Assessment and Prediction of Clinical Outcomes for ICU-Admitted Patients Diagnosed with Hepatitis: Integrating Sociodemographic and Comorbidity Data

Dimple Sushma Alluri[1], and Felix M. Pabon-Rodriguez[1,2]*

[1]Department of Biomedical Engineering and Informatics, Indiana University, Luddy School of Informatics, Computing, and Engineering, Indianapolis, Indiana, United States

[2]Department of Biostatistics and Health Data Science, Indiana University, School of Medicine, Indianapolis, Indiana, United States

Correspondence
*Felix M. Pabon-Rodriguez
Email: fpabonrodriguez@gmail.com

Abstract
Hepatitis, a disease characterized by inflammation of the liver, is a leading global health challenge that contributes to over 1.3 million deaths annually, with hepatitis B and C accounting for many of these fatalities. Intensive care unit (ICU) management of patients is particularly challenging due to the complex clinical care and resource demands. This study focuses on predicting length of stay (LoS) and discharge outcomes for ICU-admitted hepatitis patients using machine learning models. Despite advancements in ICU predictive analytics, limited research has specifically addressed hepatitis patients, creating a gap in optimizing care for this population. Leveraging data from the MIMIC-IV database, which includes around 94,500 ICU patient records, this study uses sociodemographic details, clinical characteristics, and resource utilization metrics to develop predictive models. Using Random Forest, Logistic Regression, Gradient Boosting Machines, and Generalized Additive Model with Negative Binomial Regression, these models identified medications, procedures, comorbidities, age, and race as key predictors. Total LoS emerged as an important factor in predicting discharge outcomes and location. These findings provide insights to improve resource allocation, enhance clinical decision-making, and inform future ICU management strategies for hepatitis patients.

KEYWORDS: Hepatitis, predictive models, resource utilization, health disparity, SDOH.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hepatitis, an inflammatory liver disease, remains a significant global health challenge, claiming an increasing number of lives each year. According to the World Health Organization (WHO) 2024 Global Hepatitis Report, viral hepatitis is the second leading infectious cause of death globally, responsible for 1.3 million deaths annually (1). This number has risen from 1.1 million in 2019, with 83% of these deaths attributed to hepatitis B and 17% to hepatitis C (1). Every day, approximately 3,500 people die due to hepatitis B and C infections worldwide (2). Despite advancements in diagnostic tools and treatment options, testing and treatment coverage rates have plateaued, signaling a growing public health crisis (1). In the United States, the most common forms of viral hepatitis are hepatitis A, B, and C, each impacting the liver differently and predominantly affecting distinct populations (3,4). Hepatitis B and C pose severe health risks, often leading to chronic conditions such as cirrhosis and liver cancer. These diseases are also the primary contributors to liver-related mortality globally (5). Managing intensive care unit (ICU) admitted patients with hepatitis is particularly challenging due to the treatment complexities and the resource-intensive nature of care required for severe cases.

One critical issue in ICU settings is the unpredictability of a patient's length of stay (LoS), a key metric influencing hospital resource management, patient care quality, and healthcare efficiency. Prolonged ICU stays are closely linked to increased hospital costs and heightened resource strain (6). Research also indicates that longer ICU stays correlate with increased long-term mortality rates, underscoring the need for precise LoS predictions (7). Beyond LoS, discharge outcomes and locations serve as vital metrics for assessing patient recovery, readmission

risks, and the burden on healthcare systems (8–11). Sociodemographic and clinical factors such as race, gender, marital status, insurance type, age, and type of hepatitis could significantly influence hospitalization outcomes, particularly for ICU-admitted hepatitis patients. These factors also play a crucial role in determining hospital stay duration and discharge outcomes (12–16). Recent years have seen the growing application of machine learning (ML) in healthcare, particularly predictive modeling. ML algorithms provide several advantages over traditional statistical approaches, including their ability to analyze large, complex datasets and identify subtle patterns that conventional techniques may overlook (17). Predictive models using ML have been successfully applied in ICU settings to improve forecasts related to patient outcomes, treatment responses, and resource needs (18,19). However, there is a noticeable lack of ML models tailored to hepatitis patients and their unique clinical profiles.

The objective of this study is to explore and compare ML models to predict the length of stay, discharge location, and discharge outcomes for ICU-admitted hepatitis patients. These models will incorporate sociodemographic and clinical variables from ICU admission records as key predictors. By addressing this gap, the study aims to provide valuable insights for healthcare providers, enhancing resource planning and improving hepatitis patient outcomes in ICU settings.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Data

The data set used for this study was sourced from the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-IV), version 3.0, a comprehensive and deidentified repository of patient records (20–22). It is worth mentioning that this study was completed prior to the release of version MIMIC-IV v3.1. We followed the release notes and made sure to corroborate the notes against the dataset used in this study. The MIMIC-IV comprises data collected from patients admitted to the emergency department (ED) or intensive care units at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (BIDMC) in Boston, MA. It includes over 364,000 unique patient records, with a total of 546,028 hospital admissions and nearly 94,500 ICU stays, providing a rich source of information for developing predictive models in healthcare. MIMIC-IV is organized into two main data modules: *hosp* and *icu*. The *hosp* module captures information from the hospital-wide electronic health record (EHR), detailing hospitalizations, patient demographics, laboratory results, medication administration, billing data, and more. In contrast, the *icu* module contains highly detailed clinical data from the ICU, sourced from the MetaVision clinical information system, including treatment plans, and monitoring data (20–22).

Data collection for v3.0 spans from 2008 to 2022, and the records are meticulously de-identified following Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) guidelines. Patient identifiers, such as names and social security numbers, were removed to protect privacy. Additionally, dates of death are available up to one-year post-discharge and are derived from hospital and state records. Ethical approval for data collection and the creation of this research resource was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at the BIDMC. The dataset was made accessible through a data use agreement, ensuring compliance with all ethical and legal guidelines for data usage. With this agreement in place, the database is available for researchers and academics.

2.2. Variables

The independent variables for this study include socio-demographic, clinical, and resource utilization data. Socio-demographic variables cover gender, age, race, marital status, and type of insurance. Admission characteristics include the type of admission and admission location. Clinical variables included the number of comorbidities, as well as indicators for Hepatitis A, B, C, D, and E, and Hepatic Coma. Resource utilization variables include counts of medications, procedures, and drugs dispensed before ICU admission. Additional ICU-specific measures capture the volume of fluids prescribed and the number of procedures performed within the ICU. This study aims to predict three primary outcomes: *Total Length of Stay (LoS)*, measured as the days spent in the ICU or hospital; *Discharge Location*, detailing the destination upon discharge, such as home, hospice, or skilled nursing; and *Discharge Outcome*, a binary variable indicating discharge status (death or alive).

