

# A systematic review of ontology-based clinical decision support system rules: usage, management, and interoperability

Xia Jing<sup>1\*</sup>, Hua Min<sup>2\*</sup>, Yang Gong<sup>3\*</sup>, Dean F. Sittig<sup>3</sup>, Paul Biondich<sup>4</sup>, David Robinson<sup>5</sup>, Tim Law<sup>6</sup>, Adam Wright<sup>7</sup>, Christian Nøhr<sup>8</sup>, Arild Faxvaag<sup>9</sup>, Lior Rennert<sup>1</sup>, Nina Hubig<sup>10</sup>, Ronald Gimbel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Public Health Sciences, College of Behavioral, Social, and Health Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA; <sup>2</sup>Department of Health Administration and Policy, College of Health and Human Services, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA; <sup>3</sup>School of Biomedical Informatics, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston, TX, USA; <sup>4</sup>Clem McDonald Biomedical Informatics Center, Regenstrief Institute, Department of Pediatrics, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA; <sup>5</sup>General Practitioner/Independent Consultant, Cumbria, UK; <sup>6</sup>Ohio Musculoskeletal and Neurologic Institute, Ohio University, Athens, OH, USA; <sup>7</sup>Department of Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA; <sup>8</sup>Department of Planning, Faculty of Engineering, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark; <sup>9</sup>Department of Neuromedicine and Movement Science, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; <sup>10</sup>School of Computing, College of Engineering, Computing and Applied Science, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA

\*Xia Jing, Hua Min, and Yang Gong contribute equally to the manuscript. Therefore they share the first authorship.

## Abstract:

**Objective:** Clinical decision support systems (CDSS) have a critical role in improving the quality and safety of health care delivery. CDSS rules direct the behavior of CDSS. However, the CDSS rules have not been routinely shared and reused, and ontology can promote the reusing of CDSS rules. We systematically screened literature to elaborate on the current status of ontology applied in CDSS rule management.

**Methods:** We searched PubMed, the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) Digital Library, and the Nursing & Allied Health Database for publications focusing on ontology, clinical decision support, and rules. Grounded theory and PRISMA 2020 guidelines were followed. One author started the screening and literature analysis, and two authors validated the processes and results. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were developed and refined iteratively.

**Results:** Among 81 included publications, the identified CDSS were mainly applied to managing chronic conditions, alerts for medication prescriptions, reminders for immunizations and preventive services, diagnoses, and treatment recommendations. The CDSS rules were presented in Semantic Web Rule Language, Jess, or Jena formats. Despite ontology was used to supply medical knowledge, CDSS rules, and terminologies to CDSS, ontology has not been used in CDSS rule management.

**Conclusions:** Although ontology can facilitate the reuse, management, and maintenance of CDSS rules, CDSS ontology remains unavailable indicating that more efforts are needed to improve the reusability and interoperability of CDSS rules.

**Keywords:** Ontology; Clinical decision support systems (CDSS); CDSS rules; Semantic Web technology; Interoperability

## Introduction

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) have been studied and used in clinical care delivery for longer than half a century [1-5]. The effectiveness of CDSS in clinical care has been established [6-8]. We cite some prominent examples in CDSS. Middleton et al. reviewed the two decades of clinical decision support experiences as CDSS users and developers and discussed their vision of CDSS for the future [9]. Wright et al. recommended best practice guidelines in CDSS [10-14]. Meanwhile, Sittig and colleagues comprehensively documented the challenges of CDSS [15]. McDonald is one of the earliest pioneers who demonstrated the effectiveness of CDSS in clinical care [16]. Meeting clinicians' information needs is one way to improve clinical care outcomes via CDSS. Many studies have shown the effectiveness of such CDSS, for example, Cimino's Infobutton [6, 17]. Currently, CDSS is used routinely in clinical care in the USA. An analysis of a 2015 national survey showed CDSS usage rates reached 68.5% to 100% in primary care settings based in offices [18] in the USA. Therefore, CDSS is commonly used in clinical care delivery as part of electronic health record (EHR) systems. CDSS has a range of forms: such as reminders for preventive services (e.g., immunizations, screening tests) [19, 20], alerts for drug-drug interactions [14, 21, 22], diagnostic or treatment plan recommendations [23-25], content assistance for clinicians [26-30], or recommendations for adhering to current clinical practice guidelines [31-33]. CDSS has played a critical role and is used commonly in providing safer and better quality clinical care services.

CDSS rules, like central neural systems for humans, direct the behaviors of a CDSS during operations by incorporating a patient's data, contextual information, and medical domain knowledge. CDSS rules have a central role and are a decisive factor in the relevance and usefulness of CDSS in the entire clinical workflow, including whether a CDSS will be adopted and used. CDSS rules can be written in different languages, such as Arden syntax [34], the Semantic Web Rule Language (SWRL), Jess, Jena, and other programming languages. Reusing and sharing CDSS rules is ideal since it is very costly to recreate these rules every time, but the process is not a routine operation across organizations. As a component of an EHR system, updating the CDSS rules regularly is needed to keep the CDSS relevant and useful in clinical care delivery. However, it is a very time-consuming and resource-demanding process to create, manage, maintain, reuse, and share CDSS rules—one type of CDSS artifact. This resource-demanding process has been recognized by larger institutes [4, 35], which usually are better resourced than small-scale practices. Therefore, creating and maintaining CDSS rules can be much more challenging in resource-limited office-based practices.

The ontology can facilitate the use, reuse, sharing, and interoperability of CDSS rules, solving the challenges of managing and maintaining CDSS rules across institutional borders. Ontology is the enabling technology of the Semantic Web [36] and is critical in information sharing and reusing [37, 38]. Although there are many definitions of ontology, we use the one by Gruber: "an ontology is a specification of conceptualization" [37]. Ontology has been used to generate and supply domain knowledge in many fields, including medicine [39] and CDSS [40], which is not an ontology that focuses on CDSS but includes relevant content of CDSS. Ontology can be used to shed light on achieving interoperable clinical information, such as CDSS rules, at a more granular level.

Although ontology can facilitate the reuse and sharing of CDSS rules, no CDSS ontology exists. Therefore, we are building a CDSS ontology [41]. Furthermore, to elaborate on the current status of using ontology in CDSS rules, to improve CDSS rules **reuse and interoperability**, we systematically reviewed existing English literature about the **intersection of CDSS rules**, Semantic Web technology (especially

**ontology**), and the use of ontologies in CDSS. The primary **rationale** of this systematic literature review is that even though there is no existing CDSS ontology except for our effort, the systematic examination of the literature on the intersection of CDSS rules, ontology, and the use of ontology in CDSS can provide a clearer picture on how ontology is used in CDSS, especially regarding CDSS rules. The literature review can shed light on our effort to use the Semantic Web technology to enable the reuse and maintenance of CDSS rules.


Through this effort, we aimed to achieve **three objectives**. First, this systematic review will provide an initial structure and considerations for organizing our CDSS ontology. Second, the results can help us hone our focus area: ontology use in CDSS rule management. A clear scope and comprehensive picture can form a knowledge framework of the topic that may inspire and guide future efforts to advance this field more explicitly. Third, the manually annotated results of selected publications will be used as gold standards to automatically identify entities from the literature, which complements efforts to curate CDSS ontology manually.

## Methods

### *General workflow*

After the literature search, the first 100 of all the retrieved papers were initially screened by one author (XJ), and initial inclusion and exclusion criteria were drafted. This screening was replicated, and the results were discussed, validated, and the criteria were refined and adjusted by two other authors (HM and YG). Therefore, the first 100 papers were screened by all three authors independently. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were developed, revised, and refined during the iterative literature screening, review, analysis, and discussions. Then the rest of the papers were screened by at least two authors (XJ and MH, or XJ and YG) independently to determine if a paper should be included in the literature review. The discrepancies were discussed and resolved via iterative rounds of teleconferences.

When needed, the literature was first screened using publication titles, abstracts, and full-text publications. Then after determining which papers to include, included papers were manually coded to provide more content analysis and synthesized evidence. The final results were shared and agreed upon among all authors. Therefore, the screening of each paper and manual review of included papers were conducted by two authors independently and approved by at least two authors first and all authors later. All discrepancies and concerns were resolved via group email discussions and complementary teleconferences. Figure 1 illustrates the general workflow.



**Figure 1** General workflow of the systematic literature review

### *Databases and search strategies*

On June 2, 2020, we did an initial set of literature searches. After initial review and discussions, we refined and agreed with the search strategies. On Sept 15, 2020, we searched PubMed, the Association for

Computing Machinery (ACM) Digital Library, and the Nursing & Allied Health Database for literature with the following search strategies. On January 5, 2022, we conducted the exact search again in the three literature databases as an update.

- PubMed

(clinical decision support systems[MeSH Terms]) AND (ontolog\*[Title/abstract] OR rule\*[Title/abstract])

- ACM Digital Library

The following search was conducted within the scope of the ACM Guide to Computing Literature.

[[Publication Title: "clinical decision support\*"] OR [Publication Title: cds\*]] AND [[Publication Title: ontolog\*] OR [Abstract: ontolog\*] OR [Publication Title: rule\*] OR [Abstract: rule\*]]

- Nursing & Allied Health Database (NAHD)

The following search was limited to peer-reviewed publications.

mesh(clinical decision support) AND (ti(ontology) OR ti(ontologies) OR ab(ontology) OR ab(ontologies) OR ti(rule) OR ti(rules) OR ab(rule) OR ab(rules))

### ***Inclusion and exclusion criteria***

The inclusion criteria were:

1. Literature is written in English;
2. Full-text publication available;
3. Ontology designed to implement or implemented in CDSS, especially related to CDSS rules;
4. Content includes granularity of CDSS rules;
5. Ontology designed to integrate or already integrated with health information systems (e.g., EHR), either in a production system or a prototype, with at least one architecture diagram;
6. Applied in clinical domains or designed for clinical domains to support health care providers;
7. Peer-reviewed publication; and
8. Contained details on integration between CDSS and EHR for evaluation studies.

The exclusion criteria were:

1. Only CDSS rules, regardless of any stage of the CDSS rules' lifecycle (i.e., development, identification, refinement, validation, evaluation, or implementation), or no integration was mentioned, or no mention of ontology;
2. Only Ontology was developed, evaluated, and validated, or no integration was mentioned, or no CDSS was mentioned;
3. System was designed without mentioning the granularity of CDSS rules or ontology; and
4. The publication described nonclinical decisions, such as administrative or management decisions (e.g., supply chain management).

### ***Reviewing, coding, analyzing, and synthesizing processes***

During the reviewing and manual coding, we followed grounded theory. One author (XJ) randomly selected ten papers from the *included* 81 papers to start the coding based on the focus of this literature

review: CDSS rules (including application and management), ontology, and roles of ontology. The coding results were discussed by three authors (XJ, HM, and YG). The discussion results formed the first draft of codes and code groups (Appendix 1), i.e., data items. Then the three coders (authors) reviewed and coded the first 40 of the *included* papers using the initial principles and code groups and adding new codes and code groups when needed. Midway through coding, consensus on updated principles and code groups was obtained at a second meeting and following iterative discussions. Then the refined codes and code groups were used to code the remaining papers. Every paper was coded by at least two coders independently. Then the coding results were compared, and any discrepancies were discussed to resolve. During each discussion, the code groups and codes were revised, consolidated, and updated. The refined code groups and examples are described in Appendix 2. Therefore, the data items were emerged during review and refined via discussions instead of pre-defined before reviewing.

A qualitative data analytic tool-ATLAS.ti 9 (desktop version and Web version), was used for coding by the three coders. To form the final codes and code groups, all projects (ATLAS.ti organizes the data as projects, i.e., each coder has a project to save all the papers and coding results) from all three coders were merged, and any duplicates were removed after a manual check. Then codes and code groups were later combined, and any duplicates were removed after a manual review.

After coding, the literature was analyzed and synthesized. For this process, we focused on several aspects, including the application domains of CDSS, the mechanism of CDSS used in clinical settings, CDSS rule format, authoring, management, and ontology roles. The process was iterated several times among the three coders first. Then after obtaining consensus among the three coders, the results were shared and discussed among all authors later. Through iterative discussions, any concerns, confusion, or disagreements among authors were resolved with group emails and complementary teleconferences.

We have followed the PRISMA 2020 checklist [42] in reporting the systematic review with all relevant items.

## **Results**

### ***Results related to CDSS characteristics***

The literature searches generated 1,235 publications from three sources until Jan 5, 2022. After removing duplicates and examining according to inclusion and exclusion criteria, we included 81 publications (Appendix 3) in the final review and analysis [19-21, 23-25, 43-117]. Figure 2 illustrates each step of the literature search, screening, selection flow, and results. Figure 3 summarizes the main components covered by the literature review and the summary findings. Figure 3 also serves as an initial knowledge framework on CDSS, CDSS rules, and ontology applications in CDSS.

