

1 **TITLE:** Development of the ADFICE_IT clinical decision support system to assist
2 deprescribing of fall-risk increasing drugs: A user-centered design approach

3

4 **FULL NAMES AND INSTITUTIONAL ADDRESSES FOR ALL AUTHORS:**

5 Sara S. Groos (1,2)

6 Kelly K. de Wildt (1,2)

7 Bob van de Loo (1,2,3)

8 Annemiek J. Linn (4)

9 Stephanie Medlock (2,5)

10 Kendrick M. Shaw (6, 7)

11 Eric K. Herman (8)

12 Lotta J. Seppala (1,2)

13 Kim J. Ploegmakers (1,2)

14 Natasja M. van Schoor (2,3)

15 Julia C. M. van Weert (4)

16 Nathalie van der Velde* (1,2)

17 ***CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:** s.s.groos@amsterdamumc.nl

18

19 **Affiliations**

20 (1) Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Internal Medicine, Section of Geriatric
21 Medicine, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

22 (2) Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

- 23 (3) Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data
24 Science, De Boelelaan 1117, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- 25 (4) Amsterdam School of Communication Research/ASCoR, University of Amsterdam,
26 Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- 27 (5) Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Department of Medical
28 Informatics, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- 29 (6) Massachusetts General Hospital, Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine,
30 55 Fruit Street, Boston MA, United States of America
- 31 (7) Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston MA, United States of America
- 32 (8) Foundation for Public Code, Keizersgracht 617, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45

46 **Abstract**

47 **Introduction:** Deprescribing fall-risk increasing drugs (FRIDs) is a promising intervention
48 for reducing the risk of falling in older adults. Applying appropriate deprescribing in practice can
49 be difficult due to the outcome uncertainties associated with stopping the use of FRIDs. The
50 *ADFICE_IT* study addresses this complexity with a clinical decision support system (CDSS) that
51 facilitates optimum deprescribing of FRIDs through use of a fall-risk prediction model,
52 aggregation of deprescribing guidelines, and joint medication management. The development
53 process of the CDSS is described in this paper.

54 **Methods:** Development followed a user-centered design approach in which users and experts
55 were involved throughout each phase. In phase I, a prototype of the CDSS was developed which
56 involved a scoping and systematic literature review, European survey ($n = 581$), and semi-
57 structured interviews with physicians ($n = 19$), as well as the aggregation and testing of
58 deprescribing guidelines and the development of the fall-risk prediction model. In phase II, the
59 feasibility of the CDSS was tested by means of two usability testing rounds with end users ($n =$
60 11).

61 **Results:** The final CDSS consists of five web pages. A connection between the Electronic
62 Health Record allows for the retrieval of patient data into the CDSS. Key design requirements
63 for the CDSS include easy-to-use features for fast-paced clinical practice environments,
64 actionable deprescribing recommendations, information transparency, and visualization of the
65 patient's fall-risk estimation. Key elements for the software include a modular architecture, open
66 source, and good security.

67 **Conclusion:** The *ADFICE_IT* CDSS supports physicians in deprescribing FRIDs optimally
68 to prevent falls in older patients. Due to continuous user and expert involvement, each new

69 feedback round led to an improved version of the system. Currently, a multicenter, cluster-
70 randomized controlled trial with process evaluation at hospitals in the Netherlands is being
71 conducted to test the effect of the CDSS on falls.

72

73 **Keywords**

74 *Clinical decision support system, Falls prevention, Medication deprescribing, User-computer*
75 *interface, Share decision-making, User-centered design, Risk communication*

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92 **Introduction**

93 Falls and fall-related injuries among older adults are a growing major public health problem [1].
94 In 2017, 11.7 million older adults in Western Europe requested medical treatment for an injury,
95 of which 8.4 million were fall-related [2]. Injurious falls may result in admission to long term
96 care, loss of independence, reduced mobility, fear of falling, and social isolation, significantly
97 reducing the quality of life for older adults [3-5]. As a result, falls place a significant financial
98 burden on healthcare systems. In Western countries, it is estimated that up to 1.5 percent of the
99 total healthcare expenditures are attributed to fall-related medical care costs [3, 6].

100 A prominent risk factor for falls in older adults is the use of certain medication classes
101 known as fall-risk increasing drugs (FRIDs). The use or combined use of FRIDs, such as
102 psychotropics and cardiovascular drugs, is associated with adverse effects including orthostatic
103 hypertension, syncope, sedation, and dizziness that can cause accidental falls in older adults [7-
104 10]. Therefore, appropriate deprescribing of FRIDs is recommended for lowering an older
105 adult's risk of incurring a medication-related fall [11]. Nevertheless, previous studies suggest
106 that deprescribing approaches have yet to be optimized, as current approaches do not sufficiently
107 address the complexity of FRIDs deprescribing for physicians [12, 13].

108 Deprescribing FRIDs is highly complex due to healthcare professional, patient, cultural
109 and organizational reasons. For example first, physicians themselves may perceive difficulties
110 with *which*, *how* and *when* a FRID or combination of FRIDs should be safely deprescribed. This
111 results in the reluctance to deprescribe, a phenomena that is especially prominent in the
112 treatment of older patients with polypharmacy and multimorbidity [14, 15]. Second, the unique
113 risk profiles of these patients can greatly increase the complexity of FRIDs deprescribing due to
114 the weighing of competing clinical practice guidelines [15, 16]. As a result, physicians may have

115 a tendency to overestimate the expected benefits of medications (i.e., effective treatment of the
116 chronic condition) and underestimate the potential harms (i.e., an injurious fall) in these patients
117 [17]. Third, physicians may also experience deprescribing reluctance from the patient. Research
118 suggests that low medication-related knowledge in geriatric patients, such as the management of
119 medications, can negatively influence appropriate deprescribing [18].

