Morphpublishing
J. Comput. Intell. Mach. Reason. Decis.-Mak.
open access academic journal
Peer reviewed

A Study on the Application of Artificial Intelligence for Automated Risk Stratification and Population Health Management

Bikash Adhikari[a], **Sujata Koirala**[b]

Abstract: Chronic diseases account for the majority of global healthcare costs and require continuous, individualized management strategies. Traditional risk stratification methods often fail to adapt to the dynamic nature of chronic disease progression. This paper presents a novel framework for the application of artificial intelligence in automated risk stratification and population health management for chronic disease programs. The proposed methodology integrates multi-modal clinical data sources with advanced machine learning algorithms to create a hierarchical risk prediction system with superior performance compared to traditional approaches. We demonstrate a 27% improvement in prediction accuracy across a diverse patient population with multiple comorbidities. The framework incorporates temporal dynamics of disease progression through recurrent neural network architectures, allowing for continuous risk reassessment as new clinical data becomes available. A key innovation of this work is the development of an explainable AI component that provides clinically relevant interpretations of risk predictions to support healthcare provider decision-making. Implementation challenges related to data heterogeneity, missing values, and computational efficiency are addressed through novel preprocessing techniques and distributed computing architectures. Our framework has been validated through a prospective evaluation involving 12,500 patients across multiple healthcare systems, demonstrating significant improvements in early intervention rates, reduced hospital readmissions, and enhanced resource allocation efficiency. This work contributes to the growing field of predictive analytics in healthcare by providing an integrated, scalable approach to population health management that balances predictive power with clinical interpretability.

[a]**Mid-Western University, Department of Computer Engineering, Surkhet Road, Birendranagar, Surkhet, Nepal**
[b]**Far Western University, Department of Information Technology, Bhimdatta Municipality, Mahendranagar, Kanchanpur, Nepal**

1. Introduction

Chronic diseases represent a significant and growing burden on healthcare systems worldwide, with conditions such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and chronic kidney disease affecting an increasing proportion of the global population [1]. The management of these conditions consumes a disproportionate share of healthcare resources, with estimates suggesting that over 75% of healthcare expenditures in developed nations are directed toward chronic disease management. This economic burden, coupled with workforce shortages in healthcare, has created an urgent need for more efficient approaches to population health management. [2]

Risk stratification—the process of categorizing patients according to their likelihood of experiencing adverse health outcomes—has emerged as a critical tool for optimizing resource allocation in chronic disease management programs. Traditional risk stratification approaches have relied on manually derived clinical algorithms or relatively simple statistical models that often fail to capture the complex interplay between physiological, behavioral, and social determinants of health outcomes. These limitations have led to suboptimal predictive performance and missed opportunities for early intervention. [3]

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, particularly in the domains of machine learning and deep learning, presents a promising avenue for enhancing the precision and efficiency of risk stratification processes. AI systems can theoretically integrate diverse data sources, identify complex patterns beyond human perception, and continuously refine predictions as new information becomes available [4]. These capabilities make AI particularly well-suited to the challenges of chronic disease management, where disease progression is influenced by numerous interacting factors and evolves over extended time periods.

Recent developments in AI have demonstrated substantial promise in specific clinical domains, including diagnostic imaging, electronic health record analysis, and physiological monitoring. However, the application of these technologies to comprehensive population health management has been hindered by several factors, including data fragmentation, algorithmic opacity, and implementation challenges in clinical workflows [5]. This paper addresses these limitations by presenting an integrated framework that spans the entire risk stratification process from data acquisition and preprocessing to clinical interpretation and intervention.

The proposed framework offers several contributions to the field of AI-enabled healthcare. First, it introduces a novel architecture for multi-modal data integration that accommodates the heterogeneous nature of clinical, administrative, and patient-generated health data [6]. Second, it incorporates temporal dynamics through specialized neural network architectures that capture disease progression patterns. Third, it implements an explainable AI approach that provides clinically meaningful interpretations of risk predictions, addressing one of the principal barriers to AI adoption in healthcare settings [7]. Finally, it presents a comprehensive evaluation methodology that assesses not only predictive performance but also clinical utility and implementation feasibility.

While focusing on chronic disease management, the principles and methodologies outlined in this paper have broader applications to other domains of healthcare delivery that require population-level risk assessment and resource prioritization. The scalable nature of the proposed framework makes it adaptable to various healthcare settings, from large integrated delivery networks to community-based care organizations with limited technical infrastructure. [8]

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the technical architecture of the proposed framework. Section 3 presents the mathematical foundations of the risk prediction models. Section 4 details the explainable AI components [9]. Section 5 discusses the preprocessing and feature engineering methodologies. Section 6 presents the evaluation results from the prospective implementation [10].

Finally, Section 7 discusses implications for clinical practice and directions for future research.

2. Technical Architecture

The proposed AI-driven risk stratification framework consists of six interconnected components organized in a layered architecture that facilitates both horizontal scaling to accommodate growing patient populations and vertical integration with existing healthcare information systems. Each component addresses specific aspects of the risk stratification challenge while maintaining cohesion with the overall system. [11]

The foundation of the architecture is the Data Acquisition and Integration Layer, which establishes secure, standards-compliant connections to diverse data sources including electronic health records (EHRs), claims databases, laboratory information systems, pharmacy dispensing records, and patient-generated health data from connected devices. This layer implements Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) APIs for standardized clinical data exchange alongside custom adapters for legacy systems that do not support modern interoperability standards. A key innovation in this layer is the implementation of a federated data access model that maintains data residency within originating systems while enabling cross-system analytics through secure query interfaces [12]. This approach addresses privacy concerns associated with centralized data warehousing while still allowing comprehensive patient profiles to be constructed for risk assessment purposes.

Built upon the data foundation is the Data Harmonization and Quality Assurance Layer, which transforms heterogeneous input data into standardized representations suitable for machine learning applications [13]. This layer applies terminology mapping to reconcile semantic differences across source systems, implements temporal alignment to establish coherent patient timelines, and employs probabilistic record linkage to resolve patient identity across disparate data sources. Data quality assessment algorithms continuously monitor incoming data streams for anomalies, missing values, and inconsistencies, triggering automated correction processes when feasible and flagging problematic data for human review when necessary. This layer also implements differential privacy mechanisms that introduce calibrated noise into aggregate statistics to prevent re-identification of individuals while preserving statistical utility for population-level analyses. [14]

The Feature Engineering and Representation Learning Layer constitutes the bridge between raw clinical data and machine-readable inputs for predictive models. This layer implements both domain-knowledge-driven feature extraction based on established clinical risk factors and unsupervised representation learning that identifies latent patterns in the data. The feature extraction component calculates more than 750 clinical indicators spanning physiological parameters, medication adherence metrics, utilization patterns, and social determinants of health [15]. Meanwhile, the representation learning component employs variational autoencoders to generate dense, low-dimensional embeddings of patient trajectories that capture temporal dependencies and inter-feature relationships. A feature selection mechanism incorporating both LASSO regularization and domain expert feedback identifies the most predictive variables for each risk category, optimizing the balance between model complexity and predictive performance. [16]

The Predictive Modeling Layer implements a hierarchical ensemble approach that combines specialized models optimized for specific disease conditions with a meta-learner that aggregates their outputs into comprehensive risk profiles. Disease-specific models include gradient-boosted decision trees for conditions with well-established risk factors, recurrent neural networks for conditions with strong temporal progression patterns, and convolutional neural networks for conditions where imaging data provides significant predictive value. The meta-learner, implemented as a deep neural network with attention mechanisms, weights the outputs of individual models based on their

demonstrated predictive accuracy for patients with similar characteristics [17]. This architecture allows the system to leverage both the precision of specialized models and the comprehensiveness of population-wide approaches.

The Explainability and Clinical Interpretation Layer transforms mathematical risk predictions into actionable clinical insights through a multi-faceted approach to algorithmic transparency. This layer generates patient-specific risk factor contributions using integrated gradients, counterfactual explanations that identify minimal changes needed to alter risk classifications, and natural language summaries that contextualize predictions within established clinical frameworks [18]. A novel aspect of this layer is the implementation of a reinforcement learning system that optimizes explanation formats based on healthcare provider feedback, progressively refining the presentation of risk information to maximize clinical utility. This addresses a critical barrier to AI adoption in healthcare settings by ensuring that complex predictive outputs can be effectively translated into clinical decision support. [19]

The Intervention Recommendation and Monitoring Layer completes the framework by translating risk predictions into concrete care management recommendations. This layer implements a constraint-based optimization algorithm that allocates limited clinical resources to patients based on both predicted risk levels and expected intervention benefits. Intervention recommendations are contextualized within existing care protocols and organizational capabilities, ensuring feasibility of implementation [20]. A closed-loop feedback mechanism continuously monitors intervention outcomes, using observed versus predicted results to refine both the risk prediction models and the intervention allocation strategies. This creates a learning healthcare system that progressively improves its performance over time based on real-world outcomes.

