Intra-Template Entity Compatibility based Slot-Filling for Clinical Trial Information Extraction

Christian Witte Bielefeld University, Germany cwitte@ techfak.uni-bielefeld.de

Abstract

We present a deep learning based information extraction system that can extract the design and results of a published abstract describing a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT). In contrast to other approaches, our system does not regard the PICO elements as flat objects or labels but as structured objects. We thus model the task as the one of filling a set of templates and slots; our two-step approach recognizes relevant slot candidates as a first step and assigns them to a corresponding template as second step, relying on a learned pairwise scoring function that models the compatibility of the different slot values. We evaluate the approach on a dataset of 211 manually annotated abstracts for Type 2 Diabetes and Glaucoma, showing the positive impact of modelling intratemplate entity compatibility. As main benefit, our approach yields a structured object for every RCT abstract that supports the aggregation and summarization of clinical trial results across published studies and can facilitate the task of creating a systematic review or metaanalysis.

1 Introduction

The evidence based medicine (EBM) paradigm (Sackett et al., 1996) propagates that individual medical decisions are taken on the basis of the best available clinical evidence. The activity of summarizing the existing body of evidence is a core activity to support EBM and its most prominent instrument is the systematic review. Creating a systematic review involves a high effort, involving on average 67.3 weeks and involving 5 authors per review on average (Borah et al., 2017). Keeping systematic reviews up to date involves an even much higher and continuous effort (Koch, 2006; Beller et al., 2013).

Thus, there is increased interest in partially automatizing the creation of systematic reviews (O'Connor et al., 2019). A significant hindrance Philipp Cimiano Bielefeld University, Germany cimiano@ cit-ec.uni-bielefeld.de

for the automation of systematic reviews is that data needs to be extracted by hand from published studies. This problem could be alleviated if publications were machine readable, or could be turned into a structured, machine readable form by information extraction methods (Liu et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2020).

The methods that so far have been applied to the automatic extraction of information from clinical trial publications follow the PICO framework and attempt to extract the Population, Intervention, Comparator and Outcomes from a publication. Most approaches formalize the task as a tagging or classification problem. Some approaches for instance attempt to tag spans in the text and label them with the PICO elements (e.g. (Trenta et al., 2015)). Others classify complete text segments into these classes (Boudin et al., 2010; Jin and Szolovits, 2018).

However, the PICO elements denote structured objects rather than plain tags or classes. An intervention is described by a drug, frequency of administration, administration route, dose, etc. An outcome is described by a certain increase or decrease of a value from a baseline condition, refers to a certain primary or secondary endpoint, and there are outcomes for each arm of a trial that need to be compared to each other. In spite of being structured objects, most previous work treats these elements as flat and unstructured. Treating them as such makes the automatic aggregation and summarization of results challenging if not impossible.

Towards treating information extraction from clinical publications as a problem of predicting structured elements, we model the task as a template extraction task in which each template consists of a number of slots to be extracted. In Table 1 we provide an overview of all the templates we consider in this work and the number and types of slots they have.

Towards extracting these templates and thus a

structured representation of a clinical trial and its results, we present a novel deep learning architecture. The architecture first labels spans of text as candidate slot fillers of a particular slot in a first step. In a second step, the filler is assigned to an instance of a template. With this two-step architecture, we can transform each clinical trial abstract into a structured representation that supports downstream aggregation of results.

As there can be multiple interventions, arms and outcomes in a given study, an important challenge is to predict how many instances of each template occur in a given clinical trial publication. We leave this subpart of the problem for future work and assume that the number of interventions, arms and outcomes is known a priori. This assumption is reasonable as this information is typically contained in existing registries for trials such as https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/.

When assigning slot fillers to templates, it is important to model the dependencies between the different slots as some values might be compatible while others not. We model this compatibility by a trained function that predicts a compatibility score.

In summary our contributions are as follows:

- We propose a new approach to extracting evidence from clinical trial publications that consists in instantiating a set of pre-defined templates. As a result, the key findings of a clinical trial can be represented in a fully structured and machine-readable form that supports down-stream aggregation. To the best of out knowledge, we present the first templatefilling IE approach in the clinical trial domain.
- We present a novel two-step deep learning based architecture that first recognizes slot candidates and then assigns these candidates to instances of templates. At a second step, candidates for slot fillers are assigned to a template instance.
- We show that it is possible to extract fine grained candidates of slot fillers from 37 classes yielding very good results of micro $F_1 = 76.21\%$ on the Glaucoma and $F_1 = 76.49\%$ the Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) dataset (Sanchez-Graillet et al., 2021), respectively.
- We introduce an intra-template entity compatibility optimization procedure for distributing

entities to template instance of the same type. We show the impact of including a function for scoring the compatibility of slot assignments, and show that it improves extraction results in terms of F-Measure by 6.34% and 3.95% on the Glaucoma and T2DM dataset, respectively.

2 Related Work

The template extraction and slot filling task we address is related to the field of event extraction (Frisoni et al., 2021) where the goal is to extract so called *event triggers* and the arguments of the events. Our templates can be seen as complex events and our slots as arguments thereof.

Wang et al. (2020) adopt the question answering paradigm to extract events from biomedical texts. They introduce two different types of questions for extracting event triggers and event arguments. However, in their approach the extraction of event arguments also relies on the extraction of event triggers.

Adel et al. (2018) introduce a framework for taskindependent template-based information extraction. Their approach first identifies text spans representing slot-fillers as in our approach. However, their system relies on the successful identification of anchor spans representing template instances as they cast the assignment of slot-fillers to template instances as a binary classification between anchor spans and other text spans. The slot filling system proposed by Zhang et al. (2017) is a neural architecture that can exploit the combination of semantic similarity-based attention and position-based attention. The authors address a relation extraction task and develop a large corpus of annotated relations, TACRED (Zhang et al., 2017).

More recent work has framed the task of relation extraction in the biomedical field as a slot filling task as well (Papanikolaou and Bennett, 2021). However, the work is limited to extracting binary relationships (drug-drug, compound-drug and compound-disease).

Early work on extracting information from text describing clinical trials has focused on the classification of sentences into sections of papers describing Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), e.g. Methods, Results, etc. (McKnight and Srinivasan, 2003; Hirohata et al., 2008; Chung, 2009). Such systems tackle a very coarse-grained information

Template Name	#Slots	Slots
Arm	7	AdverseEffect, FinalNumPatientsArm, Intervention, NumPatientsLeftArm, Num-
		berPatientsArm, Outcome, RelFinalNumPatientsArm,
ClinicalTrial	15	analysesHealthCondition, AllocationRatio, AnalysisApproach, Arm, CTDesign,
		CTduration, ConclusionComment, DiffBetweenGroups, EvidQualityIndicator, Fi-
		nalNumberPatientsCT, NumPatientsLeftCT, NumberPatientsCT, ObjectiveDescrip-
		tion, Population, RelNumPatientsLeftCT
DiffBetweenGroups	8	ConfIntervalDiff, DiffGroupAbsValue, DiffGroupRelValue, Outcome1, Outcome2,
		PvalueDiff, StandardDevDiff, StandardErrorDiff
Endpoint	4	AggregationMethod, BaselineUnit, EndPointDescription, MeasurementDevice
Intervention	5	Duration, Frequency, Interval, Medication, RelativeFreqTime
Medication	6	ApplicationCondition, DeliveryMethod, DoseDescription, DoseUnit, DoseValue,
		Drug
Outcome	26	BaselineValue, ChangeValue, ConfIntervalBL, ConfIntervalChangeValue, Con-
		fIntervalNumAffected, ConfIntervalResValue, Endpoint, NumberAffected, Ob-
		servedResult, PValueBL, PValueChangeValue, PValueNumAffected, PValueRes-
		Value, PercentageAffected, RelativeChangeValue, ResultMeasuredValue, SdDe-
		vBL, SdDevChangeValue, SdDevNumAffected, SdDevResValue, SdErrorBL, SdEr-
		rorChangeValue, SdErrorNumAffected, SdErrorResValue, SubGroupDescription,
		TimePoint
Population	7	in AvgAge, Country, Ethnicity, Gender, MaxAge, MinAge, Precondition
Publication	6	describes, Author, Journal, PMID, PublicationYear, Title

Table 1: Template types and corresponding slots

extraction task as they do not extract the actual content or results of a published RCT, but only extract correspondences between content and the standard sections used to describe a clinical trial in a publication. Such a sentence classification task can support the indexation and thus retrieval of information from a published RCT, but does not support the use case we consider, i.e. the aggregation of evidence across published trials.

Beyond the classification of sentences into sections of an article, other authors have considered the classification of sentences into PICO elements, that is classifying a sentence in a published clinical trial with respect to whether it describes the Population, Intervention, Comparator or an Outcome (Demner-Fushman and Lin, 2007; Chung, 2009; Boudin et al., 2010; Jin and Szolovits, 2018). Such approaches are able to extract information at a more detailed granularity, but they still do not support aggregation of evidence across studies as the mere classification of sentences with respect to PICO elements does not provide a semantic structure that can be used to describe the key results of a study.

The work by Trenta et al. (2015) goes one step further in that it tags spans of text in an RCT abstract into the PICO classes, considering the following classes: patient group, intervention, arm, control arm, measured outcome, etc. Trenta et al. (2015) rely on maximum entropy models and use integer linear programming to define constraints on the classified tokens, e.g., such that *Results* can not occur in the *Methods* section. They show that their approach is able to extract evidence tables from RCT abstracts. Yet, the different spans extracted are only indirectly related to each other in the model of Trenta et al. (2015). This gap is addressed by the approach of Nye et al. (2020), which beyond extracting PICO elements (intervention arms, outcome measures, results) also relates the different snippets to each other, yielding a relational structure.

Inspired by the work of Trenta et al. (2015) as well as Nye et al. (2020) we go one step further in extracting a complete structured object from an RCT abstract comprising of nine main template types with overall 85 slots. To our knowledge, this is thus the most fine-grained representation that so far has been considered by an information extraction system in the clinical domain.

3 Model

As already mentioned in the introduction, our proposed model consists of a two-step architecture. The first component, the entity extraction (EE) module, identifies spans of slot filler candidates (SFCs). We assume that we have a set of template types $\mathcal{T} = t_1, ..., t_{|\mathcal{L}|}$ which correspond to the template types depicted in Table 1, where \mathcal{L} denotes the number of template types. We refer to the slot j of template t_i as $s_{i,j}$. The set of all slots is $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i,j} \{s_{i,j}\}$ and the set of slots of template type t is $\mathcal{S}_t = \bigcup_i \{s_{t,j}\}$.

The set of all SFCs extracted within an abstract is denoted by \mathcal{E} . Formally speaking, the entity

extraction module implements a function f_{EE} that maps each slot filler candidate into a slot type, i.e. $f_{EE} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{S}$.

The second component, the template assignment (TA) module, maps each slot filler to a particular instance of a template. Hereby, we can have multiple instances of a given template type. For instance, in the general case a clinical study might describe multiple interventions, multiple endpoints and multiple outcomes. We denote the *i*-th instance of template t by $T_i^{(t)}$. The set of all template instances is thus $\theta = \bigcup \{T_i^{(t)}\}$ and the number of template instances of template type t is denoted by m_t . The second component thus realizes a function $f_{TA} : \mathcal{E} \to \theta$. We denote the template type to which SFC e_j has been assigned to as y_{e_i} .

Take the following sentence as an example: Mean 24-h IOP with BTFC was significantly lower than with latanoprost (18.9 vs 21.2 mmHg; p < 0.001). The first component would recognize the spans 18.9 and 21.2 and map them both to the slot type ResultMeasuredValue. Then the TA module assignes these identifies SFCs to template instances of type Outcome, together with other SCFs extracted from other sentences.

Note that both modules fully specify a mapping from entities detected in the clinical trial abstract to fully instantiated templates, where f_{EE} identifies and classifies text spans into slots and f_{EA} identifies the appropriate instance of a template.

