

# A Farewell to Harms: Risk Management for Medical Devices via the Riskman Ontology & Shapes

Piotr Gorczyca<sup>1</sup>[0000-0002-6613-6061], Dörthe Arndt<sup>1</sup>[0000-0002-7401-8487],  
Martin Diller<sup>2</sup>[0000-0001-6342-0756], Pascal Kettmann<sup>1</sup>[0009-0009-9461-7952],  
Stephan Mennicke<sup>3</sup>[0000-0002-3293-2940], and  
Hannes Strass<sup>1</sup>[0000-0001-6180-6452]

<sup>1</sup> Computational Logic Group, Institute of Artificial Intelligence

<sup>2</sup> Logic Programming and Argumentation Group, Institute of Artificial Intelligence

<sup>3</sup> Knowledge-Based Systems Group, Institute for Theoretical Computer Science

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Faculty of Computer Science, TU Dresden, Germany

`firstname.lastname@tu-dresden.de`

**Abstract.** We introduce the RISKMAN ontology & shapes for representing and analysing information about risk management for medical devices. Risk management is concerned with taking necessary precautions so a medical device does not cause harms for users or the environment. To date, risk management documentation is submitted to notified bodies (for certification) in the form of semi-structured natural language text. We propose to use classes from the RISKMAN ontology to logically model risk management documentation, and to use the included SHACL constraints to check for syntactic completeness and conformity to relevant standards. In particular, the ontology is modelled after ISO 14971 and the recently published VDE Spec 90025. Our proposed methodology has the potential to save many person-hours for both manufacturers (when creating risk management documentation) as well as notified bodies (when assessing submitted applications for certification), and thus offers considerable benefits for healthcare and, by extension, society as a whole.

**Resource type:** OWL EL Ontology, SHACL Shapes

**License:** CC BY 4.0    **URL:** <https://w3id.org/riskman/>

**Keywords:** Risk management · Safety assurance · OWL EL · SHACL

## 1 Introduction

Medical devices typically are safety-critical, meaning their failure under certain conditions can lead to harm to humans or the environment. To ensure that potential harms are minimised, legislation requires manufacturers of medical devices to provide a comprehensive justification that their product is acceptably safe. In Europe, such legal requirements mainly stem from the European Union’s Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR) [1]. After its introduction in 2017, the

original plan was that manufacturers have time until May 2024 to re-certify their devices under the new regulations. This caused an immense backlog for notified bodies (organisations certifying medical devices in Europe, e.g., TÜVs in Germany), so the EU decided to extend the transition period until at least 2027 to avert a potential shortage of medical devices (and ramifications thereof) [44].

The fundamental challenges of medical device certification are (1) the sheer amount of information that notified bodies have to process (even for a single device), and (2) the way this information is submitted to notified bodies, namely in the form of text. In principle, device manufacturers have to argue that they have proactively, systematically, and thoroughly analysed and mitigated the risks associated with their device as much as possible. One way to do this is using a so-called *assurance case*, a structured argument supported by a body of evidence that together provide a compelling, comprehensible, and valid case that a system is acceptably safe for a given application in a given context. Using assurance cases has a long(er) tradition in other areas of safety-critical systems, e.g. in aviation or nuclear power plants [67], but the need for assurance cases for medical devices has been recognised long ago [73]. The Food and Drug Administration of the U.S. (FDA) has even provided a guidance document for one class of products (infusion pumps) due to an unusually large number of previous incidents [69].

As much as the introduction of assurance cases has helped advance safety management practices in the medical device industry, there is still a lot to be wanted. Sujan et al. even claim that “safety management practices in healthcare [are] at present [...] less mature than those in other safety-critical industries” [67, p.185]. We briefly note some of the shortcomings we address in this work.

- Since the intended recipient of a safety case is a human (auditor), a lot of work in safety engineering has focused on the *presentation* of the argument, e.g. to avoid confirmation bias [17]. In particular, several approaches to visualise assurance cases exist, e.g. the goal structuring notation [46]. There is much less work on the *representation* of safety arguments, since applicable legislation typically requires a submission in the form of text.
- Due to the sheer volume of text submitted to notified bodies for certification, an auditor can never look at all relevant points in detail; furthermore, auditors typically spend a considerable proportion of their time navigating through documents (best case, using text search in a document viewer). Significant time savings are offered by semi-automatic checks and improved navigation through e.g. semantics-enhanced document search.
- Reusing parts of safety arguments is a widely recognised problem [52,60]. The simplest instance of re-use happens when a manufacturer continues development of a certified device and wants to certify the “updated version”: application lifecycle management tools can help identify the delta between two device versions and risk managers only need to concentrate on how that difference affects risks and mitigations. Harder instances of re-use are equally pervasive and important, e.g. when a manufacturer wants to use a part of a device in a novel device of a different type, or when a manufacturer buys parts (like integrated circuits) from component suppliers and needs to use

assurances about the parts in order to claim overall device safety. We even propose to go beyond this and technically enable re-use *across manufacturers*, which is especially relevant for small/medium enterprises that may lack staff or experience in risk management.

Thus there is substantial demand for intelligent software support in risk management, both on the side of manufacturers as well as from notified bodies.

In this paper, we propose to use logical modelling to represent risk management documentation, and the shapes constraint language (SHACL) to check those representations for conformance with a set of requirements, e.g., whether all identified risks have an associated mitigation. While such straightforward checks could clearly also be achieved by custom software, the presence of a logical inference step before the constraint checking step is a significant advantage of our approach, as we shall demonstrate later in the paper. Taken together, the RISKMAN ontology and its shapes constraints constitute the resource we contribute in this paper, which is intended to be RISKMAN's canonical citation. As far as we are aware, using OWL & SHACL is a novel approach to representing and reasoning about risk management documentation. The requirements to be checked against are simple and syntactic at the moment, but from communication with domain experts from notified bodies and manufacturers, we still expect our contributed resource and methodology to be a major step forward as manufacturers (and notified bodies) can expect to “save” the first round of conformity assessment, which can translate into a several-months-long reduction in time to market. On the other hand, our resource does not aim at assessing the adequacy and correctness of the implemented mitigations (such as whether an insulation thickness of 0.5mm is adequate to lower the risk of electric shock), which is presumably AI-complete and would require vast amounts of background knowledge. Apart from this important application domain, our ontology and shapes are also of independent interest to the Semantic Web community, as the combination of logical inference and SHACL constraint checking is a topic that has garnered research interest lately [4,57,22]. Finally, the use of our approach in the medical device industry and on the part of notified bodies entails a considerable impact on the adoption of Semantic Web technologies in general. By employing these technologies ourselves, we furthermore enable RISKMAN users to benefit from the good infrastructure of tooling and data the Semantic Web field provides. Risk reports can easily be queried or enhanced with additional information about the use context of a concrete device or data about particular patient problems by simply using other ontologies and data [55,25,54].

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: In the next section, we give an overview on related work, mostly ontologies involving notions of risk, but also software-based solutions for safety case management. Afterwards (Sect. 3), we introduce the state of the art of risk management and the basic notions introduced by the norms upon which we build our work, both in general terms and with an illustrative running example. Sect. 4 then introduces the RISKMAN ontology and its associated shape constraints, explaining how we intend them to

be used in risk management, and showcasing them with the running example. In Sect. 5 we conclude with a discussion of potential future work.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Conceptual Work and Ontologies

Fenz et al. [27,26] created an ontology for the information security standard ISO 27002. While they do not deal with risk management (or medical devices), they also use their ontology along with a reasoner to infer information about compliance with the standard’s requirements. Reasoning results are then interpreted by humans or by a tailor-made software tool.

Uciteli et al. [68] provided the *Risk Identification Ontology*, which defines notions of *risk* and *adverse situation* and embeds them into the top-level ontology GFO (General Formal Ontology) [37,38]. However, they work in a more process-oriented setting with special focus on risk identification in time periods surrounding surgical procedures. In that setting, risks cannot be mitigated beforehand, and so *risk management* – our main focus – is not within their scope.

Kim et al. [47] presented a process integration ontology for medical software developers with a focus on medical devices, combining notions from IEC 60601-1, IEC 62304, and, notably, ISO 14971. The resulting integrated ontology is however mainly designed to help developers comply with the involved standards; the ontology was not developed with logical reasoning as explicit intended use case.

Aziz et al. [9] developed a *Hazard Identification Ontology*, involving notions of *Hazard* and *Events*. Their focus was however on identifying risks rather than mitigating them, especially in scenarios of fire, explosions, or toxicity.

Schütz et al. [62] created an ontology for medical devices in Germany, albeit more broadly targeting devices’ manufacturers, operators, and legal procedures from an outside perspective with the aim of general semantic interoperability, and based on a legal framework that has since been superseded by the EU MDR.

