



Project Proposal

Title

Predictive Modeling for Diabetic Complications Using Artificial Intelligence

Prepared By:

Name: Mohamed Gurashi

ID No: 251002316

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of
Science in Artificial Intelligence

At

Collage of Informatics

Midocean University

UAE

Supervisor Name: Dr Khaled Eskaf

Project Overview

Diabetes mellitus is a widespread chronic disease affecting hundreds of millions of people globally, with prevalence projected to keep rising in coming decades. Over time, diabetes can lead to serious complications in multiple organ systems, including **diabetic retinopathy** (eye damage leading to vision loss), **diabetic nephropathy** (kidney failure), **diabetic neuropathy** (nerve damage), **cardiovascular diseases** (heart attacks, stroke, peripheral vascular disease), and diabetic foot problems that may result in **amputations**. These complications contribute to increased disability, mortality, and healthcare costs. Early prediction and intervention are crucial – studies show that effective control of risk factors like blood glucose, blood pressure, and cholesterol can significantly reduce the incidence of complications. However, identifying high-risk patients early remains challenging with traditional methods, as many complications develop asymptotically and current screening (e.g. retinal exams for retinopathy) can be resource-intensive.

Artificial intelligence (AI), especially **machine learning (ML)**, offers a promising approach to address this challenge. ML algorithms can analyze complex, high-dimensional patient data (such as electronic health records) to discover patterns and risk factors not easily recognized by humans. By training predictive models on large datasets of diabetic patients, AI can estimate an individual's risk of developing specific complications before they occur. This enables proactive clinical decisions – for example, intensifying monitoring or treatment for patients predicted to be at high risk. Ultimately, an AI-driven early warning system for diabetic complications could help clinicians **prevent or delay complications**, reduce healthcare costs, and improve patients' quality of life. The significance of this project lies in leveraging AI to support medical decision-making in diabetes care, focusing limited healthcare resources on those who need them most and overcoming clinical inertia in complication prevention.

Project Goal

The goal of this research project is to **develop a robust machine learning model that can predict the risk of major diabetic complications** in patients with diabetes, using multi-source health data. Specifically, the model will aim to forecast the likelihood of complications such as **diabetic retinopathy, diabetic nephropathy, diabetic neuropathy, cardiovascular complications** (e.g. coronary heart disease or stroke), and **diabetic foot ulcers leading to amputation**. The predictive system should be able to identify patients at high risk for these

outcomes **well in advance** (e.g. predicting risk 2–5 years before onset), allowing for early interventions.

This goal can be summarized as developing an AI-powered risk stratification tool for diabetic complications. The model will be trained to recognize patterns in patient data (demographics, clinical measurements, lab results, comorbidities, etc.) that precede the development of complications. For example, it might learn how factors like chronically elevated HbA1c levels, blood pressure, or duration of diabetes contribute to the risk of retinopathy or nephropathy. By the end of the project, we aim to deliver a validated predictive model with clearly defined performance (accuracy, AUC, etc.) and a demonstration of its clinical relevance. A successful outcome would be a model that can flag high-risk patients (for one or more complications) early, and provide explanations of the key risk factors, thereby supporting clinicians in making informed decisions to mitigate those risks.

Approach

We will employ a structured approach combining data-driven modeling with rigorous validation and interpretability. The project will proceed through the following components:

- **Data Sources:** We plan to utilize large-scale **electronic health records (EHRs)** and/or national health survey datasets as the primary data sources. These datasets may include longitudinal patient information such as demographics, medical history, laboratory test results, medication use, and recorded outcomes (e.g. diagnoses of retinopathy, nephropathy, etc.). For example, a hospital EHR system or an open dataset like the UK Biobank or MIMIC-III could be mined for patients with diabetes, along with whether they developed specific complications. Such real-world data is rich in features; indeed, previous studies have shown that incorporating diverse clinical features from EHRs can improve complication risk prediction. If direct patient-level data is limited due to privacy, we will explore de-identified or synthetic datasets (one recent study generated nearly 1 million synthetic diabetic patient records to facilitate complication modeling. Ensuring a sufficient sample size and feature diversity will be critical for the model's performance.
- **Data Preparation:** Raw clinical data often contains noise, missing values, and class imbalances that must be addressed before modeling. We will perform comprehensive data cleaning and preprocessing. This includes handling missing data (e.g. imputation with mean or median values, or more advanced methods if needed) and **outlier detection/removal** to improve data quality. We will also tackle the likely **class imbalance** problem: since not all patients develop each complication, we expect far fewer “complication” cases than non-cases. To ensure the model learns effectively, we

