International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: **3108-1754 (Online)**
Volume 02 Issue 08 Augustl-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5

AI Expert System for Migraine Diagnosis and Treatment: Applications and Risks

1st: Helina Rose M, 2nd: Priyadharshini S, 3rd: Rubika B, 4th: Dr.S.Suganyadevi
1,2,3: Student, 4: Assistant Professor
1,2,3,4: Department of Computer science, Sri Krishna Arts and Science College
1:helinarosem24bcs017@skasc.ac.in, 2:priyadharshinis24bcs038@skasc.ac.in,
3:rubikab24bcs038@skasc.ac.in, 4:suganyadevis@skasc.ac.in

How to Cite this Article:

M, H. R., S, P. & B, R. (2026). AI Expert System for Migraine Diagnosis and Treatment: Applications and Risks. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, <i>02</i>(8), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i8.142

https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i8.142

ABSTRACT

In the healthcare industry, artificial intelligence (AI) has grown to be a crucial tool for decision-making, especially in the areas of diagnosis, treatment planning, patient monitoring, and clinical decision support. Expert systems offer a unique approach among the various types of AI because they directly describe domain knowledge thru facts, rules, and inference procedures. The Migraine Diagnosis and Treatment Expert System (MDATES), a rule-based medical expert system created with the CLIPS production-rule environment, is the subject of a thorough case study in this paper. By analyzing clinical symptoms and connecting them with knowledge-based guidelines, MDATES is intended to help with migraine diagnosis and therapy suggestion. The approach takes into account a number of migraine symptoms and classifications, such as episodic and chronic migraine as well as specific migraine-related subtypes. The case study looks at the system's architecture, operation, applications, benefits, drawbacks, and hazards. An illustration of how expert knowledge can be converted into a computational decision-support system can be seen in the reported evaluation of MDATES. However, safe clinical implementation requires more than just strong diagnostic

performance. Incomplete or out-of-date knowledge, wrong rules, poor generalizability, automation bias, algorithmic bias, privacy threats, cybersecurity, explainability restrictions, professional responsibility, and improper use beyond of the intended clinical scope are all significant dangers. Clinical AI systems need to go via rigorous validation, human-factor evaluation, fairness assessment, privacy protection, and ongoing monitoring, according to recent research. This paper makes the case that expert systems like MDATES should not be seen as independent substitutes for medical personnel, but rather as clinical decision-support tools. Transparent knowledge management, human supervision, external validation, safety monitoring, and unambiguous accountability are all necessary for responsible deployment.

INTRODUCTION

From a research idea, artificial intelligence has grown to become a significant part of contemporary information technology. AI systems are being used more and more in the healthcare industry since these settings produce a lot of data and necessitate complicated decision-making. Medical diagnostics, medical imaging, drug development, clinical prediction, therapy suggestion, administrative automation, and personalized healthcare are among the applications of AI. According to recent research, AI can help medical personnel make better decisions, aid in diagnosis, and boost the effectiveness of clinical workflows.[1], [2].

Expert systems are a significant subset of AI. A knowledge-based computer system created to address issues that often call for human skill is known as an expert system. An expert system directly depicts knowledge rather than relying solely on statistical learning from massive datasets. An inference engine applies the knowledge, which is often stored as facts, rules, and relationships, to the information that is currently accessible. An IF-THEN statement can be used to illustrate a common rule. For instance, a simple medical rule can specify that a specific diagnostic category should be taken into account if a patient exhibits a specific set of symptoms.

Because medical decision-making frequently relies on established clinical knowledge, diagnostic criteria, and correlations between symptoms, expert systems are particularly pertinent to the healthcare industry. These links can be made clear by a rule-based system, which also enables domain experts to examine, test, alter, and review them. This offers a significant contrast with certain machine-learning systems, whose internal decision-making processes might be challenging to understand.

But there are also a lot of risks associated with using AI in healthcare. Patient safety is a top priority since incorrect AI suggestions may have an impact on diagnosis and therapy. AI systems should be assessed for safety, human factors, fairness, transparency, accountability, and practical clinical utility in addition to technical correctness, according to recent studies [3], [4]. For instance, the DECIDE-AI guideline emphasizes the significance of clinical performance, safety, and human factors as well as early clinical evaluation of AI-based decision-support systems [5].

