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Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI), along with the recent progress in biomedical language understanding, is gradually changing medical practice. With the development of biomedical language understanding benchmarks, AI applications are widely used in the medical field. However, most benchmarks are limited to English, which makes it challenging to replicate many of the successes in English for other languages. To facilitate research in this direction, we collect real-world biomedical data and present the first Chinese Biomedical Language Understanding Evaluation (CBLUE) benchmark: a collection of natural language understanding tasks including named entity recognition, information extraction, single-sentence/sentence-pair classification, and an associated online platform for model evaluation, comparison, and analysis. To establish evaluation on these tasks, we report empirical results with the current 11 pre-trained Chinese models, and experimental results show that state-of-the-art neural models perform by far worse than the human ceiling. Our benchmark is released at https://tianchi.aliyun.com/dataset/dataDetail?dataId=95414&lang=en-us.

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence is gradually changing the landscape of healthcare, and biomedical research\(^{35}\). With the fast advancement of biomedical datasets, biomedical natural language processing (BioNLP) has facilitated a broad range of applications such as biomedical text mining, which leverages textual data in Electronic Health Records (EHRs). For example, BioNLP methods can be employed to provide recommendations for specialized healthcare to those most at risk during pandemics (COVID-19) using the text and information in EHRs.
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A key driving force behind such improvements and rapid iterations of models is the use of general evaluation datasets and benchmarks [9]. Pioneer benchmarks, such as BLURB [10], PubMedQA [13], and others, have provided us with the opportunity to conduct research on biomedical language understanding and developing real-world applications. Unfortunately, most of these benchmarks are developed in English, which makes the development of the associated machine intelligence Anglo-centric. Meanwhile, other languages, such as Chinese, have unique linguistic characteristics and categories that need to be considered. Even though Chinese speakers account for a quarter of the world population, there have been no existing Chinese biomedical language understanding evaluation benchmarks.

To address this issue and facilitate natural language processing studies in Chinese, we take the first step in introducing a comprehensive Chinese Biomedical Language Understanding Evaluation (CBLUE) benchmark with eight biomedical language understanding tasks. These tasks include named entity recognition, information extraction, clinical diagnosis normalization, short text classification, question answering (in transfer learning setting), intent classification, semantic similarity, and so on.

We evaluate several pre-trained Chinese language models on CBLUE and report their performance. The current models still perform by far worse than the standard of single-human performance, leaving room for future improvements. We also conduct a comprehensive analysis using case studies to indicate the challenges and linguistic differences in Chinese biomedical language understanding. We intend to develop a universal GLUE-like open platform for the Chinese BioNLP community, and this work is a small step in that direction. Overall, the main contributions of this study are as follows:

- We propose the first Chinese biomedical language understanding benchmark, an open-ended, community-driven project with eight diverse tasks. The proposed benchmark serves as a platform for the Chinese BioNLP community and encourages new dataset contributions.
- We report a systematic evaluation of 11 Chinese pre-trained language models to understand the challenges derived by these tasks. We release the source code of the baselines as a toolkit at https://github.com/CBLUEbenchmark/CBLUE for future research purposes.

2 Related Work

Several benchmarks have been developed to evaluate general language understanding over the past few years. GLUE [29] is one of the first frameworks developed as a formal challenge affording straightforward comparison between task-agnostic transfer learning techniques. SuperGLUE [28], styled after GLUE, introduce a new set of more difficult language understanding tasks, a software toolkit, and a public leaderboard. Other similarly motivated benchmarks include DecaNLP [22], which recast a set of target tasks into a general question-answering format and prohibit task-specific parameters, and SentEval [2], which evaluate explicitly fixed-size sentence embeddings. Non-English benchmarks include RussianSuperGLUE [25] and CLUE [34], which is a community-driven benchmark with nine Chinese natural language understanding tasks. These benchmarks in the general domain provide a north star goal for researchers and are part of the reason we can confidently say we have made great strides in our field.

