Biopress Journal of Advanced Pharmacology Vol.2 Issue. 2 (2026)

Predictive Modeling Analysis to Predict Complications after Laparotomy: A PRISMA-Based Systematic Review

Dhvani chauhan[1*], Karamjeet singh[2]

[1]BDS Dasmesh institute of research and dental sciences faridkot

[2]Assistant professor Dasmesh intitute of research and dental sciences faridkot

Corresponding author: chauhandhvani7@gmail.com
Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18833447
Received: 16 February 2026
Accepted: 26 February 2026

Abstract

Background

Postoperative complications following laparotomy remain a major contributor to surgical morbidity, mortality, prolonged hospitalization, and increased healthcare burden. Traditional perioperative risk assessment tools demonstrate limited predictive accuracy at the individual patient level, prompting increasing interest in predictive modeling approaches, including machine learning–based techniques, to enhance risk stratification and clinical decision-making.

Objective

To systematically evaluate predictive modeling approaches used to forecast postoperative complications after laparotomy and to analyze their methodological characteristics, predictive performance, and clinical applicability.

Methods

A PRISMA-based systematic review was conducted to identify studies evaluating predictive models developed to estimate postoperative complications following laparotomy or major abdominal surgery. Electronic databases were systematically searched for relevant studies published within the defined time frame. Eligible studies included those employing traditional statistical models or machine learning–based algorithms for postoperative risk prediction. Data extraction focused on study design, patient population, predictors used, modeling techniques, performance metrics, validation methods, and reported clinical outcomes. Risk of bias and methodological quality were evaluated in accordance with established systematic review and prediction modeling reporting standards.

Results

The included studies demonstrated increasing utilization of machine learning–based approaches alongside traditional regression models for predicting postoperative complications. Predictive performance across studies showed moderate to good discrimination, commonly reported using AUROC values ranging from approximately 0.70 to 0.85. Models incorporating dynamic perioperative variables including intraoperative parameters and early postoperative physiological data demonstrated improved predictive performance compared with models relying solely on static preoperative predictors. However, external validation remained limited, and calibration reporting was inconsistent.

Conclusions

Predictive modeling represents a promising strategy for improving early identification of high-risk patients undergoing laparotomy. Machine learning approaches offer potential advantages in handling complex perioperative data; however, their superiority over traditional statistical models appears context-dependent. Greater emphasis on external validation, methodological transparency, and integration into clinical decision-support systems is essential for translating predictive models into routine surgical practice.

Keywords
Laparotomy; Predictive Modeling; Machine Learning; Postoperative Complications; Systematic Review; Surgical Risk Prediction; PRISMA

Introduction / Background

Laparotomy remains one of the most frequently performed major surgical procedures worldwide, particularly in emergency general surgery. Despite advances in surgical techniques, anesthesia, and perioperative care, postoperative complications following laparotomy continue to pose a significant clinical challenge [1]. These complications include surgical site infections, anastomotic leaks, postoperative ileus, pulmonary complications, sepsis, and multi-organ dysfunction, all of which contribute substantially to morbidity, mortality, prolonged hospital stay, and healthcare costs [2].

Emergency laparotomy, in particular, is associated with disproportionately high adverse outcomes. Large cohort studies and national audits report postoperative complication rates exceeding 40%, with mortality rates ranging from 10% to 20%, especially among elderly patients and those with multiple comorbidities [3]. The physiological stress of surgery, compounded by delayed presentation, sepsis, and hemodynamic instability, places this patient population at especially high risk [4].

Traditional perioperative risk stratification tools such as the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) physical status classification, Physiological and Operative Severity Score for the Enumeration of Mortality and Morbidity (POSSUM), and Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) scores have been widely used to estimate postoperative risk [5]. However, these tools suffer from several limitations, including subjective assessment, inability to incorporate high-dimensional data, and limited predictive accuracy at the individual patient level [6].

Moreover, most conventional models rely on static preoperative variables and fail to capture dynamic perioperative changes that strongly influence postoperative outcomes [7]. As a result, there is increasing recognition that existing risk prediction strategies are insufficient for guiding personalized perioperative decision-making following laparotomy [8]. This unmet need has driven growing interest in advanced predictive modeling approaches capable of integrating large volumes of perioperative data to improve early identification of high-risk patients [9].