The Migraine Diagnosis and Treatment Expert System, or MDATES for short, is the subject of this research. Because it shows how a rule-based AI system may be used to address a particular medical diagnostic issue, MDATES offers an appropriate case study. The CLIPS expert-system environment was used in the development of the system, which was intended to diagnose migraines and make therapy recommendations based on clinical data. The scenario offers a chance to analyze knowledge-based AI's benefits and drawbacks.

This paper's primary goals are to define the MDATES expert system, elucidate its architecture and functioning, pinpoint its useful applications, assess its advantages, look at ethical and technical dangers, and suggest a framework for safer implementation. Additionally, the article situates MDATES in the larger context of responsible AI development in healthcare.

BACKGROUND OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE EXPERT SYSTEMS

A. Definition of an Expert System:

An AI system that aims to mimic specific facets of human expert reasoning in a particular issue domain is called an expert system. A knowledge base, inference engine, working memory, user interface, and explanation or output mechanism are typical components of traditional expert systems.

Domain-specific information can be found in the knowledge base. Symptoms, illnesses, diagnostic standards, suggested treatments, contraindications, and connections between clinical data are examples of this in the medical field. After analyzing the information at hand, the inference engine decides which rules ought to be applied. Information pertaining to the current case is kept in working memory.

The ability to encode specialized knowledge into computational rules is the basic tenet of an expert system. When domain specialists are able to articulate the linkages that inform decisions, this method is especially helpful.

B. Rule-Based Reasoning:

Rule-based expert systems generally use production rules. Each rule has a condition and a conclusion. When the condition is satisfied, the corresponding conclusion can be generated.

For example:

IF a patient has recurrent headache,

AND the headache is associated with specific migraine symptoms,

THEN migraine should be considered as a possible diagnosis.

A real medical expert system contains many more rules and conditions than this simplified example. The inference engine determines which rules are applicable and may combine information from several symptoms before producing a recommendation.

The major advantage of rule-based reasoning is transparency. A user can potentially inspect which facts activated which rules. This can help clinicians understand the reasoning process and audit the knowledge base.

C. Expert Systems and Modern AI

The mere fact that machine learning and deep learning have taken center stage in AI research does not render expert systems obsolete. The strengths of various AI techniques vary. While expert systems are able to formally describe domain knowledge, machine-learning systems are able to identify patterns in data.

When the problem domain is limited and expert knowledge is well-established, a rule-based system may be very suitable. This could be useful for clinical decision-support jobs in the healthcare industry where traceability and safety are crucial.

AI in healthcare today progressively blends several methods. A hybrid system might have a rule-based component for clinical decision logic or safety limitations and machine learning for prediction or information extraction. However, because extra components provide additional risks of failure, hybrid systems also need to be carefully validated.

CASE STUDY: MDATES

A. Overview of MDATES:

A medical expert system called the Migraine diagnostic and Treatment Expert System (MDATES) was created to assist with migraine diagnostic and treatment recommendations. The CLIPS production-rule environment was used to implement the system. By connecting patient symptoms and characteristics to migraine categories and recommended treatments, it embodies clinical knowledge.

MDATES is not intended to take the place of a doctor. Rather, by analyzing user-supplied data and producing a diagnostic recommendation, the system offers decision help. Thus, the system serves as an illustration of a clinical decision-support tool that is knowledge-based.

Because the diagnosis of migraine often depends on the combination of symptoms and clinical history, this subject is suitable for an expert system. A number of parameters may need to be taken into account in order to classify different migraine presentations.

B. Clinical Knowledge Represented in MDATES:

MDATES identifies a specific collection of symptoms associated with migraines. The described system differentiates between episodic and chronic migraine by taking into account seven symptoms. Additionally, it takes into account a few subtypes of migraine, such as cluster-related categorization, hormonal migraine, migraine with aura, and hemiplegic migraine.

These categories' depiction demonstrates the system's knowledge-engineering methodology. The system keeps relationships as rules instead of learning diagnostic associations solely from raw data. The inference process compares the conditions listed in the knowledge base with the facts that are now available when patient data is entered.

This method offers a regulated setting for making decisions. But another significant drawback is the information base's narrow scope. It is possible for a patient to exhibit symptoms that do not match the system's stored guidelines. As a result, the system's operating boundary should be well-defined.

C. Architecture of MDATES:

The architecture of MDATES can be described through four major components.