More than one-third (35.8%, 29/81) of CDSS was used for chronic condition management, prediction, or risk assessment. The chronic conditions included type 1 and 2 diabetes, hypertension, and asthma. Other significant domains included medication prescriptions (16%; 13/81), such as medication orders and detection of adverse drug events and drug-drug interactions, and cancer care (9.9%; 8/81). Most CDSS was designed and used by health care providers, and only 11.1% (9/81) were intended to be used by patients, some of which can be used by clinicians too. Most CDSS provide recommendations, suggestions, alerts, or reminders. Among all items we compared (Table 1), EHR evaluation had the least complete information. Some CDSS was implemented in production systems (38.3%; 31/81), excluding design, and some were implemented in prototypes (37%; 30/81), including experimental systems. Table 1 summarizes the essential characteristics of CDSS. We used the terms from the corresponding papers in all

tables without changing them. For example, some papers used “physicians” as CDSS users, and others used “clinicians” as CDSS users. We used the authors’ terms in the tables.

### ***Results related to CDSS rules***

Most CDSS rules were written in the languages of SWRL (11.1%; 9/81), Web Ontology Language (OWL; 13.6%, 11/81), extensive markup language (XML; 12.3%; 10/81), Jena rules (6.2%; 5/81), and medical logic module (MLM; 3.7%; 3/81). Two publications [109, 111] used N3 language, and two [82, 109] used the natural rule language (NRL). Table 2 details the CDSS rules for publications that can fill out three (except for the authors and publication years) or more cells in table 2 ( $n = 54$ ).

The most significant CDSS rule sources were from clinical practice guidelines (44.4%; 36/81). Other sources include domain expert input, publications (e.g., textbooks, papers), multimedia sources, and Internet resources. Two publications used data mining results as CDSS rule sources [59, 65]. CDSS rule authoring and editing tools were not routinely specified in the publications. Protégé [115] was the most popular tool to edit and author CDSS rules in publications with such detail. Several publications also describe developing such tools [49, 57, 83].

Rule engines are another technical detail that many publications did not specify. Among all publications with specified rule engines, Jena (7.4%; 6/81), inference engine (7.4%; 6/81), Jess (4.9%; 4/81), JBoss (3.7%; 3/81), guideline engine (3.7%; 3/81), Drools (2.5%; 2/81), and Bayes (2.5%; 2/81) were most often used. The column for CDSS rule operation in Table 2 summarizes how the CDSS rule works in a simplified manner. Many publications do not provide details on the working mechanism of CDSS rules within the system context.

Interoperability does not seem to be the focus of the publications. Only a few papers mentioned interoperability (Table 2). They all used HL7 CDA (Health Level 7, Clinical Document Architecture) or HL7 FHIR (Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources) standards. However, we noticed that such measures are not specifically for CDSS rules but mainly for the input and output of CDSS.

### ***Results related to ontology***

In the included publications, ontology is mainly used as a knowledge source for CDSS (39.5%; 32/81) and to facilitate classification (8.6%; 7/81), reasoning, and inference (7.4%; 6/81; e.g., identification recommendations or relationships). Ontologies were also used to specify CDSS rules (15%; 12/80) or provide general knowledge for the electronic medical record (EMR) or electronic health record (EHR) systems. In some cases, these two uses also overlapped (23.5%; 19/81; i.e., the ontologies were used to provide specified CDSS rules and general knowledge).

Many authors use reasoner and rule engines interchangeably. In this manuscript, we distinguish the two concepts in a workable manner to use them. We do not intend to define them universally and comprehensively. In our description, we use the term *reasoner* to refer to the inference for a consistency check or classification for an ontology, which can be part of an ontology tool or external. In our description, we use the term *rule engine* to refer to generating or providing recommendations by incorporating a patient’s data, contextual information, and medical knowledge (usually from an ontology or knowledge base) for CDSS. However, we used the authors’ choice of terms in tables without modification. Among the publications, the most common reasoners were Pellet (13.6%; 11/81), Jena (4.9%; 4/81), the OWL reasoner (3.7%; 3/81), Jess (2.5%; 2/81), and the Euler/EYE inference engine (2.5%; 2/81).

Ontology sources should include the content and code systems used to represent the content. Content may come from a popular textbook or clinical practice guideline. The content can be coded in a specific code system, such as SNOMED CT. Because the CDSS rule source has been specified in Table 2, we only included code systems that served as a source of ontology in Table 3; We used this format to avoid redundancy in the presentation. The most often used coding systems were SNOMED CT (11.1%; 9/81), ICD10 (the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Revision; 4.9%; 4/81), Unified Medical Language System (UMLS; 4.9%; 4/81), Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes (LOINC; 3.7%; 3/81), RxNorm (2.5%; 2/81).


Many included publications also did not include complete information for ontology validation. Approximately 20 publications mentioned some validation, including validation or evaluation by domain experts (24.7%; 20/81). Some ontologies were authored by domain experts [47, 55]. Table 3 shows additional details on the roles of ontology in the publications, although Table 3 includes only the publications that can fill out three (except for the authors and publication years) or more cells ( $n = 36$ ).

### ***Other results***

After cleaning, discussion, and consolidation, we had 30 code groups and 221 final codes used in the ATLAS.ti (Appendix 2). These codes and code groups guided our results analysis and synthesis; these codes and code groups also helped us form the starting structure for the ontology we are building [41], i.e., the ontology for CDSS rule management and maintenance. Figure 4 illustrates the clinical domains of CDSS within included publications. Figure 5 shows a word cloud image generated from ATLAS.ti based on the codes used in all included publications. In the publications, we also found many large international collaborations [94, 101, 110] and solo author publications [57, 64, 105, 106]. We also noticed that some publications were missing necessary information for explaining the mechanisms of the systems that can be critical for reproducibility. Some examples include the architecture diagrams of CDSS, CDSS rule engine, CDSS rule language, how CDSS rules are managed at the backend, and integration mechanisms among CDSS rules, ontology, and EHR/EMR systems.


Based on our review, PubMed is still the clear dominant source to supply publications in this field. Approximately 90.1% (73/81) of publications were identified via PubMed. The ACM Library added only eight publications after removing duplicates.

We have followed the PRISMA 2020 checklist in writing this systematic review. However, we realize that PRISMA 2020 is intended to be used by outcome-oriented studies, which is not the focus of our systematic literature review. The publications included in our review are about design, development, and implementation. Therefore effect measures or certainty assessment were irrelevant items. We reported 18 items (out of 27 items, Appendix 4) in the full-text paper and ten in the abstract (out of 12 items, Appendix 5).




**Figure 2** Flowchart of the literature search, screening, and selection





**Figure 3** Initial knowledge framework on CDSS, CDSS rules, and ontology applications in CDSS



**Figure 4** Bar chart generated from ATLAS.ti showing the clinical domains of CDSS in included publications.



**Figure 5** Word cloud generated from ATLAS.ti based on codes in the included publications

**Table 1** Basic CDSS profiles in included publications ( $n = 81$ )

<b>Authors</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>CDSS is used for (Domain)</b>	<b>CDSS is used as</b>	<b>CDSS is used by</b>	<b>Architecture design (production/prototype)</b>	<b>CDSS evaluation</b>
Abidi SS, Manickam S [44]	2000	The automatic transformation from XML to clinical cases	Transformation tool	-	Architecture and implementation	-
De Clercq PA, Blom JA, Hasman A, et al [45]	2000	Drug interactions or drug contraindication in ICU, family medicine, and psychiatry	Alerts	Physicians	Production	A hospital in the Netherlands
Payne TH, Savarino J, Marshall R, et al. [46]	2000	Medication errors prevention and detection	Alerts, reminders, notifications to clinicians	Practitioners	In production, Veterans Affairs hospital	-
Riesco AM, Tomás RM, Mira MJ [43]	2000	Therapeutic decision analysis in oncology	Recommendation of ideal therapy	Physicians	-	-
Achour SL, Dojat M, Rieux C, et al [47]	2001	Safe blood transfusion in hospital settings	Alerts, consultation, recommendations	Physicians	Prototype	30 orders were initially studied; 20 orders were after modifications
Séroussi B, Bouaud J, Dréau H, et al [48]	2001	Prevention of medication order error in primary care	Recommendations	General practitioners	Prototype under development	A simulated case
Karadimas HC, Chailloleau C,	2002	Urology and nephrology as examples	Urgent or serious alerts	Physicians	Integrated into CIS and patient record systems	Tested in urology and nephrology departments and

Hemery F, et al [49]						stand-alone used for education.
Ray HN, Boxwala AA, Anantraman V, et al [23]	2002	Diarrhea management	Patient assessment, treatment plan recommendations	Clinicians	CDSS integrated with a mini EMR	Plan
Das AK, Musen MA [50]	2002	Integration of time-related queries for clinical data	Integrated temporal query for clinical decision support	-	Software module	-
Barth C, Tobman M, Nätscher C, et al [24]	2003	Right diagnosis or treatment	Recommendations	Gastroenterologists	Prototype, web-accessible	Patient cases
Liaw ST, Sulaiman N, Pearce C, et al [52]	2003	Falls prevention	Recommend care plans	-	Prototype, Web API	Testing by clinicians and patients, and groups
Poon EG, Wang SJ, Gandhi TK, et al [51]	2003	To review and act on laboratory test results.	Manage abnormal results, generate letters to patients, send reminders for future tests	Outpatient physicians	Production	Pilot studies in two clinics with 20 physicians and nurses
Greenes RA, Sordo M, Zaccagnini D, et al [53]	2004	Centralized rule base and rule engine for CDS, e.g., medications, lab	Alerts, reminders	Physicians	Prototype	Case analysis
Ebrahiminia V, Riou C, Seroussi B, et al [54]	2006	Therapeutic plan for type 2 diabetes and hypertension	Recommendations for prescriptions	Clinicians	-	-

Kashyap V, Morales A, Hongsermeier T [55]	2006	Lipid management	Clinical recommendation or order	Clinicians	Production	Ontology inference performance
Abidi SR [57]	2007	Breast cancer follow-up care by PCP	Patient-specific recommendations	PCP	Production, two PCP clinics	-
Jannin P, Morandi X [58]	2007	Prediction of surgical positions in neurosurgery	Neurosurgeons	Neurosurgeons	Prototype	159 surgical cases
Papageorgiou E, Stylios C, Groumpos P [60]	2007	Generic medical decision making support	Recommendations	Clinicians	Design	-
Stacey M, McGregor C, Tracy M [59]	2007	Neonatal intensive care	Early detection of sepsis, pneumothorax, and periventricular leukomalacia alerts	Clinicians	Prototype	Hypothetical case and hospital testing
Verlaene K, Joosen W, Verbaeten P [56]	2007	Generic design, two use cases: medication order and clinical pathway	Recommendations/suggestions	Clinicians	Prototype	Two scenarios
Cornalba C, Bellazzi RG, Bellazzi R [61]	2008	Risk management in hemodialysis	Suggestions for the risk profile of a patient and optimal decision	Clinicians, nephrologists	Design	Examples and case studies
Carenini M [65]	2009	Prediction, detection, monitoring of patient risk management	Alerts and notifications on efficient reaction or response to a risk situation	Clinicians	Ongoing design and ontology building	-
Dao TT, Marin F, Ho Ba Tho MC [63]	2009	Assessment, evaluation, treatment of clubfeet	Diagnosis, conservative treatment, and follow up	Patients and experts	Web-based system	Over 1000 cases used