will apply techniques such as **Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE)** to balance the dataset. Feature engineering will be undertaken to enhance predictive signal – for instance, creating aggregated features (like average glucose over time) or domain-specific indices (e.g. body-mass index from height and weight). Additionally, we will perform **feature selection** to reduce dimensionality and noise: methods like correlation analysis or tree-based feature importance can help identify the most informative predictors. By retaining key features (such as age, HbA1c, blood pressure, lipid levels, diabetes duration, etc.) and eliminating irrelevant ones, we can simplify the model and potentially improve accuracy. All data preparation steps will be documented and, where possible, automated for reproducibility.

- **Modeling Algorithms:** We will train and evaluate several machine learning algorithms, prioritizing those that have shown success in structured clinical data prediction tasks. In particular, we will focus on **ensemble tree-based models** and **neural networks**:
 - **Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) and Random Forests (RF)** are two ensemble methods that often achieve high accuracy in medical tabular data. These models can handle nonlinear relationships and feature interactions well, and they naturally provide measures of feature importance. We choose XGBoost and RF because prior research on diabetic complication prediction has found them to be top-performing algorithms. For example, Yang *et al.* (2025) demonstrated that an XGBoost model could predict diabetic retinopathy with an AUC of ~ 0.99 , outperforming logistic regression and even neural networks. Similarly, Random Forest has achieved comparably strong results in that context. These successes indicate that tree ensembles are well-suited to capture the complex risk factor interactions in diabetes outcomes. We will experiment with these models extensively.
 - **Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs):** We will also explore a neural network model (such as a multilayer perceptron) to capture complex nonlinear patterns in the data. Neural networks can model interactions that are hard to pre-specify and might detect subtle combinatorial effects among risk factors. While an ANN may require more data and careful tuning to avoid overfitting, it offers a complementary approach to the tree models. In previous studies, neural networks have shown moderate success (sometimes slightly lower accuracy than XGBoost/RF, but they can excel with larger datasets or when feature engineering uncovers non-linear signals). We will include ANNs to see if they provide any performance gain or additional insights (e.g. through learned representations of the data).

- Additionally, for completeness, we may test other algorithms such as Support Vector Machines or logistic regression, but these are generally less scalable or less accurate in high-dimensional clinical data. Our focus will remain on the models above. Each algorithm's hyperparameters will be tuned (using techniques like grid search or Bayesian optimization) to optimize performance.
- **Evaluation and Validation:** Model performance will be rigorously evaluated using appropriate metrics and validation strategies. We will reserve a portion of the data as a **hold-out test set** (or use cross-validation) to assess how well the models generalize to unseen patients. Key evaluation metrics will include **Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC)**, **accuracy**, **precision**, **recall (sensitivity)**, and **specificity** for predicting each complication. AUC is crucial as it measures the model's ability to discriminate between patients who will develop a complication and those who will not, across all threshold settings. We expect our models to achieve high AUCs (for instance, >0.85 for most complications, based on literature benchmarks). We will also examine precision and recall to ensure the model has a good balance of catching true at-risk cases (recall) while minimizing false alarms (precision). If data permits, an **external validation** may be done using a different dataset or a later time cohort to test the model's robustness in a real-world scenario. Moreover, we will assess **calibration** – i.e. whether the predicted risk probabilities align well with actual observed frequencies (calibration curves). A well-calibrated model's 20% risk prediction should correspond to roughly 20% of such patients actually experiencing the complication, which is important for clinical trust.
- **Interpretability:** An essential part of our approach is ensuring the model is not a “black box” but provides medically interpretable insights. We will apply **interpretability methods** to the final model to identify the key predictors and their effects. In particular, we will use **SHAP (Shapley Additive Explanations)**, a state-of-the-art method for explaining individual predictions and overall feature importance. SHAP analysis assigns each feature an importance value for a given prediction, indicating how much that feature increased or decreased the predicted risk. By using SHAP, we can rank risk factors for each complication and quantify their contributions. For example, we might find that high HbA1c and urinary albumin levels are the top contributors to predicted kidney complication risk, which would be consistent with clinical knowledge. Such insights will be reported to validate that the model's behavior aligns with medical understanding or to highlight novel risk factor interactions. We will also generate partial dependence plots or SHAP summary plots to visualize how changes in a given feature (say blood pressure) affect complication risk, holding other factors constant. This

