REVIEW ARTICLE

Beyond Traditional Models—The Impact of Machine Learning on Intensive Care Unit Outcome Predictions: A Narrative Review

Dipali Taneja[1*], Shivani Fotedar[2], Prabhukalyan Dash[3], Abhishek Pandey[4], Seher Taneja[5], Akash A Desai[6], Vikas Goyal[7]

Received: 30 July 2025; *Accepted:* 04 September 2025

Abstract

Accurate prediction of patient outcomes in intensive care units (ICUs) is crucial for enhancing clinical decision-making, patient care, and resource allocation. Traditional scoring systems like Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE), Simplified Acute Physiology Score (SAPS), and Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA), while valuable, fall short of fully capturing the complexities of critically ill patients. Advances in machine learning (ML) enable the analysis of high-dimensional data, including electronic health records (EHRs), physiological parameters, and genomic information, providing a more comprehensive approach to outcome prediction.

This review aims to assess the impact of ML techniques, including deep learning (DL), ensemble machine learning (EML), and reinforcement learning (RL), in improving ICU outcome predictions, particularly in identifying high-risk patients and enabling proactive interventions.

Machine learning models have shown superiority over traditional systems, enabling more accurate identification of critical patients. However, implementing ML in ICU settings comes with challenges, including data quality, model interpretability, ethical concerns, and workflow integration. Collaborative efforts between clinicians, data scientists, and multidisciplinary teams, supported by shared databases like Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC), are essential for developing generalizable ML models that work across diverse healthcare environments.

Future research should focus on improving real-time prediction using wearable technology and personalized risk assessments to further individualize ICU care. Ethical considerations, particularly data privacy and model transparency, must be addressed as ML becomes more integrated into critical care.

Journal of The Association of Physicians of India (2025): 10.59556/japi.73.1260

Introduction

Optimizing intensive care unit (ICU) resource allocation is essential for improving patient outcomes and efficiency. Traditional models like APACHE, SAPS, and SOFA estimate mortality but offer static snapshots, often limited by data inconsistencies and hospital-specific variations.[1] These models, while valuable, may not fully capture the rapidly changing nature of critical illness, leading to delayed or suboptimal decision-making.

Machine learning (ML) provides a more dynamic alternative by analyzing complex time-series data to identify nonlinear patterns, enabling real-time proactive predictions. This is crucial in ICU settings where patient conditions change quickly. Studies demonstrate ML's potential, such as Komorowski et al.'s reinforcement learning algorithms, which optimized sepsis treatment and reduced mortality by 20%. Additionally, ML models can predict respiratory failure early, prompting timely interventions and improving patient outcomes.[2,3]

This review explores how ML addresses the limitations of traditional models by identifying high-risk patients, preventing unnecessary ICU admissions, optimizing resource use, and enhancing intervention precision. However, challenges like data quality, model interpretability, and integration into clinical workflows remain significant, with generalizability across diverse populations also critical. The literature search used keywords like "AI in ICU" and "ICU mortality prediction models" across platforms like Google and PubMed Central.

Objectives

The primary objective of this narrative review is to explore the role of artificial intelligence (AI) and ML in predicting ICU mortality and improving resource management. Specifically, it will address the following key questions:

1. How do AI models compare to traditional scoring systems in predicting ICU outcomes?
2. What impact do predictive models have on ICU resource optimization?
3. What challenges exist in implementing AI-driven prediction models in ICU settings?

This review highlights advancements, limitations, and practical considerations in adopting AI for ICU outcome prediction.

Methods

This narrative review was conducted to synthesize existing literature on the role of ML and AI in predicting ICU outcomes and optimizing resource management. A comprehensive literature search and analysis were performed, focusing on studies that assessed the application of ML/AI models in ICU settings. The methodology aimed to provide a structured and detailed review of advancements in AI-driven ICU outcome prediction.

