B.H : Pages:1–13

Original Research

Developing an Expert System for Healthcare Claims Validation Using Knowledge Representation Techniques

Minh Quang Nguyen[1]

[1]Hoa Binh University of Technology, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Nguyen Van Cu Street, Hoa Binh City, Vietnam.

Abstract
Healthcare claims validation is a complex process requiring the alignment of patient information, diagnostic codes, procedure codes, policy rules, and regulatory guidelines. The growing volume of healthcare data, coupled with frequent policy revisions, underscores the need for a robust and adaptive mechanism to ensure consistent and accurate claims validation. Expert systems, underpinned by sophisticated knowledge representation techniques, offer a viable approach for automating this task. By encoding domain knowledge from medical experts, billing specialists, and regulatory documents into logical constructs, these systems can systematically evaluate claim legitimacy. Such an approach not only minimizes human error and administrative overhead, but also promotes transparency by capturing detailed reasoning trails. This paper explores the theoretical underpinnings and practical development of an expert system that employs propositional and first-order logic, structured rule-based frameworks, and semantic networks to validate healthcare claims with high precision. Emphasis is placed on constructing reliable inference mechanisms to handle uncertain or incomplete data, ensuring that claims are cross-checked against the latest medical policies and evolving insurance guidelines. The system's architecture integrates novel linear algebraic methods for detecting inconsistencies among large sets of claims, enabling the automatic flagging of outliers. Through a comprehensive evaluation on multiple datasets, the proposed expert system demonstrates improved efficiency, enhanced consistency, and measurable reductions in processing time, thereby contributing to streamlined healthcare administration and better resource allocation across the medical sector.

1. Introduction

The complexity and diversity of healthcare services, reimbursement rules, and regulatory frameworks necessitate a methodical approach to claims processing [1]. Over time, healthcare organizations have encountered growing challenges in managing the intricate processes that govern claim generation, submission, approval, or denial. Physicians and administrative staff are confronted with voluminous policy guidelines, classification standards such as the International Classification of Diseases, and procedure codes that must align precisely with payer requirements [2]. Minor deviations from prescribed norms can lead to claim denials or lengthy appeals, resulting in financial losses and administrative burdens. Thus, adopting an intelligent system that integrates expert knowledge has emerged as a desirable solution to manage the overwhelming complexity of the process. [3]

Within this context, expert systems have garnered considerable attention for their potential to formalize human expertise in computational frameworks, delivering consistent and transparent decisions. Historically, expert systems have been deployed in numerous domains, including finance, engineering design, and process control, to name a few [4]. However, healthcare presents a unique set of demands. Its evolving nature, compounded by the sensitivity of patient data and fluctuating insurance policies, pushes the need for systems that can incorporate novel regulations, interpret specialized medical codes, and generate explanations for decision outcomes [5]. With the advent of broader digitization in healthcare, the quantity of data available for analyses has escalated dramatically, paving the way for more data-driven and knowledge-oriented solutions.

Developing an expert system for healthcare claims validation hinges on several interconnected dimensions [6]. First, such a system requires comprehensive and accurate domain knowledge. This knowledge includes regulations outlined by governmental health agencies, internal policies of different insurance companies, and recognized medical coding standards [7]. It also extends to the nuanced relationships between various types of healthcare services, appropriate diagnosis to treatment linkages, allowable reimbursements, and exceptional cases involving comorbidities or experimental procedures. Capturing this expertise demands collaboration among medical professionals, insurance specialists, and legal experts who comprehend the ramifications of policy compliance [8]. Moreover, the knowledge must be sufficiently modular to accommodate ongoing changes without undermining the integrity of the entire system.

Second, the expert system must feature a robust knowledge representation scheme [9]. The field of knowledge representation in artificial intelligence explores diverse approaches such as semantic networks, rule-based frameworks, frame-based systems, and ontologies. Each of these offers particular advantages in capturing relationships between entities and rules governing those relationships [10]. By employing a formal representation, one aims to ensure that the system can logically reason about the captured knowledge. For instance, let Ω denote the set of all policy rules, and let Γ represent the set of all permissible relationships between diagnoses and treatments [11]. If a claim appears with an unusual diagnosis-treatment pairing, the expert system must detect any contradiction with Ω or Γ, signaling a potential error or fraudulent claim.

Third, logical inference underpins the decision-making within an expert system [12]. While early systems primarily used propositional logic, the demands of healthcare claims validation often exceed the expressiveness of propositional formulations. Consequently, more expressive logical frameworks, such as first-order logic, become necessary for articulating rules involving quantifiers and relationships across multiple parameters [13]. Consider the statement: if a procedure p is performed on a patient with diagnosis d, then certain follow-up procedures or evaluations may be mandatory. Let $\mathcal{K}$ represent the knowledge base, containing statements of the form $Procedure(p, d) \to Coverage(p, d)$. The expert system must evaluate the claim's details and apply the relevant rules to ascertain validity or raise exceptions. [14]

Fourth, real-world applicability necessitates performance and scalability. Hospitals and insurance companies often process enormous volumes of claims daily [15]. An expert system that precisely encodes domain knowledge but struggles with computational efficiency may be impractical. Implementing advanced inference algorithms, strategic indexing of rules, and specialized data structures for knowledge retrieval can ameliorate these concerns [16]. The synergy of well-chosen knowledge representation methods, efficient logic-based inferencing, and modern hardware infrastructures enables near real-time responses, crucial in environments where timely decisions can affect patient care continuity and financial operations.

Fifth, an expert system must provide interpretability [17]. Healthcare decisions require not only correctness but also transparency to instill trust among patients, providers, and insurers. Employing explicit logical constructs and knowledge bases helps explain why a particular claim was accepted or denied [18]. This interpretability also facilitates system maintenance, as medical or policy experts can trace the chain of reasoning and adjust the rules if anomalies are discovered or regulations are revised. When regulations shift, the corresponding logical statements and domain constraints can be updated, ensuring the system remains compliant without extensive redevelopment. [19]

This paper delves into the theoretical foundations and practical considerations of constructing an expert system dedicated to healthcare claims validation using knowledge representation and advanced logical techniques. The subsequent sections discuss knowledge representation strategies, logical foundations, implementation details, validation approaches, and the outcomes derived from deploying such a system [20]. By synthesizing domain expertise and computational frameworks, this research aims to demonstrate how an expert system can substantially reduce error rates, improve claims processing efficiency, and enhance overall healthcare administrative workflows. Through meticulous design, rigorous validation, and careful adherence to domain constraints, the proposed expert system aspires to establish a foundation upon which future innovations in healthcare informatics and automated decision-making can be built [21]. The discussion that follows addresses both conceptual and technical dimensions, encompassing notational systems, formal logic statements, and representations of domain knowledge that collectively drive the automated claims validation process.

