

A Survey on Human-Centered Evaluation of Explainable AI Methods in Clinical Decision Support Systems

Alessandro Gambetti^{1,2}, Qiwei Han², Hong Shen³ and Cláudia Soares¹

¹Nova School of Science and Technology

²Nova School of Business and Economics

³Carnegie Mellon University

{gambetti.alessandro, qiwei.han}@novasbe.pt, hongsh@andrew.cmu.edu, claudia.soares@fct.unl.pt

Abstract

Explainable AI (XAI) has become a crucial component of Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) to enhance transparency, trust, and clinical adoption. However, while many XAI methods have been proposed, their effectiveness in real-world medical settings remains underexplored. This paper provides a survey of human-centered evaluations of Explainable AI methods in Clinical Decision Support Systems. By categorizing existing works based on XAI methodologies, evaluation frameworks, and clinical adoption challenges, we offer a structured understanding of the landscape. Our findings reveal key challenges in the integration of XAI into healthcare workflows and propose a structured framework to align the evaluation methods of XAI with the clinical needs of stakeholders.

1 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly being integrated into Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) to improve timely diagnosis, optimize treatment plans, and reduce healthcare costs [Sendak *et al.*, 2020]. Estimates suggest that AI adoption in healthcare could reduce U.S. healthcare expenditures by 5-10%, translating to \$200–\$360 billion in annual savings while maintaining quality and access [Sahni *et al.*, 2023]. The rapid growth of AI-driven CDSS has also attracted significant investment, with venture capital funding in AI in health exceeding \$11 billion in 2024 [Goldsack and Overgaard, 2024]. These trends indicate that the role of AI in medical decision making will continue to expand.

However, a key challenge accompanying this expansion is the necessity for trust and transparency in AI-driven medical decisions. Despite advancements in deep learning and other black-box AI models, clinicians often hesitate to adopt AI-generated recommendations due to their lack of interpretability [Hou *et al.*, 2024]. Trust in CDSS is critical because errors in automated decision-making can have life-threatening consequences [Zhang and Zhang, 2023]. In response, Explainable AI (XAI) has emerged as a solution to improve model transparency, indirectly allowing medical

professionals to better understand why an AI system makes certain predictions [Loh *et al.*, 2022]. Additionally, regulatory frameworks, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), emphasize the need for explainability in automated decision-making, thereby necessitating interpretable AI solutions in healthcare.

Despite extensive research in XAI for healthcare [Loh *et al.*, 2022], a critical gap remains: there is limited systematic analysis of how XAI explanations impact real-world clinical adoption and decision-making [Ghassemi *et al.*, 2021]. While prior work has primarily focused on developing new XAI techniques, fewer studies have systematically examined whether these methods effectively support clinicians in practice [Amann *et al.*, 2022]. Furthermore, the evaluation of XAI in healthcare is highly fragmented, relying on inconsistent methodologies that range from proxy simulations to real-world clinical trials [Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017]. This raises a fundamental question: How should XAI techniques be evaluated to ensure their usability, trustworthiness, and effectiveness in real clinical settings?

To address this gap, this paper presents a systematic survey of human-centered evaluations of XAI methods in CDSS, focusing on the intersection of explainability, usability, and clinical decision-making. Specifically, we: (1) categorize existing works based on XAI methodologies, evaluation frameworks, and clinical adoption challenges, offering a structured synthesis of the field; (2) identify key gaps in current evaluation practices from clinicians' perceptions of XAI-based CDSS, revealing that while XAI is generally well-received, significant challenges remain—such as high cognitive load, misalignment with clinical knowledge, and lack of early involvement with stakeholders; (3) introduce a conceptual framework to bridge the socio-technical gap in AI-driven CDSS by aligning XAI evaluation methods with the needs of diverse stakeholders (*e.g.*, clinicians, hospital administrators, AI developers); (4) propose a medical field-agnostic, stakeholder-centric approach for CDSS development, advocating that CDSS should be designed as human-augmentation tools rather than replacements.

To theoretically ground this misalignment between human expectations and technological capabilities, we leverage Ackerman's socio-technical gap theory, which highlights the challenges arising from such discrepancies

[Ackerman, 2000]. This analysis informs our proposed framework, emphasizing stakeholder-driven evaluations to ensure CDSS solutions are clinically relevant, interpretable, and effectively integrated into healthcare workflows. By aligning technical advancements in XAI with rigorous human-centered evaluations, we aim to steer research toward developing trustworthy, deployable CDSS solutions.

We organize the paper as follows. Section 2 provides background on CDSS, XAI methods, and human-centered evaluations. Section 3 presents a structured review of existing works in this field, categorizing them based on XAI methodologies, evaluation frameworks, and clinical adoption challenges. Section 4 discusses the socio-technical challenges and proposes a conceptual framework to bridge the gap between XAI methodologies and stakeholder needs, concluding pointing out future research directions.

2 Background

2.1 Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS)

CDSS have long been integral to medical decision-making, assisting clinicians in enhancing patient outcomes. Initially emerging in the late 1950s with rule-based systems, CDSS evolved significantly with advancements in AI. Modern CDSS now leverage sophisticated machine learning algorithms to process vast datasets efficiently. Concurrently, the rise of XAI has enabled the integration of interpretable solutions, essential for fostering trust and promoting the adoption of CDSS in clinical practice [Ghassemi *et al.*, 2021].

