

Clinical Decision Support Systems: A Visual Survey

Kamran Farooq¹, Bisma S Khan², Muaz A Niazi^{2,*}, Stephen J Leslie³ and Amir Hussain¹

¹K. Farooq and A. Hussain are with Computing Science and Mathematics Division, University of Stirling, Scotland, UK (e-mail: kfa@cs.stir.ac.uk, ahu@cs.stir.ac.uk).

²B. S. Khan and M. A. Niazi are with the Department of Computer Science, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan (e-mail: bis.sarfraz@gmail.com, muaz.niazi@ieee.org).

³Raigmore Hospital, Inverness, Scotland, UK (e-mail: stephen.leslie@nhs.net).

*Corresponding author. E-mail: muaz.niazi@ieee.org

Abstract: Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) form an important area of research. In spite of its importance, it is difficult for researchers to evaluate the domain primarily because of a considerable spread of relevant literature in interdisciplinary domains. Previous surveys of CDSS have examined the domain from the perspective of individual disciplines. However, to the best of our knowledge, no visual scientometric survey of CDSS has previously been conducted which provides a broader spectrum of the domain with a horizon covering multiple disciplines. While traditional systematic literature surveys focus on analyzing literature using arbitrary results, visual surveys allow for the analysis of domains by using complex network-based analytical models. In this paper, we present a detailed visual survey of CDSS literature using important papers selected from highly cited sources in the Thomson Reuters web of science. We analyze the entire set of relevant literature indexed in the Web of Science database. Our key results include the discovery of the articles which have served as key turning points in literature. Additionally, we have identified highly cited authors and the key country of origin of top publications. We also present the Universities with the strongest citation bursts. Finally, our network analysis has also identified the key journals and subject categories both in terms of centrality and frequency. It is our belief that this paper will thus serve as an important role for researchers as well as clinical practitioners interested in identifying key literature and resources in the domain of clinical decision support.

Keywords Cardiovascular Decision Support Systems; CiteSpace; Clinical Decision Support System; Scientometrics

1. Introduction

The study of Clinical decision support systems (CDSS) constitutes a significant field of usage of information technology in healthcare. CDSS are designed to assist clinicians and other healthcare professionals in diagnosis as well as decision-making. CDSS uses healthcare data and a patient's medical history to make recommendations. By using a predefined set of rules, CDSS intelligently filters knowledge from complex data and presents at an appropriate time (Osheroff and Association 2006). By adopting CDSS, healthcare can become more accessible to large populations. However, it also implies that at times, CDSS may be used by people having literal medical knowledge (Ahn, Park et al. 2014).

Several researchers have contributed in the form of systematic literature reviews (SLR) and surveys to provide readers with insightful information about CDSS, as demonstrated below in Table 1.

Table 1. The existing literature review in the domain of clinical decision support systems

Author	Ref.	Study Period	Survey Type	Study Area	Papers Reviewed
Ali et al. (2016)	(Ali, Giordano et al. 2016)	2000-2014	Systematic Review	Randomised control trials of CDSS	38
Vaghela et al. (2015)	(Vaghela, Bhatt et al. 2015)	1987-2014	Survey	Classification techniques of CDSS	18
Son et al. (2015)	(Son, Jeong et al. 2015)	1979-2014	Visualisation	E-Health	3023
Njie et al. (2015)	(Njie, Proia et al. 2015)	1975-2012	Systematic Review	CDSS and prevention of cardiovascular	45

Madara (2015)	(Marasinghe 2015)	1950-2014	Systematic Review	diseases CDSSs to improve medication safety in long-term care homes	38
Martínez-Pérez et al. (2014)	(Martínez-Pérez, de la Torre-Díez et al. 2014)	2007-2013	Literature and Commercial Review	Mobile CDSS and applications	92
Loya et al. (2014)	(Loya, Kawamoto et al. 2014)	2004-2013	Systematic Review	Service oriented architecture for CDSS	44
Fatima et al. (2014)	(Fathima, Peiris et al. 2014)	2003-2013	Systematic Review	CDSSs in the care asthma and COPD patients	19
Diaby et al. (2013)	(Diaby, Campbell et al. 2013)	1960-2011	Bibliometric	MCDA in healthcare	2156
Kawamoto et al. (2005)	(Kawamoto, Houlihan et al. 2005)	1966-2003	Systematic Review	Features of CDSS important for improving clinical practices	70
Chuang et al. (2000)	(Chuang, Hripcsak et al. 2000)	1975-1998	Methodological Review	Clustering in CDSS	24

Despite the considerable variety of literature available, a key problem, researchers facing is the inability to understand the dynamics of CDSS-related literature. This is compounded due to the fact that this literature is spread across several related disciplines. Consequently, it is challenging to locate available information from a corpus of peer-reviewed articles. It is also difficult for researchers as well as clinical practitioners to comprehend the evolution of the research area.

SLR may easily get outdated, and may not meet specific requirements of a study, may not exist for new and emerging fields, and may be written for specific areas of interest. Whereas visual survey gives scientometric overview of the scientific literature, which provides a broader spectrum by embracing publications across multiple disciplines of the domain. Visual survey allows us to explore various trends and patterns in the bibliographic literature more efficiently and keeps our knowledge up to date.

In this paper, we present a visual survey of key literature from Web of Science (WoS) to provide a meaningful and valuable reference for further study in the field. We have used CiteSpace a key visually analytical tool for information visualization (Chen 2006). Although, CiteSpace has been used in a variety of disciplines, such as visual analysis of aggregation operator (Yu 2015), agent-based computing (Niazi and Hussain 2011), digital divide (Zhu, Yang et al. 2015), anticancer research (Xie 2015), tech mining (Madani 2015), and digital medicine (Fang 2015), etc. To the best of our knowledge, until now, there is no current review of recent literature on CDSS, which uses a scientometric analysis of networks formed from highly cited and important journal papers from the Web of Science (WoS).

The key contribution of this paper is the visual analysis of citations to give a scientometric overview of the diversity of the domain across its multiple sub-domains and the identification of core concepts. The ideas of visual analysis and survey stem from Cognitive Agent-based Computing framework [29] – a framework which allows for modeling and analysis of natural and artificial Complex Adaptive Systems.

In summary, the current paper identifies various important factors including the identification of the most important cluster in the cited references, visual analysis of the key authors, highly cited authors, key journals, core subject categories, countries of the origin of manuscripts, and the institutions. We hope that this work will assist researchers, academicians, and practitioners to learn about the key literature and developments in the CDSS domain.

The rest of CDSS survey is structured as: In Section II, we give a brief background of the CDSS. Next, in Section III, we present the methodology section including data collection and an overview of CiteSpace. This is followed by Section IV, containing results and discussion. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

2. Background

This section presents the necessary background of Decision Support System and CDSS.

2.1. Decision Support System (DSS)

The idea of DSS is very broad and different authors have defined it differently based on their research and roles DSS plays in the decision-making process (Druzdzel and Flynn 1999, Holsapple 2008). Some people regard DSS as a field of information management systems, whereas others consider it as an extension of management science systems (Keen 1980). Keen in his paper (Keen 1980) states that "there can be no definition of Decision Support Systems, only of Decision Support". Authors of (Finlay 1994) define it as "a computer-based system that aids the process of decision-making". Whereas the authors of (Turban 1990) define it as "an interactive, flexible, and adaptable computer-based information system, especially developed for supporting the solution of a non-structured management problem for improved decision-making. It utilises data, provides an easy-to-use interface, and allows for the decision maker's own insights." For further details, we encourage interested readers to see (Marakas , Ralph, Sprague et al. 1986, Silver 1991, Power 1997, Sauter 1997, Schroff 1998, Druzdzel and Flynn 1999, Power 2000, Power 2002).

2.1.1. History

The notion of DSS has evolved in the late *1950s*, from the theoretical studies of organisational decision-making and in the early *1960s* from technical work on interactive computer systems (Keen and Scott 1978). The idea of assisting decision-makers using computers was published in *1963*(Bonini 1963). Scot Morton is known as one of the first researcher's groups who coined the term DSS (Scott 1971). Research on DSS has gained momentum in *1974*, and by *1979* nearly *30* case studies in the domain of DSS have been published (Keen 1980). Almost *271* applications of DSS have been published during the time span of May *1988* to *1994*(Eom, Lee et al. 1998).

2.1.2. Architecture

Again, the architecture of DSS varies because different researchers have identified different components in DSS, e.g. (Sprague Jr and Carlson 1982, Haettenschwiler 2001, Power 2002). However, (Marakas) identifies five fundamental components of a generic DSS architecture: i) the user, ii) the data management system, iii) the knowledge engine, iv) the model management system, and v) the user interface.

2.1.3. Classification

Once again, there is no universal classification of DSS; different researchers have proposed a different classification. Based on user criterion, authors classify as passive DSS, active DSS, and cooperative DSS (Haettenschwiler 2001). Whereas, based on the conceptual criterion, authors classify as data-driven, knowledge-driven, communication driven, model-driven DSS, and document-driven (Power 2002).

