



OPEN LETTER

The BSSO Foundry: A community of practice for ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences

[version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 3 approved with reservations]

Janna Hastings ¹⁻³, Lisa Zhang ⁴, Paulina Schenk ⁴, Robert West ⁵, Björn Gehrke ¹, William R. Hogan ⁶, Bruce Chorpita⁷, Marie Johnston ⁸, Marta M. Marques ⁹, Thomas L. Webb ¹⁰, Harriet M. Baird¹⁰, Geert Crombez ¹¹, Susan Michie ⁴

¹Institute for Implementation Science in Health Care, Faculty of Medicine, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
²School of Medicine, University of St Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland
³Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne, Vaud, Switzerland
⁴Centre for Behaviour Change, University College London, London, England, UK
⁵Department of Behavioural Science and Health, University College London, London, England, UK
⁶Data Science Institute, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA
⁷Department of Psychology, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, USA
⁸Institute of Applied Health Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK
⁹National School of Public Health, Comprehensive Health Research Centre, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal
¹⁰School of Psychology, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England, UK
¹¹Department of Experimental-Health Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Flanders, Belgium

V1 First published: 07 Nov 2024, 9:656
<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.23230.1>
Latest published: 07 Nov 2024, 9:656
<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.23230.1>

Abstract

There has been a rapid expansion in the quantity and complexity of data, information and knowledge created in the behavioural and social sciences, yet the field is not advancing understanding, practice or policy to the extent that the insights warrant. One challenge is that research often progresses in disciplinary silos and is reported using inconsistent and ambiguous terminology. This makes it difficult to integrate and aggregate findings to produce cumulative bodies of knowledge that can be translated to applied settings. Ontologies can address these challenges; their development and use have the potential to accelerate the behavioural and social sciences. Ontologies can facilitate communication through precise specification and dissemination of terms, and enable efficient data integration, sharing, comparison and analysis. The widespread use of ontologies in the biomedical and biological sciences has led to multiple successes. It is time now for the behavioural and social sciences to follow that lead.

In recent years, a number of ontologies have been developed within

Open Peer Review

Approval Status    

	1	2	3	4
version 1				
07 Nov 2024	view	view	view	view
1. Melissa Haendel 	The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, USA			
2. Ray Stefancsik 	European Bioinformatics Institute (EMBL-EBI), Hinxton, UK			
3. Mark Musen 	Stanford University, Stanford, USA			
4. Muhammad "Tuan" Amith 	The University of Texas Medical Branch Health, Galveston, USA			

Any reports and responses or comments on the

the behavioural and social sciences; however, efforts have tended to be isolated, with limited resources to support developers and those who work (or would like to work) with and use ontologies. There is a need for coordination and exchange to reduce duplication of work and leverage the value of a community to support the interoperability of these ontologies (linking of entities across domains and datasets). We have therefore initiated the Behavioural and Social Sciences Ontology (BSSO) Foundry, a community of practice and online repository for the development, adoption and use of ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences. The BSSO Foundry aligns with and builds upon the model provided by the Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology Foundry. We describe this new initiative and how to join and contribute to the community of interoperable ontologies for the behavioural and social sciences.

.....
article can be found at the end of the article.

Plain language summary

The behavioural and social sciences have produced a vast amount of research, yet the field faces substantial challenges. These include inconsistent and ambiguous use of terms across studies. Ontologies are structured frameworks to define terms and how they are related. They have been widely used in many areas of science, such as the biological and biomedical sciences. For example, the Gene Ontology describes and organises knowledge about the functions of genes across species. Recently, ontologies are being developed in the behavioural and social sciences to help systematically map and organise research plans and findings. For example, the Behaviour Change Intervention Ontology can be used to describe interventions that aim to change behaviour. However, to coordinate efforts, reduce duplication, and facilitate coherence and interoperability, we need a central community to enable exchange and support the use of ontologies. We have therefore set up the Behavioural and Social Sciences Ontology (BSSO) Foundry, a community of practice for the development, adoption, and use of ontologies within the behavioural and social sciences. We describe this initiative, including how to join and become involved.

Keywords

ontology, behavioural and social sciences, community of practice, interoperable



This article is included in the [Human Behaviour-Change Project \(including the APRICOT project\)](#) gateway.

Corresponding authors: Janna Hastings (janna.hastings@uzh.ch), Susan Michie (s.michie@ucl.ac.uk)

Author roles: **Hastings J:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Methodology, Project Administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Zhang L:** Conceptualization, Project Administration, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Schenk P:** Conceptualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **West R:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Gehrke B:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Software, Visualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Hogan WR:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Chorpita B:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Johnston M:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Marques MM:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Webb TL:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Baird HM:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Crombez G:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review & Editing; **Michie S:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This work was supported by Wellcome [201524]; the Economic and Social Research Council under the Behavioural Research UK (BR-UK) Leadership Hub [ES/Y001044/1]; the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health under the Advancing Prevention Research In Cancer through Ontology Tools (APRICOT) project [U01CA291884].

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2024 Hastings J *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Hastings J, Zhang L, Schenk P *et al.* **The BSSO Foundry: A community of practice for ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences [version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 3 approved with reservations]** Wellcome Open Research 2024, 9:656 <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.23230.1>

First published: 07 Nov 2024, 9:656 <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.23230.1>

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s). Publication in Wellcome Open Research does not imply endorsement by Wellcome.