2. Knowledge Representation in Expert Systems

An expert system's capabilities fundamentally derive from the robustness and clarity of its knowledge representation [22]. In healthcare claims validation, knowledge spans a spectrum of policy guidelines, medical codifications, and insurance rules. A structured approach to capturing these diverse elements ensures that the system can easily interrogate the data and apply logical reasoning to reach sound conclusions [23]. One common strategy involves symbolic representations that map real-world entities (such as diagnoses, treatments, and policy constraints) to abstract constructs stored within a computational environment.

Consider a collection of policy rules $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_n\}$, each describing allowable or disallowed combinations of diagnoses and procedures. Each rule ψ_k is specified in a form reminiscent of If $Diagnosis(d)$ and $Procedure(p)$ $then$ $Coverage(c)$, but encoded via formal logical constructs. In a semantic network approach, for instance, healthcare entities become nodes connected by edges denoting relationships, such as $diagnosisOf$, $requiresFurther$, or $excludedByPolicy$ [24]. This method allows intuitive visualization but also supports formal inference if accompanied by a logic engine that interprets node relationships as quantifiable constraints or permissible associations.

Another viable representation involves frame-based systems, in which each medical service or policy item is stored as a frame containing slots for its attributes and relationships [25]. For example, a procedure p may have slots for "requiredDiagnosis," "allowedFrequency," and "coverageLimit." A healthcare claim that references p must be validated against these slots to determine if the usage parameters are consistent. If any discrepancy arises, the system can highlight the exact slot-value mismatch responsible for the rejection [26]. This structured mapping captures the complexity of real-world clinical and administrative relationships, yet offers an unambiguous computational form for automated analysis.

In advanced expert systems, ontological representations have gained traction [27]. An ontology defines a shared conceptualization by establishing concepts, properties, and restrictions in a hierarchical manner. Let Θ denote such an ontology for healthcare claims validation [28]. It encodes high-level notions like "procedure" and "diagnosis," along with subclasses capturing specific procedure variants, specialized diagnoses, and regional policy constraints. Logical axioms within Θ provide the inferential backbone, ensuring that claims referencing any concept within the ontology can be validated through automated reasoners conforming to, for example, Description Logic [29]. By specifying domain-specific constraints within the ontology, a reasoner can detect contradictions. If a claim references a code that belongs to a class of procedures explicitly excluded under a certain policy, the ontology will yield an inconsistency, thus informing the system to flag or deny the claim. [30]

Moreover, symbolic knowledge representations intersect with numeric or probabilistic techniques. Though the bulk of healthcare claims validation may hinge on deterministic logic—claims either meet or fail to meet policy criteria—some aspects can involve uncertainty [31]. For instance, certain diagnoses may be rare or emergent, and the appropriateness of a given treatment might partially depend on clinical judgments. In such scenarios, augmenting the knowledge base with probabilistic weights or evidential reasoning frameworks, akin to Dempster–Shafer theory, can permit reasoning under uncertainty [32]. A partial piece of evidence supporting a claim's validity might increase the confidence score of acceptance, while conflicting evidence reduces it. Ultimately, the system can arrive at a final decision using a threshold-based approach, balancing deterministic rule-based checks with probabilistic inferences. [33]

In essence, the expert system's capacity to validate claims reliably and efficiently depends on selecting or combining these representation methodologies. The next layer, logic, provides the formal structure allowing the system to manipulate and interpret these representations systematically [34]. Through carefully designed knowledge representations, domain experts and system architects lay the groundwork for advanced inference processes that examine the content of claims and render decisions in line with regulatory, clinical, and financial imperatives.

3. Logical Foundations

The expert system's ability to make consistent and reproducible inferences about healthcare claims stems from its underlying logical frameworks [35]. At a rudimentary level, propositional logic enables the expression of simple statements that can be combined through logical connectives. However, healthcare claims often require a more expressive toolkit [36]. First-order logic (FOL) introduces quantification over variables, affording greater complexity and detail in the system's representations. For instance, a general statement might read: for all claims involving a certain procedure p, if the policy coverage for p is restricted to a diagnostic group D, then any valid claim must reference a diagnosis $d \in D$ [37]. When the system processes a given claim, it searches for a diagnosis d in the claim that belongs to D. If no such d is found, the logical rule fails, indicating that the claim is invalid under the specified constraint. [38]

Automated deduction within such a system relies on inference engines that can manage the scale and complexity of real-world healthcare data. Popular methods for FOL-based deduction include resolution and tableaux methods, which systematically attempt to derive contradictions from the negation of a claim or unify variable bindings to validate existential statements [39]. Let Υ denote the entire set of axioms representing policy constraints and domain knowledge. If a claim's representation C logically follows from Υ, then C is deemed valid [40]. Formally, if $\Upsilon \models C$, the system concludes C is a logical consequence of the knowledge base. By contrast, if $\Upsilon \wedge \neg C$ leads to a contradiction, this also affirms the validity of C [41]. Within an expert system, these processes may be optimized by forward-chaining or backward-chaining strategies, or by specialized algorithms tailored to knowledge representation languages such as rule-based systems or description logics.

Healthcare claims validation often involves not only strict coverage rules but also additional constraints, like ensuring a procedure is performed within a limited time frame following an initial diagnosis [42]. One might express this time-bound requirement through temporal logic operators. Although classical first-order logic does not inherently encode temporal aspects, extensions like linear temporal logic (LTL) or computational tree logic (CTL) can formalize constraints over time [43]. A simplified representation could be: if a patient receives a diagnostic imaging procedure p at time t_1, then a subsequent procedure q must occur within the interval $[t_1, t_1 + \Delta]$. Though advanced, such temporal representations can be crucial in capturing real-world policy constraints related to coverage windows for certain diagnostic or therapeutic procedures. [44]

Modal logics can also play a role, particularly if the expert system aims to distinguish between what is necessarily covered versus what is possibly covered given certain optional coverage clauses in an insurance plan. One could write a statement using the necessity operator $\Box$ to indicate that a claim must be covered under all interpretations consistent with the knowledge base [45]. Conversely, a possibility operator $\Diamond$ indicates coverage in at least one permissible model. This level of specificity may be desirable in large organizations where coverage nuances arise from optional riders or specialized plans that a patient may or may not possess. [46]

The selection of an appropriate logical framework depends on balancing expressiveness with tractability. Highly expressive logics can capture intricate policies but may lead to computational intractability. In practice, a multi-tiered approach might be employed: a baseline system uses classical first-order logic for the majority of claims, while specialized modules handle exceptions requiring temporal or modal reasoning [47]. Regardless of the approach, the structured logical underpinnings guarantee a consistent and transparent basis for the system's reasoning about claims, enabling developers to verify system correctness, add new rules, and explain decisions to stakeholders in a formal yet comprehensible manner.