For BioNLP, many datasets and benchmarks have been proposed [30, 18, 33] which promote the biomedical language understanding [11, 17, 16]. Tsatsaronis et al. [27] propose biomedical language understanding datasets as well as a competition on large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering. Jin et al. [13] propose PubMedQA, a novel biomedical question answering dataset collected from PubMed abstracts. Pappas et al. [23] propose BioRead, which is a publicly available cloze-style biomedical machine reading comprehension (MRC) dataset. Gu et al. [10] create a leaderboard featuring the Biomedical Language Understanding & Reasoning Benchmark (BLURB). Unlike a general domain corpus, the annotation of a biomedical corpus needs expert intervention and is labor-intensive and time-consuming. Moreover, most of the benchmarks are based on English; ignoring other languages means that potentially valuable information may be lost, which can be helpful for generalization.

In this study, we focus on Chinese and aim to develop the first Chinese biomedical language understanding benchmark. Note that Chinese is linguistically different from English and other Indo-European languages, necessitating an evaluation BioNLP benchmark designed explicitly for Chinese.
### Table 1: Task descriptions and statistics in CBLUE. CMeEE and CMeIE are sequence labeling tasks. Others are single sentence or sentence pair classification tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Dev</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMeEE</td>
<td>NER</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Micro F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMeIE</td>
<td>Information Extraction</td>
<td>14,339</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>4,482</td>
<td>Micro F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP-CDN</td>
<td>Diagnosis Normalization</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,192</td>
<td>Micro F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP-STS</td>
<td>Sentence Similarity</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Macro F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP-CTC</td>
<td>Sentence Classification</td>
<td>22,962</td>
<td>7,682</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Macro F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUAKE-QIC</td>
<td>Intent Classification</td>
<td>6,931</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUAKE-QTR</td>
<td>Query-Document Relevance</td>
<td>24,174</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUAKE-QQR</td>
<td>Query-Query Relevance</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 **CBLUE Overview**

CBLUE consists of 8 biomedical language understanding tasks in Chinese. We will introduce the task definitions, detailed data collection procedures, and characteristics of CBLUE followingly.

3.1 Tasks

**CMeEE** Chinese Medical Named Entity Recognition, a dataset first released in CHIP2020 [4], is used for CMeEE task. Given a pre-defined schema, the task is to identify and extract entities from the given sentence and classify them into nine categories: disease, clinical manifestations, drugs, medical equipment, medical procedures, body, medical examinations, microorganisms, and department.

**CMeIE** Chinese Medical Information Extraction, a dataset that is also released in CHIP2020 [11], is used for CMeIE task. The task is aimed at identifying both entities and relations in a sentence following the schema constraints. There are 53 relations defined in the dataset, including 10 synonymous sub-relationships and 43 other sub-relationships.

**CHIP-CDN** CHIP Clinical Diagnosis Normalization, a dataset that aims to standardize the terms from the final diagnoses of Chinese electronic medical records, is used for CHIP-CDN task. Given the original phrase, the task is required to normalize it to corresponding standard terminology based on the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) standard for Beijing Clinical Edition v601.

**CHIP-CTC** CHIP Clinical Trial Classification, a dataset aimed at classifying clinical trials eligibility criteria, which are fundamental guidelines of clinical trials designed to identify whether a subject meets a clinical trial or not [38], is used for CHIP-CTC task. All text data are collected from the website of the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (ChiCTR) [5] and a total of 44 categories are defined. The task is like text classification; although it is not a new task, studies and corpus for the Chinese clinical trial criterion are still limited, and we hope to promote future researches for social benefits.

**CHIP-STS** CHIP Semantic Textual Similarity, a dataset for sentence similarity in the non-i.i.d. (non-independent and identically distributed) setting, is used for CHIP-STS task. Specifically, the task aims to transfer learning between disease types on Chinese disease questions and answer data. Given question pairs related to 5 different diseases (The disease types in the training and testing set are different), the task intends to determine whether the semantics of the two sentences are similar.

**KUAKE-QIC** KUAKE Query Intent Classification, a dataset for intent classification, is used for KUAKE-QIC task. Given the queries of search engines, the task requires to classify each of them into one of 11 medical intent categories defined in KUAKE-QIC, including diagnosis, etiology analysis, treatment plan, medical advice, test result analysis, disease description, consequence prediction, precautions, intended effects, treatment fees, and others.

**KUAKE-QTR**  KUAKE Query Title Relevance, a dataset used to estimate the relevance of the title of a query document, is used for KUAKE-QTR task. Given a query (e.g., “Symptoms of vitamin B deficiency”), the task aims to find the relevant title (e.g., “The main manifestations of vitamin B deficiency”).

