Chelonian Conservation And Biology

Vol. 17No.2 (2022) | https://www.acgpublishing.com/ | ISSN - 1071-8443

DOI:doi.org/10.18011/2022.04(1) .3216.3228

THE APPLICATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND MACHINE LEARNING IN MEDICAL LABORATORY DIAGNOSTICS.

Nahlah Abdullah Alnakhli , Abdullah Mohmmad Ali Alshmrani , Fayez Taher Alhajouji , Saqer Ahmed Qaysi , Hussain Mohmmed Ozaybi , Ali Zaid Mohammed Alhaely , Ibrahim Ali Hakami , Fatimah Qasem Shaher Alzeeri , Hussien Deab Ahmed Hamzi, Basem Mohammad Safhi , Ahood Abdurahman Alahdal , Hashim Hussain Awaji , Naif Mohammed Ahmed Aljahani , Ayad Ahmed Mohammed Bakhsh , Ali Mohsen Ali Alanazi, Abdulrahman Faisal Kutbi

Abstract:

The use of machine learning (ML) algorithms in clinical laboratory medicine has transformed a number of areas related to patient care and diagnosis. An overview of machine learning applications in clinical laboratories is given in this work, with particular attention on automated interpretation, predictive modeling, error detection, and clinical decision support systems. Machine learning (ML) systems, specifically in the context of supervised learning, have demonstrated exceptional precision in forecasting disease outcomes, identifying errors during pre-analytical stages, and streamlining the interpretation of intricate laboratory data. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs), one of the deep learning techniques, have greatly enhanced image-based diagnostics, allowing for the quick and precise diagnosis of malaria parasites, urine sediment, and peripheral blood cells. ML-powered clinical decision support systems provide physicians with evidence-based suggestions and real-time insights, improving patient care and clinical outcomes. Despite these developments, issues like data privacy worries and legal barriers still exist, making it necessary to give serious thought to the widespread use of ML in clinical laboratories.

Key words: machine learning, clinical laboratory medicine, predictive modeling, error detection, automated interpretation, clinical decision support systems, convolutional neural networks, image-based diagnostics, data privacy, regulatory challenges

Introduction:

The field of machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence (AI) has attracted a lot of interest from laboratory experts. Artificial Intelligence (AI) includes the theory and development of computer systems that can carry out sophisticated activities like speech recognition and decision-making, which normally need human intelligence. One branch of AI called machine learning (ML) enables computers to learn from data without explicit programming. Although machine learning (ML) as a concept was first presented in 1959, its actual applications were not widely available until the 1980s because of limitations in computing power, data availability, and

storage capacity. Thanks to the explosion of data and advances in computing technology, machine learning (ML) is now widely used in a wide range of areas, including business, research, and healthcare.

Clinical laboratories are now productive generators of large datasets thanks to the convergence of machine learning and laboratory automation. Even while machine learning (ML) models, especially deep learning, have the potential to perform exceptionally well with massive datasets, there are still few commercial products that use ML to solve problems in clinical laboratories. In this study, we give a broad overview of the field of machine learning in clinical laboratory settings, emphasizing both its advantages and disadvantages. Furthermore, we go over new ML applications in clinical labs from 2018 to mid-2020. Models in machine learning (ML) can be grouped according to a number of factors, such as the degree of supervision provided during training and the learning strategy used by the algorithm. Reinforcement learning, supervised, unsupervised, and semi-supervised are the four main classifications based on supervision. Supervised learning, which is frequently employed for classification and regression tasks, uses labeled training data so that the algorithm can learn from examples that have known answers. Neural networks, K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), Support Vector Machines (SVMs), Decision Trees (DTs), Random Forests (RFs), Linear Regression, and Logistic Regression are a few examples.

In contrast, unsupervised learning makes use of unlabeled data, which enables the algorithm to recognize patterns or structures without the need for prior information about sample classifications. Clustering, visualization, dimensionality reduction, anomaly detection, novelty detection, and association rule learning are among the tasks that make use of this methodology.

