

Quantifying the informativeness for biomedical text summarization: An itemset mining method

Milad Moradi, Nasser Ghadiri¹

*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Isfahan University of Technology,
Isfahan 84156-83111, Iran*

E-mail: milad.moradi@ec.iut.ac.ir, nghadiri@cc.iut.ac.ir

Abstract

Objective: Automatic text summarization helps the clinicians and researchers in the biomedical domain to access the intended information efficiently from the large volume of scientific literature and other textual resources. In this paper, we propose a summarization method that utilizes domain knowledge and an itemset mining approach to generate a conceptual model from a text document. The informativeness of sentences is quantified according to the extent that each sentence covers the main subtopics of text.

Methods: To address the concept-level analysis of text, we map the original document to biomedical concepts using the Unified Medical Language System (UMLS). Then, the essential subtopics of text are discovered using a data mining technique, namely itemset mining, and the conceptual model is constructed. The employed itemset mining algorithm supplies a set of frequent itemsets containing correlated and recurrent concepts of the input document. The final summary is created by selecting the most related and informative sentences.

¹ *Corresponding author. Address: Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran. Phone : +98-31-3391-9058, Fax: +98-31-3391-2450, Alternate email: nghadiri@gmail.com*

Results: We evaluated the competency of our itemset-based summarizer using the Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE) metrics, by performing a set of experiments. The proposed method was compared with the SUMMA, SweSum, AutoSummarize, term-based version of the itemset-based summarizer, and two baselines. The results show that the itemset-based summarizer significantly outperforms the compared competitors and the baseline methods. The itemset-based summarizer achieves the best score for all the assessed ROUGE scores (R-1: 0.7583, R-2: 0.3381, R-W-1.2: 0.0934, and R-SU4: 0.3889). We also performed a set of preliminary experiments to specify the best value for the minimum support threshold used in the itemset mining algorithm. It is demonstrated that the value of this threshold directly affects the accuracy of the conceptual model, and the relative low and a high number of discovered itemsets reduce the performance of summarization.

Conclusion: Compared to the statistical, similarity, and word frequency methods, the proposed method demonstrated that the conceptual model obtained from the concept extraction and itemset mining provides the summarizer with an efficient metric for measuring the informative content of sentences, and it leads to an improvement in the performance of biomedical text summarization.

Keywords: Biomedical text mining; Data mining; Frequent itemset mining; Informativeness; Concept-based text analysis; Domain knowledge;

1. Introduction

With the fast growth of producing digital text content in the biomedical domain, many efforts have been spent toward developing automatic tools to facilitate the difficulties of finding relevant information. Notably, clinicians and researchers are always faced with a common problem, acquiring the intended information from the vast resources of available text documents. The information is obtained from various resources, such as scientific literature databases, clinical trials, Electronic Health Record (EHR) systems, multimedia documents, e-mailed reports, and web documents [1, 2]. The biomedical literature is widely used to progress the main steps of researches and experiments, such as getting to know the state-of-the-art, collecting the required information, making new hypotheses, and interpreting the results [3]. However, achieving useful information from the large volume of biomedical literature is an

exhausting and time-consuming task. Automatic text summarization makes the task easy by condensing the source text while preserving the content that refers to the essential points of text. Reeve et al. [4] have identified five reasons for generating summaries of full-text papers even with the presence of their abstracts.

First research efforts of automatic text summarization were commenced in the late 1950s and 1960s by the early works of Luhn [5] and Edmundson [6]. During the last two decades, various summarization methods have been proposed using statistical, Natural Language Processing (NLP), machine learning, graph-theoretic, artificial intelligence, and mathematical approaches [7, 8]. In summarization systems, the source text is first analyzed and modeled by a particular approach, then, the final summary is generated. The majority of summarization systems deal with the source text through constructing a model from the words. However, in the biomedical domain, it seems that the term-level analysis of text does not yield adequate summarization performance [4, 9]. The biomedical field has its specific characteristics, such as the variety of synonyms and homonyms, elisions, and abbreviations [9]. More specifically, text documents related to each sub-domain of biomedical sciences have their particular singularities that should be taken into account. For example, in the genome sciences, each distinct gene may have multiple synonyms [10]. When a text document from the genome domain is analyzed at term-level, multiple synonymous names of a unique gene may be considered as different entities and their relation is overlooked. On the other hand, in the concept-level analysis of text, multiple terms that share the same meaning are considered as a single entity and will be referred by a single concept. Therefore, the accuracy of the model would be improved, leading to an increase in the quality of summarization [4, 9, 11, 12]. The concept-level analysis of text is performed by exploiting domain-specific biomedical knowledge sources, such as ontologies, vocabularies, and taxonomies.

Automatic text summarization is classified into *abstractive* and *extractive* systems [13]. An abstractive summarizer generates a new content that conveys the implications of the source text by employing NLP and linguistic methods. An extractive summarizer produces a shorter version of the input text through selecting the most representative sentences from the original wording and putting them together. An extractive summarization system decides which sentences are relevant and informative, and selects them for inclusion in the summary according to the model produced from the source text. By using an appropriate metric for measuring the informativeness of sentences, a summarization system can generate a highly informative summary that covers the main points of the original text. Several summarization methods measure the quality of sentences based on some statistical and general metrics. Common metrics

include the position of sentences, the frequency of words, the presence of positive and negative keywords, the length of sentences, the similarity of sentences to the document title, the existence of numerical data, and the presence of proper nouns [14-17]. Although these methods achieved a desirable summarization quality compared with their counterparts, they may not be suitable to meet the specific requirements of text modeling and sentence selection in biomedical summarization. In this type of summarization, it is required to construct an accurate conceptual model from the source text that can be effectively used to measure the relatedness and informativeness of sentences.

In this paper, we propose a novel biomedical text summarization method by employing the concept-level analysis of the text in combination with a data mining approach, namely itemset mining. The goal of our proposed itemset-based summarizer is to generate an accurate conceptual model from the source text. The produced model represents the main subtopics of text and a measure of their importance in the form of extracted frequent itemsets. In the itemset-based summarizer, first, the input text document is mapped to biomedical concepts contained in the Unified Medical Language System (UMLS) [18], a well-known knowledge source in the biomedical domain. Then, a transactional data representation is generated from the source text and its extracted concepts. Afterward, the main subtopics of the document are discovered using a well-established data mining technique, namely itemset mining [19]. To this aim, we utilize the Apriori algorithm [20]. Each extracted frequent itemset is a set of correlated concepts that frequently occur in the source text and is used to quantify the informativeness of the sentences. Eventually, the itemset-based summarizer assigns a score to each sentence that measures the informative content of the sentence. The most relevant and informative sentences are selected and put together to form the final summary.

