World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Review Article)

Check for updates

Enterprise architecture frameworks for integrating AI-driven diagnostics in healthcare systems: A comprehensive approach

Sheik Asif Mehboob *

Freeport LNG, Houston, USA.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 26(01), 535-542

Publication history: Received on 26 February 2025; revised on 03 April 2025; accepted on 05 April 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.1.1093

Abstract

This article presents a comprehensive framework for implementing artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies within healthcare diagnostic systems through enterprise architecture approaches. The integration of AI-driven diagnostics into existing healthcare infrastructure presents significant challenges related to data interoperability, security protocols, regulatory compliance, and clinical workflow disruption. By examining architectural models specifically designed for healthcare settings, this article proposes systematic integration pathways that address these challenges while maximizing diagnostic accuracy and efficiency. The article explores both technical and governance dimensions of enterprise architecture, emphasizing standardized data exchange protocols, privacy-preserving mechanisms, and integration patterns that respect legacy system constraints. Special attention is given to maintaining HIPAA compliance throughout the architectural framework while enabling real-time diagnostic capabilities across heterogeneous healthcare environments. The article suggests that a well-structured enterprise architecture approach can significantly reduce implementation barriers while creating sustainable foundations for AI expansion in clinical diagnostics, ultimately supporting improved patient outcomes through enhanced diagnostic precision and timeliness.

Keywords: Enterprise Architecture; Artificial Intelligence; Healthcare Diagnostics; Machine Learning Integration; Clinical Systems Interoperability

1. Introduction

1.1. Transformative Potential of AI/ML in Healthcare Diagnostics

Healthcare systems worldwide are undergoing a profound transformation driven by advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) technologies. These technologies have demonstrated remarkable potential to enhance diagnostic capabilities across numerous medical disciplines [1]. The integration of AI-driven diagnostic tools offers opportunities for improved accuracy, reduced diagnostic timeframes, and more personalized patient care approaches. As Kavitha and Roobini [1] highlight, machine learning algorithms can identify patterns in medical data that might escape human detection, potentially revolutionizing early disease detection and treatment planning.

1.2. Current Challenges in Healthcare System Integration

Despite these promising developments, healthcare organizations face substantial challenges when attempting to integrate AI systems with existing clinical infrastructure. These challenges include fragmented information systems, inconsistent data formats, privacy concerns, and workflow disruptions. The complexity of healthcare environments, with their legacy systems and strict regulatory requirements, creates significant barriers to the seamless implementation of AI technologies.

* Corresponding author: Sheik Asif Mehboob.

1.3. The Role of Enterprise Architecture as a Facilitating Framework

Enterprise Architecture (EA) frameworks offer a structured approach to overcome these integration challenges. As established by Osei-Tutu and Song [2], EA provides methodologies for aligning information technology capabilities with organizational objectives in healthcare settings. These frameworks facilitate the mapping of complex system interactions, data flows, and technology components, creating a coherent blueprint for technology integration while maintaining operational integrity.

1.4. Article Scope and Objectives

This article examines how EA methodologies can specifically address the unique requirements of AI integration in diagnostic healthcare systems. We explore architectural models that support data interoperability, ensure security and regulatory compliance, and enable clinical workflow optimization. The primary objective is to present a comprehensive architectural approach that healthcare organizations can adopt to successfully implement AI-driven diagnostic capabilities while navigating the technical, organizational, and regulatory complexities inherent in modern healthcare environments.

2. Fundamentals of Enterprise Architecture in Healthcare

2.1. Key EA Frameworks Applicable to Healthcare Organizations

Enterprise Architecture frameworks provide structured methodologies for organizing and integrating complex information systems within healthcare settings. As outlined by Ahsan, Shah, et al. [3], several established EA frameworks have demonstrated particular relevance to healthcare organizations. These include The Open Group Architecture Framework (TOGAF), the Zachman Framework, and the Federal Enterprise Architecture Framework (FEAF). Each framework offers distinct approaches to categorizing architectural components, managing information systems, and aligning technology investments with clinical and organizational objectives. Healthcare-specific adaptations of these frameworks have emerged to address the unique requirements of medical environments, including considerations for patient privacy, clinical workflow integration, and regulatory compliance.