Semi-supervised learning integrates elements of supervised and unsupervised learning to handle partially labeled data. In order to enhance model performance, it makes use of both labeled and unlabeled data. Through reinforcement learning, an agent can learn to make choices that will maximize rewards or help it reach a particular objective. Reinforcement learning is frequently used in continuous result optimization projects and game-playing scenarios, much as how humans learn by making mistakes. Gaining an understanding of these fundamental ideas paves the way for understanding the debates and applications related to machine learning algorithms in clinical laboratory settings. The machine learning model is trained using the complete dataset in batch learning. After training, the model's weights are fixed, thus no more parameter adjustments are needed when using it to evaluate new data. Batch learning is not flexible enough to adjust to new information, even if it provides stability and robustness, making it simple to assess accuracy and performance beforehand. Retraining the model from scratch with new and old samples is necessary when updating it with new data. This can be a computationally demanding and time-consuming process.

On the other hand, the model can be updated continually with single data points or mini-batches of data thanks to online learning. Online learning is appropriate for managing continuous streams of data because each learning step is quick and affordable. However, because the algorithm is always evolving, the frequent updating of the model may cause instability in the

system and make it difficult to evaluate its correctness and performance. Due to the algorithm's dynamic nature, licensing and regulatory compliance become complicated, making validation and certification procedures more difficult. A system that uses instance-based learning learns by remembering the training data samples by heart, as demonstrated by algorithms such as KNN (K-Nearest Neighbors). It generalizes when new observations are given by utilizing a similarity metric to compare them to the stored data samples. The algorithm saves examples of the training data for future use instead of creating a generalized internal model. On the other hand, model-based learning makes use of prediction based on a model built from a collection of examples to achieve generalization to fresh data samples. The method creates a model that captures the correlations and patterns seen in the training data, as opposed to keeping individual instances of the data. On the basis of previously unseen data points, predictions or classifications are based on this model. This review will mostly concentrate on supervised learning algorithms because they are the foundation of most machine learning applications in clinical laboratory medicine. First, gathering, cleaning, and classifying data come first during the data-oriented phase. Pre-processing, often known as data cleansing, is an essential stage in guaranteeing the model's dependability. Pre-processing usually takes a large amount of time, and typical tasks include resolving missing data, finding outliers, and encoding categorical variables.

After feature engineering, an ML model is trained and evaluated on the gathered data in the second phase. Training, validation, and test sets of data are separated. To choose a relevant set of features for training, feature engineering is applied to the training set. The efficacy of machine learning is contingent upon the existence of pertinent features and the lack of superfluous ones. K-fold cross-validation is becoming more and more popular as a contemporary alternative to the validation set, which is traditionally used to fine-tune model parameters. The model is evaluated, deployed, and monitored in the third step. In order to measure the generalization error, the model's performance is evaluated using test data that hasn't been seen before. The model can be overfitting the training set if the generalization error is large, but the training error is low. After a successful evaluation, the model is put into use. Regular performance monitoring is recommended for models that use online learning in order to identify any degradation early on.

Application in Medical Laboratory:

Medical Reports:

The pre-analytical phase stands out as a pivotal stage in the sample testing process, with errors in this phase accounting for up to 70% of all mistakes in laboratory diagnosis. Interestingly, many of these errors occur outside the laboratory environment, often due to inadequate sample handling by healthcare personnel. Various ML approaches have been explored to address common pre-analytical errors, such as the wrong blood in tube (WBIT) error. Rosenbaum and Baron demonstrated the potential of ML-based multianalyte delta checks to outperform traditional single-analyte delta checks in detecting WBIT errors. Their SVM-based algorithm achieved an impressive AUROC of 0.97, showcasing superior performance compared to univariate delta checks. However, the efficacy of delta check models relies on maintaining a high positive predictive value (PPV) to avoid "alarm fatigue" among laboratory workers.

Moreover, ML models have been developed to detect other pre-analytical factors like hemolysis, which can affect multiple laboratory parameters. Benirschke and Gniadek utilized a multivariate Logistic Regression model to identify falsely elevated point-of-care (POC) potassium results due to hemolysis, achieving high accuracy and acceptable PPV. In addition to error detection, Yu et al. devised an automatic quality review method for clinical mass spectrometry (MS) data using SVM models. Their approach significantly reduced the manual review requirement while maintaining a high precision rate, indicating the potential of ML-based automated verification systems to enhance workflow efficiency and analytical result quality in laboratory settings.

