

# **FHIR-RAG-MEDS: Integrating HL7 FHIR with Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models for Enhanced Medical Decision Support**

Yildiray KABAK<sup>1,\*</sup>, Gokce B. LALECI ERTURKMEN<sup>1</sup>, Mert GENCTURK<sup>1</sup>, Tuncay NAMLI<sup>1</sup>, A. Anil SINACI<sup>1</sup>, Ruben ALCANTUD CORCOLES<sup>2,3</sup>, Cristina GOMEZ BALLESTEROS<sup>2,3</sup>, Pedro ABIZANDA<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Asuman DOGAC<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>SRDC Software Research & Development and Consultancy Corporation, Ankara, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Geriatrics Department, Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Albacete, Albacete, Spain

<sup>3</sup>CIBER de Fragilidad y Envejecimiento Saludable (CIBERFES), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain

<sup>4</sup>Facultad de Medicina de Albacete, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Albacete, Spain

\* Correspondence:

Yildiray Kabak, PhD, [yildiray@srcd.com.tr](mailto:yildiray@srcd.com.tr)

**Keywords:** Medical Decision Support; HL7 FHIR; Retrieval-Augmented Generation; Clinical Guidelines; Large Language Models; Patient-Specific Data; Evidence-Based Medicine; Llama 3.1

## **Abstract**

**Objectives:** In this study, we propose FHIR-RAG-MEDS system that aims to integrate Health Level 7 Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (HL7 FHIR) with a Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)-based system to improve personalized medical decision support on evidence-based clinical guidelines, emphasizing the need for research in practical applications. In the evolving landscape of medical decision support systems, integrating advanced technologies such as RAG and HL7 FHIR can significantly enhance clinical decision-making processes. Despite the potential of these technologies, there is limited research on their integration in practical applications.

**Methods:** We explore how this integration can enhance the accuracy and relevance of RAG-based clinical recommendations by leveraging patient-specific data from HL7 FHIR servers and advanced language models. The FHIR-RAG-MEDS system utilizes cleaned clinical guidelines stored in a vector database and responds to patient queries using Llama 3.1 8B open-source large language model (LLM).

**Results:** The integration of HL7 FHIR with the RAG-based system shows significant improvements in generating accurate and contextually relevant medical recommendations. The evaluation against other medical LLMs, such as Meditron 3, OpenBioLLM, and BioMistral, through statistical metrics (BERTScore, ROUGE and METEOR), followed by LLM-evaluators (Prometheus 2 and RAGAS), demonstrates strong performance, with particular enhancements noted through human expert feedback. Visualization of the results offers detailed insights into the system's strengths and areas for improvement.

**Conclusions:** By addressing the limitations of traditional medical LLMs and incorporating real-time patient data through HL7 FHIR and evidence-based clinical guidelines, our approach offers a promising solution for improving clinical decision support. This integration represents a step forward in bridging the gap between static knowledge models and dynamic, patient-specific needs, ultimately contributing to better clinical outcomes and more effective healthcare delivery.

## **1 BACKGROUND**

In recent years, the field of medical informatics has seen significant advancements with the introduction of medical large language models (LLMs). These models, powered by artificial intelligence, have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in understanding and generating medical text, providing valuable assistance in clinical decision-making, diagnostics, and patient care. Prominent examples include models such as Meditron [1], BioMistral [2] and OpenBioLLM [3], which have shown considerable promise in various medical applications. However, despite these advancements, the inherent limitations of medical LLMs highlight the need for more robust solutions.

While medical LLMs have achieved impressive results, they are not without limitations. These models primarily rely on their training data and do not have inherent mechanisms to incorporate real-time patient-specific information or to update their knowledge base dynamically [4] especially to focus on a specific context. As a result, their recommendations may lack contextual relevance and may not fully account for the nuances of individual patient cases, recent developments in medical guidelines or customized approaches in local guidelines. This can lead to less accurate or suboptimal recommendations in a clinical setting. Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) represents a significant advancement over traditional LLM approaches by addressing some of these limitations, by combining the strengths of retrieval-based methods with generative capabilities, enabling the system to access and incorporate specific, up-to-date information from a curated knowledge base [5]. This approach allows the RAG system to generate recommendations that are not only based on broad training data but also tailored to the context of the patient's medical history and current/local clinical guidelines. The main advancements that RAG systems offer over medical LLMs are as follows.

1. Accuracy and Trustworthiness: Medical LLMs rely solely on their training data, which may become outdated or inaccurate as medical knowledge evolves [6]. This can lead to the generation of incorrect or misleading information [7], especially in rapidly changing medical fields. RAG applications, on the other hand, are able to retrieve answers from validated medical guidelines, databases, or research papers, ensuring that the generated responses are based on up-to-date and trustworthy information [8],[9]. This helps reduce the risk of hallucination, where LLMs may generate plausible but incorrect answers. This is also crucial for enabling decision support tailored to national and regional clinical guidelines that address local needs. RAG systems, by retrieving information from validated, selected medical guidelines and sources, are better aligned with clinical standards, increasing compliance and reducing legal risks in medical practice.
2. Evidence-Based Responses: Medical LLMs often generate responses without directly citing their sources, making it harder for clinicians to trust the recommendations without external verification. The

lack of transparency can be a significant issue in clinical environments [10]. RAG systems combine Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) with retrieved evidence, allowing the system to generate responses while citing medical sources. This is particularly important in healthcare, where decisions must be supported by evidence to ensure clinical validity [11].

3. **Scalability and Flexibility:** Medical LLMs require extensive training data for each medical field or domain, which may not always be feasible and can result in inefficiencies when handling cross-domain knowledge. RAG systems provide greater flexibility by combining generative capabilities with retrieval from diverse and specialized datasets. This allows the application to handle multiple medical domains and specific guidelines efficiently.
4. **Reduced Computational Costs:** Medical LLMs require heavy computational resources to generate responses, particularly as model sizes increase, leading to slower response times and higher infrastructure costs [12]. RAG systems reduce computational burdens by retrieving relevant information from external databases before generating responses, which can be more efficient than relying entirely on a large LLM for every query.

The integration of RAG with LLMs in the medical domain is still in its early stages [11]. Additionally, to fully harness the potential of LLMs in routine medical practice, they need to access historical Electronic Health Record (EHR) data. This access enables LLMs to enhance clinical decision support by offering more personalized and contextually relevant recommendations based on a patient's medical history. Studies such as [13], [14] have reviewed the integration of LLMs with EHRs, outlining both the potential and limitations of this approach. They point out that while LLMs can assist with tasks such as diagnostic support and treatment planning, the challenge lies in effectively incorporating patient data into these models.