Introduction

The behavioural and social sciences are essential to address global challenges, such as the climate and biodiversity crises, infectious and chronic diseases, antimicrobial resistance, food insecurity, and educational disparities, to name a few (Bavel *et al.*, 2020; Hallsworth, 2023; Nielsen *et al.*, 2024). Behavioural and social sciences “study the complex interplay between biological, behavioral, social, and environmental processes, including phenomena that occur both within the organism (e.g., genetics, neurobiology, emotion, perception, cognition) and external to the organism (e.g., environment, social relationships, societal factors, culture, policy)” (Office for Behavioral and Social Sciences Research [OBSSR], 2019). They include a broad and diverse array of disciplines such as, but not limited to, anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, human geography, and sociology.

The rapid expansion in the volume and complexity of data and evidence created in the behavioural and social sciences suggests potential, but also presents significant challenges. To illustrate, it has been estimated that over 100 papers reporting on trials of health behaviour change interventions are published every week (West & Michie, 2023). Yet this proliferation of evidence is not informing scientific advance or policy sufficiently rapidly (Glover *et al.*, 2018; Vroom & Massey, 2022). Reasons for this include working in disciplinary silos, and that the disciplines that contribute to the behavioural and social sciences often use different methods, vocabularies, definitions, and theories, making it difficult to aggregate and compare data and evidence (Larsen *et al.*, 2017; Sharp *et al.*, 2023). Studies are also reported in highly varied ways, often with important information omitted, or inconsistent or ambiguous terminology used (Michie *et al.*, 2009). For instance, “jingle-jangle” fallacies, where the same term is used for different phenomena, or different terms are used to describe the same phenomena, is a well-known problem that has hampered progress in the behavioural and social sciences (Nigg *et al.*, 2002; Rothman & Sheeran, 2020). Not only does this lead to research waste (Glasziou *et al.*, 2014), it also makes it difficult to synthesise evidence to produce cumulative knowledge that can be translated into practice and policy (Sharp *et al.*, 2023). To advance the behavioural and social sciences, we need explicit and transparent conceptualisations and languages to link and integrate evidence across disciplines, research methods and topics.

Ontologies have been proposed as a method to meet this need by providing a structured, open and shared framework for clearly defining and specifying phenomena of interest (‘entities’) (Larsen *et al.*, 2017; Michie *et al.*, 2022; Michie & Johnston, 2017) and the ways that they can be classified (‘classes’). For example, the Behaviour Change Technique Ontology (Marques *et al.*, 2024) would describe an intervention that asked

participants to do 30 minutes of physical activity five times a week as using the ‘set measurable behaviour goal BCT’ class. Ontologies are formal structures that represent phenomena within a domain in terms of uniquely specified classes of entities and relationships between them (Hastings, 2017). An ontology provides a set of entities, each of which has (i) a unique identifier or ‘URI’ (e.g., BCIO:007300 in the example above), (ii) an unambiguous label and definition, and (iii) defined relationships with other entities (Arp *et al.*, 2015). They may also contain additional metadata such as synonyms and cross-references (Hastings, 2017).

Ontologies offer important benefits that can advance science. For example, they facilitate (i) the accumulation of knowledge by linking representations of entities across domains and data sets (termed ‘interoperability’), (ii) more efficient retrieval of information, integration and sharing of data, (iii) communication and collaboration across domains (Sharp *et al.*, 2023; The Gene Ontology Consortium, 2015), and (iv) being explicit and transparent about conceptual definitions and assumptions. An influential report from the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2022) recognised the importance of ontologies in advancing the behavioural and social sciences. One of the main conclusions was that ontologies have “the potential to move behavioral science forward from a domain in which research is generally siloed and the data and results are often incompatible to one in which the evidence is searchable and more easily integrated and in which computer technology is leveraged” (p. 5). In addition, the computational structure of ontologies allows them to be ‘read’ and processed by computers allowing researchers to harness the power of artificial intelligence approaches for automated reasoning and inference in large, complex datasets (Hastings, 2017). Emerging methods are able to harness the logically structured knowledge from ontologies together with statistical approaches to artificial intelligence, such as language models, to enhance performance and support safer and more ‘grounded’ predictions (Hastings, 2024).

The use of ontologies has become widespread in the biological and biomedical sciences; the Gene Ontology being one of the most widely used and successful examples (Ashburner *et al.*, 2000). Recently, progress has been made with the development and adoption of ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences (Baird *et al.*, 2023; Michie *et al.*, 2021). Several reviews (Baird *et al.*, 2024; Blanch *et al.*, 2017; Braun *et al.*, 2023; Norris *et al.*, 2019) summarise efforts towards developing ontologies relevant to the behavioural and social sciences. In one example (Baird *et al.*, 2024), 68 ontologies were developed that considered and conceptualized human behaviour, including ontologies designed to facilitate knowledge in the health, education, and legal domain. The review also extracted data (e.g., URIs, definitions, parent classes) relating to the concepts that are relevant to human behaviour, including concepts that describe how behaviors are measured (e.g., using self-report questionnaires, electronic devices, or biomedical markers) and described (e.g., who performs the behaviour or where the behaviour takes place). From the 68

ontologies identified for this review, 6079 concepts were extracted; 5449 of these concepts reflected behaviours, 251 reflected measures of behaviour, and 1382 reflected concepts that could be used to characterise behaviours. This points more broadly to a number of existing ontologies that may inform the development of ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences, including where ontologies can (and should) be integrated and aligned.

