matters***: pt to be sent out’)

[a]Annotation from the Single-stage fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT without LLM evaluation
[b]Annotation from the fine-tuned Gemma model from prior study [10]

False positives corrected by LLM revision. The LLM revision stage was most effective at correcting FPs caused by conversational ambiguity, where a token classifier assigns a 4M label based on lexical similarity without understanding the sentence-level context. What Matters had the highest FP rates across all models. In the message *“Need #### chart brought to DNS office,”* the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT misclassified “DNS” as What Matters, likely because the abbreviation resembles “DNR” (do not resuscitate), a

concept central to the What Matters domain. The LLM revision stage, which processes the full message, recognized that "DNS office" refers to an administrative location and correctly rejected the span. Similarly, in *"…No PRN pain reliever order…,"* the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT flagged "PRN" and "reliever" as Medication because these tokens are semantically close to medication concepts. The LLM recognized from context that the message was describing the absence of an order, not a medication entity, and removed both spans (Table 5). Across all domains, the pipeline consistently reduced FP counts relative to the standalone fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT (Table 3), with the largest reductions in What Matters and Medication.

False negatives reduced by high-recall encoding. The fine-tuned Gemma baseline had the highest FN rates across most domains, particularly for entities expressed through subtle or indirect clinical language. For instance, the fine-tuned Gemma missed "pt refuses hoyer" and "refuses" in *"…pt refuses hoyer 2x assist if pt refuses stand up lift…"* (What Matters) and "equalizer boot" in *"…Dr gave orders to Dc her equalizer boot…"* (Mobility). In both cases, the clinical meaning is implied rather than stated explicitly (Table 5, examples 3-4). The fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT's token-level training captured many of these entities that the fine-tuned Gemma missed, and the 4M-ER pipeline inherited this advantage: FN counts were reduced relative to the fine-tuned Gemma across all domains (Table 4).

Remaining errors: label-level misclassification. The most persistent error type was assigning the correct span boundaries but the wrong 4M category, particularly confusing Mentation with Mobility or What Matters (Figure A2, Multimedia Appendix 1). This confusion reflects genuine clinical ambiguity. In the message *"pt family here on visit, noticed pt is not responding as normal, slurring in speech and really has no energy…,"* the gold standard annotated "has no energy" as Mentation (a cognitive/mental status observation), but the fine-tuned Gemma labeled "no energy" as Mobility (Table 5, example 5). The 4M-ER pipeline correctly categorized it as Mentation but captured only "energy" rather than "has no energy." Expressions like "no energy," "restlessness," and "not responding" sit at the boundary between Mentation and Mobility because they can reflect either a cognitive state or a physical limitation depending on context. The 4M-ER pipeline with Gemma revision reduced these misclassifications to the lowest levels across all configurations (4 Mentation-as-Mobility, 2 Mentation-as-What Matters, 1 Medication confusion), but did not eliminate them entirely. These remaining errors reflect the inherent overlap among 4M domains in conversational clinical language and represent a target for future work.

Effect of Silver Data Augmentation

Fine-tuning Bio-ClinicalBERT on the combined gold and silver data using curriculum learning (see Methods) improved the 4M-ER pipeline's performance, with the largest gains in the domains that were hardest to extract with gold data alone (Table 6). The silver-augmented fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT achieved F_1 of 0.78 (Medication), 0.69 (Mentation), 0.66 (Mobility), and 0.62 (What Matters), compared with 0.80, 0.66, 0.59, and 0.55 for the gold-only encoder. Mobility and What Matters improved by +0.07 each, reflecting the benefit of exposing the model to a broader range of entity patterns for these linguistically diverse categories during silver pretraining.

When the silver-augmented encoder was combined with LLM revision, the best configurations achieved F_1 of 0.81 (Medication, Qwen), 0.73 (Mentation, Phi), 0.67

(Mobility, Qwen), and 0.67 (What Matters, Qwen). Compared with the best gold-only pipeline results, this represents additional gains of +0.01 (Medication), +0.04 (Mentation), +0.03 (Mobility), and +0.08 (What Matters). The What Matters improvement from 0.59 to 0.67 is particularly notable, as this domain had been the most challenging due to the conversational, context-dependent nature of patient preference expressions. Full results for all silver-augmented configurations are provided in Table A2 (Multimedia Appendix 1).