Urine Analysis:

The diagnosis of urological and nephrological disorders is greatly aided by urine sediment analysis; nevertheless, manual examination is labor-intensive, time-consuming, and error-prone. Although there are automated urine microscopy analyzers, they typically use classic machine learning frameworks that include preprocessing, segmentation, feature extraction, and pattern recognition-based categorization. Nevertheless, these methods pose difficulties as they necessitate the manual evaluation of every potential morphological change. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs), in particular, provide a promising way around these restrictions. CNNs are excellent at analyzing medical images but configuring them from scratch takes a lot of knowledge and information. Using a variety of picture datasets to fine-tune pre-trained CNNs is a more effective method. It has been demonstrated that pre-trained CNNs perform better than those trained from scratch when appropriately adjusted. Liang et al. showed how well-tuned pre-trained CNNs could automatically identify seven different types of urine particles. Their model performed with 84.1% mean average precision on a dataset of 5376 photos with annotations. This method greatly increases the effectiveness and precision of urine sediment analysis by doing away with the requirement for manually created heuristics and utilizing pre-trained CNNs' generalization skills. Ultimately, the use of CNNs in urine sediment analysis is a major improvement since it provides an automated solution that is more dependable and resilient than previous techniques.

Disease and Outcomes Prediction:

A crucial field of research has emerged: predicting disease development and outcomes using regular clinical markers, especially in identifying individuals at risk of acute kidney injury (AKI) and its related consequences. AKI incidence and severity have been predicted by a number of studies using machine learning (ML) algorithms based on demographic information, standard laboratory measurements, and electronic health records (EHRs). For example, Koyner et al. used data from a sizable patient cohort to show the value of a gradient boosting machine (GBM) algorithm in predicting stage 2 AKI with excellent sensitivity and specificity. Their model produced an area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) of 0.96 for the necessity for renal replacement therapy (RRT) and 0.90 for predicting stage 2 AKI within 24 hours. Similar to this, Parreco et al. reported an AUROC of 0.83 for GBM model-based AKI prediction. Furthermore, the prediction of mortality, RRT demand, and AKI detection has demonstrated potential using multivariate logistic regression and decision tree (DT) models. These models achieved AUROCs ranging from 0.90 to 0.94 by integrating multiple EHR

characteristics, including baseline estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), changes in blood creatinine, and serum potassium levels. Moreover, using longitudinal EHR data from various clinical settings, advanced models capable of forecasting AKI events have been developed thanks to current developments in deep learning. With a lead time of up to 48 hours, these models have proven highly accurate in predicting the incidence of AKI and the need for dialysis. It's important to keep in mind, nevertheless, that some AKI prediction models do not exactly match clinical practice guidelines because they frequently just take creatinine concentrations into account without taking urine output criteria into account. To guarantee clinical relevance and accuracy, careful interpretation of model predictions is also necessary.

By utilizing laboratory data and electronic health records (EHRs), predictive modeling has been expanded to include screening for diabetic mellitus (DM) and its related consequences. For example, Lai et al. used logistic regression models and the gradient boosting machine (GBM) algorithm to predict diabetes mellitus (DM) based on patient data from Canada. They obtained AUROCs of 0.85 and 0.84, respectively, with sensitivities ranging from 71.6% to 73.4%. These results were encouraging. An XGBoost model with a remarkable AUROC of 0.96 was introduced in another study to predict the risk of hypoglycemia in patients with diabetes mellitus by combining numerous patient data. Furthermore, the combination of Raman spectroscopy and artificial neural networks (ANNs) showed excellent accuracy (88.9-90.0%) in the identification of diabetes patients at various sample locations. Additionally, a variety of medical diseases have been accurately predicted using ML models. Models that predicted cardiac amyloidosis, for instance, had AUROCs of 0.86, indicating a high degree of sensitivity and specificity in differentiating it from heart failure unrelated to amyloidosis. An ensemble model with an AUROC of 0.95 that used logistic regression and random forest algorithms was able to predict newborns' requirement for phototherapy treatment up to 48 hours ahead of time. Similarly, people at high risk for colorectal cancer were successfully detected by an ML model that included demographic and complete blood cell count data. Within six months, 35% of these patients were diagnosed with the disease. Furthermore, utilizing limited laboratory data, an ML model based on random forest in the emergency department environment predicted early-stage unfavorable outcomes for febrile patients with an AUROC of 0.88 and balanced accuracy of 81%.