Recent investments in large-scale research programmes and initiatives (such as the US National Institutes of Health funding opportunity on the expansion of existing or development of new ontologies¹, and the Behavioural Research UK consortium which involves projects using ontologies²) call for building a cumulative knowledge base in the behavioural and social sciences. However, comparatively few of the existing ontologies conform to the principles³ of good ontology practice as set out by the Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology (OBO) Foundry (Smith *et al.*, 2007). Examples of ontologies adhering to such principles include the Behaviour Change Intervention Ontology (BCIO) (Michie *et al.*, 2021), the Addiction Ontology (ADDICTO) (Hastings *et al.*, 2020), the Relationship Between Behaviours Ontology (RBBO) (Mazumdar *et al.*, 2023), the Mental Health Ontology (Schenk *et al.*, 2024a), and the Ontology for Modeling and Representation of Social Entities (Hicks *et al.*, 2016). These ontologies have been created on the basis of shared principles, such as openness, collaboration, and best practices, including incorporating well-formed definitions for all terms in the ontology.

Ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences have begun to be applied in various ways. For example, the BCIO has been used to annotate study reports in evidence synthesis (Norris *et al.*, 2024; West *et al.*, 2023), and to inform a novel machine learning algorithm for predicting smoking cessation outcomes (Hastings *et al.*, 2023). Other work has focused on developing an ‘ontology-based modelling system’ to formally represent theories of behaviour change as triples of constructs and relationships (Hale *et al.*, 2020; West *et al.*, 2019). These constructs can then be annotated, or mapped, to ontology classes for the purposes of searching, comparing and integrating theory⁴. And the RBBO ontologies are being used as the basis for online tools that can be used to collate and integrate data on the relationship between behaviours (Scott *et al.*, 2022). These applications show the potential benefits offered by ontologies in the behavioural sciences, including efficient integration of data and evidence, and integration of theories, both of

which are important for cumulative science (Hastings *et al.*, 2021).

The benefits of a community and repositories for ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences

As the number of ontologies within the behavioural and social sciences grows, there is a need to easily locate ones that are relevant and when developing new ontologies to reuse relevant parts of existing ones (e.g., their classes and relationships) to avoid unnecessary overlap and reduce duplication of work. Dedicated repositories for this domain, separate from the pre-existing repositories in the biomedical domain, can help with this, especially if these resources also provide guidance about ontology development and standards and principles that are tailored to behavioural and social scientists (e.g., by using relevant examples). Using standards and principles is important because it allows ontologies to work together in an interoperable and coherent way (Jackson *et al.*, 2021; Smith *et al.*, 2007). For example, the class ‘individual human behaviour’ (BCIO:036000) in the Human Behaviour Ontology (Schenk *et al.*, 2024b) could be reused by ontologies related to physical activity (e.g. Carlier *et al.*, 2022), or ontologies for the relationships between behaviours (e.g., RBBO; Mazumdar *et al.*, 2023). This would enable a shared conceptualisation for ‘individual human behaviour’ which supports communication and integration of data about ‘individual human behaviour’ across ontologies. In addition, refinements made to classes in one ontology (e.g., additional synonyms added or further relationships specified between entities) can be easily adopted by another ontology that includes the same classes (Masci *et al.*, 2009; Smith & Ceusters, 2010) without duplicating effort.

The behavioural and social sciences do not currently have a method for ensuring that ontologies are interoperable across different research teams, although work being conducted as part of Behavioural Research UK⁵ – the DEMO-INTER project⁶ – is developing and evaluating a workflow for enabling ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences to be interoperable. This work will be built on as part of the APRICOT (Advancing Prevention Research In Cancer through Ontology Tools) project, funded by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health, which aims to further develop the BCIO for the domains of research methods, physical activity and smoking cessation as well as further develop ontology tools for the behavioural and social sciences community.

The OBO Foundry for ontologies in the biological and biomedical sciences provides a model of how to stimulate community development and exchange of an interoperable

¹ <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-23-182.html>

² <https://www.ed.ac.uk/usher/behavioural-research-uk/our-research/br-uk-demonstration-projects>

³ <https://obofoundry.org/principles/fp-000-summary.html>

⁴ <https://osf.io/ext2y>

⁵ <https://www.br-uk.ac.uk/>

⁶ <https://osf.io/6h3dz>

suite of ontologies. The OBO Foundry guides the development of ontologies according to common principles, enabling modular composition of ontologies and ensuring technical and scientific quality (Smith *et al.*, 2007). For inclusion in the OBO Foundry, ontologies are required to follow a set of principles⁷. There is now a growing appetite and a need for a similar but bespoke community for the behavioural and social sciences, recognising the unique aspects of this field and the topics it addresses that are differentiated from the already well-developed biomedical ontologies communities. These include systemic perspectives, emergent dynamics, human development, implementation aspects, alongside the increased complexity of integrating across the different disciplinary perspectives. Thus, we propose to address this need via the initiation of the Behavioural and Social Sciences Ontology (BSSO) Foundry. The BSSO Foundry will align with and build upon the OBO Foundry model and will facilitate linkage of participating ontologies to those in the OBO Foundry where relevant via the co-participation in both communities of some of the BSSO Foundry steering committee members (as detailed below) to ensure overall coherence.