2.3. Data Processing and Preparation

Given the extensive and diverse nature of the MIMIC-IV dataset, specific steps were undertaken using the data management system MySQL to refine and tailor the data for this study on hepatitis patients admitted to the ICU (23,24). Figure 1 illustrates the data pre-processing workflow for the study group, detailing the sequential steps taken to create the final dataset.



Figure 1. Data preprocessing workflow for extracting and refining hepatitis patient records from the MIMIC-IV database.

During the preparation step of the final data set, several steps were considered. First, to isolate hepatitis-related hospital admissions, we used the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes specific to viral hepatitis that were identified and filtered from a comprehensive table of diagnostic codes from the hospital billing information (*d_icd_diagnoses*). These filtered ICD codes were then linked with a table containing hospital admission identifiers to extract records corresponding to hepatitis diagnoses. Subsequently, the table was merged with the table containing patient demographic information and total length of stay, resulting in a hepatitis-specific patient cohort. To enrich the dataset, several additional variables were obtained. Pre-ICU and post-ICU medication counts, as well as procedure counts, were derived by aggregating respective records. For patients with multiple hepatitis diagnoses, individual indicator columns for Hepatitis A, B, C, D, and E were created, facilitating an exploration of co-infections. A comorbidity count was also computed by excluding hepatitis-related ICD codes and counting the remaining diagnoses. The combined dataset initially consisted of 4,409 patient records as shown in Figure 1. A rigorous data validation process identified 534 records with inconsistencies between discharge outcomes and discharge locations. These records were excluded to ensure data integrity, resulting in a final dataset of 3,875 hepatitis patient records.

To address missing values, a thorough check was conducted across all variables. Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE) was employed to impute the missing values as appropriate (25). Predictive Mean Matching (PMM) was used for numeric columns, while Polytomous Logistic Regression (Polyreg) was applied to categorical variables with more than two levels. The imputation process was repeated five times, and the results were pooled to produce a single, complete dataset for analysis. The discharge outcome variable, which indicates whether patients were alive or deceased upon discharge, displayed a significant class imbalance, with 3,353 records for the alive category and 522 for death. To address this, the Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique (SMOTE) was used to balance the classes (26). This resulted in a revised dataset with 2,088 records labeled as alive and 1,566 as death, ensuring a more equitable representation of both classes for model training. After data cleaning and preprocessing, the records were partitioned for subsequent modeling tasks. An 80:20 split was used to separate the data into training and testing sets. The training set was used to train the models, while the testing set was reserved to evaluate predictive performance.

2.4. Machine Learning Models

Table 1 presents the models chosen for the prediction of the three outcomes of hepatitis patient records. For predicting the *discharge outcome (death or alive)*, a binary outcome, the discharge location variable was not used as predictor for the analysis, and Logistic Regression (LR) and Random Forest Classification (RFC) were used. This decision was made because certain discharge location categories overlapped with death records, providing redundant information. LR is a statistical model used for binary classification, estimating the probability of one of two possible outcomes (in this case alive or death) based on a set of predictor variables. This model uses the logistic function to transform predictions into probabilities between 0 and 1 (27). LR was chosen for its interpretability, providing clear insights into how each clinical and socio-demographic feature influences discharge outcome. This characteristic is especially valuable in this research, where understanding the relative impact of individual predictors on patient survival is crucial for making informed inferences about patient care. On the other hand, RFC is applied to enhance the accuracy of predicting discharge outcome. The model constructs multiple decision trees using random data samples, with each tree voting for a class. The final prediction is determined by the majority vote across all trees. This ensemble approach captures complex, non-linear relationships among variables, offering strong predictive performance and minimizing the risk of overfitting (28). Although it does not offer the interpretive insights of LR, RFC's capability to handle heterogeneous data makes it well-suited for maximizing predictive power in clinical scenarios (29).

Table 1. Machine learning models chosen for predicting each of the health outcomes for hepatitis patients.

Outcome	Type	Model
Discharge Outcome (Death/Alive)	Binary	Logistic Regression (LR)
		Random Forest Classification (RFC)
ICU Length of Stay (LoS)	Count	Generalized Additive Model (GAM)
	Continuous	Random Forest Regression (RFR)
Discharge Location	Categorical (>2 levels)	Gradient Boosting Model (GBM)
		Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR)

To predict *LoS* for ICU-admitted hepatitis patients, we considered two scenarios. In the first case, we considered LoS as a count variable(30), using Generalized Additive Model (GAM) with a Negative Binomial (NB) distribution, which we will denote as GAM-NB, and as a continuous variable (31) in our second case via Random Forest Regression (RFR), allowing for a comprehensive exploration of different modeling approaches. For the discrete case, a GAM-NB was utilized to address overdispersion, where the variance in the count data exceeds the mean (32). By incorporating smooth functions, the GAM framework allows for modeling potential non-linear relationships between predictors and LoS. This approach provides the necessary flexibility to capture complex patterns in the data, ensuring a robust and accurate analysis (33). For the continuous case, RFR was employed. This ensemble method constructs multiple decision trees and averages their predictions to capture non-linear relationships and interactions among predictors (28).

To predict the *discharge location* of ICU-admitted hepatitis patients, we compared a Gradient Boosting Model (GBM) and a Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR), since the outcome is categorical with more than two levels. GBM is an ensemble learning technique that builds multiple decision trees sequentially, with each new tree correcting errors made by previous ones. This model focuses on reducing bias and improving predictive performance through boosting. GBM was chosen for its strong ability to handle complex, non-linear relationships and provide high accuracy (34), which is critical in predicting discharge locations, a multi-class categorical outcome. On the other hand, the MLR is an extension of logistic regression used when the dependent variable has more than two categories (35). It models the probability of each class as a function of the predictors, providing a straightforward and interpretable approach to multi-class classification. This model was included to establish baseline, offering a simpler and interpretable model for understanding the impact of predictor variables on different discharge locations.

2.5. Model Evaluation

The models were evaluated using appropriate performance metrics based on the type of outcome variable. For LoS, regression models were evaluated using Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), R-squared (R^2), and Mean Absolute Error (MAE). RMSE measures the average magnitude of error between predicted and actual values, penalizing larger deviations more heavily, making it particularly sensitive to outliers. R^2 quantifies the proportion of variation in the dependent variable explained by the model, offering an overall measure of fit. MAE, unlike RMSE, calculates the average of the absolute errors, providing an intuitive measure of model accuracy by treating all errors equally (36). The multiclass classification models were assessed using Accuracy, the Kappa statistic, the Brier Score, and the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (ROC AUC). Accuracy reflects the percentage of correctly classified instances, while the Kappa statistic accounts for agreement by chance, providing a more robust evaluation of model performance. The Brier Score measures the mean squared difference between predicted probabilities and the actual class, with lower scores indicating better calibration. ROC AUC quantifies a model's ability to distinguish between classes, with values closer to 1 denoting superior performance(36). For the binary outcome, LR and RFC models were evaluated using Brier Score, Accuracy, Kappa, ROC AUC, Sensitivity, and Specificity. Sensitivity, also known as recall, indicates the proportion of true positives correctly identified by the model, while Specificity measures the proportion of true negatives correctly identified. These metrics provide insights into the model's ability to balance false positives and false negatives. The Brier Score evaluates the accuracy of probabilistic predictions, with lower values reflecting better performance. ROC AUC measures the discriminatory power of the model across thresholds, while Accuracy and Kappa offer overall measures of correctness, with Kappa adjusting for chance agreement (36).