**KUAKE-QQR**  KUAKE Query-Query Relevance, a dataset used to evaluate the relevance of the content expressed in two queries, is used for KUAKE-QQR task. Similar to KUAKE-QTR, the task aims to estimate query-query relevance, which is an essential and challenging task in real-world search engines.

### 3.2 Data Collection

Since machine learning models are mostly data-driven, data plays a critical role, and it is pretty often in the form of a static dataset. We collect data for different tasks from diverse sources, including clinical trials, EHRs, medical books, and search logs from real-world search engines. As biomedical data may contain private information such as the patient’s name, age, and gender, all collected datasets are anonymized and reviewed by the ethics committee to preserve privacy.

We introduce the data collection details followingly.

#### Collection from Clinical Trials

We collect clinical trial eligibility criteria text from ChiCTR, a non-profit organization that provides registration for clinical trial information. Eligibility criteria text is organized as a paragraph in the inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria in each trial registry file. We exclude meaningless text and annotate the remained text to generate the CHIP-CTC dataset.

#### Collection from EHRs

We obtain the final diagnoses of the medical records from several Class A tertiary hospitals and sample a few diagnosis items from different medical departments to construct the CHIP-CDN dataset for research purposes. **No privacy information is involved in the final diagnoses.**

#### Collection from Medical Books

To ensure the authority and practicability of the corpus, we also select medical textbooks of Pediatrics, Clinical Pediatrics, and Clinical Practice. Professional doctors compile textbooks under the Ministry of Health’s guidance, which are reliable and authoritative. Clinical Practice has rich content with timely updates and contains a standard structure for specific clinical situations. We collect data from these sources to construct the CMeIE and CMeEE datasets.

#### Collection from Search Engine Logs

To promote data diversity, we also collect search logs from real-world search engines like the Alibaba KUAKE Search Engine. First, we filter the search queries in the raw search logs by the medical tag to obtain candidate medical texts. Then, we sample the documents for each query with non-zero relevance scores (i.e., to determine if the document is relevant to the query). Specifically, we divide all the documents into three categories, namely high, middle, and tail documents, and then uniformly sample the data to guarantee diversity. We leverage the data from search logs to construct KUAKE-QTC, KUAKE-QTR, and KUAKE-QQR datasets.

### 3.3 Annotation

Each sample is annotated by three to five crowd workers, and the annotation with the majority of votes is taken to estimate human performance. During the annotation phase, we add control questions to prevent dishonest behaviors by the crowd workers. Consequently, we reject any annotations made by crowd workers who fail in the training phase, and do not adopt the results of those who achieved

---
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Figure 1: Analysis of the named entity recognition and information extraction datasets. (a) illustrates the entity (coarse-grained) distribution in CMeEE, and (b) shows the relation hierarchy in CMeIE.

low performance on the control tasks. We maintain strict and high criteria for approval and review at least 10 random samples from each worker to decide whether to approve or reject all their HITs. We also calculate the average inter-rater agreement between annotators using Fleiss’ Kappa scores $\kappa$, finding that five out of six annotations show good moderate agreement ($\kappa = 0.9$).

3.4 Characteristics

Utility-preserving Anonymization  Biomedical data may be considered as a breach in the privacy of individuals because they usually contain sensitive information. Thus, we conduct utility-preserving anonymization following [15] to anonymize the data before releasing the benchmark.

Real-world Distribution  To promote the generalization of models, all the data in our CBLUE benchmark follow real-world distribution without up/downsampling. As shown in Figure 1(a), our dataset follows long-tail distribution following Zipf’s law, so that all data will inevitably be long-tailed. Further, some datasets, such as CMedIE, have label hierarchy with both coarse-grained and fine-grained relation labels, as shown in Figure 1(b).

Diverse Tasks Setting  Our CBLUE benchmark includes eight diverse tasks, including named entity recognition, relation extraction, and single-sentence/sentence-pair classification. Besides the independent and i.i.d. scenarios, our CBLUE benchmark also contains a specific transfer learning scenario supported by the CHIP-STS dataset, in which the testing set has a different distribution from the training set.

3.5 Leaderboard

We provide a leaderboard for users to submit their own results on CBLUE. The evaluation system will give final scores for each task when users submit their prediction results. The platform offers 60 free GPU hours from Aliyun* to help researchers develop and train their models.