Farion K, Michalowski W, Wilk S, et al [62]	2009	Acute pain in the emergency room, postoperative management of prostatectomy	Triage recommendations	Clinicians	Prototype	Feasibility
Zhou Q [64]	2009	Metabolism synthesis, diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, obesity, hyperuricemia	Recommendations	Clinicians	Experimental system	20 clinical cases + 20 physicians
Basilakis J, Lovell NH, Redmond SJ, et al. [68]	2010	Telehealth, patient monitoring, health risk stratification to better manage the patient with chronic conditions	Alert, report, workflow modification	Clinicians	Framework, prototype	One case study
Borbolla D, Otero C, Lobach DF, et al [19]	2010	Preventive services, breast cancer screening	Recommendations, reminders	Physicians	Feasibility of Web service for SEBASTIAN incorporated with EMR in a hospital in Italy, production	Manually reviewed 210 patient cases
Lee J, Kim J, Cho I, et al [66]	2010	General design with a specific example in a laboratory context and hypertension	Alerts, recommendations	Clinicians	Prototype, testbed	323445 test cases
Ongenaes F, Dhaene T, De Turck F, et al [67]	2010	ICU, sepsis, pattern detection in time series	Suggestions on time-related trends or notification of pathology classification	ICU clinicians	Framework	ICU use case
Wilk S, Michalowski W, Farion K, et al [69]	2010	Management of pediatric asthma exacerbation in	Collect data, evaluate exacerbation severity, plan treatment	Emergency physicians	Simulated setting in hospital with HIS	Testing, 120 visits in 12 hours

		the emergency department				
Bouamrane MM, Rector A, Hurrell M [70]	2011	Preoperative risk assessment	Risk assessment, clinical recommendations	Clinicians	Software, mentioned implementation in practice	Example patient
Cao F, Sun X, Wang X, et al [72]	2011	Detect adverse drug events	ADE search and report	Clinicians	Production, web-based applications	-
Dao TT, Marin F, Bensahel H, et al [71]	2011	Assessment, evaluation, treatment of clubfeet, pediatric orthopedics	To generate a diagnosis, conservative treatment	Clinicians	Web application	Over 1000 cases
Lee CS, Wang MH [73]	2011	Diabetes diagnosis	Semantic description	-	Developed expert system, prototype	Experiments with cases
Bright TJ, Yoko Furuya E, Kuperman GJ, et al [75]	2012	Prescribing antibiotics	Alerts	Clinicians	Prototype	81 patient records
Chniti A, Boussadi A, Degoulet P, et al [78]	2012	Medication orders	Suggestions on whether a prescription is valid	Clinicians	Prototype in hospital	Use case
Grando A, Farrish S, Boyd C, et al. [77]	2012	ADE reduction; safe and effective multi-drug treatment, COPD, type 2 diabetes, osteoporosis, hypertension	Recommendations	Clinicians with prescription rights	Prototype	Via evaluation scenarios
Koutkias V, Kilintzis V, Stalidis G, et al [76]	2012	Prevent adverse drug events	Alerts and recommendations	Clinical personnel	Knowledge framework	By experts and test cases; knowledge base authors testing the results via studies

Paterno MD, Goldberg HS, Simonaitis L, et al [79]	2012	Chronic condition management, diabetes, or coronary artery disease	Alerts, reminders	Clinicians	Production	Partners HealthCare, Wishard Memorial Hospital
Riaño D, Real F, López-Vallverdú JA, et al [74]	2012	Chronic comorbidities management	Personalized care plan recommendations	Healthcare professionals	Production systems in Italy, part of the K4CARE project	916 patients were used to evaluate the CDSS
Artetxe A, Sanchez E, Toro C, et al [81]	2013	Diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease	-	Physicians	Production, Spanish research project	Ten patients
Corrigan D, Taweel A, Fahey T, et al. [84]	2013	Clinical prediction rules, Alvarado score	Clinical prediction	Clinicians	-	Three use cases
Farkash A, Timm JT, Waks Z [82]	2013	Hypertension	Recommendations, suggestions	Clinicians	Prototype	No user interface yet, two use cases for future
Haug PJ, Ferraro JP, Holmen J, et al [25]	2013	Pneumonia	Recommendation of diagnosis	Clinicians	An experimental system	Tested by sample patient data
Sáez C, Bresó A, Vicente J, et al. [83]	2013	Manage outpatient diabetes care in a telemedicine system	Recommendations for patient lifestyles on risks of diabetes	Physicians, patients	Production- telemedicine platform in Spanish	Ten patient records
Shojanoori R, Juric R [85]	2013	Remote patient monitoring system at care homes	Alarms, reminders, recommendations, or activating devices (e.g., heater)	Healthcare professionals	Experiment system	Preventive e-healthcare example
Wilk S, Michalowski	2013	Triage, diagnosis, therapeutic plan, disposition in the	Recommended actions, suggestions, patient data	Emergency department physicians	Pilot in production	102 patients enrolled



W, O'Sullivan D, et al. [86]		emergency room; management of pediatric asthma exacerbations	management in the emergency department			
Yao W, Kumar A [80]	2013	Generic clinical workflow, heart failure, diagnosis, and treatment	Recommendations	Healthcare professionals	Prototype	Example of patients
Yılmaz Ö, Erdur RC, Türksever M [87]	2013	Assistance in diagnosis and treatment	Recommendations	Physicians, dentists	Developed system based on SAMS	A dental scenario
Bau CT, Chen RC, Huang CY [88]	2014	Management of diabetes inpatients during surgery	Recommendations	Healthcare professionals	Prototype	12 clinicians and 20 de-identified patients
Gallerani M, Pelizzola D, Pivanti M, et al [91]	2014	Laboratory repeated examination	Recommendation, warning on the appropriateness of the laboratory test	Physicians	Embedded in computerized physician order entry in two Italian hospitals, production	Three months of testing in two hospitals
Goldberg HS, Paterno MD, Rocha BH, et al [20]	2014	Chronic condition management, immunization schedules, pediatric head trauma	Recommendations, suggestions	Clinicians or patients	Production	Deployed at Partners HealthCare and trialed in multiple sites
Sesen MB, Peake MD, Banares-Alcantara R, et al [90]	2014	Lung cancer care, treatment selection	Recommendations	Physicians/experts	Prototype with a web interface	4020 patient records retrospectively
Stewart SA, Abidi S, Parker L, et al [92]	2014	Pediatric cancer follow-up management	Recommendations	Patients	Embedded in an EHR portal in Canada	Evaluated by nurses and oncologists on content; domain experts evaluated rules

Wang HQ, Zhou TS, Tian LL, et al [89]	2014	A clinical pathway for deviated nasal septum	Provide more efficient and intelligent clinical procedures	Healthcare professionals	-	224 patients with 11473 orders were selected to use/test
Delaney BC, Curcin V, Andreasson A, et al [94]	2015	Three use cases include diabetes, reflux symptoms, diagnostic support on abdominal pain, chest pain, and shortness of breath	Identifying patients with diabetes providing diagnostic support on effective medication for reflux symptoms.	Healthcare professional	Under development, the TRANSFoRm project	Three use cases and tests in a simulated environment
Jafarpour B, Abidi SR, Ahmad AM, et al [95]	2015	Alert environment avoid alert fatigue	Alerts	Clinicians	Framework	Five general practitioners
Robles-Bykbaeva V, López-Noresb M, Pazos-Ariasb J, et al [96]	2015	Speech-language therapy	Recommendations on therapy plans, generate content for students, monitor and evaluate patient progress	Speech and language pathologists, doctors, students, patients, relatives	In production, five institutions in Ecuador	32 children assessed; 6 experts + 53 children evaluated
Shen Y, Colloc J, Jacquet-Andrieu A, et al [93]	2015	Optimal diagnosis, prognosis, treatment of gastric cancer	Suggestions on diagnosis, prognosis, treatment of gastric cancer	Clinicians and patients	-	Domain experts to provide feedback on CDSS; using 17 gastric cancer cases
Abidi SR, Cox J, Abusharekh A, et al [98]	2016	Safe prescription for patients with atrial fibrillation	Prescription eligibility check and authorization (Canadian), recommendations	Family physicians	Embedded within the IMPACT-AF ecosystem with a web-based stand-alone system	100 de-identified patient cases
Goldberg HS, Paterno MD, Grundmeier RW, et al [100]	2016	Children with minor blunt head trauma	Recommendations	Physicians in the emergency department	One web accessed CDS service integrated with EHR in two sites, production	A multicenter trial

Marco-Ruiz L, Pedrinaci C, Maldonado JA, et al [101]	2016	Methods and models to enhance CDS service-oriented architecture as Linked Services	Alerts, recommendations	Clinicians	Models are complaint to Linked Data principles, semantic representation for CDSS services	The query of CDSS services
Wilk S, Kezadri-Hamiaz M, Rosu D, et al [97]	2016	Management of advanced chronic kidney disease	Identify correct physicians, handle exceptions, execute tasks, and change physicians.	Healthcare professionals, nephrologists, cardiologists, dieticians, nurse	Proof of concept implementation in OpenMRS	Simulated scenarios, fictitious patient data
Zhang YF, Tian Y, Zhou TS, et al [99]	2016	Inpatient management of type 2 diabetes	Recommendations for care plan	Clinicians	Prototype	100 patient cases
Abidi S [106]	2017	Clinical management of comorbidities, including atrial fibrillation and chronic heart failure	Recommendations for safe and effective plans for comorbidity therapeutics	Family physicians	Web-based CDSS; stand-alone system	Domain experts on content; usability of CDSS by 10 PCP
Chen RC, Jiang HQ, Huang CY, et al [104]	2017	Diabetes management, outpatient	Recommendations on HbA1c target and medications	Endocrinologists or other physicians	Web system as a prototype	Ten patient records
Kopanitsa G [105]	2017	Treatment quality control as a use case	Check accuracy of mapping, transforming, and integrating data from multiple EHR	Clinicians	Production	3436 treatment case records evaluated
Shang Y, Wang Y, Gou L, et al [103]	2017	Type 2 diabetes and hypertension in patient management	Suggestions for treatment decisions or lifestyles	Clinicians	Production, web services	Use cases
Zhang YF, Gou L, Zhou TS, et al [102]	2017	Chronic disease management, follow-up assessment	Recommended or suggested assessment/plan	Clinicians and patients	Deployed system, web service	Case study of patients with type 2 diabetes

						(36162), follow-up assessments
Jin W, Kim DH [112]	2018	e-health services, sensors, device interoperability	Messaging	Healthcare professionals or patients	Prototype	Tested
Nakawala H, Ferrigno G, De Momi E [108]	2018	Surgical training system for thoracentesis	Surgical procedures planning, execution, practicing	Surgical trainees	Prototype	10 participants in two experiments
Séroussi B, Guézennec G, Lamy JB, et al [109]	2018	Breast cancer management	Recommendations, action plans	Clinicians	Web API, in production	Case studies
Séroussi B, Lamy JB, Muro N, et al [111]	2018	Breast cancer management	Recommend best care plan for breast cancer patients	Clinicians	Web API, in production	Use cases
Shen Y, Yuan K, Chen D, et al [107]	2018	Infectious disease diagnosis, antibiotic prescription	Suggestions	Patients	-	Compare against other ontologies: DO, IDO, ROC for 215 infectious diseases; 84 records
Winter A, Staubert S, Ammon D, et al [110]	2018	Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)	Suggestions on mechanical ventilation; surveillance of ICU patients	ICU clinicians	Architecture framework	Use case for analysis
El-Sappagh S, Ali F, Hendawi A, et al [116]	2019	Monitor and manage type 1 diabetes	Real-time patient monitoring and care plan and lifestyle recommendation	Clinicians and patients	Cloud-based EHR system	Scenario
Jafarpour B, Raza Abidi S, Van Woensel W, et al [115]	2019	Safe and efficient comorbidity management	Recommendations	Clinicians	-	Local CIG integration engine test + surveys

Nguyen BP, Reese T, Decker S, et al [21]	2019	Detect potential drug-drug interactions	-	Clinicians	-	Two implementation use cases
Román-Villarán E, Pérez-Leon FP, Escobar-Rodríguez GA, et al [113]	2019	Manage cases of complex chronic illness	Recommendation and personalized treatment plans	Clinicians	Part of the PITEs-TiSS project, in the production system in Spain, DIRAYA	-
Semenov I, Osenev R, Gerasimov S, et al [114]	2019	Improve efficiency and efficacy of health care delivery	Recommendations, suggestions	Clinicians and patients	Production system connected with HIS	15000 orders per day
Maldonado JA, Marcos M, Fernández-Breis JT, et al [117]	2020	Normalize clinical lab results; risk assessment for colorectal cancer screening	Support clinical data transformation to different formats;	Clinicians	Web-based platform	Two use cases with actual patients data

Abbreviations: -, not specified; API: application programming interface; CDSS: clinical decision support systems; CIS: clinical information systems; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CPOE: computerized physician order entry; DIRAYA: the Electronic Health Record system within the Andalusian Public Healthcare System; DO: disease ontology; EMR: electronic medical records; EHR: electronic health records; ER: emergency rooms; HIS: hospital information system; HPO: human phenotype ontology; ICU: intensive care units; IDO: infectious disease ontology; KB: knowledge base; PCP: primary care providers; ROC: receiver operating characteristics; VA: Veterans Affairs.