2.6. Resampling Techniques

To ensure the robustness and generalizability of the models, 10-fold cross-validation was employed. This approach divides the dataset into 10 subsets (or folds). The model is trained on 9 folds and validated on the remaining fold in each iteration. This process is repeated 10 times, with each fold serving as the validation set once, and the average performance across all iterations is reported. The choice of K=10 is supported by experimental analysis and observations, as it provides a balance between computational efficiency and reliability (37). K-fold cross-validation is critical for mitigating the risk of overfitting, as it ensures that the model is tested on diverse subsets of the data, not just a single train-test split. This approach provides a more reliable estimate of the model's performance on unseen data by leveraging all data points for both training and validation at different stages. Particularly for complex datasets, such as the one used in this study, 10-fold cross-validation enhances the reliability and generalizability of the results, making it a robust validation strategy for machine learning applications (38).

2.7. Software

Data analysis was conducted in the R statistical software (39,40) using various R packages to streamline data manipulation, model development, and visualization. MySQL (23) was used to extract and manage data from the MIMIC-IV database. Data processing was performed using the *tidyverse* (41), while missing data were imputed with *mice* (42), and class imbalance was addressed using *DMwR* (26,43). Model development and evaluation were facilitated by *MachineShop* (44), enabling a streamlined approach to implementing and comparing various predictive models. Statistical modeling was conducted using *MASS* (45), which supported the fitting of Negative Binomial regression models, and *mgcv* (46), which was utilized for constructing GAMs to capture nonlinear relationships. Random Forest modeling was implemented using the *randomForest* package (47). Data visualizations were created with *ggplot2* (48), while descriptive statistics and baseline characteristics were summarized using *tableone* (49).

3. RESULTS

3.1. Demographic and Descriptive Statistics

The study included a total of 3,875 patients admitted to the ICU with hepatitis-related conditions. The gender distribution was predominantly male, accounting for 68.2% (N = 2,644) of the sample, while females constituted 31.8% (N = 1,231). The average age of the participants was 53.26 years (SD = 12.77). The racial composition was primarily White (57.3%, N = 2,220), followed by Black (16.9%, N = 653), Hispanic/Latino (6.3%, N = 245),

and Asian (6.0%, N = 234). Other racial groups, such as Indian/Alaska Native and Portuguese, made up a smaller proportion of the population, each representing less than 1% of the sample. These demographic characteristics, along with details on marital status, insurance type, clinical and admission characteristics, are summarized in Table 2. The distribution of hepatitis types is shown in Figure 2, which reveals that Hepatitis C was the most prevalent condition, affecting 82.2% (N = 3,186) of the total sample. Hepatitis B was the second most common condition at 19.3% (n = 746), while Hepatitis A (1.0%, N = 37), Hepatitis D (9.2%, N = 357), and Hepatitis E (<1%) were less frequent. Additionally, 8.0% (n = 311) of patients experienced hepatic coma. Most of the study participants were either single (48.3%, N=1,873) or married (28.5%, N=1,106). When looking at insurance type, a similar proportion of participants had either Medicaid (39.8%, N=1,542) or Medicare (38.0%, N=1,472). As expected, more than 50% of patients were admitted through the emergency ward (59.3%, N=2,296). The median number of comorbidities found for this hepatitis group was 18 (IQR: 12-24 comorbidities), while the number of medications (administered and dispensed) and procedures performed pre-ICU and during at ICU, ranged (IQR) from 2 (pre-ICU procedures) to a high of 154 (for ICU medications). See Table 2 for more details about each count measure.

The distribution of hepatitis types across racial groups is depicted in Figure 3. Hepatitis C was the most prevalent condition across all racial groups, with White patients contributing the largest proportion. Among Black and Hispanic/Latino patients, Hepatitis C was also the most common condition but showed slightly smaller proportions compared to White patients, while Hepatitis B was notably more prevalent among Asian patients compared to other racial groups. In addition, Hepatitis B disproportionately affects non-White individuals compared to Whites. Hepatitis A, D, and E were observed in smaller proportions across all racial groups, with Hepatitis E being particularly rare. Hepatic Coma was most common among White patients, with smaller contributions from other racial groups.

The distribution of total length of stay (LoS) for hepatitis patients was highly skewed as commonly seen in hospital records, with most patients having a short hospital stay as shown in Figure 4. The median total length of stay was 2 days (IQR: 1–4 days), with some patients having an extended stay of over 30 days. Variations in length of stay were also observed based on admission location (Figure 5). For instance, patients admitted from emergency admissions had shorter median stays compared to those transferred from other facilities. Notably, patients transferred from other facilities exhibited a wider range of lengths of stay, including outliers with significantly extended hospitalizations. These trends highlight how admission pathways may influence the duration of ICU stays. Figure 6 illustrates the relationship between the total length of stay and discharge outcome. Patients with longer LoS were more likely to have died, as indicated by the higher median and wider range of LoS in the death group compared to the Alive group. Figure 7 on the other hand, highlights the distribution of discharge locations among patients. The majority (51.5%, n = 1,997) were discharged to home-based care. Skilled nursing or long-term care facilities accounted for 17.7% (n = 684) of discharges, while 13.5% (n = 522) of patients died. Other notable discharge destinations included rehabilitation centers (4.9%, n = 191), hospice care (2.6%, n = 100), psychiatric care (2.1%, n = 83), and other healthcare facilities (2.8%, n = 110). A small proportion of patients left the hospital against medical advice (4.4%, n = 170).

Table 2. Baseline demographic, clinical, and admission characteristics of study participants.