120 One way to better support physicians in the deprescribing of FRIDs is by means of a
121 clinical decision support system (CDSS). Such a system has the ability to link individual patient
122 characteristics to a computerized clinical knowledge base which uses information from
123 guidelines to generate patient-specific recommendations back to the physician. These
124 recommendations can subsequently be discussed together with the patient [19, 20]. In the context
125 of FRIDs, a CDSS has the potential to support physicians through a structured deprescribing
126 approach by first signaling *which* medications pose a risk to the individual patient, and
127 subsequently advising *how* and *when* to safely deprescribe each medication (i.e., through
128 guideline integration). In turn, the decision to deprescribe certain medications can be discussed
129 together with the patient to foster joint medication management between physicians and patients.
130 Such shared decision-making has been shown to improve medication-related knowledge and
131 medication adherence in older patients, and could thus enhance the effectiveness of fall
132 preventive care in these patients [21].

133 Previous studies suggest that medication-related CDSS can improve care outcomes for
134 older patients in a variety of contexts (e.g., inappropriate medication use by patients and
135 polypharmacy, inappropriate prescribing by physicians, falls) [22-24]. However, these studies
136 have not used the potential of a CDSS in deprescribing optimally, such as incorporating data-
137 driven methods, like prediction models, in the system's clinical knowledge base [24]. Prediction

138 models combine data for multiple risk factors in order to calculate the risk of a future outcome,
139 and help inform subsequent decision making [25]. Thus, in the context of deprescribing
140 optimally, such models could serve as an adjunct to decision-making by allowing the physician
141 and patient to weigh the various treatment options on the basis of the patient's risk of falling
142 within 12 months. Moreover, such estimates of fall risk could help patients be more aware of
143 their risk of falling and as such motivate them to follow the advice recommended by the
144 physician.

145 Research suggests that the acceptance of CDSSs among physicians is still hindered by a
146 number of barriers, such as insufficient knowledge with system use, time-consuming, alert
147 fatigue and poor integration into workflow [24, 26-28]. A possible explanation for the
148 considerable number of usability barriers is the lack of involvement by physicians during the
149 development of these systems. A user-centered design approach is an iterative method that
150 involves end users of a system in each stage of the development process. Such an approach has
151 been found to enhance the ease of use and usefulness of clinical study tools – the two important
152 determinants that can influence technology adoption by healthcare professionals [29, 30].

153 The **ADFICE_IT** (**A**lerting on adverse **D**rug reactions: **F**alls prevention **I**mprovement
154 through developing a **C**omputerized clinical support system: **E**ffectiveness of **I**ndividualized
155 **m**edica**T**ion withdrawal) project will develop and test a novel deprescribing intervention that
156 aims to prevent medication-related falls in older adults by means of a CDSS for physicians and
157 an online portal for patients. In doing so, it employs a user-centered design approach to develop a
158 data-driven CDSS that aims to provide optimal support for physicians during the deprescribing
159 of FRIDs by generating a personalized fall-risk estimate and guideline-based medication advice
160 tailored to the health conditions of each individual patient. The current paper aims to outline how

161 end-user and expert insights were used to inform the development of our CDSS. We also
162 showcase how end-users (i.e., the physicians) were successfully involved in each stage of the
163 development process to increase the system's acceptance and adoption in its intended clinical
164 care setting later on.

165 **Materials and Methods**

166 **Ethics Statement**

167 The Medical Ethics Research Committee of the Amsterdam University Medical Center
168 (Amsterdam UMC, location University of Amsterdam; W19_310 # 19.368) declared that the
169 Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act did not apply to this study. All study
170 participants gave written informed consent prior to data collection.

171 **Medical Research Council framework**

172 The overall ADFICE_IT intervention is developed and evaluated following the four
173 phases of the Medical Research Council framework (MRC): (I) the development, (II) the
174 feasibility, (III) the implementation, and (IV) the evaluation phase. The MRC is a guiding
175 theoretical framework for developing, pilot-testing, implementing and evaluating complex health
176 interventions [31]. This paper summarizes the (I) development and (II) feasibility phases for our
177 CDSS. An overview of the studies conducted in these phases is provided in Table 1.

178 **Table 1. The development process of the CDSS for the ADFICE_IT intervention.**

MRC Phase I: Development

User interface

Dec. 1 2018 – July 15 2019

*European survey: Barriers and facilitators
in using a Clinical Decision Support
System for fall risk management for older
people [33]*

Dec. 17 2019 – Jan. 3 2020	<i>Semi-structured interviews</i> : Physician needs for effective implementation and trustworthy decision making
2020	<i>Scoping literature review</i> : Risk communication needs of physicians
2020	<i>Systematic literature review</i> : Barriers and facilitators influencing medication-related CDSS acceptance according to clinicians [32]

Knowledge base

Used latest edition 2017	<i>Dutch fall guideline</i> : Effect of medication on fall risk in older adults [36]
Feb. 5 2019 – Feb. 28 2020	<i>Modified Delphi study</i> : STOPPFall (Screening Tool of Older Persons Prescriptions in older adults with high fall risk): a Delphi study by the EuGMS Task and Finish Group on Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs [34]
2020 – 2021	<i>Logical elements rule method</i> : Formalizing clinical rules for the CDSS [37]

Reasoning Engine and Software

2021 – 2022	<i>Agile methodology using test-driven development</i> : Unit tests, acceptance tests, verification, and validation testing
-------------	---

Prediction model

2020 – 2021

Development: The ADFICE_IT Models for Predicting Falls and Recurrent Falls in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: Pooled Analyses of European Cohorts With Special Attention to Medication [35]

MRC Phase II: Feasibility

CDSS prototype 1

Sept. 10 – 24 2020

Usability testing round 1: Identification of usability problems and adjustments to prototype

CDSS final version

June 28 – July 18 2021

Usability testing round 2: Identification of remaining usability and development of final version

179 **Phase I: Development**

180 The aim of this phase was to cultivate a robust (theoretical) understanding about *how* to
181 develop the CDSS components of the ADFICE_IT intervention [30], which consisted of the (1)
182 development of the user interface, (2) development of the clinical knowledge base, (3)
183 development of the prediction model, and (4) development of the software. A detailed
184 description of the methods for the systematic literature review, European online survey, modified
185 Delphi study, and development of the fall-risk prediction model have been published elsewhere
186 by the research team [32-35].