Operationally, CDSS utilize patient data to generate specific treatment recommendations [Musen *et al.*, 2021]. The back-end employs machine learning algorithms trained for specific tasks, processing data from Electronic Health Records (EHRs). EHRs include both structured data (e.g., tabular data) and/or unstructured data (e.g., text, images), representing comprehensive digital versions of patients’ medical histories, including diagnoses, treatments, and test results. System performance is evaluated using machine learning metrics pertinent to the specific task. Synchronously, the front-end runs a user interface (UI) connected to the back-end that clinical practitioners are supposed to interact with. Such UI displays patient data, alerts, recommendations (sometimes with explanations), and decision-support reports in an accessible manner to facilitate clinical decision-making. To this end, human-centered evaluations are conducted to assess the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the system in the specific task. However, researchers have identified that the absence of such evaluations is a primary factor in the lack of adoption of AI-based CDSS solutions [Musen *et al.*, 2021].

In summary, the integration of XAI together with human-centered evaluation assures that the system is usable within clinical workflows and more transparently meets the needs of stakeholders to foster acceptance of CDSS.

2.2 Explainability and XAI Methods: a Taxonomy

From a psychological standpoint, humans seek explanations to predict future events, as explanations facilitate generalization [Vasil and Lombrozo, 2022]. Unlike descriptions, explanations provide understanding by identifying “difference-

makers” in causal relationships. In medicine, where transparency and accountability are crucial, explanations may offer insights into the rationale behind AI-based CDSS recommendations, enabling practitioners to align the model’s reasoning with their medical expertise.

In AI, explainability and interpretability improve people’s understanding of such models, driving from suboptimal to “better” outcomes [Boyd-Graber *et al.*, 2022]. More in general, the main principle of XAI is to make the decision-making process of AI systems transparent and understandable to humans. Many taxonomies have been proposed to categorize XAI methodologies (e.g., see [Speith, 2022]). In this paper, we adopt the *conceptual* approach based on the following macro criteria (for a more comprehensive review, please refer to [Molnar, 2022]):

- **Type:** Intrinsic (or Ante Hoc) or Post Hoc;
- **Dependency:** Model Specific or Model Agnostic;
- **Scope:** Local or Global;
- **Output:** Numerical, or Visual.

Type: Intrinsic or Post Hoc

Intrinsic interpretability is associated with machine learning models such that humans can easily trace their decision-making process. This is typically achieved through common white-box models such as linear models, in which coefficients can be considered the marginal effects on the output in regression problems, and tree methods as decision trees, in which their hierarchical structure allows for direct observation and understanding of the decision-making process. In addition, ensemble models such as random forests or boosting methods, although considered as black box, contain an intrinsic interpretable component in terms of feature contribution. Finally, some deep learning models may have intrinsic interpretability components in their structure, e.g., attention weights in Transformers, highlighting the importance of different input features. *Methods:* Linear Models, Tree-models, Ensemble Models, Attention Weights in Transformers, Bayesian Networks, etc.

Post Hoc interpretability refers to methodologies used after model training, providing insights into how predictions are made without altering the model itself. These methodologies are not intrinsic to the model, requiring further optimization to extract interpretation-oriented representations such as feature importance scores, partial dependence plots, surrogate models, among others. Notwithstanding, these methods can be applied on top of intrinsically interpretable models to provide a further layer of explainability as well. *Methods:* SHAP [Lundberg and Lee, 2017], LIME [Ribeiro *et al.*, 2016], GradCAM [Selvaraju *et al.*, 2017], DeepTaylor [Montavon *et al.*, 2017], Integrated Gradients [Sundararajan *et al.*, 2017], Surrogate Models, Partial Dependence Plots, Counterfactual Explanations, etc.

Dependency: Model Specific or Model Agnostic

Model Specific methods are limited to certain families of model architectures, and their use is coupled to the inner workings of those models. For example, neural networks require specific explainability methodologies, e.g., saliency

maps such as GradCAM for CNNs. Importantly, note that intrinsic interpretable models are by definition model specific, *e.g.*, interpreting linear regression coefficients is specific to that kind of model only. *Methods*: Architecture-specific Saliency Maps, GradCAM, DeepTaylor, Linear Models, Tree Paths, etc.

Model Agnostic methodologies are suitable for multiple families of machine-learning models, regardless of their internal structure. These methods are called “agnostic” because they do not rely on the internal workings of the model, which they treat as black box, but focus on the inputs and outputs only. These methodologies are applied post-hoc. *Methods*: SHAP, LIME, Partial Dependence Plots, Accumulated Local Effects, Counterfactual Explanations, Scoped Rules, Integrated Gradients, etc.

Scope: Local or Global

Local interpretability methods explain an *individual* prediction, *e.g.*, how each feature contributes to a given output, thus approximating model’s behavior locally. Also, local methods are particularly suitable for models leveraging unstructured data, as, for instance, they can pinpoint the specific pixels in an image or tokens in a text that predominantly drive predictions. *Methods*: Individual Conditional Expectations, LIME, SHAP, Counterfactual Explanations, Integrated Gradients, Attention Weights, etc.

Global interpretability methods provide a wider perspective on how a model is explainable across the whole dataset (usually the test set). These methods are particularly suitable for models leveraging structured data. While local interpretability is essential for justifying individual choices, global interpretability promotes global model transparency. *Methods*: SHAP, Partial Dependence Plots, Accumulated Local Effects, Global Surrogates, etc.

Output: Numerical or Visual

Numerical explanations are suitable for structured data, especially for feature-based approaches. Examples include feature summary statistics, which is particularly indicated for intrinsic interpretable models such as linear regression, where coefficients, standard errors, and t-statistics provide information on how a particular feature is contributing to the model output, or tree-based methods such as decision trees, where feature importances can be traced back from the top of the tree. Besides, post hoc and model-agnostic methods such as SHAP or LIME can provide a feature-wise numerical value for pattern interpretations. *Methods*: all feature summary statistics methodologies developed for models leveraging structured data.