To evaluate the performance of the proposed itemset-based summarizer, we performed a set of experiments on a collection of biomedical scientific papers. The experimental results show that our proposed biomedical summarization method performs better than the statistical and similarity feature-based, word frequency, and baseline methods regarding the Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE) metrics [21].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. A background of text summarization and previous work in biomedical summarization is given in Section 2. In Section 3, we explain our proposed biomedical text summarization method in detail. In Section 4, the evaluation methodology is described. In Section 5, the results of the assessment are presented and

discussed. Finally, we draw some conclusions and point out the potential future work in Section 6.

2. Background

Automatic text summarization systems are designed to generate a short form of text that conveys all the substantial information of the original document [7]. Regarding the number of documents that a summarization system receives as input to produce a unified summary, summarization methods are divided into *single-document* and *multi-document* methods [1]. *Generic* versus *query-focused* is another categorization for text summarization [2]. A generic summary gives a general implication of the information provided by the source text, while a query-focused summary provides a summary that contains the content related to a given query. Summaries can be styled as *indicative* or *informative* outputs [8]. Indicative summaries provide information about the topics of the input document by pointing to some parts of the text. Users still need to read the original text for acquiring sufficient information. Informative summaries give complete and adequate content about the topics of text, so that it is not necessary to retrieve the primary document. Our proposed method is extractive, informative, generic, and single-document.

Several summarization methods, like SUMMA [14] and SweSum [15], employ statistical, term-based similarity, and word frequency features. It seems that in the biomedical summarization, the use of traditional statistical and word frequency features should be replaced by another metrics that can adequately measure the extent of informative content of each sentence. Such a parameter can improve the accuracy of summarization, because it evaluates the quality of sentences according to their actual meaning rather than their position, length, and contained terms. In this paper, we address this problem by introducing a conceptual model that can be useful for assessing the informative content of sentences in biomedical text summarization.

Various domain-independent text summarization methods have been proposed using clustering methods [22], genetic algorithms [23], graph-based methods [24], Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) [25], complex networks [26], optimization methods [27], topic based approaches [28], statistical approaches [29], and many techniques from computer sciences and computational linguistics. However, as noted earlier, the biomedical domain has some singularities that require specialized summarization methods. Domain knowledge resources can be used in text analysis process to build a rich representation of the source text and improve the

performance of biomedical summarization. One of the useful knowledge sources in the biomedical domain is the UMLS [18], developed by the US National Library of Medicine.

The UMLS is a well-known biomedical knowledge source that unifies over 100 controlled vocabularies, classification systems, and additional knowledge sources. It has been employed by some summarization systems [4, 9, 11, 12, 30-32]. The UMLS contains three main components: the Specialist Lexicon, the Metathesaurus, and the Semantic Network. The *Specialist Lexicon* [33] is considered as a lexicographic information database and contains English and biomedical vocabularies. The *Metathesaurus* [34] is a lexicon that includes a large number of biomedical and health related concepts, along with their synonyms and relationships. The *Semantic Network* [35] contains a set of broad subject categories, named semantic types, for dividing the concepts of the Metathesaurus into stable categorizations. It also defines a set of useful relationships between the semantic types. Plaza [36] investigated the impact of a set of knowledge sources on the performance of biomedical summarization. She tested different combinations of particular sources in the UMLS for retrieving biomedical domain concepts. The results showed that the quality of produced summaries could be significantly improved by using an appropriate knowledge source.

In the last two decades, various biomedical text summarization methods have been proposed using different approaches [1, 2]. Some methods have addressed this type of summarization using concept-based approaches. Plaza et al. [9] performed the biomedical summarization using a semantic graph-based approach. Their summarization method uses the concepts and semantic relations of the UMLS to construct a graph. Then, a degree-based clustering algorithm is applied to identify different themes within the document. Three different sentence selection heuristics were intended to assess the impact of various selection strategies on the quality of summarization. Another concept-based biomedical summarization system [30] makes use of genetic clustering approach in combination with graph connectivity information. It uses genetic graph clustering to identify the topics of the document according to its concepts, and the connectivity information of graph to investigate and extract the relevance of the different subjects. ChainFreq [4] is a hybrid biomedical summarization method that combines BioChain [31] and FreqDist [32] methods. In this hybrid summarizer, the BioChain is used to identify thematic sentences, and the FreqDist is responsible for removing information redundancy. Both the BioChain and the Freqdist methods utilize the UMLS concepts to improve their topic and frequency modeling approaches. Sarkar [37] identified a vocabulary of cue terms and phrases from the biomedical domain and incorporated the vocabulary as a source of domain knowledge in the summarization method. In his feature-based method, two new additional features, namely

the presence of cue medical terms and the existence of new terms, are used along with a set of traditional features, such as word frequency, sentence length, sentence position, and the similarity with the title. The summarizer assigns a score to each sentence and selects the high-scoring sentences to form the summary. As reported by the above methods, when an appropriate summarization approach is combined with domain knowledge, the biomedical summarizers can perform better than their domain-independent counterparts. Our proposed method also employs the UMLS knowledge source to improve its itemset mining model. The impact of both concept-based and term-based approaches on the performance of the itemset-based summarizer will be investigated in Section 5.

Recently, a few domain-independent summarization methods have been proposed using frequent itemsets [38-40]. They address the challenges of selecting the most relevant and non-redundant sentences in multi-document and multilingual summarization. Frequent itemset mining is a data mining technique that can be used to discover frequent patterns in a dataset. It has been actually used in summarization of different data, such as transactional data [41] and medical data [42]. In our proposed biomedical text summarization method, we employ frequent itemset mining to extract the subtopics of an input document. In the sentence scoring stage, extracted itemsets are used to measure the informative content of sentences.

3. Summarization Method

The itemset-based summarizer performs the summarization task through four steps, including (1) preprocessing, (2) data preparation for itemset mining (3) extracting main subtopics, and (4) sentence scoring and summary creation. Fig. 1 illustrates the architecture of the itemset-based summarizer. In the following subsections, each step will be described in detail.

3.1. Preprocessing

Before performing the task of summarization, the itemset-based summarizer must prepare the input document for the subsequent steps. At first, the unnecessary parts of text not required for the final summary are removed. These parts could be specified according to the input text and its logical structure. Since our evaluation corpus consists of a set of biomedical scientific papers, the figures, and tables of the input document are removed as they do not contribute in the text summarization steps. They would be added to the summary in the last step if required. Every other section of paper that seems to be unnecessary could be removed from the text. Note

that the preprocessing step is not merely limited to scientific articles. This action is customizable regarding the logical structure of the input text and the requirements of the user.




Fig. 1. The architecture of the itemset-based biomedical text summarizer.