Table 1 Comparison of Enterprise Architecture Frameworks for Healthcare AI [2, 3, 4]

Framework	Key Components	Healthcare-Specific Adaptations	AI Integration Capabilities
TOGAF	Architecture Development Method, Enterprise Continuum	Clinical process modeling, Patient data governance	Service-oriented architecture for AI microservices
Zachman	6×6 classification matrix	Enhanced security dimensions, Regulatory compliance	Data architecture focus for ML training pipelines
FEAF	Performance, Business, Data Reference Models	Patient-centered service models	Capability mapping for diagnostic AI
Healthcare-specific EA	Care delivery models, Clinical data models	HL7/FHIR standards, HIPAA compliance	Integrated clinical decision support

2.2. Architectural Layers Specific to Healthcare Information Systems

Healthcare information systems typically comprise multiple architectural layers that must be carefully aligned to support effective AI integration. According to Ilie, Moisescu, et al. [4], these layers include business architecture (clinical and administrative processes), data architecture (patient records, clinical data, research repositories), application architecture (electronic health records, diagnostic systems, administrative tools), and technology architecture (infrastructure, networks, security mechanisms). In healthcare contexts, these architectural layers must be designed with special consideration for data continuity, system availability, and adherence to healthcare standards such as HL7, DICOM, and FHIR. The interconnections between these layers create the foundation upon which AI-driven diagnostic systems can operate effectively.

2.3. Governance Structures for AI/ML Integration

Effective governance structures are essential for managing the integration of AI/ML systems within healthcare environments. Ahsan, Shah, et al. [3] emphasize the importance of establishing clear governance mechanisms that address data quality assurance, algorithm validation, clinical risk management, and ethical oversight. Governance frameworks for AI in healthcare typically involve multidisciplinary teams comprising clinical specialists, information technology professionals, data scientists, and compliance officers. These governance structures must establish processes for AI model validation, monitoring performance in clinical settings, managing updates to diagnostic algorithms, and ensuring transparency in AI-driven decision-making processes.

2.4. Enterprise Architecture Maturity Models for Healthcare

Enterprise Architecture maturity models provide healthcare organizations with frameworks to assess their architectural capabilities and plan for systematic improvement. As discussed by Ilie, Moisescu, et al. [4], these maturity models help healthcare institutions evaluate their readiness for advanced technology adoption, including AI-driven diagnostic systems. Maturity assessments typically examine dimensions such as strategic alignment, governance effectiveness, information quality, infrastructure capabilities, and skills availability. By applying EA maturity models, healthcare organizations can identify gaps in their architectural foundations that might impede AI integration, prioritize improvement initiatives, and develop roadmaps for enhancing their architectural capabilities to support advanced diagnostic technologies.

3. AI and Machine Learning Technologies in Diagnostics

3.1. Survey of Current AI/ML Diagnostic Applications

The landscape of AI and ML applications in healthcare diagnostics has expanded significantly in recent years, encompassing diverse medical specialties. These technologies are being deployed across multiple diagnostic domains, including medical imaging analysis, pathology, genomics, electrodiagnostics, and clinical decision support systems. As noted by Nambiar [5], the development of standardized approaches to evaluate these systems has become increasingly important as adoption grows. AI diagnostic tools range from rule-based expert systems to deep learning models that can identify subtle patterns in medical data. Applications include automated detection of abnormalities in radiological images, prediction of disease progression from longitudinal patient data, classification of pathology samples, and integration of multimodal inputs for comprehensive diagnostic assessments.

3.2. Technical Requirements for Diagnostic Algorithms

Diagnostic algorithms in healthcare settings must meet stringent technical requirements to ensure clinical utility and safety. Nezami, Hafeez, et al. [6] emphasize that these requirements extend beyond standard machine learning metrics to include considerations specific to healthcare applications. Technical specifications for diagnostic AI systems encompass computational efficiency, ability to handle sparse or incomplete data, interpretability of results, and adaptability to different patient populations. Additionally, these systems must maintain performance when deployed across heterogeneous hardware environments, from centralized cloud infrastructures to edge computing devices in clinical settings. The technical architecture must also support integration with existing clinical workflows and electronic health record systems while maintaining responsiveness for time-sensitive diagnostic scenarios.