Methodology

Study Design

This study was conducted as a PRISMA-based systematic review aimed at evaluating predictive modeling approaches used to forecast postoperative complications following laparotomy. The review adhered to established methodological frameworks for systematic reviews of clinical prediction models and followed recognized reporting standards to ensure transparency, reproducibility, and methodological rigor.

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were considered eligible if they investigated predictive models developed to estimate postoperative complications in patients undergoing laparotomy or major abdominal surgery. Both traditional statistical models and machine learning–based approaches were included. Eligible studies were required to report model development, validation, or performance outcomes. Observational cohort studies, retrospective analyses, prospective studies, and methodological modeling studies were included. Reviews, editorials, case reports, conference abstracts without sufficient methodological details, and studies lacking predictive modeling components were excluded.

Information Sources and Search Strategy

A comprehensive electronic literature search was conducted using major biomedical databases to identify relevant studies within the predefined time frame. The search strategy incorporated combinations of controlled vocabulary and keyword terms related to laparotomy, postoperative complications, predictive modeling, machine learning, and surgical risk prediction.Reference lists of included studies were also screened to identify additional relevant publications.

Study Selection

All identified records were screened using a structured two-stage process. Titles and abstracts were initially reviewed to assess relevance based on predefined eligibility criteria. Full-text articles were subsequently evaluated for inclusion. Discrepancies during study selection were resolved through discussion and consensus.

Data Extraction

Data extraction was performed using a standardized data collection framework. Extracted information included study characteristics, sample size, patient demographics, surgical context, predictor variables, modeling techniques, performance metrics (including discrimination and calibration where available), validation strategies, and reported clinical outcomes. Particular attention was given to perioperative predictors incorporated into predictive models.

Quality Assessment and Risk of Bias

Methodological quality and risk of bias were assessed using established evaluation principles for clinical prediction models. Assessment focused on participant selection, predictor measurement, outcome definition, handling of missing data, model development methodology, validation procedures, and reporting transparency.

Data Synthesis

Given the anticipated heterogeneity across study designs, modeling techniques, predictor variables, and outcome measures, a qualitative narrative synthesis was performed. Comparative analysis focused on model performance, methodological approaches, predictor selection, and validation strategies. Quantitative meta-analysis was not performed due to methodological and clinical variability among included studies.

Reporting Standards

The systematic review was conducted and reported in accordance with PRISMA recommendations and established guidelines for prediction model research to ensure methodological clarity and reproducibility.

Rationale for Predictive Modeling and Machine Learning

Predictive modeling aims to estimate the probability of future clinical outcomes based on patient-specific data, thereby enabling proactive risk mitigation strategies. In the context of laparotomy, accurate prediction of postoperative complications could inform surgical planning, perioperative optimization, postoperative monitoring intensity, and early intervention strategies [10].

Machine learning (ML), a subset of artificial intelligence, has emerged as a powerful tool for clinical prediction due to its ability to analyze complex, nonlinear relationships among large numbers of variables [11]. Unlike traditional statistical models, ML algorithms can automatically identify intricate patterns and interactions within high-dimensional datasets, making them particularly well suited for perioperative data analysis [12].

Rajkomar et al. demonstrated that ML-based models outperform conventional regression techniques in complex clinical prediction tasks, particularly when large datasets are available [13]. In surgical disciplines, ML has been increasingly applied to predict postoperative complications, mortality, readmissions, and length of hospital stay [14]. Several authors have emphasized that ML-driven prediction models can enhance clinical decision-making by providing individualized risk estimates rather than population-level averages [15].

However, the adoption of ML in surgery is not without challenges. Concerns regarding model interpretability, transparency, reproducibility, and external validity have been widely discussed [16]. Black-box algorithms may limit clinician trust, particularly when predictions cannot be easily explained or justified [17]. Furthermore, poor data quality, selection bias, and lack of external validation can undermine model reliability [18].

Despite these challenges, recent systematic reviews suggest that when appropriately developed and validated, predictive models—particularly ensemble ML approaches—can provide clinically meaningful improvements in postoperative risk prediction [19,20]. This growing body of evidence supports the rationale for systematically reviewing predictive modeling approaches aimed at forecasting complications after laparotomy.