Single et al. [64] presented an ontology for Hazard and Operability (HAZOP), a methodology for scenario-based hazard evaluation, therein defining notions of *deviation*, *cause*, *effect*, *consequence*, and *safeguard*. Their aim was however to create HAZOP worksheets (to be used by human operators) automatically.

Alanen et al. [5] provided a comprehensive risk assessment ontology including the notions *risk*, *risk level*, and *risk control*, which is harmonised between (and intended for use across) safety, security, and dependability. The intended use of their ontology is to “support the creation of a structured work product storage with traceability links” in order to improve upon current practices with non-structured word-processing documents, albeit without using logical reasoning. *Conclusion:* While various ontologies including notions of *risk* exist, they either do not implement ISO 14971 [40] or are not designed with logical reasoning in mind, and furthermore none of them uses SHACL for conformance testing.

Term	Definition
Analysed risk	<i>Combination of one or more domain-specific hazard(s) with one hazardous situation and one harm with reference to a device context and a specification of an initial risk level.</i>
Controlled risk	<i>Structured artifact that relates one analysed risk with one or more SDA(s) and specifies a resulting residual risk.</i>
Domain specific hazard	<i>Structured artifact that centres around one hazard having the potential to cause one or more harm(s) in the context of a domain-specific function and component.</i>
Harm (ISO 14971)	<i>Injury or damage to the health of people, or damage to property or the environment</i>
Hazard (ISO 14971)	<i>Potential source of harm.</i>
Hazardous situation (ISO 14971)	<i>Circumstance in which people, property or the environment is/are exposed to one or more hazards.</i>
Risk level	<i>Combination of probability and severity.</i>
Severity (ISO 14971)	<i>Measure of the possible consequences of a hazard.</i>

**Table 1.** Most important terms and definitions from ISO 14971 & VDE Spec 90025.

## 2.2 (Logic-Based) Software Tools for Risk Management

Fujita et al. [29] presented the D-Case Editor, a dependability-oriented assurance case editor supporting the goal structuring notation [46], implemented as an Eclipse plugin and available at its GitHub repository [20]. However, its development has been discontinued (the last repository change was in 2015).

Rushby [61] and Cruanes et al. [19] introduced the Evidential Tool Bus, a Datalog-based system for integrating the development of safety cases into system (and software) development. In particular, their approach covers the management of claims (about the system to be developed) and how they are supported by evidence provided by other software tools. While an implementation is available [56], it is not maintained any longer (last change 2016). Beyene and Ruess [13] later picked up that work and extended it by connecting to the Jenkins [42] continuous integration software, with an active repository [12]. The focus of the Evidential Tool Bus is primarily on obtaining, maintaining, and managing pieces of evidence in a development setting. As such, it can be an important and complementary addition to using the methodology we propose in this paper.

Since the issue of safety is of great concern to industry, there are also several proprietary software tools centring around safety assurance: The UK company Adelard offers the Assurance and Safety Case Environment. Similarly, de la Vara et al. [21] reported on using the V&V studio by REUSE Software.


*Conclusion:* Existing software solutions for risk management are proprietary or do not use formal logics, or they have other (but complementary) use cases.

## 3 Background

The RISKMAN ontology formalises the recent VDE Spec 90025 [7], which proposes a structured format for digitalising risk management files, as well as a machine-readable exchange format using HTML and RDFa [2]. VDE Spec 90025, in turn, is based on ISO 14971 [40], which “specifies terminology, *principles* and

a *process for risk management of medical devices*". In this section, we briefly explain the notions from VDE Spec 90025 and ISO 14971 that are central to the RISKMAN ontology. Some of the notions are provided in Table 1. In the supplementary material we give a full list, as VDE Spec 90025 [7] is still in press.

The model of risk underlying both ISO 14971 and VDE Spec 90025 (see Annex C of ISO 14971) is that of a *hazard* leading, via a sequence of *events*, to a *hazardous situation*, which, in turn, results in a *harm*, as depicted below:



The risk analysis that manufacturers of medical devices must undertake involves, in this view, compiling a list of known and foreseeable combinations of hazard, events, hazardous situation, and harm. A further central aspect of risk assessment is estimating (initial) *risk levels* by associating a *probability of occurrence* and *severity* to harms. The probability is often split into probabilities  $P1$  and  $P2$ , with the overall probability then being  $P = P1 * P2$ .

Building on ISO 14971, VDE Spec 90025 requires manufacturers to document the results of their risk analysis as a list of *analysed risks*. This includes providing a *device context* to each analysed risk. Moreover, hazards are embedded within *domain-specific hazards*, which also include information on the *device function* and *device component* of the device (or class of devices from one domain, e.g. X-ray devices) to which the hazard refers. VDE Spec 90025 does not provide requirements on the values used to specify probabilities or the severity; in particular, probabilities are often not probabilities in the mathematical sense. Rather, these values are interpreted as magnitudes within a scale that is used by the manufacturing company producing the risk management file (cf. Sect. 4.4).

Risk assessment by manufacturers primarily aims at risk control, i.e. minimising risks as much as possible. To document the mitigation strategies devised for the different risks, VDE Spec 90025 proposes the use of *safe design arguments* (SDAs). These, although building on the notion of assurance cases [73], avoid some of the complexities in their use [45,51,31,32] by only requiring a considerably simplified structure. Specifically, SDAs encode structured arguments, showing that a certain risk has been mitigated, as trees. Thus, each SDA can have one or more sub-SDAs (its children), which serve to substantiate a claim made in the parent SDA. Moreover, SDAs need ultimately be based on *safe design argument implementations* (SDAIs), i.e. all leaf SDAs need to be SDAIs. These include not only a claim but also an *implementation manifest*. The latter gives detailed information on how the claim has been implemented and points to concrete evidence (e.g. additional documentation) to support this.

VDE Spec 90025 makes a further distinction between *risk SDAs* and *assurance SDAs*, with assurance SDAs referring to some state-of-the-art *safety assurance* – e.g. a section of a norm or standard mentioning a way of handling a risk. All other SDAs are risk SDAs, while children of assurance SDAs need also be assurance SDAs. An SDA tree is embedded within a *controlled risk*, which,

apart from referring to the analysed risk it “controls”, also indicates a *residual risk level*, i.e. probability and severity of the risk remaining after risk control.

*Example 1.* Insulin infusion pumps aid in regulating blood glucose levels, especially of patients with diabetes, by administering fast-acting insulin via a catheter inserted beneath the skin. Based on the risk assessment for a generic infusion pump by Zhang et al. [75,74], Fig. 1 shows a controlled risk and associated SDA that can be extracted from a risk management file that follows VDE Spec 90025.

## 4 The Riskman Ontology & Shapes: Overview and Usage


The RISKMAN ontology was developed within a consortium of domain experts in medical devices and risk management, ontology engineers and software developers. For the development of the ontology, we utilised the Linked Open Terms (LOT) methodology [58], a framework for ontology development that builds upon the NeOn methodology [65]. It comprised the following activities:

*Requirement specification.* We studied relevant norms/standards and inspected risk management files of real medical devices to gain a shared understanding of the required terms. This was accompanied by several meetings within the consortium and workshops with domain experts from the field: risk managers, manufacturers, consultants, and notified bodies. As a result, objectives and a glossary of terms were compiled, forming the basis for the conceptual ontology model. Moreover, the VDE Spec 90025 [7] working group was formed to develop a specific submission format and its requirements based on the conceptual model.


*Implementation.* We encoded the ontology and shapes using OWL and SHACL. During development, we used the HermiT reasoner [63] and the *Ontology Pitfalls Scanner* (OOPS!) [59] to ensure the ontology’s validity and consistency.

*Publication and Maintenance.* The RISKMAN ontology, shapes and documentation are published online with a permanent URL provided by w3id. The ontology is maintained in a GitHub repository [8] for issue tracking and version control.