**Table 2** Comparison of CDSS rule characteristics in included publications ( $n = 54$ )

Authors/ year	CDSS rule language	CDSS rule authoring/ editing	Rule sources	Rule engine	Rule format/ management	Interoperability	Operation
De Clercq PA, Blom JA, Hasman A, et al, 2000 [45]	-	Knowledge Base Editor (KBE)	Guidelines	-	-	-	Patient data + events → guidelines ontology, models → recommended actions

Payne TH, Savarino J, Marshall R, et al., 2000 [46]	XML	-	-	-	Microsoft's Component Object Model (COM)	HL7	Medication order + patient data → medication order monitor check → notifications
Achour SL, Dojat M, Rieux C, 2001 [47]	MLM	Newly presented tool	UMLS	Inference engine	Arden	-	Domain ontology → knowledge base → MLM + blood data + patient states
Karadimas HC, Chailloleau C, Hemery F, et al, 2002 [49]	MLM	The Arden/J framework developed by the authors	-	-	Arden	-	-
Ray HN, Boxwala AA, Anantraman V, et al, 2002 [23]	C	-	Guidelines from WHO	Guideline engine	CLIPS	-	Clinician enter data + EMR data + CLIPS rule → guideline engine + site configuration → recommendations
Barth C, Tobman M, Nätcher C, et al, 2003 [24]	Java	-	Textbook, multimedia	Inference engine	-	-	Patient data → inference engine + rules → case-based data + systematic data → recommendations
Liaw ST, Sulaiman N, Pearce C, et al, 2003 [52]	MLM, XML	-	Literature, physicians, and patients' input	-	Arden	HL7, XML	-
Kashyap V, Morales A, Hongsermeier T, 2006 [55]	OWL	-	Guidelines	ILOG, Cerebron (OWL ontology engine)	-	-	Patient data + event → rule engine + ontology engine → recommendations
Abidi SR, 2007 [57]	OWL	Rule authoring	Guidelines	GEM execution	The rule is specified in the	-	Computerize guideline → ontology → A family

		model via an interface, self-developed		engine for CPG	logic element (class) of the CPG ontology		physician enters a patient's data via the CDSS interface, receives recommendations, explanation
Stacey M, McGregor C, Tracy M, 2007 [59]	XML	Jess	Data mining results and clinicians' input	-	-	-	Patient data + rules + ontology → alerts + archive
Verlaene K, Joosen W, Verbaeten P, 2007 [56]	XML	Eclipse Rich Client Platform, Graphical Editing Framework (GEF), ILOG JRules	Guidelines	Drools v2.4, Java and ILOG JRules v4.6	-	HL7 RIM	Patient data + event + process → rule engine → recommendation
Cornalba C, Bellazzi RG, Bellazzi R, 2008 [61]	-	-	Guidelines, publications	Bayes network	Bayes rules	-	Patient data + monitoring → risk profile → Bayes network → optimal decisions
Carenini M, 2009 [65]	XML	Semantic Business Process Composer (SBPC)	Guidelines and data mining results	Business Process Execution Language (BPEL)	-	HL7	-
Zhu Q, 2009 [64]	XML/SAGE	-	Guidelines	Re-inference	CLIPS rule set	-	Patient data + model → rules + inference → recommendations
Basilakis J, Lovell NH, Redmond SJ, et al., 2010 [68]	-	JBoss AS framework	-	JBoss Rules	jbPM (business process management)	HL7	Clinical measures → rule engine + statistical analysis tool → recommendations
Borbolla D, Otero C, Lobach DF,	XML	-	Guidelines	-	SEBASTIAN rules	HL7	Patient data + preventive service rules → reminder + explanation

et al, 2010 [19]							
Lee J, Kim J, Cho I, et al, 2010 [66]	SAGE	uEngine, BRAIN	Guidelines	uEngine, BRAIN	-	-	Patient data + events + rule engine + workflow engine → alert or recommendation
Ongenaes F, Dhaene T, De Turck F, et al, 2010 [67]	SWRL	-	Galen ontology, medical databases	-	-	-	Patient data over time + ML + semantic reasoning → suggestions
Wilk S, Michalowski W, Farion K, et al, 2010 [69]	-	JADE (Java Agent DEvelopment Framework)	Literature, Cochrane library	-	-	Mirth Connect to enable communication between the MET3-AE and HIS; HL7	-
Bouamrane MM, Rector A, Hurrell M, 2011 [70]	OWL	Protégé-OWL	Guidelines	JBoss Rules	-	-	Patient data + CDSS + ontology → risk assessment → recommendations
Cao F, Sun X, Wang X, et al, 2011 [72]	SPARQL queries, RDF	ADE ontology and knowledge base were used J2EE, DB2 V9, WebSphere V7.	Local hospital data, FDA documents, Structured Product Labeling (SPL), Linked Open Drug Data (LODD)	T-Box reasoner; A-Box reasoner	-	-	ADE knowledge + patient data → personalized ADE detection via semantic query, reasoning
Bright TJ, Yoko Furuya E, Kuperman GJ, et al, 2012 [75]	SWRL, queried by SQWRL	Protégé SWRL tab	Recommendation, assertive relational knowledge	Jess Rule Engine	Implemented in Java	-	Prescribing rules + ontology-driven alert module + patient database
Chniti A, Boussadi A, Degoulet P,	OWL	JRules, execute and manage business rules,	Business object model (BOM), the executable object model (XOM)	Jena	Java framework	-	OWL ontology/business object model entities + Jena → executable object model



et al, 2012 [78]		JRules OWL plug-in					
Grando A, Farrish S, Boyd C, et al, 2012 [77]	SWRL, OWL	Protégé	Guidelines on COPD, diabetes mellitus, osteoporosis, and hypertension	Jess reasoner	Implemented in Java	Setting-independent rules	A repository of rules + polypharmacy treatment + ontology + patient data
Koutkias V, Kilintzis V, Stalidis G, et al, 2012 [76]	XML	A frame-based version of Protégé	Clinical guidelines and protocols	Inference engine: including CIG execution engine; Finite State Machine (FSM)-based execution engine	-	-	-
Artetxe A, Sanchez E, Toro C, et al, 2013 [81]	OWL-DL	-	Clinicians	-	-	-	Patient data + lab results → agent matchmaker → diagnosis assistance
Farkash A, Timm JT, Waks Z, 2013 [82]	The Natural Rule Language (NRL)	-	Clinical practice guidelines	-	-	HL7 CCD	Patient data in CDA → service, CDS rules, criteria → treatment recommendations
Sáez C, Bresó A, Vicente J, et al, 2013 [83]	Jess	HL7-CDA wrapper, developed by authors	Rules for physician assessment, rules for patient assessment, intermediate calculus rules, ADA recommendation	Inference engine, pattern matching		HL7 – CDA input and output	CDA input → binding → inference → binding from rule results to CDA output → CDA output

			rules, rule context information				
Shojanoori R, Juric R, 2013 [85]	OWL/SWRL	-	Presented as an example, not in scale design	-	-	-	Patient data + monitoring data + contexts → ontology + reasoning → recommendations
Wilk S, Michalowski W, O'Sullivan D, et al, 2013 [86]	-	-	Requirements by emergency department physicians, guidelines	-	-	HL7 with HIS	Collect data (observation) → reasoning (decision) → action (recommendation)
Yao W, Kumar A, 2013 [80]	SWRL	Protégé + SWRLJessTab	Patient context, clinician context, resource context, location context, patient evaluation rule, patient diagnosis rule, patient treatment rule, prescription checking rule	Rule engine- Jess; Workflow engine- Drools-flow	Implemented in Java	-	Data from HIS + medical and context ontologies → rule + workflow engines → clinicians.
Yılmaz Ö, Erdur RC, Türksever M, 2013 [87]	SWRL	Protégé-OWL	Guidelines	Jess	-	-	Patient data + rule + knowledge → recommendation
Bau CT, Chen RC, Huang CY, 2014 [88]	Jena	Jena Rules	Disease, management, patient	Jena inference engine	OWL-DL, Protégé, Concept Explorer (ConExp), Jena rules	-	Patient data + patient ontology + Jena rules (from knowledge base) → IENA inference engine → recommendation
Gallerani M, Pelizzola D, Pivanti M, et al, 2014 [91]	XML	-	Publications, local domain experts	Drools rule engine	-	HL7	User request → patient data + application server check → recommendations + archive

Goldberg HS, Paterno MD, Rocha BH, et al, 2014 [20]	XML	-	Guidelines	Operational decision manager (ODM) JBoss	-	HL7 CCD	Patient data + rules → recommendations
Sesen MB, Peake MD, Banares-Alcantara R, et al, 2014 [90]	OWL	-	NICE, BTS, ESMO, NCCN guidelines, Bayesian network from existing databases	-	Not specified	-	-
Stewart SA, Abidi S, Parker L, et al, 2014 [92]	SWRL	-	Recommendations	-	-	-	CPG computerization → CPG execution + patient profiles → personalized diary composition/ recommendation
Robles-Bykbaeva V, López-Noresb M, Pazos-Ariasb J, et al, 2015 [96]	Archetype	OpenEHR	Guidelines	-	-	-	-
Abidi SR, Cox J, Abusharekh A, et al, 2016 [98]	SWRL rules	-	Canadian clinical guidelines for atrial fibrillation	CPG execution engine	-	-	NOAC ontology + patient data → recommendation via auto-fill PDF
Goldberg HS, Paterno MD, Grundmeier RW, et al, 2016 [100]	XML	Operational Decision Manager (OPM)	Literature, prior trials	-	Production rules	HL7	Patient data + prediction rules → recommendations
Zhang YF, Tian Y, Zhou	Jena	Protégé + Jena semantic framework	Clinical guidelines, care	Jena inference API	Jena rule	HL7 CDA as input and output	Patient data + ontology + rules → inference API → HL7 CDA → EMR

TS, et al, 2016 [99]			plans, domain experts, EMR				
Abidi S, 2017 [106]	OWL-DL	Protégé	Clinical practice guidelines, domain experts; drug management protocols; expert-led reconciliation of CPGs	Reasoning engine	-	-	CPG ontology → computable CPG → comorbid CPG knowledge model → patient data + physician input → recommendation
Chen RC, Jiang HQ, Huang CY, et al, 2017 [104]	Jena rules, fuzzy rules	-	Guidelines, Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)	Jena inference engine	-	-	Patient data + fuzzy rules + drug knowledge base → recommendations
Shang Y, Wang Y, Gou L, et al, 2017 [103]	Jena	Rules are within the knowledge base, Protégé	CPG knowledge class, coding system class, patient class, disease, factors, treatment, recommendation	Jena reasoner + SPARQL	Java, Jena API, Jena rules	HL7	Patient data + knowledge query + rules → rule engine → recommendation
Zhang YF, Gou L, Zhou TS, et al, 2017 [102]	Jena rules	Protégé	Clinical guidelines, nurses	-	-	HL7 and the Object Management Group (OMG)	Domain knowledge + patient data → assessment criteria → recommendation
Nakawala H, Ferrigno G, De Momi E, 2018 [108]	SWRL, OWL-DL	Protégé	Textbooks, interviews, web resources	-	-	-	Surgical procedures knowledge; instrument recognition
Séroussi B, Guézennec G, Lamy JB, et al, 2018 [109]	Formal module-driven rule language	-	PubMed, NCCN, ESMO, SEOM Clinical guidelines	-	N3	FHIR to exchange input and output of CDS	DSS query FHIR server → +patient data → FHIR resources + rules + inference engine → recommendations

	(NRL), N3, XML						
Séroussi B, Lamy JB, Muro N, et al, 2018 [111]	N3	-	Clinical guidelines, experience, prior cases	-	-	FHIR	Patient data → FHIR message → reasoning ontology → recommendations
El-Sappagh S, Ali F, Hendawi A, et al, 2019 [116]	SWRL	Protégé 5.1 editor	CPG, domain experts, web	Rule-based reasoner (e.g., Pellet)	Protégé, Jena API	Knowledgebase incorporated HL7 FHIR standards	Patient data + medical knowledge → reasoner → recommendation
Jafarpour B, Raza Abidi S, Van Woensel W, et al, 2019 [115]	OWL2	-	Guidelines	Jena reasoner	-	-	Clinical state change + external events + rules + ontology → integration engine → recommendation
Nguyen BP, Reese T, Decker S, et al, 2019 [21]	CQL	-	Decision trees, guidelines	CQL engine	-	FHIR	Patient data + event → CQL library check → alerts or recommendations
Semenov I, Osenev R, Gerasimov S, et al, 2019 [114]	-	Rule editor has an interface, no name	Clinical guidelines	Rule engine and Bayes engine	-	FHIR JSON	-
Román-Villarán E, Pérez-Leon FP, Escobar-Rodriguez GA, et al, 2019 [113]	OWL	-	Clinical guidelines, healthcare professionals	-	OWL API	HL7 FHIR	Patient data + CPG + prior treatment data of the patient's → recommended treatment plan, personalized information
Maldonado JA, Marcos M, Fernández-	OWL, Archetype		Cancer screening protocols (USA, European)	Inference reasoning		Transforming, Semantic publishing, Mapping	

Breis JT, et al [117]							
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Abbreviations: -, not specified; ADA: American Diabetes Association; ADE: adverse drug events; AF: atrial affiliation; API: application programming interface; BTS: British Thoracic Society; CCD: continuity of care document; CDA: clinical document architecture; CDSS: clinical decision support system; CIG: computer interpretable guidelines; CLIPS: C Language Integrated Production System; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CPG: clinical practice guidelines; CQL: clinical quality language; DL: description logic; EMR: electronic medical records; ESMO: European Society for Medical Oncology; FDA: Food and Drug Administration; FHIR: Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources; HIS: hospital information systems; HL7: health level 7; JESS: Java Expert System Shell; MLM: medical logic module; NCCN: National Comprehensive Cancer Network; NICE: National Institute for Clinical Excellence; NOACs: New Oral Anticoagulants; NRL: natural rule language; OWL: W3C Web Ontology Language; RIM: reference information model; SPARQL: SPARQL protocol and RDF query language; SQWRL: a query language for OWL; SWRL: Semantic Web Rule Language; UMLS: unified medical language system; WHO: World Health Organization; XML: extensible markup language.