Predictors Incorporated in Predictive Models

The performance of predictive models largely depends on the selection and quality of input variables. Across the literature, predictive models for postoperative complications after laparotomy incorporate a wide range of predictors spanning preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative domains [21].

Preoperative predictors commonly include patient demographics such as age, sex, body mass index, and comorbid conditions including diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular disease, chronic kidney disease, and pulmonary disorders [22]. Advanced age and higher comorbidity burden have consistently been associated with increased postoperative morbidity and mortality following abdominal surgery [23].

Laboratory parameters play a crucial role in risk prediction. Studies have identified hemoglobin levels, leukocyte count, serum albumin, creatinine, inflammatory markers, and electrolyte abnormalities as significant predictors of adverse postoperative outcomes [24]. Hypoalbuminemia, in particular, has been repeatedly shown to correlate with impaired wound healing, infection, and prolonged recovery [25].

Intraoperative variables such as duration of surgery, blood loss, need for transfusion, surgical urgency, and type of procedure further enhance predictive accuracy [26]. Emergency surgery status and prolonged operative time are among the strongest intraoperative predictors of postoperative complications [27].

Recent predictive models increasingly incorporate postoperative physiological parameters, including early vital signs, oxygen requirements, urine output, and biochemical trends within the first 24–48 hours after surgery [28]. Loftus et al. emphasized that dynamic perioperative data significantly improve model discrimination compared to static preoperative variables alone [29].

Feature selection and dimensionality reduction techniques are critical to prevent overfitting and enhance model interpretability [30]. Methods such as recursive feature elimination, LASSO regression, and tree-based importance ranking are commonly employed to identify the most informative predictors [31]. Explainable artificial intelligence approaches, including SHAP (Shapley Additive Explanations) values, are increasingly used to improve transparency and clinician acceptance of predictive models [32].

Types of Predictive Models Used to Predict Complications After Laparotomy

A wide range of predictive modeling approaches have been employed to forecast postoperative complications following laparotomy. These models broadly include traditional statistical methods and machine learning–based approaches, each with distinct methodological strengths and limitations [33].

Traditional Statistical Models

Logistic regression remains one of the most commonly used techniques for postoperative risk prediction due to its interpretability and ease of implementation [34]. Several studies have applied multivariable logistic regression models to estimate the probability of complications such as surgical site infection, sepsis, and mortality after abdominal surgery [35]. These models provide odds ratios that facilitate clinical interpretation but are limited in handling nonlinear relationships and complex variable interactions [36].

Machine Learning–Based Models

Recent years have seen a growing application of machine learning algorithms, including random forest, gradient boosting machines, support vector machines, and artificial neural networks, in surgical outcome prediction [37]. Random forest and gradient boosting models are particularly favored due to their robustness to overfitting and ability to capture nonlinear patterns in clinical data [38].

Huang et al. demonstrated that random forest models achieved superior discrimination compared to logistic regression in predicting early postoperative complications following intestinal obstruction surgery [39]. Similarly, gradient boosting algorithms have shown improved predictive performance for postoperative morbidity and mortality in gastrointestinal surgery cohorts [40].

Deep learning approaches, such as multilayer neural networks, have also been explored, particularly in large datasets derived from electronic health records [41]. These models can automatically learn complex feature representations; however, their limited interpretability and high data requirements restrict widespread clinical adoption [42].

Overall, the literature reflects a trend toward hybrid approaches, where machine learning models are compared against or combined with traditional statistical techniques to balance predictive accuracy and interpretability [43].

Model Performance, Validation, and Reporting Standards

Model performance assessment is a critical component of predictive modeling studies. Discrimination, commonly measured using the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC), is the most frequently reported metric [44]. Many predictive models for postoperative complications after laparotomy demonstrate AUROC values ranging from 0.70 to 0.85, indicating moderate to good discriminatory ability [45].

Calibration, which reflects agreement between predicted and observed outcomes, is often underreported despite its importance for clinical applicability [46]. Poorly calibrated models may produce accurate rankings of risk but unreliable absolute risk estimates, limiting their utility in clinical decision-making [47].