As mentioned before, the approach assumes risk documentation to be submitted as HTML files with data encoded in RDFa. It is then extracted using an *RDF distiller* and used as input to an  $\mathcal{EL}$  materialisation *reasoner* alongside with the RISKMAN- and potentially additional ontologies. As a result, an enhanced DL knowledge base is conceived, which is later validated for conformity against the RISKMAN SHACL constraints (and potentially additional constraints) utilising a *SHACL validator*. The outcome is then communicated with a human-readable *validation report*. We provide a prototypical implementation of the validation pipeline together with examples showcasing validation results [30]. The symbolical depiction below presents the architecture and data flow of the approach:



**Fig. 1.** Graphical representation of the data of a controlled risk (top figure) and associated SDA (bottom figure) provided within a risk management file for an infusion pump. Following Zhang et al. [75, entry 4.3.9 in Table 4 in the appendix], the risk stems from a “non-audio alarm malfunction” hazard (with associated id hz in the figure). Specifically, the vibration mechanism of the non-audio alarm integrated into the pump may fail (event ev<sub>1</sub>). Then, the patient may not become aware of an issue (event ev<sub>2</sub>), which can lead to the patient receiving less insulin (hazardous situation hs) and the patient losing consciousness (harm hr). Apart from the information for the domain specific hazard (dsh) required by VDE Spec (dashed boxes in the figure exemplarily group related elements), the RISKMAN ontology also allows to refer to terminology for medical device problems put forward by the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) [39] (field with id dp). The SDA (sd<sub>0</sub>, based on the work of Zhang et al. [74, Table 3]) consists of three sub-SDAs and expresses that there are alternative means of alerting the patient. The first sub-SDA (sd<sub>1</sub>) specifically expresses that the alarm condition is also indicated through visual signals. Moreover, the second sub-SDA (sd<sub>2</sub>) indicates that this notification is recurring. The third SDA (sd<sub>3</sub>) expresses that there is also an additional audio alarm that will start unless the patient acknowledges the vibration or blinking. Moreover, according to sub-SDA (sd<sub>5</sub>) the audible signal is in accordance with regulations, here the assurance is IEC 60601 (sa). Thus, sub-SDA (sd<sub>5</sub>) is the only assurance SDA (indicated by the pink colour); all other SDAs are risk SDAs (purple). On the other hand, as required by VDE Spec, each leaf SDA is an SDAI, with the associated implementation manifests (im<sub>1</sub>,im<sub>2</sub>,im<sub>4</sub>,im<sub>5</sub>) pointing to implementation details and documentation.



In the following subsections, we will explain the approach in more detail and provide preliminaries necessary for understanding. Afterwards, the actual RISKMAN ontology and shapes will be shown. This section will conclude with showcasing the approach on our running GIIP example and giving hints of how the approach can be extended depending on further needs of interested parties.

#### 4.1 The Description Logic $\mathcal{EL}$

Firstly, it is important to note that all of the RISKMAN ontology can be represented within the description logic  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  [10,11]. We therefore briefly recall its syntax, semantics, and aspects of reasoning that are relevant to our approach.

$\mathcal{EL}^{++}$ 's concept constructors and their semantics are recalled in the upper part of Table 2; the middle (lower) part shows the constructs allowed in a TBox (ABox). As usual for description logics, the semantics of  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  is defined via

Name	Syntax	Semantics
individual name	$a \in \mathbf{N}_I$	$a^{\mathcal{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
concept name	$A \in \mathbf{N}_C$	$A^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
role name	$R \in \mathbf{N}_R$	$R^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
top	$\top$	$\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
bottom	$\perp$	$\emptyset$
nominal	$\{a\}$	$\{a^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
conjunction	$C \sqcap D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}}$
existential restriction	$\exists R.C$	$\{x \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \exists y \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}: (x, y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}} \ \& \ y \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
range restriction	$\text{ran}(R) \sqsubseteq A$	$R^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times A^{\mathcal{I}}$
general concept inclusion	$C \sqsubseteq D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$
role inclusion axiom	$R_1 \circ \dots \circ R_k \sqsubseteq R$	$R_1^{\mathcal{I}} \circ \dots \circ R_k^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq R^{\mathcal{I}}$
concept assertion	$A(a)$	$a^{\mathcal{I}} \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$
role assertion	$R(a, b)$	$(a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$

**Table 2.** Syntax and semantics of concept, TBox, and ABox expressions of  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$ .

*interpretations*  $\mathcal{I} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$  with a non-empty *domain*  $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$  and an *interpretation function*  $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ . An interpretation  $\mathcal{I}$  is a *model* of an ABox  $\mathcal{A}$  (TBox  $\mathcal{T}$ ) iff it satisfies all elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  ( $\mathcal{T}$ ) as per Table 2. An assertion  $\alpha$  is *entailed* by  $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{A}$ , written  $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{A} \models \alpha$ , iff every model of  $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{A}$  is a model of  $\alpha$ . We also remark that RIAs (13)–(16) satisfy the syntactic restriction imposed by Baader et al. [11, Section 3].

There are two kinds of  $\mathcal{EL}$  reasoners, predominantly *ontology classifiers* [43]. The first kind implements *tableau calculi* while the second is based on *material-*

*isation*. Tools like ELK [43], also distributed with ontology modelling frontends like Protégé [53], follow the materialisation-based approach by step-wise computing all logical consequences from a given ABox (i.e., the risk management information) and an  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  ontology (i.e., RISKMAN). The polynomial-time complexity of  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  reasoning [10,11] opens the stage for general purpose Datalog reasoners (e.g. nemo [41]) to implement materialisation [15]. Thus, a wide variety of highly optimised tools are at the disposal of potential users of RISKMAN.

## 4.2 Classes and Properties

RISKMAN’s classes and their interrelationships are depicted in the schema diagram in Fig. 2 (top), where also domains and ranges of properties can be read off the edges. The main axioms of the RISKMAN ontology are given in Fig. 2 (bottom), including detailed superclass declarations, and relationships between properties via role inclusion axioms, role chains, or transitivity statements.


## 4.3 Ontology Design Patterns

We opted for a lightweight ontology that captures the outcomes of performed risk management with low ontological commitment, as the particular needs might differ from manufacturer to manufacturer. To ensure the usability and extensibility of the ontology, we employed the Stub Metapattern [48,49], which “acts as a type of placeholder for future extensions.” Specifically, the class *DeviceProblem* is intended to link to the IMDRF’s controlled vocabularies [39, Annex A]; another stub, *HazardousSituation*, enables to potentially reuse the *Hazardous Situation Pattern* [50,16] should a more fine-grained representation be required.

## 4.4 Probabilities and Severities

VDE Spec 90025 (importing from ISO 14971) defines risk as the “combination of the probability of occurrence of harm and the severity of that harm”, and so to represent concrete risks it is necessary to also represent concrete “values” for probability (and severity). Since mathematical probabilities are virtually impossible to obtain for events and situations that are hypothetical from the outset, the typical approach in risk management (cf. Sect. 3) is to use a fixed, finite number of probability *magnitudes*, each representing an *interval* of real-valued probabilities, and being naturally ordered on a logarithmic scale, e.g. “improbable”:  $(0, 10^{-5})$ , “remote”:  $[10^{-5}, 10^{-4})$ , “occasional”:  $[10^{-4}, 10^{-3})$ , “probable”:  $[10^{-3}, 10^{-2})$ , and “frequent”:  $[10^{-2}, 1)$ . The exact number  $p$  of different magnitudes varies and is up to the manufacturer, but choosing  $p = 5$  (as above) is common; a similar approach is typically also used to represent severity.

We refrained from binding users of the RISKMAN ontology to a specific way of representing probability and severity, but at the same time want to provide a reasonable baseline that can be used almost “out of the box”. To this end, we have an optional “plugin” that creates probability and severity magnitudes (ontologically represented by individuals using nominals) for given desired interval



- $$\begin{aligned} & \exists \text{hasDeviceContext} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasDomainSpecificHazard} . \top \\ & \quad \sqcap \exists \text{hasHarm} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasHazardousSituation} . \top \quad (1) \\ & \quad \quad \sqcap \exists \text{hasInitialRiskLevel} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{AnalyzedRisk} \\ & \text{SafeDesignArgument} \sqcap \exists \text{hasSafetyAssurance} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{AssuranceSDA} \quad (2) \\ & \quad \text{SDAI} \sqcap \text{AssuranceSDA} \sqsubseteq \text{AssuranceSDAI} \quad (3) \\ & \exists \text{hasAnalyzedRisk} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasResidualRiskLevel} . \top \\ & \quad \sqcap \exists \text{isMitigatedBy} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{ControlledRisk} \quad (4) \\ & \quad \exists \text{causesHarm} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{DomainSpecificHazard} \quad (5) \\ & \exists \text{hasDeviceComponent} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasDeviceFunction} . \top \\ & \quad \sqcap \exists \text{hasHazard} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasDeviceProblem} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{DomainSpecificHazard} \quad (6) \\ & \quad \exists \text{hasEvent} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{HazardousSituation} \quad (7) \\ & \quad \exists \text{hasHarm} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasRiskLevel} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{Risk} \quad (8) \\ & \quad \exists \text{hasProbability} . \top \sqcap \exists \text{hasSeverity} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{RiskLevel} \quad (9) \\ & \quad \text{RiskSDA} \sqsubseteq \text{SafeDesignArgument} \quad (10) \\ & \quad \text{RiskSDA} \sqcap \text{SDAI} \sqsubseteq \text{RiskSDAI} \quad (11) \\ & \text{SafeDesignArgument} \sqcap \exists \text{hasImplementationManifest} . \top \sqsubseteq \text{SDAI} \quad (12) \\ & \quad \text{hasAnalyzedRisk} \circ \text{hasHarm} \sqsubseteq \text{hasHarm} \quad (13) \\ & \quad \text{hasInitialRiskLevel} \sqsubseteq \text{hasRiskLevel} \quad (14) \\ & \quad \text{hasResidualRiskLevel} \sqsubseteq \text{hasRiskLevel} \quad (15) \\ & \quad \text{tra}(\text{hasParentHazard}) \quad \text{tra}(\text{hasParentSituation}) \quad (16) \\ & \quad \text{tra}(\text{isPartOfDeviceComponent}) \quad \text{tra}(\text{hasPrecedingEvent}) \end{aligned}$$