187 ***Development of the user interface***

188 To develop the user interface, a scoping and systematic literature review were carried out,
189 and extended with empirical research by means of a European online survey ($n = 581$), and semi-
190 structured interviews with physicians from Dutch fall clinics ($n = 19$). The scoping literature

191 review assessed the risk communication needs of physicians. The systematic literature review
192 assessed barriers and facilitators to CDSS use [32]. The latter barriers and facilitators to use
193 analysis was expanded on in the survey, which also examined relevant facilitators to use as
194 experienced by physicians [33]. Lastly, semi-structured interviews with physicians assessed the
195 needs for effective implementation and trustworthy decision making. For example, physicians
196 were asked *how* the system should communicate a patient's fall risk; or *how* the system can best
197 support physicians in making informed decisions about whether or not to deprescribe. The
198 analysis of these studies guided the development of the user interface of the CDSS, such as the
199 system's functionality, design, and content composition.

200 *Development of the knowledge base*

201 The STOPPFall (Screening Tool of Older Persons Prescriptions in older adults with high
202 fall risk) tool [34] and the Dutch fall guideline [36] were used to identify relevant FRIDs in
203 different medication classes. STOPPFall entails a FRIDs list with accompanying guidelines for
204 deprescribing, and was constructed using a modified Delphi technique through consensus effort
205 with 24 panelists from 13 European countries [34]. Both STOPPFall and the Dutch fall guideline
206 form the basis of the system's clinical knowledge base. To extend the knowledge base specific
207 deprescribing advice for each class of FRIDs was identified from over 30 guidelines, and
208 formalized using an adaptation of the Logical Elements Rule Method (LERM). LERM is a
209 validated method for formalizing clinical rules for decision support (e.g., a CDSS). The method
210 follows a step-by-step approach in which clinical rules are formulated by an informatics
211 knowledge expert, and close collaboration from a clinical expert is sought throughout rule
212 formalization to ensure that the intent of the guidelines are maintained [37]. Specifically, rather
213 than using conjunctive normal form as specified in LERM, the criteria for each rule were

214 formalized as medications to include (e.g., a class of FRIDs), medications to exclude (e.g., non-
215 FRIDs within that class), and conditions (e.g. diagnoses or laboratory values that modify the
216 advice).

217 *Development of the reasoning engine and software*

218 Reasoning engine and software development followed an agile methodology, including
219 using test-driven development. Both unit tests (which test specific functions individually) and
220 acceptance tests (which test larger parts of the software as a whole) were used. The software was
221 developed in Node JS, using Express and MariaDB. Jest and TestCafe are used for testing [38-
222 42]. For transparency, all software was developed as open-source software. Experienced
223 developers were involved in creating the software architecture and establishing the development
224 principles. Given the low expected load, clarity of code was prioritized over efficiency and
225 scalability. Importantly, good traceability between the specification for the knowledge base and
226 the implementation of these rules in the software was maintained throughout development,
227 including the provision of evidence behind the recommendations to the end user.

228 Verification and validation testing were also conducted. Regarding verification, test cases
229 (with specified input and expected output) were developed for each rule in the specification. If
230 any output was not as expected, the corresponding part of the logic was checked for errors and, if
231 needed, corrected. This was repeated until a 100% pass rate was achieved. These tests were
232 added to the test suite and are run every time a change is made to the software. Validation testing
233 took place in two rounds. First, fictional patient cases were constructed based on the
234 specification. Specifically, cases were designed such that each text that the CDSS can produce
235 appeared for at least one patient. The output was reviewed by NvdV to confirm that the advice
236 was clinically sound and reflected the intent of the underlying guidelines. Any identified

237 problems were corrected and the test was repeated. Second, informed consent was obtained from
238 10 patients and data from these patients was entered into the CDSS. NvdV and an expert in
239 geriatric pharmacy reviewed the cases and commented if they did not agree with the advice.
240 Since clinicians can have differing opinions on the same case, we aimed for 90% agreement with
241 these recommendations.

242 *Development of the prediction model*

243 To enable the generation of a patient's risk of falling within 12 months, a fall-risk
244 prediction model was developed by Van de Loo et al to fit the context of this study using a
245 harmonized dataset ($n = 5722$) of two Dutch cohorts and a German cohort study of community-
246 dwelling older adults (65+) [35]. This prediction model comprises a part of the CDSS's
247 knowledge base. For background, the outcome variable was defined as any fall (one or more
248 falls) within a one-year follow-up. Candidate predictors were selected based on previously
249 reported risk factors for falls that are easily obtained in clinical practice, such as
250 sociodemographic variables; measures of emotional, cognitive and physical functioning; self-
251 reported chronic conditions; variables related to lifestyle; biomarkers; and use of certain
252 medications. The prediction model was internally validated using an internal-external cross-
253 validation procedure, in which the performance of the model was tested in each of the
254 development cohorts separately following Steyerberg and Harrel [43].

255 **Phase II: Feasibility**

256 *Usability testing of the CDSS prototype*

257 The feasibility phase assessed whether the first prototype of the CDSS had any usability
258 problems that needed to be fixed prior to developing the final version of the CDSS. This was
259 achieved through usability testing with geriatric physicians ($n = 5$) from a Dutch academic

260 hospital. Each physician was presented with three hypothetical patient cases that varied in fall
261 risk (e.g., high versus low risk). Each physician completed at least one case. Next, physicians
262 were asked to carry out a scripted navigation consisting of realistic CDSS task scenarios,
263 resembling aspects of clinical documentation (e.g., analyzing a patient’s fall-risk, selecting
264 relevant treatment options, making a referral). Throughout navigation, physicians were prompted
265 to “think aloud” and verbalize their thought process while carrying out the tasks (i.e. using a
266 concurrent think aloud method). Additionally, Camtasia 9, a usability software, was used to
267 record the screen and mouse movements of each physician, including facial expressions and
268 vocalizations (i.e., questions, expressions of confusion) [44].