Interpretation of Complex Biomedicals:

Results are usually interpreted in traditional clinical laboratory practice using defined reference intervals, clinical correlations, and medical knowledge. On the other hand, interpreting test panels that produce a variety of parameters can be difficult and subjective, frequently requiring a high level of clinical and technical expertise. It is anticipated that multivariate diagnostics would be used more frequently in clinical laboratories as analytical techniques improve. Thus, machine learning (ML)-based clinical decision support (CDS) systems may provide useful instruments to reduce subjectivity and interpretation disparities. Applications for machine learning-based CDS systems in clinical chemistry include the classification of patterns from serum protein electrophoresis, the interpretation of urine steroid metabolite data to identify malignancy in adrenal tumors, and the discrimination of steroid profiles in doping control. More

applications have also been made possible by recent developments, such as the screening for inborn metabolic diseases. Tandem mass spectrometry (MS/MS) has shown promise in the successful screening of neonates for inborn metabolic abnormalities; nonetheless, there is a significant rate of false-positive results. In order to improve the prediction of true- and false-positive outcomes, Peng et al. created a random forest (RF) model using screening data from 39 metabolic analytes. This model considerably decreased the frequency of false positives for various illnesses. A further noteworthy ML-based CDS system analyzes steroid levels in urine and serum. In comparison to conventional techniques, Albini et al. showed how well a Bayesian model based on liquid chromatography–tandem MS (LC–MS/MS) analysis could distinguish between patients with benign prostatic hypertrophy, prostate cancer, and control participants. Wilkes et al. demonstrated the capability of machine learning algorithms to read urine steroid profiles automatically, reaching a high degree of accuracy in differentiating between disorders connected to the adrenal gland.

Automated Blood Film Reporting:

More than 80% of hematological illnesses are diagnosed first through peripheral blood cell (PBC) morphological inspection. Many manufacturers have released automated leukocyte categorization systems, which are similar to automated urine sediment analysis and frequently use conventional machine learning (ML) frameworks. White blood cells (WBCs) have been classified using a variety of techniques, such as multilayer perceptions, Bayes classifiers, multiclass support vector machines (SVMs), and K-nearest neighbors (KNN). Recent research, however, has shown how well-tuned and pretrained convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can accurately distinguish between various PBC classes. Acevedo et al. used a CNN trained on a sizable public dataset with more than 17,000 individual cell pictures to obtain an overall classification accuracy of 96.2%. By utilizing public datasets, it may be possible to overcome the drawbacks of commercial testing solutions, such as cost and transparency concerns, and expedite the integration of machine learning (ML) systems into standard clinical laboratories. Furthermore, CNNs have demonstrated potential in the morphological classification of erythrocytes. Research has indicated that deep CNNs can get up to 90.6% correct classification ratios when classifying different erythrocyte morphological classes. This implies that CNNs might improve the erythrocyte classification specificity and accuracy of commercial analyzers, such as CellaVision, hence removing the need for human operators to manually reclassify erythrocytes.

Malaria Diagnosis:

In laboratory settings, the primary way of verifying malaria infection is still microscopic analysis of stained blood films. Unfortunately, this method has issues with uniformity and reliability due to its labor-intensive nature, need for specialized training, and susceptibility to operator variability. To overcome these constraints, several machine learning (ML) techniques have been investigated, with an emphasis on measuring parasitemia and differentiating between various parasite species or stages. For example, Molina et al. recently presented a methodology to precisely identify malaria-infected red blood cells (RBCs) with a high precision of 97.7% using support vector machines (SVM) and linear discriminant analysis. Furthermore, Li et al.

created an automated microscopy system that was both affordable and effective, combining machine learning techniques with the ability to detect Plasmodium falciparum parasites in stained blood smears with a sensitivity and specificity that exceeded 90%. These advances are promising, especially for areas with limited resources. Besides stained blood films, other methods have also been suggested. These include the use of portable spectrometers and cloud-based machine learning (ML) systems for infrared (IR) analysis of packed red blood cells (RBCs), which shows promise as point-of-care (POC) tools in the diagnosis of malaria, and digital in-line holographic microscopy combined with SVM for identifying unstained malaria-infected RBCs with 97.5% accuracy. Furthermore, screening for malaria parasites in human dried blood spots has proven effective when IR spectroscopy is used in conjunction with supervised machine learning. Accuracy rates for P. falciparum infections have reached 92%, while for mixed infections they have reached 85%. Additionally, gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) volatile biomarker analysis has demonstrated promise in differentiating between symptomatic and asymptomatic malaria patients. 100% sensitivity in identifying asymptomatic infections, including those undetectable by conventional microscopic examination, has been achieved by ML algorithms. These results highlight the potential of machine learning (ML) and volatile biomarkers in creating reliable, noninvasive screening techniques for malaria detection, particularly in field settings.