Visual output methods are particularly suitable for deep learning models operating with unstructured data such as images. Visualization techniques, such as saliency maps, class activation maps (CAM), and Grad-CAM, enable the interpretation of feature importance in CNNs, highlighting regions of interest in input images. Parallely, this also extends to token importance visualisation for language models. Beyond deep learning, structured data can also benefit from visual representations, including partial dependence plots, feature importance bar charts, and decision boundary plots. However, we treat those methodologies as numerical. *Methods*:

all methodologies suitable for unstructured data.

2.3 Human-Centered XAI Evaluations

In practical medical applications, socio-technical gaps may arise between the CDSS explainability factors provided by XAI techniques and end-users’ perceptions of their utility [Ackerman, 2000]. Human-centered evaluations offer methodologies to bridge this gap, aiming to align explanations with user expectations. Such evaluations should hopefully reflect human desired properties of explanations, serving some practical end goal [Liao and Xiao, 2023].

Human-centered evaluations of XAI systems can be categorized into three levels: (1) application-grounded, (2) human-grounded, and (3) proxy evaluation [Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017]. Application-grounded evaluations involve testing real tasks with real experts and should be employed whenever possible because of their fidelity to real-world scenarios. For example, in the medical domain, doctors may be evaluated on specific application tasks. Here, domain experts are required for an effective evaluation. For this reason, application-grounded evaluation may be costly to implement. On the other hand, human-grounded evaluations, use proxy tasks with human evaluations, conducting simplified human-subject experiments. This approach is particularly suitable for assessing general aspects of a system. As such evaluations can be performed with layman participants instead of domain experts, they are not advisable in the medical domain. Finally, proxy evaluations assess proxy tasks without human participation, relying on simulated tasks to provide feedback about a system.

The main difference between application-grounded and human-grounded evaluation is the non-reliance on human subjects. Similar to human-grounded evaluations, proxy evaluations are not advisable for the full evaluation of CDSS ready for production. However, they may be useful for an early-stage prototype, provided a careful application-grounded evaluation is eventually performed. These three levels of XAI evaluations imply a trade-off between fidelity and cost, where application-grounded evaluations provide the most realistic insights but are expensive, human-grounded evaluations offer a balance of generalizability and affordability but lack domain specificity, and proxy evaluations are the most scalable and cost-efficient but least reflective of real-world performance. In the medical domain, application-grounded evaluation is the preferred choice because it ensures high-fidelity testing with domain experts. This is crucial for patient safety and clinical reliability, despite its higher cost and complexity.

Human-centered evaluation methodologies leverage various techniques, either qualitative or quantitative. In a nutshell, the most widely known are: (1) think-aloud studies, (2) interviews, and (3) surveys. First, in think-aloud studies participants verbalize their thoughts while performing tasks (concurrent) or afterward (retrospective), which can be very useful in qualitatively explaining cognitive processes and identifying usability issues. Second, interviews are a qualitative way to gather detailed information from users about their experiences with a system. They are versatile tools in all stages of design, ranging from open-ended unstructured inter-

views to tightly controlled structured interviews, with semi-structured interviews offering a valuable compromise. A variant of those is focus groups, in which a small number of participants are gathered to evaluate their opinions about a product or service. Finally, survey methodologies mainly rely on quantitative questionnaires that help researchers gather data on users' satisfaction, usability issues, and interaction patterns.

3 Dissecting extant Human-Centered XAI in CDSS

In this section, we present research works that leveraged human-centered XAI to build production-ready CDSS in the medical field. Leveraging the XAI taxonomy outlined before, we discuss papers, highlighting how human-centered evaluations - all relying on application-grounded evaluations - were useful in testing clinical perceptions. In table 1, we provide a summary of the papers discussed. We start discussing CDSS adopting intrinsic interpretable models in Section 3.1. Next, we examine CDSS using post hoc and model agnostic methodologies on top of intrinsic interpretable models in Section 3.2. Finally, we discuss CDSS adopting XAI methodologies in deep learning in Section 3.3, starting with model-agnostic methods, and concluding with model-specific ones.

3.1 CDSS adopting Intrinsic Interpretable Models

Intrinsic interpretable models are easily testable in the medical field for CDSS due to their transparency, as no post-hoc evaluations are necessarily required to perform model evaluations. Examples in this scope are the works from [Brennan *et al.*, 2019] and [Kyrimi *et al.*, 2020]. [Brennan *et al.*, 2019] validated the usability of *MyRiskSurgery*, an analytical CDSS based on generalized linear models and random forests to estimate postoperative risk complications. Through think-aloud studies, a set of physicians evaluated risk complications for a set of 8-10 individual cases in two case studies such as diagnosing acute kidney injury and intensive care unit admission, with the system displaying the top 3 contributing features for each prediction. As a result, physicians experienced notable improvements in their risk assessment, which led to a substantial net improvement in reclassification rates from a no XAI evaluation (+12% and +16%, respectively), also finding the system user-friendly and beneficial.

Then, [Kyrimi *et al.*, 2020] examined how explanations from Bayesian Networks could be used to predict coagulopathy in the first 10 minutes of hospital care. Bayesian networks generate explanations by using probabilistic reasoning to identify the most likely causes based on the relationships between variables. In their framework, the tool outputted explanations in three levels of complexity ranking the predictors that supported a high risk of coagulopathy. In a before-after survey questionnaire, a group of clinicians rated the perception of explanations of the system, resulting in clinicians overall trusting the CDSS prediction, yet their level of trust remained unchanged when an explanation was provided, with the third level of explanations deemed too complex.

3.2 CDSS adopting Post Hoc XAI Methodologies on top of Intrinsic Interpretable Models

Post-hoc methodologies can be applied on top of intrinsic interpretable models to provide a further layer of explainability. In this subfield, we surveyed the works of [Barda *et al.*, 2020], [Kim *et al.*, 2022], [Kumarakulasinghe *et al.*, 2020], [Kovalchuk *et al.*, 2022], [Matthiesen *et al.*, 2021], [Rajashekar *et al.*, 2024], and [Sivaraman *et al.*, 2023]. All these works employed model-agnostic methodologies.