Internal validation techniques such as cross-validation and bootstrapping are commonly used to assess model stability [48]. However, external validation using independent datasets remains limited, raising concerns regarding generalizability [49]. Corey et al. showed that externally validated models often exhibit reduced performance compared to internal validation results, highlighting the risk of optimism bias [50].

Recent guidelines emphasize transparent reporting of predictive models, including clear descriptions of data preprocessing, feature selection, handling of missing data, and validation strategies [51]. Adherence to reporting standards such as TRIPOD and PRISMA is essential to improve reproducibility and facilitate comparison across studies [52].

Comparison Between Machine Learning and Conventional Statistical Approaches

The comparative effectiveness of machine learning models versus traditional statistical approaches remains a subject of active debate. While machine learning models are theoretically capable of capturing complex nonlinear relationships, empirical evidence suggests that their superiority is context-dependent [53].

Christodoulou et al. conducted a systematic review demonstrating that machine learning models do not consistently outperform logistic regression in clinical prediction tasks, particularly when datasets are small or predictors are limited [54]. In contrast, large multicenter studies with high-dimensional data have reported improved discrimination using ensemble machine learning models [55].

In the context of laparotomy, studies comparing machine learning and logistic regression models indicate that machine learning approaches often yield modest performance gains, which may or may not translate into meaningful clinical benefit [56]. These findings underscore the importance of focusing not only on predictive accuracy but also on interpretability, ease of implementation, and clinical relevance [57].

Rather than viewing machine learning and traditional statistics as competing methodologies, several authors advocate for their complementary use, leveraging the strengths of each approach to enhance postoperative risk prediction [58].

Clinical Utility, Implementation Challenges, and Future Directions

Despite promising predictive performance, the translation of predictive models into routine clinical practice remains limited. One of the primary barriers is the lack of integration with existing electronic health record systems, which hampers real-time risk prediction and clinical workflow adoption [59].

Model interpretability is another major challenge. Clinicians are more likely to trust and adopt predictive tools that provide clear explanations for their predictions [60]. Explainable artificial intelligence techniques, such as SHAP values and feature importance ranking, have been proposed to improve transparency and clinician acceptance [61].

Ethical considerations, including data privacy, algorithmic bias, and fairness, must also be addressed before widespread deployment [62]. Models trained on single-center or demographically homogeneous datasets may exhibit reduced performance in diverse populations, potentially exacerbating healthcare disparities [63].

Future research should focus on prospective validation, multicenter collaboration, and integration of predictive models into clinical decision-support systems [64]. Additionally, combining predictive modeling with targeted interventions may offer the greatest potential to reduce postoperative complications and improve outcomes following laparotomy [65].

Discussion

This systematic review synthesizes recent evidence on predictive modeling approaches used to forecast postoperative complications following laparotomy, with a particular focus on machine learning–based methods. The findings demonstrate a clear and growing interest in leveraging advanced predictive analytics to address the persistently high morbidity and mortality associated with laparotomy, especially in emergency surgical settings.

Across the reviewed studies, predictive models consistently identified postoperative complications with moderate to good discriminatory performance, most commonly reflected by AUROC values between 0.70 and 0.85. Machine learning models particularly ensemble methods such as random forest and gradient boosting often demonstrated superior discrimination compared to traditional logistic regression models, especially when applied to large, high-dimensional datasets incorporating perioperative variables. This suggests that the ability of machine learning algorithms to model nonlinear relationships and complex interactions provides a tangible advantage in certain clinical contexts.

However, the superiority of machine learning was not universal. Several studies reported comparable performance between machine learning and conventional statistical approaches, highlighting that predictive accuracy is strongly influenced by data quality, sample size, and variable selection rather than algorithmic complexity alone. These findings align with broader evidence indicating that traditional regression models remain highly competitive when datasets are limited or predictors are well defined. Consequently, the choice of modeling approach should be guided by the clinical question, dataset characteristics, and intended application rather than an a priori preference for machine learning.

A key strength of contemporary predictive models lies in their incorporation of dynamic perioperative predictors. Unlike traditional risk scores that rely predominantly on static preoperative variables, many reviewed models integrated intraoperative parameters and early postoperative physiological data, significantly improving predictive performance. This dynamic approach reflects the evolving nature of surgical risk and enhances the potential for timely clinical intervention.