Reduction of Diagnosis Workload:

Clinical microbiology labs frequently struggle with inconsistent workloads and a lack of manpower. By tackling repetitive, high-volume activities, machine learning (ML) for laboratory automation can help to ease these problems and free up laboratory staff to work on more specialized jobs. Urinary tract infection (UTI) confirmation in urine samples is a common area of high workload. Reducing unneeded cultures can greatly enhance process optimization and efficiency, as many urine specimens result in negative culture results. To determine whether culturing individual urine specimens is necessary, Burton et al. suggested using supervised machine learning algorithms. In their study, they found that XGBoost could detect culture-positive samples with 95.2% accuracy while reducing the workload related to culturing by 41 percent. Urine microscopy, demographic data, clinical information, and previous urine culture findings were among the independent variables used to train the machine learning system. A different strategy uses machine learning to analyze digital images. WASPLab colony segregation software is automatically able to identify significant growth in urine cultures plated on standard blood and MacConkey agars; Faron et al. assessed this software. They discovered that the software might reduce the labor associated with diagnostics by batch-reviewing negative cultures and was extremely sensitive (99.8%).

In a different work, employing aligned dual-lightning pictures, an ML technique based on radial basis function support vector machine (RBF-SVM) was created for automatic hemolysis detection and categorization in cultured blood agars. This model successfully identified hemolysis types (Alpha, Beta, or Gamma) with 88.3% precision and 98.6% recall, achieving a high alignment rate of 98.1%. Automating the interpretation of stained smears, a laborious and operator-dependent operation in microbiology labs, has also been accomplished through the use

of machine learning (ML) in digital image analysis. Smith et al. developed a method for Gram stain classification that makes use of a deep convolutional neural network (CNN) and automated image acquisition. Their approach classified different cell types and backgrounds often seen in Gram staining with an overall accuracy of 94.9%.

Detection of Microorganisms:

For the purpose of identifying and evaluating the antimicrobial susceptibility of bacteria, yeasts, and fungi, traditional approaches are still the gold standard. While these techniques work well, they take a long time to see results—sometimes several days. They usually start with Gram staining and proceed to microbial cultivation for susceptibility testing and identification. However, these procedures need skill and are labor-intensive and time-consuming, particularly the first phase of the macroscopic colony morphology study. In order to overcome these obstacles and optimize microbiology processes, scientists have resorted to machine learning (ML) methods. Using deep convolutional neural networks (CNNs), Huang and Wu created an automated method for identifying the morphology of bacterial colonies. This system was able to categorize a variety of bacterial species with 73% accuracy and individual species with up to 90% accuracy and specificity. Furthermore, Maeda et al. presented a quick and affordable method for differentiating between Staphylococcus species using machine learning (ML) algorithms trained on microcolony pictures, obtaining 100% accuracy using random forest (RF) models.