**Table 3** Comparison of ontology roles in included publications (*n* = 36)

<b>Authors/ year</b>	<b>Ontology is used for</b>	<b>Specify CDSS rules/general knowledge</b>	<b>Validated by domain experts</b>	<b>Reasoner</b>	<b>Ontology source/language</b>	<b>With CDSS</b>	<b>With EMR/HIS</b>
De Clercq PA, Blom JA, Hasman A. et al, 2000 [45]	Knowledge source	Specify CDSS rules	Yes	-	-	-	-
Achour SL, Dojat M, Rieux C, 2001 [47]	Build MLM	Specify CDSS rules	Created by domain experts	Not specified	UMLS	Communicate	With prototype/HIS
Liaw ST, Sulaiman N, Pearce C, et al, 2003 [52]	-	-	Yes	-	ICD10-AM, ICPC2	-	HL7
Kashyap V, Morales A, Hongsermeier T, 2006 [55]	Classifier	Both	Yes, by knowledge base authors	OWL reasoner- Cerebra	Separate - ILOG	Communicate	Services on clinical data repository

Abidi SR, 2007 [57]	Knowledge source for recommendations	None specify/ Guidelines in GEM	Consult oncologist, individual clinical experience	-	Guidelines/OWL	GEM execution engine	-
Carenini M, 2009 [65]	Classify alerts and notifications	-	Experts validate taxonomy	-	JCAHO patient safety event taxonomy, ICPS, DOLCE	-	-
Farion K, Michalowski W, Wilk S, et al, 2009 [62]	Derive data, support, interface, configuration models	Both	Yes	-	-	Support ontology, executor	Implemented in prototype, web services
Ongenaë F, Dhaene T, De Turck F, et al, 2010 [67]	Classify temporal patterns	Both	Yes	DL reasoner-Pellet, probabilistic reasoner-Pronto	Rule-based reasoner	Decision module	New patients added to the ontology → automatically classified
Bouamrane MM, Rector A, Hurrell M, 2011 [70]	Classifications, recommendation	Both	Yes	Java-based Pellet	OPCS, ICD-10, NICE guideline/OWL	-	OWL, OWL API developed the system
Cao F, Sun X, Wang X, et al, 2011 [72]	Reasoning to get implicit relationships	Both	-	TBox and ABox reasoning over SNOMED	SNOMED-CT	Ontology mapping to ADE repository	Deployed in hospital as a Web application
Lee CS, Wang MH, 2011 [73]	-	Specify CDSS rules	Yes	-	Internet/OWL	-	-
Bright TJ, Yoko Furuya E, Kuperman GJ, et al, 2012 [75]	Generate prescribing alerts	Both	Yes	Jess rule engine	-	Alert module	Protégé + patient data + SWRL tab

Grando A, Farrish S, Boyd C, et al, 2012 [77]	Safe and effective polypharmacy prescription	Both	Yes	Jess reasoner	RxNorm, UMLS, COPD, hypertension, osteoporosis, diabetes guidelines	Conceptual test	Conceptual test with cases
Chniti A, Boussadi A, Degoulet P, et al, 2012 [78]	Author, execute, and manage business rules	Both	Yes	Java-based Jena	JRules OWL plug-in	Not integrated with HIS	CDS rules were implemented in HIS
Riaño D, Real F, López-Vallverdú JA, et al, 2012 [74]	Classification cases and treatment plans	Specify CDSS rules	Health care professionals provided some content	Jena	ICD10 CM, ATC/SDA modeling language	-	-
Artetxe A, Sanchez E, Toro C, et al, 2013 [81]	Infer clinical tests on patients to detect Alzheimer's disease	Both	Authored by domain experts	None specified; reasoning module	SNOMED CT, SWAN	The testing system of CDSS	Large scale Spanish research project
Sáez C, Bresó A, Vicente J, et al, 2013 [83]	Inference recommendation, assessment	Both	-	Rule-based reasoner	SNOMED CT	Case study test in a rule-based decision support module	Integrated with a telemedicine health platform
Yao W, Kumar A, 2013 [80]	Infer context information, patient conditions, rules for CDSS	Both	-	Pellet reasoner plug-in for Protégé 3.4	Jess rule engine, workflow engine-Drools-Flow 5.2	Scenario test, integration with clinical workflows	CONFlexFlow implementation, web-based services
Yılmaz Ö, Erdur RC, Türksever M, 2013 [87]	Inference new facts	Both	-	-	ICD/OWL	-	-



Bau CT, Chen RC, Huang CY, 2014 [88]	Infer recommendations for patients	Both	Yes	Jena	Jena inference engine	CDSS prototype	Patient data + CDSS
Sesen MB, Peake MD, Banares-Alcantara R, 2014 [90]	Ontological guideline rule inference	Specify CDSS rules	-	FaCT++	NICE Guidelines, OWL, mapping to SNOMED CT	OWL API + FaCT ++ semantic reasoning + probabilistic reasoning	JDBC connect to patient records database
Stewart SA, Abidi S, Parker L, et al, 2014 [92]	Computerized CPG	Specify CDSS rules	Domain experts evaluate rules	Pellet reasoner	CPG, OWL-DL	-	Embedded in an EHR portal in Canada
Abidi SR, Cox J, Abusharekh A, et al, 2016 [98]	Knowledge sources, criteria	Specify CDSS rules		OWL reasoning	AF clinical practice guidelines/OWL	Computerized NOAC authorization decision support system	Can be integrated with EHR or stand-alone web version
Marco-Ruiz L, Pedrinaci C, Maldonado JA, et al, 2016 [101]	Describing CDS services, functional, nonfunctional, and data semantics	Both	Use case validation	OWL Horst	SNOMED CT, Dublin Core/OWL	-	-
Zhang YF, Tian Y, Zhou TS, et al, 2016 [99]	Infer diagnosis, recommendations	Both	Yes /examined by domain experts	Pellet	An inference API –Jena rules	Experiments on CDSS	CDA format used to convert between EMR and CDSS
Abidi S, 2017 [106]	Knowledge sources	Specify CDSS rules	Yes, via evaluation by independent cardiologists, PCP	Pellet	Practice guidelines, domain experts; protocols	Communicate	Stand-alone EMR

Shang Y, Wang Y, Gou L, et al, 2017 [103]	Infer personalized recommendations	Both	Yes	None specify	Jena API	Web services for CDSS	Web API by using patient data + CDSS
Zhang YF, Gou L, Zhou TS, et al, 2017 [102]	-	-	-	Pellet	SNOMED CT /OWL-DL	-	EMR and other sources
Nakawala H, Ferrigno G, De Momi E, 2018 [108]	Knowledge sources	Specify production rules	Yes	Pellet	Journal article, physician, online resources, HONcode search engine; FMA, IAO, BFO, W3C time ontology	-	-
Séroussi B, Guézennec G, Lamy JB, et al, 2018 [109]	Knowledge sources	Specify CDSS rules	-	Euler/EYE inference engine	NCI Thesaurus, LOINC, SNOMED CT, OWL	-	-
Séroussi B, Lamy JB, Muro N, et al, 2018 [111]	Knowledge sources	Specify CDSS rules	-	Euler/EYE inference engine	Guidelines	Web services on CDSS	-
Shen Y, Yuan K, Chen D, et al, 2018 [107]	Identify disease and recommend treatment	Both	-	-	IDO, NCBI Taxonomy, HPO, DrugBank, DO, Internet, Guidelines	Clinical decision module	Patient data + ontology + clinical decision module + user interaction module
El-Sappagh S, Ali F, Hendawi A, et al, 2019 [116]	Provide a personalized care plan	Both	Yes	Pellet	SWRL rule engine, Jena API	Cloud-based CDSS	FHIR patient data + CDSS + ontology → FHIR → EHR
Jafarpour B, Raza Abidi S, Van Woensel W, et al, 2019 [115]	Provide domain knowledge and integration policies	-	A medical expert validated the integration solution;	Jena reasoner	SNOMED, Drug Bank/ OWL	-	Integration framework with web API, CIG server and

			medical experts instantiate integration policies				client, client connect POC
Román-Villarán E, Pérez-Leon FP, Escobar-Rodriguez GA, et al, 2019 [113]	-	Specify CDSS Rules	Yes, by clinical researchers	-	Mapped to SNOMED CT	-	-
Maldonado JA, Marcos M, Fernández-Breis JT, et al [117]	Classification of risk level	Both	-	OWL reasoner	LOINC	Web-based platform	Patient data from EHR + platform

Abbreviations: -, not specified; AD: Alzheimer’s disease; ADE: adverse drug events; AF: atrial affiliation; API: application programming interface; BFO, Basic Formal Ontology; CDA: clinical document architecture; CDSS: clinical decision support systems; CIG: computer interpretable guidelines; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; COSI: closed world OWL interpreter; CPG: clinical practice guidelines; DL: description logic; DO: disease ontology; DOLCE: Descriptive Ontology for Linguistic and Cognitive Engineering; EHR: electronic health records; EMR: electronic medical record; FCA: formal concept analysis; FHIR, HL7 fast healthcare interoperability resources; FMA, Foundational Model of Anatomy; GEM: guideline elements model; HIS: hospital information system; HL7: health level 7; HPO: Human phenotype ontology; IAO, Information Artifact Ontology; ICD10-AM: the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Tenth Revision, Australian Modification; ICPC: International Classification of Primary Care; ICPS: International Classification for Patient Safety; IDO: infectious disease ontology; JCAHO: the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations; MLM: medical logic module; NCBI: National Center for Biotechnology Information; NICE: National Institute for Clinical Excellence; NOACs: New Oral Anticoagulants; OWL: Web Ontology Language; OPCS: Office of Population Censuses and Surveys; PCP: primary care providers; POC: point of care; SDA, state-decision-action; SNOMED-CT: Systemized Nomenclature of Medicine – Clinical Terms; SWAN: Semantic Web Applications in Neuromedicine; SWRL: Semantic Web Rule Language; UMLS: unified medical language system.

## **Discussion**

### ***Summary of results***

Although CDSS has proved its effectiveness in clinical care for decades, the reusing and sharing of machine-processable CDSS rules has not been achieved. Ontology has the potential to facilitate interoperable CDSS rules. We conducted this systematic review on CDSS rules, ontology, and its applications in CDSS. Our systematic review shows the broad clinical application domains of CDSS in chronic condition management, medication order, and cancer care. Most CDSS is designed for health care providers, and most of the CDSS rules are based on clinical practice guidelines. Although we found details about CDSS rules, we noticed inconsistent presentations or unavailable information on CDSS rule language, CDSS rule engine, and evaluation details. We also observed inconsistent technical details related to ontology purposes, reasoners, mechanisms of connection, or communication with CDSS or EMR/EHR/HIS. Although some publications describe such a level of detail, not all publications include this information. It can be hard to perform reproducibility and further improvement without such information.

Although reusing and sharing CDSS artifacts is a challenge with very good recognition [1, 101], the reusability, customization, and shareability of CDSS rules are not yet a common focus, not even in publications that focus on CDSS rule editing [35, 118, 119]. We feel these topics are important, especially using ontology to achieve the goals. Therefore we conducted this literature review. Marco-Ruiz et al. [101] showed how to use CDSS artifacts in the Linked Data framework [120] by leveraging Semantic Web technologies, especially ontology. However, that work was at a higher level to describe the concepts without tangible tools implemented in clinical practices. Our motivation to build a CDSS ontology [41] aligns well with their vision. We are trying to shorten the gap between the high-level vision on these realistic issues (reusing and sharing CDSS artifacts) [1, 101] and CDSS operations in the clinical world by appraising existing efforts and using a more generic approach. The first step in filling this gap is constructing an upper-level CDSS ontology.