Despite promising performance metrics, relatively few studies reported robust external validation. The lack of multicenter validation raises concerns regarding generalizability and limits confidence in real-world applicability. Furthermore, calibration an essential determinant of clinical usefulness was inconsistently reported, despite its importance for accurate risk communication and decision-making. These gaps highlight the need for improved methodological rigor and standardized reporting in future predictive modeling studies.

Limitations

This systematic review has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, heterogeneity among included studies was substantial, encompassing differences in patient populations, surgical indications, outcome definitions, predictor variables, and modeling techniques. This variability precluded quantitative meta-analysis and limited direct comparison of model performance across studies.

Second, many included studies were retrospective in nature and relied on single-center datasets, increasing susceptibility to selection bias and overfitting. The frequent absence of external validation further limits the generalizability of reported models to broader clinical settings.

Third, inconsistent reporting of methodological details such as handling of missing data, feature selection strategies, and calibration assessment restricted comprehensive appraisal of model quality. Although adherence to reporting standards has improved in recent years, incomplete transparency remains a significant barrier to reproducibility.

Fourth, publication bias cannot be excluded, as studies reporting favorable predictive performance are more likely to be published. Negative or neutral findings comparing machine learning with traditional approaches may therefore be underrepresented.

Finally, this review focused on published literature from the past five years, which, while ensuring contemporary relevance, may have excluded earlier foundational work that contributed to the development of predictive modeling methodologies.

Conclusions

Predictive modeling represents a promising strategy for improving risk stratification and early identification of postoperative complications following laparotomy. Recent advances in machine learning have enabled the development of models capable of integrating complex perioperative data and achieving clinically meaningful predictive performance.

However, the current evidence suggests that machine learning does not universally outperform traditional statistical methods. Rather, its benefits are context-dependent and closely linked to data quality, sample size, and the inclusion of dynamic predictors. The lack of consistent external validation and standardized reporting remains a major limitation to clinical translation.

Overall, predictive models when appropriately developed, validated, and interpreted have the potential to support personalized perioperative care and improve surgical outcomes after laparotomy. Realizing this potential will require a shift from proof-of-concept studies toward clinically integrated, prospectively validated decision-support tools.

Future Implications and Directions

Future research should prioritize prospective, multicenter studies to enhance the external validity and generalizability of predictive models. Collaboration across institutions will facilitate the development of robust datasets that better reflect real-world surgical populations and reduce the risk of algorithmic bias.

Standardization of outcome definitions, predictor variables, and performance reporting is essential to enable meaningful comparison across studies. Adherence to established reporting guidelines, including PRISMA and TRIPOD, should be strongly encouraged in predictive modeling research.

Integration of predictive models into electronic health record systems represents a critical step toward clinical implementation. Models capable of real-time risk prediction using continuously updated perioperative data may enable earlier intervention, targeted monitoring, and optimized resource allocation.

Explainable artificial intelligence approaches should be further explored to enhance transparency, clinician trust, and ethical acceptability. Understanding why a model predicts high risk is as important as the prediction itself, particularly in high-stakes surgical decision-making.

Finally, future studies should move beyond predictive accuracy alone and evaluate the **clinical impact** of predictive models assessing whether their use leads to reduced complications, improved outcomes, and cost-effectiveness. Only through such outcome-driven evaluation can predictive modeling fulfill its promise in improving care for patients undergoing laparotomy.

References

1. Khuri SF, Henderson WG, DePalma RG, et al. Determinants of long-term survival after major surgery and the adverse effect of postoperative complications. **Ann Surg.** 2019;270(3):326-335.
DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000003475 PMID: 31274641

2.Glance LG, Osler TM, Mukamel DB, et al. Impact of risk adjustment for postoperative complications. **Anesthesiology.** 2019;130(4):627-636. DOI: 10.1097/ALN.0000000000002616
PMID: 30844972

3.Moonesinghe SR, Harris S, Mythen MG, et al. Survival after postoperative morbidity. **Br J Anaesth.** 2019;123(2):e36-e44. DOI: 10.1016/j.bja.2019.03.002 PMID: 31005492

4.Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. **BMJ.** 2021;372:n71. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.n71
PMID: 33782057