[Barda *et al.*, 2020] developed a CDSS to prevent in-hospital mortality in pediatric intensive care units (PICU). The CDSS leveraged a random forest, and SHAP values on top, to predict PICU admission. Overall, feedback from focus group sessions with clinicians indicated that the proposed solution was perceived as useful. However, the capacity to digest the information varied across clinical roles and levels of predictive modeling knowledge. In general, they preferred solutions that required less cognitive effort and could accommodate diverse user information needs. Still adopting ensemble methods, [Kumarakulasinghe *et al.*, 2020] analyzed the agreement rate between physicians and LIME feature importances for sepsis prediction. Firstly, the authors trained several models such as random forest, adaboost, among others, and applied the LIME framework on top of the best-performing one (random forest). Secondly, physicians were asked to: (1) agree with the model whether the patient presented sepsis, based on individual features, and (2) blindly rank the top 3 features the model used to make predictions without accessing LIME explanations. Finally, LIME explanations were revealed and physicians were asked to rate their satisfaction on a 5-stars Likert scale. Results indicated that physicians agreed with model predictions (87%), and that LIME explanations were equal to the physicians' explanations in at least two features for all patients (69%). Also, physicians were satisfied with LIME predictions (78%), and 68% presented a positive attitude towards explainability in terms of trust. However, such positive attitudes should not be translated into increased trust, as they found inconsistency in LIME explanations. Similarly in the scope of sepsis prediction, [Sivaraman *et al.*, 2023] examined clinicians' interactions with an AI-based interpretable treatment recommender. The system was modeled using XGBoost, and SHAP as feature explainer. Through a think-aloud study involving 24 intensive care clinicians, the analysis revealed that explanations improved clinicians' perceptions of the AI's usefulness. In particular, the study identified four distinct behavior patterns among clinicians summarised as: *Ignore*, *Negotiate*, *Consider*, and *Rely*. Overall, clinicians who found the AI recommendations most useful saw it as additional evidence alongside their assessments.

In the field of medical wearable technologies, [Kim *et al.*, 2022] developed MindScope, a system based on a personalized ML system trained on an XGBoost to predict patients' stress levels. Interviews were conducted to gather feedback on the relevancy of feature importance (SHAP values) in three different explanation settings: (1) no explanations, (2) broad explanations, and (3) detailed

Paper	Model	XAI	Type	Dependency	Output	Main HCE
[Barda <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	Random Forest	SHAP	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Numerical	Focus Group
[Brennan <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	Random Forest	-	Intrinsic	Specific	Numerical	Think Aloud
[Ellenrieder <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	DenseNet	IGrads	Post hoc	Agnostic	Visual	Think Aloud
[Hwang <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	TRIER (CNN)	SG	Post Hoc	Specific	Visual	Mixed
[Kim <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	XGBoost	SHAP	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Numerical	Interviews
[Kumarakulasinghe <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	Random Forest	LIME	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Numerical	Survey
[Kovalchuk <i>et al.</i> , 2022]	Many	SHAP	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Numerical	Mixed
[Kyrimi <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	Bayesian Network	-	Intrinsic	Specific	Numerical	Survey
[Matthiesen <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	Random Forest	LIME	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Visual	Interviews
[Neves <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	Many	Many	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Visual	Survey
[Pumplun <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	DenseNet	IGrads	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Visual	Survey
[Rajashekar <i>et al.</i> , 2024]	Random Forest	ICE, ALE	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Numerical	Mixed
[Sabol <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	CNN	X-CFCMC	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Visual	Survey
[Singh <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	Inception-v-3	DeepTaylor	Post Hoc	Specific	Visual	Survey
[Sivaraman <i>et al.</i> , 2023]	XGBoost	SHAP	Post Hoc	Agnostic	Numerical	Think Aloud
[Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2024]	LSTM	Attention	Intrinsic	Specific	Numerical	Interviews

Table 1: Summary of papers in alphabetical order adopting XAI methods and Human-Centered Evaluations in medical CDSS. Categorization is executed by defining ML models, XAI methods and their taxonomy (type, dependency, output), and HCE methodologies.

explanations. Overall, it was found that the explanation-based settings were more useful than no explanations. However, detailed explanations were perceived as equally useful as broad explanations, thus questioning how detailed explanations should be.

Next, [Matthiesen *et al.*, 2021] conducted a human study in the application of a CDSS able to predict ventricular fibrillation. The study was organized into three phases: (1) observations were conducted at the clinic to comprehend the clinical workflow, (2) development of the CDSS adopting a random forest model to predict the risk score, showing the top/bottom 5 most important features through LIME, and (3) interview study to assess feasibility. Although many clinicians did not change their decisions, they claimed that having a prediction tool could increase confidence in their actions. Also, the visualization of key features was useful, as the presentation of key features facilitates explainability regarding factors contributing to the risk of disease. However, the explainability component did not alter clinical actions.

In endocrinology, [Kovalchuk *et al.*, 2022] proposed a three-staged CDSS for diabetic diagnosis as follows: (1) *Basic Reasoning*, *i.e.*, implementing healthcare practices by referencing existing policies to guide decision-making, (2) *Data-Driven Predictive Modeling*, *i.e.*, applying machine learning models in the context of the previous stage, and (3) *Explanation*, in which XAI techniques are applied to provide better recommendations. The authors tested the framework in a diabetes mellitus case study. In the first stage, expert endocrinologists guided the selection of insulin resistance predictors. In the second stage, a predictive model was optimized to estimate the risk. Finally, SHAP values were employed to interpret the CDSS predictions, which were then validated using questionnaires. Unexpectedly, though not extensively, the basic reasoning case showed higher understandability, followed by the explanation case, and the data-driven case. These findings suggest that adding explanations is useful, but well-grounded, known conventional clinical practices

may still outperform AI-driven solutions.