A narrative synthesis was conducted to compare AI/ML models with traditional systems, emphasizing improvements, challenges, and ethical considerations. Recommendations for future research were drawn based on these comparisons. The search covered the period from 2016 to 2024, focusing on publications in English across databases such as PubMed, Embase,

[1]Senior Specialist, Department of Anesthesia, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Hospital, Delhi; [2]DrNB Trainee, Department of Neuroanesthesia and Neurocritical Care, Artemis Hospital, Gurugram, Haryana; [3]Physician (Student, Masters in Medical Science and Technology), IIT Kharagpur, Kharagpur, West Bengal; [4]Director (Data Scientist), S Deepaarogya AI, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India; [5]Student, Jerome Fisher Program in Management and Technology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States; [6]AI Engineer, Mangoapps Pvt Ltd, Pune, Maharashtra; [7]AI/ML Engineer, S Deepaarogya AI, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India; *Corresponding Author

How to cite this article: Taneja D, Fotedar S, Dash P, *et al.* Beyond Traditional Models—The Impact of Machine Learning on Intensive Care Unit Outcome Predictions: A Narrative Review. J Assoc Physicians India 2025;73(12):84–88.

Cochrane Library, and Google Scholar. The search strategy utilized a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms, including "ICU mortality prediction," "ML in outcome prediction," "artificial intelligence in ICU," "predictive models," "ICU resource optimization," and "healthcare analytics." Inclusion criteria encompassed all relevant study designs, including randomized controlled trials, cohort studies (retrospective and prospective), case-control studies, and narrative reviews.

Discussion

The Role of Accurate Outcome Prediction in Intensive Care Unit Patient Care

Accurate outcome prediction in the ICU is crucial for improving patient care and resource management. Mortality rates in ICUs range from 10 to 50% in high-risk groups, making timely predictions essential for enhancing clinical decision-making and optimizing treatments.[4,5] Early identification of patients at risk of deterioration helps prioritize interventions and improves communication with families regarding prognosis and end-of-life decisions. Traditional scoring systems like APACHE, SAPS, and SOFA have been widely used for mortality prediction based on clinical and physiological parameters.[1,6] However, these models are static and rely on a limited set of variables, often missing the complex, dynamic changes occurring in critically ill patients.[6] Studies show that the predictive accuracy of models like APACHE IV declines over time, achieving about 75% accuracy in some cohorts.[7] Furthermore, these models may not account for changing conditions during an ICU stay, potentially leading to delayed interventions or misjudging patient trajectories.[8]

Artificial intelligence-based ML models offer a more dynamic and personalized approach by processing large amounts of real-time patient data from electronic health records (EHRs), lab results, and vital signs, leading to higher predictive accuracy of 85 to 90%.[9] Additionally, AI can integrate nontraditional data, such as medical imaging and genomics, to further enhance prediction capabilities.[10] During the COVID-19 pandemic, AI models were effectively used to predict patient deterioration based on respiratory metrics and biomarkers, achieving pooled sensitivity of 93% and specificity of 94%, with an AUC of 0.98.[11] These results highlight the potential of AI in improving ICU outcome prediction.

Impact of Outcome Prediction on Resource Allocation and Management

Optimizing the allocation of resources within the ICU presents a pivotal challenge due to constraints such as limited bed availability, specialized personnel, and equipment.

In modern healthcare, predictive analytics significantly impact resource allocation and management in the ICU, enhancing both patient outcomes and operational efficiency.

Prioritizing Intensive Care Unit Beds

Predictive models enable healthcare providers in proactive bed allocation by forecasting patient needs based on the severity of conditions and anticipated monitoring requirements. This helps prioritize ICU admissions, minimize treatment delays, reduce adverse events, and ensure timely interventions for high-risk patients.[12,13]

Optimizing Staffing Levels

Predictive analytics enable hospitals to adjust staffing schedules based on anticipated admissions and patient acuity levels. By matching staffing to demand, hospitals can ensure that adequate and skilled staff are available during peak periods, preventing burnout and ensuring optimal patient care.[14,15] It also ensures that experienced specialists are available when necessary, further enhancing patient outcomes.