Table 6. Best 4M-ER pipeline performance with and without silver data augmentation. Values are presented as precision / recall / F_1 (ent_type). Bold indicates the best F_1 per domain.

Configuration	Medication	Mentation	Mobility	What Matters
Best gold-only 4M-ER	.80 / .80 / .80	.71 / .68 / .69	.81 / .53 / .64	.53 / .67 / .59
Best gold+silver 4M-ER [a]	.85 / .77 / **.81**	.73 / .73 / **.73**	.83 / .56 / **.67**	.70 / .64 / **.67**

[a] Best LLM revisions – What Matters, Medication and Mobility : Qwen, Mentation: Phi

Computational Efficiency and Robustness

The 4M-ER pipeline achieved better extraction performance than the fine-tuned Gemma model from the prior work [10] while using substantially fewer computational resources. Among the LLM revisers, Qwen was the fastest (26 minutes 3 seconds on the test set), followed by Gemma (38 minutes 6 seconds), Mistral (90 minutes 48 seconds), and Phi (107 minutes 54 seconds). Message filtering reduced the number of TMs processed by LLMs by approximately 35%. Nearly all 4M-ER configurations (except Phi) required less than 12 GB VRAM during inference, compared with more than 12 GB required for fine-tuning the Gemma model.

Robustness was assessed by running each configuration 5 independent times under identical conditions. All configurations demonstrated high stability under greedy decoding, with run-to-run F_1 (ent_type) variations typically within ±0.005 to ±0.02 across all domains (Figure A1, Multimedia Appendix 1). This level of reproducibility confirms that the pipeline produces consistent results without stochastic drift, supporting its reliability for clinical deployment.

Discussion

Principal Findings

The central finding of this study is that pairing a domain-specific encoder with inference-only LLM revision produces better 4M extraction than either approach alone, and does so more efficiently than fine-tuning an LLM end-to-end. The 4M-ER pipeline achieved F_1 improvements of +2 to +11 percentage points over a fully fine-tuned Gemma LLM at half the GPU cost, without requiring any additional model training. The precision and recall breakdown reveals why: LLM revision is primarily a precision mechanism. For Mobility, precision jumped from 0.63 to 0.81 after revision, meaning that 4 out of 5 Mobility entities the pipeline flagged were correct. For Mentation, precision rose from 0.62 to 0.72. Recall, meanwhile, remained stable, confirming that fine-tuned Bio-

ClinicalBERT's high-recall extraction provides a reliable foundation that the LLM refines rather than replaces. The ablation results confirmed that this division of labor (encoder for extraction, LLM for revision) is the optimal configuration; using the LLM for both roles degraded rather than improved performance. Silver data augmentation further improved the pipeline's performance ceiling, with the largest gains in the 2 most challenging domains: What Matters F_1 increased from 0.59 to 0.67, and Mobility from 0.64 to 0.67.

Comparison With Prior Work

Most prior work on 4M-related extraction has focused on individual domains using fine-tuned models applied to formal clinical narratives [14,23,24,24,25]. These approaches face 2 limitations when applied to TMs in long-term care: the terse, context-sparse nature of the text degrades model performance, and training a separate model per domain is impractical for collective 4M extraction. The 2 studies that attempted joint 4M extraction from TMs [10,26] relied on either full LLM fine-tuning (computationally expensive) or traditional classification methods (limited accuracy). The 4M-ER pipeline addresses both issues. By using the fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT as a shared encoder across all 4 domains and adding LLM revision as a lightweight reasoning layer, it achieves collective extraction without per-domain models and without the cost of LLM fine-tuning. The +2 to +11 F_1 improvement over the fine-tuned Gemma model from Farmer et al [10], achieved at half the GPU memory, demonstrates that strategic encoder-decoder pairing can outperform brute-force fine-tuning for this task.