We describe both modules in more detail subsequently. In particular, as the assignment of text spans to slots and template instances should not be modelled completely independently, we introduce an additional component that computes an overall score for a given template instance that quantifies the compatibility of the assigned text spans to all of the slots of the template instance. These scores can be regarded as factors as used in factor graph models (Kschischang et al., 2001). In order to reduce the complexity, we model the interaction between different slots in a pairwise fashion, limiting the scope of these factors to two slots.

3.1 Entity Extraction Module

The entity extraction module identifies token spans in the input document which either represent named entities or literals. The extracted token spans are later assigned to slots by the module described in section 3.2. We represent documents \mathcal{D} by a sequence of sentences (s_1, \ldots, s_{n_S}) where each

sentence s_i in turn is represented by a sequence of tokens $(w_1^{(s_i)}, \ldots, w_{n_{s_i}}^{(s_i)})$, where n_S denotes the number of sentences in document \mathcal{D} and n_{s_i} denotes the number of tokens of sentence s_i . We adopt the Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) (Devlin et al., 2019) architecture for computing contextualized token representations within the input document. A BERT layer is a stack of K identical Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) which captures pairwise token dependencies via an attention mechanism. Since most BERT implementations limit the length of input sequences by k_{max} , we split the sequence of sentences of the input document into n_C subsequences (chunks) if the number of tokens of the document exceeds this upper bound. We use the special token [SEP] to separate sentences within a given chunk c_i and prepend the special token [CLS] to each chunk which allows for capturing global context information for each chunk. The output for chunk c_i of the K-th Transformer of the BERT layer is a sequence of contextualized vectors $\mathbf{h}_{1}^{(c_{i})}, \ldots, \mathbf{h}_{n_{c_{i}}}^{(c_{i})} \in R^{d_{bert}}$, where the vector $\mathbf{h}_{j}^{(c_{i})}$ represents the *j*-th token of chunk c_{i}, d_{bert} denotes the dimension of the BERT model and n_{c_i} denotes the number of tokens in chunk c_i .

Entity extraction is implemented through two dense layers which independently predict which tokens are start and/or end positions of entities which are referenced by a slot. This is achieved by using the set of slots S as entity types. Then the predicted entity type indirectly specifies the type of the template the entity has to be assigned to since no pair of template types shares the same set of slots. More formally, the two dense layers are given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{j,start}^{(c_i)} = softmax(\mathbf{W}_{start}\mathbf{h}_j^{(c_i)} + \mathbf{b}_{start}) \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{j,end}^{(c_i)} = softmax(\mathbf{W}_{end}\mathbf{h}_j^{(c_i)} + \mathbf{b}_{end}) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{start}, \mathbf{W}_{end} \in R^{(|\mathcal{S}|+1) \times d_{bert}},$ $\mathbf{b}_{start}, \mathbf{b}_{end}, \in R^{d_{bert}}.$

The prediction of the slot is performed as follows:

$$\hat{y}_{j,start}^{(c_i)} = \arg \max \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{j,start}^{(c_i)}$$

$$\hat{y}_{j,end}^{(c_i)} = \arg \max \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{j,end}^{(c_i)}$$

At inference time we join the predicted start and end positions by assigning the closest predicted end position p_{end} of type t within the same sentence to each predicted start position p_{start} of type t under the constraint $p_{start} \ll p_{end}$.

Finally we compute a vector representation \mathbf{e}_k for each extracted SFC e_k by summing the vectors $\mathbf{h}_j^{c_i}$ of the corresponding start and end tokens of the SFC, followed by a dense layer with a ReLu activation function (Agarap, 2018).

3.2 Template Assignment Module

The TA module described in this section assigns each SFC $e_j \in \mathcal{E}$ extracted by the entity extraction module to a template in θ . As we know the slot y_{e_j} that e_j has been assigned to, the template type t of y_{e_j} determines the subset θ_t of template instances in the set θ that e_j can be assigned to. This reduces the search space considerably and essentially allows us to model the template assignment task as the one of inducing a partition.

Let's assume that SFCs are grouped into $|\mathcal{L}|$ disjoint subsets $\mathcal{E}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_{|\mathcal{L}|}$ according to their type *t*, that is:

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \{ e_j \in \mathcal{E} \mid y_{e_j} \in \mathcal{S}_t \}, \quad t \in \mathcal{L}$$
(3)

The task of template assignment can be reduced to the task of partitioning each set \mathcal{E}_t into a partition $\mathcal{P}_t = \{\mathcal{T}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{m_t}^{(t)}\}$ of \mathcal{E}_t where each set $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)}$ contains the SFCs assigned to template instance $T_i^{(t)}$.

We call a partition \mathcal{P}_t of the set \mathcal{E}_t valid if each SFC $e_j \in \mathcal{E}_t$ is assigned to exactly one partition $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_t$ and we denote the set of all valid partitions for the set \mathcal{E}_t as \mathcal{U}_t .

We propose a pairwise intra-template entity compatibility optimization objective which measures the joint compatibility of the SFCs within the sets $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)}$ of a partition. Let $q : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0,1]$ denote the function which measures the compatibility between two SFCs e_j , e_k , where $q(e_j, e_k) = 1$ means maximal compatibility and $q(e_j, e_k) = 0$ means minimal compatibility. Note that we assume that q is symmetric in its arguments, i.e., $q(e_j, e_k) = q(e_k, e_j)$. Then the mean pairwise entity compatibility score $h(\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)})$ for the set $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)}$ is given by

$$h(\mathcal{T}_{i}^{(t)}) = \frac{1}{\frac{m_{t}!}{2(m_{t}-2)!}} \sum_{e_{j}, e_{k} \in \mathcal{T}_{i}^{(t)}, j < k} q(e_{j}, e_{k}) \quad (4)$$

and the compatibility score for partition \mathcal{P}_t is the sum of the mean pairwise compatibility scores of

each template set $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_t$:

$$\sum_{\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_t} h(\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)}) \tag{5}$$

Given these definitions, we seek the partition $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t \in \mathcal{U}_t$ which maximizes the compatibility score defined by Eq. (5). Hence the optimization problem proposed by our approach is given by

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t = \arg \max_{\mathcal{P}_t \in \mathcal{U}_t} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_t} h(\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)})$$
(6)

for all template types $t \in \mathcal{L}$. For arbitrary large entity sets \mathcal{E}_t , the sets \mathcal{U}_t of valid partitions can become very large because of the combinatorial explosion, and hence finding the exact solution of the optimization problem defined by Eq. (6) can become intractable. Therefore we propose an approximate optimization method based on beam search which maintains a set $\mathcal{B}_t^{(z)}$ of n_B candidate solutions in each iteration z which are gradually refined. We define a candidate solution i for template type t as a pair $(\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}, \mathcal{P}_t^{(i)})$, where $\mathcal{P}_t^{(i)}$ denotes the candidate partition and $\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_t$ denotes the set of entities of that candidate solution which are not yet assigned to any template set $\mathcal{T}_{i}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_{t}^{(i)}$. In each iteration z, we compute all successors of all can-didate solutions $(\mathcal{E}_{t}^{(i)}, \mathcal{P}_{t}^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{B}_{t}^{(z)}$ by assigning an entity $e_j \in \mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}$ to a template set $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_t^{(i)}$, which yields a set of new candidate solutions $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_t^{(z)}$. Next we rank all candidate solutions in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_t^{(z)}$ by computing the mean intra-template entity compatibility score defined by Eq (5) for each candidate partition of the respective candidate solutions and keep only the best n_B ones, which yields the new beam $\mathcal{B}_t^{(z+1)}$ for the next iteration. After all entities for template type t have been assigned to a template after Z iterations, the partition $\mathcal{P}_t^{(i)}$ of the best ranked final candidate solution $(\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}, \mathcal{P}_t^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{B}_t^{(Z)}$ is returned. The initial seed sets $\mathcal{B}_t^{(0)}$ of candidate solutions for each template type t are given by

$$\mathcal{B}_t^{(0)} = \{ (\mathcal{E}_t, \{\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^{m_t}) \}, \quad \mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} = \{ \}$$
(7)

More details of the optimization procedure can be found in algorithm 1.

We implement the pairwise entity compatibility function $q(e_i, e_j)$ through summing the vector representations \mathbf{e}_i and \mathbf{e}_j of the corresponding entities **Data:** Set of SFCs \mathcal{E} ; entity compatibility function g; beam size n_B **Result:** Partitions $\mathcal{P}_i, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_{|\mathcal{L}|}$ for $t \in \mathcal{L}$ do Compute set of SFCs \mathcal{E}_t for template type t by Eq. (3) Compute beam seed set $\mathcal{B}_{t}^{(0)}$ defined by Eq. (7) $z \leftarrow 0$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{E}_t|$ / do Initialize set of successor candidate solutions $ilde{\mathcal{B}}_t^{(z)}$ as empty set for $(\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}, \mathcal{P}_t^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{B}_t^{(z)}$ do for $e_k \in \mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}$ do for $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)} \in \mathcal{P}_t^{(i)}$ do Remove e_k from $\mathcal{E}_t^{(i)}$ which yields the set $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_t^{(i)}$ Add e_k to set $\mathcal{T}_i^{(t)}$ which yields $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{j}^{(t)}$ Replace $\mathcal{T}_{j}^{(t)}$ in $\mathcal{P}_{t}^{(i)}$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{j}^{(t)}$ which yields $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t}^{(i)}$ Add new candidate solution $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_t^{(i)}, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t^{(i)})$ to set $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_t^{(z)}$ end end end Rank all candidate solutions in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{t}^{(z)}$ by Eq. (5)Keep the best ranked n_B candidate solutions from $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_t^{(z)}$ which yields new batch $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_t^{(z)}$ $z \leftarrow z + 1$ end Get best ranked candidate solution $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_t^{(i)}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_t^{(i)})$ from $\mathcal{B}_{t}^{(|\mathcal{E}_{t}|)}$ $\mathcal{P}_t \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\star}^{(i)}$



Algorithm 1: Pseudo-code of our proposed approximate optimization method for maximizing the mean intra-template entity compatibility when assigning the extracted entities to templates

followed by a dense layer with sigmoid activation function. More formally:

$$\hat{q}(e_i, e_j) = \sigma(\mathbf{w}_{comp} \odot (\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j) + b_{comp})$$
 (8)

where $\mathbf{w}_{comp} \in R^{d_{bert}}$, $b_{comp} \in R$ and \odot denotes the scalar product of two vectors.

3.3 Model Training

We train the model in end-to-end fashion by jointly minimizing the loss of the EE module and the TA module. The loss L_{EE} of the EE module is given by the cross entropy between the predicted SFC start position $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{j,start}^{(c_i)}$ and ground truth SFC start position $\mathbf{y}_{j,start}^{(c_i)}$ plus the cross entropy between predicted SFC end positions $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{j,end}^{(c_i)}$ and the ground truth SFC end positions $\mathbf{y}_{j,end}^{(c_i)}$.

The loss L_{TA} of the TA module is given by the cross entropy between the ground truth compatibility scores $q^*(e_i, e_j)$ and the predicted compatibility scores $\hat{q}(e_i, e_j)$ for all pairs of SFCs (e_i, e_j) in a given training set. If two SFCs e_i are assigned to the same template instance in the gold standard, then $q^*(e_i, e_j) = 1$, otherwise $q^*(e_i, e_j) = 0$, Note that we only consider pairs of slot-filler candidates which are assigned to the same template type.

The complete model is trained by minimizing the loss $L_{EE} + L_{TA}$ with respect to model parameters which are given by the parameters of the BERT encoder, the parameters of the dense layers defined by (1), (2), (8) and the parameters of the layer which is used to compute the vector representation \mathbf{e}_k of the SFCs.