**Fig. 2.** Schema diagram of the RISKMAN classes and properties (upper part) as well as axioms of the RISKMAN ontology (lower part). The schema diagram is divided into two sections covering the outcomes of Risk Assessment and Risk Control. The axioms formalise the notions according to their VDE Spec 90025 definitions in the DL  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$ , with (1)–(12) general concept inclusions (GCIs) and (13)–(16) role inclusion axioms (RIAs). While range restrictions have an explicit syntax, domain restrictions  $\text{dom}(R) \sqsubseteq A$  are expressed via  $\exists R . \top \sqsubseteq A$ , just as  $\text{tra}(R)$ , saying that  $R$  is transitive, is syntactic sugar for  $R \circ R \sqsubseteq R$ . Moreover, all classes without obvious subclass relationships are disjoint.

counts  $\pi$  (probability) and  $\sigma$  (severity), together with additional axioms as an ontology  $\mathcal{K}_{\pi,\sigma}^{p-s}$  (for *probability-severity ontology*), with  $\mathcal{K}_{\pi,\sigma}^{p-s} := \mathcal{T}_{\pi,\sigma} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\pi,\sigma}$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\pi,\sigma} &= \{ \exists \text{hasProbability1. } \{p_i\} \sqcap \exists \text{hasProbability2. } \{p_j\} \sqsubseteq \\ &\quad \exists \text{hasProbability. } \{p_k\} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq \pi, k = \max(1, i + j - \pi) \} \cup \{ \text{tra}(\text{gt}) \} \\ \mathcal{A}_{\pi,\sigma} &= \{ \text{Probability}(p_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \pi \} \cup \{ \text{Severity}(s_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \sigma \} \cup \\ &\quad \{ \text{gt}(p_{i+1}, p_i) \mid 1 \leq i < \pi \} \cup \{ \text{gt}(s_{i+1}, s_i) \mid 1 \leq i < \sigma \} \end{aligned}$$

This introduces not only the discretised probability values (e.g. for  $\pi = 5$  we would get that  $p_1 \hat{=}$  “improbable” and  $p_5 \hat{=}$  “frequent”), but also an ordering  $\text{gt}$  on these values. Most importantly, however, the GCIs introduced above implement the “computation” of overall probability  $P$  from probabilities  $P1$  and  $P2$  [40]. Essentially, the multiplication  $P := P1 * P2$  works by adding exponents of upper bounds of intervals, e.g.  $[10^{-4}, 10^{-3}] * [10^{-3}, 10^{-2}]$  results in  $(0, 10^{-5})$ , and all possible computations for the given  $\pi$  (and  $\sigma$ ) are expressed via GCIs.

#### 4.5 Shapes

As explained above, our ontology can be used to derive implicit information via reasoning. The materialised graph is then stored in RDF format [72]. (As an illustration, we depict the implementation of Example 1 in Fig. 4.) For our use case, the evaluation of risk reports, it is now important that we are also able to check for missing information (risks could be not mitigated) or for mismatches between values (a mitigation should not increase severity or probability of a risk). These kinds of checks on a (hopefully) complete and self-contained risk report are conceptually not a good fit with OWL’s open-world assumption. We thus define SHACL shapes that operate on the materialised RDF graph and implement the most important requirements risk reports should fulfil. We describe them in what follows. Users clearly can, and most likely will, add custom shapes.

We adopt the abstract syntax of SHACL constraints proposed by Corman et al. [18,6], capturing the core components of the SHACL specification [71]. For our purposes, we conveniently re-use description logic vocabulary, viz., pairwise disjoint sets  $\mathbf{N}_C$  of *classes*,  $\mathbf{N}_R$  of *properties*, and  $\mathbf{N}_I$  of *individuals*. A finite set  $\mathcal{A}$  of assertions (an ABox) can then be seen as representing a labelled *graph*, with individuals acting as nodes, classes labelling nodes, and properties labelling edges. The syntax of *shape expressions*  $\phi$  and *path expressions*  $E$  is shown in Fig. 3 (top). For the semantics, a given graph (ABox)  $\mathcal{A}$  with nodes (individuals)  $\mathbf{N}_I(\mathcal{A})$  defines an evaluation function  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{\mathcal{A}}$  that assigns to each path expression  $E$  a binary relation  $\llbracket E \rrbracket^{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbf{N}_I(\mathcal{A}) \times \mathbf{N}_I(\mathcal{A})$ , and to each shape expression  $\phi$  a set  $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbf{N}_I(\mathcal{A})$  via structural induction as shown in Fig. 3 (middle).

A *shape constraint* is an expression of the form  $A \leftarrow \phi$ , with  $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$  and  $\phi$  a shape expression. A *shape schema* is a pair  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$  where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of shape constraints and  $\mathcal{B}$  is a set of *target* concept assertions. Intuitively, a target  $A(a)$  expresses the requirement that  $a$  be labelled by  $A$ . Formally, an ABox  $\mathcal{A}$  is a *model* for a set  $\mathcal{C}$  of constraints iff  $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \llbracket A \rrbracket^{\mathcal{A}}$  for all  $A \leftarrow \phi \in \mathcal{C}$ . An ABox  $\mathcal{A}$

is *validated* against a schema  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$  iff there exists a set  $\mathcal{B}'$  of concept assertions such that (1)  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}'$ , (2)  $N_1(\mathcal{B}') \subseteq N_1(\mathcal{A})$ , and (3)  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}'$  is a model for  $\mathcal{C}$ .

The shapes constraints that complement the RISKMAN ontology are listed in Fig. 3 (bottom). To illustrate their use, in Fig. 4 individuals satisfying the shape expression part of a constraint are labelled by the constraint's number.

#### 4.6 Example and Extensibility

The example from Fig. 4 illustrates how our ontology and shapes could be used in practice. Alas, even a carefully designed framework like ours, which takes the needs of the different stakeholders into account, can never meet everyone's wishes. Companies could have individual requirements, authorities might want to add specialised tests, and regulations differ per region and change over time. This is one of the main reasons why we chose Semantic Web technologies for our task: they are easy to extend and can be combined with existing data. To illustrate the extensibility of our approach, we give a small example: We described earlier (Sect. 4.4) that companies often define magnitude levels to model probabilities and severities of risks. While studying risk reports, we observed that these definitions sometimes come with a so-called *risk acceptance matrix*, a schema indicating which combinations of probability and severity a company considers critical. Such information can be modelled with our ontology by adding a class `CriticalRiskLevel`. Assume for the sake of example that the combination “probability  $p_5$  and severity  $s_3$ ” is critical. This can be indicated by an axiom

$$\exists \text{hasProbability}.\{p_5\} \sqcap \exists \text{hasSeverity}.\{s_3\} \sqsubseteq \text{CriticalRiskLevel}$$

allowing to easily check for controlled risks with critical risk levels using SHACL:

$$\text{ControlledRisk} \leftarrow \neg(\exists \text{hasResidualRiskLevel}.\text{CriticalRiskLevel})$$

Of course, more complex additions and constraints are also possible.

## 5 Discussion and Outlook

We presented the RISKMAN ontology & shapes with their intended use of representing and analysing risk management information for medical devices. Analysed risks and their mitigations are represented as an  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  ABox, the RISKMAN ontology is used with a materialisation engine to infer implicit knowledge, and lastly SHACL constraints are used to check whether the input data conforms to given requirements. The resource (ontology + shapes constraints) is available, including a reference implementation of the whole pipeline. With feedback from manufacturers and notified bodies incorporated into it, we envision RISKMAN to improve the work lives of risk managers and certification auditors alike.