3.3. Validation Methodologies for AI-Driven Diagnostic Tools

Rigorous validation methodologies are essential for ensuring the reliability and safety of AI-driven diagnostic tools. According to Nambiar [5], standardized validation frameworks help establish confidence in AI performance across diverse healthcare contexts. Validation approaches typically involve multiple phases, beginning with pre-clinical testing using retrospective datasets, followed by prospective validation in controlled environments, and ultimately culminating in real-world clinical evaluations. These methodologies must address challenges such as dataset bias, potential distribution shifts between development and deployment environments, and variations in clinical practice patterns. Comprehensive validation also includes assessment of algorithm robustness to input variations, such as differences in imaging equipment, acquisition protocols, or patient demographics.

3.4. Performance Metrics and Benchmarking Approaches

Meaningful evaluation of AI diagnostic systems requires carefully selected performance metrics and benchmarking approaches tailored to clinical contexts. Nezami, Hafeez, et al. [6] highlight the importance of establishing standardized benchmarks that reflect real-world diagnostic challenges. Beyond traditional machine learning metrics like sensitivity and specificity, performance evaluation frameworks must consider clinical relevance, incorporating measures such as time-to-diagnosis, integration with clinical decision-making, and impact on patient outcomes. Benchmarking approaches increasingly emphasize comparative performance across diverse patient cohorts to identify potential disparities in algorithm effectiveness. Additionally, longitudinal benchmarking methods track performance stability over time, detecting potential degradation due to data drift or changes in clinical practices. These comprehensive evaluation frameworks help healthcare organizations make informed decisions about AI system adoption while ensuring ongoing quality assurance.

4. Data Interoperability and Management Frameworks

4.1. Standards for Healthcare Data Exchange (HL7, FHIR, DICOM)

Interoperability standards form the foundation for effective data exchange across healthcare systems, a critical requirement for AI integration. These standards enable consistent data representation, transmission, and interpretation across different systems and organizations. Health Level Seven International (HL7) protocols, particularly the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR), provide modern API-based approaches to clinical data exchange. Similarly, Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM) establishes standardized formats for medical imaging data. As Ibtissame, Yassine, et al. [7] highlight, standardized data exchange frameworks support real-time processing requirements for complex healthcare applications. These interoperability standards must be embedded within enterprise architecture models to ensure that AI diagnostic systems can seamlessly access and process relevant clinical data, regardless of its origin within the healthcare ecosystem. The evolution of these standards increasingly accommodates AI-specific requirements, such as support for model metadata and algorithm provenance.

4.2. Data Quality Assurance for AI/ML Systems

Data quality assurance represents a critical component of effective AI implementation in healthcare diagnostics. According to Poth, Meyer, et al. [8], quality assurance frameworks for machine learning applications must address the unique challenges of healthcare data. These frameworks encompass methodologies for detecting and managing missing values, outliers, inconsistencies, and biases within clinical datasets. Effective quality assurance requires continuous monitoring throughout the data lifecycle, from acquisition through preprocessing to utilization in diagnostic algorithms. Enterprise architectures must incorporate dedicated data quality components that establish governance policies, implement validation procedures, and provide audit mechanisms for AI training and operational data. Additionally, quality assurance frameworks should address temporal aspects of healthcare data, ensuring that historical records maintain consistency with evolving clinical terminologies and coding systems.

Table 2 Data Quality Dimensions for AI Diagnostic Systems [7, 8, 9]

Data Quality Dimension	Description	Impact on AI Performance	Architectural Considerations
Completeness	Availability of all required data elements	Affects model training	Data validation pipelines
Accuracy	Correctness of clinical data values	Influences diagnostic precision	Validation mechanisms, Expert review
Consistency	Uniformity across data sources	Enables reliable integration	Master data management, Terminology services
Timeliness	Currency and availability when needed	Critical for real-time diagnostics	Event-driven architectures
Relevance	Applicability to diagnostic tasks	Determines feature selection	Domain-specific data models

4.3. Master Data Management in Heterogeneous Healthcare Environments

Master data management (MDM) provides structured approaches for maintaining consistent, accurate, and unified patient and clinical information across heterogeneous healthcare systems. As healthcare environments typically comprise multiple specialized systems, each with its own data models and storage mechanisms, MDM becomes essential for creating coherent views of patient information. Ibtissame, Yassine, et al. [7] emphasize that effective data management frameworks must accommodate the diverse technological landscape of healthcare organizations. MDM architectures for AI-enabled diagnostics must establish authoritative sources for key data domains, implement robust entity resolution capabilities, and provide mechanisms for propagating data corrections across connected systems. These architectures should also support comprehensive data lineage tracking, enabling AI systems to understand the provenance and transformation history of the clinical data they process.