Managing Equipment Usage

By forecasting equipment needs, predictive models optimize the use of critical ICU resources like ventilators and monitors, reducing idle time and maintenance costs. This ensures the right equipment is available for patients in need, preventing shortages and reducing overuse, which enhances operational efficiency and care quality.[12,9,16]

Reducing Healthcare Costs

Predictive models help lower costs by preventing unnecessary ICU admissions and reducing the overuse of expensive equipment. Early intervention for conditions like sepsis reduces ICU stays and avoids costly treatments. Moreover, identifying patients unlikely to benefit from aggressive treatment prevents futile interventions, leading to cost savings. Accurate prediction of high-risk readmission patients enables targeted postdischarge plans, preventing expensive readmissions and leading to substantial cost savings.[17–19]

Enhancing Patient Outcomes

Accurate outcome prediction ensures that patients receive timely, appropriate care, reducing complications and improving recovery rates. By identifying high-risk patients early, predictive models support intensive monitoring and timely interventions, improving overall patient outcomes.[20,21]

Artificial intelligence and ML technologies have emerged as powerful tools in healthcare, with significant potential for improving patient care, risk stratification, and resource allocation in ICU admissions.

Machine Learning Innovations in Intensive Care Unit Outcome Prediction

Machine learning is revolutionizing ICUs by offering advanced tools for predicting patient outcomes. In healthcare, ML involves training algorithms to recognize patterns from large datasets, allowing computers to make accurate predictions based on historical data. This transformative technology is particularly beneficial in ICU settings, where timely decisions are critical.

In an ICU, a vast amount of data is collected, such as patient demographics, physiological measurements, lab results, and treatment history. ML models process this complex data to identify patterns that may be missed by traditional statistical methods. These models are trained on historical data to learn from past cases, and as more data becomes available, the predictions become increasingly precise.

Conventional scoring systems like APACHE, SAPS, and SOFA are used to evaluate patient severity, but they rely on static data inputs and predefined variables. ML models, on the other hand, can process larger and more complex datasets, enabling dynamic predictions that adapt to real-time changes in patient conditions. This ability to integrate multiple variables and detect subtle patterns makes ML particularly valuable in ICU outcome prediction.

Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of ML in ICU mortality prediction. Marafino et al.,[22] Pirracchio et al.,[23] and Weissman et al.[2] used ML models to predict inhospital mortality based on clinical data. Marafino et al.[22] focused on nursing notes from the first 24 hours of ICU admission, while Weissman et al.[2] combined structured and unstructured data from the first 48 hours. Awad et al.[24] took a different approach, predicting mortality within the first 6 hours of ICU admission. Rajkomar et al.[25] developed a deep learning (DL) model that achieved an AUC-ROC score of 0.95 for inhospital mortality, significantly outperforming traditional models.

In addition to general mortality prediction, ML has been applied to disease-specific outcomes. Celi et al.[26] developed an ML model for predicting outcomes in acute kidney injury (AKI) patients, while Garcia-Gallo et al.[27] focused on sepsis patients. These models highlight the ability of ML to tailor predictions to individual patient profiles, improving the precision of clinical interventions.[28]

Machine learning also plays a crucial role in real-time monitoring and clinical decision support. Advanced techniques like DL, EML, and RL have been successful in predicting complex medical outcomes. Liu et al.[29] developed a logistic regression model to predict mortality risk in ICU patients with pulmonary tuberculosis. Their model, which identified key factors like APACHE II scores and C-reactive protein levels, achieved sensitivities and specificities of 83.3 and 73.1%, respectively.

On the other hand, studies by Hou et al.[30] and Nemati et al.,[31] which relied on MIMIC-III (a public ICU database), faced challenges related to data size and diversity. Nonetheless, these models demonstrated the early identification of case severity, allowing for better clinical decision-making and improved patient outcomes.

The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted ML's potential in critical care. ML models predicted ICU transfer needs, severe outcomes, and inhospital mortality for COVID-19 patients. Key factors like lymphocyte percentage, lactate dehydrogenase, and creatinine levels significantly influenced predictions, demonstrating ML's utility in complex ICU care. Despite constraints with small databases, the promising results emphasize ML's crucial role in tackling pandemics and enhancing ICU care.[32]

A variety of ML models have been applied in ICU settings. Neural networks (NN), for instance, excel at recognizing patterns in complex data, while decision trees (DT) are favored for their interpretability. Support vector machines (SVM) and gradient-boosting (GB) algorithms have also been used for ICU outcome prediction.[33] Ensemble machine learning (EML), which combines multiple models, often performs better than single models.[34] Johnson et al. demonstrated that a combination of random forests (RF) and logistic regression (LR) outperformed individual models for ICU mortality prediction.[35]