Implications for Age-Friendly Health Systems

The most immediate benefit of the 4M-ER pipeline is enabling structured, real-time clinical surveillance from a data source that already exists but is currently invisible to systematic monitoring. NH care teams already communicate 4M information through TMs as part of routine care, but this information is read once by the recipient and never aggregated. When a resident's TMs mention mobility concerns in the morning, cognitive changes at midday, and a family preference for comfort care in the afternoon, no current system connects those signals across shifts and team members to identify concurrent decline across multiple 4M domains. The 4M-ER pipeline makes this cross-shift, cross-domain aggregation possible by transforming each TM into structured 4M entities as it arrives.

A related near-term application is shift handoff support. Communication during shift changes in long-term care is often fragmented, and clinically relevant 4M information discussed during the preceding shift may not be fully conveyed to the incoming team. Structured 4M output from the pipeline could be used to auto-generate shift-level summaries of what changed across each domain for each resident, providing incoming staff with an organized view of the day's 4M activity.

The pipeline also addresses a pressing compliance need. The 4M framework is now incorporated into the CMS Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting program, and health systems will increasingly need to demonstrate 4M-aligned care delivery. In long-term care, much of the evidence that this care is happening lives in unstructured TMs that cannot be audited at scale. The 4M-ER pipeline turns this unstructured evidence into reportable, auditable data, supporting quality measurement and performance reporting aligned with the AFHS initiative.

Beyond these immediate applications, the structured 4M data generated by the pipeline can support longer-term goals including standardized ontology construction for 4M interoperability and predictive modeling of resident outcomes such as avoidable hospital transfers.

Methodological Contributions

This study makes 3 methodological contributions to clinical NLP beyond the 4M application. First, it provides evidence that revision-oriented encoder-decoder architectures, where a lightweight LLM refines encoder predictions at inference time, can match or exceed the performance of fully fine-tuned LLMs while remaining accessible to institutions with limited GPU resources. This finding has implications for any clinical NER task where fine-tuning large models is impractical. Second, the message filtering strategy, which substantially reduced the LLM workload without sacrificing accuracy, demonstrates a scalable approach to managing computational cost in streaming data environments. Third, the study validates the use of the ent_type evaluation metric for clinical TMs, where entity boundaries are inherently imprecise and strict span matching would penalize clinically valid extractions.

Limitations and Future Directions

The dataset, though drawn from 16 NHs, represents a single geographic region, which may limit generalizability to care teams with different communication styles or platforms. While LLM revision substantially improved precision across all domains, recall remained modest for some domains with gold-only training (eg, Mobility recall of 0.51-0.53). Silver data augmentation partially addressed this gap, improving Mobility F_1 from 0.64 to 0.67 and What Matters from 0.59 to 0.67, but further gains may require larger or more domain-balanced silver datasets. Future work should evaluate whether the current extraction accuracy is sufficient for specific clinical applications (eg, shift-level surveillance vs real-time alerting) and determine what level of clinician oversight is needed before deployment. Only medium-sized open-source LLMs and one pre-trained Bio-ClinicalBERT were evaluated; future work should also assess whether larger models or domain-specific instruction tuning further improves revision quality.
Next steps include extending the 4M-ER pipeline with ontology-driven span normalization using a 4M knowledge graph, prospective deployment within NH communication platforms for real-time 4M tracking, and evaluation of its effect on predicting adverse events such as avoidable hospital transfers. A particularly promising direction is an adaptive 4M-ER pipeline that dynamically routes each candidate span to the most effective LLM reviser on the basis of domain. Our results indicated domain-specific strengths (Gemma for Medication and What Matters, Qwen for Mentation, Phi for Mobility), suggesting that a domain-specialized ensemble system could further improve precision and recall while maintaining efficiency.