3.6 Distribution and Maintenance

Our CBLUE benchmark was released online on April 1, 2021. Up to now, more than 300 researchers have applied the dataset, and over 80 teams have submitted their model predictions to our platform, including medical institutions (Peking Union Medical College Hospital, etc.), universities (Tsinghua University, Zhejiang University, etc.), and companies (Baidu, JD, etc.). We will continue to maintain the benchmark by attending to meet new requests and adding new tasks.

https://tianchi.aliyun.com/notebook-ai/
Table 2: Performance of baseline models on CBLUE benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CMeEE</th>
<th>CMeIE</th>
<th>CDN</th>
<th>CTC</th>
<th>STS</th>
<th>QIC</th>
<th>QTR</th>
<th>QQR</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERT-base</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT-wwm-ext-base</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-large</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-wwm-ext-base</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoBERTa-wwm-ext-large</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT-tiny</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT-xxlarge</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEN</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacBERT-base</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacBERT-large</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL-MedBERT</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Reproducibility

To make it easier to use CBLUE benchmark, we also offer a toolkit implemented in PyTorch [24] for reproducibility. Our toolkit supports mainstream pre-training models and a wide range of target tasks. Different from existing pre-training model toolkits [37], the toolkit is aimed at fast validating performance on CBLUE benchmark.

4 Experiments

Baselines We conduct experiments with baselines based on different Chinese pre-trained language models. We add an additional output layer (e.g., MLP) for each CBLUE task and fine-tune the pre-trained models. Code for reproducibility is available in [https://github.com/CBLUEbenchmark/](https://github.com/CBLUEbenchmark/)

Models We evaluate CBLUE on the following public available Chinese pre-trained models:

- **BERT-base** [5]. We use the base model with 12 layers, 768 hidden layers, 12 heads, and 110 million parameters.
- **RoBERTa-large** [21]. Compared with BERT, RoBERTa removes the next sentence prediction objective and dynamically changes the masking pattern applied to the training data.
- **RoBERTa-wwm-ext-base/large**. RoBERTa-wwm-ext is an efficient pre-trained model which integrates the advantages of RoBERTa and BERT-wwm.
- **ALBERT-tiny/xxlarge** [14]. ALBERT is a pre-trained model with two objectives: Masked Language Modeling (MLM) and Sentence Ordering Prediction (SOP), which shares weights across different layers in transformer.
- **ZEN** [6]. A BERT-based Chinese text encoder enhanced by N-gram representations, where different combinations of characters are considered during training.
- **Mac-BERT-base/large** [3]. Mac-BERT is an improved BERT with novel MLM as correction pre-training task, which mitigates the discrepancy of pre-training and fine-tuning.
- **PCL-MedBERT** [9]. A pre-trained medical language model proposed by the Intelligent Medical Research Group at the Peng Cheng Laboratory, with excellent performance in medical question matching and named entity recognition.

We implement all baselines with PyTorch [24]. Note that BERT-base, ALBERT-tiny/xxlarge, and RoBERTa-large are representatives of pre-trained language models. BERT-wwm-ext-base, RoBERTa-wwm-ext-base/large, ZEN, Mac-BERT-base/large utilize the specific characteristics (e.g., words and phrases) of the Chinese language. PCL-MedBERT further utilize domain-adaptive pre-training [12].

[9] [https://code.ihub.org.cn/projects/1775](https://code.ihub.org.cn/projects/1775)
Table 3: Human performance of two-stage evaluation scores with the best-performed model. “avg” refers to the mean score from the three annotators. “majority” indicates the performance taken from the majority vote. Bold text denotes the best result among human and model prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CMeEE</th>
<th>CMelE</th>
<th>CDN</th>
<th>CTC</th>
<th>STS</th>
<th>QIC</th>
<th>QTR</th>
<th>QQR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained annotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annotator 1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annotator 2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annotator 3</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best model</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: We conduct error analysis on dataset CMeEE and QIC. For CMeEE, we divide error cases into 6 categories, including ambiguity, need domain knowledge, overlap entity, wrong entity boundary, annotation error, and others (long sequence, rare words, etc.). For KUAKE-QIC, we divide error cases into 7 categories, including multiple triggers, colloquialism, ambiguity, rare words, annotation error, irrelevant description, and need domain knowledge.

which can consistently improve performance on tasks in the biomedical domain. We tune all the hyper-parameters based on the performance of each model on the development set. We implement each experiment five times and calculate the average performance. All the training details can be found in the supplementary materials.