4.4. Real-time Data Processing Architectures for Diagnostic Applications

Real-time data processing capabilities are increasingly essential for diagnostic applications that must deliver insights at the point of care. As Poth, Meyer, et al. [8] note, system safeguarding approaches must accommodate these temporal requirements while maintaining data quality and security. Architectural frameworks for real-time processing typically incorporate stream processing components, in-memory data structures, and event-driven patterns that minimize latency while ensuring data integrity. These architectures must balance processing efficiency with the computational demands of complex AI models, potentially leveraging distributed computing approaches and specialized hardware accelerators. Additionally, real-time architectures should implement fault-tolerance mechanisms and performance monitoring capabilities to maintain reliability in clinical settings. Enterprise architecture models must define how these real-time components integrate with existing systems, ensuring that diagnostic outputs can be immediately available to clinical decision-makers while maintaining synchronization with electronic health records and other persistent data stores.

5. Security, Privacy, and Regulatory Compliance

5.1. HIPAA Compliance in AI-Integrated Systems

The integration of AI diagnostic technologies into healthcare systems introduces complex compliance challenges related to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). As healthcare organizations develop architectural frameworks for AI implementation, they must ensure that these frameworks incorporate comprehensive HIPAA compliance mechanisms. According to Guzzi, Larussa, et al. [9], patient data management systems must implement robust security measures while maintaining data utility for analytical purposes. HIPAA-compliant architectures for AI diagnostics must address requirements for data minimization, ensuring that only necessary protected health information is processed by AI systems. Additionally, these architectures should implement appropriate access controls, authentication mechanisms, and encryption protocols that apply throughout the AI data lifecycle, from initial collection through training, validation, and operational deployment. Enterprise architecture models must also specify how AI components interact with existing security infrastructures and how responsibility for compliance is distributed across organizational units.

5.2. Risk Management Frameworks for Patient Data

Effective risk management for patient data in AI diagnostic systems requires structured approaches to identifying, assessing, and mitigating potential security and privacy vulnerabilities. Risk management frameworks should address both technical and organizational dimensions, considering threats that may arise from system design, implementation defects, operational errors, or intentional attacks. Guzzi, Larussa, et al. [9] emphasize the importance of comprehensive risk assessment approaches that consider the unique characteristics of healthcare data. Architectural models for risk management must incorporate mechanisms for continuous risk monitoring, regular security assessments, and incident response planning. These frameworks should also address specific risks associated with AI systems, such as potential data leakage through model inversion attacks, adversarial manipulations, or unintended memorization of sensitive information during training. Enterprise architectures must establish clear governance structures that assign risk management responsibilities and enable coordinated responses to emerging threats.

5.3. Ethical Considerations in AI Diagnostics

Ethical considerations form an essential component of enterprise architecture frameworks for AI diagnostic systems. These considerations extend beyond regulatory compliance to address broader concerns regarding fairness, transparency, and patient autonomy. Architectural models must establish mechanisms for identifying and mitigating algorithmic biases that could lead to disparate outcomes across different patient populations. As noted by Guzzi, Larussa, et al. [9], systems that manage patient data must incorporate appropriate consent mechanisms and respect patient preferences regarding data utilization. Enterprise architectures should also address transparency requirements, enabling clinicians and patients to understand how AI systems contribute to diagnostic decisions. These frameworks must define processes for documenting algorithmic limitations, communicating uncertainty in AI predictions, and maintaining human oversight of automated diagnostic recommendations. Additionally, ethical frameworks should establish review mechanisms that assess the broader societal implications of AI diagnostic deployments.