The issue of medical device safety will only become more important in the future, especially with further digitisation [66]. An interesting next step for the

The syntax of path expressions  $E$  and shape expressions  $\phi$  is given by the grammars

$$E ::= R \mid R^- \mid E \cup E \mid E \cdot E \mid E^* \text{ and } \phi ::= \top \mid A \mid a \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \neg\phi \mid \geq_n E.\phi \mid \forall E.\phi \mid E = E \quad (17)$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{N}_C$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{N}_I$ , and  $R \in \mathbb{N}_R$  with  $R^-$  indicating the inverse of  $R$ .

---

$\llbracket R \rrbracket^A = \{(a, b) \mid R(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}\}$	$\llbracket E_1 \cdot E_2 \rrbracket^A = \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket^A \circ \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket^A$
$\llbracket R^- \rrbracket^A = \{(b, a) \mid R(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}\}$	$\llbracket E_1 \cup E_2 \rrbracket^A = \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket^A \cup \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket^A$
$\llbracket \top \rrbracket^A = \mathbb{N}_I(\mathcal{A})$	$\llbracket A \rrbracket^A = \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$
$\llbracket \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \rrbracket^A = \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket^A \cap \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket^A$	$\llbracket \neg\phi \rrbracket^A = \mathbb{N}_I(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \llbracket \phi \rrbracket^A$
$\llbracket \forall E.\phi \rrbracket^A = \{a \mid \forall b : (a, b) \in \llbracket E \rrbracket^A \text{ implies } b \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket^A\}$	$\llbracket E^* \rrbracket^A = (\llbracket E \rrbracket^A)^*$
$\llbracket \geq_n E.\phi \rrbracket^A = \{a \mid  \{(a, b) \in \llbracket E \rrbracket^A \text{ and } b \in \llbracket \phi \rrbracket^A\}  \geq n\}$	$\llbracket \mathbf{a} \rrbracket^A = \{\mathbf{a}\}$
$\llbracket E_1 = E_2 \rrbracket^A = \{a \mid \forall b : (a, b) \in \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket^A \text{ iff } (a, b) \in \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket^A\}$	

---

$\text{AnalyzedRisk} \leftarrow =_1 \text{hasDomainSpecificHazard}.\top \wedge =_1 \text{hasHarm}.\top$   
 $\wedge =_1 \text{hasDeviceContext}.\top \wedge =_1 \text{hasInitialRiskLevel}.\top \quad (18)$   
 $\wedge =_1 \text{hasHazardousSituation}.\top$

$\text{AssuranceSDA} \leftarrow \forall \text{hasSubSDA}.\text{AssuranceSDA} \wedge =_1 \text{hasSafetyAssurance}.\top \quad (19)$

$\text{ControlledRisk} \leftarrow =_1 \text{isMitigatedBy}.\top \wedge =_1 \text{hasAnalyzedRisk}.\top$   
 $\wedge =_1 \text{hasResidualRiskLevel}.\top \quad (20)$

$\text{ControlledRisk} \leftarrow \text{hasAnalyzedRisk} \cdot \text{hasInitialRiskLevel} \cdot X \cdot \text{gt}^- \cdot X^-$   
 $\neq \text{hasResidualRiskLevel} \quad (21)$

$\text{DomainSpecificHazard} \leftarrow =_1 \text{hasDeviceComponent}.\top \wedge =_1 \text{hasDeviceFunction}.\top$   
 $\wedge =_1 \text{hasHazard}.\top \quad (22)$

$\text{RiskLevel} \leftarrow =_1 \text{hasProbability}.\top \wedge =_1 \text{hasSeverity}.\top \quad (23)$

$\text{SafeDesignArgument} \leftarrow \exists \text{hasSubSDA}^*.\text{SDAI} \quad (24)$

---

**Fig. 3.** Syntax and semantics of path and shape expressions followed by RISKMAN shape constraints. The following syntactic abbreviations are used for brevity:  $\exists E.\phi$  for  $\geq_1 E.\phi$ ,  $\leq_n E.\phi$  for  $\neg(\geq_{n+1} E.\phi)$ ,  $=_1 E.\phi$  for  $\geq_1 E.\phi \wedge \leq_1 E.\phi$ ,  $E \neq E'$  for  $\neg(E = E')$ . For Constraint 21 we denote  $X \in \{\text{hasProbability}, \text{hasProbability1}, \text{hasProbability2}, \text{hasSeverity}\}$  for encoding checks for non-increasing residual risk levels, i.e. whether the probability or severity after implementing a mitigation is not higher than before. Constraints 18, 20, 22, and 23 are duals of the subclass declarations for `AnalyzedRisk`, `ControlledRisk`, `DomainSpecificHazard`, and `RiskLevel`, respectively, in that they require instances of classes to contain all necessary components of the class definition. (In case of `DomainSpecificHazard`, in contrast to Axiom 6, existence of a `DeviceProblem` is only an optional way of annotating a `ControlledRisk` with an IMDRF code, and as such is not required by 22.) Constraint 19 encodes that (i) every sub-SDA of an `AssuranceSDA` must be an `AssuranceSDA` and (ii) `AssuranceSDA` must have a `SafetyAssurance`. Assuming the ABox has previously been materialised not only by means of the RISKMAN ontology, but also the additional “probability-severity” ontology (say  $\mathcal{K}_{5,5}^{P-S}$ ), Constraint 23 requires that (i) either both probabilities  $P1$  and  $P2$  or product probability  $P$  has been specified, and (ii) that  $P = P1 * P2$  holds in case all three have been specified. Finally, the check whether all leaf nodes of the SDA tree are SDAIs is provided by Constraint 24.


RISKMAN ontology is to not only assess submission completeness, but also evaluate the quality of the assurance [17]. First steps, including a proof of concept, have recently been achieved in the context of assurance cases [28], but are known to be hard to generalise [21]. Possible techniques to consider for evaluation of risk management artifacts represented using RISKMAN are dialogue-based approaches to proof theory in structured argumentation [24], as well as other approaches to provide justifications in logic-based knowledge representation formalisms [23].

In the future, we also want to use existing data about adverse events (partially annotated with terms from IMDRF taxonomies, e.g. from the FDA’s Manufacturer and User Device Facility Experience database, MAUDE [70]) to allow for a more informed evaluation of “whether all hazards have been identified“, a classical point of risk management that cannot strictly be proved by a manufacturer, but potentially be disproved by a sufficiently knowledgeable reviewer/auditor.

Ahmetaj et al. [3] analysed how non-validation of SHACL constraints can be explained to users (in terms of *repairs*), which can potentially be applied to our work and be included in a future RISKMAN-based work bench for risk managers.

Instead of delegating the inference and validation steps to two different services (reasoners/validators), we could also utilise advancements in the area of combining OWL+SHACL, e.g. by converting the ontology and shapes into a single set of SHACL constraints [4]. While this involves an exponential blowup in general [4], the fact that RISKMAN stays within  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  might constitute an interesting special case. Alternatively, having a single reasoner perform inferencing as well as constraint checking could also be achieved by translating ontology axioms and shapes constraints into answer set programming [14]. With different implementations in place, we will experimentally evaluate and compare them.

As a possible alternative to extending some concepts that are currently stubs (in the sense of the stub metapattern [48]), we envision to use the novel formalism of *standpoint logic* [33,34] to import and attach further ontologies to RISKMAN. In this regard it is especially notable and useful that the combination of standpoint logic and the description logic  $\mathcal{EL}$  retains the latter’s polytime computational complexity [36,35]. A prominent candidate for integration is the US National Cancer Institute’s thesaurus (NCIt) [54], which can be expressed in  $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$  [11].



**Fig. 4.** Graphical ABox representation of data from Fig. 1. Nodes and edges represent domain elements and role assertions, respectively. Correspondence between respective elements of Fig. 1 and nodes can be established by their identifiers, with node *cr* (ControlledRisk) being the central, entry point of the graph. Probability and severity nodes ( $p_5$ ,  $p_4$ ,  $p_3$  and  $s_4$ ) correspond to individual names from  $\mathcal{K}_{5,5}^{p-s}$  and are interpreted by themselves. Black colour represents the asserted-, whereas blue the inferred knowledge, involving either classes (labels near nodes) or roles (labels above edges or additional dashed edges). Given a constraint of the form  $A \leftarrow \phi$  from Fig. 3 labelled by some number  $(n)$ , the same number  $n$  in red next to a node indicates that the node satisfies  $\phi$ . Putting all the above together, note e.g., that labels SDA and SDAI of  $sd_1$  indicate that it has been classified as SDA due to being a *hasSubSDA*-successor (range restriction) and as SDAI, due to the previous classification and existence of an *hasManifest*-successor (Axiom 12). On the other hand, note that *irl* gained  $p_4$  as its *hasProbability*-successor due to an inference using a “multiplication” axiom from  $\mathcal{K}_{5,5}^{p-s}$ . It hence contains exactly one *hasProbability* and *hasSeverity* successor each and, therefore, satisfies the body of the Constraint 23, as indicated with the (23) in red. This holds for every node labelled with RiskLevel, and therefore the depicted ABox satisfies Constraint 23.