Experiments 4

We conduct experiments on two public datasets (Sanchez-Graillet et al., 2021) which contain RCT abstracts from the Glaucoma and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) domain, respectively. The corpora of both datasets are annotated at two levels: At the first level, salient entities which describe components of the PICO elements are annotated. The second level comprises template-based annotations of complex PICO elements and their interactions.

Experimental Setting 4.1

In all our experiments, we use a BERT model pretrained on biomedical and life sciences literature abstracts¹. We use the same train/validation/test split as in (Sanchez-Graillet et al., 2021), Table 2 shows the number of abstracts included in the train, validation and test sets of the respective datasets. All models are trained with the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017) for 30 epochs with an initial learning rate of $3 * 10^{-5}$ and with a linear warm-up phase over the first 10% of training steps. Further, we use batches of exactly one abstract and set the beam size of the intra-template compatibility optimization algorithm depicted in 1 to 50.

We score a predicted SFC as correct if there is a SFC in the corresponding sentence in the test set with the same label, start and end position. Further, we use the Hungarian algorithm (Kuhn, 1955) for aligning predicted and ground truth templates for

¹https://tfhub.dev/google/experts/bert/pubmed/2

	# Abstracts training set	# Abstracts validation set	# Abstracts test set
Glaucoma	69	17	21
T2DM	68	16	20

each template class, using the pairwise micro F_1 as optimization objective.

As a baseline, we implement a greedy assignment approach to assign SFCs to template instances: Given the set \mathcal{E}_t of extracted SFCs for template type t, we repeatedly loop over the template instances T_t^k , randomly pick a SFC from \mathcal{E}_T , assign this entity to T_t^k and remove it from \mathcal{E}_t . This is repeated until the set \mathcal{E}_t is empty, i.e., all SFCs for template type t have been assigned.

4.2 Results

Extraction of slot filler candidates: Our approach can extract 37 types of slot filler candidates (see Table 1). The results in terms of Precision, Recall and F-Measure for all slot types are given in Table 8 in the Appendix. Overall, the model yields a micro-averaged F-Measure of 0.80 (P=0.80, R=0.73) on the Glaucoma dataset as well as F=0.76 (P=0.80, R=0.73) on the T2DM dataset. Table 3 shows the top 10 slot types with the best extraction results. Similarly, table 4 shows the five slot types with the worst prediction results.

Template extraction: Table 8 in the Appendix shows the prediction results of the SFCs on the Glaucoma and T2DM test sets. The entries "-" indicate that the corresponding slots are not used in the respective data set. Table 5 shows the aggregated results over each template type by averaging the F-values for all slots of the corresponding template. Note that Table 5 only contains template types which could have more than one instance, whereas Table 1 shows all template types. Overall, our proposed model yields a micro F_1 score of 62.27% on the Glaucoma corpus and 64.38% on the T2DM corpus, with a gain of 6,34% in microaveraged F_1 compared to greedy assignment on the Glaucoma dataset and 3,95% on the T2DM dataset, showing the superiority of our proposed intra-template entity compatibility (ITC) algorithm. For both datasets, the instances of template Arm are extracted best with mean F_1 of 91% and 93% on the Glaucoma and T2DM dataset, respectively. The templates types that have the worst performance are Endpoint for the Glaucoma dataset (mean F=48%)

Table 3: Top 10 slot types for the Glaucoma and T2DM datasets

Slot Name	F_1
Glaucoma	
PMID	1.00
PublicationYear	1.00
RelativeChangeValue	1.00
SdErrorChangeValue	1.00
Title	0.94
SdDevResValue	0.94
NumberPatientsCT	0.93
ChangeValue	0.92
HealthCondition	0.91
NumberPatientsArm	0.91
T2DM	
NumberAffected	1.00
PMID	1.00
PublicationYear	1.00
Journal	0.97
PercentageAffected	0.95
Author	0.94
NumberPatientsArm	0.93
NumberPatientsCT	0.93
ChangeValue	0.90
CTDesign	0.88

Table 4: Slot types with the worst prediction results forthe Glaucoma and T2DM datasets

Slot Name	F_1
Glaucoma	
ObservedResult	0.00
Drug	0.27
Precondition	0.28
PointDescription	0.32
ObjectiveDescrip-	0.49
T2DM	
ConfIntervalDiff	0.00
ObservedResult	0.00
SdDevChangeValue	0.25
SdDevBL	0.38
Precondition	0.41

	Glaucoma		T2DM	
	Greedy Assignment	ITC	Greedy assignment	ITC
DiffBetweenGroups	0.58	0.64	0.47	0.48
Arm	0.85	0.91	0.93	0.93
Intervention	0.53	0.73	0.68	0.58
Medication	0.89	0.89	0.57	0.77
Outcome	0.41	0.61	0.47	0.44
Endpoint	0.51	0.48	0.56	0.60
Micro Average	0.56	0.62	0.60	0.64

Table 5: Aggregated slot-filling results (mean F_1 and overall micro F_1) (ITC=Intra-Template Compatibility)

and Outcome for the T2DM dataset (mean F=44%).

On the Glaucoma dataset, for four out of six template types, our proposed ITC algorithm yields better performance than the greedy assignment in terms of mean F_1 , for one template type (Medication) the performance is equal and for one out of six template types the performance is worse. On the T2DM dataset, for three out of six template types our ITC algorithm performs better than greedy assignment, for one template type (Arm) the performance is equal and for two out out six template types the performance is worse.

We also conducted a study simulating perfect entity extraction by performing the second step with gold standard SFCs. The results in Table 6 show that results are significantly better with perfect SFC identification, yielding an increase of more than 0.20 points in micro averaged F-Measure for the Glaucoma dataset and more than 0.15 points on the T2DM dataset. This shows the importance of good entity recognition and extraction models.

Table 7 shows the effect of the beam size on the template extraction results. Overall, we see that the beam size has a negligible effect on the results.

Case study: As a case study, we compare the predicted structure to the gold standard structure for one published clinical trial in the test set of the T2DM corpus. We cherry pick the study with the best results in terms of micro-averaged F_1 , that is $F_1 = 0.85$. The selected paper is the publication by Shankar et al. (2017). Table 10 contrasts the instances of templates specified in the gold standard vs. the instances of templates extracted by our approach. Overall, the results are very good, clearly showing the potential of our approach and hinting at the fact that the task can be solved to a satisfactory extent. Regarding the *Population* studied in the paper, our method can extract a corresponding

condition, but is not able to explicitly extract the countries in which the population was recruited (USA, Australia). With except of the health condition (type 2 diabetes mellitus), all other elements describing the characteristics of the Clinical Trial are extracted correctly. Most of the relevant endpoints are extracted correctly, albeit not always the correct units are extracted. Two endpoints are conflated into one: fasting plasma glucose and 2 - h post - meal glucose with the result that one endpoint has a unit (mg/dl) but no endpoint description. The medications for the two arms (sinagliptin vs. placebo) are extracted correctly. The dose value of sinagliptin is mistaken for the dose value of the placebo unfortunately. Most of the outcome values are extracted correctly, but the percentage of patients affected is not extracted. The p values reporting significance of results when comparing the two arms / groups are extracted perfectly.

Table 11 shows the instances of templates specified in the gold standard vs. the instances of templates extracted by our approach for the abstract from the T2DM test set with the worst prediction result in terms of micro $F_1 = 0.57$. The corresponding publication can be found in (Klein et al., 2014). Although our system gets the Publication metadata, the Clinical Trial design, Arms and Medications right to a great extent, it makes a number of important errors in the categories Endpoints and Outcomes.

5 Conclusion

We have presented a twp-step neural architecture based on a transformer model that can induce a structured representation from an abstract describing a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT). The architecture performs extraction of candidate slot fillers as a first step by identifying spans of 37 Table 6: Aggregated slot-filling results comparing the settings with perfect entity recognition using gold standard entity annotations and entity recognition by our model (mean F_1 and overall micro F_1)

	Glauco	oma	T2DM		
	Ground Truth SFCs	Predicted SFCs	Ground Truth SFCs	Predicted SFCs	
DiffBetweenGroups	0.87	0.64	0.77	0.48	
Arm	1.00	0.91	1.00	0.93	
Intervention	0.83	0.73	1.00	0.58	
Medication	0.92	0.89	0.93	0.77	
Outcome	0.69	0.61	0.59	0.44	
Endpoint	0.90	0.48	0.82	0.60	
Micro Average	0.83	0.62	0.81	0.64	

Table 7: Effect of the beam size on template extraction results (mean F_1 and overall micro F_1)

		Glaucoma				T2DM				
	10	20	30	40	50	10	20	30	40	50
DiffBetweenGroups	0.64	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.64	0.50	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.48
Arm	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
Intervention	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.72	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58
Medication	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.77	0.77	0.79	0.79	0.77	0.77
Outcome	0.58	0.61	0.57	0.56	0.61	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.43	0.44
Enpoint	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.62	0.60
Micro Average	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64

different classes. At a second step, it assigns the extracted candidate slot fillers into nine main templates. We have shown that our approach can extract candidate slot fillers reliably, yielding micro F-Measures of 76.21% and 76.49% on our Glaucoma and T2DM dataset, respectively. In terms of extraction of templates, our approach yields micro F-measures of 62.27% and 64.38% averaged over all slots on our Glaucoma and T2DM dataset, respectively. The structure of our templates is inspired by the C-TrO ontology (Sanchez-Graillet et al., 2019) and induces the most fine-grained and accurate representation of a published RCT that has been considered so far by any information extraction system. In future work we intend to show that our information extraction approach indeed supports the aggregation of results across clinical trials. Further, we plan to use the intra-template compatibility scores to infer the number of template instance for template types which could have several instances. This can be regarded as an additional layer on top of our proposed optimization algorithm. In addition, we plan to predict links between template instances.

References

- Heike Adel, Laura Ana Maria Oberländer, Sean Papay, Sebastian Padó, and Roman Klinger. 2018. Dere: A task and domain-independent slot filling framework for declarative relation extraction. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations, pages 42–47.
- Abien Fred Agarap. 2018. Deep learning using rectified linear units (relu). arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08375.
- Elaine M Beller, Joyce Kee-Hsin Chen, Una Li-Hsiang Wang, and Paul P Glasziou. 2013. Are systematic reviews up-to-date at the time of publication? *Systematic Reviews*, 2:36.
- Rohit Borah, Andrew W Brown, Patrice L Capers, and Kathryn A Kaiser. 2017. Analysis of the time and workers needed to conduct systematic reviews of medical interventions using data from the prospero registry. *BMJ Open*, 7(2).
- Florian Boudin, Jian-Yun Nie, Joan C Bartlett, Roland Grad, Pierre Pluye, and Martin Dawes. 2010. Combining classifiers for robust pico element detection. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, 10(1):1–6.
- Grace Y Chung. 2009. Sentence retrieval for abstracts of randomized controlled trials. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 9:10.

- Dina Demner-Fushman and Jimmy Lin. 2007. Answering clinical questions with knowledge-based and statistical techniques. *Computational Linguistics*, 33(1):63–103.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171– 4186.
- Giacomo Frisoni, Gianluca Moro, and Antonella Carbonaro. 2021. A survey on event extraction for natural language understanding: Riding the biomedical literature wave. *IEEE Access*, 9:160721–160757.
- Kenji Hirohata, Naoaki Okazaki, Sophia Ananiadou, and Mitsuru Ishizuka. 2008. Identifying sections in scientific abstracts using conditional random fields. In Proceedings of the Third International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Volume-I.
- Di Jin and Peter Szolovits. 2018. Pico element detection in medical text via long short-term memory neural networks. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP 2018 workshop*, pages 67–75.
- David J Klein, Tadej Battelino, DJ Chatterjee, Lisbeth V Jacobsen, Paula M Hale, Silva Arslanian, and NN2211-1800 Study Group. 2014. Liraglutide's safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics in pediatric type 2 diabetes: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Diabetes technology & therapeutics*, 16(10):679–687.
- GG Koch. 2006. No improvement-still less than half of the cochrane reviews are up to date. In *XIV Cochrane Colloquium, Dublin, Ireland*.
- F.R. Kschischang, B.J. Frey, and H.-A. Loeliger. 2001. Factor graphs and the sum-product algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(2):498–519.
- Harold W Kuhn. 1955. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97.
- Feifan Liu, Jinying Chen, Abhyuday Jagannatha, and Hong Yu. 2016. Learning for biomedical information extraction: Methodological review of recent advances. arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.07993.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2017. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*.
- Larry McKnight and Padmini Srinivasan. 2003. Categorization of sentence types in medical abstracts. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, volume 2003, page 440. American Medical Informatics Association.
- Benjamin E Nye, Ani Nenkova, Iain J Marshall, and Byron C Wallace. 2020. Trialstreamer: mapping

and browsing medical evidence in real-time. In *Proceedings of the conference. Association for Computational Linguistics. North American Chapter. Meeting*, volume 2020, page 63. NIH Public Access.