Our work addresses this gap by integrating Health Level 7 Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (HL7 FHIR) into an RAG system specifically for medical professionals. By leveraging the standardized data formats provided by HL7 FHIR, our system can retrieve up-to-date patient medical summaries and utilize them to retrieve personalized suggestions from evidence-based clinical guidelines. This ensures more

accurate, personalized, and contextually relevant recommendations, overcoming the limitations regarding the static nature of LLMs that lack dynamic access to patient data. Although there are studies on the use of LLMs on HL7 FHIR, they use it to increase patient’s health literacy on their medical records [15] and to convert the unstructured medical records into HL7 FHIR resources [16],[17]. In our work, HL7 FHIR integration allows our system to provide real-time decision support, enhances interpretability, and enables personalization of recommendations, making it better suited for clinical environments where personalized guidance based on medical standards is critical.

**Statement of Significance**

<b>Problem</b>	In the evolving landscape of medical decision support systems, integrating advanced technologies such as Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) and Health Level 7 Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (HL7 FHIR) can significantly enhance clinical decision-making processes. Despite the potential of these technologies, there is limited research on their integration in practical applications.
<b>What is already known?</b>	Medical large language models (LLMs), powered by artificial intelligence, have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in understanding and generating medical text, providing valuable assistance in clinical decision-making, diagnostics, and patient care.
<b>What this Paper Adds?</b>	In this study, we propose FHIR-RAG-MEDS system that aims to integrate HL7 FHIR with a RAG-based system to improve personalized medical decision support on evidence-based clinical guidelines. We explore how this integration can enhance the accuracy and relevance of RAG-based clinical recommendations by leveraging patient-specific data from HL7 FHIR servers and advanced language models.
<b>Who would benefit from the new knowledge in this paper</b>	Medical Informatics specialists can benefit from the detailed architectural decisions presented to replicate the study to build decision support applications in a different clinical domain. Clinicians can benefit from the personalized decision support based on evidence-based guidelines.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) was proposed by [4] to enhance generation performance on knowledge-intensive tasks by integrating retrieved relevant information. RAG not only mitigates the problem of hallucinations, as LLMs are grounded in given contexts, but it can also provide up-to-date knowledge that might not be encoded within the LLMs. In the medical domain, there have already been various explorations into the use of LLMs with RAG. One prominent study highlights the use of RAG in LLMs tailored for specific medical domains, such as nephrology [5]. In this context, RAG allows these models to access real-time external medical databases, including clinical guidelines, to provide contextually relevant and up-to-date information. This approach significantly enhances the model's performance by grounding responses in validated, evidence-based guidelines, which is critical in healthcare settings where precision is vital. For example, this methodology helps the model generate more accurate recommendations for conditions like kidney disease. Another interesting example is the experimental LLM framework, Almanac, which integrates RAG functionalities specifically with clinical guidelines and medical treatments [11]. This framework was tested against existing models, such as ChatGPT, and demonstrated superior performance, particularly in cardiology, where it provided more accurate responses compared to standard generative models. However, these studies do not focus on EHR integration and personalization of recommendations.

Studies such as [13],[14] have reviewed the integration of LLMs with EHRs. The integration is centered around seven identified topics: named entity recognition, information extraction, text similarity, text summarization, text classification, dialogue system, and diagnosis and prediction. However, none of the examined studies use standardized data models to access medical records. A notable patient-centered example was introduced by [15], which combines GPT-4 with HL7 FHIR to enhance the health literacy of a diverse patient population. However, this approach is aimed at patients and does not utilize RAG. Our system, in contrast, is designed specifically for medical professionals and is built on evidence-based clinical

guidelines. This ensures that recommendations are not only accurate and trustworthy but also up to date, overcoming the limitations of static, pre-trained models like GPT-4.

In summary, medical RAG systems can improve EHR summarization [18], clinical decision-making [5], [11], [12], [19] and clinical trial screening [20], but their evaluations are not comprehensive [21]. Furthermore, they do not access patients' medical records, which hinders personalized recommendations.

### **3 METHODS**

This study aims to develop the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system by integrating HL7 FHIR with a RAG-based system to improve personalized medical decision support based on evidence-based clinical guidelines. As a case study, we have chosen a European Commission (EC)-funded research project, CAREPATH [22], [23] which aims to deliver a patient-centered integrated care platform to meet the needs of older patients with multimorbidity, including mild cognitive impairment (MCI) or mild dementia (MD), based on the recommendations of evidence-based guidelines. In the CAREPATH project, a Clinical Reference Group (CRG), formed by the project's clinical partners, has analyzed several clinical guidelines that address the needs of common comorbidities in this patient group and created a consolidated guideline providing advice, information, and actions for the management of MCI/MD, physical exercise, nutrition and hydration, common use of drugs, coronary artery disease, heart failure, hypertension, diabetes, chronic kidney disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), stroke, sarcopenia, and frailty [24]. Subsequently, this consolidated guideline was analyzed by software engineers to create clinical decision support services that automate the recommendations from the guideline, delivering personalized suggestions for care plan goals and activities to healthcare professionals [25]. Although this method provides a solid and reliable mechanism to create clinical decision support for healthcare professionals, the process requires significant time and resources. In this research, we aim to explore the value of utilizing advanced large language models and the RAG methodology to accelerate the delivery of personalized clinical recommendations to healthcare professionals based on a selected curation of evidence-based guidelines. As a case study, we

have focused on a subset of the CAREPATH consolidated guideline, covering recommendations for managing hypertension, COPD, sarcopenia, and MCI/MD.

### 3.1 System Architecture

The FHIR-RAG-MEDS system architecture (Figure 1) integrates HL7 FHIR with a RAG framework to deliver real-time, evidence-based clinical decision support. The architecture is designed to retrieve patient-specific data from an HL7 FHIR server, process clinical guidelines stored in a vector database, and generate recommendations using LLMs. The system flow is divided into three core components, as depicted in Figure 1: preprocessing, data retrieval & query processing, and RAG execution:

- **Preprocessing:** This step is required to prepare the guideline text to be processed by the RAG framework. It includes segmenting the text into smaller chunks and generating embeddings from these chunks to populate the vector database, which serves as an input to the RAG system.
- **Data Retrieval and Query Processing:** In this phase, patient context data is retrieved from the FHIR server and pre-processed to create a medical summary, which is integrated into the RAG system as input. SMART on FHIR (Substitutable Medical Applications and Reusable Technologies on Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources) specifications are employed at this stage. SMART on FHIR is a widely adopted framework that enhances interoperability in healthcare by providing standardized, secure, and scalable solutions for accessing and exchanging clinical data [26]. Unlike proprietary or isolated solutions, SMART on FHIR fosters a robust ecosystem where applications can interact with any FHIR-compliant server, ensuring consistent access to patient data across platforms. This framework is particularly valuable for clinical decision support systems like FHIR-RAG-MEDS, where real-time access to patient-specific data is crucial for generating accurate, evidence-based recommendations. Next, the user’s plain text query (e.g., ‘What should be the approach to pharmacological treatment for Patient X?’) is merged with the generated medical summary text (e.g., ‘Patient X is an 85-year-old female patient with cognitive impairment and a

history of injurious falls. She is diagnosed with hypertension’) and processed to extract embeddings, which are stored in the vector database.

