Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/)

journal homepage: <www.elsevier.com/locate/jpi>

Journal of Pathology Informatics

Review Article

Seeing the random forest through the decision trees. Supporting learning health systems from histopathology with machine learning models: Challenges and opportunities

Ricardo Gonzalez ^{a,b, \ast ,1, Ashirbani Saha ^{c,d}, Clinton J.V. Campbell ^{e,f}, Peyman Nejat ^g,} Cynthia Lokker ^h, Andrew P. Norgan ⁱ

^a DeGroote School of Business, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

b Division of Computational Pathology and Artificial Intelligence, Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, United States

^c Department of Oncology, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

^d Escarpment Cancer Research Institute, McMaster University and Hamilton Health Sciences, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

^e William Osler Health System, Brampton, Ontario, Canada

^f Department of Pathology and Molecular Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

 8 Department of Artificial Intelligence and Informatics, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, United States

h Health Information Research Unit, Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

ⁱ Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, United States

ARTICLE INFO ABSTRACT

Keywords: Pathology Artificial intelligence Machine learning Learning health system Image processing Computer-assisted

This paper discusses some overlooked challenges faced when working with machine learning models for histopathology and presents a novel opportunity to support "Learning Health Systems" with them. Initially, the authors elaborate on these challenges after separating them according to their mitigation strategies: those that need innovative approaches, time, or future technological capabilities and those that require a conceptual reappraisal from a critical perspective. Then, a novel opportunity to support "Learning Health Systems" by integrating hidden information extracted by ML models from digitalized histopathology slides with other healthcare big data is presented.

Contents

⁎ Corresponding author at: DeGroote School of Business, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario L8S4M4, Canada.

E-mail addresses: gonzar5@mcmaster.ca, [rgonzalez@lunenfeld.ca,](mailto:rgonzalez@lunenfeld.ca) (R. Gonzalez).

¹ Present address: Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, Mount Sinai Hospital, Joseph & Wolf Lebovic Health Complex, 881–600 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M5G 1X5, Canada.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpi.2023.100347>

Received 21 August 2023; Received in revised form 6 October 2023; Accepted 1 November 2023

Available online 04 November 2023

2153-3539/© 2023 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of Association for Pathology Informatics. This is an open access article under the CC BY license [\(http://](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Epigraph

"We should take care not to make the intellect our goal. It has of course powerful muscles but no personality. It cannot lead, it can only serve, and it is not fastidious in its choice of a leader"---Albert Einstein, 1943.¹

Introduction

Some months ago, when discussing the "gold-standard" in histopathology, the corresponding author [GR] shared an anecdote. As a pathology resident, he was expected to attend the National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Science in Bogota (Colombia's capital and largest city) to improve his technical and analytical skills in forensic pathology. Many corpses of people who died of unnatural manners (i.e., homicides, suicides, acci-dents), suspiciously, unexpectedly, or for potential medical malpractices^{[2](#page-3-0)} arrived there daily. As in other countries, autopsies are part of some legal investigations there, and forensic pathologists' opinions are used to define responsibilities in courts^{[2,3](#page-3-0)} and are commonly awaited by the deceased's relatives and other concerned people[.4](#page-3-0)

Every morning, 1 or 2 corpses were assigned to him. After reading a report with the circumstances of the death, which in many homicides and suicides were unknown (the sentence "no one saw or heard a thing" was commonly found), dissecting the cadaver to collect as much evidence as possible and discussing the relevant findings with his professor, the latter always ended up the conversation by asking the same question: "Okay, [GR] so… how are you gonna kill it?"

He was definitely not being trained to become a serial killer, and, as may be expected, some witnesses could testify on his behalf. Nevertheless, this question still resonates in his mind. And, it is not because he feels guilty about those people's deaths. He neither regrets stating the causes of death with the sometimes-limited evidence available (which was the real question behind his professor's daily pun). It is because that question reflects the uncertainty that pathologists may face in their routine practices since, for many diseases, their opinions are considered the "gold-standard" by social, or more specifically, medical conventions (i.e., those who capture the "ground truth").^{5-[10](#page-3-0)}

In addition to elaborating on the rationale behind accepting pathologists' opinions as the gold-standard, in the following paragraphs, the authors address other challenges faced by the machine learning (ML) community and pathologists working in artificial intelligence in histopathology. Also, a novel opportunity to support "Learning Health Systems"[11](#page-3-0) with digital pathology by integrating hidden information extracted with ML models from histopathology slides with other healthcare big data is discussed at the end.

Challenges

Besides the need to increase adherence to reporting guidelines^{12–18} to facilitate the understanding and comparison of experimental results $^{19-23}$ $^{19-23}$ $^{19-23}$ and other issues related to models' explainability^{[24](#page-4-0)} and data, model devel-opment, and model deployment,^{[25](#page-4-0)} some important challenges that have probably been overlooked are discussed below. They are separated into 2 groups based on their potential mitigation strategy.

Challenges that may need innovative approaches, time, or future technological capabilities:

Expanding recognition capabilities of ML models

Although the ability to recognize all the expected and unexpected diseases that could be diagnosed in any given histopathological case may be out of the scope of all or almost all ML models, this limitation certainly limits their applicability in routine clinical practices.

As explained below, ML models' outputs are limited by the examples used to train them.^{26–29} Therefore, a reasonable approach to address this challenge is to create large and diverse but also more granular and compre-hensive training datasets.^{30–[32](#page-4-0)} This process could be increasingly facilitated with a broader adoption of digital pathology and artificial intelligence platforms in the futur[e33](#page-4-0)–³⁵ and collaborative efforts, such as those based on federated learning. 36,37

Extracting all the relevant information from Whole-Slide Images (WSIs)

Largely due to computational constraints to processing complete WSIs, ML models have usually been trained using sampling methods that extract small patches obtained with one or a limited number of scanning magnifications.[38](#page-4-0)–⁴⁴ The limitations of using these sampling strategies could be illustrated in the parable of the "blind men and an elephant".^{[45](#page-4-0)} As ML models' pattern recognition/prediction capabilities rely on the data contained in these patches, developing efficient methods to facilitate the extraction of all the relevant information from WSIs is of paramount importance.

Self-attention methods and other innovative approaches^{44,46-52} as well as future improvements in computational power, $38-43,51,52$ $38-43,51,52$ $38-43,51,52$ $38-43,51,52$ may help in this regard.

Challenges that may need a conceptual reappraisal from a critical perspective:

Obtaining the "ground truth" for diagnostic/classification purposes in histopathology

The reliability (i.e., "agreement," "reproducibility," or "inter- and intraobserver variability")⁵³ of pathologists' opinions has been a matter of concern for the ML community.[10,](#page-3-0)[54](#page-4-0) That is because pathologists' opinions are needed to train and test ML models for diagnosis/classification purposes, as they are regarded as the "gold-standard".^{5,6}

As ML outputs might appear magical for people without domain knowledge of the field,⁵⁵ it could be understandable if pathologists' opinions look magical to non-pathologists and their cognitive processes are perceived as "black boxes".^{[56](#page-4-0)–58} However, contrary to what people may believe or expect, pathologists are not trained to become part of a selected group of legally accountable medical doctors to whom the "ground truth" is revealed to allocate diseases' names in patients' reports.^{[59](#page-4-0)} Contrarily, inter- and intraobserver variability can be regarded as inherent to these evaluative processes.[53,58](#page-4-0),[60,61](#page-4-0) And, these processes may include some quantitative tasks, such as counting and measuring, in which computers can outperform pathologists when specific conditions are met.^{[8](#page-3-0)[,62](#page-4-0)}

Although the best way to capture the "ground truth" to improve patients' health outcomes may remain an open discussion that could be framed in an ontological and epistemological manner $63,64$ and acknowledging that resolving the historical debate between "naturalists" and "normativists"^{65–68} is beyond the scope of this paper and the authors' philosophical argumentative capabilities, some of their insights are presented below. They are related to the way pathologists make diagnoses. With them, authors intend to help readers embrace the idea that, in practice and despite their limitations, more reliable sources of "ground truth" than pathologists' opinions may not be found for diagnostic/classification purposes in histopathology. Also, and hopefully, that everyone's beliefs or expectations need to be adjusted accordingly.

During their post-graduate training, pathology trainees are exposed to a large number of histopathology cases under the supervision of their future colleagues. $69,70$ $69,70$ Besides refining their visual recognition capabilities, $69,70$ $69,70$ they are expected to learn a conceptual framework and the field-specific terminology to make diagnoses.^{[59](#page-4-0),[60](#page-4-0),[70](#page-5-0)–75} Once graduated, with the proper clinical/surgical data and relevant auxiliary tests' results (e.g., obtained with immunohistochemical or molecular studies), pathologists make diagnoses by comparing the visual information they extract from patients' tissues/samples against sets of diagnostic/classification criteria (i.e., only after confirming that a tissue/sample meets some diagnostic/classification criteria do pathologists assign a disease name/classification category to it)[.56,60](#page-4-0)[,76,77](#page-5-0) These sets of diagnostic/classification criteria are listed in histopathology classifications such as the WHO Classification of Tumours⁷⁸ and generally use concepts^{[60](#page-4-0),[79,80](#page-5-0)} to describe the presence/absence and

the spatial distribution of some normal/abnormal cells and tissue components[.56,](#page-4-0)[81,82](#page-5-0) As histopathology classifications are typically created by pathologists to be used by pathologists[,78](#page-5-0) only cells/tissue components expected to be recognizable by them are included in the diagnostic/classification criteria. $83,84$ $83,84$ $83,84$ As a consequence, as long as the morphological classifications made (and to be used) by pathologists are needed to guide clinical decisions, pathologists' opinions will be regarded as the most reliable source of "ground truth" for diagnostic/classification purposes (i.e., the "gold-standard").^{5,[85](#page-5-0)}

Although a new potential role of "hidden" information extracted from WSIs in future healthcare systems will be addressed below, employing diag-noses made by consensus^{6,10,[86](#page-5-0)–88} and/or from pathologists with relevant expertise^{10[,89](#page-5-0)} seems to be a reasonable approach to train ML models as it reflects the best available standard of care. 10