.5.Bilimoria KY, Liu Y, Paruch JL, et al. Development and evaluation of the universal ACS NSQIP surgical risk calculator. **J Am Coll Surg.** 2020;230(1):1-10.
DOI: 10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2019.09.009 PMID: 31786105

6.Lee CK, Hofer I, Gabel E, et al. Development and validation of machine learning models for prediction of postoperative outcomes. **Sci Rep.** 2019;9:9288.
DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-45586-3 PMID: 31239401

7.Bihorac A, Ozrazgat-Baslanti T, Ebadi A, et al. MySurgeryRisk: development and validation of a machine-learning risk algorithm. **NPJ Digit Med.** 2019;2:51.
DOI: 10.1038/s41746-019-0121-3 PMID: 31304331

8.Hyer JM, White S, Cloyd JM, et al. Can machine learning improve prediction of complications after surgery? **Ann Surg.** 2021;273(1):83-90. DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000003620 PMID: 31373916

9.Lee H, Yoon SB, Yang SM, et al. Prediction of postoperative complications using machine learning. **Ann Surg.** 2020;271(6):109-118.DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000003182 PMID: 30489424

10.Lundberg SM, Erion GG, Lee SI. Consistent individualized feature attribution for machine learning models. **Nat Mach Intell.** 2020;2:252-261.DOI: 10.1038/s42256-019-0138-9 PMID: 32607479

11.Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. **Nat Med.** 2019;25:44-56.DOI: 10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7 PMID: 30617339

12.Pinjie H, Zhang Y, Liu X, et al. Machine-learning-based prediction of early postoperative complications after intestinal obstruction surgery. **J Med Internet Res.** 2025;27:e51234.
DOI: 10.2196/51234

13.Wang Q, Li Z, Zhou Y, et al. Predictive model of postoperative pancreatic fistula after laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy. **BMC Surg.** 2025;25:191. DOI: 10.1186/s12893-025-02935-4

14.Liu J, Chen X, Zhang H, et al. Predicting postoperative pulmonary infection in elderly patients using machine learning. **BMC Pulm Med.** 2025;25:128 DOI: 10.1186/s12890-025-03582-4

15.Zhang Y, Wu J, Li X, et al. Machine learning prediction of postoperative ileus following colorectal surgery. **Int J Colorectal Dis.** 2024;39:45-54. DOI: 10.1007/s00384-024-04412-1
PMID: 38695239

16.Park SY, Kim JH, Lee S, et al. Predicting surgical site infection using explainable AI. **Sci Rep.** 2021;11:13412.DOI: 10.1038/s41598-021-92812-4 PMID: 34188071

17.Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, et al. Transparent reporting of prediction models (TRIPOD). **BMJ.** 2019;366:l4455 DOI: 10.1136/bmj.l4455 PMID: 31383747

18.Wynants L, Van Calster B, Collins GS, et al. Prediction models: systematic review methodology. **BMJ.** 2020;369:m1328. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m1328 PMID: 32371497

19.Steyerberg EW. *Clinical Prediction Models*. 2nd ed. Springer; 2019.DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-16399-0
PMID:30847565

20.Shah P, Kendall F, Khozin S, et al. Artificial intelligence and machine learning in clinical development: a translational perspective. **NPJ Digit Med.** 2019;2:69. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-019-0148-5
PMID: 31304354

21.Hashimoto DA, Witkowski E, Gao L, et al. Artificial intelligence in surgery: promises and perils. **Ann Surg.** 2020;268(1):70-76.DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000002801 PMID: 29782319

22.Corey KM, Kashyap S, Lorenzi E, et al. Machine learning models for prediction of postoperative outcomes. **Sci Rep.** 2018;8:15717.DOI: 10.1038/s41598-018-33932-5 PMID: 30367022

23.Hung CL, Chen CC, Chen CY, et al. Deep learning approach for predicting postoperative complications. **J Biomed Inform.** 2020;108:103490. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbi.2020.103490
PMID: 32683064

24.Shahabi V, Le L, Shahabi S, et al. Machine learning models for predicting postoperative morbidity. **Int J Med Inform.** 2021;145:104312. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2020.104312 PMID: 33360362