- Annette M O'Connor, Guy Tsafnat, Stephen B Gilbert, Kristina A Thayer, Ian Shemilt, James Thomas, Paul Glasziou, and Mary S Wolfe. 2019. Still moving toward automation of the systematic review process: a summary of discussions at the third meeting of the international collaboration for automation of systematic reviews (icasr). *Systematic reviews*, 8:57.
- Yannis Papanikolaou and Francine Bennett. 2021. Slot filling for biomedical information extraction.
- David L Sackett, William MC Rosenberg, JA Muir Gray, R Brian Haynes, and W Scott Richardson. 1996. Evidence based medicine. *BMJ*, 313(7050):170.
- Olivia Sanchez-Graillet, Philipp Cimiano, Christian Witte, and Basil Ell. 2019. C-TrO: An Ontology for Summarization and Aggregation of the Level of Evidence in Clinical Trials. In Proc. of the 5th Joint Ontology Workshops (JOWO): Ontologies and Data in the Life Sciences.
- Olivia Sanchez-Graillet, Christian Witte, Frank Grimm, and Philipp Cimiano. 2021. An annotated corpus of clinical trial publications supporting schema-based relational information extraction. *Journal of Biomedical Semantics*. Under review.
- R Ravi Shankar, Yuqian Bao, Ping Han, Ji Hu, Jianhua Ma, Yongde Peng, Fan Wu, Lei Xu, Samuel S Engel, and Weiping Jia. 2017. Sitagliptin added to stable insulin therapy with or without metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of diabetes investigation*, 8(3):321–329.
- Antonio Trenta, Anthony Hunter, and Sebastian Riedel. 2015. Extraction of evidence tables from abstracts of randomized clinical trials using a maximum entropy classifier and global constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05209*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In Advances in neural information processing systems, pages 5998–6008.
- Xing David Wang, Leon Weber, and Ulf Leser. 2020. Biomedical event extraction as multi-turn question answering. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Health Text Mining and Information Analysis*, pages 88–96.
- Stephen Wu, Kirk Roberts, Surabhi Datta, Jingcheng Du, Zongcheng Ji, Yuqi Si, Sarvesh Soni, Qiong Wang, Qiang Wei, Yang Xiang, et al. 2020. Deep learning in clinical natural language processing: a methodical review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(3):457–470.

Yuhao Zhang, Victor Zhong, Danqi Chen, Gabor Angeli, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. Position-aware attention and supervised data improve slot filling. In Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pages 35–45, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Supplementary Material

	Glaucoma		T2DM			
Slot Name	Precision	Recall	F_1	Precision	Recall	F_1
analysesHealthCondition	0.97	0.86	0.91	0.64	0.58	0.61
Author	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.88	1.00	0.94
BaselineUnit	0.62	0.48	0.54	0.81	0.81	0.81
BaselineValue	0.90	0.67	0.77	0.80	0.60	0.69
CTDesign	0.76	0.83	0.79	0.85	0.91	0.88
CTduration	0.84	0.94	0.89	0.80	0.84	0.82
ChangeValue	0.97	0.88	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.90
ConclusionComment	0.85	0.79	0.81	0.83	0.31	0.45
ConfIntervalDiff	-	-	-	0.00	0.00	0.00
Country	0.81	0.89	0.85	0.89	0.44	0.59
DiffGroupAbsValue	0.75	0.67	0.71	0.84	0.70	0.76
DoseUnit	0.61	0.82	0.70	0.84	0.80	0.82
DoseValue	0.72	0.68	0.70	0.87	0.73	0.80
Drug	0.40	0.21	0.27	0.84	0.76	0.80
EndPointDescription	0.32	0.33	0.32	0.68	0.80	0.74
Frequency	0.89	0.71	0.79	0.71	0.57	0.63
Journal	0.76	0.76	0.76	1.00	0.95	0.97
NumberAffected	0.63	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	1.00
NumberPatientsArm	0.88	0.94	0.91	1.00	0.87	0.93
NumberPatientsCT	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.93
ObjectiveDescription	0.56	0.43	0.49	0.50	0.44	0.47
ObservedResult	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PMID	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PValueChangeValue	0.50	0.75	0.60	0.83	0.45	0.59
PercentageAffected	0.82	0.95	0.88	0.96	0.94	0.95
Precondition	0.42	0.22	0.29	0.57	0.32	0.41
PublicationYear	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PvalueDiff	0.49	0.68	0.57	0.82	0.94	0.88
RelativeChangeValue	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-	-
RelativeFreqTime	0.44	0.67	0.53	-	-	-
ResultMeasuredValue	0.85	0.79	0.82	0.75	0.95	0.84
SdDevBL	1.00	0.67	0.80	0.60	0.27	0.38
SdDevChangeValue	0.89	0.67	0.76	0.22	0.29	0.25
SdDevResValue	0.87	1.00	0.93	0.41	1.00	0.58
SdErrorChangeValue	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-	-
TimePoint	0.60	0.71	0.65	0.63	0.57	0.60
Title	1.00	0.88	0.94	0.77	0.77	0.77
micro average:	0.80	0.73	0.76	0.80	0.73	0.77

Table 8: Results of the slot-filler candidate extraction on the Glaucoma and T2DM test sets

Table 9: F_1 scores of the assignment of slot-filler candidates to template instances on the Glaucoma and T2DM test sets. The ITC (Intra-Template Compatibility) columns show the results of our proposed method

	Glaucoma		T2DM		
Slot Name	Greedy Assignment	ITC	Greedy Assignment	ITC	
	DiffBetweenG	roups	·		
ConfIntervalDiff	-	-	0.00	0.00	
PvalueDiff	0.57	0.57	0.83	0.83	
DiffGroupAbsValue	0.59	0.71	0.58	0.62	
mean	0.58	0.64	0.47	0.48	
	Arm				
NumberPatientsArm	0.85	0.91	0.93	0.92	
mean	0.85	0.91	0.93	0.93	
	Interventio	on	1		
Frequency	0.79	0.79	0.68	0.58	
RelativeFreqTime	0.27	0.67	-	-	
mean	0.53	0.73	0.68	0.58	
	Medicatio	n	1		
Drug	0.37	0.34	0.73	0.83	
DoseValue	0.70	0.65	0.46	0.63	
DoseUnit	0.71	0.79	0.49	0.87	
mean	0.89	0.89	0.57	0.77	
	Outcome	,			
ResultMeasuredValue	0.44	0.41	0.61	0.56	
TimePoint	0.55	0.50	0.55	0.35	
PValueChangeValue	0.40	0.42	0.59	0.59	
PercentageAffected	0.65	0.65	0.72	0.89	
SdErrorChangeValue	0.29	1.00	-	-	
BaselineValue	0.39	0.69	0.34	0.46	
SdDevBL	0.56	0.80	0.25	0.13	
RelativeChangeValue	0.00	1.00	-	-	
ChangeValue	0.79	0.73	0.73	0.71	
SdDevResValue	0.37	0.74	0.42	0.42	
NumberAffected	0.46	0.46	0.88	0.50	
SdDevChangeValue	0.48	0.57	0.13	0.25	
ObservedResult	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
mean	0.41	0.61	0.47	0.44	
Endpoint					
EndPointDescription	0.29	0.28	0.56	0.63	
BaselineUnit	0.73	0.68	0.55	0.57	
mean	0.51	0.48	0.60	0.64	
micro average	0.56	0.62	0.60	0.64	