Variable	N = 3,875
Gender = Male (%)	2644 (68.2)
Age (Mean (SD))	53.26 (12.77)
Race (%)	
Indian/Alaska Native	10 (0.3)
Asian	234 (6.0)
Black	653 (16.9)
Hispanic/Latino	245 (6.3)
Other	120 (3.1)
Portuguese	29 (0.7)
Unknown	364 (9.4)
White	2220 (57.3)
Marital Status (%)	
Divorced	398 (10.3)
Married	1106 (28.5)
Single	1873 (48.3)
Widowed	202 (5.2)
NA	296 (7.6)
Insurance (%)	
Medicaid	1542 (39.8)
Medicare	1472 (38.0)
Other	123 (3.2)
Private	674 (17.4)
NA	296 (7.6)
Type Of Admission (%)	
Direct Emergency	230 (5.9)
Direct Observation	10 (0.3)
Elective	50 (1.3)
Emergency Unit Observation	5 (0.1)
Emergency Ward	2296 (59.3)
Observation Admit	548 (14.1)
Surgical Same Day Admission	155 (4.0)
Urgent	581 (15.0)
Number of Comorbidities (Median [IQR])	18.00 [12.00, 24.00]
Pre-ICU Medications Count (Median [IQR])	82.00 [36.00, 140.25]
Pre-ICU Procedures Count (Median [IQR])	3.00 [2.00, 6.00]
Dispensed Medications Count (Median [IQR])	65.50 [33.00, 118.50]
ICU Medications Count (Median [IQR])	54.00 [20.00, 154.00]
ICU Procedures Count (Median [IQR])	7.00 [3.00, 14.00]

3.2. Model Results and Performance

Discharge Outcome (Died/Alive)

The LR and RFC models were developed and evaluated to predict discharge outcomes (died/alive) for this group of ICU-admitted hepatitis patients. Performance metrics for both models are presented in Table 3. On the test data, LR yielded a Brier Score of 0.1302, an accuracy of 0.818, a Kappa of 0.622, and an ROC AUC of 0.887. Sensitivity and specificity were 0.73 and 0.87, respectively. The RFC model demonstrated a lower Brier Score of 0.0875, an accuracy of 0.87, a Kappa of 0.742, and a higher ROC AUC of 0.95. Sensitivity and specificity for the Random Forest model were 0.78 and 0.94, respectively. Cross-validation results are also shown in Table 3, indicating the mean and standard deviation for each metric across repeated samples. The mean Brier Score for RFC was 0.089 (±0.010), while LR had a mean Brier Score of 0.129 (±0.011). The RFC model had a mean accuracy of 0.87 (±0.017) and a mean Kappa of 0.729 (±0.037), compared to LR's mean accuracy of 0.82 (±0.02) and mean Kappa of 0.629 (±0.043).

Statistical comparisons were conducted to evaluate differences in performance metrics between the LR and RFC models. The results indicated statistically significant differences ($p < 0.001$) for all key metrics, including Brier Score, accuracy, Kappa, ROC AUC, sensitivity, and specificity. These findings demonstrated that the RFC model consistently outperformed LR across all evaluated criteria for predicting discharge outcomes for the ICU-admitted hepatitis patients. Figures 8 and 9 display the variable importance for the LR and RFC models, respectively. The top predictors in the LR model (Figure 8) were pre-ICU medications count, ICU medications count, and ICU procedures count, with sociodemographic factors such as race and age also ranking among the top 10 variables. For the RFC model (Figure 9), ICU medications count, ICU procedures count, and total LoS were identified as the most influential variables, with race and age again appearing among the top 10 predictors. These findings highlight the consistent importance of race and age as predictors, emphasizing the need to consider both clinical and sociodemographic factors when analyzing discharge outcomes. Table 4 summarizes the confusion matrix results for both models. Both the models showed good sensitivity and specify value, with RFC performing better with a higher precision.

Table 3. Performance metrics of Logistic Regression and Random Forest models on test and cross-validated data.

Metrics	Logistic Regression		Random Forest	
	Test data	Cross-validation	Test data	Cross-validation
Brier Score	0.1301	0.129 ± 0.011	0.0877	0.089 ± 0.010
Accuracy	0.8167	0.821 ± 0.020	0.8755	0.870 ± 0.017
Kappa	0.6220	0.629 ± 0.043	0.7421	0.729 ± 0.037
ROC AUC	0.8865	0.889 ± 0.017	0.9499	0.948 ± 0.012
Sensitivity	0.7350	0.736 ± 0.040	0.7823	0.780 ± 0.033
Specificity	0.8792	0.884 ± 0.019	0.9469	0.937 ± 0.016

Table 4. Confusion matrix metrics for Logistic Regression and Random Forest models

Metric	Logistic Regression		Random Forest	
	Class 0	Class 1	Class 0	Class 1
Agreement	0.4431	0.2975	0.4836	0.3261
Sensitivity	0.7737	0.6962	0.8444	0.7632
Specificity	0.6962	0.7737	0.7632	0.8444
PPV (Precision)	0.7734	0.6966	0.8270	0.7854
NPV	0.6966	0.7734	0.7854	0.8270

Total Length of Stay

While the previous models focused on classification outcome, the GAM-NB and the RFR model were utilized to predict total length of stay as discrete and continuous outcome respectively in the test data and through cross-validation. The GAM-NB was applied to predict LoS, as the mean in the dataset for LoS was 3.69, with a variance of 42.54, indicating overdispersion. On the test data, the model achieved a RMSE of 2.9619, a MAE of 1.4237, and an R-squared of 0.7594, demonstrating its ability to explain 75.94% of the variance in the LoS (Table 5). Cross-validation was also conducted with 10 folds to assess the model's robustness. The cross-validated RMSE was 5.5212, while the mean R-squared was 0.7601, and the mean MAE was 1.5634. These cross-validation results highlight slightly higher variability and prediction errors compared to the test data, likely due to the presence of extreme values or overdispersion in the data. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 10, the majority of predictions are closely aligned with actual values, deviations are observed at higher LoS, indicating potential challenges in predicting extended stays.

Table 5. Performance metrics of General Additive Model with Negative Binomial

Metric	Test Data	Cross-Validation
Root Mean Squared Error	2.9619	5.5212
Mean Absolute Error	1.4237	1.5634
R-squared	0.7594	0.7601

The RFR model was subsequently applied after log-transforming the total LoS, which resulted in improved performance, achieving an RMSE of 0.3144, an R-squared of 0.821, and an MAE of 0.2377 on the test data. Cross-validation further confirmed the model's consistency, with a mean RMSE of 0.295 (±0.020), a mean R^2 of 0.838 (±0.021), and a mean MAE of 0.229 (±0.014). However, when done in the original scale, the performance metrics were: RMSE of 3.271, R^2 of 0.755, and MAE of 1.360 (Table 6).