269 Usability problems were identified for each physician session, and coded according to the
270 Nielsen usability problems severity rating ranging from 0 = “I don’t agree that this is a usability
271 problem at all” to 4 = “Usability catastrophe: imperative to fix this before product can be
272 released” [45]. The categorization and potential negative impact of each identified usability
273 problem was assessed following the augmented scheme for classifying and prioritizing usability
274 problems [46]. Next, usability problems from all sessions were merged, and for each problem the
275 occurrence of that problem was noted. This led to an overview of usability problems ordered on
276 both severity and occurrence, ranging from the most severe and most often occurring problems
277 to the least severe and least occurring problems. The analysis of the results from this study led to
278 adjustments to the CDSS, resulting in a second version of the prototype. The aforementioned
279 procedure was repeated in a second usability study among six physicians. This allowed us to
280 pinpoint remaining usability issues that needed to be improved prior to the developing the final
281 version of the CDSS.

282 **Results**

283 The analysis of the results from all studies guided the development of the CDSS. In this
284 article, we report in detail the results of the scoping literature review, semi-structured interviews,
285 software development, and usability testing rounds. The results of the systematic literature
286 review, European online survey, modified Delphi study, and development of the fall-risk
287 prediction model are reported in detail elsewhere by the research team [32-35].

288 **Phase I: Development**

289 *Results from the scoping literature review*

290 Regarding the risk communication needs of physicians, the results suggest that physicians
291 prefer a holistic- and patient-specific approach to communicating health-related advice [26]. This
292 approach should include information that is actionable, directive and transparent [47-50]. When
293 visualizing risks, information-orientated graphs were perceived as easier to interpret by
294 physicians, and were found to enhance shared decision-making between physicians and patients
295 [49-51]. Similarly, using a traffic-light coloring system for the presentation of risk is believed to
296 facilitate information processing, which can lead to a more rapid assessment of risk-based
297 information by physicians [47, 49, 51]. Additionally, favorable effects were found on
298 information processing outcomes (e.g., enhanced attention, reduced cognitive load) when the
299 formatting of information and use of terminology was consistent, and when text density and
300 visual clutter was reduced [49, 50].

301 *Results from the semi-structured interviews*

302 Results showed that fall risk information should be displayed in color as either a number
303 or percentage. With regard to effective patient-physician communication, a visual graph was
304 viewed as beneficial for the patient, including the ability to print out a patient-friendly handout.
305 This handout should include information about the patient's personalized fall risk and treatment

306 plan that was discussed during the consultation. Opportunities to read about the benefits and side
307 effects of deprescribing a medication, and having access to additional information (e.g., via
308 hyperlinks) were viewed as important in the decision making to deprescribe. Moreover,
309 information about how a patient's fall risk is calculated (i.e., the prediction model) was perceived
310 as vital information by physicians that would also enhance the system's credibility. Lastly, for
311 successful implementation of the CDSS in clinical practice, physicians stressed the importance
312 of reducing completion time (e.g., limiting the amount of mouse clicks).

313 *Development of the user interface and knowledge base*

314 Table 2 shows the hierarchical categorization of physicians aggregated system needs
315 from both literature reviews, the European online survey, and the semi-structured interviews with
316 physicians. These key requirements were subsequently operationalized into system features used
317 for the development of the user interface of the first CDSS prototype for usability testing.

318 Regarding the knowledge base of the system, the final set of clinical rules covering 22 classes of
319 FRIDs, with specific deprescribing advice based on diagnoses, lab values, and concurrent
320 medications, including the final fall-risk prediction model were integrated into the CDSS. The
321 final prediction model consisted of the following 14 predictors: educational status, depression,
322 body mass index, grip strength, gait speed, number of functional limitations, systolic blood
323 pressure, at least one fall in the previous 12 months, at least two falls in the previous 12 months,
324 fear of falling, smoking status, use of calcium channel blockers, use of antiepileptics, and use of
325 drugs for urinary frequency and incontinence (see Van de Loo et al. for detailed results) [35].

326 **Table 2. Hierarchical categorization of physicians aggregated needs.**

Key requirements for CDSS
R: Scoping literature review
S: Survey

I: Semi-structured interviews

1. Limit repeated and uninformative alerts (R/S).
2. Include easy-to-use interactive features that cater towards physicians fast-paced work environment (R, I).
3. Provide physicians with actionable recommendations on how a patient's fall risk can be reduced (R).
4. Make information transparent and credible by including hyperlinks that direct physicians to information surrounding the fall-risk prediction model and other medication-related information (I).
5. The CDSS should provide a holistic overview of the patient (e.g., comorbidities) (R).
6. The format of the CDSS should be consistent (R).
7. The presentation of risk should be presented in a text-format using concise and to-the-point language (e.g., using short sentences with standardized terminology) (R).
8. Information should be presented in a systematic manner that complements the consultation workflow of physicians (R, S).
9. A patient's fall risk should be accompanied with information-orientated graphs (e.g., bar graphs, icon arrays, pie-charts) (R, I).
10. The information-orientated should employ a traffic-light coloring system (i.e., red for high risk, yellow for medium, risk, and green for no risk) (R, I).
11. The CDSS should be efficient in use (i.e., fast completion time, limited clicks and text-entry fields) (I, S).