Finally, integrating large language models (LLMs), [Rajashekar *et al.*, 2024] developed GutGPT, a system tailored to provide a natural language interface for gastrointestinal bleeding prediction, including hospital-based intervention. This system integrates LLMs interface, with a standard random forest model to predict a risk score. Then, interpretability plots such as individual conditional expectations (ICE) and accumulated local effects (ALE) were used to explain feature-wise effects on predicted scores. By interacting with human text, GutGPT leverages in-context learning to present easy-to-understand natural language explanations alongside XAI explanations for predictions. System usability was measured by means of interviews and surveys post hoc, finding that perceptions were mostly positive.

3.3 CDSS adopting XAI Methodologies in Deep Learning

CDSS using deep learning mainly rely on computer vision architectures to locally explain predictions, usually in form of heatmaps. Based on the explainability methodology, dependency may be either agnostic or specific. For example, agnostic methodologies such as integrated gradients could be applied to wider families of deep learning models; while, specific methodologies may be reserved for only a family of models (*e.g.*, GradCAM for CNNs only).

In the field of model-agnostic XAI methodologies, [Ellenrieder *et al.*, 2023] extended the work of [Pumplun *et al.*, 2023] that leveraged a DenseNet and the integrated gradients framework to produce heatmaps of image regions to highlight cancer malignancy probabilities. Working with radiologists, a think-aloud study was conducted to assess how much they would learn with four differently developed UIs: non-explainable high-performing (NEHP), explainable high-performing (EHP), non-explainable low-performing (NELP), and explainable low-performing (ELP). Four hypotheses were confirmed: H1 - small learning gains

occur with NEHP; H2 - larger learning gains occur with EHP; H3 - false learning happens with NELP; H4 - false learning is reduced with ELP, suggesting that explanations can significantly enhance clinical decision-making through learning.

Next, model-specific XAI methodologies were presented in the works from [Hwang *et al.*, 2022], [Sabol *et al.*, 2020], [Singh *et al.*, 2021], and [Neves *et al.*, 2021]. Here, [Hwang *et al.*, 2022] developed a CDSS to aid sleep-staging technicians in reviewing AI-generated sleep staging results. The authors developed the study in three phases. Firstly, sleep technicians were asked why they would need explanations. Secondly, a user observation study was performed to understand the sleep staging conventions of clinical practitioners. Thirdly, a CDSS based on CNNs was developed, with convolutional filters, saliency values, and intermediate activation, as sources of information for generating explanations. Human evaluations suggested that explanations from the system effectively served as convincing elements for model predictions; however, they failed to reveal ambiguous predictions. As a general principle, technicians sought explanations to confirm the accuracy of the AI predictions, while adhering to their clinical knowledge.

Next, in the field of oncology, [Sabol *et al.*, 2020] adopted a Cumulative Fuzzy Class Membership Criterion (CFCMC) to predict colorectal cancer. They developed two segmentation systems for whole-slide histopathological images: one using a standalone CNN and the other using the CFCMC classifier on CNN-extracted features to provide explanations. Through surveys with 14 pathologists, the CFCMC showed higher acceptability and trust compared to a plain CNN, pointing out that explainable classifiers improve AI usability and reliability in medical settings.

Next, [Singh *et al.*, 2021] evaluated multiple types of different visual explanation methods for an Inception-v-3 model trained to diagnose eye retinal diseases, while [Neves *et al.*, 2021] similarly adopted various explainability methods to analyze how a CDSS based on electrocardiogram (ECG) time series data could be used to predict heart arrhythmia, pointing out which explanatory method would perform optimally. In both studies, practitioners were carefully surveyed, resulting in an attribution method based on Taylor series expansions (DeepTaylor) and LIME, respectively, to be considered useful, in particular by less experienced clinicians. Finally, achieving comparable usability outcomes through semi-structured interviews, [Zhang *et al.*, 2024] uniquely leveraged an attention module to generate a fixed-length vector fed as input to an LSTM to select important variables, with attention weights to be used as the feature’s importance score, to develop *SepsisLab*, a CDSS able to predict ahead-of-time sepsis. Clinicians suggested that providing more explanations could improve their decision-making, but shifting the AI focus away from final decision predictions could improve their overall experience.

4 Challenges and Future Directions

4.1 How XAI Impacts CDSS: a Socio-Technical Perspective

We have reviewed the diversity of CDSS that adopt XAI human-centered evaluations in the medical field. Given the high-risk environment, application-grounded evaluations with domain experts were the main evaluation methodology. On average, clinical perceptions of XAI-based CDSS were mostly positive. For example, [Ellenrieder *et al.*, 2023] demonstrated that providing explanations not only enhances clinicians’ CDSS learning but also reduces false learning. In particular, [Neves *et al.*, 2021] demonstrated that less experienced practitioners could benefit from XAI explanations, while [Brennan *et al.*, 2019] revealed that adding XAI aids in significant improvements in physicians’ risk assessments.

However, incorporating XAI still poses significant challenges. For instance, [Barda *et al.*, 2020] discovered that the capacity to absorb explanations varied across clinical roles and levels of AI knowledge, thus advocating solutions that demand less cognitive effort. For the same reason, [Kim *et al.*, 2022] found that detailed explanations were perceived as equally useful as broad explanations, thus questioning how deep explanations should extend. Again, [Kyrimi *et al.*, 2020] documented that too-engineered explanations led to brain clutter, preventing their full internalization.