1. User Interface: The user interface collects information about the patient's symptoms and relevant characteristics.
2. Knowledge Base: The knowledge base contains

migraine-related facts, symptom relationships, diagnostic rules, classifications, and treatment-related recommendations.

3. Inference Engine: The inference engine evaluates the facts entered by the user and determines which rules are satisfied.

4. Recommendation and Output Module: The system presents the diagnostic classification and associated recommendation.

The conceptual architecture can therefore be expressed as:

Patient Information → User Interface → Working Facts → Knowledge Base and Inference Engine → Diagnostic Classification→ Treatment Recommendation → Human Review.

This architecture separates domain knowledge from the reasoning mechanism. Such separation is beneficial because medical knowledge can be updated without completely redesigning the inference engine.

D. Working Process:

When the user inputs patient data, MDATES starts to function. The entered data is transformed by the system into facts that the inference engine can assess.

These facts and the conditions of the rules kept in the knowledge base are compared by the inference engine. The corresponding conclusion is added to the reasoning process when a rule is met. Before the system arrives at a final classification, several rules may be assessed.

Instead of a definitive medical diagnosis, the final product is a recommendation based on knowledge. A trained medical practitioner should evaluate the outcome, take into account more clinical data, and decide on the best course of action.

E. Reported Evaluation:

300 anonymised patient records with verified migraine cases were used in the published MDATES study. Two hundred examples were used for testing, and one hundred cases were used for teaching. According to the published results, all 200 testing cases were accurately identified, and 67% of the training instances were correctly diagnosed. These findings are promising, but they should be interpreted cautiously. A system's flawless performance on a certain testing dataset does not guaranty that it would operate the same way in a different hospital, demographic, nation, or clinical setting. Before claiming widespread clinical efficacy, external validation is required.

Evaluation of clinical AI should take into account more than just accuracy. Sensitivity, specificity, calibration, error patterns, subgroup performance, clinical utility, usability, safety, and the repercussions of making inaccurate recommendations are all significant concerns. Early clinical evaluation should take human variables and system performance into account, according to DECIDE-AI [5].

APPLICATIONS OF MDATES

A. Migraine Diagnosis Support:

Support for migraine diagnosis is MDATES's main use. The system allows a clinician to arrange symptom data and generate a structured recommendation. This can serve as an additional method of assessment.

The system can assist users in taking into account symptom combinations that could otherwise go unnoticed. It can also lessen variation in preliminary assessment by continuously following the same standards.

B. Treatment Recommendation:

MDATES is also intended to offer advice for treatment. Because improper therapy might be harmful, therapeutic support is especially delicate. Recommendations should therefore be examined by trained healthcare professionals and regarded as information that supports decisions.

Contraindications, patient age, comorbidities, allergies, current medication, pregnancy status where applicable, and other clinical considerations should all be taken into account in a safe treatment recommendation system. The system shouldn't offer an unconstrained treatment recommendation if these criteria aren't included in the knowledge base.

C. Medical Education:

Medical education is another possible use. Expert systems can show how computational rules can be derived from clinical knowledge. Students can input hypothetical symptoms and see how various rules impact the final classification.

This can aid students in comprehending information representation, clinical reasoning, and AI-based decision assistance. As a result, the system can function as both an instructional tool and an AI application.

D. Decision Support in Resource-Limited Settings:

In settings where access to specialists is restricted, expert systems may also help healthcare professionals. Structured specialized knowledge can be preserved and made accessible via a computerized interface by a focused expert system.

Deployment with limited resources, however, should not be seen as an excuse for eliminating expert supervision. Rather, the system should detect circumstances that call for a referral to an expert and offer first counsel.

E. Standardization of Preliminary Assessment:

Individual differences exist in human decision-making. Every time the same inputs are provided, a rule-based system uses the same encoded criteria. Standardized preliminary assessment can be supported by this consistency.

For instructional environments, triage processes, and organized clinical workflows, standardization is especially beneficial. However, if the regulations themselves are flawed, uniformity may become hazardous. The same wrong outcome can be consistently produced by a system.

F. Remote and Digital Healthcare:

AI-based decision assistance is made possible by the growth of digital health and telemedicine. To gather symptom data prior to a clinical consultation, an expert system could be incorporated into a digital platform.