### ***Significance of the work***

We systematically reviewed literature about ontology applied in CDSS. Our approach illustrated the state-of-the-art applications of ontology in CDSS rule management. These applications present excellent potential in reusing and sharing CDSS artifacts, which are critical to clinical care quality and patient safety. Currently, it is very costly to create, maintain, and reuse these rules. Although some authors recognized this benefit [1, 35, 101], none have conducted a systematic review. Our literature review thoroughly analyzed the topic, established the knowledge framework, and created a comprehensive collection that can inform efforts to design or improve future CDSS, create a tutorial on the subject for newcomers in the field, and set the foundation for the CDSS ontology we are building.

We also recommend that authors include essential technical details in publications focusing on this topic. These details include CDSS application domain, CDSS users, CDSS notification types, CDSS evaluation (what, how, by whom), CDSS rule sources, CDSS rule language, CDSS rule engine, CDSS operation mechanism, ontology use purposes, ontology sources (both content and code systems), ontology validation, reasoner, connection/communication mechanism with CDSS, and EMR/EHR. We encourage authors to include such details to help readers reference, compare, and increase the reproducibility of the reported work.

### ***Interpretation of the results***

Rule engines are critical components of CDSS. The rule engine executes rules and patient data and context information to produce a result, e.g., an alert or a recommendation [1]. Jess is a rule engine and development environment in Java [121]. We noticed in our review that Jess is one of the famous rule engines used repeatedly. Jess can be used to develop rule-based expert systems or create Jess rules. In the popular tool Protégé, the plug-in API SWRLJessTab can convert SWRL rules to Jess rules. Jess rules can be used by Jess Rule Engine, which has many implementations in rule-based expert systems [121]. In addition to Jess, Jena and Drools were used repeatedly among the included publications. Jena is an API in Java designed to support rule-based inference and use RDF (Resource Description Framework) graphs [122]. Jena.java API can handle OWL models and is a popular framework for managing RDF/OWL descriptions [88]. Drools is a business rule management system, including a rule engine [123]. Drools also have SWRL API, which can support SWRL and SQWRL. SQWRL can query SWRL.

Reasoning via a reasoner is a critical characteristic for many ontologies, even though the current reasoning is still in the first-degree logic. Reasoning can be used for three main functions: consistency check, classification, and realization [124]. Several publications included in this systematic review specified the classification roles of the ontology and the reasoners (listed in Table 3). The OWL group has curated an updated list of OWL reasoners at the University of Manchester in the UK [124]. Parsia and colleagues compiled and compared the current OWL reasoners and their performances via the competition report [124]. Here, we only briefly discuss the reasoners used in the included publications. Among the included publications, both Pellet and Jena are popular reasoners (Table 3), and other used reasoners include FaCT++ [90], Z3 Solver reasoner [97], Euler/EYE inference engine [109, 111], OWL Horst [101], and OWL Cerebra [55]. Among these reasoners, Pellet [125] is Java-based, and it can work on SWRL rules and ontologies written in OWL2. SWRL was initially designed as a rule language for Semantic Web technologies [126]. A user needs the rule language and an editor (e.g., Protégé SWRL tab) to write, revise, and query the rules. SWRL can be queried by SQWRL (a query language for OWL) or SPARQL (SPARQL Protocol and RDF query language). Then reasoners can be used to conduct reasoning based on the rules and facts defined in the ontology or knowledge base. Protégé-OWL [127] provides an editor for SWRL rules. Protégé SWRL editor is another example.

Not all ontologies or knowledge bases were formally evaluated, validated, or authored by domain experts. Only 25% of publications mentioned about evaluated or validated by domain experts. A formal assessment or validation is critical, regardless of a manually built ontology (or knowledge base). For some ontologies (or knowledge bases) derived from other automatic methods (e.g., machine learning algorithms), the validation is even more critical to ensure the validity of the results from automated processes. Testing has not been conducted consistently across the publications. Some have been formally tested with patient databases in the production systems, some were tested via prototypes, and some were tested conceptually. Technically, all such testing is valuable, to some extent. Without some types of testing, the validity of the work can be questionable. Some ontologies were authored by domain experts, which provides greater validity than those involving nondomain experts while constructing the ontology.

Also, not all publications clearly state whether the evaluation was conducted on the CDSS. For those publications with CDSS evaluation, not all provide adequate details on what was evaluated, how the evaluation was completed, and who the evaluators were.

We noticed that not all included publications provided the needed technical details during the literature review, such as the CDSS rule engine, rule language, and ontology reasoner. Some people may argue that such information can vary dramatically during implementation. However, we believe that including such details will present the work more robustly, help users better understand the system's mechanism, provide

possibilities for others to reproduce the work, and enable others to compare the technical solutions and design more optimal options in the future.

One systematic review by Dissanayake and colleagues [40] was similar to our review. However, our review has several distinct characteristics that complement the literature with unique insights about CDSS rules, ontology, and ontology applications, especially in rule management. For example, we focused on the mechanism of these characteristics in the HIS/EHR/EMR systems. In contrast, Dissanayake's review focused on the reasoning processes during clinical decision-making, especially in forming the ontologies to support complex cognitive processes. Their study also compared evaluation metrics and evidence generated among the included publications, whereas we focused on the CDSS rule authoring, management, implementation, and ontology validation.

Our coding revealed factual evidence without any interpretations, which differs from qualitative data analysis and coding. Our discussions focused on the scope of coding, definitions of codes, the granularity of coding, dimensions, organization, categorization, and combinations of codes, articulating these points and obtaining consensus.

### ***Knowledge gap and challenges moving forward***

Although the importance and challenging nature of reusability and sharability of CDSS artifacts have been well recognized and documented, various efforts are focusing on this topic because of the potential of the Semantic Web technologies and ontology [1, 101]. However, the steps are mainly at the conceptual level without tangible tools to implement in the real world. No CDSS ontology bridges the high-level thinking, planning presented by different groups, and real-world implementations and operations of the process. This knowledge gap motivated our efforts to build a CDSS ontology that focuses on CDSS rule management and maintenance [41]. Moving forward, one challenge is more on the marketing side: let CDSS artifacts developers, vendors, and healthcare professionals, i.e., end-users, be aware of the CDSS ontology and adopt it in their work.

### ***Strengths***

This systematic review focuses on CDSS rules and ontology roles in CDSS and mechanisms of CDSS in clinical practices or prototypes. We established the initial knowledge framework on the intersections of CDSS, CDSS rules, and ontology. We summarized detailed information regarding the reasoner, rule engines, ontology, and CDSS rule formats used in each included publication. We also provided summaries (Tables 1–3) of valuable references for designing or improving systems. The side-by-side comparison also gives structured guidance for preparing future publications. We hope the knowledge framework, detailed summarizations, and comparisons can guide and enlighten future improvements and designs more explicitly in tangible ways.

### ***Limitations***

We recognize that our review has limitations. We were unable to include publications written in a language other than English. Also, we only included publications with full-text available. We had to exclude one thesis [128], which was a search result from the ACM Library, due to the unavailability of the full-text publication. Also, we excluded some publications that focused on the CDSS rule [35, 118, 119]. Although such publications had a similar focus to one aspect of our systematic review, none specified an ontology component in the publications. We also noticed that the publications on CDSS rule authoring and managing tools are from Partners HealthCare/Harvard Medical School.

We also exclude another category of papers that discussed best practices in CDSS rule management, such as Wright A et al. [10]. Although such publications can inform CDSS design, testing, and operation processes, they did not meet the focused criteria for this systematic review.

Interestingly, our two papers [129, 130] were not identified via our literature search strategies. The main reason such a search is missing is the keywords used in these papers. CDSS was not specified as a keyword in the two papers, although the content was undoubtedly within the scope of this review. Unfortunately, these two publications may not be the only papers missed by this literature search. This challenge is common to how our current literature databases are organized and how we conduct a literature search. In the future, this challenge can be minimized by carefully choosing all keywords included in the publications to maximize the possibilities found during the literature search. This is also a lesson for all authors.

## **Conclusions**

The reuse, management, and maintenance of CDSS rules are critical and challenging for clinical care. Ontology could facilitate the reusing and sharing of CDSS artifacts, e.g., CDSS rules. However, there is no CDSS ontology yet, and we are building one. We attempt to bridge the high-level visions and operational level efforts via the CDSS ontology to bring tangible applications to the field. Current publications present incomplete technical details on CDSS rules and ontology. We recommend future publications include more detailed information about the architecture diagrams, mechanism of connection among ontology, CDSS rules, EHR/EMR, CDSS rule language, reasoner, the rule engine, validation or authorization of ontology and CDSS rules, the purpose of the ontology, ontology source, and the management and maintenance of CDSS rules. Such details will increase the study's reproducibility and help readers optimize their designs and development. In addition, we hope the established knowledge framework and summarizations of the included publications can guide future improvements and designs more explicitly.

## **Acknowledgment**

This work is supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award No. R01GM138589 and partially under P20 GM121342. We thank Professor James Cimino for his valuable feedback and suggestions on the manuscript.

## **Competing interests**

None to disclose.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix 1:** Initial draft of codes and code groups used in reviewing/coding

**Appendix 2:** Refined version of codes and code groups used in reviewing/coding

**Appendix 3:** All included paper lists ( $n = 81$ ) in this systematic literature review

**Appendix 4:** PRISMA 2020 item checklist reported in our systematic literature review

**Appendix 5:** PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist reported in our systematic literature review

## References

1. Greenes R. *Clinical decision support: the road to broad adoption*. 2nd ed. San Diego, CA: Elsevier, 2014.
2. Clinical decision support systems: state of the art. AHRQ Publication No. 09-0069-EF; 2009; Rockville, MD.
3. Sittig D, Wright A, Meltzer S, et al. Comparison of clinical knowledge management capabilities of commercially-available and leading internally-developed electronic health records. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2011;**11**
4. Sittig D, Wright A, Simonaitis L, et al. The state of the art in clinical knowledge management: An inventory of tools and techniques. *Int J Med Inform* 2010;**79**:44-57
5. Moja L, Polo Friz H, Capobussi M, et al. Effectiveness of a Hospital-Based Computerized Decision Support System on Clinician Recommendations and Patient Outcomes: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2019;**2**(12):e1917094 doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.17094[published Online First: Epub Date]].
6. Enabling Health Care Decisionmaking Through Clinical Decision Support and Knowledge Management. Evidence Report No. 203. (Prepared by the Duke Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-2007-10066-I.) AHRQ Publication No. 12-E001-EF.; 2012; Rockville, MD.
7. Kawamoto K, Houlihan C, Balas E, Lobach D. Improving clinical practice using clinical decision support systems: a systematic review of trials to identify features critical to success. *J Biomed Inform* 2005;**330**:765
8. O'Connor P, Sperl-Hillen J, Rush W, et al. Impact of Electronic Health Record Clinical Decision Support on Diabetes Care: A Randomized Trial. *Ann Fam Med* 2011;**9**:12-21 doi: 10.1370/afm.1196[published Online First: Epub Date]].
9. Middleton B, Sittig DF, Wright A. Clinical Decision Support: a 25 Year Retrospective and a 25 Year Vision. *Yearb Med Inform* 2016;**Suppl 1**(Suppl 1):S103-16 doi: 10.15265/IYS-2016-s034[published Online First: Epub Date]].
10. Wright A, Ash JS, Aaron S, et al. Best practices for preventing malfunctions in rule-based clinical decision support alerts and reminders: Results of a Delphi study. *Int J Med Inform* 2018;**118**:78-85 doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2018.08.001[published Online First: Epub Date]].
11. Horsky J, Schiff G, Johnston D, Mercincavage L, Bell D, Middleton B. Interface design principles for usable decision support: a targeted review of best practices for clinical prescribing interventions. *J Biomed Inform* 2012;**45**:1202-16 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2012.09.002[published Online First: Epub Date]].
12. Wu R, Peters W, Morgan M. The next generation of clinical decision support: linking evidence to best practice. *J Healthc Inf Manag* 2002;**16**:50-55
13. Fox J, Gutenstein M, Khan O, South M, Thomson R. OpenClinical.net: A platform for creating and sharing knowledge and promoting best practice in healthcare. *Computers in Industry* 2015;**66**:63-72
14. Teich J, Osheroff J, Pifer E, Sittig D, Jenders R, Panel CER. Clinical decision support in electronic prescribing: recommendations and an action plan: report of the joint clinical decision support workgroup. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2005;**12**:365-76 doi: 10.1197/jamia.M1822[published Online First: Epub Date]].
15. Sittig D, Wright A, Osheroff J, et al. Grand challenges in clinical decision support. *J Biomed Inform* 2008;**41**:387-92
16. McDonald CJ. Protocol-based computer reminders, the quality of care and the non-perfectability of man. *N Engl J Med* 1976;**295**(24):1351-5 doi: 10.1056/nejm197612092952405[published Online First: Epub Date]].