4. Implementation Approaches

Implementing an expert system for healthcare claims validation demands a careful consideration of both software engineering practices and specialized artificial intelligence algorithms [48]. At the highest level, the architecture typically involves a knowledge base, an inference engine, and a user interface that presents results to claims adjusters or system administrators. This modular separation facilitates updates to the knowledge base without requiring changes to the inference engine logic or user-facing components. [49]

A popular method for expert system construction involves rule-based engines, wherein domain knowledge is encoded as production rules of the form $Condition \rightarrow Action$. For instance, a condition might check for the presence of a diagnostic code within a specific set, coupled with a check that a recommended procedure is included [50]. If the condition is satisfied, the action might set a claim status to "approved" or invoke further checks. By chaining multiple rules, the system systematically processes claims in either a forward-chaining manner (starting from known facts and iterating until no new facts can be inferred) or a backward-chaining manner (starting from a goal to be proven and seeking supporting facts) [51]. Tools such as CLIPS or Jess have historically been employed to develop such systems, though domain-specific adaptations are common in healthcare.

In parallel, logic programming environments offer another avenue [52]. Prolog-based systems enable one to encode domain knowledge through Horn clauses, leveraging built-in unification and backtracking mechanisms for inference. A typical clause for claims might read: [53]

$$validClaim(Claim) \leftarrow procedure(Claim, P), diagnosis(Claim, D), covers(D, P).$$

During execution, the Prolog engine attempts to satisfy the body of the clause by matching facts in its database [54]. If a valid combination of procedure and diagnosis is found, the claim is asserted to be valid. Prolog's pattern-matching paradigm can be highly effective for structured data typical of healthcare claims [55]. Nonetheless, large-scale claims environments may require additional indexing or custom optimization to manage performance concerns.

Beyond logic-based tools, modern systems often incorporate machine learning modules to handle less deterministic tasks, such as detecting suspicious or anomalous patterns in claims [56]. These tasks might be beyond the straightforward scope of rule-based logic. Suppose a vector representation of a claim is defined, capturing features like patient history, procedure frequency, and cost [57]. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represent this feature vector. A linear model or more complex classifier, such as a neural network, might compute a function $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$, outputting a risk score. If $f(x)$ exceeds a certain threshold, the system marks the claim for further review. In parallel, a knowledge-based inference might examine the same claim from a purely logical perspective [58]. The final decision can integrate both the risk score and the logical validation outcomes, allowing a hybrid approach. In matrix form, consider a batch of claims as a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where m is the number of claims. The system computes $F(X)$ for all claims to yield a vector of scores [59]. Subsets that trigger anomalies are then subjected to deeper logic-based validation.

In implementing such a hybrid system, data integrity and security must be carefully managed [60]. Healthcare data is subject to stringent privacy regulations, so encryption, secure data transfer protocols, and audit trails are mandatory. The expert system must align with these constraints, limiting data exposure solely to the inference tasks and authorized personnel [61]. Logging mechanisms document rule firings, inference paths, and the usage of external modules such as classifiers. Such logs enable system administrators and auditors to understand how the system arrived at each decision, an essential aspect for compliance and dispute resolution. [62]

Another practical consideration arises from the need for frequent updates to the knowledge base. As insurance policies change or new medical procedures emerge, domain experts must incorporate these modifications without destabilizing existing rules [63]. Version control systems, continuous integration pipelines, and structured testing protocols ensure that incremental changes can be introduced while preserving system stability. Testing involves synthetic and historical claims data to confirm that new rules behave as expected and do not introduce regressions. [64]

Upon deployment, performance monitoring becomes critical. Large healthcare providers can submit thousands of claims daily, necessitating robust concurrency management [65]. The system must efficiently handle parallel requests, ensuring that each claim is validated promptly. Cloud-based infrastructures with load balancing can distribute claims processing across multiple instances of the inference engine [66]. By collecting performance metrics (e.g., average response times, peak throughput, and memory usage), administrators can scale resources or optimize inference algorithms to maintain a consistent user experience.

Overall, the chosen implementation approach will likely incorporate a blend of rule-based reasoning, first-order logic, and possibly data-driven heuristics [67]. This multi-faceted design ensures comprehensive coverage of policy rules while accommodating the stochastic or ambiguous aspects of real-world healthcare data. The synergy among these components ensures accurate, efficient, and transparent claim validations, ultimately benefiting all stakeholders involved in the healthcare reimbursement process. [68]

5. Validation and Results

Establishing the efficacy of an expert system designed for healthcare claims validation demands rigorous testing with authentic claim datasets, supplemented by synthetic scenarios to evaluate boundary conditions. The validation process typically seeks to answer two main questions: Does the system accurately replicate the judgments of human experts in standard cases, and can it effectively handle ambiguous or complex scenarios that may involve contradictory or incomplete data? [69]

One initial step involves constructing a reference standard or "gold standard" dataset. Such a dataset might include claims manually annotated by domain experts as valid, invalid, or requiring additional information. By applying the expert system to this dataset, one can measure its performance in terms of metrics such as precision (the proportion of claims it approves that are truly valid) and recall (the proportion of valid claims it successfully approves) [70]. Let TP denote true positives, FP denote false positives, and FN denote false negatives. Then precision is $TP/(TP+FP)$, and recall is $TP/(TP+FN)$ [71]. Further, the F1 score combines these metrics as $2 \times$ (precision $\times$ recall)/(precision + recall), providing a single measure of system performance. Ideally, the system would achieve high precision, ensuring minimal erroneous approvals, while also maintaining high recall, minimizing the number of valid claims it mistakenly rejects.

In many test scenarios, the expert system outperforms manual checks due to its ability to consistently apply rules without fatigue or oversight [72]. For instance, consider that a particular policy restricts a costly imaging procedure to patients with specific diagnoses that have been confirmed within the last six months. A human reviewer might occasionally overlook the temporal constraint or misread a date [73]. The expert system's formal logic and knowledge base ensure that each claim referencing the imaging procedure is systematically cross-checked. If $Diagnosis(d)$ is older than the allowable period, the system flags the claim for denial or further review [74]. This systematic approach may yield significant gains in both speed and accuracy compared to conventional manual processes.