2.1.4. Applications

DSS applications are adopted in several areas, such as business management (Bose and Sugumaran 1999), finance management (Zopounidis, Doumpos et al. 1997), forest management (Mendoza, Sprouse et al. 1991), medical diagnosis (Alickovic and Subasi 2016), wastemanagement (Bertanza, Baroni et al. 2016, Inglezakis, Ambăruş et al. 2016), oral anticoagulation management (Fitzmaurice, Hobbs et al. 1998), ship routing (Dong, Frangopol et al. 2016), ecosystem management (Rauscher 1999), value-based management (Hahn and Kuhn 2012), World Wide Web (Chen, Hong et al. 1999), diagnosis and grading of brain tumour(Tate, Underwood et al. 2006), and so on.

We intend to provide insight to CDSS researchers and practitioners about historical trends, current developments, and future directions of the CDSS domain.

2.2. Clinical Decision Support System

Since the beginning of computers, physicians and other healthcare professionals have expected

the time when machines would aid them in the clinical decision-making and other restorative procedures. “CDSS provides clinicians, patients or individuals with knowledge and person-specific or population information, intelligently filtered or presented at appropriate times, to foster better health processes, better individual patient care, and better population health” (Osheroff and Association 2006). Ba and Wang use social network analysis in the domain of health-related online social networks (Ba and Wang 2013)

2.2.1. History

In the late 1950s, the very first articles regarding this provision appeared and within a few years, experimental prototypes were made available (Ledley and Lusted 1959). In 1970, three advisory systems have provided a useful overview of the origin of the work on CDSS: MYCIN system by Shortliffe for the selection of antibiotic therapy (Clancey, Shortliffe et al. 1979), a system by deDombal for the diagnosis of abdominal pain (Nugent, Warner et al. 1964, Clancey, Shortliffe et al. 1979), and a system called HELP for generating inpatient medical alerts (Warner 1979, Kuperman, Gardner et al. 2013).

2.2.2. Types

There exist two main types of CDSS. The first one is derived from expert systems and uses knowledge base. The knowledge base depends on inference engine to implement the rules, such as if-then-else on the patient data and presents the findings to end-users [2]. The second type of CDSS is based on the non-knowledge based systems, which depends on machine learning techniques for the analysis of clinical based data (Alther and Reddy 2015). The architectural parts in the conventional structures of CDSS consist of; user, knowledge base, inference engine and user interface (Bonney 2011).

2.2.3. Benefits

The key benefits of CDSS reported in the studies conducted in (Ivbijaro, Kolkiewicz et al. 2008, Haynes and Wilczynski 2010, Kawamoto, Del Fiol et al. 2010, Wright, Sittig et al. 2011, Musen, Middleton et al. 2014) are as follows:

1. Higher standards of patient safety: CDSSs have helped healthcare organisations all over the world acquiring higher standards of patient safety by adopting standardised clinical procedures governed by the clinical workflows encoded through these systems. Thus reducing diagnostic and prescribing errors and drug doubling issues.
2. Improving the quality of direct patient care: Their research also concluded that with the advent of CDSS, quality of care has improved to considerable levels with this extra support provided to clinicians (who are already struggling to cope with current healthcare demands). This has made it possible for clinical experts to allocate more time in providing direct patient care.
3. Standardisation and conformance of care using clinical practice guidelines: The standardisation of clinical pathways and procedures set precedents and evaluation benchmarks for healthcare trusts to achieve higher patient satisfaction levels set out by different healthcare organisations in different regions. CDSS also promote the utilisation of clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) for the development of knowledge-aware systems capable of performing effective clinical decision-making to promote standardised care.
4. Collaborative decision-making: CDSS have helped healthcare stakeholders that include clinicians, healthcare trusts and policy makers to develop safe and efficient care models using a collaborative decision-making approach to benefit both patient and a clinician. CDSS have also helped healthcare trusts to improve effectiveness in the prescribing facility through cost-effective drug order dispensation (Wright, Sittig et al. 2011). CDSS are also playing an important role in the integration of EHRs, which will help healthcare authorities to streamline information collection and clinical diagnosis operations in order to promote efficient data gathering (Ivbijaro, Kolkiewicz et al. 2008). The audit trail is another important aspect of modern healthcare systems which is achieved through the intelligent exploitation of clinical decision support capabilities.

2.2.4. Existing Reviews

Many reviews have identified the benefits of the CDSSs, in particular, Computerized Physician Order Entry systems (Hunt, Haynes et al. 1998, Eslami, de Keizer et al. 2008, Zuccotti, Maloney et al. 2014). The CDSS as part of the Computerized Physician Order Entry has been found to alleviate adverse drug events and medication errors (Jaspers, Smeulers et al. 2011, Steinman, Handler et al. 2011, Bright, Wong et al. 2012). CDSSs also have demonstrated to improve clinician performance, by way of promoting the electronic prescription of drugs, adherence to guidelines and to an extent the efficient use of time (Jaspers, Smeulers et al. 2011, Bright, Wong et al. 2012). CDSSs perform a key role in providing primary care and preventative measures at outpatient clinics, e.g. by alerting caregivers of the need for routine blood pressure checking, to recommend cervical screening, and to offer influenza vaccination (Hunt, Haynes et al. 1998, Ahmadian, van Engen-Verheul et al. 2011).

To provide effective healthcare delivery to patients, CDSS is used both in primary and secondary care units. In order to take maximum advantage from cardiovascular CDSS, it is required to ensure clinical governance in the next-generation clinical systems by considering a strong foundation in well-established clinical practice guidelines and evidence based medicine (Farooq and Hussain 2016).

2.2.5. CDSS Adoption

The adoption of CDSSs in diagnosis and management of chronic diseases, such as diabetes (O'Connor, Sperl-Hillen et al. 2011), cancer (Clauser, Wagner et al. 2011), dementia (Lindgren 2011), heart disease (DeBusk, Houston-Miller et al. 2010), and hypertension (Luitjes, Wouters et al. 2010) have played significant clinical roles in the main health care organisations in the improvement of clinical outcomes of the organisations worldwide at primary and secondary care. These CDSS also provide the foundation to system developer and knowledge expert to collate and build domain expert knowledge for screening by clinicians and clinical risk assessment (Khong and Ren 2011, Wright, Sittig et al. 2011).

An alternate approach to computer-assisted decision support was provided in the MYCIN development program, a clinical consultation system that de-emphasised diagnosis to concentrate on the appropriate management of patients who have infections (Shortliffe 1986).

2.2.6. Applications

CDSSs are considered as an important part in the modern units of healthcare organisations. They facilitate the patients, clinicians and healthcare stakeholders by providing patient-centric information and expert clinical knowledge (Classen, Phansalkar et al. 2011). To improve the efficiency and quality of healthcare, the clinical decision-making uses knowledge obtained from these smart clinical systems. The Automated DSSs of Cardiovascular are available in primary health care units and hospital in order to fulfil the ever-increasing clinical requirements of prognosis in the domain of coronary and cardiovascular diseases. The computer-based decision support strategies have already been implemented in various fields of cardiovascular care (Kuperman, Bobb et al. 2007). In the US and the UK, these applications are considered as the fundamental components of the clinical informatics infrastructures.

Ontology-driven DSS are being used widely in the clinical risk assessment of chronic diseases. The ontology-driven clinical decision support (CDS) framework for handling comorbidities in (Abidi, Cox et al. 2012) presented remarkable results in the disease management and risk assessment of breast cancer patients, which was deployed as a CDSS handling comorbidities in the healthcare setting for primary care clinicians in the Canada. They utilised semantic web techniques to model the clinical practice guidelines which were encoded in the form of a set of rules (through a domain-specific ontology) utilised by CDSSs for generating patient-specific recommendations.

Matt-MouleyBoumrane from the "University of Glasgow, 'UK" implemented an ontology-driven approach to the development of CDSS in the pre-operative risk assessment domain. In (Bouamrane, Rector et al. 2009), they reported their work by combining a preventative care software system in the pre-operative risk assessment domain with a decision support ontology developed with a logic based knowledge representation formalism. In (Farooq, Hussain et al. 2011, Farooq, Hussain et al. 2012, Farooq, Hussain et al. 2012), authors demonstrated utilisation of ontology and machine learning inspired techniques for the development of a hybrid CDS framework for cardiovascular preventative

care. Their proposed CDS framework could be utilised for automatically conducting patient pre-visit interviews. Rather than replacing human experts, it would be used to prepare the patients before visiting a hospital, deliver educational materials, preorder appropriate tests, cardiac risk assessment scores, heart disease and cardiac chest pain scores. It would make better use of both patient and clinician time.