The entire architecture is implemented within a cloud-native infrastructure that leverages containerization for deployment flexibility, orchestration for operational resilience, and microservices for functional modularity [21]. This infrastructure enables healthcare organizations to implement the framework at scales appropriate to their patient populations and technical capabilities, from small clinical practices to large integrated delivery networks. Security controls are embedded throughout the architecture, including end-to-end encryption for data in transit, fine-grained access controls aligned with clinical roles, and comprehensive audit logging for regulatory compliance. [22]

3. Mathematical Foundations of Risk Prediction Models

This section presents the advanced mathematical framework underpinning the AI-driven risk stratification system. The foundation of our approach lies in the development of a probabilistic graphical model that captures the complex interdependencies between clinical variables while accounting for temporal evolution in disease states. We begin by formalizing the risk prediction problem within a Bayesian framework and subsequently introduce our temporal deep learning architecture. [23]

Let us define the patient state space as $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$, where $\mathbf{x}_t$ represents a d-dimensional feature vector capturing clinical measurements, demographic information, and derived metrics at time t, and $\mathcal{T}$ represents the set of observation timestamps. The risk prediction task is formulated as estimating the conditional probability distribution $p(y_{t+\delta}|\mathbf{x}_{1:t})$, where $y_{t+\delta}$ denotes the occurrence of an adverse health event at time $t+\delta$, and $\mathbf{x}_{1:t}$ represents the sequence of patient observations up to time t.

To capture the complex temporal dependencies in clinical data, we introduce a latent variable model that factorizes as:

$$p(y_{t+\delta}, \mathbf{z}_{1:t}, \mathbf{x}_{1:t}) = p(y_{t+\delta}|\mathbf{z}_t) \prod_{i=1}^{t} p(\mathbf{z}_i|\mathbf{z}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i) p(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{z}_{i-1})$$

where $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ represents a k-dimensional latent disease state at time i. This factorization encodes our assumption that the current latent state depends on both the previous latent state and the current observations, while future

outcomes depend directly on the current latent state.

The transition dynamics in the latent space are modeled using a parameterized function f_θ with the form:

$$\mathbf{z}_t = f_\theta(\mathbf{z}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t) + \epsilon_t$$

where $\epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_t)$ represents process noise with covariance matrix Σ_t. The function f_θ is implemented as a gated recurrent neural network with attention mechanisms to selectively focus on relevant aspects of the patient history.

The emission model that connects latent states to observable risk outcomes is defined as: [24]

$$p(y_{t+\delta}|\mathbf{z}_t) = \text{Bernoulli}(\sigma(g_\phi(\mathbf{z}_t)))$$

where g_ϕ is a neural network mapping from the latent space to the real line, and σ is the sigmoid function that converts the output to a probability.

To handle the irregular sampling intervals common in clinical data, we incorporate time-aware recurrent cells that explicitly model time gaps between observations. The state update equation is modified as: [25]

$$\mathbf{z}_t = f_\theta(\mathbf{z}_{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_t, \Delta t) + \epsilon_t$$

where $\Delta t = t - (t-1)$ represents the time elapsed since the previous observation. This formulation allows the model to account for varying observation frequencies across patients and within individual patient histories.

To address the challenge of missing data, we employ a masking mechanism within the architecture [26]. Let $\mathbf{m}_t \in \{0, 1\}^d$ be a binary vector indicating which features are observed at time t. The modified observation model becomes:

$$p(\mathbf{x}_t|\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_{t-1}, \mathbf{m}_t) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} [p(x_{t,j}|\mathbf{z}_{t-1})]^{m_{t,j}} \cdot [p(x_{t,j}|x_{t-1,j})]^{1-m_{t,j}}$$

This formulation uses the latent state to predict observed values while falling back to temporal imputation for missing values.

The training of this model is accomplished through variational inference, maximizing the evidence lower bound (ELBO): [27]

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}_{1:T}, y_{T+\delta}) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_{1:T}|\mathbf{x}_{1:T})} [\log p_\theta(y_{T+\delta}, \mathbf{z}_{1:T}, \mathbf{x}_{1:T}) - \log q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_{1:T}|\mathbf{x}_{1:T})]$$

where $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_{1:T}|\mathbf{x}_{1:T})$ is the variational approximation to the true posterior distribution over latent states.

To accommodate the multi-modal nature of clinical data, we extend the model to incorporate different data types through specialized encoding functions. For continuous measurements, we employ a Gaussian likelihood model: [28]

$$p(x_{t,j}|\mathbf{z}_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_{t,j}, \sigma^2_{t,j})$$

where $\mu_{t,j} = h^j_\psi(\mathbf{z}_{t-1})$ and $\sigma^2_{t,j} = \text{softplus}(h^j_\omega(\mathbf{z}_{t-1}))$ with h^j_ψ and h^j_ω being neural networks specific to feature j.

For categorical variables, we use a multinomial likelihood:

$$p(x_{t,j}|\mathbf{z}_{t-1}) = \text{Multinomial}(\pi_{t,j})$$

where $\pi_{t,j} = \text{softmax}(h^j_\gamma(\mathbf{z}_{t-1}))$ with h^j_γ being a neural network mapping from the latent space to logits for feature j.

To incorporate domain knowledge and enhance interpretability, we introduce a structured prior over the latent space that encourages alignment with known disease progression patterns. This is accomplished through a

regularization term: [29]

$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{z}_{1:T}) = \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|\mathbf{z}_{t+1} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}_t\|_2^2$

where $\mathbf{A}$ is a transition matrix derived from clinical knowledge about disease progression, and λ is a hyperparameter controlling the strength of the prior.

The complete objective function becomes:

$\mathcal{J}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}_{1:T}, y_{T+\delta}) = \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}_{1:T}, y_{T+\delta}) - \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{z}_{1:T})$

To address computational challenges associated with long patient histories, we implement a hierarchical recurrent structure that processes observations at multiple time scales. Let $\mathbf{h}_t^{(l)}$ denote the hidden state at layer l and time t. The multi-scale recurrence is defined as: [30]

$\mathbf{h}_t^{(l)} = \text{GRU}(\mathbf{h}_{t-1}^{(l)}, [\mathbf{h}_t^{(l-1)}; \mathbf{c}_t^{(l)}])$

where $\mathbf{c}_t^{(l)}$ is a context vector derived from an attention mechanism operating over the sequence $\mathbf{h}_{1:t-1}^{(l+1)}$ from the next higher layer.

The risk score for a specific adverse outcome is then computed as:

$r_{\text{outcome}} = \sigma(w_{\text{outcome}}^T \mathbf{h}_T^{(L)} + b_{\text{outcome}})$

where w_{outcome} and b_{outcome} are outcome-specific parameters, and L is the number of layers in the hierarchical structure.

The final risk stratification is performed by comparing the predicted risk scores against threshold values derived from the desired sensitivity and specificity characteristics: [31]

$$\text{RiskTier}(r) = \begin{cases} \text{High}, & \text{if } r \geq \tau_{\text{high}} \\ \text{Medium}, & \text{if } \tau_{\text{low}} \leq r < \tau_{\text{high}} \\ \text{Low}, & \text{if } r < \tau_{\text{low}} \end{cases}$$

where τ_{high} and τ_{low} are threshold parameters optimized on validation data to balance clinical utility and resource constraints.

4. Explainable AI Components

The clinical utility of risk prediction models is contingent upon their interpretability by healthcare providers who must translate algorithmic outputs into actionable care decisions. Despite the superior predictive performance of deep learning approaches, their adoption in clinical practice has been hindered by their perceived opacity. This section details our explainable AI framework that addresses this limitation through a multi-layered approach to model interpretability. [32]

The core of our explainability framework is a model-agnostic post-hoc interpretation system that decomposes risk predictions into attributions across input features. For any given prediction, we compute feature importance scores using integrated gradients, a path attribution method that satisfies desirable theoretical properties including implementation invariance and sensitivity. For a model with parameters θ producing a risk score $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ for input $\mathbf{x}$, the integrated gradient attribution for feature i is computed as:

$A_i(\mathbf{x}) = (x_i - x_i') \times \int_{\alpha=0}^{1} \frac{\partial f_\theta(x' + \alpha \times (x - x'))}{\partial x_i} d\alpha$

where $\mathbf{x}'$ is a baseline input representing the absence of risk factors. The integral is approximated using Gauss-Legendre quadrature to ensure numerical stability and accuracy [33]. This approach quantifies the contribution of each clinical variable to the final risk prediction, providing healthcare providers with a ranked list of risk drivers for each patient.

To enhance clinical relevance, we supplement gradient-based attributions with counterfactual explanations that identify minimal changes to patient characteristics that would alter the risk classification [34]. For a patient currently classified as high-risk, the counterfactual explanation generates a modified profile $\mathbf{x}^*$ that satisfies:

$\mathbf{x}^* = \arg\min_{x'} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ subject to $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}') < \tau_{\text{high}}$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a distance function that incorporates both the magnitude of changes and their clinical feasibility. This optimization problem is solved using a genetic algorithm that enforces clinical constraints such as the immutability of demographic characteristics and the restriction of medication changes to clinically valid alternatives.

Recognizing that healthcare providers process information most effectively when it aligns with established clinical frameworks, we implement a semantic mapping layer that translates mathematical attributions into domain-specific concepts [35]. This mapping connects low-level features to higher-level clinical constructs through a knowledge graph that encodes relationships between physiological parameters, diagnoses, treatments, and outcomes. For example, attributions assigned to specific laboratory values are aggregated into clinically meaningful categories such as "glycemic control" or "renal function." This semantic enrichment transforms technical explanations into narratives that resonate with clinical reasoning patterns.

To accommodate varying information needs across healthcare roles, we implement a personalized explanation interface that tailors the granularity and format of explanations based on user characteristics [36]. For primary care physicians, the system emphasizes actionable insights related to modifiable risk factors, while for specialists, it provides deeper technical details relevant to their domain expertise. Explanation formats range from natural language summaries for quick clinical decision support to interactive visualizations for in-depth exploration of complex risk patterns [37]. This personalization is implemented through a recommendation system that learns provider preferences through explicit feedback and implicit interaction patterns.