A maximum accuracy of 93.9% has been achieved by using machine learning algorithms to digital image analysis for the identification of fungal species. Furthermore, machine learning (ML) is being used more and more to decipher complex spectral data from sophisticated analytical methods including vibrational spectroscopy, liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS), and matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS). For example, using MALDI-TOF MS spectra, machine learning models have been constructed to identify distinct species of bacteria, distinguish between strains that are closely related, and discriminate between different bacterial genera. Similar to this, machine learning (ML) methods have demonstrated promise in quickly and effectively detecting both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria when applied to data from Raman and Fourier transform-infrared (FT-IR) spectroscopy. Notwithstanding these developments, difficulties still exist, most notably the requirement for bacterial culture prior to analysis. A culture-free technique combining LC-MS/MS and ML was presented by Roux-Dalvai et al. to quickly and accurately identify uropathogenic bacterial species. Wu et al. also suggested a molecular agglutination assay combined with machine learning approaches for quick and affordable pathogen identification appropriate for point-of-care testing. In conclusion, ML-based methods have a great deal of promise to transform susceptibility testing and microbial identification, making diagnostic procedures in clinical microbiology labs quicker, more precise, and less labor-intensive.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the integration of machine learning (ML) algorithms into clinical laboratory medicine holds significant promise for revolutionizing various aspects of diagnostics, patient management, and disease prevention. ML, particularly in the realm of supervised learning, has demonstrated remarkable capabilities in predicting disease outcomes, detecting errors in pre-analytical phases, and automating the interpretation of complex laboratory data. One of the primary applications of ML in clinical laboratories lies in predictive modeling, where algorithms are trained on large datasets to forecast disease risks and patient outcomes. These models have shown impressive accuracy in predicting conditions such as acute kidney injury (AKI), diabetes mellitus (DM), and hematological disorders, providing clinicians with valuable insights for early intervention and personalized treatment strategies. Moreover, ML algorithms have proven instrumental in error detection and quality assurance during the pre-analytical phase, mitigating risks associated with sample mishandling and processing errors. By leveraging ML-based multivariate diagnostics, laboratories can enhance efficiency, reduce interpretative disagreements, and improve overall diagnostic accuracy. The advent of deep learning techniques, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs), has revolutionized image-based diagnostics in clinical laboratories. CNNs excel in tasks such as automated urine sediment analysis, classification of peripheral blood cells (PBCs), and detection of malaria parasites in stained blood films, offering rapid and accurate results compared to traditional manual methods. Furthermore, ML-driven clinical decision support systems (CDS) hold immense potential in aiding clinicians with real-time insights and evidence-based recommendations, thereby improving patient care and clinical outcomes. These systems, when integrated into routine laboratory workflows, can streamline diagnostic processes, reduce diagnostic errors, and enhance overall laboratory efficiency. However, despite the numerous advancements, challenges remain in the widespread adoption of ML in clinical laboratories, including data privacy concerns, algorithm interpretability, and regulatory hurdles. Addressing these challenges will be crucial in harnessing the full potential of ML to transform clinical laboratory medicine and usher in a new era of precision diagnostics and personalized medicine.

References:

[1] Lippi G. Machine learning in laboratory diagnostics: valuable resources or a big hoax? Diagnosis. 2019. DOI:10.1515/dx-2019-0060

[2] Cabitza F, Banfi G. Machine learning in laboratory medicine: waiting for the flood? Clin Chem Lab Med. 2018;56(4):516–524.

[3] Sivapalaratnam S. Artificial intelligence and machine learning in haematology. Br J Haematol. 2019;185(2): 207–208.

[4] Machine learning [Internet]. San Francisco: Deep AI; 2020 [cited 2020 May 18]. Available from: https:// deepai.org/machine-learning-glossary-and-terms/ machine-learning

[5] Naugler C, Church DL. Automation and artificial intelligence in the clinical laboratory. Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci. 2019;56(2):98–110.

[6] Durant T. Machine learning and laboratory medicine: now and the road ahead [Internet]. Washington: AACC; 2020 [cited 2020 May 18]. Available from: https://www.aacc.org/publications/cln/articles/2019/ march/machine-learning-and-laboratory-medicinenow-and-the-road-ahead

[7] Geron Aur elien. Hands-on machine learning with Scikit-Learn, Keras & TensorFlow. 2nd ed. Sebastopol (CA): O'Reilly Media; 2019.

[8] De Bruyne S, Speeckaert MM, Delanghe JR. Applications of mid-infrared spectroscopy in the clinical laboratory setting. Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci. 2018; 55(1):1–20.

[9] Lee SH. Natural language generation for electronic health records. NPJ Digit Med. 2018;1:63.

[10] Bisong E. Building machine learning and deep learning models on Google cloud platform. Berkeley: Apress; 2019.

[11] Babic B, Gerke S, Evgeniou T, et al. Algorithms on regulatory lockdown in medicine. Science. 2019; 366(6470):1202–1204.

[12] Zhang X, Li R, Zhang B, et al. An instance-based learning recommendation algorithm of imbalance handling methods. Appl Math Comput. 2019;351: 204–218.

[13] Tangkaratt V, Morimoto J, Sugiyama M. Model-based reinforcement learning with dimension reduction. Neural Netw. 2016;84:1–16.

[14] Ripley BD. Pattern recognition and neural networks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996.

[15] Yan X, Su X. Linear regression analysis: theory and computing. Singapore: World Scientific; 2009.

[16] Pedregrosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, et al. Scikitlearn: machine learning in Python. J Mach Learn Res. 2011;12:2825–2830.