The ontology-driven recommendation and clinical risk assessment system could be used as a triage system in the cardiovascular preventative care which could help clinicians prioritize patient appointments after reviewing snapshot of patient’s medical history (collected through an ontology-driven intelligent context-aware information collection using standardised clinical questionnaires) containing patient demographics information, cardiac risk scores, cardiac chest pain and heart disease risk scores, recommended lab tests and medication details. In (Farooq and Hussain 2016), they also have validated the proposed novel ontology and machine learning driven hybrid CDS framework in other application areas.

3. Methodology

In Figure 1, we illustrate the proposed methodology for the visual analysis of bibliographic literature in the domain of CDSS to uncover emerging patterns and trends.




Figure 1. The proposed methodology (adapted from [2, 3]) for the visual analysis of clinical decision support system for the discovery of emerging patterns and trends in the bibliographic data of the domain.

3.1. Data Collection

The input dataset was collected from the Thomson Reuters Web of Science (Reuters 2008) between the timespan of 2005 to 2016. Data was retrieved on 11 Nov 2016, by an extended topic search for CDSSs including the web of science. The databases searched included SCI-Expanded, SSCI, and A&HCI. The search was confined to document types including articles, reviews, letters, and editorial material published in the English language. Each data record includes information as titles, authors, abstracts, and references. The input dataset contains a total of 1,945 records.

It is pertinent to note here that there is a problem in data collected from Web of Science. The WoS data identified two cited-authors named as “Anonymous” and “Institute of Medicine.” In terms of frequency, Anonymous is the landmark node. However, on searching online it is found that WoS has picked it based on terms. Whereas on an extensive search on the internet, we found multiple papers having “Institute of Medicine” as an author.

3.2. CiteSpace: An Overview

In this research, we have used CiteSpace a key visually analytical tool for information visualisation(Chen 2006). CiteSpace is custom designed for visual analysis of citations. It uses colour coding to capture some details, which otherwise cannot be captured easily by using any other tool. In CiteSpace users can specify the years’ range and the length of the time slice interval to build various networks. CiteSpace is based on network analysis and visualisation. It enables interactive visual analysis of a knowledge domain in different ways. By selecting display of visual attributes and

different parameters, a network can be viewed in a variety of ways. CiteSpace has been used to analyse diverse domain areas such as agent-based computing (Niazi and Hussain 2011), cloud computing (Wu and Chen 2012), cross-language information retrieval (Rongying and Rui 2011), and clinical evidence (Chen and Chen 2005).

One of the key features of CiteSpace is the calculation of betweenness centrality (Chen 2006). The betweenness centrality score can be a useful indicator of showing how different clusters are connected (Chen 2016). In CiteSpace, the range of betweenness centrality scores is [0, 1]. Nodes which have high betweenness centrality are emphasised with purple trims. The thickness of the purple trims represents the strength of the betweenness centrality. The thicker the purple trim, the higher the betweenness centrality. A pink ring around the node indicates centrality ≥ 0.1 .

Burst identifies emergent interest in a domain exhibited by the surge of citations (Niazi and Hussain 2011). Citation bursts indicate the most active area of the research (Chen 2016). Burst nodes appear as a red circle around the node.

3.2.1. Colours Used

CiteSpace is designed for visualisation; it extensively relies on colours, therefore the description in this paper is based on colours.

The colours of the co-citation links personify the time slice of the study period of the first appearance of the co-citation link. Table 2 demonstrates CiteSpace's use of colour to visualise time slices. Blue colour is for earliest years, the green colour is for the middle years, and orange and red colours are for the most recent years. A darker shade of the same colour corresponds to earlier time-slice, whereas lighter shades correspond to the later time slice.

Table 2. Cite Space's use of colours to visualise links, and time slices.

Link colours	Corresponding Time Slice
Blue	Earliest years
Green	Middle years
Orange and Redish	Most recent years
Darker shade of the same colour	Earliest time-slice
Lighter shade of the same colour	Later time-slice

3.2.2. Node Types

The importance of a node can be identified easily by analysing the topological layout of the network. Three most common nodes, which are helpful in the identification of potentially important manuscripts are i) hub node, ii) landmark node, and iii) pivot node (Chen 2006).

Landmark nodes are the largest and most highly cited nodes. In CiteSpace, they are represented by concentric circles with largest radii. The concentric citation tree rings identify the citation history of an author. The colour of the citation ring represents citations in a single time slice. The thickness of a ring represents the number of citations in a particular time slice.

Hub nodes are the nodes with a large degree of co-citations. Pivot nodes are links between different clusters in the networks from different time intervals. They are either gateway nodes or shared by two networks. Whereas turning points refer to the articles which domain experts have already identified as revolutionary articles in the domain. It is a node which connects different clusters by same coloured links.

4. Results and Discussion

This section briefly demonstrates results of our analysis.

4.1. Identification of the Largest Clusters in Document Co-Citation Network

To identify the most important areas of research, here we used cluster analysis. CiteSpace is used to form the clusters. It uses time slice to analyse the clusters. The merged network of cited references is partitioned into some major clusters of articles. In Figure 2, years from 2005 to 2016 show up as yearly slices represented by unique colours. We have selected top 50 cited references per one-year time slice. The links between the nodes also represent the particular time slices. In (Chen 2006)

authors noted clusters with same colours are indicative of co-citations in any given time slice. The cluster labels start from 0; the largest cluster is labelled as (#0), the second largest is labelled as (#1), and so on. The largest cluster is the indicator of the major area of research.

It can also be noticed in the Fig. 2 that the articles of David W. Bates (1999) and Thomas D. Stamos (2001) are the intellectual turning points, which join two linked clusters: (cluster #4) “combination” and (cluster #12) “family practice” respectively. Similarly, articles of Heleen Van DerSijis (2008) and Blackford Middleton (2013) are the intellectual turning points, which join two linked clusters: (cluster #2) “decision support” and (cluster #16) “computerised prescriber order entry” respectively. After a gap of five years, Middleton B has cited a paper of Van DerSijis H, which drew the interest of many researchers in the field of “decision support”.

It is interesting to note that the half-life of the article of Bates DW is 7 years and the half-life of the article of Thomas D. Stamos is 4 years. Whereas the half-life of Van Der Sijis H’s article is 5 years and the half-life of Middleton B’s paper is 3 years.

In Table 3, details of top five co-cited references are given in terms of high frequency. By observing this table, we observed that the top five articles have low centrality, but are still significant by having more frequency.

The article by Amit X. Garg (2005) has the highest frequency of citations among all the cited references. Following it are the articles of Kensaku Kawamoto and Gilad J. Kuperman published in 2005 and 2007 respectively. The articles of Van DerSijis H and Basit Chaudhry are also included in the top five articles of this domain.




Figure 2. A merged network of cited references with 611 nodes and 1958 links on our CDSS dataset (2005-2016) based on 1-year time slices. The largest component of connected clusters divided into 13 smaller clusters. The largest cluster (Niazi 2011) is “computerised decision support” and the smallest is “computerised prescriber order entry.” The diameter of the circle corresponds to the frequency of the node. Whereas red circle indicates high citation burst of the article. The article of Garg AX has the highest frequency and highest citation burst among other articles of the domain.

Table 3 demonstrates documents in terms of frequency. It is also interesting to note that the article by Amit X. Garg (2005) is the landmark node with the largest radii. Amit X. Garg’s article also has highest citation burst of 20.71, which indicates that it has attracted huge attention from the research community. It has 223 citations 6-year half-life, whereas it has 2357 citations on Google Scholar. Following it is the article of Kensaku Kawamoto (2005) with 15.46 citation burst, 151 citations, and half-life of 6 years. It has 1684 citations on Google Scholar. Next is the article by Kuperman GJ (2007) with 3.48 citation burst, 135 citation frequency, and a half-life of 5 years. It has 547 citations on Google Scholar. It is closely followed by the Van DerSijis H (2007) with a citation burst of 15.09, citation frequency 116, and half-life of 5 years. It has 690 citations on Google Scholar. The article

byBasit Chaudhry (2006) has lowest citation burst of 2.99 among top five articles of the domain. It has a citation frequency of 112 and half-life of 6 years. It has 2491 citations on Google Scholar.

Table 3. The summary table of cited references sorted in terms of Frequency includes frequency (F), citation burst (CB), author (AU), publication year (PY), journal (J), Volume (V), page no. (PP), half-life (HL), cluster ID (CL), and Google Scholar Citations (GSC) of the top 5 most cited references.