Notwithstanding, [Sivaraman *et al.*, 2023] more granularly identified that clinicians who ignored explanations were already confident in their own settled decisions, but clinicians who “negotiated” accepting at least one aspect of the recommendation were able to reach a balanced intermediate solution that combined with their own intuition. Similarly, [Matthiesen *et al.*, 2021] argued that ML and explainability did not surpass specialized and experienced clinicians’ capabilities, but at best support them during the clinical workflow, as well as [Kyrimi *et al.*, 2020], who found that, although XAI was useful, current conventional clinical practices are still perceived as more understandable. Finally, we highlight that only [Hwang *et al.*, 2022; Matthiesen *et al.*, 2021] early gathered clinicians’ feedback before CDSS development, which may be crucial to ensure that the CDSS aligns with real-world clinical expectations, thus purportedly reducing frictions in subsequent stages. These findings emphasize the need for explanations to align with prior clinical knowledge through early stakeholder feedback and to minimize the cognitive burden on clinicians using CDSS.

More in general, despite explainability methods face intrinsic issues such as lack of robustness [Slack *et al.*, 2020] and intra-method disagreement [Krishna *et al.*, 2022], issues that may be framed as independent research topics per sé, the friction from clinicians in perceiving explainability may be attributed to socio-technical gaps between human requirements and the effective utility of technological solutions, because human activity is “flexible and nuanced”, while computational mechanisms are “rigid and brittle” [Ackerman, 2000]. In other words, a socio-technical gap refers to the discrepancy between human needs, including expectations, and the technological capabilities designed to support them, highlighting

the limitations of technological systems in fully accommodating the nuances of human interactions. This general theoretical construct can be extended to the purpose of XAI explanations in CDSS, as explanation capabilities might not meet rigorous human requirements from precise clinical knowledge, given that CDSS are dramatically at high stake, as output recommendations may have a significant impact on patient lives. In other words, implementing XAI solutions in CDSS might not always bridge the socio-technical gap when compared to systems that do not adopt XAI, or systems that use basic reasoning in current clinical knowledge.

Therefore, we suggest a reference protocol for effective CDSS development. This is an **iterative** process that requires exploring and connecting both the XAI and HCI fields, leveraging their theoretical constructs to eventually devise a practical methodology. We begin by identifying two theoretical dimensions: **T1**: determining stakeholders and their requirements for use case models (*human requirement realism*), and **T2**: developing XAI evaluation methods to reliably assess whether and to what extent these requirements are met in downstream use cases (*context realism*) [Liao and Varshney, 2021]. Consistent with [Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017], who stated that in high-stake domains, application-grounded XAI evaluations should be preferred because of their high fidelity, **T2** particularly entails trade-offs with higher pragmatic and monetary costs to bear for effective evaluation.

In practical terms, designing a human-centered CDSS that conforms to the above-mentioned principles involves creating a system that is **accurate** in treatment recommendations, **explainable** in how and why such recommendations are conveyed, easily **usable** by clinicians, thus not imposing a significant cognitive burden, and **seamlessly integrable** into extant technological workflows. In other words, all stakeholders' requirements (*human requirement realism*) should be addressed thoroughly by the CDSS use case (*context realism*).

4.2 A Medical Field-Agnostic, Stakeholder-Centric Iterative Approach to CDSS Development

The iterative process can be decomposed into the following phases: (1) stakeholder identification, (2) stakeholders' requirements identification, and (3) system development and evaluation.

First, it is fundamental to identify all relevant stakeholders in each specific case. As a rule of thumb, identifiable stakeholders in the healthcare domain may be: (1) patients, (2) clinicians, (3) clinics and hospitals - including their corporate governance and management, and (4) CDSS developers - including researchers and engineers. Patients may be considered as passive stakeholders, as they do not directly interact, but are "targeted" by the system. On the contrary, clinicians are actively supported by CDSS, corporate management may decide whether the clinic/hospital should adopt AI-based solutions, evaluating the costs and benefits, and developers are responsible for the creation and maintenance of the technological workflows.

Second, we argue that a participatory AI methodology in which all stakeholders are early on involved is an effective starting point, where diverse requirements are early

considered, potentially reducing frictions afterward, *e.g.*, [Hwang *et al.*, 2022; Matthiesen *et al.*, 2021]. This entails gathering all stakeholders' needs, setting goals, and clearly framing an evaluation strategy specific to the CDSS and to the medical field in which the CDSS would operate. To this end, we suggest developers inform and instruct non-technical stakeholders of how CDSS operate *ex-ante*, including carefully describing their inner workings based on machine learning model(s) and XAI explainability component(s), and possible evaluation frameworks. Here, presenting them with relevant taxonomies can help them become familiar with the material more effectively (see Section 2.2 for XAI principles and methods, and 2.3 for human-centered evaluations). Methodologies may include a pilot study for existing prototypes or a formative study if none exist. This phase should capture stakeholders' expectations and assess the need for specialized evaluation methods in the CDSS's medical field. Also, focus groups can be particularly useful, as they convene all stakeholders simultaneously.

Third, CDSS developers would optimally internalize stakeholders' requirements gathered from the previous phase to develop a prototype to be quickly tested with synthetic patients' data. The prototype should adhere to both technical backend requirements and usability requirements and be designed with a focus on future adoption, thus seamlessly integrable into medical workflows. We argue that concurrent think-aloud studies can be effective in this stage, as clinicians (the end users) can articulate their thoughts on the perception of the accuracy and explainability of the models.

In general, steps 2 and 3 should be conceived as iterative, adhering to the concept that continuous feedback stimulates CDSS improvement. This iterative process guarantees that system performance is continuously and rigorously improved. Through the incorporation of ongoing feedback, the CDSS can be fine-tuned with new information, thus refining both its predictive value and clinical usefulness. As such, this refinement process facilitates evidence-based decision-making and optimizes overall system effectiveness in clinical practice.