The BSSO Foundry

The BSSO Foundry provides a repository of ontologies, as well as an open community of practice and exchange (accessed at <https://bssofoundry.org/>). It aims to offer a central resource for guidance on the development, adoption and use of ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences. It will also act as a hub for collating and accessing tools and workflows that have been developed for researchers in the social and behavioural sciences to enable them to leverage the benefits of ontologies in their own work. While providing a central resource and infrastructure for exchanges, the community will encourage open dialogue across a broad range of stakeholders including actively seeking out participation and feedback from historically under-represented stakeholders.

The BSSO Foundry will serve to align ontology development efforts carried out by different research teams working within the behavioural and social sciences, fostering interoperability, and facilitating the re-use of classes where appropriate, while acknowledging the plurality of constructs in the domain (Cornelius *et al.*, 2024) and allowing for the fact that ontologies can change and evolve over time. Its organisational structure is composed of (i) a steering committee to provide strategic and scientific guidance, and (ii) an operations committee to maintain the website and curate ontology metadata.

Members of the steering committee are world-leaders in the fields of behavioural and social science, computer science, and biomedical informatics (see Table 1). The steering committee members will be reviewed on an ongoing basis and

community members who have participated actively for a significant period of time will be invited to apply to join the committee.

The lack of resources to support ontology developers was noted in the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine's report (2022). Therefore, the BSSO Foundry will seek to support the development and dissemination of tools and resources enabling the development and use of ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences (e.g., methods for matching ontologies and promoting interoperability, annotating datasets and so on). It will also play a role in organising and advertising wider education, training and dissemination efforts (e.g. workshops) that members can attend. Finally, through building a strong community around behavioural and social sciences ontologies, in the longer term the BSSO Foundry aims to advocate for the importance of ontologies in the behavioural and social sciences and take action to have impact on funding agencies for short-term and long-term funding.

The requirements for ontologies to join the BSSO Foundry include: (i) being within the scope of the behavioural and social sciences, (ii) conforming to principles of good ontology practice set out by the OBO Foundry, and (iii) a willingness for the authors of the respective ontologies to participate in community exchanges, coordination and knowledge transfer activities. The current active participating ontologies and their scope are summarised in Table 2. These ontologies have largely been developed using Basic Formal Ontology (BFO) as the upper-level organising structure (Arp *et al.*, 2015).

Joining the BSSO Foundry is free and offers the benefit of participation as well as access to Foundry resources. Initial resources offered by the BSSO Foundry in addition to the repository include a visualisation tool to diagrammatically represent entities within the BSSO Foundry ontologies⁸. This tool offers network-based hierarchical visualisations of participating ontologies or selected portions thereof via an easy-to-use web-based interface (Figure 1).

Ways to get involved with the BSSO Foundry

The BSSO Foundry is an open community of practice; we actively invite any individual or group working in the domain of behavioural and social sciences to join. To participate and exchange with others in the community, we recommend joining the mailing list and discussion forum at <http://groups.google.com/g/bssofoundry/>.

Those who wish to submit a new ontology for inclusion in the Foundry should create an issue using the public issue tracker (<https://github.com/bssofoundry/bssofoundry.github.io/issues>) with the description of the ontology, any relevant

⁷ <https://obofoundry.org/principles/fp-000-summary.html>

⁸ <https://vis.tools.bssofoundry.org/>

Table 1. Members of the Steering Committee of the BSSO Foundry (as of October 2024).

Bruce Chorpita	Professor of Clinical Psychology, UCLA, USA
Geert Crombez	Professor of Health Psychology, Ghent University, Belgium
Janna Hastings	Assistant Professor of Medical Knowledge and Decision Support, University of Zurich; co-participates in OBO Foundry community.
William R. Hogan	Professor and Director of the Data Science Institute, Medical College of Wisconsin, USA; co-participates in OBO Foundry community.
Marie Johnston	Emeritus Professor of Health Psychology, University of Aberdeen
Marta M. Marques	Assistant Professor for behavioural science and health promotion, NOVA University of Lisbon, Portugal
Susan Michie	Director of the Centre for Behaviour Change, University College London
Thomas L. Webb	Professor of Psychology, University of Sheffield, UK
Harriet Baird	Lecturer in Psychology, University of Sheffield, UK
Robert West	Professor Emeritus of Health Psychology, University College London

Table 2. BSSO Foundry ontologies (as of September 2024).