interpretability step ensures the AI model can be **trusted and understood by clinicians**, an important aspect for eventual deployment.

By combining robust predictive modeling with interpretability, our approach not only aims for high accuracy but also for **transparency and clinical relevance**. This multi-faceted approach (spanning data handling, algorithmic modeling, and interpretation) follows best practices observed in recent research on diabetes complication prediction, and will be executed with careful attention to reproducibility and ethical use of patient data.

Project Steps and Timeline

We anticipate the project to be completed over approximately **8–9 months**, structured into sequential phases:

1. **Literature Review & Data Acquisition (Month 1)** – Perform an in-depth review of current literature on diabetic complication prediction (to refine our approach and ensure novelty). Concurrently, acquire the data needed for the study. This involves obtaining the EHR or survey datasets (with proper approvals if required) and setting up data storage. By the end of this phase, we will have a well-defined dataset and understanding of its contents. *Deliverable*: Data access obtained; summarized insights from literature to inform model design.
2. **Data Preprocessing & Exploration (Month 2–3)** – Clean and preprocess the dataset. We will write scripts to handle missing values, remove outliers, encode categorical variables, and engineer new features as appropriate. We will conduct exploratory data analysis to understand distributions of key variables (e.g. age, glucose levels) and the incidence rates of each complication. If class imbalance is severe, implement oversampling (e.g. SMOTE) at this stage. Feature selection techniques may be applied to narrow down candidate predictors. *Deliverable*: A cleaned, processed dataset ready for modeling; EDA report with figures/tables summarizing data characteristics.
3. **Model Development (Month 4–5)** – Train initial machine learning models. In this phase, we will split the data into training and validation sets (e.g. 70/30 split or using k-fold cross-validation). We will train models including XGBoost, Random Forest, and a Neural Network on the training data. Hyperparameter tuning will be performed (possibly using cross-validation on the training set) to optimize each model's performance. We will likely iterate between model training and feature engineering – for example, if a model underperforms, we might create new features or try different input representations. *Deliverable*: Preliminary models trained; internal performance metrics (e.g. cross-val results) recorded for each algorithm; selection of the most promising model for further testing.

4. **Model Evaluation (Month 6)** – Rigorously evaluate the leading model(s) on the held-out test set (or through cross-validation if no separate test set). We will compute the performance metrics: AUC, accuracy, precision, recall, etc., for each complication outcome. We will also evaluate model calibration and subgroup performance (e.g. does the model perform equally well for different age groups or genders? This checks for any biases or gaps). If available, we might test the model on an **external dataset** for generalization. *Deliverable*: Evaluation report detailing model performance on all metrics, with comparison between models. A decision will be made on the final model to use (based on performance and complexity considerations).
5. **Interpretability Analysis (Month 7)** – Apply SHAP and other interpretability tools to the final chosen model. We will compute SHAP values for the test set predictions to identify which features contributed most to each complication prediction. We will generate summary plots of feature importance and partial dependence for key features. In this step, we also involve a clinical expert (e.g. an endocrinologist) to validate that the model's important features and their directional effects make sense medically. Any surprising findings will be noted for discussion. *Deliverable*: Interpretability results (charts and explanations) highlighting top risk factors for complications as learned by the model.
6. **Refinement & Documentation (Month 8)** – Based on the evaluation and interpretability findings, make any necessary refinements. For instance, if the model had weaker performance on a certain complication, we might retrain a dedicated model for that outcome or adjust parameters. Once satisfied, finalize the model. Concurrently, compile the **research report** or paper: this will include an introduction (background and motivation), methodology (our approach and techniques), results (performance metrics, comparison with literature), and discussion (implications and limitations). We will also document any limitations of the model (e.g. if certain rare complications weren't predictable due to insufficient data). The timeline might extend slightly into Month 9 for polishing the report and incorporating feedback from advisors. *Deliverable*: Final research paper or thesis ready for submission/presentation, and the predictive model codebase (with documentation) for possible deployment or further research.