F	CB	AU	PY	J	V	PP	HL	CL	GSC
223	20.71	Garg AX	2005	JAMA-J AM MED ASSOC	V293	P1223	6	3	2357
151	15.46	Kawamoto K	2005	BRIT MED J	V330	P765	6	3	1684
135	3.48	Kuperman GJ	2007	J AM MED INFORM ASSN	V14	P29	5	2	547
116	15.09	Van der Sijs H	2006	J AM MED INFORM ASSN	V13	P138	6	2	690
112	2.99	Chaudhry B	2006	ANN INTERN MED	V144	P742	5	1	2491

Table 4 contains cited documents in terms of betweenness centrality. The article by Basit Chaudhry (2006) is the most influential document with the highest centrality score of 0.43. Half-life of this article is 5 years and it has 2491 citations on Google Scholar. Following it is the article by Ross Koppel (2005) with 0.24 centrality, and half-life of 5 years. It has 1995 citations on Google Scholar. Next is the article by Amit X. Garg (2005) with 0.18 betweenness centrality and a half-life of 6 years. It has 2357 citations on Google Scholar. It is closely followed by Jerome A. Osheroff (2007) with betweenness centrality of 0.16 and half-life of 5 years. It has 357 citations on Google Scholar. Finally, we have article by Gilad J. Kuperman (2007) with lowest betweenness centrality of 0.14 among top five articles of the domain. It has a half-life of 5 years. It has 547 citations on Google Scholar.

Table 4. The summary table of cited documents sorted in terms of Centrality includes betweenness centrality (BC), author (AU), publication year (PY), journal (J), Volume (V), page no. (PP), half-life (HL), cluster ID (CL), and Google Scholar Citations (GSC) of the top 5 most cited references.

BC	AU	PY	J	V	PP	HL	CL	GSC
0.43	Chaudhry B	2006	ANN INTERN MED	V144	P742	5	4	2491
0.24	Koppel R	2005	JAMA-J AM MED ASSOC	V293	P1197	5	0	1995
0.18	Garg AX	2005	JAMA-J AM MED ASSOC	V293	P1223	6	4	2357
0.16	Osheroff JA	2007	J AM MED INFORM ASSN	V14	P141	5	4	357
0.14	Kuperman GJ	2007	J AM MED INFORM ASSN	V14	P29	5	1	547

The merged network contains a total of 611 cited references and 1,958 co-citation links. The largest cluster, i.e. (#0) of the network is disconnected from the largest component of the network. In this analysis, we will consider only largest component.

The largest component of connected clusters contains 442 nodes, which is 72% of the network. The largest component is further divided into 13 smaller clusters of different sizes. Table 5 illustrates the details of these clusters.

Cluster #1 (largest cluster) contains 65 nodes, which are 10.628% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2007. The mean silhouette score of 0.737 indicates relatively high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #2 contains 57 nodes, which are 9.328% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2009. The mean silhouette score of 0.7 indicates relatively high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #3 contains 56 nodes, which are 9.165% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2008. The mean silhouette score of 0.722 indicates relatively high homogeneity in the cluster. It is interesting to note that cluster #3 (“AIDS”) contains several articles with strongest citation burst, which indicates it is an active or emerging area of research.

Cluster #4 contains 52 nodes, which are 8.51% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2001. The mean silhouette score of 0.791 indicates average homogeneity in the cluster. It is interesting to note that most of the highly influential articles

are the members of cluster #4.

Cluster #5 contains 49 nodes, which are 8.01% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2003. The mean silhouette score of 0.772 indicates relatively high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #6 contains 45 nodes, which are 7.364% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2012. The mean silhouette score of 0.955 indicates very high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #7 contains 40 nodes, which are 6.546% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2002. The mean silhouette score of 0.73 indicates relatively high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #8 contains 19 nodes, which are 3.10% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2003. The mean silhouette score of 0.854 indicates high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #8 contains 19 nodes, which are 3.10% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2003. The mean silhouette score of 0.854 indicates high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #9 contains 18 nodes, which are 2.945% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2004. The mean silhouette score of 0.976 indicates very high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #10 contains 13 nodes, which are 2.127% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2011. The mean silhouette score of 0.976 indicates very high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #11 contains 12 nodes, which are 1.963% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2002. The mean silhouette score of 0.944 indicates very high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #12 contains 11 nodes, which are 1.800% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 1999. The mean silhouette score of 0.979 indicates very high homogeneity in the cluster.

Cluster #16 (smallest cluster) contains 5 nodes, which are 0.818% of whole nodes in the network. The average publication year of the literature in this cluster is 2010. The mean silhouette score of 0.955 indicates very high homogeneity in the cluster.

Table 5. The summary table of Largest clusters of the co-cited authors. It contains the ID of the cluster, the size of the cluster, the average publication year of the literature in the cluster, and title terms of the clusters. The merged network contains 611 nodes and 1958 connections.

Cluster ID	Size	Silhouette	Mean (Year)	Label (Log-Likelihood Ratio)	Terms (Mutual Information)
1	65 (10.638%)	0.737	2007	Impact; Adverse Drug Event; Physician Order Entry;	Computerized Decision Support
2	57 (9.328%)	0.7	2009	Alert; Ambulatory Care; Safety Alert;	Drug Administration
3	56 (9.165%)	0.722	2008	Patient Outcome; Management; Guideline;	Aid
4	52 (8.51%)	0.791	2001	Decision Support System; Primary Care; Expert System;	Combination
5	49 (8.01%)	0.772	2003	Adverse Drug Event; Medication Error; Prevention;	Chronic Illness
6	45 (7.364%)	0.955	2012	Personalized Medicine; Pharmacogenomics; Computed Tomography;	ACR Appropriateness Criteria
7	40 (6.546%)	0.73	2002	Prevention; Intervention; Adverse Drug Event;	Acute Kidney Failure
8	19 (3.10%)	0.854	2003	Emergency Medicine; ASHP; Systems Analysis;	Intra Cluster Correlation Coefficient
9	18 (2.945%)	0.976	2004	Personal Digital Assistant; Resource; PDA;	Consultation

10	13 (2.127%)	0.976	2011	Medication Alert System; Interview; Observational Study;	Surgery
11	12 (1.963%)	0.944	2002	Guideline Implementation; Adverse Event; Clinical Practice Guideline;	Factor-V-Leiden
12	11 (1.800%)	0.979	1999	Statin; Cholesterol Reduction; Treatment Panel III;	Family Practice
16	5 (0.818%)	0.995	2010	Smoking Cessation; Control Intervention; Usability;	Computerized Prescriber Order Entry

After an overview of the identification of clusters in the cited reference network, next, we move to the analysis of the journals.

4.2. Analysis of Journals

In this section, we visualise cited journals. Out of 1,945 records in the dataset, the 60 most cited journals were selected per one-year slice to build the network.

The pink rings around the nodes depicted in Figure 3 **Error! Reference source not found.** indicate that there are five nodes in the network with centrality >0.1 . “Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association” has the largest number of highly cited publications. The second largest number of publications is associated with the “The Journal of the American Medical Association.” “Proceedings of the AMIA Symposium” (2005) has the strongest citation burst among authors from the period of 2005.

Table 6 gives details of the top 5 key journals based on centrality. “The Journal of the American Medical Association” has the highest centrality score of 0.14 among all the other journals. It has 37.684 impact factor. In addition, it could be seen that in terms of centrality, the “Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association,” the “International Journal of Medical Informatics,” “The American Journal of Medicine” and the “Artificial Intelligence in Medicine” are also some of the productive journals of this domain with a centrality score of 0.13 and impact factor of 3.428, 2.363, 5.610, and 2.142 respectively.

Table 6. In terms of centrality, the five most productive journals in the bibliographic literature of the CDSS domain. Jama-j AM MED ASSOC is the most central journal with centrality score 0.14, whereas ArtifIntell Med is the least central journal with centrality score 0.13.

Centrality	Title	Abbreviated Title	Impact Factor
0.14	The Journal of the American Medical Association	Jama-j AM MED ASSOC	37.684
0.13	Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	J AM MED INFORM ASSN	3.428
0.13	International Journal of Medical Informatics	Int J MED INFORM	2.363
0.13	The American Journal of Medicine	Am J MED	5.610
0.13	Artificial Intelligence in Medicine (AIIM)	Artif INTELL MED	2.142




Figure 3. Journals' network in terms of centrality. Concentric citation tree rings indicate the citation history of the publications of a journal. The colours of the circles in the tree ring represent citations in a corresponding year. The red rings indicate the citation burst of the publication. The colours of the links correspond to the time slice. The pink rings around the node indicate the centrality ≥ 0.1 . The "J AM MED INFORM ASSN" is the highly cited journal, whereas the "Jama-j AM MED ASSOC" is the most central Journal of the domain

Table 7 gives details of the top 5 key journals based on their frequency of publications. It is interesting to note that the table organised in terms of frequency of publication gives a somewhat different set of key journals. The "Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association" is at the top with a frequency of 1169 publications and 3.428 impact factor. This is followed by "The Journal of the American Medical Association", "The New England Journal of Medicine," "The Archives of Internal Medicine", and the "Annals of Internal Medicine Journal" with frequencies 1961, 819, 687, and 655 and impact factor 37.684, 59.558, 17.333, and 16.593 respectively.

Table 7. The five most productive journals in the bibliographic literature of the CDSS domain based on frequency. J AM MED INFORM ASSN is the most cited journal with frequency 1169, whereas Ann INTERN MED is the least cited journal with frequency 655.