17. Cimino JJ. An integrated approach to computer-based decision support at the point of care. *Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association* 2007;**118**:273-88
18. Jing X, Himawan L, Law T. Availability and usage of clinical decision support systems (CDSSs) in office-based primary care settings in the USA. *BMJ Health Care Inform* 2019;**26**(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjhci-2019-100015[published Online First: Epub Date]].
19. Borbolla D, Otero C, Lobach DF, et al. Implementation of a clinical decision support system using a service model: results of a feasibility study. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2010;**160**(Pt 2):816-20
20. Goldberg HS, Paterno MD, Rocha BH, et al. A highly scalable, interoperable clinical decision support service. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2014;**21**(e1):e55-62 doi: 10.1136/amiajnl-2013-001990[published Online First: Epub Date]].
21. Nguyen BP, Reese T, Decker S, Malone D, Boyce RD, Beyan O. Implementation of Clinical Decision Support Services to Detect Potential Drug-Drug Interaction Using Clinical Quality Language. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2019;**264**:724-28 doi: 10.3233/shti190318[published Online First: Epub Date]].
22. Linder J, Schnipper J, Volk L, et al. Clinical decision support to improve antibiotic prescribing for acute respiratory infections: results of a pilot study. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*, 2007:468-72.
23. Ray H, Boxwala A, Anantraman V, Ohno-Machado L. Providing context-sensitive decision-support based on WHO guidelines. *Proc AMIA Symp*, 2002:637-41.
24. Barth C, Tobman M, Nätischer C, Sussmann H, Horsch A. Fusing a systematic and a case-based repository for medical decision support. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2003;**95**:560-4
25. Haug PJ, Ferraro JP, Holmen J, et al. An ontology-driven, diagnostic modeling system. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2013;**20**(e1):e102-10 doi: 10.1136/amiajnl-2012-001376[published Online First: Epub Date]].
26. Del Fiol G, Curtis C, Cimino JJ, et al. Disseminating context-specific access to online knowledge resources within electronic health record systems, 2013.
27. Del Fiol G, Williams MS, Maram N, Rocha RA, Wood GM, Mitchell JA. Integrating genetic information resources with an EHR. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* 2006 2006:904
28. Practical choices for infobutton customization: experience from four sites. *AMIA ... Annual Symposium proceedings / AMIA Symposium*. AMIA Symposium; 2013.
29. G DF, PJ H, JJ C, SP N, C N, JA M. Effectiveness of topic-specific infobuttons: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2008;**15**:752-59
30. Cimino JJ. An integrated approach to computer-based decision support at the point of care. *Trans Am Clin Climatol Assoc* 2007;**118**:273-88
31. Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, Jones A, J F, Keshtgar M. Using computerised decision support to improve compliance of cancer multidisciplinary meetings with evidence-based guidance. *BMJ Open* 2012;**2** doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2011-000439>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
32. Sutton DR, Fox J. The syntax and semantics of the PROforma guideline modeling language. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2003;**10**(5):433-43 doi: 10.1197/jamia.M1264[published Online First: Epub Date]].
33. Del Fiol G, Kohlmann W, Bradshaw RL, et al. Standards-Based Clinical Decision Support Platform to Manage Patients Who Meet Guideline-Based Criteria for Genetic Evaluation of Familial Cancer. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform* 2020;**4**:1-9 doi: 10.1200/cci.19.00120[published Online First: Epub Date]].
34. Hripcsak G. Writing Arden Syntax medical logic modules. *Computers in Biology and Medicine* 1994;**24**(5):331-63 doi: doi:10.1016/0010-4825(94)90002-7[published Online First: Epub Date]].
35. Zhou L, Karipineni N, Lewis J, et al. A study of diverse clinical decision support rule authoring environments and requirements for integration. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2012;**12**:128 doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-12-128[published Online First: Epub Date]].

36. Davies J, Fensel D, Harmelen FV. *Towards the semantic web: Ontology-driven knowledge management*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
37. Gruber T. What is an ontology? *Knowledge Acquisition* 1993;**5**:199-220
38. Musen MA. Dimensions of knowledge sharing and reuse. *Computers and Biomedical Research* 1992;**25**:435-67
39. Whetzel P, Noy N, Shah N, et al. BioPortal: enhanced functionality via new Web services from the National Center for Biomedical Ontology to access and use ontologies in software applications. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2011;**39**:W541-45
40. Dissanayake PI, Colicchio TK, Cimino JJ. Using clinical reasoning ontologies to make smarter clinical decision support systems: a systematic review and data synthesis. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2020;**27**(1):159-74 doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocz169[published Online First: Epub Date]].
41. Jing X, Min H, Gong Y, et al. A clinical decision support system (CDSS) ontology to facilitate portable vaccination CDSS rules: preliminary results. *AMIA 2021*. San Diego, CA., 2021.
42. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2021;**134**:178-89 doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.03.001[published Online First: Epub Date]].
43. Manjarrés Riesco A, Martínez Tomás R, Mira Mira J. A customisable framework for the assessment of therapies in the solution of therapy decision tasks. *Artif Intell Med* 2000;**18**(1):57-82 doi: 10.1016/s0933-3657(99)00029-9[published Online First: Epub Date]].
44. Abidi SS, Manickam S. Transforming XML-based electronic patient records for use in medical case based reasoning systems. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2000;**77**:709-13
45. De Clercq PA, Blom JA, Hasman A, Korsten HH. GASTON: an architecture for the acquisition and execution of clinical guideline-application tasks. *Med Inform Internet Med* 2000;**25**(4):247-63 doi: 10.1080/146392300455558[published Online First: Epub Date]].
46. Payne TH, Savarino J, Marshall R, Hoey CT. Use of a clinical event monitor to prevent and detect medication errors. *Proc AMIA Symp* 2000:640-4
47. Achour SL, Dojat M, Rieux C, Bierling P, Lepage E. A UMLS-based knowledge acquisition tool for rule-based clinical decision support system development. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2001;**8**(4):351-60 doi: 10.1136/jamia.2001.0080351[published Online First: Epub Date]].
48. Séroussi B, Bouaud J, Dréau H, et al. ASTI: a guideline-based drug-ordering system for primary care. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2001;**84**(Pt 1):528-32
49. Karadimas HC, Chailloleau C, Hemery F, Simonnet J, Lepage E. Arden/J: an architecture for MLM execution on the Java platform. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2002;**9**(4):359-68 doi: 10.1197/jamia.m0985[published Online First: Epub Date]].
50. Das AK, Musen MA. SYNCHRONUS: a reusable software module for temporal integration. *Proc AMIA Symp* 2002:195-9
51. Poon EG, Wang SJ, Gandhi TK, Bates DW, Kuperman GJ. Design and implementation of a comprehensive outpatient Results Manager. *J Biomed Inform* 2003;**36**(1-2):80-91 doi: 10.1016/s1532-0464(03)00061-3[published Online First: Epub Date]].
52. Liaw ST, Sulaiman N, Pearce C, et al. Falls prevention within the Australian general practice data model: methodology, information model, and terminology issues. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2003;**10**(5):425-32 doi: 10.1197/jamia.M1281[published Online First: Epub Date]].
53. Greenes RA, Sordo M, Zaccagnini D, Meyer M, Kuperman GJ. Design of a standards-based external rules engine for decision support in a variety of application contexts: report of a feasibility study at Partners HealthCare System. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2004;**107**(Pt 1):611-5
54. Ebrahiminia V, Riou C, Seroussi B, et al. Design of a decision support system for chronic diseases coupling generic therapeutic algorithms with guideline-based specific rules. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2006;**124**:483-8

55. Kashyap V, Morales A, Hongsermeier T. On implementing clinical decision support: achieving scalability and maintainability by combining business rules and ontologies. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* 2006;**2006**:414-8
56. Verlaene K, Joosen W, Verbaeten P. Arriclides: An Architecture Integrating Clinical Decision Support Models. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences: IEEE Computer Society*, 2007:135.
57. Abidi SR. Ontology-Based Modeling of Breast Cancer Follow-up Clinical Practice Guideline for Providing Clinical Decision Support. *Proceedings of the Twentieth IEEE International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems: IEEE Computer Society*, 2007:542–47.
58. Jannin P, Morandi X. Surgical models for computer-assisted neurosurgery. *Neuroimage* 2007;**37**(3):783-91 doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.05.034[published Online First: Epub Date]].
59. Stacey M, McGregor C, Tracy M. An architecture for multi-dimensional temporal abstraction and its application to support neonatal intensive care. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2007;**2007**:3752-6 doi: 10.1109/iembs.2007.4353148[published Online First: Epub Date]].
60. Papageorgiou E, Stylios C, Groumpos P. Novel Architecture for supporting medical decision making of different data types based on Fuzzy Cognitive Map Framework. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2007;**2007**:1192-5 doi: 10.1109/iembs.2007.4352510[published Online First: Epub Date]].
61. Cornalba C, Bellazzi RG, Bellazzi R. Building a normative decision support system for clinical and operational risk management in hemodialysis. *IEEE Trans Inf Technol Biomed* 2008;**12**(5):678-86 doi: 10.1109/titb.2008.920781[published Online First: Epub Date]].
62. Farion K, Michalowski W, Wilk S, O'Sullivan D, Rubin S, Weiss D. Clinical decision support system for point of care use--ontology-driven design and software implementation. *Methods Inf Med* 2009;**48**(4):381-90 doi: 10.3414/me0574[published Online First: Epub Date]].
63. Dao TT, Marin F, Ho Ba Tho MC. Clinical validated Computer-Aided Decision System to the clubfoot deformities. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2009;**2009**:6230-3 doi: 10.1109/iembs.2009.5334650[published Online First: Epub Date]].
64. Zhou Q. A Clinical Decision Support System for Metabolism Synthesis. *Proceedings of the 2009 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Natural Computing - Volume 02: IEEE Computer Society*, 2009:323–25.
65. Carenini M. ReMINE: an ontology-based risk management platform. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2009;**148**:32-42
66. Lee J, Kim J, Cho I, Kim Y. Integration of workflow and rule engines for clinical decision support services. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2010;**160**(Pt 2):811-5
67. Ongenaes F, Dhaene T, Turck FD, Benoit D, Decruyenaere J. Design of a probabilistic ontology-based clinical decision support system for classifying temporal patterns in the ICU: A sepsis case study. *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE 23rd International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems: IEEE Computer Society*, 2010:389–94.
68. Basilakis J, Lovell N, Redmond S, Celler B. Design of a decision-support architecture for management of remotely monitored patients. *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 2010;**14**:1216-26
69. Wilk S, Michalowski W, Farion K, Sayyad Shirabad J. MET3-AE system to support management of pediatric asthma exacerbation in the emergency department. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2010;**160**(Pt 2):841-5
70. Bouamrane M-M, Rector A, Hurrell M. Using OWL ontologies for adaptive patient information modelling and preoperative clinical decision support. *Knowl. Inf. Syst.* 2011;**29**(2):405–18 doi: 10.1007/s10115-010-0351-7[published Online First: Epub Date]].