5.4. Auditing and Traceability Mechanisms

Comprehensive auditing and traceability mechanisms are essential components of secure and compliant AI diagnostic systems. These mechanisms enable healthcare organizations to monitor system activities, verify compliance with policies and regulations, and investigate potential security incidents. According to Guzzi, Larussa, et al. [9], effective data management frameworks must maintain detailed audit trails that document all interactions with patient information. Enterprise architectures for AI diagnostics should implement logging infrastructure that captures relevant events throughout the AI lifecycle, including data access, preprocessing operations, model training, validation activities, and diagnostic recommendations. These audit mechanisms must be designed to balance completeness with performance considerations, ensuring that comprehensive logging does not impede system responsiveness in clinical settings. Additionally, traceability frameworks should enable organizations to reconstruct the lineage of specific diagnostic recommendations, identifying the data sources, algorithmic components, and human interventions that contributed to particular clinical decisions. These capabilities support both compliance verification and continuous improvement of AI diagnostic systems.

6. Systems Integration Models for AI Diagnostics

6.1. Integration Patterns for Clinical Workflows

The successful adoption of AI diagnostic tools depends significantly on their seamless integration into existing clinical workflows. Integration patterns must address the unique characteristics of healthcare processes, including their highly regulated nature, critical time sensitivity, and involvement of diverse stakeholders. These patterns define how AI diagnostic capabilities connect with clinical activities, from initial patient assessment through diagnostic decision-making to treatment planning and follow-up. As Shishmanov, Popov, et al. [10] emphasize, effective integration strategies must account for the complex ecosystem of enterprise systems and their interconnections. Integration patterns for AI diagnostics typically include event-driven architectures that respond to clinical triggers, orchestration models that coordinate activities across multiple systems, and hybrid approaches that combine automated analysis with human oversight. Enterprise architecture frameworks must specify how these patterns accommodate variation in clinical practices while maintaining consistent data flow and process integrity across the organization.

Table 3 Integration Patterns for AI Diagnostic Systems [10, 11]

Integration Pattern	Description	Application in Diagnostic Workflows
Event-Driven	Real-time processing triggered by clinical events	Automated diagnostic alerts based on results
API-First	Standardized interfaces for system communication	FHIR-based access to records for AI analysis
Microservices	Modular, independently deployable services	Specialized diagnostic algorithms as services
Data Virtualization	Unified access layer across data sources	Consolidated patient view for algorithms
Legacy Adapters	Interface layers for older systems	Integration of established systems with AI tools
Hybrid Integration	Combined on-premises and cloud services	Cloud AI with on-premises clinical data

6.2. API Strategies for Diagnostic Tool Integration

Application Programming Interface (API) strategies provide standardized approaches for connecting AI diagnostic tools with other healthcare systems. According to Shishmanov, Popov, et al. [10], well-designed API frameworks enable the creation of digital ecosystems that support innovation and extensibility. For healthcare diagnostics, API strategies must address requirements for security, performance, versioning, and documentation while accommodating healthcare-specific standards such as FHIR. Architectural models should define API governance mechanisms that establish development practices, ensure consistent implementation across the organization, and manage the API lifecycle. These strategies must balance standardization with flexibility, enabling rapid integration of new diagnostic capabilities while maintaining system coherence. Additionally, API approaches must consider how diagnostic tools interact with both internal systems and external partners, potentially leveraging API gateways to manage access control, rate limiting, and monitoring across organizational boundaries.

6.3. Cloud vs. On-Premises Deployment Considerations

Deployment architecture decisions significantly influence the performance, scalability, and security characteristics of AI diagnostic systems. Healthcare organizations must evaluate the relative advantages of cloud-based, on-premises, and hybrid deployment models based on their specific requirements and constraints. Zhang and Yang [11] highlight that architectural migration strategies must carefully consider existing system investments while enabling adoption of new technologies. Cloud deployments offer potential benefits including elastic scalability, reduced infrastructure management overhead, and access to specialized AI services and hardware. However, these benefits must be balanced against considerations including data residency requirements, network reliability, and integration with on-premises systems. Enterprise architecture frameworks should establish decision criteria for deployment models, addressing factors such as data volume, processing latency requirements, regulatory constraints, and total cost of ownership. Additionally, these frameworks should define architectural patterns for managing hybrid scenarios, where some components reside in the cloud while others remain on-premises.