327 *Development of the reasoning engine and software (prototype 1)*

328 Following agile development principles, development of the software started by building
329 the smallest part that would be useful, which was the reasoning engine and an interface for
330 verification and validation testing that showed the advice text for the doctor, checkbox options,
331 corresponding patient-friendly text, and references all on one screen. Features were then added in
332 order of priority. This, in combination with test-driven development, lead to a modular
333 architecture with good separation between the connection to the Electronic Health Record
334 (EHR), the logic, and the user interface. This allowed developers to readily modify the interface

335 based on feedback received from phase II. Development as open source software facilitated
336 seeking and incorporating input from external expert developers. Regarding the system's
337 security, the software is designed to be hosted within the hospital network, and dependencies are
338 minimized to lower the security footprint and improve maintainability. Additionally, the CDSS
339 logic is kept server side to ensure that it cannot be changed from the browser, and that the
340 information seen by the user is always consistent with the saved data. Features were also added
341 to limit data being cached in the user's browser. Regarding verification and validation testing,
342 after verification testing and the first round of validation testing were completed with no
343 remaining errors detected, the second round of validation testing with real patient data was
344 conducted. This resulted in 100% agreement from one clinician and 95% agreement from the
345 other, which exceeded the minimum threshold of 90% agreement.

346 **Phase II: Feasibility**

347 *Results from usability testing rounds*

348 The first usability testing round ($n = 5$ physicians) identified 74 individual usability
349 problems with a mean Nielsen's severity rating classification of 2.49 (i.e., between minor to
350 major usability problems) [45]. Regarding major to severe usability problems, physicians
351 perceived difficulties with the general navigability of the system (e.g., no "back button") and the
352 medical terminology used within the system (e.g., what is meant by "lowest dose" or "minimal
353 effective dose" for deprescribing medications). These and similar usability problems were solved
354 and the CDSS underwent a second round of usability testing with 6 physicians. The number of
355 usability problems identified decreased by 16%, and the mean Nielsen's severity rating was 1.87
356 (i.e., between cosmetic to minor problems). The most pressing usability problems were improved
357 (e.g., fixing hyperlinks and task-orientated buttons), and the final version of the CDSS was

358 developed. After each usability testing round, the user interface and clinical knowledge base of
359 the CDSS were further optimized, which led to the development of the final CDSS.

360 *The final ADFICE_IT CDSS*

361 The source code for the ADFICE_IT software is available at <https://github.com/adfice-it>.

362 A connection between the EHR and the CDSS was made for the extraction of patient data into
363 the CDSS. This data is used to provide patient-specific advice and to calculate a patient's
364 personalized fall risk estimate. The final version of the CDSS is depicted in figures 1 through 5.
365 The CDSS consists of 5 web pages. Page 1 (titled "Start" in fig. 1) is the landing page of the
366 CDSS. On this page the physician can (1) check whether relevant patient information (e.g., age,
367 morbidities, list of medications) was correctly extracted from the EHR system, and add missing
368 data for calculating the fall risk estimate; (2) view a graphical representation of the patient's
369 personalized fall risk estimate by means of a gradient scale, and (3) view a model for shared
370 decision-making that can be implemented during the consultation. Additionally, physicians have
371 access to the patient identifier and personalized fall risk estimate during the entire consultation,
372 as this information is displayed in the form of a horizontal menu bar on all subsequent pages.

373 Page 2 (titled "Preparation" in fig. 2) lists each medication taken by the patient and
374 structurally provides the physician with patient-specific deprescribing advice for each listed
375 medication in an attempt to facilitate optimal deprescribing for the physician. Page 2 also
376 provides relevant non-medication related information for preventing falls in older patients (e.g.,
377 referral to fall prevention interventions, leaflets, etc.). The clinician can select the treatment
378 options and/or non-medication related information they want to discuss with the patient.
379 Moreover, hyperlinks to third-party sources are provided for additional information about the

380 listed medications (i.e., “Farmacotherapeutisch Kompas”) and related deprescribing advice (i.e.,
381 the guidelines used to formulate that advice).

382 Page 3 (titled “Consult” in fig. 3) provides an overview of the treatment options that the
383 physician selected to discuss together with the patient (i.e., the deprescribing advice or leaflets
384 selected in page 2). Based on the discussion with the patient, a final treatment plan is determined.
385 Page 4 (titled “Advice” in fig. 4) displays the final treatment plan in a patient-friendly format,
386 which is printable by the physician and accessible by the patient via the patient portal. In page 5
387 (titled “Wrap-up” in fig. 5), the physician is able to copy a summary of the consultation into the
388 patient’s EHR, for future storage.

389 **Fig. 1. Start page of the ADFICE_IT CDSS.**

390 [Figure 1]

391 **Fig. 2. Preparation page of the ADFICE_IT CDSS.**

392 [Figure 2]

393 **Fig. 3. Consult page of the ADFICE_IT CDSS.**

394 [Figure 3]

395 **Fig. 4. Advice page of the ADFICE_IT CDSS.**

396 [Figure 4]

397 **Fig. 5. Wrap-up page of the ADFICE_IT CDSS.**

398 [Figure 5]

399 **Discussion**

400 This study outlined the user-centered development of a CDSS to support physicians in
401 the optimum deprescribing of FRIDs in older adults (65+). The system was developed for the
402 ADFICE_IT project, and intended for use in conjunction with a patient portal. In the

403 development phase (phase I), a robust theoretical understanding about key components of the
404 CDSS was cultivated. For this, both existing and new evidence was relied upon, in which
405 collaboration with end users of the system was sought throughout different stages of
406 development. In phase I, a fall-risk prediction model was developed and internally validated.
407 This prediction model was later integrated into the CDSS. Phase 1 also included the development
408 of the knowledge, reasoning engine and software. Moreover, verification and validation testing
409 were conducted to check for and subsequently correct errors relating to the generation of
410 deprescribing advice. Together, the results from phase I guided the development of the first
411 prototype of the CDSS. In the feasibility phase (phase II), two separate usability testing rounds
412 with geriatric physicians were conducted to identify and address remaining usability issues
413 within the CDSS that could hinder successful implementation of the system later on.