Clinicians may find it easier to prioritize cases and arrange information with this kind of integration. However, because health information may be kept in electronic systems and transmitted via networks, digital healthcare applications also raise privacy and cybersecurity issues.

ADVANTAGES OF MDATES

A. Fast Decision Support:

A computer can quickly process a predetermined set of rules. The inference procedure can generate a recommendation without the time needed to manually review each rule once patient data has been entered.

B. Consistency:

It is possible to apply the same rules repeatedly. The system does not become tired or sidetracked like human decision-making does. In repeated evaluations, this might offer consistency.

C. Knowledge Preservation:

Multiple users can access and store expert knowledge in the knowledge base. This can lessen reliance on a single specialist's physical availability.

D. Explainable Reasoning:

Compared to certain black-box machine-learning algorithms, rule-based reasoning may be more visible. Users may be able to identify the rules and symptoms that influenced a recommendation.

Explainability is becoming more widely acknowledged as a crucial prerequisite for healthcare AI. Although explanations by themselves do not ensure proper or safe usage, research suggests that explanations may improve appropriate clinician comprehension [6], [7].

E. Easy Rule Modification:

Rules can be added or changed to update a knowledge-based system. When clinical guidelines change, this is advantageous. Every change, tho, needs to be validated and reviewed by experts.

F. Educational Value:

The system illustrates how AI ideas like knowledge representation, inference, rules, facts, and decision support may be used in real-world situations. As a result, it can be helpful in teaching computer science and healthcare.

RISKS AND LIMITATIONS

A. Incorrect Knowledge:

Inaccurate knowledge is an expert system's primary risk. The system may come to the wrong decision if a medical expert gives the wrong rule.

A rule-based system typically adheres to its preprogrammed logic, in contrast to a human expert who might notice doubt or reevaluate a choice. Acquiring and validating knowledge is therefore essential.

B. Outdated Medical Knowledge:

Over time, medical knowledge evolves. Clinical guidelines, recommended treatments, contraindications, and diagnostic criteria could all be updated.

An expert system's recommendations could become out of date if it is not updated. As a result, every knowledge- base rule ought to contain a source, version, review date, and accountable authority.

C. Incomplete Knowledge Base:

Every potential clinical scenario cannot be represented by a limited body of information. Patients may have various illnesses, uncommon symptoms, or unrepresented combinations of ailments.

Thus, an expert system ought to be able to recognize when a case falls outside of its purview. Instead of requiring a diagnosis, a safe system should deliver a conclusion such as "insufficient information" or "specialist review required."

D. False Confidence:

Even in cases of uncertainty, a computer-generated response may seem authoritative. Users can mistakenly believe that the advice is supported by science.

The interface should express uncertainty and make the system's intended function very obvious. A recommendation shouldn't be presented by the system as a conclusive diagnostic.

E. Automation Bias:

When people overconfidence in recommendations made by computers, it's known as automation bias. In clinical AI, this is a major concern.

Explanations can boost trust, according to research on AI trust, but too much trust can also be detrimental when an AI system makes a bad recommendation [6]. Therefore, rather than encouraging blind faith, explainability should promote appropriate trust.

F. Algorithmic Bias:

The population utilized to create the AI system, presumptions in the knowledge base, clinical labeling, or population differences can all introduce bias.

Algorithmic systems can lead to uneven performance among subgroups, according to studies on healthcare AI fairness [8]. Incomplete or population-specific assumptions in the rules can lead to bias even in rule-based expert systems.

Therefore, before being extensively employed, MDATES should be assessed across a variety of patient populations.

G. Privacy Risks:

Sensitive personal data is processed by medical systems. Privacy protection becomes crucial when patient data is exchanged or kept.

Reducing the quantity of data gathered, limiting access, encrypting private data, and putting in place suitable retention guidelines are all essential components of a secure system. Rather than being introduced after deployment, privacy should be taken into account during system design.

H. Cybersecurity Risks:

AI systems used in healthcare could be manipulated or accessed without authorization. The system may produce inaccurate recommendations if an attacker alters the knowledge base.

The integrity of the knowledge base and patient data should both be safeguarded by security measures. Only authorized workers should be able to modify rules.

I. Accountability and Liability:

It might be challenging to assign blame when an AI recommendation causes harm to a patient. Software developers, medical professionals who developed or authorized regulations, healthcare organizations, and physicians are examples of potential stakeholders.