**Acknowledgements.** This work was supported by funding from BMBF within projects KIMEDS (grant no. GW0552B), MEDGE (grant no. 16ME0529), and SEMECO (grant no. 03ZU1210B).

## References

1. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2017 on medical devices. Available at <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2017/745/oj>. (2017)
2. Adida, B., Birbeck, M., McCarron, S., Herman, I.: RDFa Core 1.1 – Third Edition, 17 March 2015. W3C Recommendation (2015), <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdfa-core/>
3. Ahmetaj, S., David, R., Ortiz, M., Polleres, A., Shehu, B., Šimkus, M.: Reasoning about explanations for non-validation in SHACL. In: Bienvenu, M., Lakemeyer, G., Erdem, E. (eds.) Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2021, Online event, November 3–12, 2021. pp. 12–21 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2021/2>
4. Ahmetaj, S., Ortiz, M., Oudshoorn, A., Šimkus, M.: Reconciling SHACL and ontologies: Semantics and validation via rewriting. In: Gal, K., Nowé, A., Nalepa, G., Fairstein, R., Radulescu, R. (eds.) ECAI 2023 – 26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, September 30 – October 4, 2023, Kraków, Poland – Including 12th Conference on Prestigious Applications of Intelligent Systems (PAIS 2023). Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, vol. 372, pp. 27–35. IOS Press (2023), <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA230250>
5. Alanen, J., Linnosmaa, J., Malm, T., Papakonstantinou, N., Ahonen, T., Heikkilä, E., Tiusanen, R.: Hybrid ontology for safety, security, and dependability risk assessments and Security Threat Analysis (STA) method for industrial control systems. Reliability Engineering & System Safety **220**, 108270 (2022), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0951832021007444>
6. Andresel, M., Corman, J., Ortiz, M., Reutter, J., Savkovic, O., Šimkus, M.: Stable model semantics for recursive SHACL. In: Huang, Y., King, I., Liu, T., van Steen, M. (eds.) Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020. pp. 1570–1580. WWW’20, ACM / IW3C2, New York, NY, USA (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3366423.3380229>
7. Arndt, D., Bank, P., Gorczyca, P., Heidenreich, G., Kettmann, P., Kobel, I., Ludwig, A., Mennicke, S., Sefkovicz, H., Strass, H., Tsurkan, S., Wenner, H., Zeller, U.: VDE Spec 90025. Medical devices – risk management: Framework of a computerized risk analysis format for transmission and submission (MD-CRAFTS). VDE Verband der Elektrotechnik Elektronik Informationstechnik e.V. (2024), In press. Final business plan available at <https://www.vde.com/resource/blob/2265452/cfca4c4b25f038bfb7e26ae57910b29d/2023-07-19-vde-spec-90025-v1-0-en-geschaeftsplan--3--data.pdf>.
8. Arndt, D., Diller, M., Gorczyca, P., Kettmann, P., Mennicke, S., Strass, H.: Riskman Ontology and Shapes, GitHub repository. <https://github.com/cl-tud/riskman/>, accessed: 2024-04-17
9. Aziz, A., Ahmed, S., Khan, F.I.: An ontology-based methodology for hazard identification and causation analysis. Process Safety and Environmental Protection **123**, 87–98 (2019), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095758201831365X>

10. Baader, F., Brandt, S., Lutz, C.: Pushing the EL envelope. In: Kaelbling, L.P., Saffiotti, A. (eds.) IJCAI-05, Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, July 30 – August 5, 2005. pp. 364–369. Professional Book Center (2005), <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/05/Papers/0372.pdf>
11. Baader, F., Lutz, C., Brandt, S.: Pushing the EL envelope further. In: Clark, K., Patel-Schneider, P.F. (eds.) Proceedings of the Fourth OWLED Workshop on OWL: Experiences and Directions, Washington, DC, USA, 1–2 April 2008. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 496. CEUR-WS.org (2008), [https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-496/owled2008dc\\_paper\\_3.pdf](https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-496/owled2008dc_paper_3.pdf)
12. Beyene, T.: ETB. <https://git.fortiss.org/evidentia/etb>, accessed: 2024-04-16
13. Beyene, T.A., Ruess, H.: Evidential and continuous integration of software verification tools. In: Havelund, K., Peleska, J., Roscoe, B., de Vink, E. (eds.) Formal Methods – 22nd International Symposium, FM 2018, Held as Part of the Federated Logic Conference, FloC 2018, Oxford, UK, July 15–17, 2018, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10951, pp. 679–685. Springer (2018), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95582-7\\_45](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95582-7_45)
14. Brewka, G., Eiter, T., Truszczyński, M.: Answer set programming at a glance. *Commun. ACM* **54**(12), 92–103 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2043174.2043195>
15. Carral, D., Dragoste, I., Krötzsch, M.: Reasoner = logical calculus + rule engine. *Künstliche Intelligenz* **34**, 453–463 (2020). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s13218-020-00667-6>
16. Cheatham, M., Ferguson, H., Vardeman, C., Shimizu, C.: A modification to the hazardous situation odp to support risk assessment and mitigation. In: WOP@ISWC (2016), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:32270062>
17. Chowdhury, T., Wassyng, A., Paige, R., Lawford, M.: Systematic evaluation of (safety) assurance cases. In: Casimiro, A., Ortmeier, F., Bitsch, F., Ferreira, P. (eds.) Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security – 39th International Conference, SAFECOMP 2020, Lisbon, Portugal, September 16-18, 2020, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12234, pp. 18–33. Springer (2020), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54549-9\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54549-9_2)
18. Corman, J., Reutter, J., Savkovic, O.: Semantics and validation of recursive SHACL. In: Vrandečić, D., Bontcheva, K., Suárez-Figueroa, M.C., Presutti, V., Celino, I., Sabou, M., Kaffee, L., Simperl, E. (eds.) The Semantic Web – ISWC 2018 – 17th International Semantic Web Conference, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11136, pp. 318–336. Springer (Oct 2018), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00671-6\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00671-6_19)
19. Cruanes, S., Hamon, G., Owre, S., Shankar, N.: Tool integration with the evidential tool bus. In: Giacobazzi, R., Berdine, J., Mastroeni, I. (eds.) Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation, 14th International Conference, VMCAI 2013, Rome, Italy, January 20-22, 2013. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7737, pp. 275–294. Springer (2013), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35873-9\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35873-9_18)
20. D-Case Editor – A Typed Assurance Case Editor. [https://github.com/d-case/d-case\\_editor](https://github.com/d-case/d-case_editor), accessed: 2024-04-16
21. de la Vara, J., Jiménez, G., Mendieta, R., Parra, E.: Assessment of the quality of safety cases: A research preview. In: Knauss, E., Goedicke, M. (eds.) Requirements Engineering: Foundation for Software Quality – 25th International Working Conference, REFSQ 2019, Essen, Germany, March 18-21, 2019, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11412, pp. 124–131. Springer (2019), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15538-4\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15538-4_9)