Differentiating "hidden" from "diagnostically relevant" information

WSIs carry large amounts of valuable information.^{[90](#page-5-0)} Some of this information has been visually recognizable for years and used by pathologists for diagnostic/classification purposes and, secondarily or indirectly, to predict prognosis and treatment outcomes. $54,77,90$ $54,77,90$ Other information, previously hidden from human eyes, can now be extracted using some ML models.^{[41,](#page-4-0)[91,92](#page-5-0)} This has created many opportunities with the potential to augment human skills.⁹³ For example, hidden information has demonstrated to be very powerful in predicting prognosis, treatment responses, and biomarkers using clinical follow-up data as the gold-standard^{[41](#page-4-0),[91,92,94](#page-5-0)–99} and in indexing and searching for cases with similar morphological patterns within large archives of WSIs.^{[100](#page-5-0)} However, an essential distinction between hidden and diagnostically relevant information must be made. As explained above, pathologists make diagnoses by comparing the visual information they extract from patients' tissues/ samples against sets of diagnostic criteria listed in histopathology classifications.[56](#page-4-0),[76,77](#page-5-0) As these sets of diagnostic criteria are created by pathologists to be used by pathologists,⁷⁸ only those cells/tissue components expected to be recognizable by pathologists are included in them. $83,84$ Therefore, information hidden from pathologists' eyes that is not useful to assess if diagnostic/classification criteria are met (even if valuable for other purposes) can be considered irrelevant for morphologic diagnostic/classification purposes.

Nevertheless, developing ML models for morphologic diagnostic/ classification purposes that recognize diagnostically relevant cells/tissue components may have some practical advantages. For example, it could be a reasonable approach to make ML models more applicable in the long term. That is because histopathology classifications usually change over time (i.e., are "moving targets"), but most diagnostically relevant cells/tissue components do not.^{[101](#page-5-0)–111} Also, as some of these cells/tissue components are listed in the different diagnostic criteria of many related diseases, these models could accelerate the development of tools that can support pathologists in more than one narrow task (e.g., by facilitating the recognition of several diseases). 112 In addition, the need to develop "explainable" algorithms would be less relevant and could gain regulatory agencies' approval easier if their scope is to be used as decision-support tools to improve pathologists' workflows (and not replace them in clinical settings by making diagnoses directly).^{112–[115](#page-5-0)} Lastly, better performances could be achievable with less effort with some commonly used ML models (i.e., convolutional neural networks). That is because cells/ tissue components have some visual attributes (AKA features), such as colors, shapes, and textures, that these models can easily identify using convolutional kernels (i.e., feature extraction filters).[116](#page-5-0),[117](#page-5-0) In contrast, to recognize all the specific diseases/classification categories while ruling out others with morphological similarities, ML models would need to assess if all the diagnostic/classification criteria are met. And, as there is still a large gap between ML models' pattern recognition and human-level concept learning,^{[118](#page-5-0)} the ability to understand all the concepts included in diagnostic/classification criteria may be beyond current ML models' capabilities. Noteworthily, concept-based explainable methods $119,120$ $119,120$ $119,120$ could facilitate a rigorous assessment of this capability by pathologists' in the future.

Going beyond external validation in clinical settings: The need for iterative model retraining[26](#page-4-0),[121](#page-5-0)–¹²³ after ML models' deployment

As specific patterns learned from biased-training datasets are not expected to improve the performance of ML models when tested with independent datasets, only external validation is considered important evidence of generalizability.¹²⁴ However, obtaining good results in one or more external validation datasets doesn't guarantee that the model will perform well in all other settings. 26,32,125 26,32,125 26,32,125 As ML models' prediction/recognition capabilities are restricted by the amount and diversity of examples used to train them, patterns not properly represented in training datasets are not expected to be adequately predicted/recognized in validation datasets.^{26–[29](#page-4-0)} The ability to use pathologists' conceptual frameworks 60,73,79,80 60,73,79,80 60,73,79,80 60,73,79,80 60,73,79,80 60,73,79,80 (in addition to pixels-derived recurrent patterns learned from training datasets) could be needed if widely generalizable ML models are expected to be developed.^{118,[126](#page-5-0),[127](#page-5-0)} And even if, for practical reasons, it is assumed that future events (such as those expected to be predicted by ML models) will always resemble past events (e.g., those used to create training datasets), it is important to be mindful that "universally" generalizable models may still be unachievable if the generalization problem is approached from a philosophical perspective and other problems of induction, as those explained by Lauc,¹²⁸ are contemplated.

As stated by the FDA, validation datasets must contain sufficient cases representative of those the product will likely encounter during its intended use.^{[129](#page-6-0)} Therefore, for real-life practice, comprehensive validation datasets would need to be created for each clinical setting where models are planned to be used.^{[32](#page-4-0)} In addition, to improve their site-specific performances, datasets to update them (by retraining and/ or fine-tuning their hyperparameters when the selected metrics are below a predefined threshold) would also need to be constructed.^{[32](#page-4-0)} This can become an iterative process for each institution, considering that the ML model's performance would need to be monitored as new cases with previously unseen relevant characteristics would perma-nently arrive to be assessed.^{[26,](#page-4-0)[121](#page-5-0)–123,130–[132](#page-6-0)} Although the iterative nature of this process may not make ML models "universally" generalizable, 26,125,128 26,125,128 26,125,128 26,125,128 26,125,128 it would certainly boost their learning capabilities by leveraging their ability to falsify prediction rules that lack empirical adequacy (as postulated by Buchholz and Raidl).[133](#page-6-0) If some major technical challenges are overcome,^{134–[137](#page-6-0)} and these steps can be done automatically,^{[122](#page-5-0)[,132,138,139](#page-6-0)} a site-specific autonomous endless selflearning process could eventually be developed.

Opportunities

Lastly, a novel opportunity to support "Learning Health Systems" with digital pathology will be discussed.

Pathologists have been creating, refining, and validating histopathology classifications for decades. Like other taxonomists, ⁸⁵ some prefer the use of broad categories (so-called "lumpers"), and others favor more granularity ("splitters").^{[140](#page-6-0)–142} While broader categories may sometimes contribute to reducing pathologists' intra- and interobserver variability,^{[143](#page-6-0)-148} more granularity could be useful to separate groups of individuals with relevant differences for research purposes (e.g., to assess specific treatment responses) or to guide clinical decisions (e.g., to provide personalized treat-ments when differences in treatment-responses have been found).^{149–[151](#page-6-0)} However, disregarding preferences in terms of lumping or splitting and clinical pertinence or reproducibility of current histopathology classifications, it is still not uncommon to find cases that do not fit in any of their di-agnostic categories.^{[74](#page-5-0)[,152](#page-6-0)–155} When facing the associated uncertainty, pathologists could opt to request second opinions,[86](#page-5-0)–88[,156](#page-6-0) perform ancil-lary tests,^{[7](#page-3-0),[9](#page-3-0)[,157](#page-6-0),[158](#page-6-0)} select the diagnostic category where the most significant findings fit[,159](#page-6-0)–¹⁶¹ write comments (e.g., recommending complementary studies/procedures or suggesting to correlate their findings with other data), or use descriptive terms or unstandardized diagnoses.^{[152](#page-6-0)-155,[159](#page-6-0)} These strategies can help to reduce the risk of harming patients. However, the need to use them may partially explain why most histopathology classifications are updated recurrently, even if some of the tissue morphological changes used in their diagnostic criteria remain unchanged.¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰⁸

Similar to what was stated by Dr. Juan Rosai more than 2 decades ago, there are still no techniques more cost-effective, flexible, and rapidly informative than the morphological assessment of tissues by pathologists in clin-ical settings.^{[96](#page-5-0)} However, some techniques whose original role was to support or complement morphological histopathology classifications (e.g., immunohistochemistry and omics-based studies) $9,77,90,110,158$ $9,77,90,110,158$ $9,77,90,110,158$ $9,77,90,110,158$ $9,77,90,110,158$ are now redefining some of them^{[103,107,109](#page-5-0)} and in a few specific cases, replacing them for treatment purposes, $162,163$ somewhat reminiscent of how microscopic morphologic assessments once started to improve the recognition and prediction capabilities of gross descriptions and clinical findings.¹⁵⁸ Although it may be impossible to anticipate how histopathology classifications will continue to evolve, as explained below, digital pathology brings a novel opportunity to integrate large amounts of histopathology information with other healthcare big data to improve the future provision of health services.

Even if the best methods to capture the ground truth remain debatable, and the problems of induction explained by $Lauc^{128}$ are ignored, the intrinsic ability of ML to falsify prediction rules that lack empirical adequacy 133 strengthened by the increasing availability of big data^{[13,](#page-4-0)[164](#page-6-0)–166,[229](#page-7-0)} could be leveraged to develop ML models that continuously integrate and assign specific weights (i.e., relative importance) to personal (e.g., clinical, radiological, histopathological, laboratory medicine, multi-omics, self-reported, and collected with wearable devices) and population-based empirical data (e.g., related to "social determinants of health")^{[97](#page-5-0),[167](#page-6-0)-171,[229](#page-7-0)} to predict health outcomes dynamically.^{[122](#page-5-0),[123](#page-5-0),[139,172](#page-6-0)–174} In some of these models, hidden information extracted with ML models from WSIs that have shown to be valuable for prediction purposes $41,91,92,94-98$ $41,91,92,94-98$ $41,91,92,94-98$ $41,91,92,94-98$ will most likely obtain high weights. And also, diagnostically relevant morphological information extracted by pathologists and pathologists' diagnoses based on histopathology classifications, validated for decades to predict health outcomes and to develop countless treatments, $54,77,90,150$ $54,77,90,150$ $54,77,90,150$ $54,77,90,150$ $54,77,90,150$ will certainly get high weights in many of them.