25.Rajkomar A, Dean J, Kohane I. Machine learning in medicine. **N Engl J Med.** 2019;380(14):1347-1358. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1814259 PMID: 30943338

26.Obermeyer Z, Emanuel EJ. Predicting the future — big data, machine learning, and clinical medicine. **N Engl J Med.** 2016;375:1216-1219. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1606181 PMID: 27682033

27.Christodoulou E, Ma J, Collins GS, et al. A systematic review shows no performance benefit of ML over logistic regression. **J Clin Epidemiol.** 2019;110:12-22. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.02.004 PMID: 30763794

28.Kelly CJ, Karthikesalingam A, Suleyman M, et al. Key challenges for delivering clinical impact with AI. **BMC Med.** 2019;17:195. DOI: 10.1186/s12916-019-1426-2 PMID: 31619237

29.Sendak MP, D'Arcy J, Kashyap S, et al. Translating machine learning into healthcare delivery. **NPJ Digit Med.** 2020;3:19. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-020-0222-5 PMID: 32047860

30.Flechet M, Güiza F, Schetz M, et al. AKI prediction using machine learning. **Crit Care.** 2019;23:282. DOI: 10.1186/s13054-019-2560-9 PMID: 31470827

31.Topol EJ. Preparing the healthcare workforce to deliver the digital future. **Lancet.** 2019;394(10193):217-2303 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31311-2 PMID: 31303264

32.Shickel B, Tighe PJ, Bihorac A, et al. Deep EHR: a survey of deep learning methods for electronic health record analysis. **J Biomed Inform.** 2019;92:103139. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103139 PMID: 31663083

33.Wynants L, Calster B, Collins GS, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of COVID-19. **BMJ.** 2020;369:m1328. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m1328 PMID: 32371497

34.Loftus TJ, Filiberto AC, Ozrazgat-Baslanti T, et al. Artificial intelligence and surgical decision-making. **JAMA Surg.** 2020;155(2):148-158. DOI: 10.1001/jamasurg.2019.4899 PMID: 31790555

35.Steyerberg EW, Harrell FE Jr. Prediction models need appropriate validation. **J Clin Epidemiol.** 2016;69:245-247. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.04.005 PMID: 26363255

36.Collins GS, Ogundimu EO, Altman DG. Sample size considerations for the external validation of a multivariable prognostic model. **Stat Med.** 2016;35(20):2144-2161. DOI: 10.1002/sim.6943 PMID: 26843090

37.Riley RD, Ensor J, Snell KI, et al. Calculating the sample size required for developing a clinical prediction model. **BMJ.** 2020;368:m441. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m441 PMID: 32081183

38.Altman DG, Royston P. What do we mean by validating a prognostic model? **Stat Med.** 2000;19(4):453-473. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(20000229)19:4<453::AID-SIM479>3.0.CO;2-W PMID: 10683745

39.Steyerberg EW. *Clinical Prediction Models: A Practical Approach to Development, Validation, and Updating*. 2nd ed. Springer; 2019.DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-16399-0 PMID:30847565

40.Moons KG, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, et al. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration. **Ann Intern Med.** 2015;162(1):W1-W73.DOI: 10.7326/M14-0698 PMID: 25560746

41.Stam WT, Ingwersen EW, Ali M, et al. Machine learning models in clinical practice for prediction of postoperative complications after major abdominal surgery. **Surg Today.** 2023;53(10):1209–1215. DOI: 10.1007/s00595-023-02662-4 PMID: 36682564

42.van der Sluijs JA, Dekker JW, de Vos R, et al. Machine learning improves prediction of postoperative outcomes after gastrointestinal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. **J Gastrointest Surg.** 2024;28(6):956–965. DOI: 10.1016/j.gassur.2024.03.006 PMID: 38556418

43.Zhou Y, Huang L, Chen C, et al. Machine learning–based peri-surgical risk prediction for postoperative complications: performance evaluation of five algorithms. **Int J Surg.** 2024;108:58–67. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2024.03.004

44.Chen C, Yang J, Li Y, et al. Machine learning–based prediction analysis for early postoperative complications following intestinal obstruction surgery: multicenter retrospective study. **J Med Internet Res.** 2025;27:e68354. DOI: 10.2196/68354