Image: construction Precondition Precondition Precondition chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insuit in thery and the moglobin done or in combination with metformin peng y l wo f hau I lengel ss i jaa w rule of a stable atom peng y l wo f hau I lengel ss i jaa w i diabetes investig i diabetes investig i diabetes investig Journal i diabetes investig j diabetes investig i diabetes investig i diabetes investig PMID 27740719 27740719 27740719 Tile sitagliptin added to stable insult metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes rundomized Duration type 2 diabetes rundomized apy with or without metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes ObjectiveDescription of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insult interny alone or in combination with metformin. rundomized BaselineUnit: % thal c hbal c FadPointDescription Abal c hbal c rundomized BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl mg / dl mg / dl EndPointDescription ng / dl mg / dl mg / dl EndPointDescriptio		Gold Standard	Predicted
Country Preconditionusa, sustralia childs receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin or in combination with metformin or in combination with metformin (bit) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c		Рори	lation
Precondition chinese patients with type 2 diabetes alone or in combination with metformin (bale) at 7.5% and at 11%) Author shankar rr l bao y l han p l hu j l ma j l peng y l w 1 ra u l lengel ss l jaw regel ss l shankar rr l bao y l han p l hu j mag l peng yl w 1 ra u l lengel ss l jaw Journal diabetes investig j diabetes investig j diabetes investig PMiD 2017 2017 2017 Tile singliptin added to stable insulin ther- apy with or withou metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetes singliptin added to stable insulin ther- apy with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetes Pustion 24 weeks 24 weeks 24 weeks 24 weeks ObjectiveDescription of addition of singliptin in chinesy patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin theray alone or in combination with metformin. readomized BaselineUnit: % hbal c ////////////////////////////////////	Country	usa, australia	
mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformia peng y l w [1 su 1] engel s l sian (T-5% and at 11%) Author sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w u f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j 1 peng y l w f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j peng y l w f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma j peng y l w f 1 su 1] engel s l sharkar r1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu j 1 ma y p 2 l i p 2 l shabets Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon Purticon <td>Precondition</td> <td>chinese patients with type 2 diabetes</td> <td>patients with inadequate glycemic con-</td>	Precondition	chinese patients with type 2 diabetes	patients with inadequate glycemic con-
alone or in combination with metformin (balc) at 7.5% and at 11%) Author shankar rr I bao y1 han p1 hu j1 ma j1 diabetes investig j diabetes investig j diabetes investig Journal j diabetes investig j diabetes investig j diabetes investig PMID 27740719 27740719 Pablication Year 2017 2017 Tile situaljiptin added to stable insulin therapy with or withou metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes . apy with or withou metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus Design randomized 24 weeks 24 weeks 467 ve evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of situaljiptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin . receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin . TendPointDescription hbalc c f c 7.0% hbalc fastig plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal glucose BaselineUnit mg / dl mg/ dl glucose mg/ dl BaselineUnit mg / dl mg/ dl glucose mg/ dl BaselineUnit mg / dl mg/ dl glucose BaselineUnit mg		mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy	trol on insulin (glycated hemoglobin
PublicationAuthorsharkar rr I bao y I han p I hu j I ma j le gel si sharkar rr I bao y I han p I hu j ma j le gel si sharkar rr I bao y I han p I hu j ma j le gel si sharkar rr I bao y I han p I hu j ma j le gel si sharkar rr I bao y I hu j hu j di bac si section we welauted the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin addeficacy of the addition of sitagliptin i n chinese patients with typ 2 d diabets mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.BaselineUnitmg / dlmg / dlmg / dlEndPoinDescriptionhbal c of < 7.0%		alone or in combination with metformin	(hba1c) at 7.5% and at 11%)
Authorshankar rr 1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu jengel sl shankar rr 1 bao y 1 han p 1 hu jJournalj diabetes investigI ma j 1 (peng y 1 wu f 1 xu 1) ja wJournalj diabetes investig1 (diabetes investig.PMID277407192017PublicationYear20172017Tilestagliptin added to stable insulin therary any with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetes		Publi	cation
peng y wu f xu l l engel s ja wIma j peng y wu f xu l ja wJournalj diabetes investigj diabetes investig.PMID2774071927740719PublicationYear20172017Tilesingliptin added to stable insulin ther- apy with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetessingliptin added to stable insulin ther- apy with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetesDuration24 weeks24 weeksObjectiveDescription24 weeks467ObjectiveDescriptionwe evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therap alone or in combination with metformin.randomizedBaselineUnit%balcEndPointDescriptionhbal chbal cIbal c/ 2. h post - meal glucosefasting plasma glucoseBaselineUnitmg / dlmg / dlEndPointDescriptionhody of the addition of sitagliptin addediconsmatic)mg / dlmg / dlBaselineUnitmg / dlEndPointDescriptionhobal chypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymp- tomatic)hypoglycemiaBaselineUnitmg / dlEndPointDescriptionhodyweightboseValue0.3DoseUnit00DoseValue0.3DoseValue0.3DoseValue0.3DoseValue0.3DoseValue100DoseValue100ChangeValue0.4 </td <td>Author</td> <td>shankar rr bao y han p hu j ma j </td> <td>engel ss shankar rr bao y han p hu j</td>	Author	shankar rr bao y han p hu j ma j	engel ss shankar rr bao y han p hu j
Journal j diabetes investig j diabetes investig j diabetes investig PMID 27740719 2017 PublicationYear 2017 2017 Tile sitagliptin added to stable insulin ther- apy with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetes. sitagliptin added to stable insulin ther- nese patients with type 2 diabetes healthCondition type 2 diabetes mellitus randomized Duration 24 weeks 24 weeks NumberPatients 467 467 ObjectiveDescription we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. readomized BaselineUnit: % hba1c hba1c fasting plasma glucose mg / dl fasting plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal glucose BaselineUnit mg / dl fasting plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal glucose mg/dl BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl fasting plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal glucose BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl mg / dl EndPointDescription fasting plasma glucose mg / d		peng y wu f xu l engel ss jia w	ma j peng y wu f xu l jia w
PMID2774071927740719PublicationYear20172017Tilesitagliptin added to stable insulin therapy with or without metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes .sitagliptin added to stable insulin therapy with or without metformin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus randomizedDuration24 weeks24 weeksNumberPatients467467ObjectiveDescriptionwee evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.EndPointDescriptionBaselineUnit%hbal chbal cEndPointDescriptionhbal cfasting plasma glucose fasting plasma glucosefasting plasma glucose stagliptinBaselineUnitmg / dlmgmgmg / dlmgmgEndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightDoseValue100mgDoseValue0.30.3DoseValue0.30.3Pracebo100DoseValue100DoseValue100ChangeValue0.30.3Pracebo26.5ChangeValue26.5ChangeValue27.4Pracebo107DoseValue107DoseValue107DoseValue100Pracebo107DoseValue100Pracebo21.9Pracebo21.9Pracebo21.9DoseValue10.7	Journal	j diabetes investig	j diabetes invest ig .
PublicationYear 2017 2017 Tile sitagliptin added to stable insulin ther- apy with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetes . NealthCondition type 2 diabetes mellitus Design randomized Duration 24 weeks ObjectiveDescription 467 We evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin . BaselineUnit: % BaselineUnit: % IndPointDescription hbal c of < 7.0%	PMID	27740719	27740719
Tile singliptin added to stable insulin ther- nese patients with type 2 diabetes . singliptin added to stable insulin ther- nese patients with type 2 diabetes . HealthCondition type 2 diabetes mellitus randomized randomized Duration 24 weeks 24 weeks 467 weeks 467 ObjectiveDescription wee wealuated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. file BaselineUnit: % bhal c healt EndPointDescription hbal c of <7.0%	PublicationYear	2017	2017
apy with or without metformin in chi- nese patients with type 2 diabetes . apy with or without metformin in chi- see patients with type 2 diabetes . healthCondition type 2 diabetes mellitus randomized randomized Duration 24 weeks 24 weeks MumberPatients 467 467 ObjectiveDescription we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy in combination with metformin. we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy in combination with metformin. BaselineUnit: % healdtic or 30% EndPointDescription hbalc hbalc EndPointDescription hbalc of <7.0%	Tile	sitagliptin added to stable insulin ther-	sitagliptin added to stable insulin ther-
nese patients with type 2 diabetes . nese patients with type 2 diabetes . NeathCondition Design Duration 24 weeks randomized 24 weeks randomized 24 weeks 467 24 weeks 467 ObjectiveDescription we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. BaselineUnit: % hell c EndPointDescription hbal c hbal c BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl EndPointDescription hbal c of <7.0%		apy with or without metformin in chi-	apy with or without metformin in chi-
Image: Clinical Trial Design randomized Duration 24 weeks 24 weeks Advised 24 weeks 467 Weeks 467 we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy ObjectiveDescription we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy ObjectiveDescription he addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. in combination with metformin. EndPointDescription hbalc fasting plasma glucose. patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl fasting plasma glucose. patients with type 2 diabetes BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl mg / dl fasting plasma glucose. patients BaselineUnit mg / dl mg / dl mg / dl mg / dl EndPointDescription bodyweight bodyweight bodyweight DoseUnit mg glucose mg glucose DoseValue 0.3 0.3 0.3		nese patients with type 2 diabetes .	nese patients with type 2 diabetes .
healthCondition type 2 diabetes mellitus randomized 24 weeks 467 467 467 467 467 467 467 aradomized 24 weeks 24 weeks 467 467 we evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. In combination with metformin in combinati		Clinica	al Trial
Design Duration Durationrandomized randomized 24 weeks 467randomized 24 weeks 467NumberPatients ObjectiveDescription467467We evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.BaselineUnit: EndPointDescription% hbalc of < 7.0% hbalc of < 7.0%	healthCondition	type 2 diabetes mellitus	
Duration NumberPatients ObjectiveDescription24 weeks 46724 weeks 467ObjectiveDescription or in combination with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.467BaselineUnit: EndPointDescription% hbalc of <7.0%	Design	randomized	randomized
NumerPatients467467ObjectiveDescriptionwe evaluated the tolerability and efficacy of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.467BaselineUnit: EndPointDescription $\%$ hbal c of <7.0%	Duration	24 weeks	24 weeks
ObjectiveDescriptionwe evaluated the toterability and entracty of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.we evaluated the toterability and entracty of the addition of sitagliptin in chinese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.method%EndPointDescriptionhbal chbalchbal cEndPointDescriptionhbal c BaselineUnitmg / dlEndPointDescriptionmg / dlBaselineUnitmg / dlglucosemg / dlBaselineUnitmg / dlBaselineUnitmg / dlBaselineUnitmg / dlEndPointDescriptionhypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymp- tomatic)boseUnitmgDoseUnitmgDoseUnitmgDoseUnit100DoseUnit100DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit100DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit0.3DoseUnit100DoseUnit26.5ChangeValue16.4ChangeValue16.4ChangeValue16.4ChangeValue16.4ChangeValue11.4ChangeValue11.4ChangeValue11.4ChangeValue	NumberPatients	40/	
b the addition of straggpun in clinices patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin. BaselineUnit: EndPointDescription BaselineUnit EndPointDescription DoseValue DoseValue DoseValue ChangeValue ChangeValue ChangeValue ChangeValue ChangeValue ChangeValue 26.5 ChangeValue 100 ChangeValue ChangeValue 26.5 ChangeValue 10.7 ChangeValue ChangeValue 26.5 ChangeValue 10.7 ChangeValue 21.9, 8 NumberAffected 51 PercentageAffected 51 Pe	ObjectiveDescription	of the addition of site align in chinase	of the addition of site align in shinese
patients with type 2 diabetes mentulas preciving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin.patients with type 2 diabetes mentulas receiving stable insulin therapy alone or in combination with metformin .BaselineUnit:%hbal chbal cEndPointDescriptionhbal c of <7.0%		of the addition of shagiptin in clinese	of the addition of sitagipun in chinese
InclusionInclusion with metapy and/e of a combination with m		receiving stable insulin therapy alone or	receiving stable insulin therapy alone or
In communication with metorinitityIn communication with metorinitityIn communication with metorinitityBaselineUnitEndPointDescriptionhbalc of < 7.0%		in combination with metformin	in combination with metformin
BaselineUnit: EndPointDescription $hbalc$ $hbalc$ EndPointDescriptionhbalc of <7.0%		Fndr	ni comonation with metrorinin .