After removing the unnecessary parts, the plain text must be mapped to biomedical concepts contained in the UMLS Metathesaurus, to ease the creation of the conceptual model. For this purpose, we use the MetaMap program [43], developed by the National Library of Medicine. Each extracted concept belongs to a subject category, named semantic type. The semantic types divide the concepts into broader categories such as Biologic Function, Cell, Disease or Syndrome, Finding, Sign or Symptom, Mental Process, or Genetic Function. The UMLS defines over 130 semantic types and a set of semantic relations among the semantic types in its Semantic Network.

The MetaMap uses NLP and computational linguistic methods to match the phrases and concepts. It assigns a score to each mapping between a noun phrase and its paired concepts, returning the highest scoring concept along with its semantic type. If there are multiple mappings for a noun phrase and they have equal scores, the MetaMap returns multiple concepts for the noun phrase. For the itemset-based summarizer, we use the 2016 version of MetaMap

program for the mapping step and the 2015AB UMLS release as the knowledge base. Fig. 2 shows a sample sentence and its extracted concepts from the UMLS Metathesaurus.




Fig. 2. A sample sentence and its extracted concepts from the UMLS Metathesaurus.

3.2. Data preparation for itemset mining

After the mapping phase and concept extraction, the input document should be represented in an appropriate format for the itemset mining step. The most common data format to represent the input data in itemset and association rule mining is transactional data format [19]. A transactional dataset consists of a set of transactions, where each transaction contains a set of items. The input dataset should be converted to transactional format using a proper approach, according to the context that itemset mining is used. At this step, we have a set of sentences $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$, where each sentence s_i contains some concepts extracted in the previous step. This set of sentences and their concepts are converted to transactional data format by considering each sentence s_k as a transaction tr_k . The distinct concepts that appeared in s_k are considered as the items of tr_k . A more formal definition is given below:

Definition 1 (*Transactional representation of a document*). Let D be an input document. The transactional representation T of D includes a set of transactions, where each transaction tr_k corresponds to a sentence s_k , such that $s_k \in D$, and tr_k consists of distinct items i_j , where i_j is the j th concept in s_k .

Based on the above definition, the input document D is converted to transactional representation T . For example, three sentences of a sample document (available on <http://genomemedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/gm102>) are represented in Table 1. The transactional representation of these sentences is given in Table 2. A transaction number is assigned to every transaction that refers to its corresponding sentence, and the distinct concepts extracted from the sentences will make the items. In the itemset mining step, the itemset-based summarizer will use the transactional representation of the input document. The transactional

representation is utilized to generate a conceptual model based-on latent correlations among the concepts (items).

Table 1

Three sentences of the sample document, before preparation for itemset mining.

<i>Sentence number</i>	<i>Content</i>
2	“Genetic epidemiological studies of autism, bipolar disorder and schizophrenia show that the risk of developing one of these specific psychiatric illnesses is proportional to the amount of genetic material shared with an affected individual.” [44]
9	“The distinction between schizophrenia and bipolar disorder has been justified for many years by reference to family studies showing that these disorders seem to ‘breed true’.” [44]
23	“Genome-wide analyses have also implicated further related and interacting synaptic protein-coding genes in the etiology of ASDs.” [44]

Table 2

Three transactions corresponding to the three sentences represented in Table 1, after preprocessing, mapping and preparation steps. The non-essential concepts are discarded, and the remaining concepts make the items.

<i>Transaction number</i>	<i>Items</i>
2	Study of Epidemiology, Autistic Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, Schizophrenia, Mental disorders, Genetic Materials, Persons
9	Schizophrenia, Bipolar Disorder, Reference Object, family investigation, Family, Disease, Tryptophanase, Breeding
23	Genome, Protein coding gene, Autism Spectrum Disorders

3.3. Extracting main subtopics

At this stage, the itemset-based summarizer discovers the recurrent combinations of concepts from the transactional representation of the input document. The output of this step is a set of frequent k -itemsets that demonstrate the themes of document. A k -itemset is an itemset with length k that contains a set of k distinct items. If all of the items of an itemset appear in a given transaction tr_k (sentence s_k), it could be said that the itemset covers the tr_k . In itemset mining, there is a property that measures the frequency of each itemset in proportion to the total number

of transactions in the dataset. This property is called *support*, and for each itemset is defined as follows:

Definition 2 (*Itemset support*). Given the transactional representation T corresponding to document D and an itemset I , the value of support property for itemset I in T is determined as the number of transactions in T that are covered by I , divided by the total number of transactions in T .

For example, in the sample document with 85 sentences, {Proteins} is a 1-itemset that its corresponding concept appears in seven sentences. Therefore, the {Proteins} covers seven transactions in T , and its support value is $\frac{7}{85}$. The {Deletion Mutation, NRXN1 gene} is a 2-itemset and the {Autistic Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, Schizophrenia} is a 3-itemset. These two sets cover six and nine transactions in T , respectively. Hence, their support values would be $\frac{6}{85}$ and $\frac{9}{85}$. The itemset-based summarizer considers the support value of itemsets as a metric to measure their significance.

In the itemset mining step, a large number of itemsets will be produced. However, just the *frequent itemsets* are useful for the subsequent steps. In the following, a formal definition of a frequent itemset is presented.

Definition 3 (*Frequent itemset*). Itemset I is said to be frequent in transactional representation T of document D , if its support value in T is greater than or equal to a given minimum support threshold min_sup .

For example, let the min_sup value for the sample document be equal to $\frac{7}{85}$. Based on this value, the early mentioned itemsets {Proteins} and {Autistic Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, Schizophrenia} are frequent itemsets, and the itemset {Deletion Mutation, NRXN1 gene} is not frequent.

Given a transactional representation T of document D and a minimum support threshold min_sup , the frequent itemset mining process is executed to discover all the frequent itemsets in T . To perform the frequent itemset mining task, we employ Apriori [19, 20], a basic algorithm in data mining. The Apriori algorithm is basically used for association rule mining. In our proposed method, we utilize it just for extracting the frequent itemsets. We do not use its ability to generate association rules. The itemset-based summarizer considers the extracted frequent itemsets as main themes of the input text and utilizes them to select the most related and informative sentences. The inputs of the algorithm are the transactional representation TR of

document D , and the minimum support threshold min_sup . The output is a set of discovered frequent itemsets FI where each itemset demonstrates a subtopic of text and contains a set of correlated and recurrent concepts.

In Table 3, the frequent itemsets extracted from the sample document are represented. The sample document is about the Genetic overlap between autism, schizophrenia, and bipolar disorder. In this example, the value of minimum support threshold min_sup has been set to 0.07. It means that an itemset is frequent, if it covers at least 7% of the transactions. In other words, a set of correlated concepts is a central subtopic of text, if the concepts appear together in at least 7% of the sentences. A total number of 32 frequent itemsets have been produced, 25 of which are 1-itemsets, six of which are 2-itemsets, and one 3-itemset.