Conclusions

The 4M-ER pipeline, combining a fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT encoder with inference-only LLM revision, provides a scalable and resource-efficient approach for extracting Age-Friendly 4M entities from clinical TMs. The pipeline improved extraction accuracy across all 4M domains compared with standalone models and the previously fine-tuned Gemma LLM [10], while requiring fewer computational resources and maintaining high

reproducibility. Silver data augmentation further improved performance in the most challenging domains, demonstrating that the pipeline's accuracy can scale with additional training data. By transforming unstructured care team communications into structured 4M data, this pipeline can support 4M taxonomy and ontology construction, as demonstrated in the prior study [10], and provides a foundation for downstream applications including real-time clinical surveillance, compliance with emerging age-friendly quality measures, and predictive modeling in long-term care settings.

Acknowledgments
This work was supported by the National Institute on Aging of the National Institutes of Health under award R01AG078281. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Conflicts of Interest
None declared.

Data and Codes Availability
Due to the presence of potentially identifiable clinical information and institutional data use agreements, the dataset cannot be publicly shared. Requests for data access will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and require a signed data use agreement with the corresponding institution. All code used to develop and evaluate the 4M-ER pipeline is available on GitHub [40].

References
1. Alexander GL, Harrell R, Shumate S, et al. To Text or Not to Text? That is the Question. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*. 2021;2020:187-196.

2. Powell KR, Popescu M, Alexander GL. Examining Social Networks in Text Messages About Nursing Home Resident Health Status. *J Gerontol Nurs*. 2021;47(7):16-22. doi:10.3928/00989134-20210604-02

3. Powell KR, Popescu M, Lee S, Mehr DR, Alexander GL. Examining the Use of Text Messages Among Multidisciplinary Care Teams to Reduce Avoidable Hospitalization of Nursing Home Residents with Dementia: Protocol for a Secondary Analysis. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2023;12:e50231. doi:10.2196/50231

4. Fulmer T. *Age-Friendly Health Systems: A Guide to Using the 4Ms While Caring for Older Adults*. (Pelton L, Zhang J, Huang W, eds.). Institute for Healthcare Improvement; 2022.

5. Tewary S, Cook N, Pandya N, Damier S, Shnayder O, Dezine M. Using the 4M framework of the Age-Friendly Health System to improve MIPS documentation in primary care clinics: A quality improvement study. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*. 2023;44(4):631-640. doi:10.1080/02701960.2022.2117171

6. Doornebosch AJ, Smaling HJA, Achterberg WP. Interprofessional Collaboration in Long-Term Care and Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2022;23(5):764-777.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2021.12.028

7. Carron T, Rawlinson C, Arditi C, et al. An Overview of Reviews on Interprofessional Collaboration in Primary Care: Effectiveness. *Int J Integr Care*. 2021;21(2):31. doi:10.5334/ijic.5588

8. Wang Y, Wang L, Rastegar-Mojarad M, et al. Clinical information extraction applications: A literature review. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. 2018;77:34-49. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2017.11.011

9. Abdullah MHA, Aziz N, Abdulkadir SJ, Alhussian HSA, Talpur N. Systematic Literature Review of Information Extraction From Textual Data: Recent Methods, Applications, Trends, and Challenges. *IEEE Access*. 2023;11:10535-10562. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3240898

10. Farmer MS, Popescu M, Powell K. Development and evaluation of a 4M taxonomy from nursing home staff text messages using a fine-tuned generative language model. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2025;32(3):535-544. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocaf006

11. Baclic O, Tunis M, Young K, Doan C, Swerdfeger H, Schonfeld J. Challenges and opportunities for public health made possible by advances in natural language processing. *Can Commun Dis Rep*. 2020;46(6):161-168. doi:10.14745/ccdr.v46i06a02

12. Wu S, Roberts K, Datta S, et al. Deep learning in clinical natural language processing: a methodical review. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2020;27(3):457-470. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocz200

13. Devlin J, Chang MW, Lee K, Toutanova K. Bert: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North*. Published online 2019:4171-4186. doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423

14. Ramachandran GK, Lybarger K, Liu Y, et al. Extracting medication changes in clinical narratives using pre-trained language models. *J Biomed Inform*. 2023;139:104302. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2023.104302

15. Shen Z, Schutte D, Yi Y, et al. Classifying the lifestyle status for Alzheimer's disease from clinical notes using deep learning with weak supervision. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2022;22(Suppl 1):88. doi:10.1186/s12911-022-01819-4