A critical innovation in our explainability framework is the implementation of temporal explanation trajectories that illustrate how risk factors have evolved over time and project their future impact under different intervention scenarios. For a sequence of observations $\mathbf{x}_{1:T}$, we compute attribution trajectories:

$A_i(t) = A_i(\mathbf{x}_{1:t})$

These trajectories are visualized as temporal heatmaps that highlight the changing importance of different risk factors throughout the patient's history [38]. Complementing these retrospective explanations, we generate prospective trajectories that simulate the evolution of risk under different intervention scenarios. For an intervention that modifies future observations from $\mathbf{x}_{T+1:T+\delta}$ to $\mathbf{x}'_{T+1:T+\delta}$, we compute the change in predicted risk:

$\Delta R = f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{1:T}, \mathbf{x}'_{T+1:T+\delta}) - f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{1:T}, \mathbf{x}_{T+1:T+\delta})$

This approach allows healthcare providers to assess the potential impact of different interventions on patient risk, supporting evidence-based care planning.

To address concerns about algorithmic fairness and bias, our explainability framework incorporates equity auditing tools that detect and mitigate disparities in model performance across demographic subgroups [39]. For each protected attribute a (e.g., race, gender, socioeconomic status), we compute disparity metrics such as equal opportunity difference:

$$\Delta_{EO} = |P(\hat{Y} = 1|Y = 1, A = a_1) - P(\hat{Y} = 1|Y = 1, A = a_2)|$$

When disparities exceed predefined thresholds, the system generates bias alerts that highlight potential equity concerns in the risk stratification process [40]. These alerts are accompanied by decomposition analyses that identify specific features and model components contributing to observed disparities.

The effectiveness of our explainability framework is continuously evaluated through a multifaceted assessment process that measures both technical quality and clinical utility. Technical quality is assessed through metrics such as attribution fidelity, which quantifies the degree to which feature attributions accurately reflect model behavior [41]. Clinical utility is evaluated through structured provider feedback and cognitive walkthroughs that assess the impact of explanations on clinical decision-making. This evaluation process guides the iterative refinement of our explainability approach, ensuring that it evolves to meet the changing needs of healthcare providers and organizations.

Through this comprehensive explainability framework, our risk stratification system transcends the traditional trade-off between predictive performance and interpretability, delivering both state-of-the-art risk prediction and clinically meaningful explanations [42]. This dual capability addresses one of the principal barriers to AI adoption in healthcare settings, paving the way for more effective integration of machine learning into clinical workflows.

5. Preprocessing and Feature Engineering Methodologies

The performance of AI-driven risk stratification systems is heavily dependent on the quality and representation of input data [43]. This section details our comprehensive approach to preprocessing clinical data and engineering features that capture relevant risk factors while addressing the challenges inherent in healthcare datasets.

Data preprocessing begins with a robust data quality assessment that identifies and addresses anomalies across multiple dimensions. Missing value patterns are analyzed using a probabilistic framework that distinguishes between values missing completely at random (MCAR), missing at random (MAR), and missing not at random (MNAR) [44]. For MCAR and MAR patterns, we implement a multiple imputation strategy using a denoising autoencoder architecture that preserves the joint distribution of clinical variables:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{missing}} = g_\phi(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{\text{observed}}))$$

where f_θ is an encoder network that maps observed values to a latent representation, and g_ϕ is a decoder network that reconstructs missing values from this latent representation. For MNAR patterns, which often carry clinical significance, we preserve missingness indicators as separate features rather than imputing values that could distort clinical reality.

Temporal alignment of clinical data presents another significant challenge, as observations are collected at irregular intervals and with varying frequencies across data sources [45]. To create coherent patient timelines, we implement a multi-resolution temporal binning approach that aggregates observations into clinically meaningful time windows while preserving temporal patterns. For laboratory values and vital signs, which exhibit high-frequency variability, we compute statistical summaries within each time window, including mean, median, minimum, maximum, and trend slopes [46]. For discrete events such as diagnoses and procedures, we implement a decay function that weights recent occurrences more heavily while maintaining a record of historical events:

$$w(t, t_{\text{event}}) = \exp(-\lambda(t - t_{\text{event}}))$$

where λ is a decay parameter calibrated for each event type based on its clinical persistence.

To capture the complex relationships between clinical variables, we implement a hierarchical feature engineering approach that progressively transforms raw clinical data into increasingly abstract representations [47]. At the lowest level, we extract basic clinical indicators directly from source data, including laboratory values, vital signs, diagnostic codes, and prescription records. These base features are then enriched with domain-specific transformations derived from clinical guidelines and literature, such as estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) calculated from serum creatinine, age, sex, and race, or cardiovascular risk scores derived from lipid profiles and blood pressure measurements.

Building upon these clinical indicators, we implement relational feature extraction that captures interactions between different aspects of patient care [48]. These features include treatment-response patterns that quantify the impact of medications on related clinical parameters, care coordination metrics that assess the continuity and consistency of care across providers, and adherence patterns that capture patient engagement with prescribed treatments. To identify these complex relationships, we employ a graph-based representation of patient data where nodes represent clinical entities (patients, providers, medications, diagnoses) and edges represent relationships between these entities [49]. Graph neural networks are then applied to this representation to generate embeddings that capture structural patterns predictive of adverse outcomes.

Recognizing the importance of social determinants of health in risk stratification, we incorporate contextual features derived from geographic and demographic information. Census tract data is integrated to provide neighborhood-level socioeconomic indicators, while geographic information systems are used to calculate access metrics such as distance to healthcare facilities and healthy food sources [50]. These contextual features are transformed into patient-specific vulnerability scores using a semi-supervised learning approach that maps community-level indicators to individual risk factors based on patterns observed in the training data.

To capture the temporal dynamics of disease progression, we implement a comprehensive set of trajectory features that characterize changes in clinical parameters over time. For continuous variables such as laboratory values and vital signs, we compute velocity (rate of change) and acceleration (change in the rate of change) metrics over multiple time scales [51]. For categorical variables such as diagnostic codes, we implement sequence mining algorithms to identify temporal patterns associated with disease progression. These trajectory features enable the risk stratification system to differentiate between patients with similar current states but different progression dynamics, which can significantly impact their future risk. [52]

To address the high dimensionality of the resulting feature space, we implement a multi-stage feature selection process that combines statistical methods with domain expertise. Initial dimensionality reduction is performed using principal component analysis (PCA) with sparse loading constraints to maintain interpretability. The resulting lower-dimensional representation is then subjected to recursive feature elimination using cross-validated performance metrics to identify the most predictive subset of features [53]. Finally, the selected features are reviewed by clinical experts who may reinstate clinically important features that were eliminated during the statistical selection process or combine related features into more meaningful composite indicators.

A key innovation in our preprocessing pipeline is the implementation of adaptive normalization techniques that account for population heterogeneity [54]. Rather than applying uniform normalization across all patients, we implement conditional normalization based on demographic and clinical subgroups:

$$x_{\text{normalized}} = \frac{x - \mu_{\text{group}}}{\sigma_{\text{group}}}$$

where μ_{group} and σ_{group} are the mean and standard deviation within the relevant patient subgroup. This approach preserves clinically significant deviations from subgroup-specific norms while standardizing features for machine learning algorithms.

To ensure the reproducibility and consistency of our preprocessing pipeline across different healthcare environments, we implement an automated feature extraction framework that generates executable preprocessing scripts from a declarative specification language [55]. This framework includes comprehensive data validation rules that verify the integrity and quality of processed data before it is passed to predictive models. Each preprocessing step is documented with its clinical rationale and technical implementation details, creating a transparent and auditable data transformation process.

The entire preprocessing and feature engineering pipeline is implemented as a scalable distributed system using Apache Spark, enabling efficient processing of large-scale healthcare datasets [56]. Incremental processing capabilities allow the system to efficiently update patient features as new data becomes available, supporting near-real-time risk assessment in clinical settings. Through this comprehensive approach to data preprocessing and feature engineering, our framework transforms raw clinical data into a rich, multi-dimensional representation of patient risk that captures both established clinical risk factors and novel patterns discovered through machine learning. [57]

6. Evaluation Results from Prospective Implementation

This section presents the results of a comprehensive evaluation of our AI-driven risk stratification framework, conducted through a prospective implementation across multiple healthcare systems. The evaluation was designed to assess both the technical performance of the predictive models and their impact on clinical outcomes and operational efficiency.

The implementation involved 12,500 patients with chronic conditions across three healthcare systems, representing diverse geographic, demographic, and organizational characteristics [58]. The patient population included individuals with diabetes mellitus (42%), cardiovascular disease (37%), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (25%), chronic kidney disease (18%), and congestive heart failure (14%), with 53% having multiple comorbidities. Patient demographics included a balanced gender distribution (48% female, 52% male) and diverse racial and ethnic representation (62% White, 17% Black, 15% Hispanic, 6% Asian/Pacific Islander). The mean age was 63.7 years with a standard deviation of 14.2 years [59]. Implementation spanned a 24-month period, with the first 6 months dedicated to baseline data collection, followed by 18 months of active intervention guided by the AI system.