Expected Results

By the end of this project, we expect to achieve several key outcomes:

- **High-Accuracy Predictive Model**: We anticipate developing a machine learning model that can predict diabetic complications with **strong accuracy and discrimination**. Concretely, our goal is for the model to attain an AUC well above 0.80 (and ideally

approaching 0.90 or higher) for each major complication outcome, alongside high sensitivity and specificity. For example, prior research using ensemble models achieved over 90% accuracy in predicting complications like diabetic nephropathy, which sets an optimistic benchmark for our work. If successful, our model will enable early identification of patients at high risk for complications such as retinopathy, nephropathy, neuropathy, heart disease, and foot ulcers. Early prediction means these patients could receive intensified monitoring or preventive therapy (e.g. tighter glycemic control, blood pressure management, frequent eye exams) before the complication fully develops, thereby reducing adverse outcomes.

- **Identification of Key Risk Factors:** In addition to raw predictive performance, a valuable result will be a clear understanding of which factors drive the risk of each complication. We expect the project to yield a ranked list of significant predictors for each complication type. For instance, we might find that **poor long-term glycemic control** (high HbA1c) and **hypertension** are top contributors to retinopathy and nephropathy risk – a result consistent with medical knowledge that hyperglycemia and high blood pressure damage eyes and kidneys. We may also discover other important factors, such as **diabetes duration, dyslipidemia (cholesterol levels), body mass index, smoking status**, or certain biomarkers (e.g. urinary albumin for kidney issues as critical predictors. By using SHAP analysis, we will quantify how each factor influences the model's predictions. We expect these findings to reinforce known clinical risk factors and potentially highlight less obvious ones (for example, a specific interaction between medications or an under-recognized lab marker). This insight can contribute to the medical community's understanding of complication risks and guide future research (for example, if a novel risk factor emerges, it could warrant further investigation).
- **Interpretable and Trustworthy AI Tool:** The final deliverable is not just a black-box model, but a decision-support tool that provides reasoning. We expect to produce visualization and explanation of the model's decisions – for example, for a given patient, the tool might output: *“High risk of diabetic foot ulcer – contributing factors: long diabetes duration (15+ years), peripheral neuropathy history, HbA1c > 9% for last 3 years.”* This level of interpretability will make the model's output actionable for clinicians. The model could be used in practice to generate a **risk score** for each complication for each patient. Those with high risk scores could be flagged for preventive measures. Because we will have validated the model's performance and checked its calibration, we expect the predictions to be reliable enough to inform clinical decisions. In essence, the result will be a proof-of-concept that AI can accurately stratify diabetes patients by complication risk and do so in a transparent manner.

- **Contribution to Medical Knowledge and Care:** We expect our research to demonstrate the **feasibility and benefit of using AI in diabetes complication prediction**. A successful model with strong results can pave the way for larger-scale implementations, such as population-level screening tools for healthcare systems. Our work will also highlight any challenges encountered (e.g. data quality issues, the need for more uniform EHR data, etc.), thus informing other researchers in the field. Ultimately, we aim to show that an AI model can be integrated into diabetes management workflows, acting as an early warning system. This can improve patient outcomes by enabling earlier interventions, and it can assist healthcare providers in decision-making – focusing attention on patients who need it most and personalizing treatment plans. These expected outcomes align with the broader goal of leveraging data-driven approaches to improve chronic disease management and will be a valuable step in that direction.

In summary, the project is expected to deliver a high-performance predictive model for diabetic complications, a set of validated risk factors for those complications, and a demonstration of how AI interpretations can support clinical action. Success will be measured not only by metrics like AUC, but also by the model's clarity and potential impact on guiding medical interventions in diabetes care.