Recent studies have increasingly employed deep learning techniques to improve prediction accuracy. Hao et al.,[36] Zahid et al.,[37] and Caicedo-Torres et al.[38] used deep learning models with accuracy ranges between 0.86 and 0.87. Zahid et al.'s self-normalizing neural network (SNN) slightly outperformed Pirracchio et al.'s[23] super learner model (AUC-ROC 0.86 vs 0.85). However, DL models, though highly accurate, are often criticized for their lack of interpretability. This has prompted efforts to improve transparency, as demonstrated by Caicedo-Torres et al.[38] and Sha et al.,[39] who employed visualization techniques to make the predictions more understandable for clinicians.

In addition to model development, ML innovations have extended to real-time monitoring and EHRs.[40] This allows predictive models to be continuously updated as patient conditions change. Another exciting development is the use of natural language processing (NLP) to analyze unstructured clinical notes. By incorporating NLP, Shickel et al. significantly enhanced the accuracy of ICU outcome predictions.[41] Challenges with data availability and the absence of AKI prognostic markers in MIMIC datasets were pointed out by He et al.[42]

Despite these limitations, the increasing availability of high-quality data and advancements in model interpretability are paving the way for ML to have a profound impact on ICU care.

Challenges in Implementing Machine Learning-based Outcome Prediction

Using ML for predicting patient outcomes in ICUs holds great promise but faces several challenges. These challenges cover technical, ethical, and logistical aspects and need to be addressed for the successful integration of ML into healthcare.[43,44]

Data Quality and Availability

Intensive care unit data is complex and comes from various sources, leading to inconsistencies and errors. Some facilities still rely on paper records, making digitization difficult. Missing data, especially in mortality cases, further hampers ML model performance.[45–48] Additionally, organizations are often reluctant to share data, which limits the development of effective models. Standardizing data formats, such as Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) and Critical Care Data Exchange Format (CCDEF), could improve data exchange.[49]

Model Interpretability

Complex ML models, like DL, often lack transparency, hindering clinical acceptance. Clinicians need interpretable outputs for effective integration into practice. Early clinician involvement in model design ensures better workflow integration and trust.[49–51] Inclusive datasets capturing diverse patient characteristics and techniques like multivariate imputation enhance model accuracy and timely interventions.[47,48,50,51] Clinicians must understand how algorithms improve patient care within workflows. An accessible AI curriculum for medical students and clinicians can foster critical appraisal and safe use of AI tools.

Generalization and Validation

Machine learning models often struggle to generalize across different patient populations. Overfitting, where models perform well on training data but fail with new data, is a key issue. External validation is necessary but rare, and the use of multi-center databases raises privacy concerns. Class imbalance, particularly in mortality cases, skews performance, affecting critical care predictions. Underrepresentation of ethnic minorities impacts model accuracy.[20,43] Addressing imbalances in mortality data and including underrepresented groups are essential for reliable, equitable ML applications across diverse healthcare settings.[20,52]

Ethical and Legal Considerations

Data privacy and consent are major ethical issues in AI-based healthcare. High-profile cases like NHS's data sharing with DeepMind and Google's Project Nightingale show the risks of using patient data without consent.[53–55] Biases in training data can lead to unequal treatments, and frameworks like the Personal Data Protection Bill, 2019, aim to protect patient privacy.[53–56]

Integration with Clinical Workflow

To be effective in ICUs, ML models must fit seamlessly into existing workflows. ICU settings require real-time data processing, and the model's output should be actionable. Ensuring these models work across both advanced hospitals and resource-limited settings is key to their widespread adoption.[43,52]

Feature Engineering and Selection

Intensive care unit data is dynamic, making feature engineering challenging. Identifying relevant variables and capturing time-sensitive data requires advanced techniques. Measurement errors and self-reporting inaccuracies also introduce biases, which must be corrected to ensure fairness, which requires deep domain knowledge and advanced analytical techniques.[43,52,57]

Regulatory Approval

Gaining regulatory approval is essential for deploying ML models in healthcare. Bodies like the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)[58] require rigorous testing to confirm a model's safety and reliability. While this process is time-consuming, it is necessary for ensuring the safe use of ML in clinical settings.[43,44,52]