Backmit DescriptionhbalchbalcEndPointDescriptionhbalc of <7.0%	BaselineUnit [.]	%	
EndPointDescriptionhbalc of < 7.0%hbalc of < 7.0%BaselineUnitmg / dlmg / dlEndPointDescription2 - h post - meal glucosemg / dlBaselineUnitmg / dlmg/dlEndPointDescriptionfasting plasma glucosemg/dlBaselineUnitmg / dlmg/dlEndPointDescriptionmg / dlhypoglycemiaBaselineUnitmg / dlhypoglycemiaEndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightDoseUnitmgmgDoseUnitmgmgDoseUnitngmgDoseUnit100mgDoseUnit100placeboDrugplaceboplaceboDoseUnit0.30.3ChangeValue0.70.3ChangeValue10.70.3ChangeValue10.70.7ChangeValue10.70.7ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected8ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected64PercentageAffected21.9NumberAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51Percent	EndPointDescription	hba1c	hba1c
BaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl 2 - h post - meal glucosemg / dl fasting plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal glucoseBaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl fasting plasma glucosemg/dlBaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl fasting plasma glucosemg/dlBaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl hypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymp- tomatic)hypoglycemiaBaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightBaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightDoseUnit DoseUnitmg 100mgDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue100placeboDrugplaceboplaceboDoseValue0.30.3PercentageAffected16mex 24PercentageAffected826.5ChangeValue26.526.5ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected5121.9PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrecentageAffected5121.9, 8PrelueDiffp = 0.013p < 0.001	EndPointDescription	hba1c of $< 7.0\%$	hba1c of $< 7.0\%$
EndPointDescription $2 \cdot h post - meal glucosefasting plasma glucose, 2 \cdot h post - meal glucoseBaselineUnitmg / dlmg/dlEndPointDescriptionmg / dlhypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymptomatic)BaselineUnitmg / dlhypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymptomatic)BaselineUnit:bodyweightbodyweightBaselineUnit:bodyweightbodyweightBaselineUnit:mgmgChargeValue100mgDoseUnitmgmgDoseUnit100sitagliptinDoseUnit100placeboDoseValue0placeboDoseValue0.30.3Outcomes0.30.3ChangeValue0.70.3ChangeAffected16mexek 24PercentageAffected826.5ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected5121.9PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PercentageAffected5121.9, 8PralueDiffp < 0.001$	BaselineUnit	mg / dl	mg / dl
BaselineUnitmg / dlmg/dlEndPointDescriptionfasting plasma glucosemg/dlBaselineUnitmg / dlhypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymptomatic)BaselineUnit:bodyweightEndPointDescriptionbodyweightBaselineUnit:bodyweightEndPointDescriptionbodyweightDoseValue100DoseValue100DoseValue100DoseValue100DoseValue0.3DoseValue0.3DrugplaceboPercentageAffected16TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue10.7ChangeValue10.7ChangeValue10.7PercentageAffected8ChangeValue10.7NumberAffected51PercentageAffected </td <td>EndPointDescription</td> <td>2 - h post - meal glucose</td> <td>fasting plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal</td>	EndPointDescription	2 - h post - meal glucose	fasting plasma glucose, 2 - h post - meal
BaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl fasting plasma glucosemg/dlBaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl hypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymptomatic)hypoglycemiaBaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightBaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightDoseUnit DoseValuemg 100mgDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue0placeboDrugplaceboplaceboChangeValue0.30.3PercentageAffected16week 24PercentageAffected8secondChangeValue10.710.7ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected5126.5PercentageAffected51PercentageAffec		r ···· ð ·····	glucose
EndPointDescriptionfasting plasma glucoseBaselineUnitmg / dlEndPointDescriptionhypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymptomatic)BaselineUnit:bodyweightEndPointDescriptionbodyweightDoseUnitmgDoseUnitmgDoseValue100DrugsitagliptinsitagliptinsitagliptinDoseValue100DrugplaceboDareyplaceboDrugplaceboDarey0.3PercentageAffected16TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected16ChangeValue0.7ChangeValue0.5ChangeValue10.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected51 <td>BaselineUnit</td> <td>mg / dl</td> <td>mg/dl</td>	BaselineUnit	mg / dl	mg/dl
BaselineUnit EndPointDescriptionmg / dl hypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymp- tomatic)hypoglycemiaBaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightDoseUnit DoseValuemgmgDoseUnit DoseValue100mgDoseUnit DoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue100placeboDrugplaceboplaceboDrugplacebo0.3ChangeValue0.70.3ChangeValue0.30.3PercentageAffected16TimePointweek 24week 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected51PercentageAffected51 <t< td=""><td>EndPointDescription</td><td>fasting plasma glucose</td><td></td></t<>	EndPointDescription	fasting plasma glucose	
EndPointDescriptionhypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymptomatic)hypoglycemiaBaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightboseVnitbodyweightbodyweightDoseUnitmgmgDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue100placeboDoseValue0placeboDoseValue0.7classecondChangeValue0.30.3PercentageAffected16seek 24PercentageAffected8classecondChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected64placeboPercentageAffected5121.9PercentageAffected5121.9, 8ObservedResult21.921.9, 8ObservedResultpeicher spoup had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.peicondPauleDiffp < 0.001	BaselineUnit	mg / dl	
tomatic)tomatic)BaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightbodyweightmgMedicationsDoseUnitmgDoseValue100DrugsitagliptinboseValue100DoseValueplaceboDrugplaceboDrugplaceboOutcomesChangeValue0.7ChangeValue0.3PercentageAffected16TimePointweek 24week 24week 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue26.5ChangeValue10.7Outcomes10.7ChangeValue10.7OutschageValue12.9SchageValue12.9PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51.9PualueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$	EndPointDescription	hypoglycemia (symptomatic or asymp-	hypoglycemia
BaselineUnit: EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightImage: DoseUnit DoseValuemgmgDoseValue100mgDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseUnit DoseValue100sitagliptinDoseValue100placeboDoseValueplaceboplaceboDrugplacebooutcomesChangeValue0.7contextPercentageAffected16flootTimePointweek 24week 24PercentageAffected8contextChangeValue26.526.5ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected64percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPolueDiffp < 0.001		tomatic)	
EndPointDescriptionbodyweightbodyweightMedicationsDoseUnitmgDoseValue100DrugsitagliptinsitagliptinsitagliptinDoseValue100DoseValue100DoseValue100DoseValue100DrugplaceboplaceboplaceboChangeValue0.7ChangeValue0.3OutcomesChangeValue16TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected16ChangeValue26.526.526.5ChangeValue10.7ChangeValue10.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected21.9NumberAffected51PercentageAffected21.9neither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$	BaselineUnit:		
MedicationsDoseUnitmgmgDoseValue100sitagliptinDoseUnit100placeboDoseValueplaceboplaceboDrugplacebooutomesChangeValue0.7cutomesChangeValue0.30.3PercentageAffected16fillerTimePointweek 24week 24PercentageAffected8cutomesChangeValue26.526.5ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected64percentageAffectedPercentageAffected51percentageAffectedPercentageAffected5121.9, 8ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.21.9, 8PvalueDiffp < 0.001	EndPointDescription	bodyweight	bodyweight
DoseUnitmgmgDoseValue100sitagliptinDrugsitagliptinsitagliptinDoseValue100sitagliptinDrugplaceboplaceboDrugplacebo0.1ChangeValue0.70.3ChangeValue0.30.3PercentageAffected1616TimePointweek 24Vece Value26.526.5ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected21.9NumberAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageIffp < 0.001		Medic	cations
Dose Value100sitagliptinDrugsitagliptinsitagliptinDose Unit100 100 Dose Value 100 placeboDrugplaceboplaceboChange Value 0.7 0.3 Change Value 0.3 0.3 Percentage Affected16week 24Percentage Affected8 26.5 Change Value 26.5 26.5 Change Value10.7 10.7 Number Affected64 27.4 Percentage Affected51 21.9 , 8Observed Resultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight. 21.9 , 8PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	DoseUnit	mg	mg
DrugsitagiiptinsitagiiptinDoseUnit100 100 DoseValue 100 placeboDrugplacebo $0100000000000000000000000000000000000$	DoseValue		16 11 61
Dose Value100placeboDrugplacebo $placebo$ OutcomesOutcomesChange Value0.7Change Value0.3Percentage Affected16TimePointweek 24Percentage Affected8Change Value26.5Change Value14.4Change Value10.7Number Affected64Percentage Affected51Percentage Affected51Percentage Affected51Percentage Affected21.9Observed Resultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.PalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	Drug	sitagliptin	sitagiiptin
Dose valueplaceboDrugplaceboOutcomesChangeValue 0.7 ChangeValue 0.3 Off 0.3 PercentageAffected 16 TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected 8 ChangeValue 26.5 ChangeValue 14.4 ChangeValue 10.7 NumberAffected 64 PercentageAffected 51 PercentageAffected 51 PercentageAffected 51 PercentageAffected 21.9 NumberAffected 51 PercentageAffected 21.9 NumberAffected 51 PercentageAffected 21.9 Differences between groupsPvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$	DoseUnit	100	
DidgpraceodpraceodOutcomesChangeValue0.7ChangeValue0.3PercentageAffected16TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue26.5ChangeValue14.4ChangeValue10.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected21.9NumberAffected51PercentageAffected21.9PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected51PercentageAffected21.9, 8ObservedResultp = 0.001PvalueDiffp < 0.001	Dose value	plaasha	placebo
ChangeValue0.7ChangeValue0.30.3PercentageAffected16TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue26.5ChangeValue14.4ChangeValue10.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected27.4NumberAffected51PercentageAffected21.9, 8ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	Diug	Dute	omes
Change Value0.7Change Value0.3Percentage Affected16TimePointweek 24Percentage Affected8Change Value26.5Change Value14.4Change Value10.7Number Affected64Percentage Affected27.4Number Affected51Percentage Affected21.9Number Affected19.7Number Affected51Percentage Affected21.9Number Affected10.7Number Affected51Percentage Affected21.9Differences between groupsPvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$	ChangeValue	0.7	
PercentageAffected TimePoint160.3PercentageAffected16week 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue26.526.5ChangeValue14.414.4ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected27.427.4NumberAffected51PercentageAffected21.921.9, 8ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	ChangeValue	0.3	03
TercentageAffected10TimePointweek 24PercentageAffected8ChangeValue26.5ChangeValue14.414.4ChangeValue10.7NumberAffected64PercentageAffected27.4NumberAffected51PercentageAffected21.9ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$	Percentage Affected	16	0.5
PercentageAffectedNumber of the second	TimePoint	week 24	week 24
ChangeValue26.526.5ChangeValue14.414.4ChangeValue10.710.7NumberAffected6427.4PercentageAffected27.427.4NumberAffected5121.9, 8ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.21.9, 8PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	Percentage Affected	8	WCCK 24
Change Value14.414.4Change Value10.710.7Number Affected6427.4Percentage Affected27.427.4Number Affected5121.9, 8Observed Resultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.21.9, 8Pvalue Diff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ Pvalue Diff $p = 0.013$ $p = 0.013$ Pvalue Diff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	ChangeValue	26.5	26.5
Change Value11.111.1Change Value10.710.7Number Affected64Percentage Affected27.4Number Affected51Percentage Affected21.9Observed Resultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.Differences between groupsPvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ p < 0.001	ChangeValue	14.4	14.4
NumberAffected64PercentageAffected27.4NumberAffected51PercentageAffected21.9ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.Differences between groupsPvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ p < 0.001	ChangeValue	10.7	10.7
PercentageAffected 27.4 NumberAffected 51 PercentageAffected 21.9 ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight.Differences between groupsPvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ p < 0.001	NumberAffected	64	10.7
NumberAffected 51 21.9 PercentageAffected 21.9 21.9, 8 ObservedResult neither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight. 21.9, 8 PvalueDiff p < 0.001	PercentageAffected	27.4	27.4
PercentageAffected ObservedResult 21.9 neither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight. $21.9, 8$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	NumberAffected	51	
ObservedResultneither group had a significant change from baseline in bodyweight. $21000000000000000000000000000000000000$	PercentageAffected	21.9	21.9.8
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ObservedResult	neither group had a significant change	
Differences between groupsPvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$		from baseline in bodyweight.	
PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$ PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$		Differences b	etween groups
PvalueDiff $p = 0.013$ $p = 0.013$ PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	PvalueDiff	p < 0.001	p < 0.001
PvalueDiff $p < 0.001$ $p < 0.001$	PvalueDiff	p = 0.013	p = 0.013
	PvalueDiff	p < 0.001	p < 0.001