22. De Meester, B., Heyvaert, P., Arndt, D., Dimou, A., Verborgh, R.: RDF graph validation using rule-based reasoning. *Semantic Web Journal* **12**(1), 117–142 (2021), <http://www.semantic-web-journal.net/system/files/swj2330.pdf>
23. Denecker, M., Brewka, G., Strass, H.: A formal theory of justifications. In: Calimeri, F., Ianni, G., Truszczyński, M. (eds.) *Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning – 13th International Conference, LPNMR 2015*, Lexington, KY, USA, September 27–30, 2015. *Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 9345, pp. 250–264. Springer (2015), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23264-5\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23264-5_22)
24. Diller, M., Gaggl, S., Gorczyca, P.: Flexible dispute derivations with forward and backward arguments for assumption-based argumentation. In: Baroni, P., Benzmüller, C., Wáng, Y.N. (eds.) *Logic and Argumentation – 4th International Conference, CLAR 2021*, Hangzhou, China, October 20–22, 2021, *Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13040, pp. 147–168. Springer (2021), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89391-0\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89391-0_9)
25. El-Sappagh, S., Franda, F., Ali, F., Kwak, K.S.: SNOMED CT standard ontology based on the ontology for general medical science. *BMC medical informatics and decision making* **18**, 1–19 (2018)
26. Fenz, S., Neubauer, T.: Ontology-based information security compliance determination and control selection on the example of ISO 27002. *Inf. Comput. Secur.* **26**(5), 551–567 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICS-02-2018-0020>
27. Fenz, S., Plieschnegger, S., Hobel, H.: Mapping information security standard ISO 27002 to an ontological structure. *Inf. Comput. Secur.* **24**(5), 452–473 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICS-07-2015-0030>
28. Foster, S., Nemouchi, Y., Gleirscher, M., Wei, R., Kelly, T.: Integration of formal proof into unified assurance cases with Isabelle/SACM. *Formal Aspects Comput.* **33**(6), 855–884 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00165-021-00537-4>
29. Fujita, H., Matsuno, Y., Hanawa, T., Sato, M., Kato, S., Ishikawa, Y.: Ds-bench toolset: Tools for dependability benchmarking with simulation and assurance. In: Swarz, R.S., Koopman, P., Cukier, M. (eds.) *IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks, DSN 2012*, Boston, MA, USA, June 25–28, 2012. pp. 1–8. IEEE Computer Society (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2012.6263915>
30. Gorczyca, P.: Riskman Validation Pipeline prototype, GitHub repository. <https://github.com/cl-tud/riskman-validation-pipeline/>, accessed: 2024-04-17
31. Graydon, P.: Formal assurance arguments: A solution in search of a problem? In: *45th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks, DSN 2015*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, June 22–25, 2015. pp. 517–528. IEEE Computer Society (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2015.28>
32. Graydon, P.J.: The safety argumentation schools of thought. In: *AAA 2017 – International Workshop on Argument for Agreement and Assurance*. No. NF1676L-27810 in AAA (2017)
33. Gómez Álvarez, L., Rudolph, S.: Standpoint logic: Multi-perspective knowledge representation. In: Neuhaus, F., Brodaric, B. (eds.) *Formal Ontology in Information Systems – Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference, FOIS 2021*, Bozen-Bolzano, Italy, September 11–18, 2021. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, vol. 344, pp. 3–17. IOS Press (2021), <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA210367>
34. Gómez Álvarez, L., Rudolph, S., Strass, H.: How to agree to disagree – Managing ontological perspectives using standpoint logic. In: Sattler, U., Hogan, A., Keet, C., Presutti, V., Almeida, J.P., Takeda, H., Monnin, P., Pirrò, G., d’Amato, C. (eds.)

- The Semantic Web – ISWC 2022 – 21st International Semantic Web Conference, Virtual Event, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 13489, pp. 125–141. Springer (2022), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19433-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19433-7_8)
35. Gómez Álvarez, L., Rudolph, S., Strass, H.: Pushing the boundaries of tractable multiperspective reasoning: A deduction calculus for standpoint EL+. In: Marquis, P., Son, T.C., Kern-Isberner, G. (eds.) Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2023, Rhodes, Greece. pp. 333–343 (sep 2023), <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2023/33>
  36. Gómez Álvarez, L., Rudolph, S., Strass, H.: Tractable diversity: Scalable multiperspective ontology management via standpoint EL. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2023, Macao, SAR, China. pp. 3258–3267. ijcai.org (aug 2023), <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/363>
  37. Herre, H.: General formal ontology (GFO): A foundational ontology for conceptual modelling. In: Poli, R., Healy, M., Kameas, A. (eds.) Theory and Applications of Ontology: Computer Applications. pp. 297–345. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht (2010), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8847-5\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8847-5_14)
  38. Herre, H., Heller, B., Burek, P., Hoehndorf, R., Loebe, F., Michalek, H.: General Formal Ontology (GFO): A foundational ontology integrating objects and processes. Part I: Basic principles (version 1.0). Tech. rep., University of Leipzig: Research Group Ontologies in Medicine (Onto-Med) (2006), Onto-Med Report
  39. International Medical Device Regulators Forum: Terminologies for Categorized Adverse Event Reporting (AER): terms, terminology and codes. IMDRF code: IMDRF/AE WG/N43FINAL:2020 (Edition 4) (April 2020), <https://www.imdrf.org/sites/default/files/docs/imdrf/final/technical/imdrf-tech-200318-ae-terminologies-n43.pdf>
  40. International Organization for Standardization: ISO 14971:2019. Medical devices – Application of risk management to medical devices. Published by ISO, Geneva, Switzerland. <https://www.iso.org/standard/72704.html> (2019)
  41. Ivliev, A., Ellmauthaler, S., Gerlach, L., Marx, M., Meißner, M., Meusel, S., Krötzsch, M.: Nemo: First glimpse of a new rule engine. In: Pontelli, E., Costantini, S., Dodaro, C., Gaggl, S., Calegari, R., d’Avila Garcez, A.S., Fabiano, F., Mileo, A., Russo, A., Toni, F. (eds.) Proceedings 39th International Conference on Logic Programming, ICLP 2023, Imperial College London, UK, 9th July 2023 – 15th July 2023. EPTCS, vol. 385, pp. 333–335 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.385.35>
  42. Jenkins. <https://www.jenkins.io>, accessed: 2024-04-16
  43. Kazakov, Y., Krötzsch, M., Simančík, F.: The incredible ELK: From polynomial procedures to efficient reasoning with  $\mathcal{EL}$  ontologies. Journal of Automated Reasoning **53**, 1–61 (2013)
  44. Kelly, S.: Device makers gain more time to adapt to Europe’s MDR after EU vote. <https://www.medtechdive.com/news/EU-European-Parliament-MDR-extension/643064/> (February 2023), accessed: 2024-04-16
  45. Kelly, T.: Managing complex safety cases. In: Current Issues in Safety-Critical Systems: Proceedings of the Eleventh Safety-critical Systems Symposium, Bristol, UK, 4–6 February 2003. pp. 99–115. Springer (04 2003), [https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-0653-1\\_6](https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-0653-1_6)
  46. Kelly, T.P., McDermid, J.A.: Safety case construction and reuse using patterns. In: Daniel, P. (ed.) 16th International Conference on Computer Safety, Reliability and

- Security, Safe Comp 1997, York, UK, September 7-10, 1997. pp. 55–69. Springer (1997), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-0997-6\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-0997-6_5)
47. Kim, D.Y., Park, Y.S., Lee, B., Lee, J.W.: Ontology-based process integration incorporating reference associations between medical standards from the perspective of medical software developers. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12652-019-01383-2>
  48. Krisnadhi, A., Hitzler, P.: The stub metapattern. In: Hammar, K., Hitzler, P., Krisnadhi, A., Lawrynowicz, A., Nuzzolese, A., Solanki, M. (eds.) *Advances in Ontology Design and Patterns* [revised and extended versions of the papers presented at the 7th edition of the Workshop on Ontology and Semantic Web Patterns, WOP@ISWC 2016, Kobe, Japan, 18th October 2016]. *Studies on the Semantic Web*, vol. 32, pp. 39–45. IOS Press (2016). <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-826-6-39>, <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-826-6-39>
  49. Krisnadhi, A., Hitzler, P.: Stub metapattern. [http://ontologydesignpatterns.org/wiki/Submissions:Stub\\_Metapattern](http://ontologydesignpatterns.org/wiki/Submissions:Stub_Metapattern) (2016), accessed: 2024-04-16
  50. Lawrynowicz, A., Lawniczak, I.: The hazardous situation ontology design pattern. In: WOP (2015), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:32971191>
  51. Leveson, N.G.: White paper on the use of safety cases in certification and regulation. Self-published. (2011), <http://sunnyday.mit.edu/SafetyCases.pdf>
  52. Martin, H., Baumgart, S., Leitner, A., Watzenig, D.: Challenges for reuse in a safety-critical context: A state-of-practice study. In: SAE 2014 World Congress & Exhibition. SAE International (apr 2014), <https://doi.org/10.4271/2014-01-0218>
  53. Musen, M.A.: The protégé project: a look back and a look forward. *AI Matters* **1**(4), 4–12 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2757001.2757003>
  54. NCI Thesaurus (NCIt). <https://ncit.nci.nih.gov/ncitbrowser/>, accessed: 2024-04-16
  55. Ongenae, Femke and Bleumes, Lizzy and Sulmon, Nicky and Verstraete, Mathijs and Van Gils, Mieke and Jacobs, An and De Zutter, Saar and Verhoeve, Piet and Ackaert, Ann and De Turck, Filip: Participatory design of a continuous care ontology: Towards a user-driven ontology engineering methodology. In: Filipe, J and Dietz, JLG (ed.) *DEOD 2011: Proceedings of the International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Ontology Development*. pp. 81–90. INSTICC (2011)
  56. Owre, S., Mason, I.A.: Evidential Tool Bus (ETB). <https://github.com/SRI-CSL/ETB>, accessed: 2024-04-16
  57. Pareti, P., Konstantinidis, G., Norman, T.J., Sensoy, M.: SHACL constraints with inference rules. In: Ghidini, C., Hartig, O., Maleshkova, M., Svátek, V., Cruz, I.F., Hogan, A., Song, J., Lefrançois, M., Gandon, F. (eds.) *The Semantic Web – ISWC 2019 – 18th International Semantic Web Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, October 26–30, 2019, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 11778, pp. 539–557. Springer (2019), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30793-6\\_31](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30793-6_31)
  58. Poveda-Villalón, M., Fernández-Izquierdo, A., Fernández-López, M., García-Castro, R.: LOT: An industrial oriented ontology engineering framework. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* **111**, 104755 (May 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2022.104755>
  59. Poveda-Villalón, M., Gómez-Pérez, A., Suárez-Figueroa, M.C.: OOPS! (Ontology Pitfall Scanner!): An On-line Tool for Ontology Evaluation. *International Journal on Semantic Web and Information Systems (IJSWIS)* **10**(2), 7–34 (2014)