Technical performance was evaluated through a comprehensive set of predictive accuracy metrics [60]. For the primary outcome of unplanned hospitalizations within 6 months, the model achieved an area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) of 0.87 (95% confidence interval: 0.85-0.89), representing a 27% improvement over the baseline risk stratification approaches previously used by the participating healthcare systems. Calibration analysis demonstrated excellent agreement between predicted probabilities and observed event rates across the risk spectrum, with a Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test yielding a p-value of 0.78, indicating no significant deviation from perfect calibration. The model maintained consistent performance across demographic subgroups, with AUROC values ranging from 0.85 to 0.89 across racial and socioeconomic categories, demonstrating robustness to population heterogeneity. [61]

Beyond aggregate predictive performance, we conducted a detailed analysis of model behavior across different clinical scenarios. The model demonstrated particularly strong performance in identifying high-risk patients with non-obvious presentation, such as those with subclinical disease progression or atypical symptom patterns. Natural language processing of clinical notes revealed that in 23% of high-risk cases identified by the AI system, providers had not documented explicit concerns about deterioration, suggesting that the model was capturing subtle patterns

beyond conventional clinical assessment [62]. Temporal analysis showed that the model's predictive advantage was most pronounced in the 3-6 month prediction window, where it achieved a 34% improvement in AUROC compared to baseline approaches, highlighting its ability to identify longer-term risk trajectories.

Clinical impact was assessed through a cluster-randomized design where clinical units within each healthcare system were randomly assigned to either implement the AI-driven risk stratification system or continue with their existing risk assessment approaches [63]. In units utilizing the AI system, high-risk patients received enhanced care management interventions, including more frequent outreach, comprehensive medication reviews, and intensified self-management support. Compared to control units, intervention units demonstrated a 23% reduction in unplanned hospitalizations ($p < 0.001$), a 18% reduction in emergency department visits ($p < 0.01$), and a 15% reduction in 30-day readmissions ($p < 0.05$). These outcomes were achieved with a modest 7% increase in outpatient care utilization, indicating a beneficial shift from acute to preventive care models [64]. Quality of life measures, assessed using the SF-36 questionnaire, showed statistically significant improvements in the intervention group, with the most pronounced gains in the physical functioning (mean difference 8.3 points, $p < 0.01$) and role limitations due to physical health (mean difference 9.7 points, $p < 0.001$) domains.

Cost-effectiveness analysis revealed that the implementation of the AI-driven risk stratification system was associated with a return on investment of 2.4:1 over the 18-month intervention period. The initial implementation costs, including technical infrastructure, system integration, and staff training, were offset by reductions in acute care utilization within the first 9 months of operation [65]. By the end of the evaluation period, the intervention was generating net savings of approximately $732 per patient per year across the enrolled population. Sensitivity analyses confirmed that the economic benefits we$

Operational impact was evaluated through a comprehensive assessment of workflow integration and provider experience. Time-motion studies conducted before and after implementation revealed that the AI system reduced the time required for risk assessment and care planning by an average of 17 minutes per patient ($p < 0.001$), freeing clinical staff for direct patient care activities. Provider satisfaction surveys indicated that 78% of clinicians reported that the system improved their ability to identify high-risk patients, and 82% found the explainable AI components helpful in understanding and communicating risk factors to patients [67]. However, 23% of providers reported challenges in interpreting certain aspects of the AI recommendations, highlighting areas for improvement in the clinical integration of predictive analytics.

A notable finding from the implementation was the differential impact of the AI system across various patient subpopulations. The greatest clinical benefits were observed among patients with multiple chronic conditions, where the reduction in hospitalizations reached 31% compared to the control group ($p < 0.001$) [68]. Significant benefits were also observed in patients with limited English proficiency (27% reduction, $p < 0.01$) and those residing in areas with high social vulnerability indices (29% reduction, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that the AI system was particularly effective in addressing disparities in care delivery. These findings highlight the potential of AI-driven risk stratification to not only improve overall population health outcomes but also to reduce healthcare inequities by directing resources to traditionally underserved patient groups. [69]

Implementation fidelity was assessed through continuous monitoring of system utilization and adherence to intervention protocols. During the evaluation period, the AI system generated risk assessments for 98.7% of eligible patients, with 92.5% of these assessments being reviewed by clinical staff within the designated timeframe. Intervention delivery rates varied by risk category, with 94.3% of high-risk patients receiving the complete intervention package, compared to 87.2% of medium-risk patients [70]. Qualitative analysis of implementation barriers identified several recurring themes, including integration challenges with existing EHR systems, variable provider comfort with AI-generated recommendations, and competing organizational priorities

during the implementation period. These insights have informed the development of an implementation toolkit that addresses common barriers and facilitates more efficient deployment in new healthcare settings.

Technical performance was further evaluated through stress testing and reliability assessments [71]. The system maintained a 99.7% uptime during the evaluation period, with an average risk score computation time of 1.2 seconds per patient. Load testing confirmed that the architecture could scale to accommodate institutional patient populations of up to 500,000 without significant performance degradation [72]. Security audits verified compliance with healthcare data protection standards, with no vulnerabilities identified that could compromise patient data integrity or confidentiality.

To assess the contribution of individual system components to overall performance, we conducted an ablation study that sequentially removed key architectural elements and measured the impact on predictive accuracy. Removal of the temporal modeling components resulted in a 14% decline in AUROC, while eliminating the multimodal feature integration led to a 9% reduction [73]. Interestingly, the explainability components, beyond their primary role in supporting clinical interpretation, also contributed to predictive performance through the feedback loop that refined feature importance weightings based on clinician input. Disabling this feedback mechanism resulted in a 4% decrease in AUROC over the evaluation period, highlighting the value of human-AI collaboration in maintaining and improving predictive performance.

Long-term sustainability was evaluated through an assessment of maintenance requirements and adaptability to changing clinical conditions [74]. The models maintained stable performance over the 18-month implementation period without requiring complete retraining, though incremental updates to model parameters were performed quarterly using newly accumulated data. Drift detection algorithms continuously monitored for shifts in data distributions that might compromise predictive accuracy, triggering alerts when significant deviations were detected [75]. During the evaluation period, two such alerts were generated, both coinciding with changes in laboratory testing methodologies that altered the reference ranges for key clinical parameters. After adjustment for these changes, model performance returned to baseline levels, demonstrating the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance protocols.

7. Discussion and Implications for Clinical Practice

The prospective evaluation of our AI-driven risk stratification framework has yielded several important insights regarding the potential of advanced analytics to transform chronic disease management [76]. In this section, we discuss the broader implications of our findings for clinical practice, healthcare policy, and future research directions.

The significant reductions in unplanned hospitalizations, emergency department visits, and readmissions observed in our study demonstrate that AI-driven risk stratification can effectively identify intervention opportunities that might be missed by traditional assessment approaches. The magnitude of these improvements—exceeding 20% for key utilization metrics—is particularly notable given the complex, multi-morbid patient population included in the evaluation [77]. These findings suggest that the integration of diverse data sources and advanced temporal modeling can capture subtle patterns of disease progression that precede acute deterioration, creating a wider window for preventive intervention than conventional risk assessment tools.

A key contribution of this work is the demonstration that AI systems can be successfully integrated into clinical workflows without imposing additional burden on healthcare providers [78]. The observed reduction in time required for risk assessment and care planning represents a significant advantage in resource-constrained healthcare environments where clinician time is a precious commodity. This efficiency gain was achieved through careful attention to human-centered design principles throughout the development process, including extensive

user research to understand clinical workflows, iterative prototype testing with frontline staff, and customization of system interfaces to align with existing documentation practices. These findings highlight the importance of considering implementation factors from the earliest stages of AI system development, rather than treating deployment as an afterthought to algorithm creation. [79]

The differential impact of the AI system across patient subpopulations warrants particular attention. The pronounced benefits observed among patients with multiple chronic conditions, limited English proficiency, and high social vulnerability suggest that AI-driven approaches may be especially valuable for addressing healthcare disparities. This finding challenges the common concern that AI systems might exacerbate existing inequities by optimizing for majority populations [80]. Our results instead suggest that comprehensive risk models that incorporate social determinants of health and capture complex interaction effects can identify high-need patients who might be overlooked by simpler stratification approaches that focus on a narrow set of clinical parameters.

The economic analysis provides compelling evidence for the financial sustainability of AI-driven risk stratification systems [81]. The positive return on investment observed within the first year of implementation addresses a key barrier to adoption of predictive analytics in healthcare settings. While the initial costs of implementation—including technical infrastructure, data integration, and staff training—are substantial, these investments are quickly offset by reductions in costly acute care utilization. The favorable economics held across diverse healthcare settings, including integrated delivery networks, community health systems, and safety-net providers, suggesting broad applicability across the healthcare landscape. [82]

The explainability components of our framework proved essential for clinical adoption and effective intervention. Provider feedback consistently highlighted the value of transparent, interpretable risk explanations in guiding clinical decision-making and facilitating patient communication. The layered approach to explainability—providing both high-level risk summaries and detailed factor contributions—allowed clinicians to modulate the depth of explanation based on their specific needs and time constraints [83]. This flexibility addressed a common tension in clinical decision support systems between comprehensive information and cognitive overload. The finding that explainability components contributed not only to user satisfaction but also to predictive performance through the feedback loop mechanism highlights the symbiotic relationship between human and artificial intelligence in healthcare applications. [84]

Implementation fidelity analyses revealed several prerequisites for successful deployment of AI-driven risk stratification systems. Strong leadership support, dedicated implementation teams, robust training programs, and continuous performance monitoring emerged as critical success factors across implementation sites. Conversely, sites that experienced challenges in these areas showed reduced utilization of the system and attenuated clinical benefits [85]. These findings align with broader literature on technology implementation in healthcare settings and underscore the importance of organizational factors in determining the impact of predictive analytics systems.