Table 6. Performance Metrics of Random Forest Regression Models

Metric	Test Data	Log Transformed Test Data	Cross-Validation
Root Mean Squared Error	3.271	0.3144	0.295 (±0.020)
Mean Absolute Error	1.360	0.2377	0.229 (±0.014)
R-squared	0.755	0.821	0.838 (±0.021)

Figure 11 illustrates the variable importance of the RFR model for predicting LoS. The most influential predictors were the number of ICU medications and procedures, comorbidities count, and pre-ICU procedure count. While clinical factors were most prominent, sociodemographic variables such as age and race also emerged as notable predictors, highlighting their potential impact on length of stay alongside clinical characteristics. Figure 12 illustrates the relationship between predicted and actual LoS values for the RFR model. The plot on the left presents the scatter plot for the log-transformed data, where a strong linear relationship is observed, with predictions closely aligning with the actual values. In contrast, the plot on the right displays the scatter plot for the original LoS data, where greater dispersion is evident, particularly for higher values.

Discharge Location

Building on the evaluation of model performance for previous outcomes, the focus now turns to predicting discharge location. The Gradient Boosting Model (GBM) was evaluated on the test data, achieving a Brier Score of 0.589, an accuracy of 0.558, a Kappa of 0.211, and an ROC AUC of 0.7407 (Table 7). Cross-validation analysis showed a mean Brier Score of 0.595 (±0.0206), a mean accuracy of 0.559 (±0.227), a mean Kappa of 0.2077 (±0.0391), and a mean ROC AUC of 0.7319 (±0.0282), indicating stable performance across folds. The Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) produced an accuracy of 0.5639 (95% CI: 0.5281-0.5991) on the test data, with a Kappa value of 0.2037, and Brier Score of 0.5896 (Table 7). Cross-validation yielded consistent results,

with a mean accuracy of 0.5658 (±0.15), a mean Kappa of 0.2335 (±0.30), and a mean Brier Score of 0.6 (±0.0352), suggesting comparable predictive performance across folds (Table 7). Significant predictors ($p < 0.05$) identified in this model included gender, marital status, insurance type, type of admission, number of comorbidities, and number of ICU procedures and medications. Figure 13 illustrates the variable importance of GBM, highlighting the number of ICU medications, comorbidities, age, total length of stay, and race as the most influential predictors.

Building on the evaluation of model performance for previous outcomes, the focus now turns to predicting discharge location. The GBM was evaluated on test data, achieving a Brier Score of 0.589, an accuracy of 0.558, and a Kappa of 0.2110 (Table 7). Cross-validation analysis showed a mean Brier Score of 0.5950 (±0.0206), a mean accuracy of 0.559 (±0.227), and a mean Kappa of 0.2077 (±0.0391), indicating stable performance across folds. The MLR produced an accuracy of 0.5639 (95% CI: 0.5281-0.5991) on the test data, with a Kappa value of 0.2037 (Table 7). We found consistent results during the cross-validation, with accuracy values around 0.5658 (±0.153) and Kappa values near 0.2335 (±0.30). Significant predictors ($p < 0.05$) identified in this model included gender, marital status, insurance type, type of admission, number of comorbidities, and number of ICU procedures and medications. Figure 13 illustrates the variable importance of GBM, highlighting the number of ICU medications, comorbidities, age, total length of stay and race as the most influential predictors.

Table 7. Performance metrics of Gradient Boosting and Multinominal Regression models on test and cross-validated data.

Metric	Gradient Boosting Model		Multinominal Regression	
	Test Data	**Cross Validation**	**Test Data**	**Cross Validation**
Accuracy	0.5587	0.5591 (±0.2270)	0.5639	0.5658 (±0.15)
Kappa	0.2110	0.2077 (±0.0391)	0.2037	0.2335 (±0.30)
Brier Score	0.5898	0.5950 (±0.0206)	0.5896	0.6 (±0.0352)

4. DISCUSSION

Despite significant advancements in critical care for hepatitis-related conditions, this study highlights the complexities associated with ICU LoS, discharge outcomes (died/alive), and discharge locations. By leveraging machine learning models, we predicted these outcomes and identified key predictors, including ICU procedures, medication counts, comorbidities, and sociodemographic factors such as age and race. Notably, race consistently emerged as one of the top predictors across all models, underscoring its critical role in influencing health outcomes for hepatitis patients. This finding is particularly significant as it aligns with observed racial disparities in the raw data, suggesting systemic inequities. Additionally, Hepatitis C emerged as the most prevalent condition in our cohort, aligning with global epidemiological trends that underscore its significant burden on critical care systems (50,51). These findings emphasize the potential of predictive analytics in not only identifying key drivers of health outcomes, but also in addressing disparities, optimizing resource allocation, improving patient outcomes, and reducing healthcare costs.

This study investigated the prediction of ICU LoS for hepatitis patients using ML models, including GAM-NB and RFR. Between these two models, RFR demonstrated superior predictive accuracy, particularly after applying a log transformation to stabilize variance. The log-transformed RFR achieved an R^2 of 0.821 and an RMSE of 0.3144 on test data, effectively capturing complex interactions among predictors. By comparison, GAM-NB achieved an R^2 of 0.7594 and RMSE of 2.9619, effectively addressing overdispersion but yielding higher errors. The key predictors for LoS included ICU medication counts, ICU procedure counts, comorbidities, pre-ICU procedures, and patient age. These findings align with prior studies (52), which demonstrated that higher procedural and pharmacological interventions often correlate with disease severity and resource intensity, leading to longer ICU stays. Similarly, another study by Tola Getachew Bekele et al. (53) emphasized that prolonged ICU stays are associated with complications, readmissions, and sedative use, underscoring the importance of clinical management strategies to optimize LoS. Although the models performed well for shorter stays, predicting longer LoS posed challenges due to increased variability and extreme values, as reflected in Figures 10 and 13 from this

manuscript. In a study by Xu et al. (31), the authors observed similar challenges, reporting that ML models often struggle to predict longer stays due to the inherent variability of extended ICU durations. Our study reflects these findings, with greater error dispersion observed in the upper range of LoS predictions. The performance of RFR in predicting LoS aligns with Iwase et al. (54), who reported high predictive accuracy for ICU stays using Random Forest (RF). Ensemble methods such as RF excelled in capturing nonlinear interactions and handling heterogeneous predictors, as further evidenced by the work of Alghatani et al. (55), who achieved 65% accuracy for LoS predictions in ICU datasets. While GAM-NB effectively addressed overdispersion, its higher cross-validation errors indicate that variability in extended LoS remains a challenge. Future research could incorporate additional clinical variables or hierarchical modeling techniques to enhance predictions for longer LoS.