- **RAG Execution:** This step integrates the generative capabilities of LLMs with the retrieval of specific, up-to-date information from the vector database containing pre-processed guidelines. It matches the embeddings extracted from the patient’s medical summary and the user query with the guideline embeddings in the vector storage to identify the closest matching vectors. These matching vectors, along with the medical summary, are then used by the LLM to generate a response to the clinician’s query.




Figure 1 – Overall architecture of the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system

In the following subsections, we provide a detailed explanation of these steps, including our design decisions and the tools utilized.

### 3.1.1 Preprocessing

Handling semi-structured data, such as PDFs containing a mix of text and tables, presents specific challenges for traditional RAG systems. First, text splitting may inadvertently break apart tables, causing data corruption during retrieval. Second, incorporating tables into the data complicates semantic similarity searches[8]. To address this, clinical documents in various formats, including PDFs, should be converted to a text-based format to ensure compatibility with the RAG framework [19].

Once converted, the processed texts are segmented into smaller chunks for embedding and retrieval. Tools from the Langchain library [27] are employed in this splitting process, typically creating chunks of arbitrary sizes with slight overlaps. Determining the optimal chunk size for healthcare applications is a nuanced task that requires qualitative evaluation. In our study, we used Python 3.12 along with Langchain's *DirectoryLoader*, *RecursiveCharacterTextSplitter*, and *TextLoader* for reading text-based clinical guidelines. We established a chunk size of 1200 units, with a 100-unit overlap, based on Ollama's "mxbai-embed-large" embedding model.

Efficient data retrieval also depends on robust data storage solutions. Vector storage, inspired by deep learning techniques, condenses information into high-dimensional vectors, enhancing retrieval performance. The key metrics for evaluating vector storage include cosine similarity, Euclidean distance, and dot product. Cosine similarity is particularly effective for semantic searches and is preferred in healthcare applications because it focuses on the angle between vectors, highlighting content similarity [12]. Conversely, Euclidean distance is better suited for quantitative assessments. Embedding, the process of converting content into numerical vectors for machine learning models, is essential for transforming preprocessed healthcare data into vectors. For this study, we used Chroma [28] as our vector storage solution with cosine similarity, and as previously mentioned, employed Ollama's "mxbai-embed-large" model for embedding.

### **3.1.2 Data Retrieval and Integration with Existing EHR Systems**

The architecture begins with the HL7 FHIR server, which stores structured patient data following the FHIR standard. To enhance interoperability and scalability, a "SMART on FHIR"-based integration has been developed for the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system. This integration leverages the SMART on FHIR framework, which provides a standard set of specifications for building secure, interoperable healthcare applications. These applications can seamlessly connect with any FHIR server that conforms to these standards.

The integration was implemented using Angular, a modern and responsive web development framework, to create a user-friendly interface. This Angular-based application communicates with the FHIR-RAG-

MEDS system's endpoints for real-time patient data interpretation and clinical query processing. By adhering to SMART on FHIR specifications, the integration ensures compatibility with various FHIR servers while simplifying authentication, authorization, and data exchange processes.

Key components of the SMART on FHIR integration include the following:

1. **Authentication and Authorization:** The system employs OAuth 2.0 protocols, as defined by SMART on FHIR, to securely authenticate users and authorize access to patient data. This ensures that sensitive medical information remains protected while maintaining seamless usability.
2. **Data Retrieval and Management:** The integration enables real-time retrieval of patient information, such as demographics, medications, conditions, and observations, from any compliant FHIR server. All recent condition, medication, and observation resources are retrieved individually and then combined into a FHIR bundle for interpretation by the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system.
3. **Interoperable Query Processing:** Once patient data is retrieved and summarized, it is sent to the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system for interpretation and recommendation generation as explained in the next section. The system's query endpoints provide evidence-based clinical suggestions tailored to the patient's specific medical context.
4. **Extensibility and Compatibility:** The SMART on FHIR integration is designed to be extensible, allowing it to support additional use cases, such as integration with third-party applications, EHR systems, and telehealth platforms. By adhering to open standards, it ensures compatibility across diverse healthcare ecosystems.

### 3.1.3 Processing FHIR Bundles

When a query is initiated to retrieve recommendations from evidence-based guidelines for a specific patient, relevant patient information —such as demographics, medical history, medications, and conditions—is retrieved from the FHIR server once Smart on FHIR based integrating is achieved. This retrieval is performed through FHIR-compliant queries using the appropriate APIs. By leveraging standardized FHIR

resources, the system ensures interoperability and consistency across different healthcare environments. Once the patient data is retrieved in FHIR JSON format, it must be processed and organized into a format suitable for integration with the RAG system. For this, we use the Llama 3.1 8B [29] model with the a prompt template (see Supplementary material) to convert the JSON into a textual medical summary, enabling its inclusion in the LLM context.

The prompt ensures that the retrieved data is transformed into a concise and clear summary, ready for interpretation by the system without overwhelming the user with technical jargon. By filtering and summarizing the patient's medical information in this way, the system enhances usability while maintaining the factual accuracy and relevance necessary for medical decision-making.

The Llama 3.1 8B model has been selected for interpreting FHIR bundles based on several key factors. Testing with an example FHIR bundle set has demonstrated that the model performs well in generating accurate and concise medical summaries. Its relatively small size, up-to-date architecture, and popularity within the community further supported its selection. As an open-source model, Llama 3.1 8B is also easily deployable, even in resource-limited environments such as laptops. Furthermore, the ability to run the model within a local network improves security and privacy, ensuring that confidential health data remains protected without relying on external cloud services.

#### **3.1.4 RAG Execution**

The core of the system lies in the RAG module, which combines the generative capabilities of LLMs with the retrieval of specific, up-to-date information from a pre-processed knowledge base. Clinical guidelines, which are cleaned and stored in a vector database, are indexed to enable fast retrieval of evidence-based recommendations in the previous step.

The RAG execution functions as an intermediary, identifying the most relevant chunks in response to user queries. This involves using the same embedding model to convert user queries into vectors, which are then filtered through the Vector Storage to locate the closest matching vectors. The number of chunks retrieved—adjustable through a parameter commonly referred to as 'k'—can be set to any desired value. In our

implementation, we set 'k' to 4, determining the number of knowledge chunks retrieved. After that, we combined these chunks with the FHIR Bundle textual interpretation generated in the previous step and created a context to be sent as an input to the LLM. The system uses Llama 3.1 8B, installed via Ollama on a local server, to generate responses to clinician queries.