71. Dao TT, Marin F, Bensahel H, Ho Ba Tho MC. Computer-aided decision system for the clubfeet deformities. *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2011;**696**:623-35 doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-7046-6\_64[published Online First: Epub Date]].
72. Cao F, Sun X, Wang X, Li B, Li J, Pan Y. Ontology-based knowledge management for personalized adverse drug events detection. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2011;**169**:699-703
73. Lee CS, Wang MH. A fuzzy expert system for diabetes decision support application. *IEEE Trans Syst Man Cybern B Cybern* 2011;**41**(1):139-53 doi: 10.1109/tsmcb.2010.2048899[published Online First: Epub Date]].
74. Riaño D, Real F, López-Vallverdú JA, et al. An ontology-based personalization of health-care knowledge to support clinical decisions for chronically ill patients. *J Biomed Inform* 2012;**45**(3):429-46 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2011.12.008[published Online First: Epub Date]].
75. Bright TJ, Yoko Furuya E, Kuperman GJ, Cimino JJ, Bakken S. Development and evaluation of an ontology for guiding appropriate antibiotic prescribing. *J Biomed Inform* 2012;**45**(1):120-8 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2011.10.001[published Online First: Epub Date]].
76. Koutkias V, Kilintzis V, Stalidis G, et al. Knowledge engineering for adverse drug event prevention: on the design and development of a uniform, contextualized and sustainable knowledge-based framework. *J Biomed Inform* 2012;**45**(3):495-506 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2012.01.007[published Online First: Epub Date]].
77. Grando A, Farrish S, Boyd C, Boxwala A. Ontological approach for safe and effective polypharmacy prescription. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* 2012;**2012**:291-300
78. Chniti A, Boussadi A, Degoulet P, Albert P, Charlet J. Pharmaceutical validation of medication orders using an OWL Ontology and Business Rules. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2012;**180**:1224-6
79. Paterno MD, Goldberg HS, Simonaitis L, et al. Using a service oriented architecture approach to clinical decision support: performance results from two CDS Consortium demonstrations. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* 2012;**2012**:690-8
80. Yao W, Kumar A. CONFlexFlow: Integrating Flexible clinical pathways into clinical decision support systems using context and rules. *Decis. Support Syst.* 2013;**55**(2):499–515 doi: 10.1016/j.dss.2012.10.008[published Online First: Epub Date]].
81. Artetxe A, Sanchez E, Toro C, et al. IMPACT OF REFLEXIVE ONTOLOGIES IN SEMANTIC CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS. *Cybern. Syst.* 2013;**44**(2–3):187–203 doi: 10.1080/01969722.2013.762256[published Online First: Epub Date]].
82. Farkash A, Timm JT, Waks Z. A model-driven approach to clinical practice guidelines representation and evaluation using standards. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2013;**192**:200-4
83. SáEz C, Bresó A, Vicente J, Robles M, García-Gómez JM. An HL7-CDA wrapper for facilitating semantic interoperability to rule-based Clinical Decision Support Systems. *Comput. Methods Prog. Biomed.* 2013;**109**(3):239–49 doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2012.10.003[published Online First: Epub Date]].
84. Corrigan D, Taweel A, Fahey T, Arvanitis T, Delaney B. An ontological treatment of clinical prediction rules implementing the Alvarado score. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2013;**186**:103-7
85. Shojanoori R, Juric R. Semantic remote patient monitoring system. *Telemed J E Health* 2013;**19**(2):129-36 doi: 10.1089/tmj.2012.0128[published Online First: Epub Date]].
86. Wilk S, Michalowski W, O'Sullivan D, et al. A task-based support architecture for developing point-of-care clinical decision support systems for the emergency department. *Methods Inf Med* 2013;**52**(1):18-32 doi: 10.3414/me11-01-0099[published Online First: Epub Date]].
87. Yılmaz Ö, Erdur RC, Türksever M. SAMS--a systems architecture for developing intelligent health information systems. *J Med Syst* 2013;**37**(6):9989 doi: 10.1007/s10916-013-9989-5[published Online First: Epub Date]].

88. Bau CT, Chen RC, Huang CY. Construction of a clinical decision support system for undergoing surgery based on domain ontology and rules reasoning. *Telemed J E Health* 2014;**20**(5):460-72 doi: 10.1089/tmj.2013.0221[published Online First: Epub Date]].
89. Wang HQ, Zhou TS, Tian LL, Qian YM, Li JS. Creating hospital-specific customized clinical pathways by applying semantic reasoning to clinical data. *J Biomed Inform* 2014;**52**:354-63 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2014.07.017[published Online First: Epub Date]].
90. Sesen MB, Peake MD, Banares-Alcantara R, et al. Lung Cancer Assistant: a hybrid clinical decision support application for lung cancer care. *J R Soc Interface* 2014;**11**(98):20140534 doi: 10.1098/rsif.2014.0534[published Online First: Epub Date]].
91. Gallerani M, Pelizzola D, Pivanti M, Boni M, Lamma E, Bellodi E. Appropriateness of Repeated Execution of Laboratory Examinations: A CDSS Approach. *Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics: IEEE Computer Society, 2014*:161–69.
92. Stewart SA, Abidi S, Parker L, Bernstein M, Abidi SS. Clinical guideline-driven personalized self-management diary for paediatric cancer survivors. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2014;**205**:18-22
93. Shen Y, Colloc J, Jacquet-Andrieu A, Lei K. Emerging medical informatics with case-based reasoning for aiding clinical decision in multi-agent system. *J Biomed Inform* 2015;**56**:307-17 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2015.06.012[published Online First: Epub Date]].
94. Delaney BC, Curcin V, Andreasson A, et al. Translational Medicine and Patient Safety in Europe: TRANSFoRm--Architecture for the Learning Health System in Europe. *Biomed Res Int* 2015;**2015**:961526 doi: 10.1155/2015/961526[published Online First: Epub Date]].
95. Jafarpour B, Abidi SR, Ahmad AM, Abidi SS. INITIATE: An Intelligent Adaptive Alert Environment. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2015;**216**:285-9
96. Robles-Bykbaeva V, López-Noresb M, Pazos-Ariasb J, Quisi-Peraltaa D, García-Duqueb J. An Ecosystem of Intelligent ICT Tools for Speech-Language Therapy Based on a Formal Knowledge Model. *MEDINFO 2015, 2015*:50-54.
97. Wilk S, Kezadri-Hamiaz M, Rosu D, et al. Using Semantic Components to Represent Dynamics of an Interdisciplinary Healthcare Team in a Multi-Agent Decision Support System. *J Med Syst* 2016;**40**(2):42 doi: 10.1007/s10916-015-0375-3[published Online First: Epub Date]].
98. Abidi SR, Cox J, Abusharekh A, Hashemian N, Abidi SS. A Digital Health System to Assist Family Physicians to Safely Prescribe NOAC Medications. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2016;**228**:519-23
99. Zhang Y-F, Tian Y, Zhou T-S, Araki K, Li J-S. Integrating HL7 RIM and ontology for unified knowledge and data representation in clinical decision support systems. *Comput. Methods Prog. Biomed.* 2016;**123**(C):94–108 doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2015.09.020[published Online First: Epub Date]].
100. Goldberg HS, Paterno MD, Grundmeier RW, et al. Use of a remote clinical decision support service for a multicenter trial to implement prediction rules for children with minor blunt head trauma. *Int J Med Inform* 2016;**87**:101-10 doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2015.12.002[published Online First: Epub Date]].
101. Marco-Ruiz L, Pedrinaci C, Maldonado JA, Panziera L, Chen R, Bellika JG. Publication, discovery and interoperability of Clinical Decision Support Systems: A Linked Data approach. *J Biomed Inform* 2016;**62**:243-64 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2016.07.011[published Online First: Epub Date]].
102. Zhang YF, Gou L, Zhou TS, et al. An ontology-based approach to patient follow-up assessment for continuous and personalized chronic disease management. *J Biomed Inform* 2017;**72**:45-59 doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2017.06.021[published Online First: Epub Date]].
103. Shang Y, Wang Y, Gou L, Wu C, Zhou T, Li JS. Development of a Service-Oriented Sharable Clinical Decision Support System Based on Ontology for Chronic Disease. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2017;**245**:1153-57

104. Chen RC, Jiang HQ, Huang CY, Bau CT. Clinical Decision Support System for Diabetes Based on Ontology Reasoning and TOPSIS Analysis. *J Healthc Eng* 2017;**2017**:4307508 doi: 10.1155/2017/4307508[published Online First: Epub Date]].
105. Kopanitsa G. Integration of Hospital Information and Clinical Decision Support Systems to Enable the Reuse of Electronic Health Record Data. *Methods Inf Med* 2017;**56**(3):238-47 doi: 10.3414/me16-01-0057[published Online First: Epub Date]].
106. Abidi S. A Knowledge-Modeling Approach to Integrate Multiple Clinical Practice Guidelines to Provide Evidence-Based Clinical Decision Support for Managing Comorbid Conditions. *J Med Syst* 2017;**41**(12):193 doi: 10.1007/s10916-017-0841-1[published Online First: Epub Date]].
107. Shen Y, Yuan K, Chen D, et al. An ontology-driven clinical decision support system (IDDAP) for infectious disease diagnosis and antibiotic prescription. *Artif Intell Med* 2018;**86**:20-32 doi: 10.1016/j.artmed.2018.01.003[published Online First: Epub Date]].
108. Nakawala H, Ferrigno G, De Momi E. Development of an intelligent surgical training system for Thoracentesis. *Artif Intell Med* 2018;**84**:50-63 doi: 10.1016/j.artmed.2017.10.004[published Online First: Epub Date]].
109. Séroussi B, Guézennec G, Lamy JB, et al. Reconciliation of multiple guidelines for decision support: a case study on the multidisciplinary management of breast cancer within the DESIREE project. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* 2018:1527-36
110. Winter A, Stäubert S, Ammon D, et al. Smart Medical Information Technology for Healthcare (SMITH). *Methods Inf Med* 2018;**57**(S 01):e92-e105 doi: 10.3414/me18-02-0004[published Online First: Epub Date]].
111. Seroussi B, Lamy JB, Muro N, et al. Implementing Guideline-Based, Experience-Based, and Case-Based Approaches to Enrich Decision Support for the Management of Breast Cancer Patients in the DESIREE Project. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2018;**255**:190-94
112. Jin W, Kim DH. Design and Implementation of e-Health System Based on Semantic Sensor Network Using IETF YANG. *Sensors (Basel)* 2018;**18**(2) doi: 10.3390/s18020629[published Online First: Epub Date]].
113. Román-Villarán E, Pérez-Leon FP, Escobar-Rodríguez GA, Martínez-García A, Álvarez-Romero C, Parra-Calderón CL. An Ontology-Based Personalized Decision Support System for Use in the Complex Chronically Ill Patient. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2019;**264**:758-62 doi: 10.3233/shti190325[published Online First: Epub Date]].
114. Semenov I, Osenev R, Gerasimov S, Kopanitsa G, Denisov D, Andreychuk Y. Experience in Developing an FHIR Medical Data Management Platform to Provide Clinical Decision Support. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;**17**(1) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17010073[published Online First: Epub Date]].
115. Jafarpour B, Raza Abidi S, Van Woensel W, Raza Abidi SS. Execution-time integration of clinical practice guidelines to provide decision support for comorbid conditions. *Artif Intell Med* 2019;**94**:117-37 doi: 10.1016/j.artmed.2019.02.003[published Online First: Epub Date]].
116. El-Sappagh S, Ali F, Hendawi A, Jang JH, Kwak KS. A mobile health monitoring-and-treatment system based on integration of the SSN sensor ontology and the HL7 FHIR standard. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2019;**19**(1):97 doi: 10.1186/s12911-019-0806-z[published Online First: Epub Date]].
117. Maldonado JA, Marcos M, Fernández-Breis JT, Giménez-Solano VM, Legaz-García MDC, Martínez-Salvador B. CLIN-IK-LINKS: A platform for the design and execution of clinical data transformation and reasoning workflows. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 2020;**197**:105616 doi: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2020.105616[published Online First: Epub Date]].
118. Regier R, Gurjar R, Rocha RA. A clinical rule editor in an electronic medical record setting: development, design, and implementation. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc* 2009;**2009**:537-41

119. Sordo M, Rocha BH, Morales AA, et al. Modeling decision support rule interactions in a clinical setting. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2013;**192**:908-12
120. Bizer C, Heath T, Berners-Lee T. Linked Data - The Story So Far. *Int. J. Semantic Web Inf. Syst.* 2009;**5**:1-22
121. Sandia National Laboratories. Jess, the Rule Engine for the Java Platform. Secondary Jess, the Rule Engine for the Java Platform Nov 25th, 2013. <https://jess.sandia.gov/>.
122. The Apache Software Foundation. Apache Jena. Secondary Apache Jena. <https://jena.apache.org/>.
123. Red Hat. Drools. Secondary Drools. <https://www.drools.org/>.
124. Parsia B, Matentzoglou N, Gonçalves RS, Glimm B, Steigmiller A. The OWL Reasoner Evaluation (ORE) 2015 Competition Report. *J Autom Reason* 2017;**59**(4):455–82 doi: 10.1007/s10817-017-9406-8[*published Online First: Epub Date*]].
125. Sirin E, Parsia B, Grau BC, Kalyanpur A, Katz Y. Pellet: A practical OWL-DL reasoner. *Journal of Web Semantics* 2007;**5**(2):51-53 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2007.03.004>[*published Online First: Epub Date*]].
126. Supporting Rule System Interoperability on the Semantic Web with SWRL; 2005; Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
127. Musen M, Team tP. The Protégé Project: A Look Back and a Look Forward. *AI Matters* 2015;**1**:4-12 doi: 10.1145/2757001.2757003[*published Online First: Epub Date*]].
128. Farooq K. A Novel Ontology and Machine Learning Driven Hybrid Clinical Decision Support Framework for Cardiovascular Preventative Care. GRIN Verlag, 2016.
129. Jing X, Kay S, Marley T, Hardiker NR, Cimino JJ. Incorporating personalized gene sequence variants, molecular genetics knowledge, and health knowledge into an EHR prototype based on the Continuity of Care Record Standard. *J Biomed Inform* 2012;**45**:82-92
130. Jing X, Kay S, Marley T, Hardiker NR. Integration of an OWL-DL knowledge base with an EHR prototype and providing customized information. *J Med Syst* 2014;**38**