The prediction of discharge outcomes (alive/died) was conducted using LR and RFC models. RFC outperformed LR across all metrics, achieving an accuracy of 87.5%, a Kappa of 0.742, and a ROC AUC of 0.95 on test data, compared to the metrics by LR, achieving an accuracy of 81.67%, a Kappa of 0.622, and an ROC AUC of 0.89. These results highlight the robustness of ensemble methods like RF in handling complex interactions among clinical and demographic predictors. Statistically significant predictors for discharge outcomes included ICU medication counts, ICU procedure counts, and total LoS, all of which reflect disease severity and the intensity of care and key variables in predicting LoS. Prolonged LoS has been linked to increased mortality, consistent with Moitra et al. (7), who found that each additional ICU day beyond seven days significantly raises mortality risk. Similar findings were reported by Lingsma et al. (56) and Tola Getachew Bekele et al. (53), who highlighted the correlation between extended LoS and mortality, emphasizing its role as both a predictor and consequence of severe illness. The sociodemographic factors also played a crucial role in predicting discharge outcomes. Race, for instance, emerged as a significant predictor in our study, aligning with Olanipekun et al. (57), who found disparities in ICU mortality among demographic groups.

The prediction of discharge location presented unique challenges, primarily due to the small number of 3,875 records and the number of discharge categories (k=8). GBM and MLR yielded moderate performance for this multi-categorical outcome, with accuracies of 55.87% and 56.39% and Kappa values of 0.2110 and 0.2037, respectively. These results highlight the complexities of multi-class prediction in critical care settings with limited data. SMOTE was applied to address class imbalance but resulted in data loss, which limited the model's performance. Abad et al. (58) addressed similar challenges using hierarchical classifiers and SMOTE to manage imbalanced multi-class datasets, suggesting that advanced techniques and larger datasets are critical for improving predictive accuracy. Additionally, the authors noted that discharge decisions are influenced by subjective factors such as caregiver preferences, resource availability, and social support, which may not be fully captured by clinical and demographic data alone. Top predictors for discharge location included gender, marital status, insurance type, admission type, number of comorbidities, and ICU procedures and medications. These findings align with Mickle and Deb (59), who highlighted the importance of clinical and patient characteristics in discharge planning. The association of ICU procedures and medications with discharge location reflects the intensity of care required, further emphasizing their relevance in critical care contexts. Future studies should explore hierarchical classifiers, minimize the number of discharge categories, and incorporate additional variables such as functional status and physiological scores to enhance predictive performance. As highlighted (59), integrating larger datasets and advanced modeling techniques can provide more clinically actionable insights.
This study has several limitations that warrant further consideration. First, the reliance on the MIMIC-IV database, which reflects a single institution's patient population and care practices, may limit the generalization of the findings to other healthcare settings with differing demographics and protocols. Second, the imbalanced distribution of outcomes, particularly for rare discharge destinations (e.g., hospice, against medical advice), may have reduced model stability and predictive accuracy. While ML models like RF demonstrated strong performance, their limited interpretability compared to simpler models like Logistic Regression poses challenges for clinical adoption. Future research should focus on validating these findings across diverse datasets to enhance generalizability. Addressing outcome imbalances through advanced techniques without data loss will be critical for better prediction of rare outcomes like hospice discharge or leaving against medical advice. Moreover, future studies could explore fitting a GAM with a Zero-Inflated Negative Binomial (ZINB) distribution to account for overdispersion and zero inflation at the same time. Expanding this work to include real-time predictive tools

integrated into Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) could provide dynamic insights for resource allocation and care optimization. Finally, although not a limitation, it would be recommended and appropriate to consider the most recent version of the MIMIC-IV database to account for all updates and changes. As mentioned in the Methods section, this study was completed prior to the release of version 3.1. We carefully considered all the notes from the release and determined that data extracted from version 3.0 was appropriate for the analysis.

5. CONCLUSION

This study highlights the potential of machine learning in advancing critical care for hepatitis patients. The models identified key predictors of ICU length of stay, discharge outcomes, and discharge locations, with clinical factors such as pre-ICU and ICU procedures and medication counts playing a significant role in determining these outcomes. Additionally, sociodemographic factors, including age and race, were consistently identified as important predictors, highlighting the presence of racial disparities among ICU-admitted patients diagnosed with hepatitis. These findings highlight the importance of addressing such disparities while using predictive analytics to optimize resource allocation, improve patient outcomes, and guide targeted interventions. Despite its strengths, the study also revealed challenges such as variability in extended length of stay and limited data for multi-class predictions, underscoring the need for further advancements in predictive modeling strategies in these areas. Continued research in this area is essential not only to enhance predictive models but also to support broader public health efforts aimed at preventing, detecting, and managing hepatitis, ultimately reducing the burden of liver disease and hepatitis-related complications.

6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

7. FUNDING STATEMENT

This study did not receive any funding.

8. ETHICS STATEMENT

The Indiana University Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) staff determined the analysis done in this study was not human subject research and did not require further Institutional Review Board (IRB) review before conducting the study with MIMIC-IV v3.0. The study was conducted under the data use agreement governing MIMIC-IV, ensuring compliance with ethical standards for research involving human subjects.

9. DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The datasets used for this study are available at MIMIC-IV v3.0 only for credentialed users following the PhysioNet Credentialed Health Data Use Agreement (DUA).

REFERENCES

1. WHO. Global hepatitis report 2024: action for access in low- and middle-income countries. 2024.
2. WHO. WHO sounds alarm on viral hepatitis infections claiming 3500 lives each day [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/09-04-2024-who-sounds-alarm-on-viral-hepatitis-infections-claiming-3500-lives-each-day
3. CDC. 2022 Viral Hepatitis Surveillance Report [Internet]. 2022 Apr [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/hepatitis/statistics/2022surveillance/index.htm
4. CDC. 2023 Viral Hepatitis Surveillance Report. 2025.
5. WHO. Hepatitis [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/hepatitis/viral-hepatitis-in-the-world-map#tab=tab_1
6. Peres IT, Hamacher S, Oliveira FLC, Thomé AMT, Bozza FA. What factors predict length of stay in the intensive care unit? Systematic review and meta-analysis. J Crit Care. 2020 Dec;60:183–94.
7. Moitra VK, Guerra C, Linde-Zwirble WT, Wunsch H. Relationship Between ICU Length of Stay and Long-Term Mortality for Elderly ICU Survivors*. Crit Care Med. 2016 Apr;44(4):655–62.
8. Whitcomb W. Choosing location after discharge wisely [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.the-hospitalist.org/hospitalist/article/155424/transitions-care/choosing-location-after-discharge-wisely
9. Mechanic R. Post-Acute Care — The Next Frontier for Controlling Medicare Spending. New England Journal of Medicine. 2014 Feb 20;370(8):692–4.
10. Newhouse JP, Garber AM. Geographic Variation in Medicare Services. New England Journal of Medicine. 2013 Apr 18;368(16):1465–8.
11. Kuo YF, Goodwin JS. Association of Hospitalist Care With Medical Utilization After Discharge: Evidence of Cost Shift From a Cohort Study. Ann Intern Med. 2011 Aug 2;155(3):152–9.
12. Ghosh AK, Geisler BP, Ibrahim S. Racial/ethnic and socioeconomic variations in hospital length of stay. Medicine. 2021 May 21;100(20):e25976.
13. Hayes RM, Carter PR, Gollop ND, Reynolds J, Uppal H, Sarma J, et al. 108 The Impact of Marital Status on Mortality and Length of Stay in Patients Admitted with Myocardial Infarction: Abstract 108 Table 1. Heart. 2016 Jun 3;102(Suppl 6):A77.1-A77.
14. Dubin JA, Bains SS, Monárrez R, Gilmor R, Swartz GN, Katanbaf RM, et al. The Effect of Insurance Type on Length of Stay Following Total Knee Arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty. 2025 Jan;40(1):75–9.
15. Eskandari M, Alizadeh Bahmani AH, Mardani-Fard HA, Karimzadeh I, Omidifar N, Peymani P. Evaluation of factors that influenced the length of hospital stay using data mining techniques. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2022 Oct 29;22(1):280.
16. Ng M, Carrieri PM, Awendila L, Socías ME, Knight R, Ti L. Hepatitis C Virus Infection and Hospital-Related Outcomes: A Systematic Review. Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2024 Mar 7;2024:1–23.
17. An Q, Rahman S, Zhou J, Kang JJ. A Comprehensive Review on Machine Learning in Healthcare Industry: Classification, Restrictions, Opportunities and Challenges. Sensors. 2023 Apr 22;23(9):4178.
18. Choi MH, Kim D, Choi EJ, Jung YJ, Choi YJ, Cho JH, et al. Mortality prediction of patients in intensive care units using machine learning algorithms based on electronic health records. Sci Rep. 2022 May 3;12(1):7180.