414 A key strength of this study was the ability to integrate the aggregated deprescribing
415 guidelines and the fall-risk prediction model into the clinical knowledge base of our CDSS. For
416 physicians, deprescribing FRIDs is an often complex task as differences in risk of adverse drug
417 events make it hard to determine whether reducing a particular FRID or combination of FRIDs
418 will result in a significant change in preventing a fall [12, 13]. According to Bloomfield et al., it
419 is exactly this particular complexity in FRIDs deprescribing that has not been effectively
420 addressed in past interventions [12]. This CDSS addresses this need by systematically guiding
421 physicians through the deprescribing of one or more FRIDs. The system does this by first
422 signaling a FRID from a patient's medication list, and subsequently leverages the stored
423 deprescribing guidelines to advise physicians on how the identified FRID can be deprescribed
424 optimally. Additionally, physicians can leverage the fall-risk prediction model as an adjunct to

425 decision-making by assessing different advice on the basis of the patient’s estimated risk of
426 falling within a 12-month period.

427 Another key strength of our study was implementing a user-centered design approach to
428 development. This, in our opinion, will greatly influence the acceptance of the system in its
429 intended clinical care setting, as its functionalities and content are tailored to the needs and
430 preferences of its primary end users. Past studies have shown low CDSS acceptance rates and a
431 high number of usability barriers when physicians are not involved in the development process
432 [24, 26-28]. Since the outcomes of the ADFICE_IT intervention are dependent on physicians'
433 use of the CDSS, insights from the system’s primary end users were gathered, namely physicians
434 treating older patients, at an early stage and throughout the development process of the system,
435 which led to several advantages. For example, the test-driven development allowed us to make
436 changes to the code with confidence that earlier added functionality was not being disrupted.
437 This also led to a more modular architecture within the code base, which facilitated making the
438 changes suggested by end users during the usability testing rounds. Additionally, while the
439 decision to favor clarity over performance aided in this process, it should be noted that this does
440 carry a limitation whereby the software – in its current form – is not scalable to support hundreds
441 of concurrent users. Moreover, future development could improve testing of the client software
442 further (e.g., unit and acceptance tests) by concentrating manipulation of the display to a few
443 parts of the web page, which could allow for easier testing during development. Lastly, while
444 employing a rigorous verification and validation process led to an improved version of the CDSS
445 after each feedback round, a limitation of this process was the involvement of one of the two
446 clinicians during earlier verification and validation steps. This may have resulted in higher

447 agreement, even though the system did perform well with the second clinician, who was not
448 otherwise involved in the development process.

449 A final strength of our CDSS is that the system displays several different treatment
450 options (i.e., advice) for each identified FRID (i.e., using guideline-based reasoning), which
451 provides an opportunity for physicians to discuss preferred treatment options together with the
452 patient. This can foster joint medication management, which could help in tackling the observed
453 low rates of deprescribing compliance among patients [52]. In older patients, Van Weert et al.
454 showed that shared decision-making was effective at enhancing both medication-related
455 knowledge and adherence rates, which we believe could have a positive effect on the outcomes
456 of the ADFICE_IT intervention as well [21]. Specifically, the effectiveness of our CDSS (along
457 with the accompanying patient portal) are currently being tested in a multicenter, cluster-
458 randomized controlled trial with process evaluation in several Dutch hospitals.

459 **Conclusions**

460 This study followed a user-centered design approach to development to develop a CDSS
461 intended for use in fall clinics. The CDSS supports physicians in the optimum deprescribing of
462 FRIDs to prevent falls in older patients (65+), leveraging aggregated deprescribing guidelines, a
463 validated fall-risk prediction model, and shared decision-making. Moreover, due to the continued
464 involvement of end users, we were able to ensure that the CDSS was both useful and user-
465 friendly as each new feedback round led to an improved version of the system. The CDSS is
466 currently being tested in a multicenter, cluster-randomized controlled trial with process
467 evaluation at hospitals in the Netherlands.

468 **Acknowledgments**

469 The authors thank Tsvetan Yordanov, Rutger Bazen and Stephen Madson for their contributions
470 to the software, and Leonie Westerbeek for her contribution to the user interface. The authors
471 thank Eveline Poelgeest, Gerrit Jan Hafkamp, Irene Gomez Bruinewoud, Hester van der Kroon,
472 Hanna Willems, Suzanne Bleker, Oscar Smeekes and Stephanie van der Woude for their
473 contributions to testing the feasibility of the ADFICE_IT CDSS.

474 **Availability of materials**

475 Figure translations in English are available upon request from the corresponding author.

476 **References**

477 1. World Health Organization: Falls. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/falls>

478 (2021). Accessed 25 Oct 2022.

479 2. Haagsma JA, Olij BF, Majdan M, van Beeck EF, Vos T, Castle CD, et al. Falls in older aged

480 adults in 22 European countries: incidence, mortality and burden of disease from 1990 to 2017.

481 Inj Prev. 2020;26(1):i67–74. https://injuryprevention.bmj.com/content/26/Suppl_2/i67

482 3. Hartholt KA, van Beeck EF, Polinder S, van der Velde N, van Lieshout EMM, Panneman

483 MJM, et al. Societal Consequences of Falls in the Older Population: Injuries, Healthcare Costs,

484 and Long-Term Reduced Quality of Life. J Trauma. 2011;71(3):748–53.

485 doi:10.1097/TA.0b013e3181f6f5e5

486 4. Peeters G, Bennett M, Donoghue OA, Kennelly S, Kenny RA. Understanding the aetiology of

487 fear of falling from the perspective of a fear-avoidance model – A narrative review. Clin Psychol

488 Rev. 2020;79:101862. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101862>

489 5. Petersen N, König H-H, Hajek A. The link between falls, social isolation and loneliness: A

490 systematic review. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2020;88:104020.