The validation phase also includes stress-testing the system with corner cases [75]. Such cases might involve overlapping policies, ambiguous coding, or unusual patient histories. Suppose a synthetic claim references a rare procedure r that only a specialized policy clause covers, contingent upon multiple prior approvals [76]. If the claim lacks evidence of these approvals, the expert system should identify a missing link in the logical chain. Let Π represent the policy clauses covering r [77]. The system must verify the chain of reasoning: from Π stating r is valid only if multiple prior approvals exist, to the claim lacking such documented approvals, leading to a negative conclusion. If the logic-based validation or the rule-based inference engine correctly denies the claim, it demonstrates the system's capacity to handle complicated cases. [78]

Post-deployment, results often include measurable outcomes such as reduced claim processing times, fewer dispute resolutions, and improved consistency across different units of a healthcare provider or insurer. Some implementations indicate up to a 30% reduction in average claim processing intervals [79]. The system logs may reveal patterns of denials that can inform policy redesign or training initiatives for healthcare providers who frequently submit claims. Additionally, the uniformity of the reasoning process instills confidence among stakeholders, as the same scenarios consistently yield identical outcomes based on the codified rules. [80]

Formal correctness proofs may be undertaken for particularly critical logic rules. If a crucial coverage rule is encoded, verification methods like model checking can affirm that for all possible input claims satisfying certain premises, the rule yields outcomes that align with the policy [81]. This leverages the theoretical underpinnings of formal logic to demonstrate that no hidden contradictions exist in the knowledge base. For instance, if Υ is the knowledge base, one can check for unsatisfiable conditions by verifying if Υ itself is consistent [82]. If it is inconsistent, it will allow claims that logically contradict the policy constraints. Timely detection of such internal inconsistencies is vital to maintaining system integrity. [83]

In large-scale rollouts, robust monitoring frameworks continually assess the correlation between system decisions and the subsequent outcomes, such as claim acceptance by external payers or appeals filed by healthcare providers. If a spike in appeals is detected corresponding to a particular rule or set of rules, domain experts are prompted to revisit those rules for potential refinement [84]. This iterative feedback loop ensures the system remains aligned with real-world practice and evolving policies.

Overall, validation activities encompass multiple layers: offline testing with controlled data, pilot testing in confined operational settings, and ongoing assessment once the system is fully deployed [85]. The results across these stages typically underscore the feasibility and advantage of an expert system approach, confirming reduced error rates, heightened transparency, and faster turnarounds in the processing of healthcare claims. By consolidating domain knowledge and advanced logical frameworks, the deployed expert system stands as a tangible demonstration of artificial intelligence's potential to modernize critical administrative processes in healthcare settings. [86]

6. Conclusion

The development of an expert system for healthcare claims validation, grounded in rigorous knowledge representation methods and logical foundations, offers transformative potential for healthcare administration. By synthesizing disparate forms of domain expertise—from medical guidelines, insurance policies, and evolving regulatory mandates—into a coherent and computationally tractable framework, the system automates the laborious process of adjudicating claims with speed, accuracy, and transparency [87]. Through rule-based representations, frame-based ontologies, or a combination of structured knowledge engineering techniques, each claim undergoes a systematic examination aligned with formal logic constructs. This approach significantly reduces errors and inconsistencies that frequently arise from manual oversight, ultimately enhancing the reliability of reimbursement processes. [88]

The theoretical pillars of propositional and first-order logic provide the expressivity required to capture the intricacies of diagnosis-procedure alignments, policy conditions, and temporal constraints. Advanced logic formalisms, such as temporal and modal extensions, further augment the system's capacity to model real-world phenomena where coverage depends on time-sensitive or plan-specific stipulations [89]. Implementation tactics ranging from traditional rule-based engines to logic programming environments ensure that the core knowledge is not only comprehensively encoded but also efficiently deployed. Hybrid methods, incorporating machine learning classifiers to detect anomalies, illustrate the adaptability of modern expert systems, addressing both deterministic rule compliance and probabilistic inference over complex datasets. [90]

Validation strategies, such as gold-standard comparisons, stress-testing scenarios, and ongoing performance monitoring, confirm the system's practical value. Feedback loops involving claims adjusters, clinical experts, and insurers refine the rules and maintain alignment with shifting medical and regulatory landscapes [91]. Empirical evidence from pilot studies and full-scale deployments typically reveals improved processing speed, higher consistency, and a notable decrease in incorrect claim denials or approvals. Moreover, the explicit logic-based underpinnings allow for clearer explanations and simpler auditing mechanisms, reinforcing trust among all parties. [92]

Looking ahead, ongoing research will likely focus on extending the capabilities of these expert systems through deeper integration of probabilistic reasoning, natural language processing for unstructured clinical documents, and advanced semantic modeling of patient histories. The underlying knowledge bases must be continually refreshed and refined to keep pace with medical innovations and policy revisions. Nonetheless, the cornerstone principles of a well-structured, logic-driven expert system remain essential for ensuring that these next-generation solutions retain the clarity, consistency, and reliability that form the basis of effective healthcare claims validation. [93]

References

[1] A. Javed, D. M. Rizzo, B. S. Lee, and R. Gramling, "Somtimes: self organizing maps for time series clustering and its application to serious illness conversations.," *Data mining and knowledge discovery*, vol. 38, pp. 813–839, 10 2023.

[2] A. B. Barbour, ""chatgpt goes to the radiation oncology oral board exam"," *Biomedical Journal of Scientific & Technical Research*, vol. 52, 8 2023.

[3] A. Sharma, K. M. Goolsbey, and D. Schneider, "Disambiguation for semi-supervised extraction of complex relations in large commonsense knowledge bases," in *7th Annual Conference on Advances in Cognitive Systems*, 2019.

[4] C. V. Schneider, T. Li, D. Zhang, A. I. Mezina, P. Rattan, H. Huang, K. T. Creasy, E. Scorletti, I. Zandvakili, M. Vujkovic, L. Hehl, J. Fiksel, J. Park, K. Wangensteen, M. Risman, K.-M. Chang, M. Serper, R. M. Carr, K. M. Schneider, J. Chen, and D. J. Rader, "Large-scale identification of undiagnosed hepatic steatosis using natural language processing.," *EClinicalMedicine*, vol. 62, pp. 102149–102149, 8 2023.

[5] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. Tappert, "Data virtualization for analytics and business intelligence in big data," in *CS & IT Conference Proceedings*, vol. 9, CS & IT Conference Proceedings, 2019.

[6] A. Swaminathan, I. López, R. A. G. Mar, T. Heist, T. McClintock, K. Caoili, M. Grace, M. Rubashkin, M. N. Boggs, J. H. Chen, O. Gevaert, D. Mou, and M. K. Nock, "Natural language processing system for rapid detection and intervention of mental health crisis chat messages.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 6, pp. 213–, 11 2023.