Who is in charge of validation, implementation, monitoring, maintenance, and final clinical judgments should be clearly defined by governance.

J. Lack of Generalizability:

It's possible that a system created with a particular dataset won't function as effectively with other populations. Performance may be impacted by variations in age, gender, ethnicity, clinical documentation, medical procedures, and illness prevalence.

External validation is therefore required. Just because a system worked well during development does not mean that it will generalize.

K. Human–Computer Interaction Problems:

If people misinterpret a system's interface, even a technically sound system may fail. Users may make mistakes if data entry is challenging or advice are offered in a confusing manner.

Thus, it is important to assess both technical performance and human elements. Because their effectiveness depends on how users and technology interact, clinical AI systems are complicated interventions [5].

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. Patient Autonomy:

Simply because an AI system is involved, patients shouldn't lose authority over their medical decisions. Instead than eradicating patient involvement, AI should facilitate well-informed healthcare decision-making.

B. Transparency:

When AI is employed, both patients and medical personnel should be aware of it. Clear communication of the system's goals, constraints, and intended function is essential.

C. Explainability:

Meaningful rationale should ideally accompany a medical suggestion. This can include the diagnostic category chosen, rules triggered, symptoms taken into account, and reasons for escalation in a rule-based expert system.

Explainability is a crucial ethical prerequisite for AI decision-support systems in healthcare, according to recent comprehensive research [7].

D. Fairness:

AI shouldn't consistently provide specific patient groups worse recommendations. Therefore, system validation should include a fairness assessment.

E. Accountability:

The ultimate decision should be made by a distinct human authority. AI systems shouldn't be used as a justification for shirking professional accountability.

F. Safety:

Convenience or automation should not take precedence over patient safety. When information is absent, unclear, or outside the system's knowledge area, the system should be built to fail securely.

RISK-MITIGATION STRATEGIES

A. Knowledge-Base Validation:

Qualified medical professionals should review each clinical rule. Rules should be continuously reviewed and connected to trustworthy clinical evidence.

B. Version Control:

Version information for the knowledge base should be kept up to date by the system. Every time a rule is altered, the system ought to document who made the modification, why, and when it was verified.

C. External Validation:

Independent datasets from various organizations and demographics should be used to test MDATES. Weaknesses that are not apparent in the original dataset can be found during external validation.

D. Human-in-the-Loop Design:

Before taking clinical action, the system ought to mandate that medical professionals analyze recommendations. This human-in-the-loop strategy helps lower the possibility of improper automation.

E. Uncertainty and Scope Detection:

The system ought to be able to identify circumstances when it lacks adequate information. It should suggest more details or expert review rather than providing a forced response.

F. Privacy Protection:

The data minimization principle should guide the collection of patient data. It is necessary to put in place access controls, encryption, authentication, safe storage, and suitable deletion procedures.

G. Continuous Monitoring:

After deployment, AI systems shouldn't be regarded as completed goods. Continuous performance monitoring is necessary. Updates may be necessary if clinical populations, guidelines, or system behavior change.

H. User Training:

Healthcare workers ought to receive training on the system's strengths and weaknesses. The fact that the AI recommendation is encouraging rather than authoritative should be emphasized in training.

I. Incident Reporting:

There should be a system in place for reporting near misses, security problems, unexpected conduct, and inaccurate suggestions. The system should be improved by analyzing reported instances.

J. Safety-Based Escalation:

Instead of making a standard automated advice, the system ought to recognize potentially dangerous or unusual presents and suggest prompt professional evaluation.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER AI APPROACHES

The knowledge representation and reasoning techniques of expert systems are different from those of machine-learning systems. While expert systems often rely on explicit rules developed from expert knowledge, machine-learning systems learn patterns from datasets.

Expert systems may be simpler to audit due to their explicit structure. A rule can be examined directly, but a complicated neural network's reasoning would need other methods of explanation.

However, sophisticated patterns that are challenging to articulate manually may be recognized by machine-learning systems. When sufficiently big and representative datasets are available, this presents a potential benefit for data-driven systems.

Another method is offered by large language models. They may generate erroneous or unsubstantiated information, but they are capable of processing natural language and giving general answers. Because its knowledge is clearly limited, a narrow expert system like MDATES can offer a more regulated reasoning environment.