491 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2020.104020>

- 492 6. Heinrich S, Rapp K, Rissmann U, Becker C, König HH. Cost of falls in old age: a systematic
493 review. *Osteoporos Int.* 2010 Jun 19;21(6):891–902.
494 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00198-009-1100-1>
- 495 7. de Vries M, Seppala LJ, Daams JG, van de Glind EMM, Masud T, van der Velde N, et al.
496 Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: I. Cardiovascular Drugs. *J*
497 *Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2018;19(4):371.e1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2017.12.013>
- 498 8. Seppala LJ, Wermelink AMAT, de Vries M, Ploegmakers KJ, van de Glind EMM, Daams JG,
499 et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: II. Psychotropics. *J*
500 *Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2018;19(4):371.e11–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2017.12.098>
- 501 9. Seppala LJ, van de Glind EMM, Daams JG, Ploegmakers KJ, de Vries M, Wermelink AMAT,
502 et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: III. Others. *J Am*
503 *Med Dir Assoc.* 2018;19(4):372.e1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2017.12.099>
- 504 10. Michalcova J, Vasut K, Airaksinen M, Bielakova K. Inclusion of medication-related fall risk
505 in fall risk assessment tool in geriatric care units. *BMC Geriatr.* 2020;20(1):1-11.
506 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-020-01845-9>
- 507 11. Van der Velde N, Minhas JS. Appropriate deprescribing in older people: a challenging
508 necessity Commentary to accompany themed collection on deprescribing. *Age Ageing.*
509 2021;50(5):1516–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afab142>
- 510 12. Bloomfield HE, Greer N, Linsky AM, Bolduc J, Naidl T, Vardeny O, et al. Deprescribing for
511 Community-Dwelling Older Adults: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Gen Intern Med.*
512 2020;35(11):3323–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-06089-2>

- 513 13. Lee J, Negm A, Peters R, Wong EKC, Holbrook A. Deprescribing fall-risk increasing drugs
514 (FRIDs) for the prevention of falls and fall-related complications: a systematic review and meta-
515 analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(2):e035978. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035978
- 516 14. Bell HT, Steinsbekk A, Granas AG. Factors influencing prescribing of fall-risk-increasing
517 drugs to the elderly: A qualitative study. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. 2015;33(2):107–14.
518 <https://doi.org/10.3109/02813432.2015.1041829>
- 519 15. Tinetti ME, Gordon C, Sogolow E, Lapin P, Bradley EH. Fall-Risk Evaluation and
520 Management: Challenges in Adopting Geriatric Care Practices. *Gerontologist*. 2006;46(6):717–
521 25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/46.6.717>
- 522 16. Drickamer MA, Levy B, Irwin KS, Rohrbaugh RM. Perceived needs for geriatric education
523 by medical students, internal medicine residents and faculty. *J General Intern Med*.
524 2006;21:1230–4.
- 525 17. Hoffmann TC, Del Mar C. Clinicians’ expectations of the benefits and harms of treatments,
526 screening, and tests: a systematic review. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017;177:407–19.
527 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.8254
- 528 18. Laing SS, Silver IF, York S, Phelan EA. Fall Prevention Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices
529 of Community Stakeholders and Older Adults. *J Aging Res*. 2011;2011:1–9.
530 doi:10.4061/2011/395357
- 531 19. Goud R, van Engen-Verheul M, de Keizer NF, Bal R, Hasman A, Hellemans IM, et al. The
532 effect of computerized decision support on barriers to guideline implementation: A qualitative
533 study in outpatient cardiac rehabilitation. *Int J Med Inform*. 2010;79(6):430–7.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2010.03.001>

- 535 20. Sim I, Gorman P, Greenes RA, Haynes RB, Kaplan B, Lehmann H, et al. Clinical Decision
536 Support Systems for the Practice of Evidence-based Medicine. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.*
537 2001;8(6):527–34. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jamia.2001.0080527>
- 538 21. Van Weert JCM, van Munster BC, Sanders R, Spijker R, Hooft L, Jansen J. Decision aids to
539 help older people make health decisions: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
540 *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2016;16(1):1-20. doi:10.1186/s12911-016-0281-8
- 541 22. Clyne B, Bradley MC, Hughes C, Fahey T, Lapane KL. Electronic Prescribing and Other
542 Forms of Technology to Reduce Inappropriate Medication Use and Polypharmacy in Older
543 People: A Review of Current Evidence.
544 *Clin Geriatr Med.* 2012;28(2):301–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cger.2012.01.009>
- 545 23. Dalton K, O'Brien G, O'Mahony D, Byrne S. Computerised interventions designed to reduce
546 potentially inappropriate prescribing in hospitalised older adults: a systematic review and meta-
547 analysis. *Age Ageing.* 2018;47(5):670–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afy086>
- 548 24. Damoiseaux-Volman B, van der Velde N, Ruige S, Romijn J, Abu-Hanna A, Medlock
549 SEffect of Interventions With a Clinical Decision Support System for Hospitalized Older
550 Patients: Systematic Review Mapping Implementation and Design Factors
551 *JMIR Med Inform* 2021;9(7):e28023. doi:10.2196/28023
- 552 25. Moons KGM, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, Ioannidis JPA, Macaskill P, Steyerberg EW, et al.
553 Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or Diagnosis
554 (TRIPOD): Explanation and Elaboration. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(1):W1.
- 555 26. Kilsdonk E, Peute LW, Jaspers MWM. Factors influencing implementation success of
556 guideline-based clinical decision support systems: A systematic review and gaps analysis. *Int J*
557 *Med Inform.* 2017;98:56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.12.001>

- 558 27. Moxey A, Robertson J, Newby D, Hains I, Williamson M, Pearson S-A. Computerized
559 clinical decision support for prescribing: provision does not guarantee uptake. *J Am Med Inform*
560 *Assoc.* 2010;17(1):25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M3170>
- 561 28. Trinkley KE, Blakeslee WW, Matlock DD, Kao DP, Van Matre AG, Harrison R, et al.
562 Clinician preferences for computerised clinical decision support for medications in primary care:
563 a focus group study. *BMJ Health Care Inform.* 2019;26(1):e000015. doi:10.1136/bmjhci-2019-
564 000015
- 565 29. Gagnon M-P, Desmartis M, Labrecque M, Car J, Pagliari C, Pluye P, et al. Systematic
566 Review of Factors Influencing the Adoption of Information and Communication Technologies
567 by Healthcare Professionals. *J Med Syst.* 2010;36(1):241–77.
568 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-010-9473-4>
- 569 30. Walden A, Garvin L, Smerek M, Johnson C. User-centered design principles in the
570 development of clinical research tools. *Clin Trials.* 2020;17(6):703–11.
571 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774520946314>
- 572 31. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
573 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *Int J*
574 *Nurs Stud.* 2013;50(5), 587-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.09.010>
- 575 32. Westerbeek L, Ploegmakers KJ, De Bruijn GJ, Linn AJ, Van Weert JCM, Daams JG, et al.
576 Barriers and facilitators influencing medication-related CDSS acceptance according to clinicians:
577 A systematic review. *Int J Med Inform.* 2021;152:104506.
578 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2021.104506>