Table 10: Predicted and gold standard structures for the abstract of the clinical trial described in Shankar, R Ravi et al. "Sitagliptin added to stable insulin therapy with or without metformin in Chinese patients with type 2 diabetes." Journal of diabetes investigation vol. 8,3 (2017): 321-329. doi:10.1111/jdi.12585; within one template type, horizontal lines separate different instances of the same template type

AvgAge 14.8 Country ohio MaxAge 17 MaxAge 17 MaxAge 10 Precondition youth treated with diet / exercise alone or with metformia and having a hemoglo bin a l c (hbal c) level of 6 . 5 - 11 %; youth Image Author battelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen Iv; chatt- terjee dj; klein dj; hale pm Iopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arslanian s; bone m; randell t; jacobsen Iv; chatterjee dj; haza 1; jac schep- per j; wadva rp; wintergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pm Journal diabetes technol ther . diabetes technol ther . PMID 25036533 25036533 Journal tiabetes technol ther . Di4 PMID 25036533 25036533 CTDesign randomized 1 double - blind randomized CTduration 5 weeks 5 weeks CTduration 5 weeks 5 weeks EndPointDescription gastrointestinal aes Endpoints EndPointDescription balc gastrointestinal aes EndPointDescription bow weight kg BaselineUnit Kg kg ObservedResult no serious adverse events gaschine		Gold Standard	Predicted
AvgAge 14.8 Country ohio MaxAge 17 MinAge 10 Precondition youth treated with diet / exercise alone or with metformin and having a hemogle bin al c (hbal c) level of 6.5 - 11 %; youth Iopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arstanian s; bone m; randelt i; jacobsen bin al c (hbal c) level of 6.5 - 11 %; Author battelino t; arstanian s; jacobsen lv; chat- terjee dj; klein dj; hale pm Iopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arstanian s; bone m; randelt i; jacobsen pri ; wadva pr; wintergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pm Journal diabetes technol ther. diabetes technol ther. PMID 25036533 25036533 Publication Year 2014 2014 CTDesign randomized Sweeks CTUDesign randomized Sweeks CTUDesign seves \$ \$ weeks Sweeks \$ weeks \$ Sweeks \$ \$ Suberprintion severe hypoglycemia hbal c EndPointDescription gastrointestinal aes 1 EndPointDescription severe hypoglycemia hbal c BaselineUnit mg mg Medications <t< td=""><td></td><td>Popul</td><td>lation</td></t<>		Popul	lation
Operation 1.1 ObservedResult 17 MaxAge 17 MaxAge 17 Precondition youth reated with diet / exercise alone or with metformin and having a hemoglo bin al c (hbal c) level of 6 . 5 - 11 %; youth Author battelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen Iv; chatr Interview battelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen Iv; chatr Iv; chatrejee dj; hzazn i; fery r, christina e; tolizis p; de schepper j; wadwa rp; wintergerst k; klein dj; baarent t; hale pm Tournal diabetes technol ther . PMIID 25036533 Publication Year 2014 CTDesign randomized lobule - blind randysesHealthCondition type 2 diabetes Uppe 2 diabetes type 2 diabetes CTDuration 5 weeks CTduration 5 weeks NumberPatientsArm 14 ItadpointDescription severe hypoglycemia Ibal c maseline Unit Baseline Unit ge DoseUnit mg IndPointDescription severe hypoglycemia Ibal c gaseline Unit Baseline Unit ge DoseUnit <t< td=""><td>ΑνσΑσε</td><td>14 8</td><td></td></t<>	ΑνσΑσε	14 8	
Owny Own MaxAge 17 MinAge 10 Precondition youth treated with diet / exercise alone or with metformin and having a hemoglo bin al c (hbal c) level of 6 . 5 - 11 %; youth Publication Author battelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen lv; chat- terjee dj; klein dj; hale pm Iopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arslanian s; bone m; randelt i; jacobsen pri ; wadva gri, mitalikian e; totizis p; de schep- per j; wadva gri, wintergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pm Journal diabetes technol ther . diabetes technol ther . PMID 25036533 25036533 PublicationYear 2014 2014 CTDesign randomized double - blind randomized CTduration 5 weeks 5 weeks CTduration 5 weeks 5 weeks CTduration 5 weeks 5 weeks EndPointDescription gastrointestinal aes 16 EndPointDescription gastrointestinal aes 16 EndPointDescription gastrointestinal aes 16 EndPointDescription 35 . 6 0 DoseUnit mg mg BaselineUnit	Country	ohio	
MinAge 10 Precondition youth treated with diet / exercise alone or with metformin and having a hemoglo bin al c (hbal c) level of 6 . 5 - 11 %; youth Publication Author battelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen Iv; chat- terjee dj; klein dj; hale pm lopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arslanian s; bone m; randell t; jacobsen Iv; chatterjee dj; hzazn i; ferry r; chris- tersen m; stalikan e; tolizis p; de schep- per j; wadva rp; wintergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pm Journal diabetes technol ther . diabetes technol ther . PMID 25036533 25036533 2014 2014 CTDresign randomized I double - blind randomized CTDresign randomized I double - blind randomized CTDresign randomized I double - blind randomized CTDresign gastrointestrinal aes fendpoints EndPointDescription gestrointestrinal aes fendpoints EndPointDescription gastrointestrinal aes fendpoints EndPointDescription bbal c gaselineUnit BaselineUnit kg kg EndPointDescription body weight gaselineUnit BaselineUnit kg	MaxAge	17	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	MinAge	10	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Precondition	youth treated with diet / exercise alone	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Trecondition	or with metformin and having a hemoglo	
Jointle (10016) For Gold Cold Cold Cold Cold Cold Cold Cold C		bin alc (bhalc) level of 6^{-5} - 11 %	
PublicationAuthorbattelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen Iv; chat terjee dj; klein dj; hale pmlopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arslanian s; bone m; randell t; jacobsen Iv; chatterjee dj; harzan 1; ferry r; chris- tensen m; tsalikian e; toltzis p; de schepp per j; wadwa rp; wintergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pmJournaldiabetes technol ther .diabetes technol ther .PMID2503653325036533Publication Year20142014Clinical TrialanalysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetesTDesignrandomized I double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesIbal cEndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiaIbal cBaselineUnitkgkgDoseUnitmg mg placebol liraglutideOutcomes0by weightBaselineUnit35 . 6ObservedResultno serious adverse events hasSdDevBLAssdDevBL0. 86ChargeValue0. 86ChargeValue0. 86ChargeValue0. 54Oot500BaselineValue8. 1ChargeValue0. 54DoseUnifp = 0. 9703p = 0. 0007p = 0. 0007		vouth	
Authorbattelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen lv; chattericelopez x; neufeld n; battelino t; blumer j; arslanian s; bone m; randell t; jacobsenAuthorbattelino t; arslanian s; jacobsen lv; chatterice dj; hazan l; ferry r; christensen m; tsalikian e; toltzis p; de schepper j; wadva n; winergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pmJournaldiabetes technol ther .diabetes technol ther .PMID2503653325036533Publication Year20142014Clinical TrialanalysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksSumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointsEndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiahba1cEndPointDescriptionbdv weightkgBaselineUnitkgkgDoseUnitmgmgDrugliraglutideplacebo liraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventsascAnsSdDevBL35. 6OutcomesObservedResult1. 71. 710. 3Change Value0. 860. 86TimePoint5 weeks0. 86Change Value0. 500. 50Ansenice Value0. 500. 50AnselineValue1. 71. 710. 3Change Value0. 500. 54Dote0. 500. 54Dotel0. 540		Publi	cation
Termsterjee dj; klein dj; hale pmarslanian s; bone m; randell t; jacobsen lv; chatterjee dj; hanan 1; ferry r; chris- tensen m; tsälikian e; totizis p; de schep- per j; wadwa n; wintergerst k; klein dj; barrett t; hale pmJournaldiabetes technol ther .diabetes technol ther .PMID2503653325036533PublicationYear20142014analysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetestype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized I double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77TEndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiaEndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiahba1cEndPointDescriptionboy weight kg%BaselineUnit $\%$ $\%$ DoseUnitmgmgprugliraglutideOutcomesObservedResultno serious adverse events hassAlDevBL35. 6ObservedResult1.3. 21.7.710. 3ResultMeasuredValue1.71.710. 3ChangeValue0. 860. 86TimePointS weeks0.ResultMeasuredValue1.71.710. 3ChangeValue0. 540. 54ChangeValue0. 540. 54DoseUnifp = 0. 9703p = 0. 9703hasPalueDiffp = 0. 9703p = 0. 9703hasPalueDiffp = 0. 9703p = 0.9703	Author	battelino t: arslanian s: jacobsen ly: chat-	lopez x: neufeld n: battelino t: blumer i:
Index of the prime spin of the		teriee di: klein di: hale pm	arslanian s: bone m: randell t: jacobsen
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } tensen m; tsalikian e; toltzis p; de schepper j; wadwarp; wintergerst k; klein dj; barret t; hale pm diabetes technol ther . diabetes technol ther . PMID 25036533 250365533 250365533 250365533 25036553 250365553 2503655555555555555555555555555555555555$		····j·····; ···························	ly: chatteriee di: hazan l: ferry r: chris-
Journaldiabetes technol ther .per j; wadwa rp; wintergerst k; klein dj; barret t; hale pmJournaldiabetes technol ther .diabetes technol ther .PMID2503653325036533PublicationYear20142014analysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetestype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm1414EndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiahba1cBaselineUnitgastrointestinal aes6EndPointDescriptionbody weightkgBaselineUnitkgkgDoscUnitmgmgDrugliraglutideplacebo liraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse events0utcomesObservedResultno serious adverse events5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12secalation .TimePoint5 weeks0. 86ChangeValue0. 860. 86TimePoint5 weeks0. 2010. 04ChangeValue0. 500. 5010. 04ChangeValue0. 540. 54Outcomes0. 540. 54Differences between groupshasPulueDiffp = 0. 9703p = 0. 9703p = 0. 0007p = 0. 0007			tensen m: tsalikian e: toltzis p: de schep-
Journaldiabetes technol ther .barrett t; hale pmJournaldiabetes technol ther .diabetes technol ther .PMID2503653325036533PublicationYear20142014Clinical TrialanalysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm1414EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aes6EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aes6EndPointDescriptionbody weightkgBaselineUnitkgkgDoseUnitmgmgDrugliraglutideplacebol liraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 60ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL0. 860 . 86TimePoint5 weeks6ResultMeasuredValue1.71 . 710 . 3ChangeValue0. 508.1ChangeValue0. 540 . 54DaselineValue8.11ChangeValue0. 540 . 54Differences between groupshasPalueDiffp = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007			per i: wadwa rp: wintergerst k: klein di:
Journaldiabetes technol ther .diabetes technol ther .PMID2503653325036533PublicationYear20142014analysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetestype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm7TrandomizedEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionbba1cEndPointDescriptionbba1cBaselineUnit $%$ CobservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultover emonon at lower liraglutideObservedResult1.7TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0. 86ObservedResult1.7TimePoint5 weeksArmsDiscuttMeasuredValue1.7AsselineValue0. 50BaselineValue0. 50AsselineValue0. 50AsselineValue0. 50AsselineValue0. 50AsselineValue0. 50AsselineValue0. 54ObservedResult0. 54AsselineValue0. 54AsselineValue0. 54AsselineValue0. 54AsselineValue0. 54AsselineValue0. 54AsselineValue0. 54AsselineValueDiffp = 0. 0007Differences between groupsAsselineValueDiffp = 0. 0007<			barrett t: hale pm
PMID 25036533 25036533 PublicationYear 2014 2014 analysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetestype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized I double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77777EndPointDescriptiongestrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionhba1cBaselineUnit $\%$ BaselineUnitkgkgkgDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideDoseUnitno serious adverse eventshasAbdevBL35. 6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasAbdue12ResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue13. 2ResultMeasuredValue1.71.710.3ChangeValue0.560.860. 86ChangeValue0.540.540. 540.540. 540.540. 540.540. 540.540. 540.540. 540.540. 540.540. 540.50121007p = 0. 97031007p = 0. 0007	Journal	diabetes technol ther .	diabetes technol ther .
PublicationYear20142014Clinical TrialanalysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized I double - blindrandomized I double - blindBaseline Unit%Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2">Colspan="2"C	PMID	25036533	25036533
DefinitionClinical TrialanalysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedrandomizedCTduration5 weeksNumberPatientsArm14NumberPatientsArm777EndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiahbal cmaseEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionbbal cBaselineUnit%Medications%DoseUnitmgmgmgDrugliraglutideDoseUnitno serious adverse eventsAsSOdDevBL35.6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventsasselineValue113.2ResultMeasuredValue1.7ChangeValue0.86ChangeValue0.54O.900p = 0.9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0.9703p = 0.9070p = 0.9703	PublicationYear	2014	2014