Maintenance and Updating

Machine learning models need to be updated regularly to maintain their accuracy as healthcare practices evolve. Continuous monitoring is required to avoid model drift, ensuring reliable predictions over time.[59]

Accountability

Determining who is responsible when ML-based predictions fail is a challenge. Clinicians may be hesitant to rely on models if they are held liable, while developers are often detached from clinical practice. Ensuring accountability and building trust through transparent models is critical.[60,61]

Shortage of Machine Learning Experts

The lack of professionals skilled in both healthcare and ML is slowing the adoption of these technologies. Investing in training programs is crucial to developing a workforce capable of deploying ML tools effectively.[44]

Addressing these challenges will be key to unlocking the full potential of ML in critical care settings.

Future Directions in Machine Learning-based Outcome Prediction

The future of ML-based outcome prediction in healthcare is set to evolve along multiple dimensions, driven by advancements in AI, big data, and emerging technologies. A key trend is integrating explainable AI (XAI) to improve transparency and clinician trust. Techniques like local interpretable model-agnostic explanations (LIME), SHapley additive exPlanations (SHAP), and gradient-weighted class activation mapping (Grad-CAM) will help healthcare professionals understand how specific factors influence predictions.[62] Lundberg et al. showed SHAP's effectiveness in improving ICU prediction model interpretability.[63]

With growing high-dimensional data availability—genomics, proteomics, lifestyle—ML will support personalized medicine by tailoring predictions to individual patients.[64] Continuous monitoring *via* wearables and EHR updates will enable dynamic adjustments to patient care, improving both short- and long-term outcomes.[65]

Federated learning (FL) addresses data privacy while enhancing ML model accuracy and generalizability by allowing hospitals to collaborate without sharing sensitive data, crucial for ICUs.[66] XAI will help detect and mitigate biases, promoting equitable interventions.[62] RL also shows promise in ICU care, optimizing treatment decisions using real-time feedback.[62,66]

Artificial intelligence integration into clinical workflows will require collaboration among data scientists, healthcare professionals, ethicists, and regulatory bodies. Shared databases like the MIMIC database can accelerate model development and validation across diverse patient populations.[67]

Limitations of Artificial Intelligence in Outcome Prediction

The applicability of AI remains theoretical, with models having shown promise in controlled environment settings; validation in real-world clinical scenarios is yet to be explored in operational hospital environments. There has been insufficient focus on model interpretability, which limits adoption by healthcare professionals. Many studies referenced in the literature have relied heavily on retrospective datasets for training and testing models, which fail to account for dynamic changes in patient conditions or real-time decision-making in ICUs.

Scalability and resource constraints in low-resource settings are questionable, with most references focusing on the development of models in well-resourced, high-income country settings where data collection infrastructure and computational power are readily available. Ethical concerns are also not adequately addressed, particularly in terms of algorithmic bias, data privacy, and fairness, which are essential for equitable healthcare solutions. A key limitation is the lack of focus on patient-centered outcomes. While clinical metrics are often the focus, patient-centered outcomes and long-term impacts remain underexplored.

These gaps highlight the need for more comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and ethically aware research that moves beyond technical innovation to address real-world challenges in deploying AI for ICU mortality prediction.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this narrative review highlights the transformative potential of ML in healthcare, potentially significantly enhancing patient outcomes and resource management. ML's ability to analyze complex, real-time data offers significant advantages over traditional scoring systems like APACHE, SAPS, and SOFA, facilitating more accurate and personalized patient predictions that enhance clinical outcomes and resource allocation.

Despite these advancements, challenges such as data quality, model interpretability, and integration into clinical workflows remain barriers to widespread adoption. Future research must focus on improving data accuracy, ensuring transparency in ML models, and establishing robust validation methods.

Integrating ML into clinical practice could revolutionize ICU care through timely, data-driven decision-making, leading to reduced unnecessary admissions and improved intervention precision. Ultimately, by addressing current challenges and embracing ongoing advancements, ML has the potential to become an indispensable tool in critical care, significantly enhancing patient outcomes and healthcare delivery.