Ontology	Scope	URL
Addiction Ontology (ADDICTO), including the E-Cigarette Ontology (E-CigO)	Addiction research and clinical practice	https://addictovocab.org/ (Cox <i>et al.</i> , 2023; Hastings <i>et al.</i> , 2020)
Behaviour Change Intervention Ontology (BCIO)	Human behaviour change and behaviour change interventions	https://www.bciontology.org/ (Michie <i>et al.</i> , 2021)
GALENOS mental health ontology (GMHO)	Mental health	https://www.galenos.org.uk/ontology (Schenk <i>et al.</i> , 2024a)
Mental Functioning Ontology (MF)	Mental functioning	https://github.com/jannahastings/mental-functioning-ontology (Hastings <i>et al.</i> , 2012)
Emotion Ontology (MFOEM)	Affective phenomena such as emotions, moods, appraisals and subjective feelings	https://github.com/jannahastings/emotion-ontology (Hastings <i>et al.</i> , 2011)
Relationship Between Behaviours Ontology (RBBO)	Human behaviour and studies measuring relationships between behaviours	https://sites.google.com/sheffield.ac.uk/turbbo (Mazumdar <i>et al.</i> , 2023)
Ontology for Modeling and Representation of Social Entities (OMRSE)	Human social interactions, such as social acts, social roles, social groups, and organizations.	https://github.com/mcwdsi/OMRSE/wiki/OMRSE-Overview (Hicks <i>et al.</i> , 2016)
Contextualised and Personalised Physical activity and Exercise Recommendations (COPPER)	Support action and coping planning in the context of physical activity promotion by providing personalised recommendations for activities, activity context, barriers and coping strategies.	https://github.ugent.be/COPPER (Braun <i>et al.</i> , 2024)



Figure 1. Screenshots of (A) the BSSO Foundry website, which can be accessed at <https://bssofoundry.org/>, and (B) the ontology visualisation tool, which can be accessed at <https://vis.tools.bssofoundry.org/>. The visualisation tool enables hierarchical visualisation of ontologies contained in the BSSO Foundry.

publications, and a link to the ontology OWL file. This will be considered by members of the steering committee on an ongoing basis who will assess the ontology against the requirements for joining (see above) and will support the submitters to address any actions required to ensure that the ontology is conformant with the principles and best practices, e.g. the use of standard identifier formats to support interoperability.

The issues tracker can also be used to report problems or request new features or activities.

Conclusion

Ontologies have the potential to advance and accelerate the behavioural and social sciences. However, work is needed to enable behavioural and social scientists to adopt and actively use ontologies. The BSSO Foundry will serve as a new home for the growing community of ontology developers and users in the behavioural and social sciences. The Foundry will facilitate collaboration in developing, refining and

maintaining ontologies – the overarching goal being to support transparent and explicit specifications of concepts, phenomena and ideas and a cumulative evidence base in behavioural and social sciences.

Ethics and consent

Ethical approval and consent were not required.

Data availability

No data are associated with this article.

Software availability

Source code available from: <https://github.com/bssofoundry/> (The BSSO Foundry Repository) and <https://github.com/ontology-tools/onto-vis> (The BSSO Foundry visualisation tool)

Archived software available from: [10.5281/zenodo.1398286](https://zenodo.org/record/1398286)

License: CC-BY (Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International)