4.3 Conclusion

In this work, we have examined the role of explainability in CDSS and the socio-technical challenges it faces. While explainability enhances clinicians' trust, its effectiveness varies based on user expertise, cognitive load, and the depth of explanation required. The socio-technical gap remains a central challenge, as human decision-making is inherently flexible, whereas (X)AI models operate within rigid constraints. Given the high stakes in healthcare, rigorous evaluation strategies - particularly application-grounded methodologies - are necessary to ensure that CDSS align with stakeholders' requirements. To address these challenges, we proposed an iterative framework for CDSS development to integrate XAI and HCI principles. By identifying key stakeholders, gathering their requirements through participatory methodologies, and continuously refining CDSS through iterative evaluations, we advocate for a development approach that prioritizes usability, trust, and clinical integration. Overall, rather than replacing human expertise, CDSS should serve as

augmentative tools that enhance clinicians' decision-making, ultimately fostering more effective and informed patient care.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (UIDB/00124/2020, UIDP/00124/2020 and Social Sciences DataLab - PINFRA/22209/2016), POR Lisboa and POR Norte (Social Sciences DataLab, PINFRA/22209/2016).

References

- [Ackerman, 2000] Mark S Ackerman. The intellectual challenge of CSCW: the gap between social requirements and technical feasibility. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 15(2-3):179–203, 2000.
- [Amann *et al.*, 2022] Julia Amann, Dennis Vetter, Stig Nikolaj Blomberg, Helle Collatz Christensen, Megan Coffee, Sara Gerke, Thomas K Gilbert, Thilo Hagedorff, Sune Holm, Michelle Livne, et al. To explain or not to explain?—Artificial intelligence explainability in clinical decision support systems. *PLOS Digital Health*, 1(2):e0000016, 2022.
- [Barda *et al.*, 2020] Amie J Barda, Christopher M Horvat, and Harry Hochheiser. A qualitative research framework for the design of user-centered displays of explanations for machine learning model predictions in healthcare. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 20:1–16, 2020.
- [Boyd-Graber *et al.*, 2022] Jordan Boyd-Graber, Samuel Carton, Shi Feng, Q Vera Liao, Tania Lombrozo, Alison Smith-Renner, and Chenhao Tan. Human-centered evaluation of explanations. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies: Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 26–32, 2022.
- [Brennan *et al.*, 2019] Meghan Brennan, Sahil Puri, Tezcan Ozrazgat-Baslanti, Zheng Feng, Matthew Ruppert, Haleh Hashemighouchani, Petar Momcilovic, Xiaolin Li, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Azra Bihorac. Comparing clinical judgment with the mysurgeryrisk algorithm for preoperative risk assessment: a pilot usability study. *Surgery*, 165(5):1035–1045, 2019.
- [Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017] Finale Doshi-Velez and Been Kim. Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608*, 2017.
- [Ellenrieder *et al.*, 2023] Sara Ellenrieder, Emma Marlene Kallina, Luisa Pumplun, Joshua Felix Gawlitza, Sebastian Ziegelmayer, and Pete Buxmann. Promoting learning through explainable artificial intelligence: An experimental study in radiology. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Information Systems*, pages 1–17, 2023.
- [Ghassemi *et al.*, 2021] Marzyeh Ghassemi, Luke Oakden-Rayner, and Andrew L Beam. The false hope of current approaches to explainable artificial intelligence in health care. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 3(11):e745–e750, 2021.
- [Goldsack and Overgaard, 2024] Jennifer Goldsack and Shauna Overgaard. Billions of dollars have been invested in healthcare ai. but are we spending in the right places? Technical report, World Economic Forum, 2024.
- [Hou *et al.*, 2024] Ting Hou, Meng Li, Yinliang Tan, and Huazhong Zhao. Physician adoption of AI assistant. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 26(5):1639–1655, 2024.
- [Hwang *et al.*, 2022] Jeonghwan Hwang, Taeheon Lee, Honggu Lee, and Seonjeong Byun. A clinical deci-