6.4. Legacy System Integration Approaches

Legacy system integration represents a significant challenge for healthcare organizations implementing AI diagnostic capabilities. Many healthcare institutions rely on established systems that contain valuable clinical data but may use outdated technologies or proprietary interfaces. According to Zhang and Yang [11], effective integration approaches must address these legacy constraints while enabling gradual migration toward modern architectures. Integration strategies include wrapper approaches that encapsulate legacy functionality behind standardized interfaces, data synchronization mechanisms that maintain consistency between legacy and modern systems, and incremental modernization approaches that gradually replace legacy components. Enterprise architecture frameworks must provide guidance for assessing legacy systems, identifying integration challenges, and selecting appropriate approaches based on factors including system criticality, technical debt, and organizational priorities. Additionally, these frameworks should establish governance mechanisms for managing the complexity of environments with both legacy and modern components, ensuring that diagnostic data flows seamlessly across technological boundaries.

7. Conclusion

The integration of AI and machine learning technologies into healthcare diagnostic systems represents a transformative opportunity that requires thoughtful architectural approaches to realize its full potential. This article has examined how enterprise architecture frameworks can facilitate this integration while addressing critical considerations including system interoperability, data management, security, and regulatory compliance. By establishing coherent architectural models that span business, data, application, and technology layers, healthcare organizations can create environments where AI diagnostic tools seamlessly connect with existing clinical workflows and information systems. These architectural frameworks must balance innovation with practical constraints, accommodating legacy systems while enabling adoption of emerging technologies. As healthcare continues its digital transformation journey, enterprise architecture will play an increasingly vital role in ensuring that AI implementations deliver tangible improvements in diagnostic accuracy, efficiency, and patient outcomes while maintaining the security, privacy, and ethical standards essential to healthcare. The evolving landscape of healthcare AI will require ongoing refinement of architectural approaches, with particular attention to governance mechanisms that promote responsible innovation, equitable access, and continuous improvement of diagnostic capabilities across diverse healthcare settings.

References

[1] M. Kavitha and S. Roobini, "Application of AI and ML Techniques for Revolutionized Health Care System," in 2022 Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Smart Energy (ICAIS), February 23–25, 2022, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9742899

[2] Kofi Osei-Tutu and Yeong-Tae Song, "Enterprise Architecture for Healthcare Information Systems," in 2020 14th International Conference on Ubiquitous Information Management and Communication (IMCOM), January 3-5, 2020, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9001677/citations#citations

[3] Kamran Ahsan, Hanifa Shah, et al., "The Role of Enterprise Architecture in Healthcare-IT," IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine, 2009, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5070833/citations#citations

[4] Liviu Ilie, Mihnea Alexandru Moisescu, et al., "Enterprise Architecture Role in Hospital Management Systems," in 2021 23rd International Conference on Control Systems and Computer Science (CSCS), 2021, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9481024/citations#citations

[5] Raghunath Nambiar, "Towards an Industry Standard for Benchmarking Artificial Intelligence Systems," in 2018 IEEE 34th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), 2018, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8509433

[6] Zeinab Nezami, Maryam Hafeez, et al., "Benchmark Dataset for Generative AI on Edge Devices," IEEE DataPort, December 12, 2024, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieee-dataport.org/documents/benchmark-dataset-generative-ai-edge-devices

[7] Kandrouch Ibtissame, Redouani Yassine, et al., "Real-Time Data Processing Technologies in Big Data: Comparative Study," in 2017 IEEE International Conference on Power, Control, Signals and Instrumentation Engineering (ICPCSI), 21 June 2018, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8392202

[8] Alexander Poth, Burkhard Meyer, et al., "Quality Assurance for Machine Learning – An Approach to Function and System Safeguarding," in 2020 IEEE 20th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security (QRS), 2020, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://qrs20.techconf.org/QRS2020_FULL/pdfs/QRS2020-4LGdOos7NAbR8M2s6S6ezE/891300a022/891300a022.pdf

[9] Pietro Hiram Guzzi, Tiziana Larussa, et al., "A Framework for Patient Data Management and Analysis in Randomized Clinical Trials," in 2020 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM), 13 January 2021, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9313544

[10] Krasimir Todorov Shishmanov, Veselin Dimitrov Popov, et al., "API Strategy for Enterprise Digital Ecosystem," in 2021 IEEE 8th International Conference on Problems of Infocommunications, Science and Technology (PIC S&T), 16 May 2022, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9772206

[11] Z. Zhang and H. Yang, "Incubating Services in Legacy Systems for Architectural Migration," in 11th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference, 17 January 2005, IEEE. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1371920