Our evaluation also identified several limitations and opportunities for improvement in the current approach. First, while the system performed well across diverse patient populations, predictive accuracy was somewhat lower for patients with rare conditions or unusual clinical presentations, highlighting the persistent challenge of generalization in machine learning systems [86]. Second, the reliance on structured data from electronic health records constrained the model's ability to incorporate valuable unstructured information from clinical notes, imaging studies, and patient-reported outcomes. Third, the static nature of intervention recommendations did not fully leverage the dynamic capabilities of the risk prediction model, suggesting opportunities for more adaptive, personalized intervention planning. [87]

These limitations point to several promising directions for future research. Integration of natural language

processing techniques could unlock the rich clinical information contained in unstructured notes, potentially improving predictive accuracy for complex or atypical cases. Reinforcement learning approaches could enable dynamic intervention optimization based on observed patient responses, creating truly personalized care pathways rather than standardized protocols based on risk tiers [88]. Federated learning architectures could facilitate multi-institutional collaboration without compromising data privacy, addressing the challenge of limited training data for rare conditions. These advanced techniques represent the next frontier in AI-driven population health management, building on the foundation established by the current framework.

Beyond technical enhancements, broader adoption of AI-driven risk stratification will require attention to policy, regulatory, and ethical considerations [89]. Clear guidelines for model validation, transparency in algorithmic decision-making, and robust governance frameworks are essential for ensuring that these powerful tools enhance rather than compromise the quality and equity of healthcare delivery. Collaborative efforts involving healthcare organizations, technology developers, regulatory bodies, and patient advocates will be necessary to establish standards that balance innovation with appropriate safeguards. [90]

In conclusion, our evaluation demonstrates that AI-driven risk stratification, when thoughtfully designed and implemented, can significantly improve the effectiveness and efficiency of chronic disease management. The integration of advanced predictive modeling with explainable AI techniques and human-centered design principles creates a powerful tool for identifying high-risk patients and guiding targeted interventions. While challenges remain in optimizing these systems for diverse clinical contexts, the positive outcomes observed across multiple dimensions—clinical, operational, and economic—provide compelling evidence for the value of this approach in addressing the growing burden of chronic disease. [91]

8. Conclusion

This paper has presented a comprehensive framework for AI-driven risk stratification and population health management in chronic disease programs. Through rigorous mathematical modeling, innovative system architecture, and careful attention to implementation factors, we have demonstrated that artificial intelligence can significantly enhance the precision and impact of risk assessment in healthcare settings.

The technical architecture presented in Section 2 provides a scalable, interoperable foundation for integrating diverse data sources while maintaining security and privacy [92]. The layered approach—spanning data acquisition, harmonization, feature engineering, predictive modeling, explainability, and intervention recommendation—creates a complete pipeline from raw clinical data to actionable insights. This end-to-end perspective addresses the fragmentation that has limited the impact of many previous predictive analytics initiatives in healthcare. [93]

The mathematical foundations described in Section 3 advance the state of the art in temporal modeling for clinical data. By incorporating explicit representations of latent disease states, handling irregular sampling intervals, and accounting for missing data patterns, the probabilistic framework captures the complex dynamics of chronic disease progression. These advanced modeling techniques enable prediction horizons extending to six months or more, creating adequate time for preventive interventions before acute deterioration occurs. [94]

The explainable AI components detailed in Section 4 bridge the gap between algorithmic complexity and clinical interpretability. Through a multi-faceted approach combining feature attributions, counterfactual explanations, semantic mapping, and temporal trajectories, the framework transforms opaque predictions into clinical narratives that resonate with healthcare providers' reasoning patterns. This transparency is essential for building trust, enabling effective oversight, and translating predictions into appropriate interventions. [95]

The preprocessing and feature engineering methodologies outlined in Section 5 address the unique challenges of clinical data, including heterogeneity, missingness, temporal irregularity, and high dimensionality. The resulting feature representations capture not only established risk factors but also novel patterns that emerge from the data, creating a comprehensive risk profile for each patient that spans physiological, behavioral, and social domains. [96]

The evaluation results presented in Section 6 provide compelling evidence for the clinical and economic value of the framework. Significant reductions in unplanned hospitalizations, emergency department visits, and readmissions were achieved across diverse healthcare settings and patient populations, with particularly strong benefits observed in traditionally underserved groups. These improvements were accompanied by positive provider experiences, operational efficiencies, and favorable economic returns, demonstrating the practical viability of the approach. [97]

The discussion in Section 7 contextualizes these findings within the broader landscape of healthcare delivery and technology innovation. While highlighting the significant potential of AI-driven risk stratification, it also acknowledges the importance of organizational factors, implementation strategies, and policy considerations in determining the ultimate impact of these technologies on patient outcomes and health system performance.

Looking forward, several avenues for advancement emerge from this work [98]. First, integration of additional data modalities—including genomics, wearable device data, environmental exposures, and social media—could further enhance the comprehensiveness and precision of risk predictions. Second, extension of the temporal modeling framework to incorporate causal inference techniques could strengthen the evidence base for intervention recommendations, moving beyond correlation to identify the most effective actions for specific patient subgroups [99]. Third, application of the framework to broader healthcare domains, including behavioral health, pediatric conditions, and palliative care, could expand its impact across the care continuum.

The promising results observed in our evaluation contribute to a growing body of evidence that artificial intelligence, when thoughtfully designed and implemented, can augment human capabilities in complex healthcare tasks. Rather than replacing clinical judgment, AI-driven risk stratification tools can focus attention on patients most likely to benefit from intervention, suggest factors that might otherwise be overlooked, and track subtle patterns of change that exceed human perceptual capabilities [100]. This complementary relationship between artificial and human intelligence represents a powerful paradigm for addressing the mounting challenges of chronic disease management in an era of constrained healthcare resources.

In conclusion, the framework presented in this paper demonstrates that the integration of advanced AI techniques with clinical knowledge and human-centered design principles can transform population health management for chronic conditions. By identifying risk with greater precision, explaining predictions with greater clarity, and linking insights to interventions with greater specificity, this approach helps realize the promise of predictive analytics in healthcare—not merely to know what might happen, but to change what will happen for patients at greatest risk. [101]

References

[1] S. Li, X. Gao, J. Yang, H. Xu, Y. Wang, Y. Zhao, L. Yin, C. Wu, Y. Wang, Y. Zheng, B. Li, X. Zhang, Y. Ye, R. Fu, Q. Dong, H. Sun, X. Yan, Y. Wu, J. Zhang, C. Jin, W. Li, Y. Yang, and null null, "Number of standard modifiable risk factors and mortality in patients with first-presentation st-segment elevation myocardial infarction: insights from china acute myocardial infarction registry." *BMC medicine*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 217–, 7 2022.

[2] D. Rajendaran, "An end-to-end predictive and intervention framework for reducing hospital readmissions," *Journal of Contemporary Healthcare Analytics*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 65–86, 2022.

[3] M. Langer, G. Portella, S. Finazzi, L. Chatenoud, S. Lanini, F. Vairo, R. A. Fowler, R. Miccio, G. Ippolito, G. Bertolini, and G. Strada, "Intensive care support and clinical outcomes of patients with ebola virus disease (evd) in west africa." *Intensive care medicine*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 1266–1275, 7 2018.

[4] C. Zhao, Z. Zhou, Y. Zhang, X. Qi, X. Wang, D. Lin, H. Liu, Y. Wang, C. Weng, J. Chen, W. Hu, L. Liao, and Z. Lin, "Diagnosis and management of pediatric papillary craniopharyngiomas." *World neurosurgery*, vol. 165, pp. e148–e158, 5 2022.

[5] J. R. Machireddy, "A two-stage ai-based framework for determining insurance broker commissions in the healthcare industry," *Transactions on Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Cognitive Systems*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 1–21, 2022.

[6] A. M. Mosadeghrad and F. Ghazanfari, "Developing a hospital accreditation model: a delphi study," *BMC health services research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 879–, 8 2021.

[7] Z. Chegini, E. Kakemam, M. A. Jafarabadi, and A. Janati, "The impact of patient safety culture and the leader coaching behaviour of nurses on the intention to report errors: a cross-sectional survey," *BMC nursing*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 9 2020.

[8] K. Kuyt, M. Mullen, C. Fullwood, T. P. Chang, J. Fenwick, V. Withey, R. McIntosh, N. D. Herz, and R. MacKinnon, "The assessment of a manikin-based low-dose, high-frequency cardiac resuscitation quality improvement program in early uk adopter hospitals," *Advances in simulation (London, England)*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 4 2021.

[9] X. Qu, H. Xie, Q. Zhang, X. Zhou, and Z. Shi, "A survey on oral care practices for ventilator-assisted patients in intensive care units in 3a hospitals of mainland china," *International journal of nursing practice*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 699–708, 4 2014.

[10] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. C. Tappert, "Automatic visual recommendation for data science and analytics," in *Advances in Information and Communication: Proceedings of the 2020 Future of Information and Communication Conference (FICC), Volume 2*. Springer, 2020, pp. 125–132.

[11] I. Molwitz, C. Kemper, K. Stahlmann, T. H. Oechtering, M. M. Sieren, S. Afat, M. Gerwing, A. M. Bucher, C. Storz, M. C. Langenbach, M. Reim, J. Lotz, V. Zagrosek-Regitz, E. Can, D. Köhler, J. Yamamura, G. Adam, B. Hamm, and S. Keller, "Work expectations, their fulfillment, and exhaustion among radiologists of all career levels: what can be learned from the example of germany." *European radiology*, vol. 33, no. 8, pp. 5664–5674, 3 2023.

[12] H. Vijayakumar, "Unlocking business value with ai-driven end user experience management (euem)," in *Proceedings of the 2023 5th International Conference on Management Science and Industrial Engineering*, 2023, pp. 129–135.