Thus, a mix of these methods may be used in the future of healthcare AI. A hybrid architecture might employ a human physician to make the final decision, an expert system to apply established medical standards, and machine learning to extract symptoms from clinical literature.

DISCUSSION

Expert systems' advantages and disadvantages are demonstrated by the MDATES scenario. The system serves as an example of how medical information can be converted into computational rules and applied to structured clinical decision assistance.

Explicit reasoning is one of its best features. Experts may be able to review and edit the knowledge base. In the healthcare industry, this is useful since users might need to know why a certain recommendation was made.

Explicit logic, however, does not ensure accuracy. If a transparent system's rules are out-of-date or partial, it can still be flawed. As a result, explainability needs to be paired with validation and high-quality evidence.
Although the described MDATES examination shows encouraging outcomes, the 100% testing result should not be taken as evidence of clinical efficacy. It is necessary to take into account the dataset's size and composition, the usage of verified migraine cases, and the narrow clinical scope. Conditions that are not reflected in the test results may manifest in real-world patients.

Therefore, prospective clinical evaluation should replace retrospective technical testing in clinical AI evaluation. DECIDE-AI places a strong emphasis on human factors, safety, and clinical value, as well as evaluation in actual clinical settings [5].

Trust is another crucial concern. Healthcare practitioners must have enough faith in an AI system to use it correctly, but not so much that they blindly accept all of its recommendations. According to recent study, explainability may have an impact on trust, but unclear or contradictory explanations might not increase trust [6].

Another important factor is fairness. Due to variations in datasets, clinical procedures, and patient characteristics, healthcare AI systems may function differently among populations. According to algorithmic fairness research, if fairness is not taken into consideration during the development and implementation process, AI may replicate or exacerbate already-existing disparities [8].

Governance and privacy are equally crucial. Even if a medical expert system is theoretically correct, it is nevertheless unethical if it lacks accountability or discloses private patient data. Principles including autonomy, safety, openness, accountability, equity, and sustainability are highlighted in recent study on healthcare AI governance [9], [10].

Therefore, MDATES is best suited as an assisting system. It should assist clinicians in reviewing treatment alternatives, organizing data, and taking into account potential diagnostic categories. Without expert supervision, it shouldn't make treatment decisions on its own.

FUTURE ENHANCEMENTS

Future versions of MDATES could be improved in several ways:

First, a wider variety of headache illnesses and differential diagnosis might be added to the knowledge base. This would make it easier for the system to recognize instances that don't fit typical migraine patterns.

Second, a method for uncertainty or confidence could be incorporated into the system. It could highlight if the evidence is strong, moderate, or insufficient rather than just generating a diagnostic category.

Third, a rule-explanation feature could be included in the system. After choosing a recommendation, the user might see the signs and guidelines that led to the outcome.

Fourth, knowledge provenance could be incorporated into the system. Every clinical rule might be linked to the source of the evidence and the validation date. This would enhance maintenance and auditability.

Fifth, a variety of external datasets could be used to assess MDATES. Stronger proof of generalizability would come from testing across several hospitals and patient demographics.

Sixth, given stringent security and privacy guidelines, the system might be connected with electronic health records. Although a thorough cybersecurity assessment would be necessary, such integration might save laborious data entry.

Seventh, a clinician feedback mechanism might be incorporated into the system. A doctor's disagreement with the recommendation may be noted and examined. This data may be used to pinpoint the knowledge base's shortcomings.

Lastly, machine learning and structured rules could be combined in a hybrid expert system design. While the expert system might use verified clinical principles, machine learning could help extract information from unstructured clinical notes.

RECOMMENDED DEPLOYMENT FRAMEWORK

A responsible deployment framework for MDATES can be divided into six stages:

Stage 1: Knowledge Preparation: Gather clinical information from trustworthy sources and confirm it with subject matter specialists.
Test individual rules, inference pathways, input validation, security controls, and software behavior in

Stage 2: Technical Verification.

Stage 3: Clinical Validation: Evaluate the system's diagnostic performance across pertinent subgroups using separate datasets.

Stage 4: Human-Factor Evaluation: Assess workload, automation bias potential, clinician comprehension, trust, and usability.

Stage 5: Controlled Deployment: Install the system in a small clinical setting under human supervision.

Stage 6: Continuous Monitoring: Keep an eye on population trends, user comments, safety issues, accuracy, and knowledge base modifications.