16. Xu D, Chen W, Peng W, et al. Large language models for generative information extraction: a survey. *Front Comput Sci*. 2024;18(6):186357. doi:10.1007/s11704-024-40555-y

17. Agrawal M, Hegselmann S, Lang H, Kim Y, Sontag D. Large language models are few-shot clinical information extractors. In: Goldberg Y, Kozareva Z, Zhang Y, eds. *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics; 2022:1998-2022. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.130

18. Hu Y, Chen Q, Du J, et al. Improving large language models for clinical named entity recognition via prompt engineering. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2024;31(9):1812-1820. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocad259

19. Guevara M, Chen S, Thomas S, et al. Large language models to identify social determinants of health in electronic health records. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2024;7(1):6. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00970-0

20. Sivarajkumar S, Ameri K, Li C, Wang Y, Jiang M. Automating Adjudication of Cardiovascular Events Using Large Language Models. *arXiv*. Preprint posted online June 29, 2025:arXiv:2503.17222. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2503.17222

21. Sreenivas SC, Chowdhury S, Masum M. Enhancing Clinical Named Entity Recognition via Fine-Tuned BERT and Dictionary-Infused Retrieval-Augmented Generation. *Electronics*. 2025;14(18):3676. doi:10.3390/electronics14183676

22. Hong Z, Magdamo CG, Sheu Y han, et al. Natural Language Processing to Detect Cognitive Concerns in Electronic Health Records Using Deep Learning. *arXiv*. Preprint posted online November 12, 2020:arXiv:2011.06489. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2011.06489

23. Chen A, Paredes D, Yu Z, et al. Identifying Symptoms of Delirium from Clinical Narratives Using Natural Language Processing. *Proc (IEEE Int Conf Healthc Inform)*. 2024;2024:305-311. doi:10.1109/ichi61247.2024.00046

24. Albashayreh A, Herr K, Fan W, Street WN, Gilbertson-White S. Harnessing Natural Language Processing and High-Dimensional Clinical Notes to Detect Goals-of-Care and Surrogate-Designation Conversations. *Clin Nurs Res*. Published online October 31, 2024:10547738241292657. doi:10.1177/10547738241292657

25. Le TD, Miao Z, Alvarado S, Smith B, Paiva W, Thieu T. Leveraging deep active learning to identify low-resource mobility functioning information in public clinical notes. *arXiv*. Preprint posted online November 27, 2023:arXiv:2311.15946. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2311.15946

26. Powell K, Isnainy M, Lee S, et al. Using Novel Natural Language Processing Approaches to Examine Age-Friendly Communication about Nursing Home Residents with Dementia. *The Gerontologist*.

27. Babaian T, Xu J. Entity recognition from colloquial text. *Decis Support Syst*. 2024;179(C). doi:10.1016/j.dss.2024.114172

28. Bio_ClinicalBERT Model. emilyalsentzer/Bio_ClinicalBERT · Hugging Face. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://huggingface.co/emilyalsentzer/Bio_ClinicalBERT

29. Alsentzer E, Murphy JR, Boag W, et al. Publicly Available Clinical BERT Embeddings. *arXiv*. Preprint posted online June 20, 2019:arXiv:1904.03323. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1904.03323

30. Sentence-transformer. sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2 · Hugging Face. January 5, 2024. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2

31. Gemma-2-9b-it model. google/gemma-2-9b-it · Hugging Face. July 10, 2025. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://huggingface.co/google/gemma-2-9b-it

32. Phi-3-Medium-4K-Instruct. microsoft/Phi-3-medium-4k-instruct · Hugging Face. May 1, 2025. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://huggingface.co/microsoft/Phi-3-medium-4k-instruct

33. Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct. Qwen/Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct · Hugging Face. July 21, 2025. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct

34. Yang A, Yang B, Hui B, et al. Qwen2 Technical Report. *arXiv*. Preprint posted online September 10, 2024:arXiv:2407.10671. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2407.10671

35. Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407. mistralai/Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407 · Hugging Face. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407

36. GPT-OSS. https://ollama.com/library/gpt-oss:20b. Accessed March 31, 2026. https://ollama.com/library/gpt-oss:20b

37. Nervaluate: NER evaluation considering partial match scoring. Accessed December 1, 2025. https://github.com/MantisAI/nervaluate

38. OpenAI. ChatGPT. Accessed March 25, 2026. https://chatgpt.com/

39. Anthropic. Claude. Accessed March 25, 2026. https://claude.ai/new

40. Amewudah P. 4M-ER Codes. https://github.com/philipamewudah/4M-ER. 2026. Accessed March 31, 2026. https://github.com/philipamewudah/4M-ER

Abbreviations

4M-ER: 4M Entity Recognition
AFHS: Age-Friendly Health Systems
BERT: Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers
BIO: Begin, Inside, Outside
CMS: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
EHR: electronic health record
FN: false negative
FP: false positive
GPU: graphics processing unit
HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
ICL: in-context learning
IRB: Institutional Review Board
LLM: large language model
LTC: long-term care
NER: Named Entity Recognition
NH: nursing home
NLP: Natural Language Processing
TM: text message
VRAM: video random access memory

Authors' Contributions

PA: conceptualization, methodology, software, formal analysis, investigation, visualization, writing – original draft. KP: funding acquisition, supervision, writing – review and editing. MP: supervision, writing – review and editing. MF: writing – review and editing. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

Multimedia Appendix 1

Table A1. Comparison of evaluation metrics for NER-related tasks (ent_type, strict, exact, and partial match).

Ground Truth		Prediction		Evaluation Metrics			
Label	**Entity/Span**	**Label**	**Entity/Span**	**Ent_Type**	**Strict**	**Exact**	**Partial**
medication	ibuprofen	medication	ibuprofen	***COR*** [a]	COR	COR	COR
mentation	memory loss	mentation	forgetfulness	***INC*** [b]	INC	INC	INC
mobility	uses wheelchair	mobility	wheelchair	***COR***	INC	COR	COR
what matters	attending	what matters	going to church	***INC***	INC	INC	INC
medication	paracetamol	mentation	paracetamol	***INC***	INC	COR	COR
mobility	needs cane	mentation	needs	***INC***	INC	INC	COR

[a] COR stands for correct
[b] INC stands for incorrect

Textbox A1. Zero-shot prompt for optional 4M candidate span detection by LLMs.

```
You are an information extraction system.
Use the GUIDE to Scan the MESSAGE and identify spans for the labels: what_matters, medication,
mentation, mobility.
 Rules:
- Think step by step.
- Indices are 0-based; end is EXCLUSIVE.
- Spans MUST be exact substrings of MESSAGE (no rewriting) and not cut inside a word.
- Immediately adjacent spans must be combined as one span and given the best label.
- Spans SHOULD NOT OVERLAP each other.
- Pick minimal complete spans. Return at most 12 spans total.
 GUIDE:
{4M Definitions}
 Return JSON ONLY and END with <END_JSON>:
 {"new_spans": [ {"label":"what_matters|medication|mentation|mobility", "span":[start,end]}]}
MESSAGE:
"""{message}"""
```

Figure A1. Robustness analysis of 4M-ER pipeline configurations. Mean F_1 (ent_type) scores with SD whiskers are shown across 5 repeated runs for each 4M domain. All configurations exhibit minimal variance (typically ≤0.02), demonstrating high run-to-run stability.



Figure A2. Confusion matrices comparing misclassification patterns for Bio-ClinicalBERT alone, Bio-ClinicalBERT + Gemma revision, and the fine-tuned Gemma model. LLM revision reduces cross-label confusion, particularly misclassification of Mentation as What Matters and Mobility as What Matters.



Appendix Text: Silver Data Generation Pipeline. Full description of the 3-stage silver labeling pipeline (candidate extraction, adjudication, and skeptic review), data distribution analysis, and silver data filtering strategy.