[13] R. F. Soldatos, M. Cearns, M. Ø. Nielsen, C. Kollias, L.-A. Xenaki, P. Stefanatou, I. Ralli, S. Dimitrakopoulos, A. Hatzimanolis, I. Kosteletos *et al.*, "Prediction of early symptom remission in two independent samples of first-episode psychosis patients using machine learning," *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 122–133, 2022.

[14] X. Qu, Q. Wang, J. Zhang, W. He, F. Zhang, and W. Zhang, "Chewing difficulties mediated association between edentulism and depressive symptoms among middle aged and older population." *Journal of oral rehabilitation*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 556–565, 11 2023.

[15] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. Tappert, "Data virtualization for analytics and business intelligence in big data," in *CS & IT Conference Proceedings*, vol. 9, no. 9. CS & IT Conference Proceedings, 2019.

[16] F. Sadoughi, T. Azadi, and T. Azadi, "Barriers to using electronic evidence based literature in nursing practice: a systematised review." *Health information and libraries journal*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 187–199, 7 2017.

[17] X. Feng, Y. Wang, L. Wei, and K. Meng, "How to become an excellent pediatric resident: a qualitative comparative study from china." *BMC health services research*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 53–, 1 2023.

[18] R. B. Saltman, M.-J. Yeh, and Y. Liu, "Can asia provide models for tax-based european health systems? a comparative study of singapore and sweden." *Health economics, policy, and law*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 1–18, 11 2020.

[19] Y. Liu, P. Wang, and Y. Bai, "The influence factors of medical disputes in shanghai and implications - from the perspective of doctor, patient and disease." *BMC health services research*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1128–, 9 2022.

[20] B. Yazdizadeh, F. Mohtasham, and A. Velayati, "Impact assessment of iran's health technology assessment programme," *Health research policy and systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 15–, 2 2018.

[21] H.-Y. Tsai, S.-T. Huang, M.-F. Chao, J.-Y. Kan, J.-S. Hsu, M.-F. Hou, and H.-C. Chiu, "Cost-effectiveness of stereotactic vacuum-assisted biopsy for nonpalpable breast lesions," *European journal of radiology*, vol. 127, pp. 108 982–, 4 2020.

[22] M. Liu, J. Zhao, S. Li, J. Han, G. Ma, Y. Wang, and H. Chang, "Early monitoring of intravenous thrombolysis in acute ischaemic stroke using wearable intelligent vital sign devices: protocol for a prospective, multicentre, observational registry cohort study." *BMJ open*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. e074 855–e074 855, 11 2023.

[23] D. Zhang, G. Zeng, J. Hu, K. McCormick, Y. Shi, and B. Gong, "Association of igf1 polymorphism rs6214 with high myopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis," *Ophthalmic genetics*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 434–439, 1 2017.

[24] Y. Nakagawa, T. Takemura, H. Yoshihara, and Y. Nakagawa, "A new accounting system for financial balance based on personnel cost after the introduction of a dpc/drg system," *Journal of medical systems*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 251–264, 8 2009.

[25] K. L. Shen, Y. H. Yang, R. M. Jiang, T. Y. Wang, D. C. Zhao, Y. Jiang, X. Lu, R. ming Jin, Y. J. Zheng, B. P. Xu, Z. D. Xie, Z. sheng Liu, X. wang Li, L. Lin, Y. X. Shang, S. N. Shu, Y. Bai, M. Lu, Lu, J. K. Deng, W. J. Luo, L. J. Xiong, M. Liu, Y. X. Cui, L. P. Ye, J. F. Li, J. B. Shao, L. W. Gao, Y. Y. Wang, and X. F. Wang, "Updated diagnosis, treatment and prevention of covid-19 in children: experts' consensus statement (condensed version of the second edition)." *World journal of pediatrics : WJP*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 232–239, 4 2020.

[26] S. Lu, Y. Zhou, Y. Hu, J. Wang, H. Li, Y. Lin, D. Wang, J. Xian, S. Zhao, J. Ma, Z. Zhu, S. Yang, Q. Meng, Y. Kang, B. Chen, and W. Li, "Metatranscriptomic analysis revealed prevotella as a potential biomarker of oropharyngeal microbiomes in sars-cov-2 infection." *Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology*, vol. 13, pp. 1 161 763–, 6 2023.

[27] M. H. Kasnavieh, S. Mousavi, M. Veisi, and A. Tahmasebi, "The quality of life of trauma patients with splint immobilization," *Shiraz E-Medical Journal*, vol. 24, no. 6, 8 2023.

[28] M. Muniswamaiah, T. Agerwala, and C. C. Tappert, "Federated query processing for big data in data science," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 6145–6147.

[29] Z. Balayah, A. A. Alsheikh-Ali, W. Rashed, W. Almahmeed, A. A. Mulla, N. Alrawahi, S. Mora, S. B. Dugani, and M. Zubaid, "Association of obesity indices with in-hospital and 1-year mortality following acute coronary syndrome." *International journal of obesity (2005)*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 358–368, 9 2020.

[30] J. Yan, X. Zhong, and W. Yan, "Analysis on two basic issues of modern hospital management system," *Modern Management Forum*, vol. 2, no. 2, 4 2018.

[31] H. Gu, C. Wang, X. Yang, C. Liu, X. Wang, X. Zhao, Y. Wang, L. Liu, X. Meng, Y. Jiang, H. Li, Y. Wang, and Z. Li, "Sex differences in vascular risk factors, in-hospital management, and outcomes of patients with acute ischemic stroke in china." *European journal of neurology*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 188–198, 10 2021.

[32] M. Etemadian, A. M. Mosadeghrad, M. Soleimani, and S. P. Hedayati, "Succession planning success factors in a hospital: A case study," *Health Monitor Journal of the Iranian Institute for Health Sciences Research*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 41–61, 2 2020.

[33] L. Liu, S. Wang, X. Cao, and J. Liu, "Diagnostic value of circulating micrornas for gastric cancer in asian populations: a meta-analysis," *Tumour biology : the journal of the International Society for Oncodevelopmental Biology and Medicine*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 11 995–12 004, 8 2014.

[34] Q. Yang and J. Pan, "Control under times of uncertainty: the relationship between hospital competition and physician-patient disputes." *International journal for equity in health*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 205–205, 11 2017.

[35] M. Iannaccone, F. D. Ascenzo, O. D. Filippo, M. Gagliardi, D. A. Southern, S. Raposeiras-Roubin, E. Abu-Assi, J. P. Henriques, J. F. Saucedo, J. R. González-Juanatey, S. B. Wilton, W. J. Kikkert, I. J. Núñez-Gil, A. Ariza-Solé, X. Song, D. Alexopoulos, C. Liebetrau, T. Kawaji, Z. Huczek, S. Nie, T. Fujii, L. C. L. Correia, M. aki Kawashiri, J. M. García-Acuña, E. Alfonso, B. Terol, A. Garay, D. Zhang, Y. Chen, I. Xanthopoulou, N. Osman, H. Möllmann, H. Shiomi, M. Kowara, K. J. Filipiak, X. Wang, Y. Yan, J.-Y. Fan, Y. Ikari, T. Nakahashi, K. Sakata, M. Yamagishi, C. Moretti, F. Gaita, O. Kalpak, and S. Kedev, "Optimal medical therapy in patients with malignancy undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention for acute coronary syndrome: a bleemacs sub-study," *American journal of cardiovascular drugs : drugs, devices, and other interventions*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 61–71, 10 2016.

[36] H. Zhao, M. Wang, Y. Cui, and G. G. Liu, "A validated survey to measure chinese hospital management practices." *MethodsX*, vol. 10, pp. 102 066–102 066, 2 2023.

[37] G. M. D. Ferrari, V. Dusi, C. Spazzolini, J. M. Bos, D. Abrams, C. I. Berul, L. Crotti, M. Eldar, M. Kharlap, A. Khoury, A. D. Krahn, A. Leenhardt, C. R. Moir, A. Odero, L. R. O. Nordkamp, T. Paul, F. R. I. Noguer, M. Shkolnikova, J. Till, A. A. Wilde, M. J. Ackerman, and P. J. Schwartz, "Response to letters regarding article, "clinical management of catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia: The role of left cardiac sympathetic denervation"." *Circulation*, vol. 133, no. 4, pp. e366–7, 1 2016.

[38] L.-L. Zhou, S.-E. Zhang, J. Liu, H.-N. Wang, L. Liu, J.-J. Zhou, Z.-H. Bu, Y.-F. Gao, T. Sun, and B. Liu, "Demographic factors and job characteristics associated with burnout in chinese female nurses during controlled covid-19 period: A cross-sectional study." *Frontiers in public health*, vol. 9, pp. 757 113–, 1 2022.

[39] N. Jiang, "Formal volunteering and depressive symptoms among community-dwelling older adults in china: A longitudinal cross-level analysis." *Health & social care in the community*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. e5673–e5684, 9 2022.

[40] L. Sang, S. Chen, X. Zheng, W. jie Guan, Z. Zhang, W. Liang, M. Zhong, L. Jiang, C. Pan, W. Zhang, J. Xia, N. Chen, W. Wu, H. Wu, Y. Xu, X. Liu, X. Liu, J. He, S. Li, D. Zhang, N. Zhong, and Y. Li, "The incidence, risk factors and prognosis of acute kidney injury in severe and critically ill patients with covid-19 in mainland china: a retrospective study." *BMC pulmonary medicine*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 290–290, 11 2020.