Although major challenges related to data governance/ management, $1^{35,175-183}$ $1^{35,175-183}$ $1^{35,175-183}$ ethical/legal, 1^{84-187} and environmental $1^{188,189}$ $1^{188,189}$ $1^{188,189}$ considerations would need to be addressed, these "dynamic multimodal ML models" may become cost-effective in different populations^{[169,](#page-6-0)190-[193](#page-7-0)} if conceived as the integrative tools needed to provide precision health^{22[,164,165](#page-6-0),[168](#page-6-0),[194](#page-7-0)-196} and support some of the iterative cycles of knowledge generation and continuous improvement of "learning health systems". 11[,197](#page-7-0)–200

Final remarks

Finally, considering that ML capabilities are limited by the data used to train them^{[26](#page-4-0)–29} and that a significant amount of medical data currently comes from non-marginalized populations, it is highly predictable that some of these multimodal ML models will not work well on marginalized groups.[166](#page-6-0)[,185,201](#page-7-0)–²⁰⁵ As this situation may perpetuate and even reinforce health disparities,^{[166](#page-6-0),[185](#page-7-0),[187](#page-7-0),[202](#page-7-0),206-[210](#page-7-0)} in addition to employing some debiasing methods[,202,203,206,211](#page-7-0) allocating more resources to collect data from marginalized populations^{212–214} and training ML models to address the social determinants of health or mitigate their effects^{[171,](#page-6-0)[215](#page-7-0)-219} need to be contemplated. Also, regarding the epigraph, what Albert Einstein once said¹ about the intellect could also be applied to artificial intelligence algorithms nowadays. Accordingly, beyond any technical considerations, an over-reliance on ML models in health systems should be avoided 204 204 204 and the active participation of healthcare professionals during their devel-oping, deploying, and monitoring could be beneficial.^{[220,221](#page-7-0)}

Even though the real impact of these "dynamic multimodal ML models" would undoubtedly need to be permanently assessed for specific health outcomes in different settings, $222-224$ if they can help to create more equitable healthcare systems continuously supported by high-quality big data, it could be expected that the number of corpses that arrive at forensic pathology facilities will one day be reduced and that fewer of them will be assigned with preventable causes of death. Also, and hopefully, that people will only remember with a smile the uncertainty experienced by pathology residents when facing [GR]'s forensic pathology professor's puns.

Funding

This "viewpoint" article did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgments

None.

Appendix A. Glossary of terms

References

- 1. Wikimedia Commons, the free media repository. File:03 ALBERT EINSTEIN.ogg. Published February 27, 2023. Accessed March 29, 2023. [https://commons.wikimedia.](https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=File:03_ALBERT_EINSTEIN.ogg&oldid=736428816) [org/w/index.php?title=File:03_ALBERT_EINSTEIN.ogg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=File:03_ALBERT_EINSTEIN.ogg&oldid=736428816)&oldid=736428816.
- 2. Osorio L, Duque M, Velosa G, Carreño M, Arias L, Morales M. Guía de necropsias de procedimientos para la realización de necropsias medicolegales. Segunda edición. Published online 2004. Accessed March 25, 2023. [https://www.medicinalegal.gov.co/](https://www.medicinalegal.gov.co/normalizacion-forense/guias-protocolos-y-reglamentos) [normalizacion-forense/guias-protocolos-y-reglamentos](https://www.medicinalegal.gov.co/normalizacion-forense/guias-protocolos-y-reglamentos)
- Weedn VW. Bases of forensic pathology expert testimony with emphasis on Iowa v Tyler. Acad Forensic Pathol 2021;11(4):185. [https://doi.org/10.1177/](https://doi.org/10.1177/19253621211060961) [19253621211060961.](https://doi.org/10.1177/19253621211060961)
- 4. Oppewal F, Meyboom-De Jong B. Family members' experiences of autopsy. Fam Pract 2001;18(3):304–308. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/18.3.304>.
- 5. Abels E, Pantanowitz L, Aeffner F, et al. Computational pathology definitions, best practices, and recommendations for regulatory guidance: a white paper from the Digital Pathology Association. J Pathol 2019;249(3):286–294. [https://doi.org/10.1002/path.](https://doi.org/10.1002/path.5331) [5331](https://doi.org/10.1002/path.5331).
- 6. Colling R, Pitman H, Oien K, et al. Artificial intelligence in digital pathology: a roadmap to routine use in clinical practice. J Pathol 2019;249(2):143–150. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1002/path.5310) [1002/path.5310.](https://doi.org/10.1002/path.5310)
- 7. den Bakker MA. Is histopathology still the gold standard? Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd 2017: 160. Accessed March 18, 2023. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28120732/>.
- Aeffner F, Wilson K, Martin NT, et al. The gold standard paradox in digital image analysis: manual versus automated scoring as ground truth. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2017;141 (9):1267–1275. [https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2016-0386-RA.](https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2016-0386-RA)
- 9. Masood S. The changing role of pathologists from morphologists to molecular pathologists in the era of precision medicine. Breast J 2020;26(1):27–34. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1111/tbj.13728) [1111/tbj.13728](https://doi.org/10.1111/tbj.13728).
- 10. Chen PHC, Mermel CH, Liu Y. Evaluation of artificial intelligence on a reference standard based on subjective interpretation. Lancet Digit Health 2021;3(11):e693–e695. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(21\)00216-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00216-8).
- 11. Friedman CP, Allee NJ, Delaney BC, et al. The science of Learning Health Systems: foundations for a new journal. Learn Health Syst 2017;1(1), e10020. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10020) [1002/lrh2.10020.](https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10020)