Frequency	Title	Abbreviated Title	Impact Factor (2016)
1169	Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association (JAMIA)	J AM MED INFORM ASSN	3.428
1096	The Journal of the American Medical Association	Jama-j AM MED ASSOC	37.684
819	The New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM)	New ENGL J MED	59.558
687	Archives of Internal Medicine	Arch INTERN MED	17.333
655	Annals of Internal Medicine Journal	Ann INTERN MED	16.593

After a visual analysis of the journals, in the next section, we will analyse the authors' network.

4.3. Analysis of Co-Authors

This section analyses the author collaborative network. Figure 4 displays the visualisation of the core authors of the domain. The merged network contains 346 authors and 719 co-citation links. As shown in Fig. 4, burst nodes appear as a red circle around the node. The citation burst in authors network specifies the authors who have rapidly grown the number of publications.




Figure 4. Co-authors network visualisation. The merged network contains 346 nodes and 719 links. Top 20% nodes are selected per slice (of length 3). Burst nodes appear as a red circle around the node. Concentric citation tree rings indicate the citation history of the publications of an author. David BW is the highly cited node with the frequency of 59, whereas Payne TH is the most central node with a centrality score of 0.08. Gurwitz JH and Field TS have longest citation burst periods.

As shown in Figure 5, in terms of frequency, David BW is the landmark node with largest radii of the citation ring. Payne TH is the most central author of this domain.

Visualisation in Figure 5 illustrates the authors who have the strongest citation bursts and years in which it took place. It can be seen that Ali S. Raja (2014) from "Harvard Medical School, USA" has the strongest burst among the top 5 authors since 2005. Ivan K. Ip (2005) from "Harvard Medical School, USA" has the second strongest burst, which took place in the period of 2013 to 2016. Following him are Terry S. Field (2005) from Meyers Primary Care Institute, Ramin Khorasani (2014) from "Brigham and Women's Hospital", and Jerry H. Gurwitz (2005) from "Meyers Primary Care Institute, USA."

Authors	Year	Strength	Begin	End	2005 - 2016
Raja AS	2005	5.2538	2014	2016	-----
Ip IK	2005	4.4697	2013	2016	-----
Field TS	2005	4.4586	2005	2009	-----
Khorasani R	2005	4.3956	2014	2016	-----
Gurwitz JH	2005	4.0089	2005	2009	-----

Figure 5. The top 5 Co-authors associated with strongest citation bursts. The history of the burstness of authors includes names of the authors, publication year, burst strength, starting and ending year of the citation burst. "Raja AS" has strongest citation burst among all other authors. "Field TS" and "Gurwitz JH" have the longest burst period.

Even though this visualisation gives a general picture of the several authors, Table 8 also illustrates a comprehensive analysis of authors' network. Here we can notice that highly cited author in the network is David Bates with 59 citations. David Bates is a Prof. of Medicine at "Harvard Medical School, USA." His areas of interest are medication safety, patient safety, quality, medical informatics, and clinical decision support. Next is Adam Wright, an Assoc. Prof. of Medicine, "Harvard Medical School, USA" and "Brigham and Women's Hospital, USA". His areas of interest are health information technology, medical informatics, biomedical informatics, clinical information systems, and CDS. Dean F. Sittig is the Christopher Sarofim Family Prof. of Bioengineering, "Biomedical Informatics, and UTHealth, USA." CDS, electronic health records, medical informatics, and biomedical informatics are his areas of interest. Next is Blackford Middleton, an Instructor, "Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, USA". His areas of interest include personal health record, clinical informatics, CDs, knowledge management, and electronic medical record. Finally, we have Ramin Khorasani, MD, PhD, "Brigham and Women's Hospital, USA."

Table 8. The top 5 Authors in terms of the frequency. David Bates is the most cited author with 395 citations.

Frequency	Author	Abbreviations
395	David Bates	BATES DW
296	Amit X. Garg	GARG AX
255	Kensaku Kawamoto	KAWAMOTO K
180	Rainu Kaushal	KAUSHAL R
173	Gilad J. Kuperman	KUPERMAN GJ

For additional relative analysis, we have observed the top-cited authors based on centrality, as depicted in Table 9. Thomas Payne a Prof. of Medicine, "University of Washington, USA." His areas of interest are clinical informatics and clinical computing. Richard D Boyce, Asst. Prof. of "Biomedical Informatics, University of Pittsburgh, USA". His areas of interest are Pharmacoepidemiology, medication safety, knowledge representation, comparative effectiveness research, and semantic web. Next is Robert R Freimuth, "Mayo Clinic, USA." His areas of interest include genomics CDS, personalised medicine, genetic variation, data integration, Pharmacogenomics, data integration and interoperable infrastructure. Matthias Samwald, "Medical University of Vienna, Austria." His interest is in biomedical informatics.

Table 9. The top 5 Co-Authors in terms of centrality. Payne TH is the most central author with a centrality score 0.08, whereas the rest of the authors have the same centrality score 0.07.

Centrality	Author	Abbreviations	Year
0.08	Thomas Payne	Payne TH	2008
0.07	David Bates	Bates DW	2005
0.07	Richard D Boyce	Boyce RD	2014
0.07	Robert R Freimuth	Freimuth RR	2014
0.07	Matthias Samwald	Samwald M	2014

After analysing authors' network, in the next section, we have visualised the cited authors' network.

4.4. Analysis of Cited-Authors

This section analyses the authors' co-citation network. Figure 6 displays the visualisation of the cited authors of this domain. The merged network contains 211 cited authors and 656 links. Burst nodes appear as a red circle around the node; the citation burst in cited-authors network specifies the authors who have rapidly grown the number of citations. In terms of frequency, David BW is the landmark node with largest radii of the citation ring. The pink ring around David BW indicates that it is also the most central author of this domain.




Figure 6. Cited-authors network visualisation. The merged network contains 211 nodes and 656 links. Burst nodes appear as a red circle around the node. Concentric citation tree rings indicate the citation history of the publications of an author. The pink rings around the node indicate the centrality score ≥ 0.1 . Bates DW is the landmark with largest radii and is also the hub node with the highest degree.

Even though this visualisation gives a general picture of the several authors, Table 10 also illustrates a comprehensive analysis of authors' network. Here we can notice that highly cited author in the network is David Bates with 460 citations. Next is Amit X. Garg, a Prof. of Medicine (Nephrology), Biostatistics & Epidemiology, "Western University, Canada". His areas of interest are kidney diseases, kidney donation, and clinical research. Following him is Kensaku Kawamoto, an Asst. Prof. of Biomedical Informatics and Assoc. CMIO in the "University of Utah, USA". Knowledge management, CDS, and standards and interoperability are his areas of interest. Next is Rainu Kaushal, "Departments of Medicine, Quality Improvement, Risk Management, and Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA". Finally, we have Gilad J. Kuperman, an Adjunct Assoc. Prof. of Biomedical Informatics, "Columbia University Clinical Informatics, USA".

Table 10. The Top 5 Cited-Authors in terms of the frequency. David Bates is the most cited author with 460 citations, whereas Kuperman GJ is the least cited author with 198 citations.

Frequency	Author	Abbreviations	Year
460	David Bates	Bates DW	2005
338	Amit X. Garg	Garg AX	2005

280	Kensaku Kawamoto	Kawamoto K	2005
207	Rainu Kaushal	Kaushal R	2005
198	Gilad J. Kuperman	Kuperman GJ	2005

For additional comparative analysis, we have observed the top-cited authors in terms of centrality. Fresh names which enter in Table 11 are: David Blumenthal from the “Harvard Medical School, USA” and Basit Chaudhry from the “University of California, USA.”

Table 11. The top 5 Cited-Authors in terms of centrality. Bates DW is the most central author with a centrality score of 0.29, whereas Chaudhry B is the least central author with a centrality score of 0.12.

Centrality	Author	Abbreviations	Year
0.29	David Bates	Bates DW	2005
0.13	Gilad J. Kuperman	Kuperman GJ	2005
0.13	Amit X. Garg	Garg AX	2005
0.13	David Blumenthal	Blumenthal D	2009
0.12	Basit Chaudhry	Chaudhry B	2007

After analysing authors’ network, in the next section, we will visualise the countries of the origin of the key publications of the domain.

4.5. Analysis of Countries

In this section, we demonstrate a visual analysis of the spread of research in the domain from different countries. For this visualisation, top 30 countries are chosen from the entire time span of 16 years (i.e. 2005-2016) for each one-year time slice. In Fig. 7, the concentric rings of different colours represent papers published in different time slices. The diameter of the ring thus indicates the frequency of the country. From the display, it can be seen that the “United States” has the highest frequency, which indicates that the origin of key publications in the domain is the “United States”. This is followed by articles originating from England, Canada, Netherlands, and Australia. The pink circle around the node represents the centrality ≥ 0.1 . As depicted in Figure 7, the Canada has highest centrality value. This is followed by the US, England, Germany, and Spain. Red circles represent the citation burst. The Scotland has the strongest citation burst, which provides the evidence that the articles originating in the domain from the Scotland have attracted a degree of attention from its research community.