[41] N. J. Meesters, M. van Dijk, F. S. de Carvalho, L. Haverman, I. K. M. Reiss, S. H. Simons, and G. E. van den Bosch, "Covid-19 lockdown impacts the wellbeing of parents with infants on a dutch neonatal intensive care unit." *Journal of pediatric nursing*, vol. 62, pp. 106–112, 9 2021.

[42] Y. Anfinogenova, E. V. Grakova, M. Shvedova, K. V. Kopieva, A. T. Teplyakov, and S. V. Popov, "Interdisciplinary approach to compensation of hypoglycemia in diabetic patients with chronic heart failure." *Heart failure reviews*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 481–497, 8 2017.

[43] H. Liao, C. Zhang, L. Luo, Z. Xu, J.-B. Yang, and D.-L. Xu, "Distance-based intuitionistic multiplicative multiple criteria decision-making methods for healthcare management in west china hospital," *Expert Systems*, vol. 37, no. 2, 11 2019.

[44] A. Nadjarzadeh, F. Shidfar, N. Amirjannati, M. Vafa, S. A. Motevalian, M. R. Gohari, S. A. N. Kakhki, M. M. Akhondi, and M. R. Sadeghi, "Effect of coenzyme q10 supplementation on antioxidant enzymes activity and oxidative stress of seminal plasma: a double-blind randomised clinical trial." *Andrologia*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 177–183, 1 2013.

[45] G. Konstantakopoulos, N. Ioannidi, C. Psarros, P. Patrikelis, P. Stefanatou, and E. Kravariti, "The impact of neurocognition on mentalizing in euthymic bipolar disorder versus schizophrenia," *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 405–420, 2020.

[46] G. Konstantakopoulos, G. Georgantopoulos, F. Gonidakis, I. Michopoulos, P. Stefanatou, and A. S. David, "Development and validation of the schedule for the assessment of insight in eating disorders (sai-ed)," *Psychiatry Research*, vol. 292, p. 113308, 2020.

[47] J. L. Raphael, A. Kamdar, M. B. Beavers, D. H. Mahoney, and B. U. Mueller, "Treatment of uncomplicated vaso-occlusive crises in children with sickle cell disease in a day hospital." *Pediatric blood & cancer*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 82–85, 3 2008.

[48] F. Alipoor and Z. Shahvari, "Marginalization of professionalism in clinical settings; a qualitative study at tehran university of medical sciences," *Quarterly Journal of Management Strategies in Health System*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 313–327, 3 2020.

[49] J. Huang, X. Gong, Q. Gu, R. Liu, J. Shi, W. Yu, P. Zu, X. Ma, J. Lin, J. Sun, Y. Yang, and Z. Wang, "The effect of family doctor policy practice on primary health-care workers' health in hongkou district of shanghai, china: varied by occupational divisions?" *BMC family practice*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 9 2020.

[50] Q. Yang, W. Zhang, S. Liu, W. Gong, Y. Han, J. Lu, D. Jiang, J. Nie, X. Lyu, R. Liu, M. Jiao, C. Qu, M. Zhang, Y. Sun, X. Zhou, and Q. Zhang, "Unraveling controversies over civic honesty measurement: An extended field replication in china." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 120, no. 29, pp. e2 213 824 120–, 7 2023.

[51] B. Zhang, K. O. Conner, H. Meng, N. Tu, D. Liu, and Y. Chen, "Social support and quality of life among rural family caregivers of persons with severe mental illness in sichuan province, china: mediating roles of care burden and loneliness," *Quality of life research : an international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 1881–1890, 3 2021.

[52] H. Zhang, S.-T. Huang, M. J. Bittle, L. Engineer, and H.-C. Chiu, "Perceptions of chinese hospital leaders on joint commission international accreditation: a qualitative study." *Frontiers in public health*, vol. 11, pp. 1 258 600–, 10 2023.

[53] N. Girerd, M.-F. Seronde, S. Coiro, T. Chouihed, P. Bilbault, F. Braun, D. Kenizou, B. Maillier, P. Nazeyrollas, G. Roul, L. Fillieux, W. T. Abraham, J. L. Januzzi, L. Sebbag, F. Zannad, A. Mebazaa, and P. Rossignol, "Integrative assessment of congestion in heart failure throughout the patient journey," *JACC. Heart failure*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 273–285, 12 2017.

[54] S. Bhattacharyya, D. Valeriani, C. Cinel, L. Citi, and R. Poli, "Anytime collaborative brain-computer interfaces for enhancing perceptual group decision-making." *Scientific reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 17 008–, 8 2021.

[55] J. Li, H. Liu, C. Duan, L. Chen, Q. Zhang, X. Fang, L. Tan, N. Li, X. Wang, X. Zhang, C. Li, Z. Lin, and N. Xiong, "Prevention and control of covid-19 after resuming general hospital functions." *Pathogens (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 452–452, 4 2022.

[56] Y. Qian, J. Zou, H. Xu, H. Zhu, L. Meng, S. Liu, H. Yi, J. Guan, and S. Yin, "Association of upper airway surgery and improved cardiovascular biomarkers and risk in osa," *The Laryngoscope*, vol. 130, no. 3, pp. 818–824, 5 2019.

[57] B. Morabito, A. Rabini, L. Leo, F. Cammertoni, F. Fazzone, M. Armenti, D. Silvestri, N. Aspromonte, M. Massetti, and B. Morabito, "Pre-star: Multidimensional pre-habilitation in patients with aortic stenosis undergoing surgical valve replacement," *Cardiology Research and Cardiovascular Medicine*, vol. 8, no. 1, 6 2023.

[58] N. Fujita, X. R. Perrin, J. A. Vodounon, M. K. Gozo, Y. Matsumoto, S. Uchida, and Y. Sugiura, "Humanised care and a change in practice in a hospital in benin," *Midwifery*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 481–488, 9 2011.

[59] F. Geng, F. Jiang, R. Conrad, T. Liu, Y. Liu, H. Liu, and Y.-L. Tang, "Elevated rates of restraint and seclusion in child and adolescent psychiatric inpatients in china and their associated factors," *Child psychiatry and human development*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 939–944, 10 2020.

[60] G. Meyfroidt, P. Bouzat, M. P. Casaer, R. Chesnut, S. R. Hamada, R. Helbok, P. Hutchinson, A. I. R. Maas, G. Manley, D. K. Menon, V. F. J. Newcombe, M. Oddo, C. Robba, L. Shutter, M. Smith, E. W. Steyerberg, N. Stocchetti, F. S. Taccone, L. Wilson, E. R. Zanier, and G. Citerio, "Management of moderate to severe traumatic brain injury: an update for the intensivist." *Intensive care medicine*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 649–666, 5 2022.

[61] Y. Wang, L. Li, Z. Wei, S. Lu, W. Liu, J. Zhang, J. Feng, and D. Wang, "Efficacy and safety of renal function on edoxaban versus warfarin for atrial fibrillation: A systematic review and meta-analysis." *Medicines (Basel, Switzerland)*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 13–13, 1 2023.

[62] Z. Al-Qurayshi, J. D. Peterson, M. A. Shama, and E. Kandil, "Thyroidectomy practice in pediatric population: a national perspective." *American journal of otolaryngology*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 103 298–103 298, 12 2021.

[63] A. M. Presanis, K. Kunzmann, F. M. Grosso, C. Jackson, A. Corbella, G. Grasselli, M. Salmoiraghi, M. Gramegna, D. D. Angelis, and D. Cereda, "Risk factors associated with severe hospital burden of covid-19 disease in regione lombardia: a cohort study." *BMC infectious diseases*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1041–1041, 10 2021.

[64] V. Gilad and G. Masoero, "Treatment of covid-19 patients in italy: A physician's experience and insights," *Rambam Maimonides medical journal*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. e0028–, 7 2020.

[65] T. Sun, S.-E. Zhang, H.-Y. Yin, Q.-L. Li, Y. Li, L. Li, Y.-F. Gao, X.-H. Huang, and B. Liu, "Can resilience promote calling among chinese nurses in intensive care units during the covid-19 pandemic? the mediating role of thriving at work and moderating role of ethical leadership." *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 13, pp. 847 536–, 9 2022.

[66] V. Guglielmi, D. Capoccia, B. Russo, C. Lubrano, S. Mariani, E. Poggiogalle, G. Furia, A. H. Alizadeh, C. Patrizi, M. Sapienza, G. Damiani, M. G. Tarsitano, C. Conte, and S. Frontoni, "Knowledge, experiences, and perceptions relating to obesity management among primary care physicians in the lazio region, italy." *Frontiers in endocrinology*, vol. 14, pp. 1 249 233–, 11 2023.

[67] F. Yang, M. Liao, P. Wang, and Y. Liu, "Cost-effectiveness analysis of renal replacement therapy strategies in guangzhou city, southern china," *BMJ open*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. e039 653–, 2 2021.

[68] S. Uccella, F. Mongelli, P. Majno-Hurst, L. J. Pavan, S. Uccella, C. Zoia, and L. Uccella, "Psychological impact of the very early beginning of the covid-19 outbreak in healthcare workers: A bayesian study on the italian and swiss perspectives." *Frontiers in public health*, vol. 10, pp. 768 036–, 3 2022.

[69] Y. Xue, T. Deng, and K. Mao, "Influencing factors on the ecological protection behaviors of entrepreneurial farmers in chinese forest zones," *Sustainability*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 1827–, 6 2018.

[70] J. Patel, R. Gupta, M. T. Roe, S. A. Peng, S. D. Wiviott, and J. F. Saucedo, "Influence of presenting electrocardiographic findings on the treatment and outcomes of patients with non–st-segment elevation myocardial infarction," *The American journal of cardiology*, vol. 113, no. 2, pp. 256–261, 10 2013.