Table 3

The frequent itemsets extracted from the transactional representation of the sample document related to the genetic overlap between autism, schizophrenia, and bipolar disorder.

<i>Itemset</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Itemset</i>	<i>Support</i>
{Autistic Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, Schizophrenia}	0.105	{Alleles}	0.094
{neuroligin, Binding (Molecular Function)}	0.070	{Reporting}	0.082
{Deletion Mutation, NRXN1 gene}	0.070	{Proteins}	0.082
{Schizophrenia, Autism Spectrum Disorders}	0.070	{Encode (action)}	0.070
{Bipolar Disorder, Schizophrenia}	0.223	{Genes}	0.129
{Autistic Disorder, Schizophrenia}	0.152	{Autism Spectrum Disorders}	0.223
{Autistic Disorder, Bipolar Disorder}	0.105	{Genome}	0.105
{Mental Retardation}	0.070	{Genome-Wide Association Study}	0.070
{NRXN1 gene}	0.129	{Study}	0.094
{Procedure findings}	0.070	{Diagnosis}	0.070
{Binding (Molecular Function)}	0.082	{Tryptophanase}	0.094
{Staphylococcal Protein A}	0.070	{Disease}	0.094
{neuroligin}	0.176	{Persons}	0.105
{Copy Number Polymorphism}	0.105	{Schizophrenia}	0.352
{Scientific Study}	0.082	{Bipolar Disorder}	0.235
{Deletion Mutation}	0.164	{Autistic Disorder}	0.200

3.4. Sentence scoring and summary creation

After performing the itemset mining step that discovers the main subtopics of text, the sentences of document can be ranked based on how much they are informative and cover the main subtopics of text. Hence, a scoring strategy would be required to quantify the informativeness of the sentences.

The support value of each itemset indicates that how much the itemset is significant. It means that in comparing two itemsets extracted from a given document, an itemset is assumed to be more valuable and informative if it has a higher support value. Therefore, the support value of the itemsets that cover a sentence is an appropriate measure to quantify the importance of the sentence. The itemset-based summarizer assigns a score to each sentence by adding the support value of the itemsets that cover the sentence. The score of each sentence is calculated as follows:

$$Score(s_i) = \sum_{FI_j \mid FI_j \in FI \wedge FI_j \text{ covers } tr_i} Support(FI_j) \quad (1)$$

where s_i is the i_{th} sentence in document D , and tr_i is the transaction corresponding to s_i . FI is the set of all frequent itemsets extracted from the transactional representation T of document D , and FI_j is the j_{th} itemset in FI .

After scoring all the sentences of the input document, the summarizer can decide which sentences should be selected for inclusion in the final summary. Two factors contribute to an increase in the score of a sentence: 1) the number of frequent itemsets that cover the sentence, and 2) the support value of the frequent itemsets that cover the sentence. Therefore, the sentences that contain more frequent itemsets and are covered by high supporting frequent itemsets produce higher scores. The summarizer considers the high-scoring sentences to be high informative and more related to the main topics of the input text. After the sentence-scoring, the sentences are sorted based on their score. The top N sentences are selected to build the final summary, where N is the number of sentences that must be chosen for the summary and is determined by the compression rate. The summarizer arranges the selected sentences according to their appearance order in the input text. Finally, if the summary refers to a figure or a table of the primary document that was removed in the preprocessing step, it would be added to the summary. Fig. 3 shows the summary of the sample document produced by the itemset-based

summarizer. In this example, for brevity reasons, the compression rate has been set to 10%. It means that the size of summary must be 10% of the input document.

Such diagnostic categories are therefore likely to be heterogeneous and the boundaries between them somewhat arbitrary. Autism, schizophrenia and bipolar disorder have traditionally been considered as separate disease entities, although they do share some common behavioral characteristics and cognitive deficits.

Therefore, just as for NRXN1 deletions, it is apparent that these large CNVs confer risk of a range of neurodevelopmental phenotypes, including autism, mental retardation and schizophrenia.

The advent of the GWAS has allowed most of the common SNP variation in the human genome to be tested for association and the first wave of such studies has been reported for schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and autism.

Furthermore, there have been recent reports of association for common alleles at several GABA receptor genes in a subtype of bipolar disorder and schizophrenia, which implicate loci also reported as associated with ASDs.

Such biological roles fit with hypotheses of the etiology of autism and schizophrenia in which a neurodevelopmental insult and adult imbalance in excitatory and inhibitory neurotransmission occur in the absence of overt macro-pathology. SHANK3 is implicated in autism by several lines of evidence and functions as a post-synaptic scaffolding protein that binds indirectly to neuroligins, forming a potentially functional circuit of neurexin-neuroligin-Shank that is dysregulated in ASDs.

Whole-genome studies of many thousands of affected individuals are uncovering evidence for genetic overlap between autism, schizophrenia and bipolar disorder.

Studies of CNVs and other rare alleles have found overlap between autism and schizophrenia, whereas those of common SNP variants have shown overlap between schizophrenia and bipolar disorder.

The findings also support the view that schizophrenia has a stronger neurodevelopmental component than bipolar disorder and suggest that it lies on a gradient of decreasing neurodevelopmental impairment between syndromes such as mental retardation and autism, on one hand, and bipolar disorder on the other.

We have based this conclusion on the fact that several rare CNVs, including deletions of NRXN1, are associated with mental retardation, autism and schizophrenia, and on the overlap in common risk alleles seen between schizophrenia and bipolar disorder.

Fig. 3. The summary of the sample document generated by the itemset-based summarizer (compression rate=10%).

4. Evaluation

The performance of text summarization systems can be evaluated by two types of methods, *Extrinsic* and *Intrinsic* [45]. The extrinsic method evaluates the impact of summarization on the quality of a specific task that uses the produced summaries, such as question answering systems or search engines. The intrinsic method evaluates the performance of summarization regarding the quality of summary measures like informativeness, accuracy, relevancy, comprehensiveness, and readability. Since we intend to assess the competency of the itemset-based summarizer regarding the informative content of produced summaries, we evaluate its performance through intrinsic evaluation.

4.1. Evaluation dataset and metrics

To assess the performance of the proposed summarization method, we need to summarize a corpus of biomedical text documents that their model summaries (gold standard) are available. The model summary is used to measure the similarity between its content and the system-generated summary. To the authors' knowledge, such a corpus has not been developed for evaluating the single-document biomedical text summarization methods. However, a common approach is summarizing a collection of biomedical articles, and using the abstract of each article as the model summary. To evaluate the performance of the itemset-based summarizer, we employed a collection of 400 biomedical articles, randomly selected from the BioMed Central's corpus for text mining research (<http://old.biomedcentral.com/about/datamining>). We used the abstracts of the papers as the model summaries. This dataset is large enough for the results of the evaluations to be significant [46].