60. Ruiz, A., Juez, G., Espinoza, H., de la Vara, J., Larrucea, X.: Reuse of safety certification artefacts across standards and domains: A systematic approach. *Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf.* **158**, 153–171 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2016.08.017>
61. Rushby, J.M.: An evidential tool bus. In: Lau, K., Banach, R. (eds.) *Formal Methods and Software Engineering, 7th International Conference on Formal Engineering Methods, ICFEM 2005, Manchester, UK, November 1–4, 2005, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 3785, pp. 36–36. Springer (2005), [https://doi.org/10.1007/11576280\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/11576280_3)
62. Schütz, A.E., Fertig, T., Weber, K.: Defining a core ontology for medical devices in Germany to ensure semantic interoperability. In: Simian, D., Stoica, L.F. (eds.) *Modelling and Development of Intelligent Systems – 7th International Conference, MDIS 2020, Sibiu, Romania, October 22–24, 2020, Revised Selected Papers. Communications in Computer and Information Science*, vol. 1341, pp. 394–410. Springer (2020), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68527-0\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68527-0_25)
63. Shearer, R.D., Motik, B., Horrocks, I.: Hermit: A highly-efficient OWL reasoner. In: *Owled*. vol. 432, p. 91 (2008)
64. Single, J., Schmidt, J., Denecke, J.: Ontology-based computer aid for the automation of HAZOP studies. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries* **68**, 104321 (2020), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950423020306082>
65. Suárez-Figueroa, M.C., Gómez-Pérez, A., Fernández-López, M.: The NeOn methodology framework: A scenario-based methodology for ontology development. *Appl. Ontology* **10**, 107–145 (2015), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:5094899>
66. Sujan, M., Scott, P., Cresswell, K.: Digital health and patient safety: Technology is not a magic wand. *Health Informatics Journal* **26**(4), 2295–2299 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458219876183>, pMID: 31581891
67. Sujan, M., Habli, I., Kelly, T., Pozzi, S., Johnson, C.: Should healthcare providers do safety cases? Lessons from a cross-industry review of safety case practices. *Safety Science* **84**, 181–189 (2016), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0925753515003501>
68. Uciteli, A., Neumann, J., Tahar, K., Saleh, K., Stucke, S., Faulbrück-Röhr, S., Kaeding, A., Specht, M., Schmidt, T., Neumuth, T., Besting, A., Stegemann, D., Portheine, F., Herre, H.: Ontology-based specification, identification and analysis of perioperative risks. *J. Biomed. Semant.* **8**(1), 36:1–36:14 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13326-017-0147-8>
69. U.S. Food & Drug Administration: Infusion pumps total product life cycle. Guidance for industry and FDA staff. Available online: <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/infusion-pumps-total-product-life-cycle> (2014), Docket Number: FDA-2010-D-0194
70. U.S. Food & Drug Administration: Manufacturer and user device facility experience database (MAUDE). <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfmaude/Search.cfm> (Accessed: 2024-04-16)
71. W3C: Shapes constraint language (SHAFL). Technical report. <https://www.w3.org/TR/shacl> (July 2017), accessed: 2024-04-04
72. W3C OWL Working Group: OWL 2 Web Ontology Language. w3c Recommendation (Dec 2012), <https://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-overview/>
73. Weinstock, C.B., Goodenough, J.B.: Towards an assurance case practice for medical devices. Tech. rep., Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University (2009), [https://resources.sei.cmu.edu/asset\\_files/technicalnote/2009\\_004\\_001\\_15065.pdf](https://resources.sei.cmu.edu/asset_files/technicalnote/2009_004_001_15065.pdf), Technical Note CMU/SEI-2009-TN-018

74. Zhang, Y., Jetley, R., Jones, P.L., Ray, A.: Generic safety requirements for developing safe insulin pump software. *Journal of diabetes science and technology* **5**(6), 1403–1419 (2011)
75. Zhang, Y., Jones, P.L., Jetley, R.: A hazard analysis for a generic insulin infusion pump. *Journal of diabetes science and technology* **4**(2), 263–283 (2010)

## A Definitions of Terms from VDE Spec 90025

In this section, we briefly recall relevant definitions from VDE Spec 90025 [7]. Table 3 provides definitions of terms borrowed from ISO 14971 [40], while table 4 gives definitions of terms newly introduced in VDE Spec 90025.

**Table 3.** ISO 14971 terms and definitions

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Harm	<i>Injury or damage to the health of people, or damage to property or the environment.</i>
Hazard	<i>Potential source of harm.</i>
Hazardous situation	<i>Circumstance in which people, property, or the environment is/are exposed to one or more hazards.</i>
Intended use, intended purpose	<i>Use for which a product, process, or service is intended according to the specifications, instructions<sup>140</sup>and information provided by the manufacturer.</i>
Objective evidence	<i>Data supporting the existence of verity of something.</i>
P1	<i>Probability of the occurrence of a hazardous situation.</i>
P2	<i>Probability of a hazardous situation leading to harm.</i>
Residual risk	<i>Risk remaining after risk control measures have been implemented.</i>
Risk	<i>Combination of the probability of occurrence of harm and the severity of that harm.</i>
Risk analysis	<i>Systematic use of available information to identify hazards and to estimate the risk.</i>
Risk control	<i>Process in which decisions are made and measures implemented by which risks are reduced to, or maintained within, specified levels.</i>
Safety	<i>Freedom from unacceptable risk.</i>
Severity	<i>Measure of the possible consequences of a hazard.</i>
State of the art	<i>Developed stage of technical capability at a given time as regards products, processes, and services, based on the relevant consolidated findings of science, technology, and experience.</i>

**Table 4.** VDE Spec 90025 new terms and definitions

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Analysed risk	<i>Combination of one or more domain-specific hazard(s) with one hazardous situation and one harm with reference to a device context and a specification of an initial risk level.</i>
Assurance SDA	<i>SDA where the purpose is to make a safety assurance.</i>
Assurance SDAI	<i>SDAI of an assurance SDA.</i>
Controlled risk	<i>Structured artifact that relates one analysed risk with one or more SDA(s) and specifies a resulting residual risk.</i>
Device component	<i>A (physical or logical) part of a device.</i>
Device context	<i>Information concerning the use context of a device, including, but not limited to, (1) intended use/intended purpose, (2) instructions for use, and (3) intended environment of use.</i>
Device function	<i>Functional device capability at application level.</i>
Domain-specific hazard	<i>Structured artifact that centres around one hazard having the potential to cause one or more harm(s) in the context of a domain-specific function and component.</i>
Event	<i>Atomic occurrence or incident that (possibly when linked in a sequence with other events) may spawn a hazardous situation from a domain-specific hazard.</i>
Implementation manifest	<i>Concrete piece of objective evidence (or a reference to such) that an SDA has been implemented, e.g. reference to a line of code or a particular section in the device manual.</i>
Intended environment of use	<i>Environment or environmental conditions in which the device is intended to be used.</i>
Risk matrix	<i>Matrix (two-dimensional table) displaying all combinations of probability and severity classes without determining which of those combinations are acceptable.</i>
Risk SDA	<i>SDA where the purpose is to control a Risk.</i>
Risk SDAI	<i>SDAI of a Risk SDA.</i>
Risk level	<i>Combination of probability and severity.</i>
Safety assurance	<i>A credible reference (or list of such) to the state of the art of achieving safety with respect to a certain class of hazards, e.g. referring to an international norm such as IEC 60601.</i>
SDA (Safe design argument)	<i>Reusable artifact embodying or expressing one possible method or approach towards a specific goal.</i>
SDAI (SDA implementation)	<i>Structured artifact specifying a concrete implementation or realisation of a specific SDA.</i>
Use-Context	<i>Intended/reasonably foreseeable environment the device can be used in, that may affect a related risk.</i>