19. Levin S, Barnes S, Toerper M, Debraine A, DeAngelo A, Hamrock E, et al. Machine-learning-based hospital discharge predictions can support multidisciplinary rounds and decrease hospital length-of-stay. BMJ Innov. 2021 Apr;7(2):414–21.

20. Johnson A, Bulgarelli L, Pollard T, Gow B, Moody B, Horng S, et al. MIMIC-IV (version 3.0) [Internet]. PhysioNet. 2024 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.13026/hxp0-hg59

21. Johnson AEW, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, Gayles A, Shammout A, Horng S, et al. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. Sci Data. 2023 Jan 3;10(1):1.

22. Goldberger AL, Amaral LAN, Glass L, Hausdorff JM, Ivanov PCh, Mark RG, et al. PhysioBank, PhysioToolkit, and PhysioNet. Circulation. 2000 Jun 13;101(23).

23. Oracle Corporation. MySQL: The world's most popular open-source database [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.mysql.com/

24. Oracle. What is MySQL? [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.oracle.com/mysql/what-is-mysql/

25. Azur MJ, Stuart EA, Frangakis C, Leaf PJ. Multiple imputation by chained equations: what is it and how does it work? Int J Methods Psychiatr Res. 2011 Mar 24;20(1):40–9.

26. Pradipta GA, Wardoyo R, Musdholifah A, Sanjaya INH, Ismail M. SMOTE for Handling Imbalanced Data Problem : A Review. In: 2021 Sixth International Conference on Informatics and Computing (ICIC). IEEE; 2021. p. 1–8.

27. Stoltzfus JC. Logistic Regression: A Brief Primer. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2011 Oct 13;18(10):1099–104.

28. Wrld AI. Random forest: The ultimate guide to regression and classification [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://medium.com/@adeevmardia/random-forest-the-ultimate-guide-to-regression-and-classification-33506d6cf865

29. Couronné R, Probst P, Boulesteix AL. Random forest versus logistic regression: a large-scale benchmark experiment. BMC Bioinformatics. 2018 Dec 17;19(1):270.

30. Fernandez GA, Vatcheva KP. A comparison of statistical methods for modeling count data with an application to hospital length of stay. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2022 Dec 4;22(1):211.

31. Xu Z, Zhao C, Scales CD, Henao R, Goldstein BA. Predicting in-hospital length of stay: a two-stage modeling approach to account for highly skewed data. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2022 Dec 24;22(1):110.

32. Zeileis A, Kleiber C, Jackman S. Regression Models for Count Data in *R*. J Stat Softw. 2008;27(8).

33. Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Generalized Additive Models. In: Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online. Wiley; 2014.

34. Zhang Z, Zhao Y, Canes A, Steinberg D, Lyashevska O. Predictive analytics with gradient boosting in clinical medicine. Ann Transl Med. 2019 Apr;7(7):152–152.

35. Kwak C, Clayton-Matthews A. Multinomial Logistic Regression. Nurs Res. 2002 Nov;51(6):404–10.

36. Zwanenburg A, Löck S. familiar: End-to-End Automated Machine Learning and Model Evaluation. CRAN: Contributed Packages. 2022.

37. Verma VK, Saxena K, Banodha U. Analysis Effect of K Values Used in K Fold Cross Validation for Enhancing Performance of Machine Learning Model with Decision Tree. In 2024. p. 374–96.

38. Wilimitis D, Walsh CG. Practical Considerations and Applied Examples of Cross-Validation for Model Development and Evaluation in Health Care: Tutorial. JMIR AI. 2023 Dec 18;2:e49023.

39. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated development for R [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.rstudio.com/

40. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 May 5]. Available from: https://www.R-project.org/

41. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome to the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw. 2019 Nov 21;4(43):1686.

42. Buuren S van, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. **mice** : Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in *R*. J Stat Softw. 2011;45(3).

43. Torgo L. Data Mining with R. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2016.

44. Smith BJ. MachineShop: Machine Learning Models and Tools. CRAN: Contributed Packages. 2018.

45. Venables WN, Ripley BD. Modern Applied Statistics with S. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2002.

46. Wood SN. Fast Stable Restricted Maximum Likelihood and Marginal Likelihood Estimation of Semiparametric Generalized Linear Models. J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol. 2011 Jan 1;73(1):3–36.

47. Liaw A, Wiener M. Classification and regression by randomForest. 2002;18–22.

48. Wickham H. ggplot2. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016.

49. Yoshida K, Bartel A. tableone: Create “Table 1” to Describe Baseline Characteristics with or without Propensity Score Weights. CRAN: Contributed Packages. 2014.

50. Brunner N, Bruggmann P. Trends of the Global Hepatitis C Disease Burden: Strategies to Achieve Elimination. Journal of Preventive Medicine and Public Health. 2021 Jul 31;54(4):251–8.

51. Petruzziello A, Marigliano S, Loquercio G, Cozzolino A, Cacciapuoti C. Global epidemiology of hepatitis C virus infection: An up-date of the distribution and circulation of hepatitis C virus genotypes. World J Gastroenterol. 2016;22(34):7824.