Orcid

Dipali Taneja https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3294-977X
Shivani Fotedar https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1037-7731
Prabhukalyan Dash https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5390-5382
Abhishek Pandey https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6570-3913
Seher Taneja https://orcid.org/0009-0004-7086-5680
Akash A Desai https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2315-3728
Vikas Goyal https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0361-6494

References

1. Hosseini M, Ramazani J. Evaluation of acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II and sequential organ failure assessment scoring systems for prognostication of outcomes among intensive care unit's patients. Saudi J Anaesth 2016;10(2):168–173.
2. Weissman GE, Hubbard RA, Ungar LH, et al. Inclusion of unstructured clinical text improves early prediction of death or prolonged ICU stay. Crit Care Med 2018;46(7):1125–1132.
3. Komorowski M, Celi LA, Badawi O, et al. The artificial intelligence clinician learns optimal treatment strategies for sepsis in intensive care. Nat Med 2018;24(11):1716–1720.
4. Kalın BS, Özçaylak S, Solmaz İ, et al. Assessment of risk factors for mortality in patients in medical intensive care unit of a tertiary hospital. Indian J Crit Care Med 2022;26(1):49–52.
5. Pellathy TP, Pinsky MR, Hravnak M. Intensive care unit scoring systems. Crit Care Nurse 2021;41(4):54–64.
6. Hwang SY, Kim IK, Jeong D, et al. Prognostic performance of sequential organ failure assessment,

