

# ConceptMap

## Relationship Direction

Concept Map - mapping is made from source to target but the relationship is interpreted from target to source eg "broader" is to say that target is less specific than the source. Is this reversal causing confusing

Feeling of the group was that the existing implementation (ie "mapping relationship is about the target") is the more intuitive and we just need to highlighted that sooner rather than later (the specification is already considered to be clear on this topic). Note that the mapping relationship is a sub property of the match element itself ie the target.

<https://build.fhir.org/conceptmap-operation-translate.html> and <https://build.fhir.org/valueset-concept-map-relationship.html>

SNOMED CT has similar functionality in Complex Maps with the correlationId field which takes << 447247004 |SNOMED CT source code to target map code correlation value (foundation metadata concept)]

DK Thought that the terms used here come from the linguistics domain which may explain some of the trouble here.

RH Adds from SKOS: *Note on skos:broader direction: for historic reasons, the name of the skos:broader property (the word "broader") does not provide an explicit indication of its direction. The word "broader" should read here as "has broader concept"; the subject of a skos:broader statement is the more specific concept involved in the assertion and its object is the more generic one.*

Tracker on this: [#16364](#)

**Update 12 Nov:** RH "The relationship itself should make the relationship direction explicit so 'broader-target' rather than just 'broader'. Group suggested going further eg 'has-broader-target' this could be done in the display text rather than the code itself. This more explicit set of values maintains the existing relationship direction (target 'relationship type' source)