- 12. Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, Moons KGM. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRI-POD statement. Ann Intern Med 2015;162(1):55–63. [https://doi.org/10.7326/](https://doi.org/10.7326/M14-0697) [M14-0697](https://doi.org/10.7326/M14-0697).
- 13. Luo W, Phung D, Tran T, et al. Guidelines for developing and reporting machine learning predictive models in biomedical research: a multidisciplinary view. J Med Internet Res 2016;18(12):e323. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5870>.
- 14. Norgeot B, Quer G, Beaulieu-Jones BK, et al. Minimum information about clinical artificial intelligence modeling: the MI-CLAIM checklist. Nat Med 2020;26(9):1320–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1041-y>.
- 15. Shelmerdine SC, Arthurs OJ, Denniston A, Sebire NJ. Review of study reporting guidelines for clinical studies using artificial intelligence in healthcare. BMJ Health Care Inform 2021;28(1):e100385. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjhci-2021-100385>.
- 16. Sounderajah V, Ashrafian H, Aggarwal R, et al. Developing specific reporting guidelines for diagnostic accuracy studies assessing AI interventions: the STARD-AI Steering Group. Nat Med 2020;26(6):807–808. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0941-1>.
- 17. Vasey B, Nagendran M, Campbell B, et al. Reporting guideline for the early-stage clinical evaluation of decision support systems driven by artificial intelligence: DECIDE-AI. Nat Med 2022;28(5):924–933. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01772-9>.
- 18. Fell C, Mohammadi M, Morrison D, Arandjelovic O, Caie P, Harris-Birtill D. Reproducibility of deep learning in digital pathology whole slide image analysis. PLoS Digit
- Health 2022;1(12):e0000145. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000145>. 19. Yu AC, Mohajer B, Eng J. External validation of deep learning algorithms for radiologic diagnosis: a systematic review. Radiol Artif Intell 2022;4(3):e210064. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.210064) [10.1148/ryai.210064.](https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.210064)
- 20. Gao Y, Li S, Jin Y, et al. Assessment of performance of the machine learning-based breast cancer risk prediction model: a systematic review and meta-analysis (preprint). JMIR Public Health Surveil 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.35750>.
- 21. Dhiman P, Ma J, Navarro CA, et al. Reporting of prognostic clinical prediction models based on machine learning methods in oncology needs to be improved. J Clin Epidemiol 2021;138:60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.06.024](mailto:gonzar5@mcmaster.ca).
- 22. Corti C, Cobanaj M, Marian F, et al. Artificial intelligence for prediction of treatment outcomes in breast cancer: systematic review of design, reporting standards, and bias. Cancer Treat Rev 2022;108:102410. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctrv.2022.102410](mailto:rgonzalez@lunenfeld.ca).
- 23. Blanco D, Altman D, Moher D, Boutron I, Kirkham JJ, Cobo E. Scoping review on interventions to improve adherence to reporting guidelines in health research. BMJ Open 2019;9(5):e026589. [https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026589.](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026589)
- 24. McCoy LG, Brenna CTA, Chen SS, Vold K, Das S. Believing in black boxes: machine learning for healthcare does not need explainability to be evidence-based. J Clin Epidemiol 2022;142:252–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.11.001.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.11.001)
- 25. Nakagawa K, Moukheiber L, Celi L, et al. AI in pathology: what could possibly go wrong? Semin Diagn Pathol 2023;40(2). [https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semdp.2023.02.](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semdp.2023.02.006) [006](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semdp.2023.02.006).
- 26. Van Calster B, Steyerberg EW, Wynants L, van Smeden M. There is no such thing as a validated prediction model. BMC Med 2023;21(1):70. [https://doi.org/10.1186/](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-023-02779-w) [s12916-023-02779-w.](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-023-02779-w)
- 27. Tang H, Sun N, Shen S. Improving generalization of deep learning models for diagnostic pathology by increasing variability in training data: experiments on osteosarcoma subtypes. J Pathol Inform 2021;12:30. [https://doi.org/10.4103/jpi.jpi_78_20.](https://doi.org/10.4103/jpi.jpi_78_20)
- 28. Tellez D, Litjens G, Bándi P, et al. Quantifying the effects of data augmentation and stain color normalization in convolutional neural networks for computational pathology. Med Image Anal 2019;58:101544. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2019.101544.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2019.101544)
- 29. Vali-Betts E, Krause KJ, Dubrovsky A, et al. Effects of image quantity and image source variation on machine learning histology differential diagnosis models. J Pathol Inform 2021;12(1):5. https://doi.org/10.4103/jpi.jpi_69_20.
- 30. Gildenblat J, Klaiman E. Self-supervised similarity learning for digital pathology. Published online January 13, 2020. [10.48550/arXiv.1905.08139](doi:10.48550/arXiv.1905.08139)
- 31. Abu Haeyeh Y, Ghazal M, El-Baz A, Talaat IM. Development and evaluation of a novel deep-learning-based framework for the classification of renal histopathology images. Bioengineering 2022;9(9):423. [https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering9090423.](https://doi.org/10.3390/bioengineering9090423)
- 32. Homeyer A, Geißler C, Schwen LO, et al. Recommendations on compiling test datasets for evaluating artificial intelligence solutions in pathology. Mod Pathol 2022;35:1759– 1769. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41379-022-01147-y>.
- 33. Schüffler PJ, Geneslaw L, Yarlagadda DVK, et al. Integrated digital pathology at scale: a solution for clinical diagnostics and cancer research at a large academic medical center. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2021;28(9):1874–1884. [https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocab085) [ocab085](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocab085).
- 34. Zehra T, Shabbir A. Adoption of digital pathology in developing countries: from benefits to challenges. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak 2021;31(9):1120–1122. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.29271/jcpsp.2021.09.1120) [10.29271/jcpsp.2021.09.1120.](https://doi.org/10.29271/jcpsp.2021.09.1120)
- 35. Shimizu H, Nakayama KI. Artificial intelligence in oncology. Cancer Sci 2020;111(5): 1452–1460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cas.14377>.
- 36. Lin Y, Wang H, Li W, Shen J. Federated learning with hyper-network—a case study on whole slide image analysis. Sci Rep 2023;13(1):1724. [https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-28974-6) [s41598-023-28974-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-28974-6).
- 37. Rieke N, Hancox J, Li W, et al. The future of digital health with federated learning. Npj Digit Med 2020;3(1):1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00323-1>.
- 38. Komura D, Ishikawa S. Machine learning methods for histopathological image analysis. Comput Struct Biotechnol J 2018;16:34–42. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2018.01.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2018.01.001) [001.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2018.01.001)
- 39. Tizhoosh HR, Pantanowitz L. Artificial intelligence and digital pathology: challenges and opportunities. J Pathol Inform 2018;9:38. https://doi.org/10.4103/jpi.jpi_53_18.
- 40. Ciga O, Xu T, Nofech-Mozes S, Noy S, Lu FI, Martel AL. Overcoming the limitations of patch-based learning to detect cancer in whole slide images. Sci Rep 2021;11(1):8894. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-88494-z>.
- 41. Shmatko A, Ghaffari Laleh N, Gerstung M, Kather JN. Artificial intelligence in histopathology: enhancing cancer research and clinical oncology. Nat Cancer 2022;3(9):1026– 1038. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43018-022-00436-4>.
- 42. Coudray N, Ocampo PS, Sakellaropoulos T, et al. Classification and mutation prediction from non–small cell lung cancer histopathology images using deep learning. Nat Med 2018;24(10):1559–1567. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0177-5>.
- 43. Couture H. From patches to slides: how to train deep learning models on gigapixel images with weak supervision. Medium. Published April 2, 2021. Accessed March 25, 2023. [https://towardsdatascience.com/from-patches-to-slides-how-to-train-deep](https://towardsdatascience.com/from-patches-to-slides-how-to-train-deep-learning-models-on-gigapixel-images-with-weak-supervision-d2cd2081cfd7)[learning-models-on-gigapixel-images-with-weak-supervision-d2cd2081cfd7](https://towardsdatascience.com/from-patches-to-slides-how-to-train-deep-learning-models-on-gigapixel-images-with-weak-supervision-d2cd2081cfd7)
- 44. Dimitriou N, Arandjelović O, Caie PD. Deep learning for whole slide image analysis: an overview. Front Med 2019:6. Accessed May 3, 2023. [https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2019.00264) [2019.00264.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2019.00264)
- 45. Wikipedia Contributors. Blind_men_and_an_elephant. Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Wikimedia Foundation; 2023. Accessed March 24, 2023. [https://en.wikipedia.](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Blind_men_and_an_elephant&oldid=1146288237) [org/w/index.php?title=Blind_men_and_an_elephant](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Blind_men_and_an_elephant&oldid=1146288237)&oldid=1146288237.
- 46. Hassanin M, Anwar S, Radwan I, Khan FS, Mian A. Visual Attention Methods in Deep Learning: An In-Depth Survey. Published online April 20, 2022. Accessed April 3, 2023. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07756>.
- 47. Zheng Y, Gindra RH, Green EJ, et al. A graph-transformer for whole slide image classification. IEEE Trans Med Imaging 2022;41(11):3003–3015. [https://doi.org/10.1109/](https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2022.3176598) [TMI.2022.3176598](https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2022.3176598).
- 48. Shen Y, Ke J. A deformable CRF model for histopathology whole-slide image classification. In: Martel AL, Abolmaesumi P, Stoyanov D, et al, eds. Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2020. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer International Publishing; 2020. p. 500–508. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59722-1_48) [030-59722-1_48.](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59722-1_48)
- 49. Hou L, Samaras D, Kurc TM, Gao Y, Davis JE, Saltz JH. Patch-Based Convolutional Neural Network for Whole Slide Tissue Image Classification. Published online March 9, 2016. [10.48550/arXiv.1504.07947](doi:10.48550/arXiv.1504.07947)
- 50. Lu MY, Williamson DFK, Chen TY, Chen RJ, Barbieri M, Mahmood F. Data-efficient and weakly supervised computational pathology on whole-slide images. Nat Biomed Eng 2021;5(6):555–570. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-020-00682-w>.
- 51. Li K, Qian Z, Han Y, et al. Weakly supervised histopathology image segmentation with self-attention. Med Image Anal 2023;86:102791. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2023.102791) [2023.102791](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2023.102791).
- 52. Chen CL, Chen CC, Yu WH, et al. An annotation-free whole-slide training approach to pathological classification of lung cancer types using deep learning. Nat Commun 2021;12(1):1193. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21467-y>.
- 53. Kottner J, Audige L, Brorson S, et al. Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS) were proposed. Int J Nurs Stud 2011;48(6):661–671. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.01.016) doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.01.016.