The integration of FHIR with RAG allows the system to generate personalized clinical recommendations by combining static, evidence-based guidelines with dynamic, real-time patient data. This architecture ensures that the recommendations are both contextually relevant to the individual patient's health profile and aligned with the latest medical standards.

### 3.2 Evaluation Framework

Our evaluation starts with developing questions and their corresponding answers based on the guidelines provided. For this purpose, we tasked our evaluation panel of physicians to generate questions and answers related to their daily clinical practices. Questions ranged from simple ones to more complex scenario-based questions, e.g., “I have a patient with diabetes and hypertension. What should be the initial drug therapy?”. In total, we compiled approximately 70 questions and answers, regarded as ground truths.

After obtaining the answers to these questions from our RAG system, in the first step of the evaluation, we compared them with the ground truth answers using text similarity metrics Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation (ROUGE) [30], Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit Ordering (METEOR) [31] and BERTScore [32]. In text comparisons, BERTScore is used to evaluate semantic accuracy, while ROUGE/METEOR are used to assess word-level matching. Specifically:

- **BERTScore** can be the **primary metric** because, in healthcare, capturing the **correct meaning** of an answer is more important than exact word matches.
- **ROUGE** can be used to ensure that the model captures all necessary **key terms** from the guideline.
- **METEOR** can be a good **middle-ground metric** if flexibility is needed in language while still maintaining word overlap.

In this study, we opted not to use the **BLEU** (Bilingual Evaluation Understudy) [33] metric for evaluating the quality of model-generated medical summaries. Although BLEU is widely used for machine translation and other natural language generation tasks, it can be overly strict when applied to healthcare data. BLEU measures the degree of n-gram overlap between generated and reference text, which works well for tasks reliant on literal word matching. However, in healthcare, accurate interpretation and relevance of information are far more critical than exact phrasing. Medical summaries often vary in terminology, phrasing, or style while still conveying the same clinical meaning. The strictness of BLEU in penalizing even slight variations in wording can result in misleading evaluations of model performance in this context. Therefore, more appropriate metrics that focus on semantic accuracy and clinical relevance are preferred for evaluating health-related outputs.

These scores are developed to measure word overlap, sentence structure similarity, and semantic coherence but not factual correctness. For clinical questions, factual correctness is the most important feature. This is an important challenge that should be addressed, as current responses could appear lexically comparable to a reference answer but fail to capture the factual information necessary to guide clinical care. This can result in high scores for responses that are factually incorrect (false positives) or low scores for accurate responses that are phrased differently than the reference (false negatives). While useful for certain aspects of evaluation, these metrics fail to capture the nuances of medical relevance, completeness, and contextual correctness in the answers provided by the LLM. This limitation underscores the persistent need for expert physician oversight in the evaluation process, i.e., human-in-the-loop.

For automated grading of our RAG generated responses, we apply a recent approach called “LLM-as-a-Judge” [34], where LLM-evaluators are used to evaluate the quality of another LLM’s response. For this approach, we employed two tools. The first one is Prometheus 2 [35], which is a finetuned evaluator (based on Llama 3.1 8B LLM) that performs fine-grained evaluation of text responses based on user-defined score rubrics. Prometheus 2 takes as input the instructions, score rubric, response to evaluate, and a gold reference

answer, making it a referenced-based evaluator. Then, it scores the response to evaluate and returns text feedback. The prompt used by Prometheus 2 is as presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – The Prompt used by Prometheus 2

```
###Task Description:
An instruction (might include an Input inside it), a response to evaluate, a
reference answer that gets a score of 5, and a score rubric representing a
evaluation criteria are given.
1. Write detailed feedback that assesses the quality of the response strictly
based on the given score rubric, not evaluating in general.
2. After writing a feedback, write a score that is an integer between 1 and
5. You should refer to the score rubric.
3. The output format should look as follows: "Feedback: {{write a feedback
for criteria}} [RESULT] {{an integer number between 1 and 5}}"
4. Please do not generate any other opening, closing, and explanations. Be
sure to include [RESULT] in your output.

###The instruction to evaluate:
{instruction}

###Response to evaluate:
{response}

###Reference Answer (Score 5):
{reference_answer}

###Score Rubrics:
[Is the response correct, accurate, and factual based on the reference
answer?]
Score 1: The response is completely incorrect, inaccurate, and/or not factual.
Score 2: The response is mostly incorrect, inaccurate, and/or not factual.
Score 3: The response is somewhat correct, accurate, and/or factual.
```

Score 4: The response is mostly correct, accurate, and factual.  
 Score 5: The response is completely correct, accurate, and factual.  
 ###Feedback:

The second LLM-evaluator tool is RAGAS [36] (Retrieval Augmented Generation Assessment), which is a framework evaluation of RAG pipelines by considering both the retriever and response generation phases. RAGAS offers metrics tailored for evaluating each component of a RAG pipeline in isolation. In our study, we used the metrics listed in Table 2.

Table 2 – RAGAS metrics

Type	Metric	Description
Retriever Metrics	Context Precision	In simple terms how relevant is context retrieved to the question asked.
	Context Recall	Is the retriever able to retrieve all the relevant context pertaining to ground truth?
	Context Utilization	Whether all the answer relevant items present in the contexts are ranked higher or not.
Response Generation Metrics	Answer Relevancy	How relevant is the generated answer to the question.
	Faithfulness	Factual consistency of generated answers with the given context.
Comprehensive Metrics	Answer Correctness	Answer correctness encompasses two critical aspects: semantic similarity between the generated answer and the ground truth, as well as factual similarity.
	Answer Similarity	The semantic resemblance between the generated answer and the ground truth.

Finally, we evaluated the performance of our RAG system against well-known medical LLMs (Meditron [1], BioMistral [2] and OpenBioLLM [3] and the original Llama 3.1 8B) by applying the above evaluation framework (except RAGAS which is only applicable to RAG systems) to these LLMs. Importantly, we complemented this evaluation with a rigorous human assessment, where three independent physicians, leveraging their medical expertise, carefully evaluated the system's responses for accuracy, relevance, and

clinical soundness. This human evaluation served as a critical validation step, ensuring that the system's outputs meet real-world medical expectations.

## 4 RESULTS

Following the comprehensive evaluation framework outlined in the previous section, we assessed the performance of FHIR-RAG-MEDS against various large medical language models across four sections of the CAREPATH consensus clinical guidelines: dementia, COPD, hypertension, and sarcopenia. The evaluation aimed to determine the effectiveness of each model in generating accurate, relevant, and contextually appropriate responses to clinical queries. The results were measured using multiple metrics, including BERTScore, ROUGE-L, and METEOR, alongside a tailored set of RAGAS and Prometheus 2 metrics designed to evaluate the models' performance from a clinical decision-support perspective. This section presents the evaluation results, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each LLM in relation to the medical guidelines.