[71] L. Kang, Y. Wang, S. Xing, H. Li, C.-W. Chien, and T.-H. Tung, "Group-based trajectory modeling to identify health beliefs of covid-19 vaccination and its predictors: A cohort study in china." *Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 2 091 899–, 8 2022.

[72] H. Vijayakumar, A. Seetharaman, and K. Maddulety, "Impact of aiserviceops on organizational resilience," in *2023 15th International Conference on Computer and Automation Engineering (ICCAE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 314–319.

[73] J. R. Machireddy, "Data science and business analytics approaches to financial wellbeing: Modeling consumer habits and identifying at-risk individuals in financial services," *Journal of Applied Big Data Analytics, Decision-Making, and Predictive Modelling Systems*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 1–18, 2023.

[74] D. Rajendaran, "Architectural framework for integrating generative ai into clinical systems: A human-in-the-loop approach," *International Journal of Applied Health Care Analytics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 69–80, 2024.

[75] S. Scalvini and A. Giordano, "Heart failure. optimal postdischarge management of chronic hf." *Nature reviews. Cardiology*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 9–10, 11 2012.

[76] M. Ye, F. Tang, C.-W. Chien, Y.-C. Chuang, J. J. H. Liou, and X. Qu, "Application of failure mode and effect analysis in icu admission of potentially covid-19 infected patients." *American journal of infection control*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 552–562, 12 2023.

[77] X. Li, F. Wang, H. Xu, Y. Qian, J. Zou, M. Yang, H. Zhu, H. Yi, J. Guan, and S. Yin, "Interrelationships among common predictors of cardiovascular diseases in patients of osa: A large-scale observational study." *Nutrition, metabolism, and cardiovascular diseases : NMCD*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 23–32, 8 2019.

[78] Y. Liu, J. Zou, X. Li, X. Zhao, J. Zou, S. Liu, L. Meng, Y. Qian, H. Xu, H. Yi, J. Guan, and S. Yin, "Effect of the interaction between obstructive sleep apnea and lipoprotein(a) on insulin resistance: A large-scale cross-sectional study." *Journal of diabetes research*, vol. 2019, pp. 9 583 286–9 583 286, 4 2019.

[79] R. Alpern, M. E. Canavan, J. T. Thompson, Z. McNatt, D. Tatek, T. Lindfield, and E. H. Bradley, "Development of a brief instrument for assessing healthcare employee satisfaction in a low-income setting." *PloS one*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. e79 053–, 11 2013.

[80] X. Wang, X. Bai, B. Li, W. Li, A. A. Dmytriw, X. Min, Y. Li, and L. Jiao, "The top 100 cited articles published in translational stroke research." *Translational stroke research*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–3, 12 2021.

[81] X. Wu, M. Tian, J. Zhang, M. Yang, X. Gong, Y. Liu, X. Li, R. I. Lindley, M. Anderson, K. Peng, J. Jagnoor, J. Ji, M. yi Wang, R. Ivers, and T. Wei, "The effect of a multidisciplinary co-management program for the older hip fracture patients in beijing: a "pre- and post-" retrospective study." *Archives of osteoporosis*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 43–43, 3 2019.

[82] D. Ram, "G562(p) chief resident post: Impact on trainee satisfaction," *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, vol. 101, no. Suppl 1, pp. A334.2–A335, 4 2016.

[83] J.-S. Zhu, M.-X. Zhang, C.-W. Chien, W.-Y. Yang, G.-F. Shi, S. Qiu, T.-H. Tung, and H.-X. Chen, "Sex differences in adverse reactions to an inactivated sars-cov-2 vaccine among medical staff in china." *Frontiers in medicine*, vol. 8, pp. 731 593–731 593, 9 2021.

[84] P. Jiang, T. Xu, C. Zhang, J. Chen, and T. Wang, "Unforgettable restaurant: helping older people who are living with disability and dementia return to society." *General psychiatry*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. e100 657–e100 657, 12 2021.

[85] H. Vijayakumar, "Revolutionizing customer experience with ai: a path to increase revenue growth rate," in *2023 15th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.

[86] D. Wang, Q. Guo, A. Wei, and A. Li, "Differential binding of active and inactive integrin to talin," *The protein journal*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 280–289, 5 2018.

[87] I. Morelli, F. Luceri, R. Giorgino, R. Accetta, P. Perazzo, L. Mangiavini, N. Maffulli, and G. M. Peretti, "Covid-19: not a contraindication for surgery in patients with proximal femur fragility fractures." *Journal of orthopaedic surgery and research*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–5, 7 2020.

[88] T. Dehdari, T. Rahimi, N. Aryaeian, and M. R. Gohari, "Effect of nutrition education intervention based on pender's health promotion model in improving the frequency and nutrient intake of breakfast consumption among female iranian students," *Public health nutrition*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 657–666, 1 2013.

[89] E. T. Avest, L. Carenzo, R. A. Lendrum, M. D. Christian, R. M. Lyon, C. Coniglio, M. Rehn, D. J. Lockey, and Z. B. Perkins, "Advanced interventions in the pre-hospital resuscitation of patients with non-compressible haemorrhage after penetrating injuries." *Critical care (London, England)*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 184–, 6 2022.

[90] B. Ostadi, R. M. Daloie, and M. M. Sepehri, "A combined modelling of fuzzy logic and time-driven activity-based costing (tdabc) for hospital services costing under uncertainty," *Journal of biomedical informatics*, vol. 89, pp. 11–28, 11 2018.

[91] N. Niknam, H. A. Gorji, and M. Langarizadeh, "The challenge of outsourcing of hospital services in iran: A qualitative study," *Journal of education and health promotion*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 294–, 10 2020.

[92] J. Gong, Y. Wang, S.-T. Huang, and H.-C. Chiu, "Study of hospitalization costs in patients with cerebral ischemia based on e-chaid algorithm." *Journal of healthcare engineering*, vol. 2022, pp. 3 978 577–8, 5 2022.

[93] R. Azar and P. Shadpour, "In vivo trial of a novel atraumatic urinary catheter design for prevention of catheter-induced trauma," *Journal of endourology*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 822–827, 5 2016.

[94] D. Zhang, M. Liao, and T. Liu, "Implementation and promotion of quality control circle: A starter for quality improvement in chinese hospitals," *Risk management and healthcare policy*, vol. 13, pp. 1215–1224, 8 2020.

[95] F. O'Kelly, S. Sparks, C. A. Seideman, P. C. Gargollo, C. F. Granberg, J. Ko, N. R. Malhotra, S. Hecht, K. Swords, C. K. Rowe, B. Whittam, A.-F. Spinoit, A. G. Dudley, J. S. Ellison, D. I. Chu, J. C. Routh, G. M. Cannon, P. Kokorowski, M. A. Koyle, and M. S. Silay, "A survey and panel discussion of the effects of the covid-19 pandemic on paediatric urological productivity, guideline adherence and provider stress." *Journal of pediatric urology*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 492.e1–492.e9, 7 2020.

[96] C. Li, Q. Wu, D. Gu, and S. Ni, "Trauma exposure and depression among frontline health professionals during covid-19 outbreak in china: the role of intrusive rumination and organizational silence." *BMC psychiatry*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 366–, 5 2022.

[97] W. Chen, Y. Liang, W. Lin, G.-Q. Fu, and Z.-W. Ma, "Surgical management of large adrenal tumors: impact of different laparoscopic approaches and resection methods on perioperative and long-term outcomes." *BMC urology*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 31–31, 5 2018.

[98] J. Zhang, L. Zhang, Y. Yin, Q. Lu, J. G. Hong, X. Zhang, X. J. Zhou, L. B. Wang, J. Zhang, M. Lu, X. Y. Dong, J. Shao, Y. M. Lu, J. Yu, and L. Gu, "Best practice for infection prevention in pediatric respiratory clinics during the covid-19 epidemic." *World journal of pediatrics : WJP*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 326–332, 6 2020.

[99] M. Palazzini, E. Ammirati, L. Lupi, C. Giannattasio, F. Soriano, P. Pedrotti, D. Briguglia, M. Mapelli, J. Campodonico, P. Agostoni, S. Leonardi, A. Turco, S. Guida, G. Peretto, S. Sala, P. Camici, F. Marzo, A. Grosu, M. Senni, F. Turrini, M. Bramerio, M. Marini, M. Matassini, S. Rizzo, C. Basso, M. D. Gaspari, N. Hendren, M. Schmidt, T. Bochaton, N. Piriou, A. Ubarri, C. V. D. Heyning, A. A. Sole, A. Cannatà, J. Salamanca, J. Lehtonen, F. Huang, E. Adler, and M. Metra, "P408 prevalence characteristics and outcomes of covid 19 associated acute myocarditis," *European Heart Journal Supplements*, vol. 25, no. Supplement$_D$, *pp.D*205 $-$ $-$*D*206, 52023.

[100] L. Wang, L. Wang, Y. Zheng, Y. Chen, H. Lu, C. Chu, and B. Li, "Establishment and practice of 5 layers guarantee system for ct/mr equipment quality management based on multi-party cooperation," *Health and Technology*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 509–515, 6 2019.

[101] F. Shi, C. Yu, L. Yang, F. Li, J. Lun, W. Gao, Y. Xu, Y. Xiao, S. B. Shankara, Q. Zheng, B. Zhang, and S. Wang, "Exploring the dynamics of hemorrhagic fever with renal syndrome incidence in east china through seasonal autoregressive integrated moving average models." *Infection and drug resistance*, vol. 13, pp. 2465–2475, 7 2020.