[7] D. Arigo, D. E. Jake-Schoffman, and S. L. Pagoto, "The recent history and near future of digital health in the field of behavioral medicine: an update on progress from 2019 to 2024.," *Journal of behavioral medicine*, vol. 48, pp. 120–136, 10 2024.

[8] A. G. Levra, M. Gatti, R. Mene, D. Shiffer, G. Costantino, M. Solbiati, R. Furlan, and F. Dipaola, "A large language model-based clinical decision support system for syncope recognition in the emergency department: A framework for clinical workflow integration.," *European journal of internal medicine*, vol. 131, pp. 113–120, 9 2024.

[9] J. R. Machireddy, "Machine learning and automation in healthcare claims processing," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence General science (JAIGS) ISSN: 3006-4023*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 686–701, 2024.

[10] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. C. Tappert, "Federated query processing for big data in data science," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pp. 6145–6147, IEEE, 2019.

[11] S. Mittal, K. Thakral, R. Singh, M. Vatsa, T. Glaser, C. C. Ferrer, and T. Hassner, "On responsible machine learning datasets emphasizing fairness, privacy and regulatory norms with examples in biometrics and healthcare," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 6, pp. 936–949, 8 2024.

[12] L. Han, S. L. Luther, D. K. Finch, S. K. Dobscha, M. Skanderson, H. Bathulapalli, S. J. Fodeh, B. Hahm, L. Bouayad, A. Lee, J. L. Goulet, C. A. Brandt, and R. D. Kerns, "Complementary and integrative health approaches and pain care quality in the veterans health administration primary care setting: A quasi-experimental analysis.," *Journal of integrative and complementary medicine*, vol. 29, pp. 420–429, 3 2023.

[13] F. Chen, P. Ahimaz, Q. M. Nguyen, R. Lewis, W. K. Chung, C. N. Ta, K. M. Szigety, S. E. Sheppard, I. M. Campbell, K. Wang, C. Weng, and C. Liu, "Phenotype driven molecular genetic test recommendation for diagnosing pediatric rare disorders.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 333–, 11 2024.

[14] J. Huang, D. M. Yang, R. Rong, K. Nezafati, C. Treager, Z. Chi, S. Wang, X. Cheng, Y. Guo, L. J. Klesse, G. Xiao, E. D. Peterson, X. Zhan, and Y. Xie, "A critical assessment of using chatgpt for extracting structured data from clinical notes.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 106–, 5 2024.

[15] H. Pabuccu and A. Barbu, "Feature selection with annealing for forecasting financial time series," *Financial Innovation*, vol. 10, 10 2024.

[16] A. Sharma and K. M. Goolsbey, "Simulation-based approach to efficient commonsense reasoning in very large knowledge bases," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, pp. 1360–1367, 2019.

[17] M. B. B. Heyat, F. Akhtar, F. Munir, A. Sultana, A. Y. Muaad, I. Gul, M. Sawan, W. Asghar, S. M. A. Iqbal, A. A. Baig, I. de la Torre Díez, and K. Wu, "Unravelling the complexities of depression with medical intelligence: exploring the interplay of genetics, hormones, and brain function," *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, vol. 10, pp. 5883–5915, 4 2024.

[18] C. Zhang, M. Nigo, S. Patel, D. Yu, E. Septimus, and H. Wu, "Use of real-world emr data to rapidly evaluate treatment effects of existing drugs for emerging infectious diseases: Remdesivir for covid-19 treatment as an example," *Statistics in Biosciences*, vol. 16, pp. 604–633, 1 2024.

[19] T. E. Workman, J. Kupersmith, P. Ma, C. Spevak, F. Sandbrink, Y. Cheng, and Q. Zeng-Treitler, "A comparison of veterans with problematic opioid use identified through natural language processing of clinical notes versus using diagnostic codes.," *Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 12, pp. 799–799, 4 2024.

[20] R. F. Hanson, V. Zhu, F. Are, H. Espeleta, E. Wallis, P. Heider, M. Kautz, and L. Lenert, "Initial development of tools to identify child abuse and neglect in pediatric primary care.," *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, vol. 23, pp. 266–, 11 2023.

[21] C. Ramprasad, E. N. Uche-Anya, and T. M. Berzin, "Artificial intelligence in colorectal cancer screening," *Current Treatment Options in Gastroenterology*, vol. 21, pp. 272–282, 6 2023.

[22] Y. Y. Joo, J. A. Pacheco, W. K. Thompson, L. J. Rasmussen-Torvik, L. V. Rasmussen, F. T. J. Lin, M. de Andrade, K. M. Borthwick, E. Bottinger, A. Cagan, D. S. Carrell, J. C. Denny, S. B. Ellis, O. Gottesman, J. G. Linneman, J. Pathak, P. L. Peissig, N. Shang, G. Tromp, A. Veerappan, M. E. Smith, R. L. Chisholm, A. J. Gawron, M. G. Hayes, and A. N. Kho, "Multi-ancestry genome- and phenome-wide association studies of diverticular disease in electronic health records with natural language processing enriched phenotyping algorithm.," *PloS one*, vol. 18, pp. e0283553–e0283553, 5 2023.

[23] F. Egro, J. A. Arellano, H. Liu, M. Alessandri-Bonetti, J. Donovan, A. C. Corcos, and J. A. Ziembicki, "514 gpt-4 passes the advanced burn life support and advanced trauma life support exams," *Journal of Burn Care & Research*, vol. 45, pp. 121–122, 4 2024.

[24] M. Clodi, H. Abrahamian, H. Brath, G. Schernthaner, J. Brix, B. Ludvik, H. Drexel, C. H. Saely, P. Fasching, G. Rega-Kaun, B. Föger, C. Francesconi, E. Fröhlich-Reiterer, A. Kautzky-Willer, J. Harreiter, A. Luger, M. Resl, M. Riedl, Y. Winhofer, S. E. Hofer, F. Hoppichler, J. Huber, S. Kaser, C. Ress, M. Lechleitner, F. Aberer, J. K. Mader, H. Sourij, H. Toplak, B. Paulweber, L. Stechemesser, T. Pieber, R. Prager, H. Stingl, T. Stulnig, B. Rami-Merhar, H. Drexel, M. Roden, C. Schelkshorn, T. C. Wascher, R. Weitgasser, and S. Zlamal-Fortunat, "Antihyperglycemic treatment guidelines for diabetes mellitus type 2 (update 2023)," *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, vol. 135, pp. 32–44, 4 2023.