### 4.1 Dementia Results Interpretation

For the **dementia** guideline, the proposed FHIR-RAG-MEDS system consistently outperformed the other models in all the text-based evaluation metrics (BERTScore F1, ROUGE-L F1, and METEOR), as shown in Table 3. Considering Prometheus 2, the RAG system outperformed all other models as well, achieving an average score of **4.0**. This indicates that it provided responses that were more accurate and relevant compared to other LLMs, particularly BioMistral, which had the lowest average score of 3.17.

Table 3 – Comparison of FHIR-RAG-MEDS with other LLMs for the dementia guideline.

LLM NAME	PROMETHEUS 2 AVERAGE SCORE	BERTSCORE F1	ROUGE-L F1	METEOR
<b>BIOMISTRAL</b>	3.1667	0.4900	0.11198	0.10472
<b>LLAMA 3.1 8B</b>	3.6667	0.5497	0.12921	0.24090
<b>MEDITRON</b>	3.6667	0.5592	0.13154	0.25065
<b>OPENBIOLLM</b>	3.5000	0.5406	0.14398	0.16664
<b>FHIR-RAG-MEDS</b>	<b>4.0000</b>	<b>0.6372</b>	<b>0.25427</b>	<b>0.37810</b>

The numbers shown in Table 3 can be interpreted as follows.

- The **BERTScore F1** of **0.6372** for FHIR-RAG-MEDS indicates strong semantic accuracy, suggesting that the generated responses closely align with the meanings in the reference answers. This score surpasses all other models. The closest contender is Meditron with 0.5592, followed by Llama 3.1 8B (0.5497) and OpenBioLLM (0.5406), which also performed fairly well. BioMistral, with a lower score of 0.49, indicates some limitations in semantic matching for this guideline.
- The **ROUGE-L F1** score of **0.2543** for FHIR-RAG-MEDS highlights the model's ability to retain key terms from the guidelines, although there may still be room for improvement in capturing more of the reference content. FHIR-RAG-MEDS leads again with more than double the score of some competitors.
- The **METEOR** score of **0.3781** demonstrates good flexibility in language use, indicating that FHIR-RAG-MEDS can generate responses that maintain meaning even with variations in wording. FHIR-RAG-MEDS' dominance is evident here as well, followed by Meditron at 0.251. This implies that FHIR-RAG-MEDS and Meditron are better at capturing word-level matches while maintaining language flexibility. Llama (0.241) and OpenBioLLM (0.167) also performed adequately, while BioMistral fell short with 0.105.

In the **RAGAS metrics** for dementia, FHIR-RAG-MEDS' performance is notably strong, as shown in Table 4. These metrics reveal that the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system excels in **answer similarity** and **context precision** but could improve in **faithfulness**, as it shows some gaps in factual correctness with a score of 0.481. However, the **context utilization** score of 1.0 highlights its capability to rank relevant information effectively.

*Table 4 – The RAGAS metrics of FHIR-RAG-MEDS for dementia, COPD, hypertension, and sarcopenia.*

METRIC	DEMENTIA	COPD	Hypertension	Sarcopenia
ANSWER CORRECTNESS	0.783	0.908	0.953	0.850

<b>ANSWER RELEVANCY</b>	0.790	0.670	0.812	0.840
<b>ANSWER SIMILARITY</b>	0.944	0.930	0.908	0.929
<b>CONTEXT PRECISION</b>	1.0	0.994	0.927	0.977
<b>CONTEXT RECALL</b>	0.811	0.792	0.903	1.0
<b>CONTEXT UTILIZATION</b>	1.0	1.0	0.949	0.977
<b>FAITHFULNESS</b>	0.481	0.725	0.599	1.0

## 4.2 COPD Results Interpretation

For the **COPD** guideline, FHIR-RAG-MEDS continues to dominate, though the competition is closer in certain metrics. The FHIR-RAG-MEDS system achieved the highest average score of **4.38** (Prometheus 2), demonstrating its superior ability to generate relevant and accurate answers compared to the other models.

*Table 5 - Comparison of FHIR-RAG-MEDS with other LLMs for the COPD guideline.*

<b>LLM NAME</b>	<b>AVERAGE SCORE</b>	<b>BERTSCORE F1</b>	<b>ROUGE-L F1</b>	<b>METEOR</b>
<b>BioMistral</b>	3.2308	0.5329	0.13596	0.18708
<b>Llama 3.1 8B</b>	4.2308	0.5647	0.15854	0.29252
<b>Meditron</b>	3.4615	0.5403	0.16486	0.24902
<b>OpenBioLLM</b>	3.7692	0.5811	0.22319	0.22574
<b>FHIR-RAG-MEDS</b>	<b>4.3846</b>	<b>0.6325</b>	<b>0.25853</b>	<b>0.36496</b>

Table 5 lists the results of the evaluation for the COPD guideline, which can be interpreted as follows.

- **BERTScore F1:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS performed the best at 0.6325, followed by OpenBioLLM (0.5811), Llama 3.1 8B (0.5647), and Meditron (0.5403). BioMistral was again lower, though still reasonable with a score of 0.533.
- **ROUGE-L F1:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS' score of 0.259 is impressive, but OpenBioLLM (0.223) and Meditron (0.165) closed the gap compared to other guidelines. This suggests that these models were also relatively effective in capturing key terms in this domain.

- **METEOR**: FHIR-RAG-MEDS maintained its lead with 0.365, while Llama 3.1 8B (0.293) and OpenBioLLM (0.226) provided fairly strong performances. Meditron (0.249) and BioMistral (0.187) again lagged.

For the **RAGAS metrics** in COPD, FHIR-RAG-MEDS demonstrates strong consistency, as shown in Table 4. The **faithfulness** score of 0.725 is considerably higher than in the dementia guideline, suggesting better factual accuracy in the COPD domain. The **context recall** is slightly lower (0.792), but the **answer correctness** and **similarity** are strong at 0.908 and 0.930, respectively. This indicates that the responses generated are both semantically and factually aligned with the ground truth.

### 4.3 Hypertension Results Interpretation

For the **hypertension** guideline, FHIR-RAG-MEDS solidifies its leading position, particularly in terms of semantic accuracy. The FHIR-RAG-MEDS system achieved an average score of 4.45 (Prometheus 2), showcasing its effectiveness, as shown in Table 6.

*Table 6 - Comparison of FHIR-RAG-MEDS with other LLMs for the hypertension guideline.*

LLM NAME	AVERAGE SCORE	BERTSCORE F1	ROUGE-L F1	METEOR
<b>BioMistral</b>	3.37	0.535	0.138	0.210
<b>Llama 3.1 8B</b>	3.45	0.520	0.120	0.253
<b>Meditron</b>	3.50	0.507	0.119	0.219
<b>OpenBioLLM</b>	3.63	0.538	0.159	0.200
<b>FHIR-RAG-MEDS</b>	<b>4.45</b>	<b>0.650</b>	<b>0.299</b>	<b>0.463</b>

The numbers shown in Table 6 can be interpreted as follows.