4.1 Benchmark Results

We report the results of our baseline models on CBLUE benchmark in Table 2. We notice that the model obtain better performance with larger pre-trained language models. We also observe that models which use whole word masking do not always yield better performance than others in some tasks, such as CTC, QIC, QTR, and QQR, indicating that tasks in our benchmark are challenging, and more sophisticated technologies should be developed. Further, we find that ALBERT-tiny achieves comparable performance to base models in task of CDN, STS, QTR, and QQR, illustrating that smaller models may also be efficient in specific tasks. Finally, we notice that PCL-MedBERT, which tends to be state-of-the-art in Chinese biomedical text processing tasks, while does not perform as well as we expected. This further demonstrates the difficulty of our benchmark, and contemporary models may find difficulty to quickly achieve outstanding performance.

4.2 Human Performance

For all of the tasks in CBLUE, we ask human annotators to label instances from the testing set and compute the annotators’ majority vote against the gold label. Similar to SuperGLUE [28], we first need to train the annotators before they work on the testing data. Annotators are asked to annotate some data from the development set; then, their annotations are validated against the gold standard. Annotators need to correct their annotation mistakes repeatedly so that they can master the specific tasks. Finally, they annotate instances from the testing data, and these annotations are used to compute the final human scores. The results are shown in Table 3, and the last row of Table 2. In most of tasks, humans tend to behave better than machine learning models. We analyze the human performance detailedly in the next section.
We show some cases on CMeEE in Table 4. In the second row, we notice that given the instance of “The results of blood biochemical analysis show that vitamin B lack rate is about 12% to 19%.”, ROBERTA and PCL-MedBERT obtain different predictions. The reason is that there exist medical terminologies such as “抗毒素抗体 (anti-toxin antibodies)” and “抗毒素 (anti-toxin)” are biomedical terminologies, and the general pre-trained language model has to leverage domain knowledge to understand those phrases. Furthermore, there exist many instances with overlap entity, ambiguity, need domain knowledge, annotation error are major reasons that result in the prediction failure. Furthermore, there exist many instances with overlap entity, which may lead to confusion for named entity recognition task. While in the analysis for KUAKE-QIC, almost half of bad cases are due to multiple triggers and colloquialism. Colloquialism is natural in search queries, which means that some descriptions of the Chinese medical text are too simplified, colloquial, or inaccurate.

### 4.3 Case studies

We choose two datasets: CMeEE and KUAKE-QIC, a sequence labeling and classification task respectively, to conduct case studies. As shown in Figure 2, we report the statistics of the proportion of various types of error cases. For CMeEE, we notice that overlap entity, ambiguity, need domain knowledge, annotation error are major reasons that result in the prediction failure. Furthermore, there exist many instances with overlap entity, which may lead to confusion for named entity recognition task. While in the analysis for KUAKE-QIC, almost half of bad cases are due to multiple triggers and colloquialism. Colloquialism is natural in search queries, which means that some descriptions of the Chinese medical text are too simplified, colloquial, or inaccurate.

We show some cases on CMeEE in Table 4. In the second row, we notice that given the instance of “The rash can be reduced by the host producing specific anti-toxin antibodies.”, ROBERTA and PCL-MedBERT obtain different predictions. The reason is that there exist medical terminologies such as “抗毒素抗体 (anti-toxin antibodies)” and “抗毒素 (anti-toxin)” are biomedical terminologies, and the general pre-trained language model has to leverage domain knowledge to understand those phrases. Furthermore, there exist many instances with overlap entity, which may lead to confusion for named entity recognition task. While in the analysis for KUAKE-QIC, almost half of bad cases are due to multiple triggers and colloquialism. Colloquialism is natural in search queries, which means that some descriptions of the Chinese medical text are too simplified, colloquial, or inaccurate.