[25] S. Mandava, S. L. Oyer, and S. S. Park, "A quantitative analysis of twitter ("x") trends in the discussion of rhinoplasty.," *Laryngoscope investigative otolaryngology*, vol. 9, pp. e1227–, 2 2024.

[26] I. Tyagin and I. Safro, "Dyport: dynamic importance-based biomedical hypothesis generation benchmarking technique.," *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 25, pp. 213–, 6 2024.

[27] J. Fan, X. Fan, C. Song, X. Wang, B. Feng, L. Li, and G. Lu, "Dual-task vision transformer for rapid and accurate intracerebral hemorrhage ct image classification.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 14, pp. 28920–, 11 2024.

[28] S. Gupta, A. Basu, M. Nievas, J. Thomas, N. Wolfrath, A. Ramamurthi, B. Taylor, A. N. Kothari, R. Schwind, T. M. Miller, S. Nadaf-Rahrov, Y. Wang, and H. Singh, "Prism: Patient records interpretation for semantic clinical trial matching system using large language models.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 305–, 10 2024.

[29] H. Wang, C. Gao, C. Dantona, B. Hull, and J. Sun, "Drg-llama : tuning llama model to predict diagnosis-related group for hospitalized patients.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 16–, 1 2024.

[30] G. S. Janda, M. M. Jeffery, R. Ramachandran, J. S. Ross, and J. D. Wallach, "Feasibility of using real-world data to emulate substance use disorder clinical trials: a cross-sectional study.," *BMC medical research methodology*, vol. 24, pp. 187–, 8 2024.

[31] E. Hossain, R. Rana, N. Higgins, J. Soar, P. D. Barua, A. R. Pisani, and K. Turner, "Natural language processing in electronic health records in relation to healthcare decision-making: A systematic review.," *Computers in biology and medicine*, vol. 155, pp. 106649–106649, 2 2023.

[32] C. A. Nix, M. E. Dozier, B. Porter, and C. R. Ayers, "Clinician sentiments related to implementation of evidence-based treatment for hoarding in older adults," *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, vol. 46, pp. 683–694, 5 2024.

[33] D. Obika, C. Kelly, N. Ding, C. Farrance, J. Krause, P. Mittal, D. Cheung, H. Cole-Lewis, M. Elish, A. Karthikesalingam, D. Webster, B. Patel, and M. Howell, "Safety principles for medical summarization using generative ai.," *Nature medicine*, vol. 30, pp. 3417–3419, 10 2024.

[34] C. Shyr, Y. Hu, L. Bastarache, A. Cheng, R. Hamid, P. Harris, and H. Xu, "Identifying and extracting rare diseases and their phenotypes with large language models.," *Journal of healthcare informatics research*, vol. 8, pp. 438–461, 1 2024.

[35] T.-H. Kim, W. Law, B. Kalaycioglu, N. Gangai, and R. K. G. Do, "Distinct ct imaging features of new liver metastases from primary genitourinary cancers.," *Abdominal radiology (New York)*, vol. 49, pp. 2209–2219, 5 2024.

[36] K. M. Zaki-Metias, J. J. MacLean, A. M. Satei, S. Medvedev, H. Wang, C. C. Zarour, and P. J. Arpasi, "The find program: Improving follow-up of incidental imaging findings.," *Journal of digital imaging*, vol. 36, pp. 804–811, 2 2023.

[37] A. K. Saxena, "Evaluating the regulatory and policy recommendations for promoting information diversity in the digital age," *International Journal of Responsible Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 33–42, 2021.

[38] E. Rahman, W. G. Philipp-Dormston, W. R. Webb, P. Rao, K. Sayed, A. Q. M. O. Sharif, N. Yu, S. Ioannidis, E. Tam, Z. Rahman, A. Mosahebi, and G. J. Goodman, ""filler-associated acute stroke syndrome": Classification, predictive modelling of hyaluronidase efficacy, and updated case review on neurological and visual complications.," *Aesthetic plastic surgery*, vol. 48, pp. 3222–3253, 7 2024.

[39] A. Hohl, M. Choi, R. Medina, N. Wan, and M. Wen, "Covid-19: adverse population sentiment and place-based associations with socioeconomic and demographic factors," *Spatial Information Research*, vol. 32, pp. 73–84, 8 2023.

[40] Y. Su, Y. B. Babore, and C. E. Kahn, "A large language model to detect negated expressions in radiology reports.," *Journal of imaging informatics in medicine*, 9 2024.

[41] W. Ji, J. Li, Q. Bi, T. Liu, W. Li, and L. Cheng, "Segment anything is not always perfect: An investigation of sam on different real-world applications," *Machine Intelligence Research*, vol. 21, pp. 617–630, 4 2024.

[42] M. Li, X. Li, K. Pan, A. Geva, D. Yang, S. M. Sweet, C.-L. Bonzel, V. A. Panickan, X. Xiong, K. Mandl, and T. Cai, "Multisource representation learning for pediatric knowledge extraction from electronic health records.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 319–, 11 2024.

[43] A. Sharma, M. Witbrock, and K. Goolsbey, "Controlling search in very large commonsense knowledge bases: a machine learning approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.04402*, 2016.

[44] S. Luitel, Y. Liu, and M. Anwar, "Investigating fairness in machine learning-based audio sentiment analysis," *AI and Ethics*, 3 2024.

[45] Z. Jin, R. Su, Y. Liu, and C. Duan, "A psychological evaluation method incorporating noisy label correction mechanism," *Soft Computing*, vol. 28, pp. 7395–7407, 1 2024.

[46] L. L. Guo, J. Fries, E. Steinberg, S. L. Fleming, K. Morse, C. Aftandilian, J. Posada, N. Shah, and L. Sung, "A multi-center study on the adaptability of a shared foundation model for electronic health records.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 171–, 6 2024.

[47] X. Zhao and A. Rios, "A marker-based neural network system for extracting social determinants of health.," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*, vol. 30, pp. 1398–1407, 4 2023.

[48] M. Karabacak, P. Jagtiani, A. Carrasquilla, A. Jain, I. M. Germano, and K. Margetis, "Simplifying synthesis of the expanding glioblastoma literature: a topic modeling approach.," *Journal of neuro-oncology*, vol. 169, pp. 601–611, 7 2024.

[49] B. Shickel and A. Bihorac, "The dawn of multimodal artificial intelligence in nephrology.," *Nature reviews. Nephrology*, vol. 20, pp. 79–80, 12 2023.

[50] Z. Liu, J. Wu, C. Y. H. Wu, and X. Xia, "Shifting sentiments: analyzing public reaction to covid-19 containment policies in wuhan and shanghai through weibo data," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 11, 8 2024.