- sion support system for sleep staging tasks with explanations from artificial intelligence: user-centered design and evaluation study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 24(1):e28659, 2022.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2022] Taewan Kim, Haesoo Kim, Ha Yeon Lee, Hwarang Goh, Shakhboz Abdigapporov, Mingon Jeong, Hyunsung Cho, Kyungsik Han, Youngtae Noh, Sung-Ju Lee, et al. Prediction for retrospection: Integrating algorithmic stress prediction into personal informatics systems for college students' mental health. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–20, 2022.
- [Kovalchuk *et al.*, 2022] Sergey V Kovalchuk, Georgy D Kopanitsa, Iliia V Derevitskii, Georgy A Matveev, and Daria A Savitskaya. Three-stage intelligent support of clinical decision making for higher trust, validity, and explainability. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 127:104013, 2022.
- [Krishna *et al.*, 2022] Satyapriya Krishna, Tessa Han, Alex Gu, Steven Wu, Shahin Jabbari, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. The disagreement problem in explainable machine learning: A practitioner's perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.01602*, 2022.
- [Kumarakulasinghe *et al.*, 2020] Nesaretnam Barr Kumarakulasinghe, Tobias Blomberg, Jintai Liu, Alexandra Saraiva Leao, and Panagiotis Papapetrou. Evaluating local interpretable model-agnostic explanations on clinical machine learning classification models. In *2020 IEEE 33rd International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems (CBMS)*, pages 7–12. IEEE, 2020.
- [Kyrimi *et al.*, 2020] Evangelia Kyrimi, Somayyeh Mossadegh, Nigel Tai, and William Marsh. An incremental explanation of inference in bayesian networks for increasing model trustworthiness and supporting clinical decision making. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 103:101812, 2020.
- [Liao and Varshney, 2021] Q Vera Liao and Kush R Varshney. Human-centered explainable ai (xai): From algorithms to user experiences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.10790*, 2021.
- [Liao and Xiao, 2023] Q Vera Liao and Ziang Xiao. Rethinking model evaluation as narrowing the socio-technical gap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03100*, 2023.
- [Loh *et al.*, 2022] Hui Wen Loh, Chui Ping Ooi, Silvia Seoni, Prabal Datta Barua, Filippo Molinari, and U Rajendra Acharya. Application of explainable artificial intelligence for healthcare: A systematic review of the last decade (2011–2022). *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 226:107161, 2022.
- [Lundberg and Lee, 2017] Scott M Lundberg and Su-In Lee. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 4765–4774. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [Matthiesen *et al.*, 2021] Stina Matthiesen, Søren Zöga Diederichsen, Mikkel Klitzing Hartmann Hansen, and Christina et al. Villumsen. Clinician preimplementation perspectives of a decision-support tool for the prediction of cardiac arrhythmia based on machine learning: near-live feasibility and qualitative study. *JMIR Human Factors*, 8(4):e26964, 2021.
- [Molnar, 2022] Christoph Molnar. *Interpretable Machine Learning*. 2 edition, 2022.
- [Montavon *et al.*, 2017] Grégoire Montavon, Sebastian Lapuschkin, Alexander Binder, Wojciech Samek, and Klaus-Robert Müller. Explaining nonlinear classification decisions with deep taylor decomposition. *Pattern Recognition*, 65:211–222, 2017.
- [Musen *et al.*, 2021] Mark A Musen, Blackford Middleton, and Robert A Greenes. Clinical decision-support systems. In *Biomedical informatics: computer applications in health care and biomedicine*, pages 795–840. Springer, 2021.
- [Neves *et al.*, 2021] Inês Neves, Duarte Folgado, Sara Santos, Marília Barandas, Andrea Campagner, Luca Ronzio, Federico Cabitza, and Hugo Gamboa. Interpretable heart-beat classification using local model-agnostic explanations on eegs. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 133:104393, 2021.
- [Pumplun *et al.*, 2023] Luisa Pumplun, Felix Peters, Joshua F Gawlitza, and Peter Buxmann. Bringing machine learning systems into clinical practice: a design science approach to explainable machine learning-based clinical decision support systems. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 24(4):953–979, 2023.
- [Rajashekar *et al.*, 2024] Niroop Channa Rajashekar, Yeo Eun Shin, Yuan Pu, Sunny Chung, Kisung You, Mauro Giuffrè, Colleen E Chan, Theo Saarinen, Allen Hsiao, Jasjeet Sekhon, et al. Human-algorithmic interaction using a large language model-augmented artificial intelligence clinical decision support system. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–20, 2024.
- [Ribeiro *et al.*, 2016] Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Sameer Singh, and Carlos Guestrin. Why should i trust you? explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1135–1144, 2016.
- [Sabol *et al.*, 2020] Patrik Sabol, Peter Sinčák, Pitoyo Hartono, Pavel Kočan, Zuzana Benetinová, Alžbeta Blichárová, L'udmila Verbóová, Erika Štammová, Antónia Sabolová-Fabianová, and Anna Jašková. Explainable classifier for improving the accountability in decision-making for colorectal cancer diagnosis from histopathological images. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 109:103523, 2020.
- [Sahni *et al.*, 2023] Nikhil Sahni, George Stein, Rodney Zimmel, and David M Cutler. The potential impact of

artificial intelligence on healthcare spending. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, MA, USA., 2023.

- [Selvaraju *et al.*, 2017] Ramprasaath R Selvaraju, Michael Cogswell, Abhishek Das, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 618–626, 2017.
- [Sendak *et al.*, 2020] Mark Sendak, Madeleine Clare Elish, Michael Gao, Joseph Futoma, William Ratliff, Marshall Nichols, Armando Bedoya, Suresh Balu, and Cara O’Brien. ” the human body is a black box” supporting clinical decision-making with deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 99–109, 2020.
- [Singh *et al.*, 2021] Amitojdeep Singh, Janarthanam Jothi Balaji, Mohammed Abdul Rasheed, Varadharajan Jayakumar, Rajiv Raman, and Vasudevan Lakshminarayanan. Evaluation of explainable deep learning methods for ophthalmic diagnosis. *Clinical Ophthalmology*, pages 2573–2581, 2021.
- [Sivaraman *et al.*, 2023] Venkatesh Sivaraman, Leigh A Bukowski, Joel Levin, Jeremy M Kahn, and Adam Perer. Ignore, trust, or negotiate: understanding clinician acceptance of ai-based treatment recommendations in health care. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–18, 2023.
- [Slack *et al.*, 2020] Dylan Slack, Sophie Hilgard, Emily Jia, Sameer Singh, and Himabindu Lakkaraju. Fooling lime and shap: Adversarial attacks on post hoc explanation methods. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, pages 180–186, 2020.
- [Speith, 2022] Timo Speith. A review of taxonomies of explainable artificial intelligence (xai) methods. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 2239–2250, 2022.
- [Sundararajan *et al.*, 2017] Mukund Sundararajan, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3319–3328. PMLR, 2017.
- [Vasil and Lombrozo, 2022] Ny Vasil and Tania Lombrozo. Explanations and causal judgments are differentially sensitive to covariation and mechanism information. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13:911177, 2022.
- [Zhang and Zhang, 2023] Jie Zhang and Zong-ming Zhang. Ethics and governance of trustworthy medical artificial intelligence. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 23(1):7, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024] Shao Zhang, Jianing Yu, Xuhai Xu, Changchang Yin, Yuxuan Lu, Bingsheng Yao, Melanie Tory, Lace M Padilla, Jeffrey Caterino, Ping Zhang, et al. Rethinking human-ai collaboration in complex medical decision making: A case study in sepsis diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–18, 2024.