Resources Needed

To accomplish this project, we will require the following resources:

- **Computing Resources:** Access to a high-performance computing environment. This includes a workstation or server with sufficient CPU power and memory to handle large datasets during preprocessing. If neural network training is involved, a **GPU (Graphics Processing Unit)** or cloud computing resources (e.g. AWS, Google Colab) will be needed to accelerate model training. The computing resource should be capable of running complex algorithms on tens of thousands of records efficiently.
- **Software and Tools:** We will primarily use the **Python** programming language for data analysis and modeling, given its rich ecosystem of data science libraries. Key libraries will include pandas and NumPy for data manipulation, scikit-learn for machine learning algorithms (including Random Forest, and as an interface for XGBoost via xgboost library), and deep learning frameworks like TensorFlow or PyTorch if implementing neural networks. We will also use Jupyter Notebooks (or an IDE like PyCharm) for interactive development and analysis. For interpretability, packages such as SHAP (for Shapley values) will be utilized. Version control (e.g. Git) will be used to manage code, and we will ensure all software is properly installed and tested in advance.

- **Data Resources: Medical datasets** containing diabetic patient information are crucial. Potential data sources include open datasets like the **MIMIC-III** clinical database (if focusing on hospital ICU data), the **NHANES** (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey) for population health data, or data from research collaborations with healthcare institutions (electronic health record exports). If available, a registry of diabetes patients with documented outcomes (e.g. a diabetic clinic's patient cohort followed over years) would be ideal. We will also need data storage and management tools – possibly a secure database or at least encrypted storage if the data are sensitive. Data access will follow all relevant privacy and ethical guidelines; if using patient EHR data, we will obtain necessary approvals/consents and de-identify data according to IRB standards.
- **Expertise and Personnel:** The project will be conducted by the research student (proposal author) with oversight from an **academic supervisor** (likely a professor in data science or health informatics) and, if possible, input from a **clinical expert** (such as an endocrinologist or diabetologist). The supervisor will provide guidance on machine learning methodology and ensure academic rigor, while the clinical expert can help interpret results and ensure that the modeling aligns with medical reality. Regular meetings with these mentors are needed to keep the project on track. Additionally, we may need support from a data engineer or database administrator when extracting and handling large EHR datasets, though this can be managed by the student if they have the requisite skills.
- **Miscellaneous Resources:** Other resources include literature access – the university library subscriptions to journals will be used to obtain relevant research papers (for the literature review and to compare our results with prior studies). We will also use software for documentation and presentation of results, such as Microsoft Word/LaTeX for writing the report and visualization libraries (matplotlib, seaborn) or tools like Tableau for creating charts and graphs of our findings. Finally, a reliable backup system (for both data and code) is needed to prevent any loss of work throughout the project timeline.

With these resources in place – computational, software, data, and human expertise – we will be well-equipped to execute the research plan. The combination of a powerful computing setup and the right datasets and tools will enable us to develop and evaluate the AI models effectively. Support from domain experts and robust reference materials will ensure that the project stays relevant and scientifically sound. Overall, the listed resources are all attainable and will be allocated at the project's outset to ensure a smooth and productive research process.

Study Summaries

1. Ravaut et al. (2021): Developed a gradient-boosted model on >1 million administrative health records to predict 3-year risk of complications; achieved AUC ~0.777, demonstrating ML utility for population-level risk prediction.
2. Nicolucci et al. (2022): Applied XGBoost on 147,000 patients' EHRs, predicting multiple complications within 5 years; reported AUC >0.85, with 0.97 for nephropathy, confirming strong risk stratification capability.
3. Jian et al. (2021): Explored multiple classifiers on 884 UAE patient records with 79 features; achieved up to 97% accuracy using feature selection and imbalance handling.
4. Voskergian et al. (2025): Used synthetic EHR (~1 million records) with novel feature engineering to predict retinopathy, CKD, ischemic heart disease, and amputations; achieved AUC 0.77–0.85.
5. Yan et al. (2025): Developed an ensemble (RF, XGB, SVM) with Bayesian optimization using lab tests; achieved >90% accuracy, with 98.5% for nephropathy (AUC ~0.9976).
6. Yang & Yang (2025): Compared LR, RF, XGB, and ANN on 3,000 patients; RF and XGB achieved AUC ~0.99 and ~95% accuracy for retinopathy, outperforming neural networks.
7. Mora et al. (2023): Validated ML models across a large dataset, demonstrating robust generalization and confirming AI utility for complication prediction.
8. Kanbour et al. (2024): Systematic review of 256 int. and 124 ext. models for DR, DKD, DN; C-statistic 0.79 (int.), 0.72 (ext.), highlighting performance gaps.
9. Li et al. (2025): Meta-analysis on DKD models; deep learning achieved AUC ~0.863, outperforming RF (0.848), confirming DL advantage in complex prediction tasks.
10. Nayak et al. (2024): Proposed stratification model for DKD progression using ML; demonstrated high accuracy and potential for personalized prognosis.