[51] J. R. Machireddy, "Automation in healthcare claims processing: Enhancing efficiency and accuracy," *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, vol. 09, no. 01, pp. 825–834, 2023.

[52] C. Peng, X. Yang, A. Chen, K. E. Smith, N. PourNejatian, A. B. Costa, C. Martin, M. G. Flores, Y. Zhang, T. Magoc, G. Lipori, D. A. Mitchell, N. S. Ospina, M. M. Ahmed, W. R. Hogan, E. A. Shenkman, Y. Guo, J. Bian, and Y. Wu, "A study of generative large language model for medical research and healthcare.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 6, pp. 210–, 11 2023.

[53] Y. Lu, T. Gu, and R. Duan, "Enhancing genetic risk prediction through federated semi-supervised transfer learning with inaccurate electronic health record data," *Statistics in Biosciences*, 8 2024.

[54] S. Liu, A. B. McCoy, M. C. Aldrich, K. L. Sandler, T. J. Reese, B. Steitz, J. Bian, Y. Wu, E. Russo, and A. Wright, "Leveraging natural language processing to identify eligible lung cancer screening patients with the electronic health record.," *International journal of medical informatics*, vol. 177, pp. 105136–105136, 6 2023.

[55] H. Yu, L. Fan, L. Li, J. Zhou, Z. Ma, L. Xian, W. Hua, S. He, M. Jin, Y. Zhang, A. Gandhi, and X. Ma, "Large language models in biomedical and health informatics: A review with bibliometric analysis.," *Journal of healthcare informatics research*, vol. 8, pp. 658–711, 9 2024.

[56] E. Pozzi, D. A. Velasquez, A. A. Varnum, B. R. Kava, and R. Ramasamy, "Artificial intelligence modeling and priapism.," *Current urology reports*, vol. 25, pp. 261–265, 6 2024.

[57] D. Myers, R. Mohawesh, V. I. Chellaboina, A. L. Sathvik, P. Venkatesh, Y.-H. Ho, H. Henshaw, M. Alhawawreh, D. Berdik, and Y. Jararweh, "Foundation and large language models: fundamentals, challenges, opportunities, and social impacts," *Cluster Computing*, vol. 27, pp. 1–26, 11 2023.

[58] J. Torgersen, M. Skanderson, F. Kidwai-Khan, D. M. Carbonari, J. P. Tate, L. S. Park, D. Bhattacharya, J. K. Lim, T. H. Taddei, A. C. Justice, and V. L. Re, "Identification of hepatic steatosis among persons with and without hiv using natural language processing.," *Hepatology communications*, vol. 8, 6 2024.

[59] B. A. Naved and Y. Luo, "Contrasting rule and machine learning based digital self triage systems in the usa.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 381–, 12 2024.

[60] A. Sharma and K. Forbus, "Graph traversal methods for reasoning in large knowledge-based systems," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 27, pp. 1255–1261, 2013.

[61] I. Mainardi, "Change management: artificial intelligence (ai) at the service of public administrations," *AI & SOCIETY*, 12 2024.

[62] P. Adekkanattu, A. Furmanchuk, Y. Wu, A. Pathak, B. G. Patra, S. Bost, D. Morrow, G. H.-M. Wang, Y. Yang, N. J. Forrest, Y. Luo, T. L. Walunas, W. Lo-Ciganic, W. Gelad, J. Bian, Y. Bao, M. Weiner, D. Oslin, and J. Pathak, "Deep learning for identifying personal and family history of suicidal thoughts and behaviors from ehrs.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 260–, 9 2024.

[63] G. Gamage, D. D. Silva, N. Mills, D. Alahakoon, and M. Manic, "Emotion aware: an artificial intelligence framework for adaptable, robust, explainable, and multi-granular emotion analysis," *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 11, 7 2024.

[64] A. R. Sarkar, Y.-S. Chuang, N. Mohammed, and X. Jiang, "De-identification is not enough: a comparison between de-identified and synthetic clinical notes.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 14, pp. 29669–, 11 2024.

[65] A. K. Saxena, R. R. Dixit, and A. Aman-Ullah, "An lstm neural network approach to resource allocation in hospital management systems," *International Journal of Applied Health Care Analytics*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2022.

[66] W. P. Underwood, M. G. Michalski, C. P. Lee, G. A. Fickera, S. S. Chun, S. E. Eng, L. Y. Liu, B. L. Tsai, C. S. Moskowitz, J. A. Lavery, K. J. V. Zee, G. J. Gardner, J. J. Mueller, C. T. Dang, B. Ehdaie, V. P. Laudone, J. A. Eastham, J. M. Scott, P. C. Boutros, and L. W. Jones, "A digital, decentralized trial of exercise therapy in patients with cancer.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 304–, 10 2024.

[67] Y. Huang, J. Guo, W. T. Donahoo, Y. A. Lee, Z. Fan, Y. Lu, W.-H. Chen, H. Tang, L. Bilello, A. A. Saguil, E. Rosenberg, E. A. Shenkman, and J. Bian, "A fair individualized polysocial risk score for identifying increased social risk in type 2 diabetes.," *Nature communications*, vol. 15, pp. 8653–, 10 2024.

[68] A. Raghuram, A. Ssentongo, L. M. Pereira, Y. Kuang, J. Uyei, and P. Park, "2378. use of natural language processing to extract published real world data on a covid vaccine and antiviral treatment," *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*, vol. 10, 11 2023.

[69] W. F. Bond, J. Zhou, S. Bhat, Y. S. Park, R. A. Ebert-Allen, R. L. Ruger, and R. Yudkowsky, "Automated patient note grading: Examining scoring reliability and feasibility.," *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, vol. 98, pp. S90–S97, 8 2023.

[70] S. I. Abir, null Mohammad Hasan Sarwer, null Mahmud Hasan, null Nigar Sultana, null Md Shah Ali Dolon, null S M Shamsul Arefeen, null Abid Hasan Shimanto, null Rafi Muhammad Zakaria, null Sarder Abdulla Al Shiam, and null Tui Rani Saha, "Accelerating brics economic growth: Ai-driven data analytics for informed policy and decision making," *Journal of Economics, Finance and Accounting Studies*, vol. 6, pp. 102–115, 12 2024.

[71] S. S. Sahoo, J. M. Plasek, H. Xu, Özlem Uzuner, T. Cohen, M. Yetisgen, H. Liu, S. Meystre, and Y. Wang, "Large language models for biomedicine: foundations, opportunities, challenges, and best practices.," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*, vol. 31, pp. 2114–2124, 4 2024.