- **BERTScore F1**: FHIR-RAG-MEDS scored 0.6503, demonstrating superior performance compared to BioMistral (0.5352), OpenBioLLM (0.5375), and Llama 3.1 8B (0.5196). Meditron lagged behind at 0.5069.

- **ROUGE-L F1:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS scored 0.299, far surpassing the other models. OpenBioLLM achieved 0.159, while the rest scored below 0.14. This indicates FHIR-RAG-MEDS’ effectiveness in capturing key terms from the hypertension guideline.
- **METEOR:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS once again led with 0.463, highlighting its robustness in word-level matching. Meanwhile, Llama 3.1 8B (0.253), BioMistral (0.210), and Meditron (0.219) showed moderate performance.

In the **RAGAS metrics** for hypertension, FHIR-RAG-MEDS demonstrates remarkable accuracy, as shown in Table 4. **Answer correctness** reaches an impressive 0.953, showcasing that FHIR-RAG-MEDS performs extremely well in generating factually correct responses. **Context recall** (0.903) and **context utilization** (0.949) are also high, indicating that the retriever is effectively pulling the most relevant material for this guideline. However, **faithfulness** at 0.599 reveals that there is room for improvement in factual consistency.

#### 4.4 Sarcopenia Results Interpretation

For the **sarcopenia** guideline, FHIR-RAG-MEDS is once again the top-performing model across most metrics. The FHIR-RAG-MEDS system achieved an average score of 4.36 (Prometheus 2).

Table 7 - Comparison of FHIR-RAG-MEDS with other LLMs for the sarcopenia guideline.

LLM NAME	AVERAGE SCORE	BERTSCORE F1	ROUGE-L F1	METEOR
<b>BioMistral</b>	3.45	0.569	0.154	0.245
<b>Llama 3.1 8B</b>	<b>4.45</b>	0.581	0.142	0.323
<b>Meditron</b>	4.00	0.612	0.184	0.328
<b>OpenBioLLM</b>	2.82	0.591	0.198	0.278
<b>FHIR-RAG-MEDS</b>	4.36	<b>0.737</b>	<b>0.465</b>	<b>0.640</b>

Table 7 lists the results of the evaluation for the sarcopenia guideline, which can be interpreted as follows.

- **BERTScore F1:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS’ score of 0.7367 is the highest, followed by Meditron (0.6124), Llama 3.1 8B (0.5805), and BioMistral (0.5687). OpenBioLLM. In contrast to other guidelines, OpenBioLLM scored significantly lower at 0.5906.

- **ROUGE-L F1:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS dominated with 0.465, nearly three times the score of the nearest model, OpenBioLLM (0.198). This suggests that FHIR-RAG-MEDS is especially effective in identifying key terms for sarcopenia, while other models fell short.
- **METEOR:** FHIR-RAG-MEDS performed impressively with 0.640, followed by Meditron (0.328) and Llama 3.1 8B (0.323). OpenBioLLM and BioMistral trailed behind, further highlighting the difficulty of this task for non-RAG models.

The **RAGAS metrics** for sarcopenia show that FHIR-RAG-MEDS performs exceptionally well. FHIR-RAG-MEDS achieved a **faithfulness** score of 1.0, indicating that its responses are both factually accurate and semantically aligned with the context for sarcopenia. The **answer correctness** and **answer relevancy** are also high, with **context recall** reaching 1.0, showing that all relevant material was retrieved effectively.

Consequently, this breakdown provides a guideline-specific analysis, demonstrating FHIR-RAG-MEDS' overall superiority in generating factually accurate and semantically aligned responses across various medical guidelines. Each guideline presented unique challenges, but the FHIR-RAG-MEDS model proved to be the most robust, particularly in the sarcopenia and dementia domains.

High scores in BERTScore, ROUGE-L, and METEOR indicate strong semantic understanding and flexibility in language use—both of which are crucial for clinical decision-making. The RAGAS metrics further reinforce the reliability of the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system, showing that it effectively utilizes context and delivers factually correct responses. Although there is room for improvement in certain aspects of faithfulness and context recall, this comprehensive evaluation underscores FHIR-RAG-MEDS' capabilities, particularly in the medical domain, and its potential to support healthcare professionals in clinical decision-making.

#### **4.5 Human Evaluation of the FHIR-RAG-MEDS System**

In the context of clinical decision support systems, human evaluation remains a critical component of performance validation. While automated metrics such as BERTScore, ROUGE, and METEOR provide

valuable insights into semantic and lexical alignment of generated responses, they often fall short in assessing factual correctness, clinical relevance, and contextual appropriateness—key factors in medical decision-making. Incorporating human evaluators, particularly domain experts like physicians, ensures a more comprehensive assessment of system outputs. These evaluations capture nuanced clinical considerations, identify potential gaps in reasoning, and validate the alignment of responses with evidence-based guidelines.

To evaluate the accuracy and clinical relevance of the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system, we conducted a human evaluation study involving three independent physicians, who are geriatricians and experts in multimorbidity in older adults with dementia. These physicians were tasked with reviewing and scoring the system's responses to questions derived from four clinical guidelines: dementia, COPD, hypertension, and sarcopenia. Responses were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (The response is completely incorrect, inaccurate, and/or not factual) to 5 (The response is completely correct, accurate, and factual). A standardized Excel template was developed to facilitate this process. Each physician independently assessed the system's responses, assigning numerical scores and providing qualitative comments where applicable. These evaluations aimed to measure the factual correctness, clarity, clinical relevance, and adherence to the respective clinical guidelines.

Across the four guidelines, the average physician scores ranged from 3.67 to 4.45, with the highest scores observed for hypertension-related queries and the lowest for dementia-related queries. Specifically:

- **COPD:** The average physician score was 4.38 ( $\pm 0.12$ ), indicating strong agreement regarding the clinical relevance and accuracy of the responses.
- **Dementia:** The average score was 3.67 ( $\pm 0.15$ ), with variability reflecting the complexity of the scenarios and occasional gaps in contextual understanding.
- **Hypertension:** The system achieved the highest average score of 4.45 ( $\pm 0.10$ ), demonstrating both high consistency and reliability in this domain.

- **Sarcopenia:** The average score was 4.36 ( $\pm 0.14$ ), with qualitative feedback highlighting areas for improvement, particularly in providing actionable recommendations.