- 54. Marchevsky AM, Walts AE, Lissenberg-Witte BI, Thunnissen E. Pathologists should probably forget about kappa. Percent agreement, diagnostic specificity and related metrics provide more clinically applicable measures of interobserver variability. Ann Diagn Pathol 2020;47:151561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2020.151561>.
- 55. Lee EY, Maloney NJ, Cheng K, Bach DQ. Machine learning for precision dermatology: advances, opportunities, and outlook. J Am Acad Dermatol 2021;84(5):1458–1459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2020.06.1019>.
- 56. Hamilton PW, van Diest PJ, Williams R, Gallagher AG. Do we see what we think we see? The complexities of morphological assessment. J Pathol 2009;218(3):285–291. [https://doi.org/10.1002/path.2527.](https://doi.org/10.1002/path.2527)
- 57. Nisbett RE, Wilson TD. Telling more than we can know: verbal reports on mental processes. Psychol Rev 1977;84:231–259. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.3.231.](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.3.231)
- 58. Bussolati G. Dissecting the pathologist's brain: mental processes that lead to pathological diagnoses. Virchows Arch 2006;448(6):739–743. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-006-0164-y) [006-0164-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-006-0164-y).
- 59. ACGME Program Requirements for Graduate Medical Education in Anatomic Pathology and Clinical Pathology. Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME). 2022:64. Accessed March 20, 2023. [https://www.acgme.org/globalassets/pfassets/](https://www.acgme.org/globalassets/pfassets/programrequirements/300_pathology_2022.pdf) [programrequirements/300_pathology_2022.pdf](https://www.acgme.org/globalassets/pfassets/programrequirements/300_pathology_2022.pdf).
- 60. Pena GP, Andrade-Filho JS. How does a pathologist make a diagnosis? Arch Pathol Lab Med 2009;133(1):124–132. [https://doi.org/10.5858/133.1.124.](https://doi.org/10.5858/133.1.124)
- 61. Packer MDC, Ravinsky E, Azordegan N. Patterns of error in interpretive pathology: a review of 23 powerpoint presentations of discordances. Am J Clin Pathol 2022;157(5): 767–773. [https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqab190.](https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqab190)
- 62. Pell R, Oien K, Robinson M, et al. The use of digital pathology and image analysis in clinical trials. J Pathol Clin Res 2019;5(2):81–90. [https://doi.org/10.1002/cjp2.127.](https://doi.org/10.1002/cjp2.127)
- 63. [Bodernreider O, Smith B, Burgun A. The ontology-epistemology divide: a case study in](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0295) [medical terminology. Form Ontol Inf Syst Proc Int Conf FOIS Conf 2004;2004:185](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0295)–195.
- 64. Loughlin M, Bluhm R, Fuller J, et al. Diseases, patients and the epistemology of practice: mapping the borders of health, medicine and care. J Eval Clin Pract 2015;21(3):357– 364. [https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12370.](https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12370)
- 65. Broadbent A. Health as a secondary property. Br J Philos Sci 2019;70(2):609–627. [https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axx014.](https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/axx014)
- 66. Amoretti MC, Lalumera E. Wherein is the concept of disease normative? From weak normativity to value-conscious naturalism. Med Health Care Philos 2022;25(1):47– 60. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-021-10048-x.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-021-10048-x)
- 67. Conley BA, Glackin SN. How to be a naturalist and a social constructivist about diseases. Philos Med 2021;2(1). [https://doi.org/10.5195/pom.2021.18.](https://doi.org/10.5195/pom.2021.18)
- [Kingma E. Paracetamol, Poison, and Polio: Why Boorse](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0320)'s account of function fails to dis[tinguish health and disease. Br J Philos Sci 2010;61\(2\):241](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0320)–264.
- 69. Crowley RS, Naus GJ, Stewart III J, Friedman CP. Development of visual diagnostic expertise in pathology: an information-processing study. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2003;10 (1):39–51. <https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M1123>.
- 70. Krupinski EA, Graham AR, Weinstein RS. Characterizing the development of visual search expertise in pathology residents viewing whole slide images. Hum Pathol 2013;44(3):357–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2012.05.024>.
- 71. Ohori NP, Radkay LA, Macpherson TA, Yousem SA, Schoedel KE. Changes in resident graduate characteristics in a large pathology training program, 1994 to 2013. Acad Pathol 2016;3. [https://doi.org/10.1177/2374289516643543.](https://doi.org/10.1177/2374289516643543)2374289516643543.
- 72. Assarzadegan N, Casler V, Esnakula A, et al. 233 GI pathology residency education: barrett esophagus (BE) biopsy evaluation. Am J Clin Pathol 2018;149(suppl_1): S99-S100. [https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqx123.232.](https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqx123.232)
- 73. Bordage G. Conceptual frameworks to illuminate and magnify. Med Educ 2009;43(4): 312–319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03295.x>.
- 74. Brierley DJ, Farthing PM, Zijlstra-Shaw S. How consultants determine diagnostic competence in histopathology trainees. J Clin Pathol 2019;72(9):622–629. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2019-205984) [10.1136/jclinpath-2019-205984](https://doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2019-205984).
- 75. Powsner SM, Costa J, Homer RJ. Clinicians are from Mars and pathologists are from Venus. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2000;124(7):1040–1046. [https://doi.org/10.5858/](https://doi.org/10.5858/2000-124-1040-CAFMAP) [2000-124-1040-CAFMAP.](https://doi.org/10.5858/2000-124-1040-CAFMAP)
- 76. Pantanowitz L, Mello-Thoms C. Part VI applied perception. 33. Perception issues in pathology. In: Krupinski EA, Samei E, Krupinski EA, eds. The Handbook of Medical Image Perception and Techniques. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press; 2018. p. 495–505. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108163781.033) [org/10.1017/9781108163781.033.](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108163781.033)
- 77. Funkhouser WK. Pathology. Mol Pathol. Published online 2018:217-229. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802761-5.00011-0) [org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802761-5.00011-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802761-5.00011-0)
- 78. Uttley L, Indave BI, Hyde C, White V, Lokuhetty D, Cree I. Invited commentary—WHO classification of tumours: how should tumors be classified? Expert consensus, systematic reviews or both? Int J Cancer 2020;146(12):3516–3521. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.32975) [1002/ijc.32975.](https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.32975)
- 79. Chow ZL, Indave BI, Lokuhetty MDS, Ochiai A, Cree IA, White VA. Misleading terminology in pathology: lack of definitions hampers communication. Virchows Arch 2021;479 (2):425–430. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-021-03069-7>.
- 80. [Molavi DW. Chapter 2. Descriptive terms in anatomic pathology. The Practice of Surgical](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0375) Pathology: A Beginner'[s Guide to the Diagnostic Process. 2nd ed. Springer; 2017. p. 6-15.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0375)
- 81. [Reddy VB, David O, Spitz DJ, Haber MH.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0380) Gattuso's Differential Diagnosis in Surgical Pathology. [Elsevier Health Sciences. 2021.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0380)
- 82. Tambasco M, Costello BM, Kouznetsov A, Yau A, Magliocco AM. Quantifying the architectural complexity of microscopic images of histology specimens. Micron 2009;40(4): 486–494. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micron.2008.12.004.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micron.2008.12.004)
- 83. Kim JM, Sohn JH, Cho MY, et al. Inter-observer reproducibility in the pathologic diagnosis of gastric intraepithelial neoplasia and early carcinoma in endoscopic submucosal dissection specimens: a multi-center study. Cancer Res Treat 2019;51(4):1568–1577. <https://doi.org/10.4143/crt.2019.019>.
- 84. Lee LH, Yantiss RK, Sadot E, et al. Diagnosing colorectal medullary carcinoma: interobserver variability and clinicopathological implications. Hum Pathol 2017;62:74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2016.12.013>.
- 85. Salto-Tellez M, Cree I. Cancer taxonomy: pathology beyond pathology. Eur J Cancer Oxf Engl 1990 2019:115. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2019.03.026.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2019.03.026)
- 86. Peters TS. Pathology peer review–a concept for consideration. Toxicol Pathol 1996;24 (5):654–656. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019262339602400523>.
- 87. Peck M, Moffat D, Latham B, Badrick T. Review of diagnostic error in anatomical pathology and the role and value of second opinions in error prevention. J Clin Pathol 2018;71(11):995-1000. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2018-205226>.
- 88. Nakhleh RE, Nosé V, Colasacco C, et al. Interpretive diagnostic error reduction in surgical pathology and cytology: guideline from the College of American Pathologists Pathology and Laboratory Quality Center and the Association of Directors of Anatomic and Surgical Pathology. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2015;140(1):29–40. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2014-0511-SA) [5858/arpa.2014-0511-SA.](https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2014-0511-SA)
- 89. Amerikanos P, Maglogiannis I. Image analysis in digital pathology utilizing machine learning and deep neural networks. J Pers Med 2022;12(9):1444. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm12091444) [3390/jpm12091444.](https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm12091444)
- 90. Rosai J. The continuing role of morphology in the molecular age. Mod Pathol Off J U S Can Acad Pathol Inc 2001;14(3):258–260. [https://doi.org/10.1038/modpathol.](https://doi.org/10.1038/modpathol.3880295) [3880295.](https://doi.org/10.1038/modpathol.3880295)
- 91. Echle A, Rindtorff NT, Brinker TJ, Luedde T, Pearson AT, Kather JN. Deep learning in cancer pathology: a new generation of clinical biomarkers. Br J Cancer 2021;124(4): 686–696. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-020-01122-x>.
- 92. Levy-Jurgenson A, Tekpli X, Kristensen VN, Yakhini Z. Spatial transcriptomics inferred from pathology whole-slide images links tumor heterogeneity to survival in breast and lung cancer. Sci Rep 2020;10(1):18802. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75708-z>.
- 93. Harrison Jr JH, Gilbertson JR, Hanna MG, et al. Introduction to artificial intelligence and machine learning for pathology. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2021;145(10):1228–1254. <https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2020-0541-CP>.
- 94. Fu Y, Jung AW, Torne RV, et al. Pan-cancer computational histopathology reveals mutations, tumor composition and prognosis. Nat Cancer 2020;1(8):800–810. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43018-020-0085-8) [org/10.1038/s43018-020-0085-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43018-020-0085-8).
- 95. Rawat RR, Ortega I, Roy P, et al. Deep learned tissue "fingerprints" classify breast cancers by ER/PR/Her2 status from H&E images. Sci Rep 2020;10(1):7275. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-64156-4) [org/10.1038/s41598-020-64156-4.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-64156-4)
- 96. Courtiol P, Maussion C, Moarii M, et al. Deep learning-based classification of mesothelioma improves prediction of patient outcome. Nat Med 2019;25(10):1519–1525. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0583-3.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0583-3)
- 97. Tran KA, Kondrashova O, Bradley A, Williams ED, Pearson JV, Waddell N. Deep learning in cancer diagnosis, prognosis and treatment selection. Genome Med 2021;13(1): 152. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-021-00968-x.](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-021-00968-x)