Figure 7. Countries network of 55 nodes and 263 links. The burst nodes appear as a red circle around the node. Concentric citation tree rings indicate the citation history of the publications of a country. The pink circle around the node represents the centrality ≥ 0 . The USA is the highly cited node, whereas Canada is the most central node and Scotland has strongest citation burst.

After a visual analysis of countries, we will present a visual analysis of institutions of highly cited publications.

4.6. Analysis of Institutions

In this section, visualisation of institutions is performed. Figure 8 contains a merged network of institutions of 319 nodes and 844 edges. We have selected top 50 nodes per one-year length time slice from 1,945 records. The “Harvard” is the most central, as well as highly cited node among all other institutions. Following it is the “Brigham and Women’s Hospital, USA.” Whereas the “University of Massachusetts, USA” has the strongest citation burst.




Figure 8. The network of Institutions, containing 319 nodes and 844 edges. Concentric citation tree rings demonstrate the citation history of the publications of an institution. The purple circle represents betweenness centrality. The thicker the purple ring, the higher the centrality score. The “University of Massachusetts” has the strongest burst. The Harvard is the highly cited and most central institution of the domain.

A visual analysis of the history of the burstness of institutions identifies universities that are specifically active in the research in this domain. As shown in Figure 9, the “University of Massachusetts, USA” has the strongest and longest citation burst among all other institutes in the timespan of 2006 to 2009. The “Indiana University School of Medicine, USA” also has the longest period of the burst from 2013 till 2016. Whereas, the “Weill Cornell Graduate School of Medical Sciences, USA” has shortest citation burst.

Institutions	Year	Strength	Begin	End	2005 - 2016
Univ Massachusetts	2005	6.2883	2006	2009	██████
Indiana Univ Sch Med	2005	6.1261	2013	2016	████████████████
Cleveland Clin Fdn	2005	4.1361	2010	2011	██████████
Johns Hopkins Univ	2005	4.0639	2012	2013	██████
Weill Cornell Med Coll	2005	3.9329	2011	2012	██████

Figure 9. History of the burstness of institutions includes names of institutions, year of publication, the strength of burstness, beginning and ending year of the citation burst. The “University of Massachusetts” has the strongest burst, whereas the “University of Massachusetts” and the “Indiana University School” have the longest period of burst among all other institutions.

Next, we performed an analysis in terms of the frequency of publications associated with the institutions. Table 12 represents the top five institutions based on frequency. The “Harvard, USA” has the highest ranking with the frequency of 165 publications. The “Brigham & Women’s Hospital, USA” followed it closely with the frequency of 122 publications. Next is the “Vanderbilt University, USA” with the frequency of 62 publications. With 56 publications, next, we have the “University of Utah, USA”. Following it, we have the “University of Washington, USA” with the frequency of 55

publications.

Table 12. The top Institutions in terms of Frequency. “Harvard” has the highest frequency of 165, whereas the “University of Washington” has the lowest frequency of 55.

Frequency	Institution	Countries
165	Harvard University	USA
122	Brigham and Women’s Hospital	USA
62	Vanderbilt University	USA
56	University of Utah	USA
55	University of Washington	USA

In the Table 13 below, we performed another analysis in terms of the centrality of the publications. Table 13 contains the list of the top five universities based on the centrality. It is interesting to note that top two universities the “Harvard” and “Brigham & Women’s Hospital, USA” with centrality scores 0.3 and 0.17 respectively are also the highly cited institutions. Following them is the “University of Utah, USA” with centrality score 0.14. Next is the “University of Washington, USA” with centrality score 0.09. With centrality value 0.07, it seems however that the “Heidelberg University, USA” has the lowest centrality score among all other institutions.

Table 13. The top 5 institutions in terms of the centrality. Top most University has a centrality score of 0.3, whereas the “Heidelberg University” has a lowest centrality score of 0.07.

Centrality	Institutions	Countries
0.3	Harvard University	USA
0.17	Brigham and Women’s Hospital	USA
0.14	University of Utah	USA
0.09	University of Washington	USA
0.07	Heidelberg University	Germany

After visualisation of institutions, in the next section, we will present an analysis of subject categories of the domain.

4.7. Analysis of Categories

In this section, our next analysis is to discover publications associated with various categories. Fig. 10 depicts the temporal visualisation of categories in the domain. This merged network contains 95 categories and 355 links (co-occurrences). We have selected top 50 nodes per one-year time slice. The detailed analysis based on the centrality and frequency is given below.

Table 14 lists the top 5 categories based on centrality. The category “Health Care Sciences & Services” leads over other categories with centrality value 0.29. It is closely followed by “Engineering” with centrality 0.28. Next is “Computer Science” with centrality score 0.25. Following it is the “Surgery” with centrality 0.18. Subsequently, we have “Nursing” with centrality score 0.16.

For relative analysis, we have also analysed these categories in terms of frequency of publications of manuscripts. The outcomes of this analysis are illustrated underneath in Table 15.

Table 14. The top 5 categories based on centrality. The subject category “HEALTH CARE SCIENCES & SERVICES” leads over other categories with a centrality score of 0.29.

Centrality	Category
0.29	Health Care Sciences and Services
0.28	Engineering
0.25	Computer Science
0.18	Surgery
0.16	Nursing




Figure 10. The category network containing 95 categories and 355 links. Concentric citation tree rings demonstrate the citation history of the publications of an institution. The purple circle represents betweenness centrality. The thicker the purple ring, the higher the centrality score. Medical Informatics is the category with highest frequency, whereas Health Care Sciences and Services is the most central category.

Table 15 lists the top 5 categories based on frequency. With the frequency of 658, “Medical Informatics” leads the rest of the categories. Following it is the “Computer Science” with a frequency of 545. Next is “Health Care Sciences & Services” with a frequency of 495, which is followed by “Computer Science, Information Systems” and “Computer Science, Interdisciplinary Applications” with frequencies 320 and 318 respectively.

Table 15. The top 5 categories based on frequency. The subject category “Medical Informatics” leads over other categories with a frequency of 658.

Frequency	Category
658	Medical Informatics
545	Computer Science
495	Health Care Sciences & Services
320	Computer Science, Information Systems
318	Computer Science, Interdisciplinary Applications

After visually analysing co-authors, journals, co-cited authors, countries, institutions, and subject categories, in the end, we are presenting the summary of the results.

5. Summary of Results

In this paper, we have utilized CiteSpace for the analysis of various types of visualization to

identify emerging trends and abrupt changes in scientific literature in the domain over time. In this section, we give an overview of the key results of the visual analysis performed in this study.

Firstly, using clustering of cited references we observed Cluster #1, the “computerised decision support” is the largest cluster, which contains 65 nodes that are 10.638% of whole nodes in the network. The articles of Bates DW (1999), Stamos TD (2001), Van Der Sijs H (2008), and Middleton B (2013) are the key turning point. The half-life of these articles is 7, 4, 5, and 3 years respectively.

Subsequent analyses verified that there is conducted diversity in authors, journals, countries, institutions, and subject categories.

In the analysis of journals, we observed that the “Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association” has the largest number of highly cited publications in the domain and “Journal of the American Medical Association” is the most central journal among all other journals.

In terms of the analysis of the author’s network, we observed that Ali S. Raja (2014) has the strongest burst among top all authors of the domain since 2005. We also observed that most collaborative author in the network is David Bates, a Prof. of Medicine at the “Harvard School”, has 59 citations is also the most central author with centrality score 0.33. His areas of interest are medication safety, patient safety, quality, medical informatics, and clinical decision support. It is interesting to note that David Bates is also the highly cited and most central cited author of this domain.

In the analysis of countries, top 30 countries were chosen from the entire time span of 2005-2016 for each one-year time slice. We observed that the United States has the highest frequency, which indicates the origin of key publications in the domain. Whereas Canada has the highest centrality score. Scotland has the strongest citation burst, which provides the evidence that the articles originating in the domain from Scotland have attracted a degree of attention from its research community.

On the visual analysis of institutions, we found that “The University of Massachusetts” has the strongest and longest citation burst in the timespan of 2006 to 2009. The “Indiana University School of Medicine” also has the longest period of the burst among all other institutes from 2013 till 2016. Harvard has a top ranking with a frequency of 165 publications. It is interesting to note that the Harvard is also the most central institution with the centrality score 0.3.

In the analysis of categories, we observed that the category “Health Care Sciences & Services” leads over other categories with centrality value 0.29. Whereas with a frequency of 658, the category “Medical Informatics” leads the rest of the categories.

6. Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we have demonstrated a comprehensive visual and scientometric survey of the CDSS domain. This research covers all Journal articles in Thomson Reuters from the period 2005-2016. Our survey is based on real data from the Web of Science databases. This allowed us to comprehend all publications in the domain of CDSSs.