This lifetime model aligns with the way clinical AI is now thot of, which views deployment as a continuous process instead of a singular technical event [5].

CONCLUSION

An extensive case study of MDATES, an AI-based expert system for migraine diagnosis and treatment advice, was provided in this work. The system shows that knowledge-based AI is still relevant in the medical field. MDATES can offer structured decision assistance by evaluating patient data using an inference engine and expressing clinical knowledge thru defined rules.

Rapid processing, consistency, expert knowledge preservation, possible explainability, educational value, and application in resource-constrained contexts are just a few of the system's many benefits. Expert systems differ from many data-driven AI techniques in these ways.

However, before expert systems can be utilized securely in actual clinical settings, serious dangers need to be addressed. Patient safety may be impacted by inaccurate regulations, out-of-date medical information, insufficient coverage, limited generalizability, automation bias, algorithmic bias, privacy risks, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and issues with accountability.

Although there is positive evidence from the described MDATES examination, clinical safety cannot be shown just by technical accuracy. It is essential to do independent validation, prospective clinical evaluation, human-factor assessment, fairness analysis, privacy protection, and ongoing monitoring.

Therefore, ethical human-AI cooperation should be the main focus of medical expert systems in the future. Doctors should not be replaced by expert systems. Rather, they ought to serve as organized aides that support experts in gathering data, determining potential diagnoses, and making more educated choices.

Expert systems are still useful in today's AI ecosystem, as MDATES shows, especially when the problem area is clearly defined and transparent reasoning is crucial. Expert systems can help make clinical decision support safer, more reliable, and easier to access with the right protections. However, in the absence of such protections, the same technologies could generate new types of clinical risk and foster false confidence. Therefore, in addition to artificial intelligence technology, successful deployment requires stringent validation, ethical governance, professional monitoring, security, and ongoing improvement.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Vasey, M. Nagendran, B. Campbell, D. A. Clifton, G. S. Collins, S. Denaxas, A. K. Denniston, L. Faes, B. Geerts, M. Ibrahim, X. Liu, B. A. Mateen, P. Mathur, M. D. McCradden, L. Morgan, J. Ordish, C. Rogers, S. Saria, D. S. W. Ting, P. Watkinson, W. Weber, P. Wheatstone, and P. McCulloch, "Reporting guideline for the early-stage clinical evaluation of decision support systems driven by artificial intelligence: DECIDE-AI," *Nature Medicine*, vol. 28, pp. 924–933, 2022.

[2] W.-C. Juang, M.-H. Hsu, Z.-X. Cai, and C.-M. Chen, "Developing an AI-assisted clinical decision support system to enhance in-patient holistic health care," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 10, 2022.

[3] P. Festor, Y. Jia, A. C. Gordon, A. A. Faisal, I. Habli, and M. Komorowski, "Assuring the safety of AI-based clinical decision support systems: A case study of the AI Clinician for sepsis treatment," *BMJ Health & Care Informatics*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2022.

[4] S. H. Park and W. C. Cha, "Application strategies for artificial intelligence-based clinical decision support system: From the simulation to the real-world," *Healthcare Informatics Research*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 185–187, 2022.

[5] B. Vasey *et al.*, "Reporting guideline for the early stage clinical evaluation of decision support systems driven by artificial intelligence: DECIDE-AI," *BMJ*, vol. 377, 2022.

[6] R. Rosenbacke, Å. Melhus, M. McKee, and D. Stuckler, "How explainable artificial intelligence can increase or decrease clinicians' trust in AI applications in health care: Systematic review," *JMIR AI*, vol. 3, 2024.

[7] N. Freyer, D. Groß, and M. Lipprandt, "The ethical requirement of explainability for AI-DSS in healthcare: A systematic review of reasons," *BMC Medical Ethics*, vol. 25, no. 104, 2024.

[8] R. J. Chen, J. J. Wang, D. F. K. Williamson, T. Y. Chen, J. Lipkova, M. Y. Lu, S. Sahai, and F. Mahmood, "Algorithmic fairness in artificial intelligence for medicine and healthcare," *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 7, pp. 719–742, 2023.

[9] R. Bouderhem, "Shaping the future of AI in healthcare through ethics and governance," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 11, no. 416, 2024.