52. Gwynn ME, Poisson MO, Waller JL, Newsome AS. Development and validation of a medication regimen complexity scoring tool for critically ill patients. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. 2019 May 17;76(Supplement_2):S34–40.

53. Bekele TG, Melaku B, Demisse LB, Abza LF, Assen AS. Outcomes and factors associated with prolonged stays among patients admitted to adult intensive care unit in a resource-limited setting: a multicenter chart review. Sci Rep. 2024 Jun 17;14(1):13960.

54. Iwase S, Nakada T aki, Shimada T, Oami T, Shimazui T, Takahashi N, et al. Prediction algorithm for ICU mortality and length of stay using machine learning. Sci Rep. 2022 Jul 28;12(1):12912.

55. Alghatani K, Ammar N, Rezgui A, Shaban-Nejad A. Predicting Intensive Care Unit Length of Stay and Mortality Using Patient Vital Signs: Machine Learning Model Development and Validation. JMIR Med Inform. 2021 May 5;9(5):e21347.

56. Lingsma HF, Bottle A, Middleton S, Kievit J, Steyerberg EW, Marang-van de Mheen PJ. Evaluation of hospital outcomes: the relation between length-of-stay, readmission, and mortality in a large international administrative database. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018 Dec 14;18(1):116.

57. Olanipekun T, Abe T, Sobukonla T, Tamizharasu J, Gamo L, Kuete NT, et al. Association between race and risk of ICU mortality in mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients at a safety net hospital. J Natl Med Assoc. 2022 Feb;114(1):18–25.

58. Abad ZSH, Maslove DM, Lee J. Predicting Discharge Destination of Critically Ill Patients Using Machine Learning. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform. 2021 Mar;25(3):827–37.

59. Mickle CF, Deb D. Early prediction of patient discharge disposition in acute neurological care using machine learning. BMC Health Serv Res. 2022 Oct 25;22(1):1281.

FIGURES



Figure 2. Distribution of hepatitis types among study participants.



Figure 3. Distribution of hepatitis types across racial groups.



Figure 4. Distribution of total LoS for hepatitis patients.



Figure 5. Length of stay by admission location.



Figure 6. Discharge outcome based on total LoS.



Figure 7. Distribution of discharge locations among patients.



Figure 8. Variable importance for Logistic Regression.



Figure 9. Variable importance for Random Forest classification.



Figure 10. Predicted vs. Actual Length of Stay for the Generalized Additive Model (GAM)



Figure 11. Variable Importance for Random Forest Regression Model.



Figure 12. Predicted vs. Actual Length of Stay for the Random Forest Regression Model: (Left) Log-Transformed Data and (Right) Original Data.



Figure 13. Variable importance for Gradient Boost model.


ICU stays table (*icu*): (N1=94,458)
Admission table (*hosp*): (N2=546,028)
Merged records based on unique IDs (N=94,458)
Combined LoS for the same hospital admission IDs (N=85,242)
Filtered hepatitis patients (N=4,409)
Removed due to Inconsistencies (N=534)
Final data set (N=3,875)


Distribution of Hepatitis Types
Count
3000
2000
1000
0
Hepatic_Coma
Hepatitis_A
Hepatitis_B
Hepatitis_C
Hepatitis_D
Hepatitis_E
Hepatitis Type
Hepatitis_Type
Hepatic_Coma
Hepatitis_A
Hepatitis_B
Hepatitis_C
Hepatitis_D
Hepatitis_E


Distribution of Hepatitis Types Across Racial Groups
Percentage
0
20
40
60
AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKA NATIVE
ASIAN
BLACK
HISPANIC/LATINO
OTHER
PORTUGUESE
WHITE
Race
Hepatitis Type
Hepatic_Coma
Hepatitis_A
Hepatitis_B
Hepatitis_C
Hepatitis_D
Hepatitis_E


Distribution of Length of Stay (LoS) for Hepatitis Patients
Count
1000
750
500
250
0
0
30
60
90
Total Length of Stay (Days)


Length of Stay by Admission Location
Unknown
Transfer from Other Facility
Referrals
Internal Transfers
Emergency Admissions
Admission Location
0
30
60
90
Total Length of Stay (Days)


Length of Stay Distribution by Survival Status
Total Length of Stay (Days)
90
60
30
0
Survived
Died
Hospital Status


Frequency of Discharge Locations
NA
Skilled Nursing/Long-Term Care
Rehabilitation
Psychiatric Care
Other Healthcare Facility
Hospice Care
Home-Based Care
Death
Against Medical Advice
Count
0
500
1000
1500
2000
Discharge Location


Variable Importance from Logistic Regression Model
Pre-ICU Medications Count
ICU Medications Count
ICU Procedures Count
Total Length of Stay
Dispensed Medications Count
Hepatitis_B
Hepatitis_C
Race
Age
Admission Location
Comorbidities Count
Hepatic_Coma
Admission Type
Marital Status
Insurance
Pre-ICU Procedures Count
Hepatitis_D
Gender
Hepatitis_E
Hepatitis_A
Variable
0
25
50
75
100
Importance


Variable Importance from Random Forest Model
ICU Medications Count
ICU Procedures Count
Total Length of Stay
Pre-ICU Procedures Count
Comorbidities Count
Age
Race
Pre-ICU Medications Count
Dispensed Medications Count
Insurance
Admission Location
Hepatitis_B
Marital Status
Hepatic_Coma
Admission Type
Hepatitis_C
Gender
Hepatitis_D
Hepatitis_A
Hepatitis_E
Variable
0
25
50
75
100
Importance


Predicted vs Actual Length of Stay
Predicted Length of Stay
Actual Length of Stay
0
25
50
75
0
20
40
60


Variable Importance from Random Forest Model
ICU Medications Count
ICU Procedures Count
Comorbidities Count
Pre-ICU Procedures Count
Age
Admission Type
Race
Admission Location
Insurance
Marital Status
Gender
Hepatitis C
Dispensed Medication Count
Hepatitis B
Pre-ICU Medications Count
Hepatic Coma
Hepatitis D
Hepatitis A
Hepatitis E
Variable
0
25
50
75
100
Importance Score


Predicted vs Actual Values (Random Forest)
Actual Values
Predicted Values
0
1
2
3
4
1
2
3


Predicted vs Actual Values (Original Model)
Actual Values
Predicted Values
0
30
60
90
0
10
20
30
40


Variable Importance from Gradient Boosting Model
ICU Medications Count
Comorbidities Count
Age
Total Length of Stay
ICU Procedures Count
Race
Pre-ICU Procedures Count
Admission Location
Insurance
Marital Status
Hepatic Coma
Admission Type
Hepatitis D
Pre-ICU Medications Count
Dispensed Medication Count
Hepatitis C
Gender
Hepatitis B
Hepatitis A
Hepatitis E
Variable
0
25
50
75
100
Importance Score