References

- Arp R, Smith BD, Spear AD: **Building ontologies with basic formal ontology**. MIT Press, 2015.
[Reference Source](#)
- Ashburner M, Ball CA, Blake JA, *et al.*: **Gene Ontology: tool for the unification of biology**. *Nat Genet.* 2000; **25**(1): 25–29.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Baird HM, Hastings J, Johnston M, *et al.*: **Ontologies of behaviour: current perspectives and future potential in health psychology**. *Eur Health Psychol.* 2023; **23**(2).
[Reference Source](#)
- Baird HM, Maikore FS, Norman P, *et al.*: **Characterising human behaviour through ontologies: a systematic review**. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Sheffield, 2024.
- Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, *et al.*: **Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response**. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020; **4**(5): 460–471.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Blanch A, García R, Planes J, *et al.*: **Ontologies about human behavior**. *European Psychologist.* 2017; **22**(3): 180–197.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Braun M, Carlier S, De Backere F, *et al.*: **Development and evaluation of the contextualised and personalised physical activity and exercise recommendations ontology**. September 11, 2024.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Braun M, Carlier S, De Backere F, *et al.*: **Content and quality of physical activity ontologies: a systematic review**. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2023; **20**(1): 28.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Carlier S, Braun M, De Paepe A, *et al.*: **The design of an ontology-driven mHealth behaviour change ecosystem to increase physical activity in adults**. *Springer EBooks.* 2022; 452–468.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Cornelius T, Schenk P, Dixon D, *et al.*: **Double, double, measurement trouble, sorry to burst your construct bubble**. *Eur Health Psychol.* 2024; **23**(2).
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Cox S, West R, Notley C, *et al.*: **Toward an ontology of tobacco, nicotine and vaping products**. *Addiction.* 2023; **118**(1): 177–188.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Gene Ontology Consortium: **The Gene Ontology Consortium: going forward**. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2015; **43**(D1): D1049–D1056.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Glasziou P, Altman DG, Bossuyt P, *et al.*: **Reducing waste from incomplete or unusable reports of biomedical research**. *Lancet.* 2014; **383**(9913): 267–276.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Glover M, Montague E, Pollitt A, *et al.*: **Estimating the returns to united kingdom publicly funded musculoskeletal disease research in terms of net value of improved health outcomes**. *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2018; **16**(1): 1.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Hale J, Hastings J, West R, *et al.*: **An Ontology-Based Modelling System (OBMS) for representing behaviour change theories applied to 76 theories [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2020; **5**: 177.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Hallsworth M: **A manifesto for applying behavioural science**. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2023; **7**(3): 310–322.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hastings J: **Preventing harm from non-conscious bias in medical generative AI**. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2024; **6**(1): e2–e3.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hastings J: **Primer on Ontologies**. *Methods Mol Biol.* 2017; **1446**: 3–13.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hastings J, Ceusters W, Jensen M, *et al.*: **Towards an Ontology of Mental Functioning (ICBO Workshop)**. In: Janna Hastings, Werner Ceusters, Mark Jensen, Kevin Mulligan & Barry Smith (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Biomedical Ontology*. 2012.
[Reference Source](#)
- Hastings J, Ceusters W, Smith B, *et al.*: **The Emotion Ontology: Enabling Interdisciplinary Research in the Affective Sciences**. *Springer.* 2011.
[Reference Source](#)
- Hastings J, Cox S, West R, *et al.*: **Addiction ontology: applying basic formal ontology in the addiction domain**. *Qeios.* 2020.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hastings J, Glauber M, West R, *et al.*: **Predicting outcomes of smoking cessation interventions in novel scenarios using ontology-informed, interpretable machine learning [version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2023; **8**: 503.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hastings J, West R, Michie S, *et al.*: **Ontologies for the behavioural and social sciences: opportunities and challenges**. In: *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR, 2021; 1–17.
[Reference Source](#)
- Hicks A, Hanna J, Welch D, *et al.*: **The ontology of medically related social entities: recent developments**. *J Biomed Semantics.* 2016; **7**(1): 47.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Jackson R, Matentzoglou N, Overton JA, *et al.*: **OBO foundry in 2021: operationalizing open data principles to evaluate ontologies**. *Database (Oxford).* 2021; **2021**: baab069.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Larsen KR, Michie S, Hekler EB, *et al.*: **Behavior change interventions: the potential of ontologies for advancing science and practice**. *J Behav Med.* 2017; **40**(1): 6–22.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Marques MM, Wright AJ, Corker E, *et al.*: **The behaviour change technique ontology: transforming the behaviour change technique taxonomy v1 [version 1; peer review: 4 approved]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2024; **8**: 308.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Masci AM, Arighi CN, Diehl AD, *et al.*: **An improved ontological representation of dendritic cells as a paradigm for all cell types**. *BMC Bioinformatics.* 2009; **10**(1): 70.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Mazumdar S, Maikore F, Lanfranchi V, *et al.*: **Understanding the relationship between behaviours using semantic technologies**. HCl Int. 2023 Posters 25th Int. Conf. Hum.-Comput. Interact. HCII 2023 Cph. Den. July 23-28 2023 Proc. Part III. 2023; (accessed 5.3.24).
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Michie S, Fixsen D, Grimshaw JM, *et al.*: **Specifying and reporting complex behaviour change interventions: the need for a scientific method**. *Implement Sci.* 2009; **4**(1): 40.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Michie S, Hastings J, Johnston M, *et al.*: **Developing and using ontologies in behavioural science: addressing issues raised [version 2; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2022; **7**: 222.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Michie S, Johnston M: **Optimising the value of the evidence generated in implementation science: the use of ontologies to address the challenges**. *Implement Sci.* 2017; **12**(1): 131.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Michie S, West R, Finnerty AN, *et al.*: **Representation of behaviour change interventions and their evaluation: development of the upper level of the behaviour change intervention ontology [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2021; **5**: 123.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine: **Ontologies in the behavioral sciences: accelerating research and the spread of knowledge**. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2022.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Nielsen KS, Cologna V, Bauer JM, *et al.*: **Realizing the full potential of behavioural science for climate change mitigation**. *Nature Climate Change.* 2024.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Nigg CR, Allegrante JP, Ory M: **Theory-comparison and multiple-behavior research: common themes advancing health behavior research**. *Health Educ Res.* 2002; **17**(5): 670–679.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Norris E, Finnerty AN, Hastings J, *et al.*: **A scoping review of ontologies related to human behaviour change**. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2019; **3**(2): 164–172.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Norris E, Zhang L, Wuerstl K, *et al.*: **A data extraction template for the behaviour change intervention ontology [version 1; peer review: 4 approved, 1 approved with reservations]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2024; **9**: 168.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Office for Behavioral and Social Sciences Research: **BSSR definition**. 2019; [accessed 10/07/24].
[Reference Source](#)
- Rothman AJ, Sheeran P: **What is slowing us down? Six challenges to accelerating advances in health behavior change**. *Ann Behav Med.* 2020; **54**(12): 948–959.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Schenk PM, Hastings J, Michie S: **Developing the mental health ontology: protocol for a step-wise method to develop an ontology for the mental health domain as part of the GALENOS Project [version 1; peer review: 1 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2024a; **9**: 40.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Schenk PM, West R, Castro O, *et al.*: **An ontological framework for organising and describing behaviours: the human behaviour ontology [version 1; peer review: 3 approved with reservations]**. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2024b; **9**: 237.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Scott A, Webb TL, Norman P, *et al.*: **A new resource for behavioural science - Developing tools for understanding the relationship between behaviours**.

Poster presented at the 36th conference of the European Health Psychology Society, Bratislava, Slovakia, August, 2022.