[10] I. Ihaddouchen, S. N. R. Buijsman, G. Pozzi, D. van de Sande, A. A. Reis, R. Townsend, J. van den Hoven, D. Gommers, and M. E. van Genderen, "Responsible artificial intelligence in healthcare: A systematic review on the use of ethical principles in the development and deployment of artificial intelligence," *BMJ Digital Health & AI*, 2026.

[11] C. I. Eke and L. Shuib, "The role of explainability and transparency in fostering trust in AI healthcare systems: A systematic literature review, open issues and potential solutions," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 37, pp. 1999–2034, 2025.

[12] M. Frasca, D. La Torre, G. Pravettoni, and I. Cutica, "Explainable and interpretable artificial intelligence in medicine: A systematic bibliometric review," *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 4, no. 15, 2024.

[13] Z. Kastrati, D. Moosa, A. Imran, and

S. Sher, "The enlightening role of explainable artificial intelligence in medical and healthcare domains: A systematic literature review," *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, vol. 166, 2023.

[14] D. Muhammad and M. Bendechache, "Unveiling the black box: A systematic review of explainable artificial intelligence in medical image analysis," *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, vol. 24, pp. 542–560, 2024.

[15] N. A. Aziz, A. Manzoor, M. D. M. Qureshi, M. A. Qureshi, and W. Rashwan, "Explainable AI in healthcare: Systematic review of clinical decision support systems," 2024.

[16] B. Z. Wubineh *et al.*, "Exploring the opportunities and challenges of implementing artificial intelligence in healthcare: A systematic literature review," *Urologic Oncology: Seminars and Original Investigations*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 48–56, 2024.

[17] L. Sandmann, S. Riepenhausen, L. Plagwitz, *et al.*, "Systematic analysis of ChatGPT, Google search and Llama 2 for clinical decision support tasks," *Nature Communications*, vol. 15, 2024.

[18] P. Hager, F. Jungmann, R. Holland, *et al.*, "Evaluation and mitigation of the limitations of large language models in clinical decision-making," *Nature Medicine*, vol. 30, pp. 2613–2622, 2024.

[19] D. Göndöcs and V. Dörfler, "AI in medical diagnosis: AI prediction & human judgment," *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, vol. 151, 2024.

[20] L. Benzinger, F. Ursin, W.-T. Balke,

T. Kacprowski, and S. Salloch, "Should artificial intelligence be used to support clinical ethical decision-making? A systematic review of reasons," *BMC Medical Ethics*, vol. 24, no. 48, 2023.

[21] C. Jones, J. Thornton, and J. C. Wyatt, "Artificial intelligence and clinical decision support: Clinicians' perspectives on trust, trustworthiness, and liability," *Medical Law Review*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 501–520, 2023.

[22] N. Niraula, W. Sun, J. Jin, *et al.*, "A clinical decision support system for AI-assisted decision-making in response-adaptive radiotherapy," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 5279, 2023.

[23] A. Habbal, M. K. Ali, and M. A. Abuzaraida, "Artificial Intelligence Trust, Risk and Security Management (AI TRiSM): Frameworks, applications, challenges and future research directions," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 240, 2024.

[24] G. Scarpato, P. Ferroni, and F. Guadagni, "XAI unveiled: Revealing the potential of explainable AI in medicine—A systematic review," *IEEE Access*, 2024.

[25] W.-C. Juang *et al.*, "Developing an AI-assisted clinical decision support system to enhance in-patient holistic health care," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 10, 2022.

[26] S. Shiang, E. Garwood, and C. M. Debenedectis, "Artificial intelligence-based decision support system implementation in radiology residency: Introducing residents to AI in the clinical setting," *Clinical Imaging*, vol. 92, pp. 32–37, 2022.

[27] A. Ali, M. L. Sadi, and M. O. Goni, "Diagnosis of heart diseases: A fuzzy-logic-based approach," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2024.

[28] M. Markkandan, N. P. G. Bhavani, and S. S. Nath, "A privacy-preserving expert system for collaborative medical diagnosis across multiple institutions using federated learning," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 14, 2024.

[29] N. H. H. M. *et al.*, "Artificial intelligence in healthcare: Applications, challenges, and ethical considerations," *Journal of Healthcare Engineering*, 2023.

[30] World Health Organization, "Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: Guidance on large multi-modal models," World Health Organization, 2024.