To evaluate the performance of the itemset-based summarizer in term of its ability to improve the informativeness of automatic summaries, we used the ROUGE package [21]. ROUGE estimates the shared content by comparing a system-generated summary with single or multiple model summaries. The estimation is performed by calculating the proportion of shared n -grams between the system and model summaries. For the evaluations, we used four ROUGE metrics:

- ROUGE-1: it computes the number of shared unigrams between the system and model summaries.
- ROUGE-2: it computes the number of shared bigrams between the system and model summaries.
- ROUGE-W-1.2: it compares the consecutive matches between the system and model summaries and computes the union of the longest common subsequences.
- ROUGE-SU4: it calculates the overlap of skip-bigrams (pairs of words having intervening word gaps) between the system and model summaries and allows a skip distance of four between the bigrams.

The ROUGE metrics compute a scores between 0 and 1. A higher score indicates a greater content overlap between the system and model summaries. Therefore, a summarizer is assumed to be better if its produced summaries obtain higher ROUGE scores, because they contain more shared content with the model summaries and are considered to be more informative. It is worth mentioning that the ROUGE has shown high correlation with the human judges [21], and the Document Understanding Conference (DUC) has adopted it as the official evaluation metric for text summarization.

4.2. The value of minimum support threshold

We conducted two sets of experiments to evaluate the performance of our itemset-based method for biomedical text summarization. To tune the parameter of the system, the first part of experiments is described in this subsection. Afterward, the second part of experiments will be described in the next subsection that evaluates the itemset-based summarizer against other summarization methods.

We designed and performed a set of preliminary experiments, in order to determine the best value for the *min_sup* threshold involved in discovering frequent itemsets (Section 3.3). The Apriori algorithm finds the frequent itemsets that their support value is greater than or equal to the *min_sup* threshold. Then, the itemset-based summarizer considers the extracted frequent itemsets as the main themes of the document. It assigns a score to each sentence based on the frequent itemsets that cover the sentence. Therefore, the higher value of *min_sup* threshold leads to a fewer number of frequent itemsets to be discovered, and fewer number of itemsets participate in the sentence scoring. In contrast, the lower value of *min_sup* threshold leads to more frequent itemsets to be extracted, and more itemsets get involved in the sentence scoring. We assessed the impact of lower and higher values of the *min_sup* threshold on the performance of the proposed itemset-based summarizer. The threshold value that reports the highest ROUGE scores is chosen as the best value for the *min_sup*, and will be used in the subsequent experiments for evaluating the itemset-based summarizer against other summarization methods.

For specifying the best value for the *min_sup* threshold, we used a separate evaluation dataset consisted of 100 biomedical articles, randomly selected from the BioMed Central's corpus for text mining research. The abstracts of the articles were used as the model summaries.

4.3. Comparing against other summarizers

We compared our proposed summarization method against other research-oriented, commercial, and baseline summarizers to assess its appropriateness for biomedical text summarization. The other summarizers used in the evaluations are: *SUMMA* [14], *SweSum* [15], *Microsoft AutoSummarize*, *term-based version of the itemset-based summarizer*, *Lead baseline*, and *Random baseline*.

SUMMA [14] is a publicly available research summarizer for both single and multi-document summarization. It selects the sentences for inclusion in the summary based on several

statistical and similarity-based features. Each feature has a customizable weight that specifies its importance. For the evaluations, we used these features for the SUMMA: the frequency of terms contained in the sentence, the position of the sentence in the document, the similarity of the sentence to the first sentence of the document, and the overlap between the sentence and the title of the document. SweSum [15] is another research-oriented summarizer that its online version (<http://swesum.nada.kth.se/index-eng-adv.html>) is available for public usage. For the sentence scoring, it uses a set of features such as presence in the first line of the text, presence of numerical values in the sentence, and the presence of keywords in the sentence. The user can customize the weight of each feature. For the type of text option, we used the ‘Academic’ text. AutoSummarize is a commercial application and a feature of the Microsoft Word software [47]. It performs the sentence scoring and summarization tasks based on a word frequency algorithm. Higher scores are assigned to the sentences that contain more frequent words. We used these tree summarizers for the evaluations, to assess the competency of the statistical and similarity feature-based and word frequency summarization methods for summarizing biomedical text documents, compared to our proposed conceptual itemset-based text modeling.

The term based version of the itemset-based summarizer uses terms instead of concepts to build an itemset-based model. In the term-based version of our method, the stage of mapping text to biomedical concepts is no longer needed, but two additional steps are added for extracting appropriate terms that can be used in the itemset mining stage. The first step is stop-word elimination that removes the highly frequent words that have little lexical content. To this aim, we employed the Natural Language Toolkit (NLTK) stop-word corpus [48]. The second step is stemming, reducing all the words contained in the sentences to their corresponding stem. For this purpose, we adopted the porter stemming algorithm [49]. After applying these two steps, the resulted terms form the items, and the remaining steps are performed similarly to the original concept-based version. The goal of using the term-based version for the evaluations is to investigate the impact of concept-level analysis of text on the accuracy of the itemset-based text modeling for biomedical text summarization, compared to term-level analysis.

We also used two baseline methods in the experiments. The Lead baseline method returns the first N sentences of the input text as the summary, and the Random baseline randomly selects N sentences and generates the summary.

In our evaluations, the compression rate was set to 30% for all the summarizers. It means that the size of generated summary would be equal to 30% of the input document. This choice is based on a widely accepted standard that says the compression rate should be between 15% and

35% [50]. The statistical significance of our results was tested using Wilcoxon signed-rank test with a 95% confidence interval.

5. Results and discussion

In this section, first, we present the results of the preliminary experiments and the impact of the value of min_sup threshold on the performance of the proposed method. Then, the results of evaluations that compare the itemset-based summarizer with other summarization methods will be presented and discussed.

5.1. Preliminary experiment results

The initial experiments were performed to determine the best value for the min_sup threshold. The Apriori algorithm decides whether the extracted itemsets are frequent, according to the min_sup threshold. As mentioned in Section 4.2, the number of discovered frequent itemsets has an inverse relationship with the value of support threshold. In fact, the higher value of the minimum support threshold leads to fewer number of frequent itemsets to be discovered and vice versa. The results of experiments are represented in Fig. 4. For brevity reasons, only ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-SU4 scores are reported. The best value for the min_sup threshold is 0.08 (i.e. 8%) that provides the best scores for the ROUGE metrics.