Sharp C, Kaplan RM, Strauman TJ: **The use of ontologies to accelerate the behavioral sciences: promises and challenges.** *Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* 2023; **32**(5): 418–426.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Smith B, Ashburner M, Rosse C, *et al.*: **The OBO Foundry: coordinated evolution of ontologies to support biomedical data integration.** *Nat Biotechnol.* 2007; **25**(11): 1251–1255.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Smith B, Ceusters W: **Ontological realism: a methodology for coordinated evolution of scientific ontologies.** *Appl Ontol.* 2010; **5**(3–4): 139–188.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Vroom EB, Massey OT: **Moving from implementation science to implementation practice: the need to solve practical problems to improve**

behavioral health services. *J Behav Health Serv Res.* 2022; **49**(1): 106–116.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

West R, Bonin F, Thomas J, *et al.*: **Using machine learning to extract information and predict outcomes from reports of randomised trials of smoking cessation interventions in the human behaviour-change project [version 1; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations].** *Wellcome Open Res.* 2023; **8**: 452.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

West R, Godinho CA, Bohlen LC, *et al.*: **Development of a formal system for representing behaviour-change theories.** *Nat Hum Behav.* 2019; **3**(5): 526–536.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

West R, Michie S: **How many papers are published each week reporting on trials of interventions involving behavioural aspects of health?** *Qeios.* 2023.
[Publisher Full Text](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:



Version 1

Reviewer Report 11 December 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.25586.r111963>

© 2024 Amith M. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Muhammad "Tuan" Amith 

The University of Texas Medical Branch Health, Galveston, Texas, USA

The authors of the manuscript introduces the Behavioral and Social Science Ontology (BSSO) Foundry, an ontology repository specific to ontologies representing social behavioral subdomains. The authors introduces the reader to a concise review of the landscape of social behavioral ontologies and the gap and need for them. It is presumed with the growth of data sets from diverse social behavioral datasets, there needs to be ontology models that can integrate and harmonize these datasets, as well as central repository as a "go to" source find ontologies. Leaning on the success of the OBO Foundry, the authors propose their own repository that replicates their practices and infrastructure. BSSO offers facilities to promote terminology reusability and interoperability, and has a multidisciplinary committee to shape the vision of the platform.

Comments:

- Overall the manuscript finely articulates background motivation for behavioral-social ontologies and would be a welcomed piece to share to those who are not familiar with the importance and role of ontologies for science research.
- Unfortunately the link to the repository (BSSO's main link) isn't active so I am unable to review the platform. Based on what is provided through the manuscript (visualization link), the visualization seem to be relatively simple compared to the features provided by BioPortal and OBO Foundry. In fact there is OntoPortal (<https://ontoportal.org/>) that provides the technology that is similar to BioPortal. Is there a rationale or maybe a comparison on how their own platform would differentiate from the others?
- I am not sure how the visualization can be helpful. After attempting to use it, I did get a simple tree structure but then again ontologies tend to be more complex and polyhierachal. I wonder if the platform should leverage VOWL to assist in the visualization or some pseudo-version of UML. It would be helpful to understand how a potential user might utilize the visualization. I also wonder if it might be useful to conduct some usability assessment with potential users?

- While I understand the need to have a central repository for behavioral and social-related ontologies, there is a concern that it might create silos. Maybe an explanation of why OBO or BioPortal may not be suitable to provide the support that is needed. Also term selection seems to be "localized" to the seven ontologies on the platform. How will the platform guarantee interoperability/coverage with terms from other repositories?

Is the rationale for the Open Letter provided in sufficient detail?

Yes

Does the article adequately reference differing views and opinions?

No

Are all factual statements correct, and are statements and arguments made adequately supported by citations?

Yes

Is the Open Letter written in accessible language?

Yes

Where applicable, are recommendations and next steps explained clearly for others to follow?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: knowledge engineering, public health informatics, semantic web, ontology, knowledge graph-driven software applications

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Reviewer Report 10 December 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.25586.r111965>

© 2024 Musen M. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Mark Musen 

Stanford University, Stanford, USA

This submission is not a scientific report but an announcement of the formation of a group of investigators who propose to serve as a steering committee for an informal organization to promote the use of ontology in the behavioral and social scientists and to ensure that ontologies in these disciplines adhere to certain unspecified standards. The BSSO Foundry will be modeled on the OBO Foundry, which has had a significant effect on ontology development in biomedicine.

The authors refer to the BSSO Foundry as a community of practice, but, as noted in the U.S. National Academies report that has stimulated recent evaluation of ontology development in the behavioral and social sciences, this is a discipline where currently there is neither much of a "community" nor much "practice." One does not create a community of practice simply by hanging up a shingle. The OBO Foundry was successful because its formation followed nearly a decade of annual bio-ontology workshops at the ISMB conference and several meetings on "Standards and Ontologies in Functional Genomics" that nurtured a vibrant community. The OBO Foundry also was kickstarted by significant funding from the U.S. National Institutes of Health, which was essential for consolidating the community and for developing infrastructure. Yes, the OBO Foundry was announced with a publication, but its originators had to lay significant groundwork first.