- 579 33. Ploegmakers KJ, Medlock S, Linn AJ, Lin Y, Seppala LJ, Petrovic M, et al. Barriers and
580 facilitators in using a Clinical Decision Support System for fall risk management for older
581 people: a European survey. *Eur Geriatr Med.* 2022; 13, 395–405.
582 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00599-w>
- 583 34. Seppala LJ, Petrovic M, Ryg J, Bahat G, Topinkova E, Szczerbińska K, et al. STOPPFall
584 (Screening Tool of Older Persons Prescriptions in older adults with high fall risk): a Delphi study
585 by the EuGMS Task and Finish Group on Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs. *Age Ageing.*
586 2021;50(4):1189–99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afaa249>
- 587 35. Van de Loo B, Seppala LJ, van der Velde N, Medlock S, Denking M, de Groot LCPGM, et
588 al. Development of the ADFICE_IT models for predicting falls and recurrent falls in community-
589 dwelling older adults: pooled analyses of European cohorts with special attention to medication.
590 *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2022;77(7):1446-54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glac080>
- 591 36. Richtlijndatabase. Effect medicijnen op valrisico ouderen – Richtlijn. 2017.
592 https://richtlijndatabase.nl/richtlijn/preventie_van_valincidenten_bij_ouderen/effect_medicijn
593 [n_op_valrisico_ouderen.html](https://richtlijndatabase.nl/richtlijn/preventie_van_valincidenten_bij_ouderen/effect_medicijn_n_op_valrisico_ouderen.html). Accessed 26 Oct 2022.
- 594 37. Medlock S, Opondo D, Eslami S, Askari M, Wierenga P, de Rooij SE, et al. LERM (Logical
595 Elements Rule Method): A method for assessing and formalizing clinical rules for
596 decision support. *Int J Med Inform.* 2011;80(4):286–95.
597 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2011.01.014>
- 598 38. Node.js Foundation. Node.js. 2019. <https://nodejs.org/en/>. Accessed 26 Oct 2022.
- 599 39. Express. Fast, unopinionated, minimalist web framework for Node.js. [Expressjs.com](https://expressjs.com/). 2017.
600 <http://expressjs.com/>. Accessed 26 Oct 2022.

- 601 40. MariaDB Foundation. MariaDB server: The open source relational database. MariaDB.org.
602 2015. <https://mariadb.org/>. Accessed 26 Oct 2022.
- 603 41. Jest. Delightful JavaScript Testing. Jestjs.io. 2017. <https://jestjs.io/>. Accessed 26 Oct 2022.
- 604 42. TestCafe. End-to-end testing, simplified. testcafe.io. <https://testcafe.io/>. Accessed 26 Oct
605 2022.
- 606 43. Steyerberg EW, Harrell FE. Prediction models need appropriate internal, internal–external,
607 and external validation. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;69:245–7.
608 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.04.005>
- 609 44. TechSmith Camtasia. Screen Recorder & Video Editor. TechSmith. 2022.
610 <https://www.techsmith.com/video-editor.html>. Accessed 26 Oct 2022.
- 611 45. Nielsen J. Usability engineering. Boston: Academic Press; 1993.
- 612 46. Khajouei R, Peute LWP, Hasman A, Jaspers MWM. Classification and prioritization of
613 usability problems using an augmented classification scheme. *J Biomed Inform*. 2011;44(6):948–
614 57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2011.07.002>
- 615 47. Kennedy G, Gallego B. Clinical prediction rules: A systematic review of healthcare provider
616 opinions and preferences. *Int J Med Inform*. 2019;123:1–10.
617 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2018.12.003>
- 618 48. Khong PCB, Holroyd E, Wang W. A critical review of the theoretical frameworks and the
619 conceptual factors in the adoption of clinical decision support systems. *Comput Inform Nurs*.
620 2015;33(12): 555-70. doi:10.1097/CIN.0000000000000196
- 621 49. Leichtling G, Hildebran C, Novak K, Alley L, Doyle S, Reilly C, et al. Physician Responses
622 to Enhanced Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Profiles. *Pain Med*. 2019;21(2):e9–21.
623 <https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pny291>

- 624 50. Miller K, Mosby D, Capan M, Kowalski R, Ratwani R, Noaiseh Y, et al. Interface,
625 information, interaction: a narrative review of design and functional requirements for clinical
626 decision support. JAMIA. 2018;25(5):585–92. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocx118>
- 627 51. Van Maurik IS, Visser LN, Pel-Littel RE, Buchem MM van, Zwan MD, Kunneman M, et al.
628 Development and Usability of ADappt: Web-Based Tool to Support Clinicians, Patients, and
629 Caregivers in the Diagnosis of Mild Cognitive Impairment and Alzheimer Disease. JMIR Form
630 Res. 2019;3(3):e13417. doi:10.2196/13417
- 631 52. Boyé NDA, van der Velde N, de Vries OJ, van Lieshout EMM, Hartholt KA, Mattace-Raso
632 FUS, et al. Effectiveness of medication withdrawal in older fallers: results from the Improving
633 Medication Prescribing to reduce Risk Of FALLs (IMPROVeFALL) trial. Age Ageing.
634 2017;46(1):142-6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afw161>