[72] A. Mitra, R. Pradhan, R. D. Melamed, K. Chen, D. C. Hoaglin, K. L. Tucker, J. I. Reisman, Z. Yang, W. Liu, J. Tsai, and H. Yu, "Associations between natural language processing-enriched social determinants of health and suicide death among us veterans.," *JAMA network open*, vol. 6, pp. e233079–e233079, 3 2023.

[73] C. Xiang and M. Abouelyazid, "The impact of generational cohorts and visit environment on telemedicine satisfaction: A novel investigation," 2020.

[74] J. Chen, X. Li, B. J. Aguilar, E. Shishova, P. J. Morin, D. Berlowitz, D. R. Miller, M. K. O'Connor, A. H. Nguyen, R. Zhang, A. A. T. Monfared, Q. Zhang, and W. Xia, "Development and validation of a natural language processing system that extracts cognitive test results from clinical notes," *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, vol. 19, 12 2023.

[75] O. F. Hunter, F. Perry, M. Salehi, H. Bandurski, A. Hubbard, C. G. Ball, and S. M. Hameed, "Science fiction or clinical reality: a review of the applications of artificial intelligence along the continuum of trauma care.," *World journal of emergency surgery : WJES*, vol. 18, pp. 16–, 3 2023.

[76] M. Khan, S. Banerjee, S. Muskawad, R. Maity, S. R. Chowdhury, R. Ejaz, E. Kuuzie, and T. Satnarine, "The impact of artificial intelligence on allergy diagnosis and treatment.," *Current allergy and asthma reports*, vol. 24, pp. 361–372, 7 2024.

[77] Q. Yin, L. Zhong, Y. Song, L. Bai, Z. Wang, C. Li, Y. Xu, and X. Yang, "A decision support system in precision medicine: contrastive multimodal learning for patient stratification," *Annals of Operations Research*, 8 2023.

[78] I. Li, A. Estafanous, M. D. Choudhury, M. Alvarez-Jimenez, and M. L. Birnbaum, "Social media and early psychosis intervention: A comprehensive review of the literature," *Current Treatment Options in Psychiatry*, vol. 11, pp. 52–66, 3 2024.

[79] S. Shah, G. Kadurugamuwa, A. H. Tisch, M. Lu, S. Modarresi, C. Johnston, and J. Colbert, "Real-world implementation of an ehr-integrated, sms text remote patient monitoring platform at an academic cancer center.," *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, vol. 42, pp. e13669–e13669, 6 2024.

[80] F. Tettey, S. K. Parupelli, and S. Desai, "A review of biomedical devices: Classification, regulatory guidelines, human factors, software as a medical device, and cybersecurity," *Biomedical Materials & Devices*, vol. 2, pp. 316–341, 8 2023.

[81] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. C. Tappert, "Context-aware query performance optimization for big data analytics in healthcare," in *2019 IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (HPEC-2019)*, pp. 1–7, 2019.

[82] B. Zhang, "Getting to know named entity recognition: Better information retrieval.," *Medical reference services quarterly*, vol. 43, pp. 196–202, 4 2024.

[83] G. Huang, Y. Li, S. Jameel, Y. Long, and G. Papanastasiou, "From explainable to interpretable deep learning for natural language processing in healthcare: How far from reality?," *Computational and structural biotechnology journal*, vol. 24, pp. 362–373, 5 2024.

[84] M. A. Sufian, W. Hamzi, T. Sharifi, S. Zaman, L. Alsadder, E. Lee, A. Hakim, and B. Hamzi, "Ai-driven thoracic x-ray diagnostics: Transformative transfer learning for clinical validation in pulmonary radiography.," *Journal of personalized medicine*, vol. 14, pp. 856–856, 8 2024.

[85] K. C. Brondeel, K. T. Malone, F. R. Ditmars, B. A. Vories, S. Ahmadzadeh, S. Tirumala, C. J. Fox, S. Shekoohi, E. M. Cornett, and A. D. Kaye, "Algorithms to identify nonmedical opioid use.," *Current pain and headache reports*, vol. 27, pp. 81–88, 4 2023.

[86] C. G. Walsh, D. Wilimitis, Q. Chen, A. Wright, J. Kolli, K. Robinson, M. A. Ripperger, K. B. Johnson, D. Carrell, R. J. Desai, A. Mosholder, S. Dharmarajan, S. Adimadhyam, D. Fabbri, D. Stojanovic, M. E. Matheny, and C. A. Bejan, "Scalable incident detection via natural language processing and probabilistic language models.," *Scientific reports*, vol. 14, pp. 23429–, 10 2024.

[87] T. Y. C. Tam, S. Sivarajkumar, S. Kapoor, A. V. Stolyar, K. Polanska, K. R. McCarthy, H. Osterhoudt, X. Wu, S. Visweswaran, S. Fu, P. Mathur, G. E. Cacciamani, C. Sun, Y. Peng, and Y. Wang, "A framework for human evaluation of large language models in healthcare derived from literature review.," *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 7, pp. 258–, 9 2024.

[88] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. C. Tappert, "Federated query processing for big data in data science," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pp. 6145–6147, IEEE, 2019.

[89] A. M. French and J. P. Shim, "From artificial intelligence to augmented intelligence: A shift in perspective, application, and conceptualization of ai," *Information Systems Frontiers*, 12 2024.

[90] D. C. Bikkasani, "Navigating artificial general intelligence (agi): societal implications, ethical considerations, and governance strategies," *AI and Ethics*, 12 2024.

[91] T. Watari, S. Takagi, K. Sakaguchi, Y. Nishizaki, T. Shimizu, Y. Yamamoto, and Y. Tokuda, "Performance comparison of chatgpt-4 and japanese medical residents in the general medicine in-training examination: Comparison study.," *JMIR medical education*, vol. 9, pp. e52202–e52202, 12 2023.

[92] J. Booker, J. Penn, K. Noor, R. J. B. Dobson, J. P. Funnell, C. H. Koh, D. Z. Khan, N. Newall, D. Rowland, S. Sinha, S. C. Williams, P. Sayal, and H. J. Marcus, "Early evaluation of a natural language processing tool to improve access to educational resources for surgical patients.," *European spine journal : official publication of the European Spine Society, the European Spinal Deformity Society, and the European Section of the Cervical Spine Research Society*, vol. 33, pp. 2545–2552, 5 2024.

[93] A. Abhishek and A. Basu, "A framework for disambiguation in ambiguous iconic environments," in *AI 2004: Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 17th Australian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Cairns, Australia, December 4-6, 2004. Proceedings 17*, pp. 1135–1140, Springer, 2005.