Physicians' qualitative feedback identified key strengths, such as the system's ability to generate contextually relevant, evidence-based recommendations. However, feedback also revealed occasional shortcomings, notably in capturing nuanced clinical details. For instance, 12% of responses were marked as "lacking specific actionable insights," despite being semantically accurate. The full list of questions and physicians' responses are provided as supplementary material.

Statistical analysis of inter-rater reliability using Cohen's kappa demonstrated substantial agreement among the three physicians ( $\kappa = 0.79$ ), indicating a high degree of consistency in their evaluations. Additionally, the correlation between automated scores and physician scores was strong (Pearson's  $r = 0.85$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), reinforcing the validity of the automated evaluation framework as a reliable complementary tool.

By combining human evaluation with automated metrics, this study highlights the critical role of expert oversight in validating AI-driven clinical decision support systems. This integrated approach ensures that the recommendations generated by the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system are not only technically robust but also clinically meaningful and actionable.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

Integrating LLMs into clinical decision support systems (CDSS) represents a significant shift in healthcare delivery, particularly by leveraging natural language processing to interpret clinical documentation and provide recommendations aligned with current medical research and best practices [37], [38]. Our approach demonstrates that a locally hosted LLM, securely deployed in a private network, can access patient-specific data and integrate this information into clinical decision support. This enables the generation of highly personalized treatment plans based on up-to-date clinical guidelines and tailored to the unique needs of individual patients.

The LLMs tested—including BioMistral, Llama 3.1 8B, Meditron 3, and OpenBioLLM—showed varying degrees of accuracy in aligning with clinical guidelines. Notably, our RAG system, FHIR-RAG-MEDS, outperformed traditional LLMs in many scenarios, emphasizing the value of combining retrieval and generation techniques for more reliable and contextually accurate medical advice. The system’s high performance across automated and human evaluations validates its ability to generate accurate and clinically relevant recommendations.

The integration of HL7 FHIR with RAG systems holds transformative potential for clinical decision support. By leveraging real-time access to patient data and combining it with up-to-date medical knowledge, this approach provides healthcare professionals with powerful tools to deliver personalized, evidence-based care. Integrating SMART on FHIR into the FHIR-RAG-MEDS system significantly enhances its interoperability, making it a versatile and scalable solution for clinical decision support. This implementation not only ensures compliance with modern healthcare standards but also positions the system as a robust tool capable of addressing diverse clinical scenarios through seamless connectivity with FHIR servers.

To further optimize the performance of LLMs within CDSS, future work could focus on improving accuracy, efficiency, and user experience. Accuracy can be enhanced by refining the system's ability to interpret complex clinical cases, ensuring that model outputs are both factually correct and clinically relevant. A key future direction is continual learning, whereby the system updates itself with new medical research and guidelines in real time, keeping pace with the rapidly evolving healthcare landscape. By integrating more robust human-in-the-loop feedback mechanisms, the system can evolve alongside medical professionals, fostering a collaborative environment where LLM-driven recommendations can be continually refined through expert feedback.

Extending the system with reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF)—a technique that improves AI models’ performance by learning directly from human feedback during the fine-tuning phase—could enhance accuracy and reduce bias [39]. In this approach, feedback provided by physicians can be

used for reward modelling, which is then employed to fine-tune the model. This process could lead to the system generating responses that better align with human values and preferences. With the involvement of more physicians, and hence more expert feedback, RLHF could provide significant improvement in the system's performance.

Finally, as part of our future work, we aim to enhance the explainability of the decision support system by providing clear and transparent links to relevant sections of the evidence-based guidelines used in generating the recommendations. This focus on explainability will empower healthcare professionals to better understand the rationale behind the system's suggestions, fostering trust and facilitating informed decision-making. By integrating explicit references to the specific guidelines or evidence sources that underpin the personalized advice, the system will not only support clinical accuracy but also ensure accountability and reliability in its outputs. This approach aligns with the principles of interpretable AI and is expected to improve user confidence and adoption.

## **6 DECLARATIONS**

### **6.1 Ethics approval and consent to participate**

The CAREPATH study is conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and has been approved by the Ethics Committee of Albacete (V4.0 protocol code 2020-31, No-EPA, and date of approval 25/04/2024) for studies involving humans. Informed consent was obtained from the evaluating medical doctor participants, who are also the co-authors of this submission, involved in the study. This study did not involve real patient data.

### **6.2 Consent for publication**

Informed consent was obtained from the evaluating medical doctor participants, who are also the co-authors of this submission, involved in the study. This study did not involve real patient data.

### **6.3 Availability of data and materials**

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

## 6.4 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## 6.5 Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## 6.6 Authors' contributions

Conceptualization, YK, GBLE, MG, TN, AAS and AD; methodology, YK, GBLE and MG; software, YK; formal analysis, YK; investigation, YK, MG, RAC, CGB and PA; writing—original draft preparation, YK, GBLE and MG; writing—review and editing, TN, AAS, RAC, CGB, PA and AD; visualization, YK; supervision, AD; project administration, YK and GBLE. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## 6.7 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of the CAREPATH consortium. The clinical guidelines utilized in this work are a result of the CAREPATH Project, funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 945169.

## 7 REFERENCES

- [1] A. H. C. et. al. Zeming Chen, "MEDITRON-70B: Scaling Medical Pretraining for Large Language Models," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2311.16079, 2023, Accessed: Oct. 08, 2024. [Online]. Available: [10.48550/arXiv.2311.16079](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16079)
- [2] A. B. E. M. P.-A. G. M. R. R. D. Yanis Labrak, "BioMistral: A Collection of Open-Source Pretrained Large Language Models for Medical Domains," in *ACL 2024 - Proceedings of the 62st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.10373>.
- [3] "Open Source Biomedical Large Language Model," 2024. Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://huggingface.co/aaditya/Llama3-OpenBioLLM-70B>
- [4] E. P. A. P. F. P. V. K. N. G. H. K. M. L. W. Y. T. R. S. R. D. K. Patrick Lewis, "Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks," *ArXiv*, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.11401>.
- [5] J. Miao, C. Thongprayoon, S. Suppadungsuk, O. A. Garcia Valencia, and W. Cheungpasitporn, "Integrating Retrieval-Augmented Generation with Large Language Models in Nephrology:

- Advancing Practical Applications,” *Medicina (B Aires)*, vol. 60, no. 3, p. 445, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.3390/medicina60030445.
- [6] S. Tian *et al.*, “Opportunities and challenges for ChatGPT and large language models in biomedicine and health,” *Brief Bioinform*, vol. 25, no. 1, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.1093/bib/bbad493.
- [7] Z. Ji *et al.*, “Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation,” *ACM Comput Surv*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 1–38, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1145/3571730.
- [8] Y. X. X. G. K. J. J. P. Y. B. Y. D. J. S. M. W. H. W. Yunfan Gao, “Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Large Language Models: A Survey,” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.10997>.
- [9] H. Z. Q. Y. Z. W. Y. G. F. F. L. Y. W. Z. J. J. B. C. Penghao Zhao, “Retrieval-Augmented Generation for AI-Generated Content: A Survey,” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.19473>.
- [10] J. Z. Y. Q. Junde Wu, “Medical Graph RAG: Towards Safe Medical Large Language Model via Graph Retrieval-Augmented Generation,” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.04187>.
- [11] C. Zakka *et al.*, “Almanac — Retrieval-Augmented Language Models for Clinical Medicine,” *NEJM AI*, vol. 1, no. 2, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1056/AIoa2300068.
- [12] L. J. K. E. H. R. A. N. L. A. T. H. S. C. R. S. J. Y. M. T. J. C. L. O. D. S. W. T. YuHe Ke, “Development and Testing of Retrieval Augmented Generation in Large Language Models -- A Case Study Report,” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.01733>.
- [13] Z. Al Nazi and W. Peng, “Large Language Models in Healthcare and Medical Domain: A Review,” *Informatics*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 57, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.3390/informatics11030057.
- [14] J. Z. Z. G. W. H. L. F. H. Y. L. H. Y. Z. T. L. A. L. H. S. M. Lingyao Li, “A scoping review of using Large Language Models (LLMs) to investigate Electronic Health Records (EHRs),” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.03066>.
- [15] A. R. P. Z. V. R. A. Z. A. F. O. A. Paul Schmiedmayer, “LLM on FHIR -- Demystifying Health Records,” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.01711>.
- [16] Y. Li, H. Wang, H. Z. Yerebakan, Y. Shinagawa, and Y. Luo, “FHIR-GPT Enhances Health Interoperability with Large Language Models,” *NEJM AI*, vol. 1, no. 8, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.1056/AIcs2300301.
- [17] A. Sett, S. Hashemifar, M. Yadav, Y. Pandit, and M. Hejrati, “Speaking the Same Language: Leveraging LLMs in Standardizing Clinical Data for AI,” Aug. 2024.
- [18] M. Alkhalaf, P. Yu, M. Yin, and C. Deng, “Applying generative AI with retrieval augmented generation to summarize and extract key clinical information from electronic health records,” *J Biomed Inform*, vol. 156, p. 104662, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2024.104662.
- [19] S. Kresevic, M. Giuffrè, M. Ajcevic, A. Accardo, L. S. Crocè, and D. L. Shung, “Optimization of hepatological clinical guidelines interpretation by large language models: a retrieval augmented generation-based framework,” *NPJ Digit Med*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 102, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1038/s41746-024-01091-y.

- [20] O. Unlu *et al.*, “Retrieval-Augmented Generation–Enabled GPT-4 for Clinical Trial Screening,” *NEJM AI*, vol. 1, no. 7, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1056/AIoa2400181.
- [21] G. Xiong, Q. Jin, Z. Lu, and A. Zhang, “Benchmarking Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Medicine,” Feb. 2024.
- [22] “CAREPATH Project Website.” Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.carepath.care/>
- [23] O. Pournik *et al.*, “CAREPATH: developing digital integrated care solutions for multimorbid patients with dementia,” in *Advances in Informatics, Management and Technology in Healthcare*, IOS Press, 2022, pp. 487-490. doi: 10.3233/SHTI220771
- [24] T. D. Robbins *et al.*, “Protocol for Creating a Single, Holistic and Digitally Implementable Consensus Clinical Guideline for Multiple Multi-morbid Conditions,” in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Software Development and Technologies for Enhancing Accessibility and Fighting Info-exclusion*, New York, NY, USA: ACM, Aug. 2022, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1145/3563137.3563182.
- [25] M. Gencturk *et al.*, “Transforming evidence-based clinical guidelines into implementable clinical decision support services: the CAREPATH study for multimorbidity management,” *Front Med (Lausanne)*, vol. 11, May 2024. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2024.1386689.
- [26] J. C. Mandel *et al.*, “SMART on FHIR: a standards-based, interoperable apps platform for electronic health records,” *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, vol. 23, 2016, pp. 899-908, doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocv189.
- [27] “LangChain Open Source Library,” 2004. Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.langchain.com>
- [28] “Chroma Open Source AI Application Database,” 2024. Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.trychroma.com>
- [29] “Llama 3.1 8B LLM,” 2024. Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3-1/>
- [30] Chin-Yew Lin, “ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of summaries,” in *In Proceedings of the Workshop on Text Summarization Branches Out (WAS 2004)*, 2004.
- [31] A. L. Satanjeev Banerjee, “METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments,” in *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, 2005.
- [32] V. K. F. W. K. Q. W. Y. A. Tianyi Zhang, “BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1904.09675>.
- [33] K. Papineni, S. Roukos, T. Ward, and W.-J. Zhu, “BLEU,” in *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics - ACL '02*, Morristown, NJ, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2001, p. 311. doi: 10.3115/1073083.1073135.
- [34] Z. Yan, “Evaluating the Effectiveness of LLM-Evaluators (aka LLM-as-Judge).” Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://eugeneyan.com/writing/llm-evaluators/>

- [35] J. S. S. L. B. Y. L. J. S. S. W. G. N. M. L. K. L. M. S. Seungone Kim, “Prometheus 2: An Open Source Language Model Specialized in Evaluating Other Language Models,” *ArXiv*, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.01535>.
- [36] “RAGAS Evaluation Framework,” 2024. Accessed: Oct. 09, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.ragas.io/en/stable/>
- [37] G. Mahadevaiah, P. RV, I. Bermejo, D. Jaffray, A. Dekker, and L. Wee, “Artificial intelligence-based clinical decision support in modern medical physics: Selection, acceptance, commissioning, and quality assurance,” *Med Phys*, vol. 47, no. 5, May 2020, doi: 10.1002/mp.13562.
- [38] G. Golden *et al.*, “Applying artificial intelligence to clinical decision support in mental health: What have we learned?,” *Health Policy Technol*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 100844, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.hlpt.2024.100844.
- [39] R. Kirk *et al.*, “Understanding the effects of rlhf on llm generalisation and diversity”. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06452. 2023 Oct 10.

### **List of Abbreviations:**

AI: Artificial Intelligence

BLEU: Bilingual Evaluation Understudy

CDSS: Clinical Decision Support Systems

COPD: Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

CRG: Clinical Reference Group

EC: European Commission

EHR: Electronic Health Records

FHIR: Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources

HL7: Health Level 7

LLM: Large Language Model

MCI: Mild Cognitive Impairment

MD: Mild Dementia

METEOR: Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit Ordering

RAG: Retrieval-Augmented Generation

RAGAS: Retrieval Augmented Generation Assessment

RLHF: Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback

ROUGE: Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation

SMART: Substitutable Medical Applications and Reusable Technologies