acute physiology and chronic health evaluation III, and simplified acute physiology score II scores in patients with suspected infection according to intensive care unit type. J Clin Med 2023;12(19):6402.
7. Keegan MT, Gajic O, Afessa B. Comparison of APACHE III, APACHE IV, SAPS 3, and MPM0III and influence of resuscitation status on model performance. Chest 2012;142(4):851–858.
8. Kumar AA. Mortality prediction in the ICU: the daunting task of predicting the unpredictable. Indian J Crit Care Med 2022;26(1):13–14.
9. Alowais SA, Alghamdi SS, Alsuhebany N, et al. Revolutionizing healthcare: the role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice. BMC Med Educ 2023;23(1):689.
10. Olang O, Mohseni S, Shahabinezhad A, et al. Artificial intelligence-based models for prediction of mortality in ICU patients: a scoping review. J Intensive Care Med 2024:8850666241277134.
11. Xin Y, Li H, Zhou Y, et al. The accuracy of artificial intelligence in predicting COVID-19 patient mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 2023;23(1):155.
12. Ortiz-Barrios M, Arias-Fonseca S, Ishizaka A, et al. Artificial intelligence and discrete-event simulation for capacity management of intensive care units during the COVID-19 pandemic: a case study. J Bus Res 2023;160:113806.
13. Pagel C, Banks V, Pope C, et al. Development, implementation and evaluation of a tool for forecasting short term demand for beds in an intensive care unit. Oper Res Health Care 2017;15:19–31.
14. Yinusa A, Faezipour M. Optimizing healthcare delivery: a model for staffing, patient assignment, and resource allocation. Appl Syst Innov 2023;6(5):78.
15. Porcel-Gálvez AM, Fernández-García E, Rafferty AM, et al. Factors that influence nurse staffing levels in acute care hospital settings. J Nurs Scholarsh 2021;53(4):468–478.
16. Stivi T, Padawer D, Dirini N, et al. Using artificial intelligence to predict mechanical ventilation weaning success in patients with respiratory failure, including those with acute respiratory distress syndrome. J Clin Med 2024;13(5):1505.
17. Teng AK, Wilcox AB. A review of predictive analytics solutions for sepsis patients. Appl Clin Inform 2020;11(3):387–398.
18. Rogers P, Boussina AE, Shashikumar SP, et al. Optimizing the implementation of clinical predictive models to minimize national costs: sepsis case study. J Med Internet Res 2023;25:e43486.
19. Ericson O, Hjelmgren J, Sjövall F, et al. The potential cost and cost-effectiveness impact of using a machine learning algorithm for early detection of sepsis in intensive care units in Sweden. J Health Econ Outcomes Res 2022;9(1):101–110.
20. Saqib M, Iftikhar M, Neha F, et al. Artificial intelligence in critical illness and its impact on patient care: a comprehensive review. Front Med (Lausanne) 2023;10:1176192.
21. Mao Z, Liu C, Li Q. et al. Intelligent intensive care unit: current and future trends. Intensive Care Res 2023;3:182–188.
22. Marafino BJ, Boscardin WJ, Dudley RA. Efficient and sparse feature selection for biomedical text classification via the elastic net: application to ICU risk stratification from nursing notes. J Biomed Inform 2015;54:114–120.
23. Pirracchio R, Petersen ML, Carone M, et al. Mortality prediction in intensive care units with the Super ICU Learner Algorithm (SICULA): a population-based study. Lancet Respir Med 2015;3(1):42–52.
24. Awad A, Bader-El-Den M, McNicholas J, et al. Early hospital mortality prediction of intensive care unit patients using an ensemble learning approach. Int J Med Inform 2017;108:185–195.
25. Rajkomar A, Oren E, Chen K, et al. Scalable and accurate deep learning with electronic health records. NPJ Digit Med 2018;1:18.
26. Celi LA, Galvin S, Davidzon G, et al. A database-driven decision support system: customized mortality prediction. J Pers Med 2012;2(4):138–148.
27. Garcia-Gallo JE, Fonseca-Ruiz NJ, Celi LA, et al. A machine learning-based model for 1-year mortality prediction in patients admitted to an intensive care unit with a diagnosis of sepsis. Med Intensiva 2018.
28. Lynch CM, Abdollahi B, Fuqua JD, et al. Prediction of lung cancer patient survival via supervised machine learning classification techniques. Int J Med Inform 2017;108:1–8.
29. Liu Q, Gao J, Luo B, et al. Prediction model for death in patients with pulmonary tuberculosis accompanied by respiratory failure in ICU: retrospective study. Ann Palliat Med 2020;9:2731–2740.
30. Hou N, Li M, He L, et al. Predicting 30-days mortality for MIMIC-III patients with sepsis-3: a machine learning approach using XGboost. J Transl Med 2020;18:462.
31. Nemati S, Holder A, Razmi F, et al. An interpretable machine learning model for accurate prediction of sepsis in the ICU. Crit Care Med 2018;46:547–553.
32. Li G, Xu F, Yin X, et al. Lactic dehydrogenase-lymphocyte ratio for predicting prognosis of severe COVID-19. Medicine (Baltimore) 2021;100(4):e24441.
33. Woodman RJ, Mangoni AA. A comprehensive review of machine learning algorithms and their application in geriatric medicine: present and future. Aging Clin Exp Res 2023;35(11):2363–2397.
34. Elhaddad M, Hamam S. AI-driven clinical decision support systems: an ongoing pursuit of potential. Cureus 2024;16(4):e57728.
35. Johnson AE, Ghassemi MM, Nemati S, et al. Machine learning and decision support in critical care. Proc IEEE Inst Electr Electron Eng 2016;104(2):444–466.