Our analysis has produced many interesting results. The CDSS has gained the interest of the research community from the era of 2005. David Bates is the highly cited author in the literature of CDSS, whereas Ali S. Raja is the author who has rapidly grown the number of publications during the period of study. The “Journal of the American Informatics Medical Association” is the top ranking source journal. It contributes 1169 publications during the period of study. The United States has contributed the highest number of publications, whereas the United Kingdom is the second highest productive country. Most of the contributions came from Harvard, whereas the “University of Massachusetts” remained specifically active in the research in this domain. The “Health Care Sciences & Services” leads the rest of the categories in CDSS.

A significant dimension of future work is to conduct scientometric analysis for identifying disease patterns, specifically in the cardiovascular, breast cancer and diabetes domains

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research project is funded by the EPSRC (Grant Ref. No. EP/H501584/1) and Sitekit Solutions Ltd. We would like to thank Professor Warner Slack from Harvard Medical School for providing useful insights and for his support and encouragement.

REFERENCES

- Abidi, S., J. Cox, S. Abidi and M. Shepherd (2012). Using OWL ontologies for clinical guidelines based comorbid decision support. System Science (HICSS), 2012 45th Hawaii International Conference on, IEEE.
- Ahmadian, L., M. van Engen-Verheul, F. Bakhshi-Raiez, N. Peek, R. Cornet and N. F. de Keizer (2011). "The role of standardized data and terminological systems in computerized clinical decision support systems: literature review and survey." International journal of medical informatics **80**(2): 81-93.
- Ahn, J. T., G. H. Park, J. Son, C. S. Lim, J. Kang, J. Cha, K. Park and D. M. Kim (2014). "Development of test toolkit of hard review to evaluate a random clinical decision support system for the management of chronic adult diseases." Wireless Personal Communications **79**(4): 2469-2484.
- Ali, S. M., R. Giordano, S. Lakhani and D. M. Walker (2016). "A review of randomized controlled trials of medical record powered clinical decision support system to improve quality of diabetes care." International journal of medical informatics **87**: 91-100.
- Alickovic, E. and A. Subasi (2016). "Medical decision support system for diagnosis of heart arrhythmia using dwt and random forests classifier." Journal of medical systems **40**(4): 1-12.
- Alther, M. and C. K. Reddy (2015). Clinical decision support systems, Healthcare Data Analytics, Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- Ba, S. and L. Wang (2013). "Digital health communities: The effect of their motivation mechanisms." Decision Support Systems **55**(4): 941-947.
- Bertanza, G., P. Baroni and M. Canato (2016). "Ranking sewage sludge management strategies by means of Decision Support Systems: A case study." Resources, Conservation and Recycling **110**: 1-15.
- Bonini, C. P. (1963). Simulation of Information and Decision System in the Firm, Prentice-Hall.
- Bonney, W. (2011). Impacts and risks of adopting clinical decision support systems, INTECH Open Access Publisher.
- Bose, R. and V. Sugumaran (1999). "Application of intelligent agent technology for managerial data analysis and mining." ACM SIGMIS Database **30**(1): 77-94.
- Bouamrane, M.-M., A. Rector and M. Hurrell (2009). A hybrid architecture for a preoperative decision support system using a rule engine and a reasoner on a clinical ontology. Web Reasoning and Rule Systems, Springer: 242-253.
- Bright, T. J., A. Wong, R. Dhurjati, E. Bristow, L. Bastian, R. R. Coeytaux, G. Samsa, V. Hasselblad, J. W. Williams and M. D. Musty (2012). "Effect of clinical decision-support systems: a systematic review." Annals of internal medicine **157**(1): 29-43.
- Chen, C. (2006). "CiteSpace II: Detecting and visualizing emerging trends and transient patterns in scientific literature." Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology **57**(3): 359-377.
- Chen, C. (2016). CiteSpace: A Practical Guide for Mapping Scientific Literature. New York, USA, Nova Science Publishers.
- Chen, C. and Y. Chen (2005). Searching for clinical evidence in CiteSpace. AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings, American Medical Informatics Association.
- Chen, W.-C., T.-P. Hong and R. Jeng (1999). "A framework of decision support systems for use on the World Wide Web." Journal of Network and Computer Applications **22**(1): 1-17.
- Chuang, J.-H., G. Hripcsak and R. A. Jenders (2000). Considering clustering: a methodological review of clinical decision support system studies. Proceedings of the AMIA Symposium, American Medical Informatics Association.
- Clancey, W. J., E. H. Shortliffe and B. G. Buchanan (1979). Intelligent computer-aided instruction for medical diagnosis. Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer Application in Medical Care, American Medical Informatics Association.
- Classen, D. C., S. Phansalkar and D. W. Bates (2011). "Critical drug-drug interactions for use in electronic health records systems with computerized physician order entry: review of leading approaches." Journal of patient safety **7**(2): 61-65.
- Clauser, S. B., E. H. Wagner, E. J. A. Bowles, L. Tuzzio and S. M. Greene (2011). "Improving modern cancer care through information technology." American journal of preventive medicine **40**(5): S198-S207.
- DeBusk, R. F., N. Houston-Miller and L. Raby (2010). "CLINICAL VALIDATION OF A

DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR ACUTE CORONARY SYNDROMES." Journal of the American College of Cardiology **10**(55): A132. E1240.

Diaby, V., K. Campbell and R. Goeree (2013). "Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) in health care: a bibliometric analysis." Operations Research for Health Care **2**(1): 20-24.

Dong, Y., D. M. Frangopol and S. Sabatino (2016). "A decision support system for mission-based ship routing considering multiple performance criteria." Reliability Engineering & System Safety **150**: 190-201.

Druzdzel, M. J. and R. R. Flynn (1999). "Decision support systems. Encyclopedia of library and information science. A. Kent." Marcel Dekker, Inc. Last Login **10**(03): 2010.

Eom, S. B., S. M. Lee, E. Kim and C. Somarajan (1998). "A survey of decision support system applications (1988–1994)." Journal of the Operational Research Society **49**(2): 109-120.

Eslami, S., N. F. de Keizer and A. Abu-Hanna (2008). "The impact of computerized physician medication order entry in hospitalized patients—a systematic review." International journal of medical informatics **77**(6): 365-376.

Fang, Y. (2015). "Visualizing the structure and the evolving of digital medicine: a scientometrics review." Scientometrics **105**(1): 5-21.

Farooq, K. and A. Hussain (2016). "A novel ontology and machine learning driven hybrid cardiovascular clinical prognosis as a complex adaptive clinical system." Complex Adaptive Systems Modeling **4**(1): 1-21.

Farooq, K., A. Hussain, S. Leslie, C. Eckl, C. MacRae and W. Slack (2012). An ontology driven and bayesian network based cardiovascular decision support framework. Advances in Brain Inspired Cognitive Systems, Springer: 31-41.

Farooq, K., A. Hussain, S. Leslie, C. Eckl, C. MacRae and W. Slack (2012). Semantically Inspired Electronic Healthcare Records. Advances in Brain Inspired Cognitive Systems, Springer: 42-51.

Farooq, K., A. Hussain, S. Leslie, C. Eckl and W. Slack (2011). Ontology-driven cardiovascular decision support system. Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare (PervasiveHealth), 2011 5th International Conference on, IEEE.

Fathima, M., D. Peiris, P. Naik-Panvelkar, B. Saini and C. L. Armour (2014). "Effectiveness of computerized clinical decision support systems for asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in primary care: a systematic review." BMC pulmonary medicine **14**(1): 1.

Finlay, P. N. (1994). Introducing decision support systems, NCC Blackwell.

Fitzmaurice, D., F. Hobbs, B. Delaney, S. Wilson and R. McManus (1998). "Review of computerized decision support systems for oral anticoagulation management." British journal of haematology **102**: 907-909.

Gwo-Hshiang, T. (2010). "Multiple attribute decision making: methods and applications." Multiple Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications.

Haettenschwiler, P. (2001). "Neues anwenderfreundliches konzept der entscheidungsunterstützung." Zurich, vdf Hochschulverlag AG: 189-208.

Hahn, G. J. and H. Kuhn (2012). "Designing decision support systems for value-based management: A survey and an architecture." Decision Support Systems **53**(3): 591-598.

Haynes, R. B. and N. L. Wilczynski (2010). "Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: Methods of a decision-maker-researcher partnership systematic review." Implement Sci **5**(1): 12.

Holsapple, C. W. (2008). DSS architecture and types. Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1, Springer: 163-189.

Hunt, D. L., R. B. Haynes, S. E. Hanna and K. Smith (1998). "Effects of computer-based clinical decision support systems on physician performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review." Jama **280**(15): 1339-1346.

Inglezakis, V., M. Ambăruș, N. Ardeleanu, K. Moustakas and M. Loizidou (2016). "WASTE MANAGEMENT IN ROMANIA: CURRENT DATA AND APPLICATION OF A DECISION SUPPORT TOOL." Environmental Engineering & Management Journal (EEMJ) **15**(3).