- 98. Meroueh C, Chen ZE. Artificial intelligence in anatomical pathology: building a strong foundation for precision medicine. Hum Pathol 2023;132:31–38. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2022.07.008) [1016/j.humpath.2022.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2022.07.008).
- 99. Yu KH, Beam AL, Kohane IS. Artificial intelligence in healthcare. Nat Biomed Eng 2018;2(10):719–731. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-018-0305-z.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-018-0305-z)
- 100. Kalra S, Tizhoosh HR, Shah S, et al. Pan-cancer diagnostic consensus through searching archival histopathology images using artificial intelligence. NPJ Digit Med 2020;3:31. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0238-2.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0238-2)
- 101. Cserni G. Histological type and typing of breast carcinomas and the WHO classification changes over time. Pathologica 2020;112(1):25–41. [https://doi.org/10.32074/1591-](https://doi.org/10.32074/1591-951X-1-20) [951X-1-20.](https://doi.org/10.32074/1591-951X-1-20)
- 102. Pearson BE, Markert JM, Fisher WS, et al. Hitting a moving target: evolution of a treatment paradigm for atypical meningiomas amid changing diagnostic criteria. Neurosurg Focus 2008;24(5):E3. [https://doi.org/10.3171/FOC/2008/24/5/E3.](https://doi.org/10.3171/FOC/2008/24/5/E3)
- 103. Park K. Cervical adenocarcinoma: integration of HPV status, pattern of invasion, morphology and molecular markers into classification. Histopathology 2020;76(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/his.13995>.
- 104. Juhlin C, Mete O, Baloch Z. The 2022 WHO classification of thyroid tumors: novel concepts in nomenclature and grading. Endocr Relat Cancer 2022;30(2). [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1530/ERC-22-0293) [10.1530/ERC-22-0293.](https://doi.org/10.1530/ERC-22-0293)
- 105. Compérat E, Amin MB, Berney DM, et al. What's new in WHO fifth edition urinary tract. Histopathology 2022;81(4):439–446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/his.14764>.
- 106. Berney DM, Cree I, Rao V, et al. An introduction to the WHO 5th edition 2022 classification of testicular tumours. Histopathology 2022;81(4):459–466. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1111/his.14675) [1111/his.14675](https://doi.org/10.1111/his.14675).
- 107. Carbone A. Cancer classification at the crossroads. Cancers 2020;12(4):980. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers12040980) [org/10.3390/cancers12040980.](https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers12040980)
- 108. [Chen N, Zhou Q. The evolving Gleason grading system. Chin J Cancer Res 2016;28\(1\):](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0515) 584–[586.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf0515)
- 109. Berger TR, Wen PY, Lang-Orsini M, Chukwueke UN. World Health Organization 2021 classification of central nervous system tumors and implications for therapy for adulttype gliomas: a review. JAMA Oncol 2022;8(10):1493–1501. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.2844) [1001/jamaoncol.2022.2844](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.2844).
- 110. Alaggio R, Amador C, Anagnostopoulos I, et al. The 5th edition of the World Health Organization classification of haematolymphoid tumours: lymphoid neoplasms. Leukemia 2022;36(7):1720–1748. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41375-022-01620-2.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41375-022-01620-2)
- 111. Falini B, Martelli MP. Comparison of the International Consensus and 5th WHO edition classifications of adult myelodysplastic syndromes and acute myeloid leukemia. Am J Hematol 2023;98(3):481–492. [https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.26812.](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.26812)
- 112. Sandbank J, Bataillon G, Nudelman A, et al. Validation and real-world clinical application of an artificial intelligence algorithm for breast cancer detection in biopsies. Npj Breast Cancer 2022;8(1):1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41523-022-00496-w>.
- 113. Crigger E, Reinbold K, Hanson C, Kao A, Blake K, Irons M. Trustworthy augmented intelligence in health care. J Med Syst 2022;46(2):12. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-021-01790-z) [021-01790-z.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-021-01790-z)
- 114. Hogg HDJ, Al-Zubaidy M, Talks J, et al. Stakeholder perspectives of clinical artificial intelligence implementation: systematic review of qualitative evidence. J Med Internet Res 2023;25:e39742. <https://doi.org/10.2196/39742>.
- 115. Tosun AB, Pullara F, Becich MJ, Taylor DL, Fine JL, Chennubhotla SC. Explainable AI (xAI) for anatomic pathology. Adv Anat Pathol 2020;27(4):241–250. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1097/PAP.0000000000000264) [10.1097/PAP.0000000000000264.](https://doi.org/10.1097/PAP.0000000000000264)
- 116. Feng P, Tang Z. A survey of visual neural networks: current trends, challenges and opportunities. Multimed Syst 2023;29(2):693–724. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00530-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00530-022-01003-8) [022-01003-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00530-022-01003-8).
- 117. Caicedo JC, Cruz A, Gonzalez FA. Histopathology image classification using bag of features and kernel functions. In: Combi C, Shahar Y, Abu-Hanna A, eds. Artificial Intelligence in Medicine. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer; 2009. p. 126–135. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02976-9_17) doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02976-9_17.
- 118. Holzinger A, Saranti A, Angerschmid A, Finzel B, Schmid U, Mueller H. Toward humanlevel concept learning: pattern benchmarking for AI algorithms. Patterns 2023;4(8), 100788. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100788>.
- 119. Gupta LK, Koundal D, Mongia S. Explainable methods for image-based deep learning: a review. Arch Comput Methods Eng 2023;30(4):2651–2666. [https://doi.org/10.1007/](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11831-023-09881-5) [s11831-023-09881-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11831-023-09881-5).
- 120. Plass M, Kargl M, Kiehl TR, et al. Explainability and causability in digital pathology. J Pathol Clin Res. Published online April 12, 2023. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1002/cjp2.322) [1002/cjp2.322](https://doi.org/10.1002/cjp2.322)
- 121. Paleyes A, Urma RG, Lawrence ND. Challenges in deploying machine learning: a survey of case studies. ACM Comput Surv 2022;55(6):114.1–114:29. [https://doi.org/10.1145/](https://doi.org/10.1145/3533378) [3533378.](https://doi.org/10.1145/3533378)
- 122. Jenkins DA, Martin GP, Sperrin M, et al. Continual updating and monitoring of clinical prediction models: time for dynamic prediction systems? Diagn Progn Res 2021;5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41512-020-00090-3>.
- 123. Binuya MAE, Engelhardt EG, Schats W, Schmidt MK, Steyerberg EW. Methodological guidance for the evaluation and updating of clinical prediction models: a systematic review. BMC Med Res Methodol 2022;22(1):316. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-022-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-022-01801-8) [01801-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-022-01801-8).
- 124. Ho SY, Phua K, Wong L, Bin Goh WW. Extensions of the external validation for checking learned model interpretability and generalizability. Patterns 2020;1(8), 100129. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2020.100129.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2020.100129)
- 125. Futoma J, Simons M, Panch T, Doshi-Velez F, Celi LA. The myth of generalisability in clinical research and machine learning in health care. Lancet Digit Health 2020;2(9): e489–e492. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(20\)30186-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30186-2).
- 126. Lake BM, Ullman TD, Tenenbaum JB, Gershman SJ. Building machines that learn and think like people. Behav Brain Sci 2017;40:e253. [https://doi.org/10.1017/](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X16001837) [S0140525X16001837.](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X16001837)
- 127. Nie W, Yu Z, Mao L, Patel AB, Zhu Y, Anandkumar A. Bongard-LOGO: A New Benchmark for Human-Level Concept Learning and Reasoning. Published online January 4, 2021. [10.48550/arXiv.2010.00763](doi:10.48550/arXiv.2010.00763)
- R. Gonzalez et al. Journal of Pathology Informatics 15 (2024) 100347
- 128. Lauc D. Machine learning and the philosophical problems of induction. In: Skansi S, ed. Guide to Deep Learning Basics: Logical, Historical and Philosophical Perspectives. Springer International Publishing; 2020. p. 93-106. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37591-1_9.
- 129. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). DEN200080. De Novo Request for Classification or the Paige Prostate. Published September 21, 2021. Accessed October 7, 2022. [https://www.accessdata.fda.](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf20/DEN200080.pdf) [gov/cdrh_docs/pdf20/DEN200080.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf20/DEN200080.pdf).
- 130. Rojas JC, Fahrenbach J, Makhni S, et al. Framework for integrating equity into machine learning models: a case study. CHEST 2022;161(6):1621–1627. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2022.02.001) [1016/j.chest.2022.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2022.02.001).
- 131. Shankar S, Herman B, Parameswaran AG. Rethinking Streaming Machine Learning Evaluation. Published online May 23, 2022. [10.48550/arXiv.2205.11473](doi:10.48550/arXiv.2205.11473)
- 132. Symeonidis G, Nerantzis E, Kazakis A, Papakostas GA. MLOps definitions, tools and challenges. 2022 IEEE 12th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC); 2022. p. 0453–0460. [https://doi.org/10.1109/CCWC54503.](https://doi.org/10.1109/CCWC54503.2022.9720902) [2022.9720902.](https://doi.org/10.1109/CCWC54503.2022.9720902)
- 133. Buchholz O, Raidl E. A falsificationist account of artificial neural networks. Br J Philos Sci. Published online July 22, 2022:721797. <https://doi.org/10.1086/721797>
- 134. Maleki F, Muthukrishnan N, Ovens K, Reinhold C, Forghani R. Machine learning algorithm validation: from essentials to advanced applications and implications for regulatory certification and deployment. Neuroimaging Clin N Am 2020;30(4):433–445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nic.2020.08.004>.
- 135. Parisi GI, Kemker R, Part JL, Kanan C, Wermter S. Continual Lifelong Learning with Neural Networks: A Review. Published online February 21, 2018. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2019.01.012) [1016/j.neunet.2019.01.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2019.01.012)
- 136. Lavin A, Gilligan-Lee CM, Visnjic A, et al. Technology readiness levels for machine learning systems. Nat Commun 2022;13(1):6039. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-33128-9) [022-33128-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-33128-9).
- 137. Wu X, Xiao L, Sun Y, Zhang J, Ma T, He L. A survey of human-in-the-loop for machine learning. Future Gener Comput Syst 2022;135:364–381. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2022.05.014) [future.2022.05.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2022.05.014).
- 138. John MM, Olsson HH, Bosch J. Towards MLOps: a framework and maturity model. 2021 47th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA); 2021. p. 1–8. [https://doi.org/10.1109/SEAA53835.2021.00050.](https://doi.org/10.1109/SEAA53835.2021.00050)
- 139. Levy TJ, Coppa K, Cang J, et al. Development and validation of self-monitoring autoupdating prognostic models of survival for hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Nat Commun 2022;13(1):6812. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34646-2>.
- 140. Endersby J. Lumpers and splitters: Darwin, Hooker, and the search for order. Science 2009;326(5959):1496–1499. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165915>.
