| Time | Section |
|-------|---|
| 02:12 | Introduction of Heidi Lindroth and Anirban Bhattacharyya |
| 03:37 | Expanding the Horizons of Delirium Prediction (Heidi Lindroth) |
| 04:11 | Altered States on ICU |
| | Martyn Stones and Janice Sharp's book on hallucinations from people in the ICU |
| | • Spoke of a specific example from her experience with someone who was experiencing severe delirium |
| | and hallucinations |
| | Thinks AI can help physicians by being a decision support tool |
| 08:02 | Current Delirium Prediction |
| | • Machine learning is a fundamental process of AI, algorithm based, and there are different types |
| | (supervised, unsupervised, and reinforcement) |
| | • Al→ Machine Learning→ Deep Learning Venn diagram |
| 08:35 | Machine Learning: Different Ways of Learning |
| | • Supervised |
| | • Labeled data (we know the variables going in) |
| | • I ransparent, explainable |
| | • Human informed and guided |
| | • I ypes/examples: |
| | - Logistic & Elitear regression, decision-dees (random forest), support vector machine, |
| | • About 95% of existing delirium prediction models |
| | Unsupervised |
| | • Unlabeled data (we do not know variables) |
| | • Find hidden structures or patterns within data |
| | • Considered "Black Box" (so, this is not as trusted) |
| | • Types/examples: |
| | Clustering, more advanced neural nets |
| | Convolutional Neural Nets, Recurrent Neural nets, transformers, etc. |
| | 5% future potential to unlock hidden potential? |
| | Reinforcement Learning |
| | Decision making |
| | Repeated trial & error, learns through rewards |
| | Learn series of actions (similar to Bayesian) |
| | • Human in the loop |
| | • Has been used to understand clinician decision making (inverse) |
| 10.25 | O 0%: need to explore now to apply in definition prediction |
| 10.55 | Data Types |
| | • Subclured. |
| | \sim FHR flowsheet data |
| | • Relational Database/Datamart |
| | • This is most often used because easy to use |
| | • Unstructured: |
| | • Data types vary |
| | • Text, images, waveform |
| | • Data Lakes |
| | • Not easy to use |

Expanding the Horizons of Delirium Prediction by Leveraging Artificial Intelligence Presenters: Heidi Lindroth, PhD, RN, FAAN and Anirban Bhattacharyya, MD, MS, MPH

| 11:27 | Model Development & Testing |
|-------|--|
| | • Typical Schema: Train \rightarrow Validate \rightarrow Test |
| | • Train: |
| | Develop model and select features (i.e. variables) |
| | Validate |
| | • Evaluate developed model and improve (hyperparameter tuning—iterative process) |
| | • Test |
| | New data (model has not seen) and report performance |
| 12:13 | Evaluating Performance of ML Models |
| | • Look for these 5 statistics: Area under the receiver operator curve (AUROC), Accuracy, Precision, |
| | Recall, F1 Score |
| | • Need to find a balance between precision and recall because the more thorough your model, the less |
| | precise it will be |
| 10.07 | • These all run from 0 to 1 and a higher score means better performance |
| 13:25 | How is Supervised ML different from regular Logistic Regression? |
| | • Terminology: variables vs. features/labels |
| | • Intent: Examining relationships vs. finding the best performing model |
| | Problem Being Solve: Practice-based or Research-based? Exploratory, hypothesis generating? |
| 15:47 | What is the Same? |
| | • Inform Model (our assumptions continue to inform modeling) |
| | • Hidden Potential (thinking outside of our assumptions, allow assistance in identifying patterns in data |
| 17 47 | that we cannot see because of our assumptions) |
| 1/:4/ | where are we now? |
| | • Search terms "Delirium" AND "Machine Learning" (PubMed search diagram) |
| | • 3 systematic reviews done already |
| | • Postoperative (PMID 39393836): random forest most frequently used, pooled AUC 0.792, Ensemble models perform better (AUC 0.805) |
| | \sim All Adult Settings (PMID 35922015): pooled performance AUROC: 0.89 |
| | • All Settings (PMID 34373042): random forest. AUROC 0.79-0.91 |
| 18:47 | How Could AI Improve Delirium Prediction? |
| | • Reduce noise in data |
| | • Dynamic modeling (incorporate real-time information, adapt to changing circumstances) |
| | • Incorporate various data types (structured, unstructured wearables, environmental, genetic, lifestyle, |
| | ambient sensing, etc.) |
| | • Improve screening for studies (more precise, efficient, and dynamic screening for eligibility) |
| | • What else? (passive digital markers, detection, prognosis, ???) |
| 20:14 | Previous Work: Static Models & Dynamic Models |
| | • In static models we look at a specific time period for what data is going to predict the outcome of |
| | delirium and then once we have that data, we have a pretty large time frame of when that delirium |
| | might occur |
| | • In dynamic models, we're able to change and shorten that lead time. |
| | • The ROC improved as the time got shorter, which makes sense that we're able to predict |
| | delirium the closer to the event actually happening |
| 21:38 | What Could We Do? |
| | • Are we predicting the risk of delirium? Low, medium, high risk? |
| | • Are we predicting the presence of delirium? Diagnostic focused |
| | • Are we predicting the prognosis? The likely course and outcomes for this individual? |
| | • Are we predicting treatment response? |
| | Are we predicting disease progression? |