36. Hao D, Ghassemi MM, Mengling F. The effects of deep network topology on mortality prediction. Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc 2016;2016:2602–2605.
37. Zahid MAH, Lee J (Eds). Mortality prediction with self-normalizing neural networks in intensive care unit patients. In: Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE EMBS International Conference on Biomedical & Health Informatics (BHI); 2018 Mar 4–7; pp. 226–229.
38. Caicedo-Torres W, Gutierrez J. ISeeU: visually interpretable deep learning for mortality prediction inside the ICU. J Biomed Inform 2019;98:103269.
39. Sha Y, Wang MD. Interpretable predictions of clinical outcomes with an attention-based recurrent neural network. ACM BCB 2017;2017:233–240.
40. Cowie MR, Blomster JI, Curtis LH, et al. Electronic health records to facilitate clinical research. Clin Res Cardiol 2017;106(1):1–9.
41. Shickel B, Tighe PJ, Bihorac A, et al. Deep EHR: a survey of recent advances in deep learning techniques for electronic health record (EHR) analysis. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 2019;22(5):1589–1604.
42. He J, Lin J, Duan M. Application of machine learning to predict acute kidney disease in patients with sepsis associated acute kidney injury. Front Med (Lausanne) 2021;8:792974.
43. Kelly CJ, Karthikesalingam A, Suleyman M, et al. Key challenges for delivering clinical impact with artificial intelligence. BMC Med 2019;17:195.
44. Ahmed MI, Spooner B, Isherwood J, et al. A systematic review of the barriers to the implementation of artificial intelligence in healthcare. Cureus 2023;15(10):e46454.
45. Atallah L, Nabian M, Brochini L, et al. Machine learning for benchmarking critical care outcomes. Healthc Inform Res 2023;29(4):301–314.
46. Saadatmand S, Salimifard K, Mohammadi R, et al. Using machine learning in prediction of ICU admission, mortality, and length of stay in the early stage of admission of COVID-19 patients. Ann Oper Res 2023;328:1043–1071.
47. Syed M, Syed S, Sexton K, et al. Application of machine learning in intensive care unit (ICU) settings using MIMIC dataset: systematic review. Informatics 2021;8(1):16.
48. Kang CY, Yoon JH. Current challenges in adopting machine learning to critical care and emergency medicine. Clin Exp Emerg Med 2023;10(2):132–137.
49. Ayaz M, Pasha MF, Alahmadi TJ, et al. Transforming healthcare analytics with FHIR: a framework for standardizing and analyzing clinical data. Healthcare (Basel) 2023;11(12):1729.
50. Norrie J. The challenge of implementing AI models in the ICU. Lancet Respir Med 2018;6(12):886–888.
51. Che Z, Purushotham S, Khemani R, et al. Interpretable deep models for ICU outcome prediction. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2017;2016:371–380.
52. Yang J, Soltan AAS, Clifton DA. Machine learning generalizability across healthcare settings: insights from multi-site COVID-19 screening. NPJ Digit Med 2022;5:69.
53. Gerke S, Minssen T, Cohen G. Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare. Artif Intell Healthc 2020:295–336.
54. Beil M, Proft I, van Heerden D, et al. Ethical considerations about artificial intelligence for prognostication in intensive care. ICMx 2019;7:70.
55. Schneble CO, Elger BS, Shaw DM. Google's Project Nightingale highlights the necessity of data science ethics review. EMBO Mol Med 2020;12(3):e12053.
56. Jawad LA. Security and privacy in digital healthcare systems: challenges and mitigation strategies. Abhigyan 2024;42(1):23–31.
57. YA Amer A, Vranken J, Wouters F, et al. Feature engineering for ICU mortality prediction based on hourly to bi-hourly measurements. Appl Sci 2019;9(17):3525.
58. Massella M, Dri DA, Gramaglia D. Regulatory considerations on the use of machine learning based tools in clinical trials. Health Technol (Berl) 2022;12(6):1085–1096.
59. Gutierrez G. Artificial intelligence in the intensive care unit. Crit Care 2020;24.
60. Habli I, Lawton T, Porter Z. Artificial intelligence in health care: accountability and safety. Bull World Health Organ 2020;98(4):251–256.
61. Maliha G, Gerke S, Cohen IG, et al. Artificial intelligence and liability in medicine: balancing safety and innovation. Milbank Q 2021;99(3):629–647.
62. Ali S, Akhlaq F, Imran AS, et al. The enlightening role of explainable artificial intelligence in medical & healthcare domains: a systematic literature review. Comput Biol Med 2023;166:107555.
63. Lundberg SM, Erion G, Chen H, et al. From local explanations to global understanding with explainable AI for trees. Nat Mach Intell 2020;2(1):56–67.
64. Ho D, Quake SR, McCabe ERB, et al. Enabling technologies for personalized and precision medicine. Trends Biotechnol 2020;38(5):497–518.
65. Habehh H, Gohel S. Machine learning in healthcare. Curr Genomics 2021;22(4):291–300.
66. Roggeveen LF, Hassouni AE, de Grooth HJ, et al. Reinforcement learning for intensive care medicine: actionable clinical insights from novel approaches to reward shaping and off-policy model evaluation. Intensive Care Med Exp 2024;12(1):32.
67. Rogers P, Wang D, Lu Z. Medical information mart for intensive care: a foundation for the fusion of artificial intelligence and real-world data. Front Artif Intell 2021;4:691626.