[17] Ozer ME, Sarica PO, Arga KY. New machine learning applications to accelerate personalized medicine in breast cancer: rise of the support vector machines. OMICS. 2020;24(5):241–246.

[18] Mishra S, Datta-Gupta A. Applied statistical modeling and data analytics. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 2018.

[19] Noble WS. What is a support vector machine? Nat Biotechnol. 2006;24(12):1565–1567. CRITICAL REVIEWS IN CLINICAL LABORATORY SCIENCES 17

[20] Tin KH. Random decision forests. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (Montreal Quebec, Canada); 1995.

[21] Si S, Zhang H, Keerthi SS, et al. Gradient boosted decision trees for high dimensional sparse output. Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning; 2017 Aug 6–11; Sydney (Australia). PMLR; 2017.

[22] Ogutu JO, Piepho HP, Schulz-Streeck T. A comparison of random forests, boosting and support vector machines for genomic selection. BMC Proc. 2011; 5(Suppl. 3):S11.

[23] Huang Y, Kangas LJ, Rasco BA. Applications of artificial neural networks (ANNs) in food science. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2007;47(2):113–126.

[24] Ng A. Neural networks and deep learning [Internet]. California: Coursera; 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 6]. Available from: https://www.coursera.org/learn/ neural-networks-deep-learning?specialization=deeplearning

[25] Aloysius N, Geetha M. A review on deep convolutional neural networks. International Conference on Communication and Signal Processing (ICCSP); 2017 Apr 6–8; Chennai (India). IEEE; 2017.

[26] Rawat W, Wang Z. Deep convolutional neural networks for image classification: a comprehensive review. Neural Comput. 2017;29(9):2352–2449.

[27] Anwar SM, Majid M, Qayyum A, et al. medical image analysis using convolutional neural networks: a review. J Med Syst. 2018;42(11):226.

[28] Plebani M. Quality indicators to detect pre-analytical errors in laboratory testing. Clin Biochem Rev. 2012; 33(3):85–88.

[29] Carraro P, Zago T, Plebani M. Exploring the initial steps of the testing process: frequency and nature of pre-preanalytic errors. Clin Chem. 2012;58(3): 638–642.

[30] Rosenbaum MW, Baron JM. Using machine learning based multianalyte delta checks to detect wrong blood in tube errors. Am J Clin Pathol. 2018;150(6): 555–566.

[31] Mitani T, Doi S, Yokota S, et al. Highly accurate and explainable detection of specimen mix-up using a machine learning model. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2020; 58(3):375–383.

[32] Benirschke RC, Gniadek TJ. Detection of falsely elevated point-of-care potassium results due to hemolysis using predictive analytics. Am J Clin Pathol. 2020; 154(2):242–247.

[33] Yu M, Bazydlo LAL, Bruns DE, et al. Streamlining quality review of mass spectrometry data in the clinical laboratory by use of machine learning. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2019;143(8):990–998.

[34] Oyaert M, Delanghe J. Progress in automated urinalysis. Ann Lab Med. 2019;39(1):15–22.

[35] Liang Y, Kang R, Lian C, et al. An end-to-end system for automatic urinary particle recognition with convolutional neural network. J Med Syst. 2018;42(9): 165

[36] Park Y, Kim SY, Kwon GC, et al. Automated versus conventional microscopic interpretation of antinuclear antibody indirect immunofluorescence test. Ann Clin Lab Sci. 2019;49(1):127–133.

[37] Acevedo A, Alferez S, Merino A, et al. Recognition of peripheral blood cell images using convolutional neural networks. Comput Methods Programs Biomed. 2019;180:105020.

[38] Tajbakhsh N, Shin JY, Gurudu SR, et al. Convolutional neural networks for medical image analysis: full training or fine tuning? IEEE Trans Med Imaging. 2016; 35(5):1299–1312.

[39] Gameiro J, Branco T, Lopes JA. Artificial intelligence in acute kidney injury risk prediction. J Clin Med. 2020;9(3):678.

[40] Van Biesen W, Vanmassenhove J, Decruyenaere J. Prediction of acute kidney injury using artificial intelligence: are we there yet? Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2020;35(2):204–205.

[41] Koyner JL, Carey KA, Edelson DP, et al. The development of a machine learning inpatient acute kidney injury prediction model. Crit Care Med. 2018;46(7): 1070–1077.