As noted by the authors, the U.S. National Institutes of Health launched an initiative to stimulate development of ontologies in the behavioral and social sciences. This program supports a Behavioral and Social Science Ontology Coordinating Center and several individual grants to support practitioners who are building ontologies in this area. One of the co-authors of the current paper is a recipient of one of these NIH grants for ontology development. There is no discussion in the current paper how the BSSO Foundry initiative might relate to the newly funded BSSO program in the United States, and what synergies might accrue from collaboration. It seems premature to publish an announcement of the BSSO Foundry without this discussion. (Disclosure: I am a principal investigator of the BSSO Coordinating Center, and my colleagues and I eagerly seek collaboration.)

The OBO Foundry has been in existence for nearly two decades. What have the authors learned from observing the OBO Foundry experience? What lessons might apply to the proposed BSSO Foundry initiative? What will the authors do differently? Why can't the authors simply join forces with the OBO Foundry in some way? Why can't the BSSO Foundry take advantage of the enormous infrastructure for ontology development, dissemination, and use developed in the biomedical community? These are all basic questions that need to be addressed by any organization that intends to pattern itself on the OBO Foundry and to lead the development of new terminological resources in a different area of science.

Is the rationale for the Open Letter provided in sufficient detail?

Partly

Does the article adequately reference differing views and opinions?

Partly

Are all factual statements correct, and are statements and arguments made adequately

supported by citations?

Yes

Is the Open Letter written in accessible language?

Yes

Where applicable, are recommendations and next steps explained clearly for others to follow?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Data science

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Reviewer Report 30 November 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.25586.r111958>

© 2024 Stefancsik R. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Ray Stefancsik 

European Bioinformatics Institute (EMBL-EBI), Hinxton, UK

The authors present a compelling case for the creation of the Behavioural and Social Sciences Ontology (BSSO) Foundry, a comprehensive framework designed to advance research, analysis, and policy-making in the behavioural and social sciences. The manuscript effectively articulates the critical gaps in existing research infrastructure and demonstrates the potential benefits of this innovative collaborative platform.

The paper builds robustly on the established principles of the Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology (OBO) Foundry. The BSSO Foundry's approach, characterized by modular ontology composition, ensures both technical and scientific rigor. Moreover, the transparent organizational structure and governance model are strategically designed to foster community engagement and knowledge exchange.

I have verified that all web resources referenced in the paper are freely accessible and appear to be valuable tools for researchers. The abstract, main text, tables, and figures are clear, well-structured, and informative.

One area for potential improvement is the "Plain language summary." While currently adequate, it

could be enhanced to better communicate the concept to readers unfamiliar with ontologies. I recommend explicitly explaining that these ontologies are structured knowledge frameworks that use precisely defined terms and relationships comprehensible to both humans and computers. I think by explaining that this approach not only ensures interoperability but also provides scalability in data-intensive research areas would foster better understanding of the benefit the BSSO Foundry can provide and might facilitate wider community involvement.

The manuscript successfully introduces the BSSO Foundry as a promising resource with significant potential to advance interdisciplinary research in the behavioural and social sciences.

Is the rationale for the Open Letter provided in sufficient detail?

Yes

Does the article adequately reference differing views and opinions?

Yes

Are all factual statements correct, and are statements and arguments made adequately supported by citations?

Yes

Is the Open Letter written in accessible language?

Yes

Where applicable, are recommendations and next steps explained clearly for others to follow?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: ontologies (information science); biomedical ontologies; biomedical databases; genetics; phenotypes; molecular biology

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Reviewer Report 26 November 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.25586.r110746>

© 2024 Haendel M. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Melissa Haendel 

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA

This letter focuses on the effort to create and govern a suite of interoperable behavior and social ontologies. While it is true that standards for behavioral health and social sciences have been lacking and/or are not designed with interoperability in mind, it is not clear what scientific challenges the authors are trying to overcome with this new approach. Furthermore, they don't discuss existing standards and how they could be evolved or be interoperable with resources in the BSSO Foundry. This includes mental health standards such as DSM and RDOC, as well as other popular ontologies that contain behavioral terms, such as the Human Phenotype Ontology.

The manuscript would do well to better define the landscape and how the proposed BSSO ontologies fit within that landscape, as well as how they might advance specific scientific areas if the BSSO was successful. I would also recommend an evaluation of the content of the BSSO ontologies to illustrate how their interoperability is somehow more cohesive than the broader suite found outside the BSSO (OBO Foundry, clinical terminologies and standards, etc.). Finally, a set of use cases should be included to illustrate the kinds of data and process standardization that might be possible with the BSSO ontologies. The manuscript feels like a "build it and they will come" initiative without these use cases and more content evaluation.

Minor:

The visualization tool figure should show content from one or more of the BSSO ontologies.

Governance is not described, but there is a steering committee.

The rationale for only including BFO-based ontologies is not clear. There are pros and cons to using BFO, and many users find BFO-based ontologies hard to adopt for a variety of reasons. BFO also has not always been adequate to represent complex entities with complex properties, which one might expect in the behavior and social domains.

Is the rationale for the Open Letter provided in sufficient detail?

Partly

Does the article adequately reference differing views and opinions?

Partly

Are all factual statements correct, and are statements and arguments made adequately supported by citations?

Yes

Is the Open Letter written in accessible language?

Yes

Where applicable, are recommendations and next steps explained clearly for others to follow?

No

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Genetics, semantic engineering, phenotyping and precision medicine, clinical informatics

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.