| Considerations for the Lifecycle of an Algorithm |
|---|
| • Once the algorithm is done, what does it need next? |
| Participation, research, skills, concern, knowledge (diagram) |
| Expanding Horizons: Developing and Implementing AI Models for Delirium Prediction in Critical Care |
| (Anirban Bhattacharyya) |
| Learning Objectives |
| Understand the principles behind AI model development for delirium prediction |
| • Identify challenges like transparency, fairness, and bias in AI |
| Explore the lifecycle of an AL algorithm and its clinical implementation |
| Envision the future of AI in delirium care, including multimodal approaches |
| Apply insights to improve AI development and integration in healthcare |
| Model Building |
| Delirium prediction to use as a screening tool |
| • 16546 patients |
| Continuous prediction using sliding observation windows |
| Model Building- Outcome |
| • Typically diagnosed using CAM-ICU (administered by nurses and done once or twice a shift) |
| • Distribution of CAM-ICU (overwhelming majority had delirium in first week of admission) |
| We analyzed timing and frequency to plan prediction |
| Model Building- Features |
| • Have to use features that are commonly available |
| • So, in the ICU that means: vital signs, routinely done labs |
| • In their model also included additional labs and medications, and this improved the performance of |
| their model (however the added lab is not done that frequently in the ICU, and if it is done there is |
| suspicion that something else is going on) |
| • So, they went with a model with all vital signs and routinely done labs even though it sacrifices some |
| of the performance |
| Model Building- Missingness |
| • Because the features are routinely collected, in the eICU there was very little missingness |
| • Used 1-hour bins for vital signs |
| • 6-hour bins for labs |
| Model Building- Observation and Prediction Windows |
| • Used 3 different approaches to machine learning (logistic regression, random forest, and LSTM) |
| • Ran the analysis on different observation and prediction windows (the AUC graphs you can see on the |
| Silde) |
| LST M models performed the best Found that if you abserved for 12 hours and then predicted 12 hours about them was pretty and |
| • Found that If you observed for 12 hours and then predicted 12 hours ahead, there was pretty good |
| • Observing for 12 and 24 hours was better than 48 for predicting meaning that whatever causes |
| • Observing for 12 and 24 hours was better than 48 for predicting, meaning that whatever causes delirium is happening in the near short term and not very far off |
| Modeling Building- Ontimization |
| • Did feature ranking for ventilation, heart rate, age, WBC, SOFA score, and Vasonressor dose |
| Chose to have a more sensitive test |
| Model Building- Challenges Ahead |
| • Fairness metrics, transparency, explainability > causality, real time performance, deal with |
| discrepancies |
| Implementation: Research to Practice |
| • Standards, best practices, and operational tools |
| |

| | Quality assurance |
|-------|--|
| | Transparency and accountability |
| | • Risk management for AI models in health care |
| | • AI Lifecycle: |
| | ○ Planning & Design → Data Collection & Management → Model Building & Tuning → |
| | Verification & Validation \rightarrow Model Deployment \rightarrow Operation & Monitoring \rightarrow Real-World |
| | Performance Evaluations |
| 43:49 | Reporting of Delirium Prediction Algorithms |
| | • Less than 10% of the models actually show the specific purpose of why they were building it or how it |
| | would be used |
| | • Do a good job at verifying and validating the model (in about 40% of the studies) |
| | • Concerns in model interpretability and operations & monitoring. Very few reports on that |
| 45:15 | Future of AI Models for Delirium |
| | • Model evolution (different models for different outcomes, personalized care, proactive & preventive) |
| | Multimodal AI (Structured Data, Computer Vision, Knowledge base, Tie data to context) |
| | • Trust building and Integration (Data visualization tools, Action items integrating with A2F bundle, |
| | Clinician training) |
| 47:35 | What Do We Do Next? |
| | Think about your role |
| | Advocacy for AI integration, data sharing |
| | Standardize AI building and implementation |
| | Multidisciplinary teams and settings to address challenges |
| 48:35 | Questions and Answers |