- 141. Simpson GG. The principles of classification and a classification of mammals. Bull AMNH; v. 85. Classification of mammals. Published online 1945. Accessed March 5, 2023. <https://digitallibrary.amnh.org/handle/2246/1104>
- 142. Punjabi LS, Lai YN, Thomas A. And the story goes on: non-conventional dysplasia of the colorectum. J Pathol Transl Med 2022;56(2):109–110. [https://doi.org/10.4132/jptm.](https://doi.org/10.4132/jptm.2021.12.29) [2021.12.29.](https://doi.org/10.4132/jptm.2021.12.29)
- 143. Paquette C, Jeffus SK, Quick CM, Conaway MR, Stoler MH, Atkins KA. Interobserver variability in the application of a proposed histologic subclassification of endocervical adenocarcinoma. Am J Surg Pathol 2015;39(1):93-100. [https://doi.org/10.1097/PAS.](https://doi.org/10.1097/PAS.0000000000000316) 0000000000000000316
- 144. Steigen SE, Søland TM, Nginamau ES, et al. Grading of oral squamous cell carcinomas intra and interrater agreeability: simpler is better? J Oral Pathol Med 2020;49(7):630– 635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jop.12990>.
- 145. Mariappan P, Fineron P, O'Donnell M, et al. Combining two grading systems: the clinical validity and inter-observer variability of the 1973 and 2004 WHO bladder cancer classification systems assessed in a UK cohort with 15 years of prospective follow-up. World J Urol 2021;39(2):425–431. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-020-03180-5.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-020-03180-5)
- 146. Darragh TM, Colgan TJ, Cox JT, et al. The lower anogenital squamous terminology standardization project for HPV-associated lesions: background and consensus recommendations from the College of American Pathologists and the American Society for Colposcopy and Cervical Pathology. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2012;136(10):1266–1297. <https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.LGT200570>.
- 147. Chandler I, Houlston RS. Interobserver agreement in grading of colorectal cancers findings from a nationwide web-based survey of histopathologists. Histopathology 2008;52(4):494–499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2559.2008.02976.x>.
- 148. Martins-Filho SN, Paiva C, Azevedo RS, Alves VAF. Histological grading of hepatocellular carcinoma—a systematic review of literature. Front Med 2017:4. Accessed March 22, 2023. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2017.00193>.
- 149. Parry MG, Cowling TE, Sujenthiran A, et al. Risk stratification for prostate cancer management: value of the Cambridge Prognostic Group classification for assessing treatment allocation. BMC Med 2020;18:114. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01588-9) [01588-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-020-01588-9).
- 150. Rosai J, Ackerman LV. The pathology of tumors, part III: grading, staging & classification. CA Cancer J Clin 1979;29(2):66–77. <https://doi.org/10.3322/canjclin.29.2.66>.
- 151. Barresi V, Reggiani Bonetti L, Ieni A, Domati F, Tuccari G. Prognostic significance of grading based on the counting of poorly differentiated clusters in colorectal mucinous adenocarcinoma. Hum Pathol 2015;46(11):1722–1729. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2015.07.013) [humpath.2015.07.013.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2015.07.013)
- 152. Bracamonte E, Gibson BA, Klein R, Krupinski EA, Weinstein RS. Communicating uncertainty in surgical pathology reports: a survey of staff physicians and residents at an academic medical center. Acad Pathol 2016;3. [https://doi.org/10.1177/](https://doi.org/10.1177/2374289516659079) [2374289516659079](https://doi.org/10.1177/2374289516659079).2374289516659079.
- 153. Lindley SW, Gillies EM, Hassell LA. Communicating diagnostic uncertainty in surgical pathology reports: disparities between sender and receiver. Pathol - Res Pract 2014;210(10):628–633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prp.2014.04.006>.
- 154. Galloway M, Taiyeb T. The interpretation of phrases used to describe uncertainty in pathology reports. Pathol Res Int 2011;2011, 656079. [https://doi.org/10.4061/2011/](https://doi.org/10.4061/2011/656079) [656079](https://doi.org/10.4061/2011/656079).
- 155. Stephens-LaBorde IS, Brierley DJ. Why won't the pathologist give me a diagnosis? Interpreting uncertainty in head and neck pathology reports. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2022;60(5):577–583. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2021.10.009.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2021.10.009)
- 156. Silverberg SG, Corson JM, Dehner LP, et al. Consultations in surgical pathology: association of directors of anatomic and surgical pathology. Am J Clin Pathol 1994;102(2): 152–153. [https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/102.2.152.](https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/102.2.152)
- 157. Schacht V, Kern JS. Basics of immunohistochemistry. J Invest Dermatol 2015;135(3):1– 4. [https://doi.org/10.1038/jid.2014.541.](https://doi.org/10.1038/jid.2014.541)
- 158. Moore DA, Young CA, Morris HT, et al. Time for change: a new training programme for morpho-molecular pathologists? J Clin Pathol 2018;71(4):285–290. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2017-204821) [1136/jclinpath-2017-204821.](https://doi.org/10.1136/jclinpath-2017-204821)
- 159. Meyer AND, Giardina TD, Khawaja L, Singh H. Patient and clinician experiences of uncertainty in the diagnostic process: current understanding and future directions. Patient Educ Couns 2021;104(11):2606–2615. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.07.028.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.07.028)
- 160. Kassin SM, Dror IE, Kukucka J. The forensic confirmation bias: problems, perspectives, and proposed solutions. J Appl Res Mem Cogn 2013;2(1):42–52. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2013.01.001) [1016/j.jarmac.2013.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2013.01.001).
- 161. Dror IE. Biases in forensic experts. Science 2018;360(6386):243. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat8443) [1126/science.aat8443.](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat8443)
- 162. Lemery S, Keegan P, Pazdur R. First FDA approval agnostic of cancer site when a biomarker defines the indication. N Engl J Med 2017;377(15):1409–1412. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1709968) [org/10.1056/NEJMp1709968](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1709968).
- 163. Mansinho A, Fernandes RM, Carneiro AV. Histology-agnostic drugs: a paradigm shift—a narrative review. Adv Ther 2023;40(4):1379–1392. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12325-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12325-022-02362-4) [022-02362-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12325-022-02362-4).
- 164. Beckmann JS, Lew D. Reconciling evidence-based medicine and precision medicine in the era of big data: challenges and opportunities. Genome Med 2016;8(1):134. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-016-0388-7.](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-016-0388-7)
- 165. Schüssler-Fiorenza Rose SM, Contrepois K, Moneghetti KJ, et al. A longitudinal big data approach for precision health. Nat Med 2019;25(5):792–804. [https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0414-6) [s41591-019-0414-6.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0414-6)
- 166. Norori N, Hu Q, Aellen FM, Faraci FD, Tzovara A. Addressing bias in big data and AI for health care: a call for open science. Patterns 2021;2(10), 100347. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2021.100347) [1016/j.patter.2021.100347.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2021.100347)
- 167. Chen RJ, Lu MY, Williamson DFK, et al. Pan-cancer integrative histology-genomic analysis via multimodal deep learning. Cancer Cell 2022;40(8):865-878.e6. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2022.07.004) [10.1016/j.ccell.2022.07.004.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2022.07.004)
- 168. Kline A, Wang H, Li Y, et al. Multimodal machine learning in precision health: a scoping review. Npj Digit Med 2022;5(1):1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-00712-8>.
- 169. Amal S, Safarnejad L, Omiye JA, Ghanzouri I, Cabot JH, Ross EG. Use of multi-modal data and machine learning to improve cardiovascular disease care. Front Cardiovasc Med 2022;9, 840262. [https://doi.org/10.3389/fcvm.2022.840262.](https://doi.org/10.3389/fcvm.2022.840262)
- 170. Mohsen F, Ali H, El Hajj N, Shah Z. Artificial intelligence-based methods for fusion of electronic health records and imaging data. Sci Rep 2022;12(1). [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-22514-4) [1038/s41598-022-22514-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-22514-4).
- 171. Li Y, Wang H, Luo Y. Improving fairness in the prediction of heart failure length of stay and mortality by integrating social determinants of health. Circ Heart Fail. Published online November 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.122.009473>
- 172. Lenert MC, Matheny ME, Walsh CG. Prognostic models will be victims of their own success, unless…. J Am Med Inform Assoc JAMIA 2019;26(12):1645–1650. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz145) [org/10.1093/jamia/ocz145](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz145).
- 173. Lee C, Light A, Saveliev ES, van der Schaar M, Gnanapragasam VJ. Developing machine learning algorithms for dynamic estimation of progression during active surveillance for prostate cancer. Npj Digit Med 2022;5(1):1–7. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-00659-w) [00659-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-00659-w).
- 174. Pickett KL, Suresh K, Campbell KR, Davis S, Juarez-Colunga E. Random survival forests for dynamic predictions of a time-to-event outcome using a longitudinal biomarker. BMC Med Res Methodol 2021;21(1):216. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01375-x) [01375-x.](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01375-x)
- 175. Kilkenny MF, Robinson KM. Data quality: "Garbage in garbage out.". Health Inf Manag J 2018;47(3):103–105. [https://doi.org/10.1177/1833358318774357.](https://doi.org/10.1177/1833358318774357)
- 176. Baumfeld Andre E, Carrington N, Siami FS, et al. The current landscape and emerging applications for real-world data in diagnostics and clinical decision support and its impact on regulatory decision making. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2022;112(6):1172–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpt.2565>.
- 177. Chomutare T, Tejedor M, Svenning TO, et al. Artificial intelligence implementation in healthcare: a theory-based scoping review of barriers and facilitators. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2022;19(23). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192316359>.
- 178. Fisher S, Rosella LC. Priorities for successful use of artificial intelligence by public health organizations: a literature review. BMC Public Health 2022;22(1):2146. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14422-z) [org/10.1186/s12889-022-14422-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14422-z).
- 179. Haendel MA, Chute CG, Robinson PN. Classification, ontology, and precision medicine. N Engl J Med 2018;379(15):1452–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1615014>.
- 180. Liu J. Social data governance: towards a definition and model. Big Data Soc 2022;9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517221111352>.20539517221111352.
- 181. Padron-Monedero A, Suárez RS, Bogaert P, et al. Integrating technical and political views for a sustainable European Distributed Infrastructure on Population Health. Arch Public Health 2022;80(1):29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13690-022-00790-w>.
- 182. Peng C, Goswami P, Bai G. A literature review of current technologies on health data integration for patient-centered health management. Health Informatics J 2020;26(3): 1926–1951. [https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458219892387.](https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458219892387)