Overview

To augment the limited gold-annotated training set we developed a multi-stage silver labeling pipeline that combines large language model reasoning with deterministic lexical matching to produce high-confidence weakly labeled training data. The pipeline was designed to prioritize precision over recall, under the premise that noisy false positives are more damaging to downstream model training than missed entities. All LLM calls were executed locally using gpt-oss:20b through the Ollama framework (v0.18.1).

Stage 1: Candidate Extraction

Each unlabeled clinical message was processed by 3 complementary extraction methods operating in parallel:

1. An LLM-based extractor that reads the full message and proposes candidate text spans with domain hints for the 4 entity categories (Medication, Mentation, Mobility, and What Matters). The LLM was prompted with domain definitions and labeling function specifications for each category and instructed to return

short, specific (atomic) spans as exact substrings of the message, with a maximum of 30 spans per message.

2. A deterministic lexical candidate generator using regular expressions to identify known medication names, dosage patterns (eg, dose units, routes, frequencies), medication action keywords (eg, "discontinue," "start," "hold"), mentation keywords (eg, "confusion," "agitation," "oriented"), mobility keywords (eg, "ambulat," "transfer," "fall," "wheelchair"), and What Matters keywords (eg, "prefers," "refuses," "hospice," "DNR"). Disposition language co-occurring with family or next-of-kin mentions was also captured as What Matters candidates.
3. The gold-trained fine-tuned Bio-ClinicalBERT model from Stage 1 of the 4M-ER pipeline, which contributed additional candidate spans based on learned contextual patterns. A confidence threshold of 0.5 was applied to filter low-confidence predictions, and a maximum of 30 candidates per message was retained.

Stage 2: Adjudication

Candidate spans from Stage 1 were merged by proximity and domain, grouped, and submitted to an LLM adjudicator. For each span group, the adjudicator made a classification decision: whether the span constitutes a valid 4M entity and, if so, which domain it belongs to. The adjudicator was required to provide a verbatim evidence quote from the source text and a numerical confidence score (0 to 1) to support each decision. Spans classified as non-4M entities (is_4m=false) or assigned the label NO_LABEL were discarded. Evidence quotes that could not be verified as exact substrings of the original message were flagged and the confidence was capped at 0.6.

Stage 3: Skeptic Review

Every span that Stage 2 labeled as a 4M entity was subjected to a final adversarial review by a separate LLM call (the "skeptic"). The skeptic was instructed to challenge the proposed label and reject weak, ambiguous, or borderline annotations. Only spans that maintained high confidence through both adjudication (≥0.75) and skeptic review (≥0.80) were retained in the final silver dataset. Overlapping spans were resolved by retaining the higher-confidence span. This 3-stage extract-adjudicate-challenge design maximizes precision of the silver labels at the cost of some recall.

Silver Dataset Characteristics

The resulting silver dataset comprised 2,502 labeled messages, each containing at least 1 annotated entity span, with the following token-level distribution:

Token Label	Count	Percentage
O (outside)	62,303	76.37%
Medication (B+I)	13,992	72.6% of entities
What Matters (B+I)	2,273	11.8% of entities
Mobility (B+I)	1,907	9.9% of entities
Mentation (B+I)	1,106	5.7% of entities

The silver dataset exhibited a strong skew toward Medication entities (72.6% of entity tokens) compared with the gold training set (61.7%), with reduced representation of What Matters (11.8% vs 21.7%), Mobility (9.9% vs 9.5%), and Mentation (5.7% vs 7.2%).

This imbalance reflects the inherent strength of lexical and pattern-based extraction for pharmacological entities, which have distinctive surface forms (drug names, dosage patterns), relative to more linguistically diverse categories such as What Matters, where relevant spans tend to be conversational, indirect, and context-dependent.

Silver Data Filtering

To mitigate the distributional mismatch between the medication-heavy silver data and the more balanced gold evaluation distribution, the silver dataset was filtered to retain only messages where Medication entities comprised less than 50% of all entity tokens. This reduced the silver training set from 2,502 to 636 examples, enriching the remaining data for the underrepresented categories (Mentation, Mobility, and What Matters).