Fig. 4. ROUGE-2 and ROUGE-SU4 scores for different values of the minimum support threshold min_sup .

It can be observed from Fig. 4 that according to the ROUGE scores, the value of *min_sup* threshold has a significant impact on the quality of the generated summaries. In Table 4, the average number of all discovered frequent itemsets and the average number of *k*-itemsets are reported, where *k* is equal to 1, 2, 3, and 4. The average numbers are given for each tested support threshold.

As reported in Table 4, and considering Fig. 4, when the support threshold value is relatively small, for instance, 0.02 or 0.03, an enormous number of extracted itemsets are returned. These itemsets participate in the sentence scoring step, whereas only a small number of them are indeed important. As a result, the sentence scoring is performed using numerous redundant itemsets, and the quality of the produced summaries is reduced. On the other hand, when a relatively high value, e.g. 0.19 or 0.2, is chosen for the value of *min_sup* threshold, the number of discovered frequent itemsets is remarkably reduced. In this case, the summarizer quantifies the informativeness of the sentences according to a low number of itemsets, whereas this number of itemsets is not enough to decide about how much informative a sentence is. In fact, the summarizer assigns scores to the sentences based on a limited number of main subtopics, while there are other important subtopics disregarded by an extreme value of the support threshold. Consequently, the summarizer cannot accurately assign scores to the sentences based on their actual informativeness. Hence, the quality of the produced summaries is reduced.

In Fig. 4, the minimum support threshold of 0.08 reports the best ROUGE scores (R-2: **0.3359**, R-SU4: **0.3884**). As Table 4 shows, when the minimum support threshold is equal to 0.08, the average number of all discovered frequent itemsets is 74.3. The average number of frequent 1-itemsets, 2-itemsets, 3-itemsets, and 4-itemsets are 18.9, 19, 16.7, and 11.9, respectively. These figures and the obtained ROUGE scores show that the discovered frequent itemsets provide adequate knowledge to the summarizer. By using an optimized *min_sup* value, the summarizer can adequately quantify the informativeness of the sentences by calculating the score of each sentence, according to the support values of the extracted frequent itemsets. When the value of minimum support threshold decreases, and it becomes less than 0.08, the number of redundant itemsets participated in the sentence scoring increases, and as a result, the summarizer is misled by numerous unimportant itemsets. On the other hand, when a value more than 0.08 is assigned to the value of the *min_sup* threshold, the number of required itemsets decreases. As a consequence, the important itemsets that could help the summarizer to quantify the informative content of the sentences effectively, are no longer available to help the summarizer. In this situation, the knowledge of the summarizer about the main subtopics of text

is inadequate, and this negatively affects the accuracy of the summarizer and the quality of the produced summaries.

Table 4

The average number of all extracted frequent itemsets and the average number of k -itemsets, for the preliminary experiments evaluation corpus. The average numbers have been given for each tested minimum support threshold in the preliminary experiments. The numbers have been rounded off to one decimal digit.

<i>min_sup</i> <i>threshold</i>	Average number of all frequent itemsets	Average number of frequent 1-itemsets	Average number of frequent 2-itemsets	Average number of frequent 3-itemsets	Average number of frequent 4-itemsets
0.02	1891.0	96.2	239.0	355.4	416.6
0.03	974.9	62.6	129.0	179.2	200.8
0.04	557.4	46.4	76.9	100.0	110.9
0.05	322.0	36.2	52.3	63.0	62.9
0.06	166.1	27.5	33.2	34.1	30.2
0.07	133.0	22.8	25.9	25.4	23.0
0.08	74.3	18.9	19.0	16.7	11.9
0.09	60.1	15.5	15.0	13.1	9.6
0.10	51.5	12.8	12.5	11.1	8.5
0.11	35.8	11.3	10.0	7.6	4.6
0.12	23.9	9.6	7.8	4.5	1.7
0.13	19.2	7.7	6.4	3.7	1.2
0.14	16.5	6.9	5.3	3.1	1.1
0.15	15.2	6.3	4.9	2.9	1.0
0.16	12.5	5.4	4.0	2.3	0.8
0.17	11.8	5.0	3.8	2.2	0.8
0.18	9.8	4.3	3.1	1.8	0.5
0.19	6.8	3.6	2.1	0.8	0.2
0.20	6.2	3.2	2.0	0.8	0.2

5.2. Evaluation results

To evaluate the performance of our proposed itemset-based biomedical summarizer, we compared the ROUGE scores assigned to our method with the scores assigned to the other six summarizers, including *SUMMA*, *SweSum*, *Microsoft AutoSummarize*, *Itemset-based summarizer (term-based version)*, *Lead baseline*, and *Random baseline*. The ROUGE toolkit assigned four different scores to each summarizer through comparing the system-generated summaries with the model summaries. [Table 5](#) shows the ROUGE scores obtained by all the summarizers. As can be observed, our proposed itemset-based biomedical summarizer reports higher ROUGE scores than the other summarizers and baseline methods. Compared with the

other six summarizers, the itemset based summarizer significantly improves all the reported ROUGE metrics according to Wilcoxon signed-rank test ($p < 0.05$). The term-based version of the itemset-based summarizer substantially performs better than the *SweSum*, *Lead baseline*, *AutoSummarize*, and *Random baseline* for all the reported ROUGE scores. It also greatly improves the ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-SU4 scores compared with the *SUMMA*, although, its improvement is not significant for the ROUGE-W-1.2 score ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5

ROUGE scores for the itemset-based summarizer and its term-based version, two research summarizers, a commercial application and two baselines. The best score for each metric is shown in bold type. The summarizers are sorted by decreasing the ROUGE-2 score.

	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-W-1.2	ROUGE-SU4
<i>Itemset-based summarizer</i>	0.7583	0.3381	0.0934	0.3889
<i>Itemset-based summarizer (term-based)</i>	0.7297	0.3219	0.0853	0.3694
<i>SUMMA</i>	0.7058	0.3114	0.0807	0.3498
<i>SweSum</i>	0.6804	0.2901	0.0772	0.3397
<i>Lead baseline</i>	0.6322	0.2529	0.0721	0.3196
<i>AutoSummarize</i>	0.6281	0.2436	0.0692	0.3125
<i>Random baseline</i>	0.5602	0.2128	0.0669	0.2908

The results show that the Random baseline performs worse than other summarizers. As expected, creating the summary by random selection of sentences from the documents does not lead to producing useful summaries. The Lead baseline performs better than the Random baseline because a portion of valuable information of a scientific article is presented when beginning by the introduction. However, the summarization performance of the Lead baseline is not satisfying, and it would be required that all the relevant information throughout the document to be contained in the final summary. Moreover, other types of biomedical text documents may not have the same structure as the scientific articles, and the Lead baseline may give worse summarization performance when the other types of text documents are used.