- 183. Ghaffari Laleh N, Truhn D, Veldhuizen GP, et al. Adversarial attacks and adversarial robustness in computational pathology. Nat Commun 2022;13(1):5711. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-33266-0) [10.1038/s41467-022-33266-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-33266-0).
- 184. Gerke S, Minssen T, Cohen G. Chapter 12 Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare. In: Bohr A, Memarzadeh K, eds. Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare. Academic Press; 2020. p. 295–336. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818438-7.00012-5) [818438-7.00012-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818438-7.00012-5).
- 185. Kostick-Quenet KM, Cohen IG, Gerke S, et al. Mitigating racial bias in machine learning. J Law Med Ethics J Am Soc Law Med Ethics 2022;50(1):92-100. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2022.13) [1017/jme.2022.13.](https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2022.13)
- 186. Mehta MC, Katz IT, Jha AK. Transforming global health with AI. N Engl J Med 2020;382(9):791–793. [https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1912079.](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1912079)
- 187. Crawford K. The Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence. Yale University Press. 2021. [https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1ghv45t.](https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1ghv45t)
- 188. Dhar P. The carbon impact of artificial intelligence. Nat Mach Intell 2020;2(8):423–425. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-0219-9>.
- 189. Wolf RM, Abramoff MD, Channa R, Tava C, Clarida W, Lehmann HP. Potential reduction in healthcare carbon footprint by autonomous artificial intelligence. Npj Digit Med 2022;5(1):1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-00605-w>.
- 190. Ericson O, Hjelmgren J, Sjövall F, Söderberg J, Persson I. The potential cost and cost-effectiveness impact of using a machine learning algorithm for early detection of sepsis in intensive care units in Sweden. J Health Econ Outcomes Res 2022;9(1):101–110. [https://doi.org/10.36469/jheor.2022.33951.](https://doi.org/10.36469/jheor.2022.33951)
- 191. de Vos J, Visser LA, de Beer AA, et al. The potential cost-effectiveness of a machine learning tool that can prevent untimely intensive care unit discharge. Value Health 2022;25(3):359–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2021.06.018>.
- 192. Gomez Rossi J, Rojas-Perilla N, Krois J, Schwendicke F. Cost-effectiveness of artificial intelligence as a decision-support system applied to the detection and grading of melanoma, dental caries, and diabetic retinopathy. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5(3), e220269. [https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.0269.](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.0269)
- 193. Acosta JN, Falcone GJ, Rajpurkar P, Topol EJ. Multimodal biomedical AI. Nat Med 2022;28(9):1773–1784. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01981-2.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01981-2)
- 194. Praduman J. Council post: how AI will drive the precision health research revolution through 2030. Forbes. Accessed March 23, 2023. [https://www.forbes.com/sites/](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2021/09/10/how-ai-will-drive-the-precision-health-research-revolution-through-2030/) [forbestechcouncil/2021/09/10/how-ai-will-drive-the-precision-health-research](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2021/09/10/how-ai-will-drive-the-precision-health-research-revolution-through-2030/)[revolution-through-2030/](https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2021/09/10/how-ai-will-drive-the-precision-health-research-revolution-through-2030/)
- 195. Bove R, Schleimer E, Sukhanov P, et al. Building a precision medicine delivery platform for clinics: the University of California, San Francisco, BRIDGE experience. J Med Internet Res 2022;24(2), e34560. <https://doi.org/10.2196/34560>.
- 196. Gambhir SS, Ge TJ, Vermesh O, Spitler R. Toward achieving precision health. Sci Transl Med 2018;10(430):eaao3612. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aao3612>.
- 197. McGinnis JM, Fineberg HV, Dzau VJ. Advancing the learning health system. N Engl J Med 2021;385(1):1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2103872>.
- 198. Kohn MS, Topaloglu U, Kirkendall ES, Dharod A, Wells BJ, Gurcan M. Creating learning health systems and the emerging role of biomedical informatics. Learn Health Syst 2022;6(1), e10259. [https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10259.](https://doi.org/10.1002/lrh2.10259)
- 199. Sheikh K, Abimbola S. Learning health systems: pathways to progress. A Flagship Report from the Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research. World Health Organization; 2021. p. 129. Accessed August 10, 2023. [https://ahpsr.who.int/publications/i/](https://ahpsr.who.int/publications/i/item/learning-health-systems-pathways-to-progress) [item/learning-health-systems-pathways-to-progress](https://ahpsr.who.int/publications/i/item/learning-health-systems-pathways-to-progress).
- 200. Kasperbauer TJ. Conflicting roles for humans in learning health systems and AI-enabled healthcare. J Eval Clin Pract 2021;27(3):537–542. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13510>.
- 201. Tzovaras BG, Tzovara A. Chapter 8. The personal data is political. The Ethics of Medical Data Donation [Internet]. Springer; 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04363-6_8.
- 202. Afrose S, Song W, Nemeroff CB, Lu C, Yao D, (Daphne).. Subpopulation-specific machine learning prognosis for underrepresented patients with double prioritized bias correction. Commun Med 2022;2(1):1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-022-00165-w>.
- 203. Wiens J, Price WN, Sjoding MW. Diagnosing bias in data-driven algorithms for healthcare. Nat Med 2020;26(1):25–26. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0726-6.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0726-6)
- 204. Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan A. The weirdest people in the world? Behav Brain Sci 2010;33(2–3):61–83. [https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X.](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X)
- 205. Popejoy AB, Fullerton SM. Genomics is failing on diversity. Nature 2016;538(7624): 161–164. [https://doi.org/10.1038/538161a.](https://doi.org/10.1038/538161a)
- 206. A A, S M, A S, et al. A racially unbiased, machine learning approach to prediction of mortality: algorithm development study. JMIR Public Health Surveill 2020;6(4). <https://doi.org/10.2196/22400>.
- 207. Wang H, Li Y, Naidech A, Luo Y. Comparison between machine learning methods for mortality prediction for sepsis patients with different social determinants. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 2022;22(suppl 2). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-022-01871-0>.
- 208. Obermeyer Z, Powers B, Vogeli C, Mullainathan S. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science 2019;366(6464):447–453. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342) doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342.
- 209. Chen IY, Szolovits P, Ghassemi M. Can AI help reduce disparities in general medical and mental health care? AMA J Ethics 2019;21(2):167–179. [https://doi.org/10.1001/](https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2019.167) [amajethics.2019.167.](https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2019.167)
- 210. Celi LA, Cellini J, Charpignon ML, et al. Sources of bias in artificial intelligence that perpetuate healthcare disparities—a global review. PLoS Digit Health 2022;1(3), e0000022. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000022>.
- 211. Huang J, Galal G, Etemadi M, Vaidyanathan M. Evaluation and mitigation of racial bias in clinical machine learning models: scoping review. JMIR Med Inform 2022;10(5), e36388. [https://doi.org/10.2196/36388.](https://doi.org/10.2196/36388)
- 212. Office of Data Science Strategy, National Institute of Health. Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning Consortium to Advance Health Equity and Researcher Diversity (AIM-AHEAD) Program. Accessed March 23, 2023. [https://datascience.nih.gov/arti](https://datascience.nih.gov/artificial-intelligence/aim-ahead)ficial[intelligence/aim-ahead.](https://datascience.nih.gov/artificial-intelligence/aim-ahead)
- 213. B B, M R, C P, et al. Reaching the hard-to-reach: a systematic review of strategies for improving health and medical research with socially disadvantaged groups. BMC Med Res Methodol 2014:14. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-42.](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-42)
- 214. Seastedt KP, Schwab P, O'Brien Z, et al. Global healthcare fairness: we should be sharing more, not less, data. PLoS Digit Health 2022;1(10):e0000102. [https://doi.org/10.1371/](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000102) [journal.pdig.0000102](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pdig.0000102).
- 215. Chen S, Bergman D, Miller K, Kavanagh A, Frownfelter J, Showalter J. Using Applied Machine Learning to Predict Healthcare Utilization Based on Socioeconomic Determinants of Care, 26. 2020. Accessed March 23, 2023. [https://www.ajmc.com/view/using](https://www.ajmc.com/view/using-applied-machine-learning-to-predict-healthcare-utilization-based-on-socioeconomic-determinants-of-care)[applied-machine-learning-to-predict-healthcare-utilization-based-on-socioeconomic](https://www.ajmc.com/view/using-applied-machine-learning-to-predict-healthcare-utilization-based-on-socioeconomic-determinants-of-care)[determinants-of-care](https://www.ajmc.com/view/using-applied-machine-learning-to-predict-healthcare-utilization-based-on-socioeconomic-determinants-of-care).
- 216. Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Sholle E, et al. Assessing the impact of social determinants of health on predictive models for potentially avoidable 30-day readmission or death. PLoS ONE 2020;15(6):e0235064. [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235064.](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235064)
- 217. Irvin JA, Kondrich AA, Ko M, et al. Incorporating machine learning and social determinants of health indicators into prospective risk adjustment for health plan payments. BMC Public Health 2020;20(1):608. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08735-0>.
- 218. Suarez NL, Abraham P, Carney M, et al. Practical approaches to advancing health equity in radiology, from the AJR special series on DEI. Am J Roentgenol. Published online January 11, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.22.28783>
- 219. Teshale AB, Htun HL, Owen A, et al. The role of social determinants of health in cardiovascular diseases: an umbrella review. J Am Heart Assoc 2023;12(13), e029765. [https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.123.029765.](https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.123.029765)
- 220. Hofer IS, Burns M, Kendale S, Wanderer JP. Realistically integrating machine learning into clinical practice: a road map of opportunities, challenges, and a potential future Anesth Analg $2020;130(5);1115-1118$. https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE Anesth Analg 2020;130(5):1115–1118. [https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.](https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000004575) [0000000000004575](https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000004575).
- 221. Försch S, Klauschen F, Hufnagl P, Roth W. Artificial intelligence in pathology. Dtsch Ärztebl Int 2021;118(12):199–204. <https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.m2021.0011>.
- 222. Lau F, Kuziemsky C, eds. Handbook of eHealth Evaluation: An Evidence-Based Approach. University of Victoria; 2017. Accessed August 19, 2023. [http://www.ncbi.](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK481590/) [nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK481590/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK481590/).
- 223. Guo C, Ashrafian H, Ghafur S, Fontana G, Gardner C, Prime M. Challenges for the evaluation of digital health solutions—a call for innovative evidence generation approaches. Npj Digit Med 2020;3(1):1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-00314-2>.
- 224. Silberman J, Wicks P, Patel S, et al. Rigorous and rapid evidence assessment in digital health with the evidence DEFINED framework. Npj Digit Med 2023;6(1):1–8. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00836-5) doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00836-5.
- 225. Russell S, Norvig P. Artifi[cial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. Global Edition. 4th ed.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf1055) Pear[son Education Limited. 2021.](http://refhub.elsevier.com/S2153-3539(23)00161-X/rf1055)
- 226. Radakovich N, Nagy M, Nazha A. Machine learning in haematological malignancies. Lancet Haematol 2020;7(7):e541–e550. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026\(20\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(20)30121-6) [30121-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(20)30121-6).
- 227. Nagendran M, Chen Y, Lovejoy CA, et al. Artificial intelligence versus clinicians: systematic review of design, reporting standards, and claims of deep learning studies. BMJ 2020;368:m689. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m689>.
- Park SH, Choi J, Byeon JS. Key principles of clinical validation, device approval, and insurance coverage decisions of artificial intelligence. Korean J Radiol 2021;22(3):442– 453. [https://doi.org/10.3348/kjr.2021.0048.](https://doi.org/10.3348/kjr.2021.0048)
- Moor M, Banerjee O, Abad ZSH, et al. Foundation models for generalist medical artificial intelligence. Nature 2023;616:259–265. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-05881-4) [05881-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-05881-4).