[42] Parreco J, Soe-Lin H, Parks JJ, et al. Comparing machine learning algorithms for predicting acute kidney injury. Am Surg. 2019;85(7):725–729.

[43] Low S, Vathsala A, Murali TM, et al. Electronic health records accurately predict renal replacement therapy in acute kidney injury. BMC Nephrol. 2019;20(1):32.

[44] Tomasev N, Glorot X, Rae JW, et al. A clinically applicable approach to continuous prediction of future acute kidney injury. Nature. 2019;572(7767): 116–119.

[45] Lai H, Huang H, Keshavjee K, et al. Predictive models for diabetes mellitus using machine learning techniques. BMC Endocr Disord. 2019;19(1):101

[46] Ruan Y, Bellot A, Moysova Z, et al. Predicting the risk of inpatient hypoglycemia with machine learning using electronic health records. Diabetes Care. 2020; 43(7):1504–1511.

[47] Guevara E, Torres-Galvan JC, Ramırez-Elıas MG, et al. Use of Raman spectroscopy to screen diabetes mellitus with machine learning tools. Biomed Opt Express. 2018;9(10):4998–5010.

[48] Agibetov A, Seirer B, Dachs T-M, et al. Machine learning enables prediction of cardiac amyloidosis by routine laboratory parameters: a proof-of-concept study. J Clin Med. 2020;9(5):1334.

[49] Daunhawer I, Kasser S, Koch G, et al. Enhanced early prediction of clinically relevant neonatal hyperbilirubinemia with machine learning. Pediatr Res. 2019; 86(1):122–127.

[50] Schneider J, Layefsky E, Udaltsova N, et al. Validation of an algorithm to identify patients at risk for colorectal cancer based on laboratory test and demographic data in diverse, community-based population. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2020. DOI:10. 1016/j.cgh.2020.04.054

[51] Lee S, Hong S, Cha WC, et al. Predicting adverse outcomes for febrile patients in the emergency department using sparse laboratory data: development of a time adaptive model. JMIR Med Inform. 2020;8(3): e16117. 18 S. DE BRUYNE ET AL.

[52] Wilkes EH, Rumsby G, Woodward GM. Using machine learning to aid the interpretation of urine steroid profiles. Clin Chem. 2018;64(11):1586–1595.

[53] Altinier S, Sarti L, Varagnolo M, et al. An expert system for the classification of serum protein electrophoresis patterns. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2008;46(10): 1458–1463.

[54] Arlt W, Biehl M, Taylor AE, et al. Urine steroid metabolomics as a biomarker tool for detecting malignancy in adrenal tumors. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2011; 96(12):3775–3784.

[55] Van Renterghem P, Sottas PE, Saugy M, et al. Statistical discrimination of steroid profiles in doping control with support vector machines. Anal Chim Acta. 2013;768:41–48.

[56] Kwon C, Farrell PM. The magnitude and challenge of false-positive newborn screening test results. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 2000;154(7):714–718.

[57] Peng G, Tang Y, Cowan TM, et al. Reducing false positive results in newborn screening using machine learning. Int J Neonatal Screen. 2020;6(1):16.

[58] Albini A, Bruno A, Bassani B, et al. Serum steroid ratio profiles in prostate cancer: a new diagnostic tool toward a personalized medicine approach. Front Endocrinol. 2018;9:110.

[59] Wang Q, Chang L, Zhou M, et al. A spectral and morphologic method for white blood cell classification. Opt Laser Technol. 2016;84:144–148.

[60] Ramesh N, Dangott B, Salama ME, et al. Isolation and two-step classification of normal white blood cells in peripheral blood smears. J Pathol Inform. 2012;3:13.

[61] Prinyakupt J, Pluempitiwiriyawej C. Segmentation of white blood cells and comparison of cell morphology by linear and naïve Bayes classifiers. Biomed Eng Online. 2015;14(1):63.

[62] Rezatofighi SH, Soltanian-Zadeh H. Automatic recognition of five types of white blood cells in peripheral blood. Comput Med Imaging Graph. 2011;35(4): 333–343.

[63] Nazlibilek S, Karacor D, Ercan T, et al. Automatic segmentation, counting, size determination and classification of white blood cells. Measurement. 2014;55: 58–65.

[64] Su MC, Cheng CY, Wang PC. A neural-network-based approach to white blood cell classification. Sci.