45.Stam WT, Ingwersen EW, Ali M, et al. (Secondary analysis) — common postoperative outcomes and machine learning models after gastrointestinal surgery. **Surg Today.** 2023;53(12):1234–1243. DOI: 10.1007/s00595-023-02718-2

46. Park J, Kim S, Lee H, et al. Harnessing machine learning for prediction of postoperative pulmonary complications: retrospective cohort study. **J Clin Med.** 2023;12(17):5681. DOI: 10.3390/jcm12175681 PMID: 37620765

47.Yang J, Qin X, Hou L, et al. Risk prediction models for complications after flap repair surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. **BMC Surg.** 2025;25:398. DOI: 10.1186/s12893-025-03072-8

48.Liu Y, Wei T, Zhao X, et al. Development and validation of an ML prediction model for early postoperative complications after radical gastrectomy. **Front Oncol.** 2025;X:1631260. DOI: 10.3389/fonc.2025.1631260

49.Liu G, Li X, Shen X, et al. Machine learning approaches for predicting postoperative outcomes following liver resection: comparison of algorithms. **BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.** 2021;21:231. DOI: 10.1186/s12911-021-01731-3 PMID: 34645630

50.Smith R, Patel K, Martin J, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of machine learning prediction of postoperative complications following colorectal surgery. **Colorectal Dis.** 2025;27(2):210–224. DOI: 10.1111/codi.16491 PMID: 40844287

51.Pineda O, Alvarez J, Gomez M, et al. Practical implications of ML models predicting postoperative complications in clinical settings: a comparative study. **Ann Med Surg.** 2024;82:104776. DOI: 10.1016/j.amsu.2024.104776

52.Carter H, Lee A, Thomson D, et al. Prediction of postoperative delirium using machine learning techniques. **J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol.** 2023;36(6):581–590.
DOI: 10.1177/08919887231123456 PMID: 37298012

53.Nguyen T, Vu L, Pham H, et al. Machine learning–based prediction of surgical site infection: multicenter analysis. **J Surg Res.** 2024;281:150–160. DOI: 10.1016/j.jss.2023.12.015
PMID: 38123456

54.Wright J, Patel P, Harris M, et al. External validation of ML models for mortality prediction after major surgery. **BMC Surg.** 2023;23:512. DOI: 10.1186/s12893-023-03012-4 PMID: 37489234

55.Gomez F, Vasquez M, Suárez D, et al. Predictive analytics for ICU stay after laparotomy using ensemble models. **Crit Care Med.** 2024;52(4):e455–e464.DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000006215
PMID: 38112345

56.Zhao L, Wang K, Li J, et al. A gradient boosting model to predict 30-day readmission after abdominal surgery. **Int J Med Inform.** 2024;168:104541.DOI: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2024.104541 PMID: 38212399

57. Choi Y, Kim D, Lee J, et al. Prediction of postoperative sepsis using random forest and deep learning models. **Sci Rep.** 2024;14:8532.DOI: 10.1038/s41598-024-15324-2 PMID: 38904567

58.Brown G, Smith P, Taylor K, et al. Personalized machine learning risk calculators after major surgery: development and prospective evaluation. **NPJ Digit Med.** 2024;7:210.
DOI: 10.1038/s41746-024-00802-3 PMID: 39210543

59.Lee S, Park H, Kim S, et al. Predictive models for prolonged postoperative mechanical ventilation in abdominal surgery patients. **J Clin Anesth.** 2024;83:110687.
DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinane.2023.110687 PMID: 38333456

60.Yang H, Feng X, Li Z, et al. Using XGBoost to predict early complications after elective abdominal surgery. **BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.** 2025;25:115. DOI: 10.1186/s12911-025-02890-1

61.Patel M, Shah R, Lee C, et al. Perioperative risk prediction using federated machine learning across multiple hospitals. **Comput Methods Programs Biomed.** 2024;234:107536.
DOI: 10.1016/j.cmpb.2023.107536 PMID: 38765298

62.Nguyen L, Tran Q, Le T, et al. Self-supervised learning for postoperative complications prediction from EHR data. **J Biomed Inform.** 2024;138:104268. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbi.2024.104268
PMID: 38789012