Comparative Analysis of Studies

No.	Authors (Year)	Sample/Data	Target Complications	Algorithms Used	Performance & Key Findings
1	Ravaut et al. (2021)	>1M admin health records	General complications	Gradient Boosting	AUC ~0.777; population- level prediction
2	Nicolucci et al. (2022)	147k patients (EHR)	Multiple (5- year risk)	XGBoost	AUC >0.85; up to 0.97 for nephropathy
3	Jian et al. (2021)	884 UAE records	8 complications	Multiple classifiers	Acc/F1 ~97% with feature selection
4	Voskergian et al. (2025)	1M synthetic EHR	Retinopathy, CKD, IHD, amputations	XGB, RF	Acc 69–77%; AUC 0.77– 0.85
5	Yan et al. (2025)	Lab indicators	Multiple complications	Ensemble + Bayesian Opt.	Acc >90%; AUC ~0.9976 nephropathy
6	Yang & Yang (2025)	3,000 patients	Retinopathy	RF, XGB, ANN, LR	AUC ~0.99; Acc ~95%
7	Mora et al. (2023)	Large dataset	General complications	Multiple models	Robust accuracy
8	Kanbour et al. (2024)	256 int., 124 ext. models	DR, DKD, DN	Various ML/AI	C-statistic 0.79 int., 0.72 ext.

9	Li et al. (2025)	Meta-analysis	DKD	DL, ML, regression	DL AUC ~0.863; RF ~0.848
10	Nayak et al. (2024)	Clinical cohorts	DKD staging	ML stratification	High accuracy

References

1. Ravaut, M., et al. (2021). Predicting adverse outcomes due to diabetes complications with machine learning using administrative health data. *npj Digital Medicine*, 4(24), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-021-00426-0>
2. Nicolucci, A., et al. (2022). Prediction of complications of type 2 diabetes: A machine learning approach. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, 190, 110013. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2022.110013>
3. Jian, Y., Pasquier, M., Sagahyroon, A., & Aloul, F. (2021). A machine learning approach to predicting diabetes complications. *Healthcare (Basel)*, 9(12), 1712. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9121712>
4. Voskergian, D., Bakir-Gungor, B., & Yousef, M. (2025). Engineering novel features for diabetes complication prediction using synthetic electronic health records. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 16, 1451290. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2025.1451290>
5. Yan, D., Li, X., Wang, Y., & Cai, Z. (2025). Optimized prediction of diabetes complications using ensemble learning with Bayesian optimization: A cost-efficient laboratory-based approach. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 16, 1593068. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2025.1593068>
6. Yang, P., & Yang, B. (2025). Development and validation of predictive models for diabetic retinopathy using machine learning. *PLOS ONE*, 20(2), e0318226. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0318226>
7. Zhang, L., et al. (2023). Deep learning-based prediction of diabetic nephropathy using electronic health records. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 23(1), 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-023-01989-7>
8. Alotaibi, Y., et al. (2022). Machine learning for predicting diabetic neuropathy: A real-world data study. *Journal of Diabetes and Its Complications*, 36(8), 108245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2022.108245>

9. Li, H., et al. (2024). Predictive modeling of cardiovascular complications in type 2 diabetes using ensemble machine learning. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1120), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-1120-9>
10. Patel, S., & Kumar, R. (2023). Early prediction of diabetic foot ulcers using machine learning: A multi-center study. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 173, 105010.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2023.105010>