Ivbijaro, G., L. Kolkiewicz, L. McGee and M. Gikunoo (2008). "Addressing long-term physical healthcare needs in a forensic mental health inpatient population using the UK primary care Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF): an audit." Mental health in family medicine **5**(1): 51.

Jaspers, M. W., M. Smeulders, H. Vermeulen and L. W. Peute (2011). "Effects of clinical decision-support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a synthesis of high-quality systematic review findings." Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association **18**(3): 327-

334.

Kawamoto, K., G. Del Fiol, C. Orton and D. F. Lobach (2010). "System-agnostic clinical decision support services: benefits and challenges for scalable decision support." The open medical informatics journal **4**: 245.

Kawamoto, K., C. A. Houlihan, E. A. Balas and D. F. Lobach (2005). "Improving clinical practice using clinical decision support systems: a systematic review of trials to identify features critical to success." Bmj **330**(7494): 765.

Keen, P. G. (1980). "Decision support systems: a research perspective." Decision Support Systems: Issues and Challenges (New York: Pergamon Press, 1980): 23-44.

Keen, P. G. and M. Scott (1978). Decision support systems; an organizational perspective.

Khong, P. and R. Ren (2011). "Healthcare information system: building a cyber database for educated decision making." International Journal of Modelling, Identification and Control **12**(1-2): 133-140.

Kuperman, G. J., A. Bobb, T. H. Payne, A. J. Avery, T. K. Gandhi, G. Burns, D. C. Classen and D. W. Bates (2007). "Medication-related clinical decision support in computerized provider order entry systems: a review." Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association **14**(1): 29-40.

Kuperman, G. J., R. M. Gardner and T. A. Pryor (2013). HELP: a dynamic hospital information system, Springer Science & Business Media.

Ledley, R. and L. B. Lusted (1959). "The use of electronic computers to aid in medical diagnosis." Proceedings of the IRE **47**(11): 1970-1977.

Lindgren, H. (2011). Integrating clinical decision support system development into a development process of clinical practice—experiences from dementia care. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, Springer: 129-138.

Loya, S. R., K. Kawamoto, C. Chatwin and V. Huser (2014). "Service oriented architecture for clinical decision support: A systematic review and future directions." Journal of medical systems **38**(12): 1-22.

Luitjes, S. H., M. G. Wouters, A. Franx, H. C. Scheepers, V. M. Coupé, H. Wollersheim, E. A. Steegers, M. P. Heringa, R. P. Hermens and M. W. van Tulder (2010). "STUDY PROTOCOL Open Access."

Madani, F. (2015). "Technology Mining" bibliometrics analysis: applying network analysis and cluster analysis." Scientometrics **105**(1): 323-335.

Marakas, G. Decision Support Systems in the Twenty-First Century, 1999, Prentice Hall, Inc. Upper Saddle River, NJ, ISBN: 0-13-744186-X.

Marasinghe, K. M. (2015). "Computerised clinical decision support systems to improve medication safety in long-term care homes: a systematic review." BMJ open **5**(5): e006539.

Martínez-Pérez, B., I. de la Torre-Díez, M. López-Coronado, B. Sainz-De-Abajo, M. Robles and J. M. García-Gómez (2014). "Mobile clinical decision support systems and applications: a literature and commercial review." Journal of medical systems **38**(1): 1-10.

Mendoza, G. A., W. Sprouse, W. G. Luppold, P. Araman and R. J. Meimban (1991). "An integrated management support and production control system for hardwood forest products." Computers in Industry **16**(4): 343-351.

Musen, M. A., B. Middleton and R. A. Greenes (2014). Clinical decision-support systems. Biomedical informatics, Springer: 643-674.

Niazi, M. and A. Hussain (2011). "Agent-based computing from multi-agent systems to agent-based models: a visual survey." Scientometrics **89**(2): 479-499.

Niazi, M. A. K. (2011). Towards a novel unified framework for developing formal, network and validated agent-based simulation models of complex adaptive systems, University of Stirling.

Njie, G. J., K. K. Proia, A. B. Thota, R. K. Finnie, D. P. Hopkins, S. M. Banks, D. B. Callahan, N. P. Pronk, K. J. Rask and D. T. Lackland (2015). "Clinical decision support systems and prevention: a community guide cardiovascular disease systematic review." American journal of preventive medicine **49**(5): 784-795.

Nugent, C. A., H. R. Warner, J. T. Dunn and F. H. Tyler (1964). "Probability theory in the diagnosis of Cushing's syndrome." The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism **24**(7): 621-627.

O'Connor, P. J., J. M. Sperl-Hillen, W. A. Rush, P. E. Johnson, G. H. Amundson, S. E. Asche, H. L. Ekstrom and T. P. Gilmer (2011). "Impact of electronic health record clinical decision support on diabetes care: a randomized trial." The Annals of Family Medicine **9**(1): 12-21.

Osheroff, J. A. and A. M. I. Association (2006). A roadmap for national action on clinical decision support, June 13, 2006, American Medical Informatics Association.

Power, D. (1997). "What is a DSS." The On-Line Executive Journal for Data-Intensive Decision Support **1**(3): 223-232.

Power, D. (2002). "Decision Support Systems: Concepts and Resources for Managers." Studies in Informatics and Control **11**(4): 349-350.

Power, D. J. (2000). "Web-based and model-driven decision support systems: concepts and issues." AMCIS 2000 Proceedings: 387.

Ralph, J., H. Sprague and H. Watson (1986). Decision Support Systems: Putting Theory into Practice, Prentice Hall.

Rauscher, H. M. (1999). "Ecosystem management decision support for federal forests in the United States: a review." Forest ecology and management **114**(2): 173-197.

Reuters, T. (2008). Web of science. Online factsheet Thomson Reuters, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Rongying, Z. and C. Rui (2011). Visual analysis on the research of cross-language information retrieval. Uncertainty Reasoning and Knowledge Engineering (URKE), 2011 International Conference on, IEEE.

Sauter, V. (1997). Decision support systems: an applied managerial approach, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schroff, A. M. (1998). An approach to user oriented decision support systems.

Scott, M. M. (1971). Management decision systems: computer-based support for decision making, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Shortliffe, E. H. (1986). "Update on ONCOCIN: a chemotherapy advisor for clinical oncology." Informatics for Health and Social Care **11**(1): 19-21.

Silver, M. S. (1991). Systems that support decision makers: description and analysis, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Son, Y.-J., S. Jeong, B.-G. Kang, S.-H. Kim and S.-K. Lee (2015). "Visualization of e-Health research topics and current trends using social network analysis." Telemedicine and e-Health **21**(5): 436-442.

Sprague Jr, R. H. and E. D. Carlson (1982). Building effective decision support systems, Prentice Hall Professional Technical Reference.

Steinman, M. A., S. M. Handler, J. H. Gurwitz, G. D. Schiff and K. E. Covinsky (2011). "Beyond the prescription: medication monitoring and adverse drug events in older adults." Journal of the American Geriatrics Society **59**(8): 1513-1520.

Tate, A. R., J. Underwood, D. M. Acosta, M. Julià-Sapé, C. Majós, À. Moreno-Torres, F. A. Howe, M. Van Der Graaf, V. Lefournier and M. M. Murphy (2006). "Development of a decision support system for diagnosis and grading of brain tumours using in vivo magnetic resonance single voxel spectra." NMR in Biomedicine **19**(4): 411-434.

Turban, E. (1990). Decision support and expert systems: management support systems, Prentice Hall PTR.

Vaghela, C., N. Bhatt and D. Mistry (2015). "A Survey on Various Classification Techniques for Clinical Decision Support System." International Journal of Computer Applications **116**(23).

Warner, H. R. (1979). "Computer--Assisted Medical Decision-Making."

Wright, A., D. F. Sittig, J. S. Ash, D. W. Bates, J. Feblowitz, G. Fraser, S. M. Maviglia, C. McMullen, W. P. Nichol and J. E. Pang (2011). "Governance for clinical decision support: case studies and recommended practices from leading institutions." Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association **18**(2): 187-194.

Wu, J. and Q. Chen (2012). Mapping the emerging field of cloud computing: Insights from a visualization analysis. Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC), 2012 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE.

Xie, P. (2015). "Study of international anticancer research trends via co-word and document co-citation visualization analysis." Scientometrics **105**(1): 611-622.

Yu, D. (2015). "A scientometrics review on aggregation operator research." Scientometrics **105**(1): 115-133.

Zhu, S., H. H. Yang and L. Feng (2015). Visualizing and Understanding the Digital Divide. International Conference on Hybrid Learning and Continuing Education, Springer.

Zopounidis, C., M. Doumpos and N. F. Matsatsinis (1997). "On the use of knowledge-based decision support systems in financial management: a survey." Decision Support Systems **20**(3): 259-277.

Zuccotti, G., F. Maloney, J. Feblowitz, L. Samal, L. Sato and A. Wright (2014). "Reducing risk with clinical decision support." Appl Clin Inform **5**(3): 746-756.