As can be observed from the ROUGE scores obtained by the AutoSummarize, the word frequency heuristic may not provide a useful measure for quantifying the informativeness of sentences for this type of summarization. It is showed that in the context of biomedical text summarization, the quality of summaries produced by a summarizer that relies on word frequency algorithm (AutoSummarize) is lower than the feature-based methods (SUMMA and SweSum), and the two versions of the itemset-based summarizer. When the two feature-based summarizers (SUMMA and SweSum) are used, we observe a significant improvement in the

performance of summarization, regarding the ROUGE scores, compared with the baseline methods and the AutoSummarize. The SUMMA method uses statistical, and similarity features and the SweSum uses position-based and term-based features for sentence scoring and sentence selection. Nevertheless, it seems that the features used by these two summarizers may not be served as adequate measures to quantify the informative content of sentences in this type of summarization. It would be required to analyze the document at a conceptual level and select the sentences according to the subtopics that each sentence covers.

As [Table 5](#) shows, the term-based version of the itemset-based summarizer provides better summarization performance than the domain-independent summarizers (SUMMA, SweSum, and AutoSummarize) and the two baseline methods. It constructs a model from the input text using discovered frequent itemsets, where each itemset contains a set of correlated terms and shows one of the main themes of the document. According to the evaluation results, the term-based version of the itemset-based summarizer can improve the quality of the produced summaries by utilizing the extracted itemsets that can efficiently measure the informativeness of sentences within a text document. Eventually, the best ROUGE scores are reported by the itemset-based summarizer (concept-based version) customized to summarize text biomedical documents. The itemset-based summarizer can improve the performance of summarization by representing the document at a conceptual level and dealing with concepts rather than terms. Through the use of itemset mining, the correlated concepts are extracted in the form of frequent itemsets, and the summarizer considers them as thematic concepts. When the input text is mapped to biomedical concepts, a single concept would be representative of multiple words or phrases sharing a common meaning. This operation will increase the accuracy of the produced model. Consequently, the summary is constructed based on an accurate conceptual model. The itemset-based summarizer utilizes the generated model to quantify the informative content of the sentences. The summarizer assigns a score to each sentence according to the support value of itemsets that cover the sentence. The assigned scores are considered as the informativeness metric of sentences, and the high-scoring sentences are chosen for inclusion in the final summary. The result of this modeling and summarization strategy is a considerable improvement in the quality of the produced summaries as evaluated by the obtained ROUGE scores.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel biomedical text summarization method by employing a well-known data mining technique, namely itemset mining, and conceptual modeling of text. The input document was mapped to the concepts contained in the UMLS, to facilitate the concept-level analysis of the source text. With the use of concept-level analysis rather than traditional term-based approaches, the itemset-based summarizer could actually deal with the inherent singularities of biomedical text. The recurrent and correlated concepts appeared together in the source text were discovered using frequent itemset mining. The discovered frequent itemsets demonstrated the important themes of the input document. The itemset-based summarizer quantified the relatedness and informativeness of each sentence, using the support values of the frequent itemsets that covered the sentence. Eventually, the final summary was produced by putting the most informative sentences together. The itemset-based summarizer was evaluated on a collection of 400 biomedical scientific articles. Compared with other summarization methods that utilize statistical and similarity features or word frequency algorithms, the itemset-based summarizer produced more informative summaries and showed better summarization performance.

The evaluation results confirm that the use of itemset mining in combination with domain knowledge provides an appropriate approach for generating an accurate conceptual model for biomedical text summarization. Furthermore, it has been shown that the extracted frequent itemsets can be effectively used to measure the informative content of the sentences. We also investigated the role of the minimum support threshold involved in the itemset mining algorithm, on the quality of produced summaries. The support values less than the optimum threshold value generate a number of itemsets that mislead the summarizer and reduce its accuracy by redundant information. Moreover, the support values greater than the optimum threshold value will produce fewer itemsets. In this case, the summarizer's knowledge is not sufficient, and its accuracy decreases due to the incomplete information about the essential subtopics.

Although the itemset-based summarizer has shown its efficiency and usefulness for single-document biomedical text summarization, it may encounter the redundancy problem in multi-document summarization. We intend to concentrate on addressing this issue by incorporating a redundancy reduction strategy into the summarization method and proposing a multi-document summarization method. Our future work will also include extending the itemset-based conceptual modeling for query-focused biomedical text summarization.

7. Mode of availability

The Java source code of the itemset-based biomedical text summarizer and its documentation are accessible at <http://dkr.iut.ac.ir/content/code-itemset-based-summarizer>.

References

- [1] R. Mishra, J. Bian, M. Fiszman, C. R. Weir, S. Jonnalagadda, J. Mostafa, *et al.*, "Text summarization in the biomedical domain: a systematic review of recent research," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, vol. 52, pp. 457-467, 2014.
- [2] S. Afantenos, V. Karkaletsis, and P. Stamatopoulos, "Summarization from medical documents: a survey," *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, vol. 33, pp. 157-177, 2005.
- [3] W. W. Fleuren and W. Alkema, "Application of text mining in the biomedical domain," *Methods*, vol. 74, pp. 97-106, 2015.
- [4] L. H. Reeve, H. Han, and A. D. Brooks, "The use of domain-specific concepts in biomedical text summarization," *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 43, pp. 1765-1776, 2007.
- [5] H. P. Luhn, "The automatic creation of literature abstracts," *IBM Journal of research and development*, vol. 2, pp. 159-165, 1958.
- [6] H. P. Edmundson, "New methods in automatic extracting," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 16, pp. 264-285, 1969.
- [7] M. Gambhir and V. Gupta, "Recent automatic text summarization techniques: a survey," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pp. 1-66, 2016.
- [8] V. Gupta and G. S. Lehal, "A survey of text summarization extractive techniques," *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Web Intelligence*, vol. 2, pp. 258-268, 2010.
- [9] L. Plaza, A. Díaz, and P. Gervás, "A semantic graph-based approach to biomedical summarisation," *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, vol. 53, pp. 1-14, 2011.
- [10] R. A. Erhardt, R. Schneider, and C. Blaschke, "Status of text-mining techniques applied to biomedical text," *Drug discovery today*, vol. 11, pp. 315-325, 2006.
- [11] P. Chen and R. Verma, "A query-based medical information summarization system using ontology knowledge," in *19th IEEE Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems (CBMS'06)*, 2006, pp. 37-42.
- [12] L. Plaza and J. Carrillo-de-Albornoz, "Evaluating the use of different positional strategies for sentence selection in biomedical literature summarization," *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 14, p. 1, 2013.
- [13] E. Lloret and M. Palomar, "Text summarisation in progress: a literature review," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 37, pp. 1-41, 2012.
- [14] H. Saggion, "A robust and adaptable summarization tool," *Traitement Automatique des Langues*, vol. 49, 2008.
- [15] H. Dalianis, *Swesum: A text summerizer for swedish*: KTH, 2000.
- [16] M. A. Fattah and F. Ren, "GA, MR, FFNN, PNN and GMM based models for automatic text summarization," *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 23, pp. 126-144, 2009.
- [17] R. M. Alguliev and R. M. Aliguliyev, "Effective summarization method of text documents," in *The 2005 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI'05)*, 2005, pp. 264-271.