analysesHealthConditiontype 2 diabetestype 2 diabetesCTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aes14EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aes14EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aes14EndPointDescriptionbba1c $\%$ BaselineUnit $\%$ $\%$ EndPointDescriptionbody weightkgBaselineUnitmgplacebol liraglutideOutcomesOutcomesObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35.60.86ObservedResult121.710.3TimePoint5 weeks0.86ResultMeasuredValue1.71.710.3ChangeValue0.500.54Outcase0.540.54Daseline Value0.540.54Differences between groups1.54hasPvalueDiffp = 0.9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0.9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0.0007		Clinic	al Trial
CTDesignrandomized double - blindrandomizedCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm14NumberPatientsArm7TEndpointsEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionhba1cEndPointDescriptionhba1cBaselineUnit $\%$ MedicationsmgDoseUnitmgmgliraglutideDoseUnitno serious adverse eventsAnsSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventsAssGdDevBL12BaselineValue13.2TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.860.860.86ChangeValue0.040.5010.04ChangeValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp=0.0007p=0.0007p=0.0007	analysesHealthCondition	type 2 diabetes	type 2 diabetes
CTdurationSweeksSweeksCTduration5 weeks5 weeksNumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiahba1cEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aes $\end{subscription}$ BaselineUnit%%EndPointDescriptionbody weightkgBaselineUnit%%EndPointDescriptionbody weightkgBaselineUnit% $\end{subscription}$ DoseUnitmgmgDrugliraglutideplacebolliraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultvere most common at lower liraglutideMedications12BaselineValue12ResultMeasuredValue1.7TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.9703hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ p = 0.9703 $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$	CTDesign	randomized double - blind	randomized
OrientOrientArmsNumberPatientsArm14NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionBaselineUnit $%$ EndPointDescriptionBaselineUnitkgkgDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL13.2ResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue13.2ResultMeasuredValue1.71.710.3ChangeValue0.86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.940.950BaselineValue1.901.911.92BaselineValue1.92BaselineValue1.941.951.961.971.971.971.971.901.911.921.921.931.941.941.951.951.961.971.971.971.971.971.97 </td <td>CTduration</td> <td>5 weeks</td> <td>5 weeks</td>	CTduration	5 weeks	5 weeks
NumberPatientsArm1414NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndpointsEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionhba1c $\%$ BaselineUnit $\%$ $\%$ EndPointDescriptionbody weightBaselineUnitkgkgkgDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideDoseUnitno serious adverse eventsAsSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultseeksResultMeasuredValue113.2ResultMeasuredValue1.7I.3.2ChangeValue0.86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$		Ar	ms
NumberPatientsArm11NumberPatientsArm77EndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aesEndPointDescriptionhba1cBaselineUnit $%$ $%$ mgEndPointDescriptionbody weightgastrointestinalkgBaselineUnitkg $%$ mgDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutidedoses during dose escalation .5TimePoint5S weeks0 . 86ChangeValue0 . 86On aselineValue0 . 90AsselineValue0 . 50BaselineValue0 . 54ChangeValue0 . 54Differences between groups <td>NumberPatientsArm</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td>	NumberPatientsArm	14	14
Inducer attents finitionPEndpointsEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aeshba1cEndPointDescriptionhba1cBaselineUnit $%$ BaselineUnitkgkgkgDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultvere most common at lower liraglutideObservedResult12BaselineValue12.ResultMeasuredValue11. 7I.3. 20. 86ChangeValue0. 46ObservelResult0. 86ObservelValue0. 50BaselineValue0. 50BaselineValue<	NumberPatientsArm	7	7
EndPointDescriptionsevere hypoglycemiahba1cEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal aeshba1cEndPointDescriptionhba1c $\%$ BaselineUnit $\%$ $\%$ EndPointDescriptionbody weightBaselineUnitkgkgDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideDoseUnitmgDoseUnitno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue1.2BaselineValue1.3 . 2ResultMeasuredValue0 . 86ChangeValue0 . 04ChangeValue0 . 50BaselineValue0 . 50BaselineValue0 . 50hasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007		, Endr	points
IndependenceInterventionEndPointDescriptiongastrointestinal assEndPointDescriptionhba1cBaselineUnit $%$ EndPointDescriptionbody weightBaselineUnit $%$ BaselineUnit $%$ MedicationsDoseUnitmgprugliraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultvere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue1. 7ChangeValue0 . 86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0 . 040. 50BaselineValueBaselineValue0 . 90JaselineValue0 . 50BaselineValue9 . 90JaseValue0 . 54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007	EndPointDescription	severe hypoglycemia	hba1c
EndPointDescription BaselineUnitbalc $\%$ $\%$ EndPointDescription BaselineUnitbody weight kgkgEndPointDescription BaselineUnitbody weight kgkgDoseUnit Drugmg liraglutidemg placebolliraglutideObservedResult hasSdDevBLno serious adverse events adverse events doses during dose escalation .mg mg placebolliraglutideObservedResult hasSdDevBLno serious adverse events doses during dose escalation .mg mg placebolliraglutideTimePoint5 weeksnoResultMeasuredValue TimePoint12 sweeksnoResultMeasuredValue Differences between groups hasPvalueDiff0 . 50 placebollirences between groups placebollirences between groupshasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007	EndPointDescription	gastrointestinal aes	
BaselineUnit $\%$ BaselineUnit kg EndPointDescriptionbody weightBaselineUnitkgMedicationsDoseUnitmgDrugliraglutideDrugliraglutideObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutidedoses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue1.7ChangeValue0 . 86O. 40 . 5010 . 04ChangeValue0 . 50BaselineValue8 . 1ChangeValue0 . 54DaselineValue9 . 9703hasPvalueDiff $p = 0 . 9703$ p = 0 . 9703 $p = 0 . 9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0 . 0007$	EndPointDescription	hbalc	
EndPointDescription BaselineUnitbody weight kgkgEndPointDescription BaselineUnitbody weight kgkgDoseUnit Drugmg placebolliraglutidemg placebolliraglutideDoseUnit Drugmg placebolliraglutidemg placebolliraglutideObservedResult hasSdDevBLno serious adverse events ass. 6mg placebolliraglutideObservedResult hasSdDevBLno serious adverse events asset during dose escalation .mg placebolliraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksmost common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .ResultMeasuredValue BaselineValue1.71.710.3ChangeValue ChangeValue0.86 5 weeks0.86ChangeValue BaselineValue0.50 8.10.5010.04ChangeValue ChangeValue0.50 8.10.54Differences between groups hasPvalueDiffp = 0.9703 p = 0.9703 p = 0.0007	BaselineUnit		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Baseline UnitkgkgBaseline UnitmgMedicationsDose Unitmgplacebo liraglutideDrugliraglutideOutcomesObserved Resultno serious adverse eventshasSdDev BL35 . 6.Observed Resultwere most common at lower liraglutidedoses during dose escalationTimePoint5 weeksResult Measured Value12Baseline Value1.7Change Value0 . 86TimePoint5 weeksChange Value0 . 040.508 . 1Change Value8 . 1Change Value0 . 540.540 . 54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0 . 9703$ $p = 0 . 0007$ $p = 0 . 0007$	EndPointDescription	body weight	
InstructionMedicationsDoseUnitmgmgDrugliraglutidemgplacebol liraglutideOutcomesObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12Baseline Value1.3.2ResultMeasuredValue1.7ChangeValue0.86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.040.50Baseline ValueBaseline Value0.50ChangeValue0.54Dot0.54ChangeValue0.54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$	BaselineUnit	kg	kg
DoseUnit Drugmg liraglutidemg placebolliraglutideDoseTvedResult hasSdDevBLno serious adverse events 35.6 OutcomesObservedResultno serious adverse events 35.6 ObservedResultObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .OutcomesTimePoint5 weeksSeeksResultMeasuredValue12 113.2ResultMeasuredValueBaselineValue1.71.710.3ChangeValue0.86 5 weeks0.86TimePoint5 weeksOutcomesChangeValue0.040.5010.04ChangeValue0.50Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp=0.9703p=0.9703hasPvalueDiffp=0.0007p=0.0007		Medic	cations
Drugliraglutideplacebo liraglutideOutcomesOutcomesObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL35 . 6ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue1.7ResultMeasuredValue0 . 86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0 . 86Outcomes0 . 86ChangeValue0 . 04ChangeValue0 . 50BaselineValue8 . 1ChangeValue0 . 54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 0007	DoseUnit	mg	mg
DescriptionOutcomesObservedResultno serious adverse eventshasSdDevBL 35.6 ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint 5 weeksResultMeasuredValue 12 BaselineValue 113.2 ResultMeasuredValue 1.7 $1.710.3$ ChangeValue 0.86 TimePoint 5 weeksChangeValue 0.04 0.50 BaselineValue 0.54 Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$	Drug	liraglutide	placebo liraglutide
ObservedResult hasSdDevBLno serious adverse events 35.6 ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12 113.2 BaselineValue1.7I.710.3ChangeValue0.86 5 weeksChangeValue0.04O.9040.5010.04ChangeValue0.50 8.1 ChangeValue0.50 8.1 ChangeValue0.9703 $9=0.9703$ p = 0.9703 hasPvalueDiffp = 0.9703 $p = 0.0007$		Outc	omes
hasSdDevBL35.6ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue113.2ResultMeasuredValue1.7I.710.3ChangeValue0.86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0.04O.040.5010.04ChangeValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.50BaselineValue0.54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp = 0.9703p = 0.9703p = 0.9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0.0007p = 0.0007p = 0.0007	ObservedResult	no serious adverse events	
ObservedResultwere most common at lower liraglutide doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue113 . 2ResultMeasuredValue1 . 7I . 7 10 . 3ChangeValue0 . 86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0 . 04O . 040 . 50 0 . 04ChangeValue0 . 50BaselineValue8 . 1ChangeValue0 . 54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 9703hasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007	hasSdDevBL	35.6	
doses during dose escalation .TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue113 . 2ResultMeasuredValue1 . 7I . 710 . 3ChangeValue0 . 86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0 . 04O . 040 . 50 l 0 . 04ChangeValue0 . 50BaselineValue8 . 1ChangeValue0 . 54O . 540 . 54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiffp = 0 . 9703p = 0 . 0007p = 0 . 0007	ObservedResult	were most common at lower liraglutide	
TimePoint5 weeksResultMeasuredValue12BaselineValue113 . 2ResultMeasuredValue1 . 7I. 7 0 . 3ChangeValue0 . 86TimePoint5 weeksChangeValue0 . 04O. 900 . 50 0 . 04ChangeValue0 . 50BaselineValue8 . 1ChangeValue0 . 54Other State0 . 54Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0 . 9703$ $p = 0 . 0007$ $p = 0 . 0007$		doses during dose escalation .	
ResultMeasuredValue 12 BaselineValue 113.2 ResultMeasuredValue 1.7 I.710.3 ChangeValue 0.86 TimePoint 5 weeks ChangeValue 0.04 O.50 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.50 BaselineValue 0.50 BaselineValue 0.50 BaselineValue 0.54 ChangeValue 0.54 Differences between groups hasPvalueDiff p = 0.9703 p = 0.9703 p = 0.9703	TimePoint	5 weeks	
BaselineValue 113.2 ResultMeasuredValue 1.7 1.710.3 ChangeValue 0.86 0.86 TimePoint 5 weeks 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.04 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.50 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.50 0.54 ChangeValue 0.54 0.54 ChangeValue 0.54 0.54 MasPvalueDiff p = 0.9703 p = 0.9703 hasPvalueDiff p = 0.0007 p = 0.0007	ResultMeasuredValue	12	
ResultMeasuredValue 1.7 1.710.3 ChangeValue 0.86 0.86 TimePoint 5 weeks 0.00 ChangeValue 0.04 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.50 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.50 0.5010.04 ChangeValue 0.50 0.54 ChangeValue 0.54 0.54 ChangeValue 0.54 0.54 AngeValue 0.9703 $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$	BaselineValue	113.2	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	ResultMeasuredValue	1.7	1.710.3
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ChangeValue	0.86	0.86
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	TimePoint	5 weeks	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ChangeValue	0.04	0.5010.04
Baseline Value8.1Change Value 0.54 Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$	ChangeValue	0.50	
ChangeValue 0.54 0.54 Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$	BaselineValue	8.1	
Differences between groupshasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$	ChangeValue	0.54	0.54
hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.9703$ $p = 0.9703$ hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$		Differences b	etween groups
hasPvalueDiff $p = 0.0007$ $p = 0.0007$	hasPvalueDiff	p = 0.9703	p = 0.9703
	hasPvalueDiff	p = 0.0007	p = 0.0007

Table 11: Predicted and gold standard structures for the abstract of the clinical trial described in Klein, David J et al. "Liraglutide's safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics "pediatric type 2 diabetes: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial" Diabetes technology & therapeutics vol. 16,19 (2014): 679-687. doi:10.1089/dia.2013.0366; within one template type, horizontal lines separate different instances of the same template type; "I" separates SFCs