### Table 4: Case studies in CMeEE. We evaluate roberta-wwm-ext and PCL-MedBERT on 3 sampled sentences, with their gold labels and model predictions. Ite (medical examination items), Pro (medical procedure), Bod (body), and Sym (clinical symptoms) are labels for medical named words. O means that the model fails to extract the entity from sentences. RO=roberta-wwm-ext, MB=PCL-MedBERT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>MB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>血液生化分析的结果显示维生素B缺乏率约为12%～19%。</td>
<td>血液生化分析</td>
<td>Ite</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results of blood biochemical analysis show that vitamin B lack rate is about 12% to 19%.</td>
<td>blood biochemical analysis</td>
<td>Ite</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>皮疹可因宿主产生特异性的抗毒素抗体而减少。</td>
<td>抗毒素抗体</td>
<td>Bod</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rash can be reduced by the host producing specific anti-toxin antibodies.</td>
<td>anti-toxin antibodies</td>
<td>Bod</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>根据遗传物质的结构和功能改变的不同，可将遗传病分为五类：1.染色体病指染色体数目异常，或者染色体结构异常，包括缺失、易位、倒位等</td>
<td>缺失, 易位, 倒位</td>
<td>Sym, Sym, Sym</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sym, Sym, Sym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the structure and function of genetic material, genetic diseases are divided into five categories: 1. Chromosomal diseases refer to abnormal chromosome number or chromosome structure abnormalities, including deletions, translocations, inversions...</td>
<td>deletions, translocations, inversions</td>
<td>Sym, Sym, Sym</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sym, Sym, Sym</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We further show some cases on KUAKE-QIC in Table 5. In the first case, we notice that both BERT and BERT-ext fail to obtain the intent label of the query “请问淋巴细胞比率偏高、中性细胞比率偏低有事吗? (Does it matter if the ratio of lymphocytes is high and the ratio of neutrophils is low?)”, while MedBERT can obtain the correct prediction. Since “淋巴细胞比率 (ratio of lymphocytes)” and “中性细胞比率 (ratio of neutrophils)” are biomedical terminologies, and the general pre-trained language model has to leverage domain knowledge to understand those phrases. Moreover, we observe that all models obtain incorrect predictions for the query “咨询：请问小孩一般什么时候出水痘 (Consultation: When do children usually get chickenpox?)” in the second case. Note that there exists lots of colloquial text in search queries (colloquialism), which have different distributions, thus, mislead the model predictions.

---

8 See definitions of errors supplementary materials.
In summary, we conclude that tasks in CBLUE are not easy to solve since the Chinese language has unique characteristics, and more robust models that fully understand the semantics of Chinese, especially the informal or formal usages in the medical domain, should be taken into consideration.

4.4 Limitations

Although our CBLUE offers diverse settings, there are still some tasks not covered by the benchmark, such as medical dialogue generation [20, 19, 36] or medical diagnosis [31]. We encourage researchers in both academics and industry to contribute new datasets. Besides, our benchmark is static; thus, models may still achieve outstanding performance on tasks but fail on simple challenge examples and falter in real-world scenarios. We leave this as future works to construct a platform including dataset creation, model development, and assessment, leading to more robust and informative benchmarks.

4.5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we present a Chinese Biomedical Language Understanding Evaluation (CBLUE) benchmark, which consists of eight natural language understanding tasks, along with an online leaderboard for model evaluation. We evaluate 11 current language representation models on CBLUE and analyzed their results. The results illustrate the limited ability of state-of-the-art models to handle some of the more challenging tasks. In contrast to English benchmarks such as GLUE/SuperGLUE and BLURB, whose model performance already matches human performance, we observed that this is far from the truth for Chinese biomedical language understanding. We hope our benchmark can help promote developing stronger natural language understanding models in the future.

4.6 Broader Impact

The COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019) pandemic has had a significant impact on society, both because of the severe health effects of COVID-19 and the public health measures implemented to slow its spread. A lack of information fundamentally causes many difficulties experienced during the outbreak; attempts to address these needs caused an information overload for both researchers and the public. Biomedical natural language processing—the branch of artificial intelligence that interprets human language—can be applied to address many of the information needs making urgent by the COVID-19 pandemic. Unfortunately, most language benchmarks are in English, and no biomedical benchmark currently exists in Chinese. Our benchmark CBLUE, as the first Chinese biomedical language understanding benchmark, can serve as an open testbed for model evaluations to promote the advancement of this technology.
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