- [18] S. J. Nelson, T. Powell, and B. Humphreys, "The unified medical language system (umls) project," *Encyclopedia of library and information science*, pp. 369-378, 2002.
- [19] R. Agrawal, T. Imieliński, and A. Swami, "Mining association rules between sets of items in large databases," *ACM SIGMOD Record*, vol. 22, pp. 207-216, 1993.
- [20] R. Agrawal, H. Mannila, R. Srikant, H. Toivonen, and A. I. Verkamo, "Fast Discovery of Association Rules," *Advances in knowledge discovery and data mining*, vol. 12, pp. 307-328, 1996.
- [21] C.-Y. Lin, "Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries," in *Text summarization branches out: Proceedings of the ACL-04 workshop*, 2004.
- [22] L. Yang, X. Cai, Y. Zhang, and P. Shi, "Enhancing sentence-level clustering with ranking-based clustering framework for theme-based summarization," *Information sciences*, vol. 260, pp. 37-50, 2014.
- [23] M. Mendoza, S. Bonilla, C. Noguera, C. Cobos, and E. León, "Extractive single-document summarization based on genetic operators and guided local search," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 41, pp. 4158-4169, 2014.
- [24] G. Erkan and D. R. Radev, "LexRank: Graph-based lexical centrality as salience in text summarization," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, pp. 457-479, 2004.
- [25] J.-Y. Yeh, H.-R. Ke, W.-P. Yang, and I.-H. Meng, "Text summarization using a trainable summarizer and latent semantic analysis," *Information processing & management*, vol. 41, pp. 75-95, 2005.
- [26] L. Antigueira, O. N. Oliveira, L. da Fontoura Costa, and M. d. G. V. Nunes, "A complex network approach to text summarization," *Information Sciences*, vol. 179, pp. 584-599, 2009.
- [27] R. M. Alguliev, R. M. Aliguliyev, M. S. Hajirahimova, and C. A. Mehdiyev, "MCMR: Maximum coverage and minimum redundant text summarization model," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 38, pp. 14514-14522, 2011.
- [28] S. Harabagiu and F. Lacatusu, "Using topic themes for multi-document summarization," *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, vol. 28, p. 13, 2010.
- [29] J.-H. Lee, S. Park, C.-M. Ahn, and D. Kim, "Automatic generic document summarization based on non-negative matrix factorization," *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 45, pp. 20-34, 2009.
- [30] H. D. Menéndez, L. Plaza, and D. Camacho, "Combining graph connectivity and genetic clustering to improve biomedical summarization," in *2014 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, 2014, pp. 2740-2747.
- [31] L. Reeve, H. Han, and A. D. Brooks, "BioChain: lexical chaining methods for biomedical text summarization," in *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM symposium on Applied computing*, 2006, pp. 180-184.
- [32] L. H. Reeve, H. Han, S. V. Nagori, J. C. Yang, T. A. Schwimmer, and A. D. Brooks, "Concept frequency distribution in biomedical text summarization," in *Proceedings of the 15th ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*, 2006, pp. 604-611.
- [33] (accessed 18.05.2016). *National Library of Medicine. UMLS Specialist Lexicon fact sheet*. <<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/factsheets/umlslex.html>>.
- [34] (accessed 18.05.2016). *National Library of Medicine. UMLS Metathesaurus fact sheet*. <<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/factsheets/umlsmeta.html>>.
- [35] (accessed 18.05.2016). *National Library of Medicine. UMLS Semantic Network fact sheet*. <<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/factsheets/umlssemn.html>>.

- [36] L. Plaza, "Comparing different knowledge sources for the automatic summarization of biomedical literature," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, vol. 52, pp. 319-328, 2014.
- [37] K. Sarkar, "Using domain knowledge for text summarization in medical domain," *International Journal of Recent Trends in Engineering*, vol. 1, pp. 200-205, 2009.
- [38] E. Baralis, L. Cagliero, S. Jabeen, and A. Fiori, "Multi-document summarization exploiting frequent itemsets," in *Proceedings of the 27th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, 2012, pp. 782-786.
- [39] E. Baralis, L. Cagliero, N. Mahoto, and A. Fiori, "GRAPHSUM: Discovering correlations among multiple terms for graph-based summarization," *Information Sciences*, vol. 249, pp. 96-109, 2013.
- [40] E. Baralis, L. Cagliero, A. Fiori, and P. Garza, "Mwi-sum: A multilingual summarizer based on frequent weighted itemsets," *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, vol. 34, p. 5, 2015.
- [41] M. Mampaey, N. Tatti, and J. Vreeken, "Tell me what i need to know: succinctly summarizing data with itemsets," in *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2011, pp. 573-581.
- [42] C. Ordonez, N. Ezquerra, and C. A. Santana, "Constraining and summarizing association rules in medical data," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 9, pp. 1-2, 2006.
- [43] (accessed 18.05.2016). *National Library of Medicine. MetaMap Portal*. <<http://mmtx.nlm.nih.gov/>>.
- [44] L. S. Carroll and M. J. Owen, "Genetic overlap between autism, schizophrenia and bipolar disorder," *Genome medicine*, vol. 1, p. 1, 2009.
- [45] K. S. Jones and J. R. Galliers, *Evaluating natural language processing systems: An analysis and review* vol. 1083: Springer Science & Business Media, 1995.
- [46] C.-Y. Lin, "Looking for a few good metrics: Automatic summarization evaluation-how many samples are enough?," in *NTCIR*, 2004.
- [47] "Microsoft Word 2007," ed: Microsoft Coporation, 2007.
- [48] E. Loper and S. Bird, "NLTK: The natural language toolkit," in *Proceedings of the ACL-02 Workshop on Effective tools and methodologies for teaching natural language processing and computational linguistics-Volume 1*, 2002, pp. 63-70.
- [49] *The Porter Stemming Algorithm*. <<http://tartarus.org/martin/PorterStemmer/>>.
- [50] R. Mitkov, *The Oxford handbook of computational linguistics*: Oxford University Press, 2005.