Physiological Trajectories and Observation Patterns in ICU Mortality Prediction: Transportability Under Changing Measurement Conditions

Benjamin T. Pike

arXiv:2610.42126v1 [cs.LG] 30 Oct 2026

Abstract

Objective To distinguish the transferable predictive value of physiological trajectories from that of observation patterns in ICU mortality prediction, and to assess whether measurement timing affects performance independently of observation quantity.

Materials and Methods In-hospital mortality was predicted at 48 hours using MIMIC-III, MIMIC-IV, and eICU. Nested representations progressively integrated latest-value snapshots (R1), longitudinal physiological summaries (R2), and measurement frequency and timing features (R3). Models fitted on 7,762 MetaVision patients were evaluated on 21,682 MIMIC-IV patients and 43,878 eICU patients across 204 hospitals. The effect of measurement timing was assessed while holding the number of retained observations constant.

Results Physiological trajectories improved external prediction in eICU (R2–R1 log-loss difference −0.00922, 95% CI −0.01148 to −0.00704). Observation-pattern features improved locally developed eICU models (R3–R2 −0.00257, 95% CI −0.00370 to −0.00146), but not clearly after transfer from MetaVision (−0.00012, 95% CI −0.00206 to +0.00208). R3 was favoured in 10 of 30 source bootstrap refits. At matched observation counts, retaining measurements spread throughout the window reduced log loss relative to random retention by 0.03280 for R3 versus 0.00703 for R2. Removing the final 12 hours increased log loss relative to count-matched random removal by 0.01947 for R3 versus 0.00822 for R2. Under reduced availability, the local R3 increment changed from beneficial to harmful.

Discussion Physiological trajectories transferred more consistently, while observation-pattern features were particularly sensitive to the timing and availability of measurements.

Conclusion Clinical prediction models should be evaluated not only in new patient populations but also under the measurement conditions that supply their inputs.

1. Background and Significance

Modern intensive care produces rich longitudinal records, with repeated physiological measurements capturing not only a patient's current state but also how their condition evolves over time. The latest heart rate, blood pressure, creatinine, or lactate measurement offers only a snapshot of current physiology, whereas the preceding trajectory can reveal whether an abnormality is persistent, improving, or worsening. This longitudinal information is widely used for ICU mortality prediction, with models often drawing on repeated physiological and laboratory measurements collected during the early course of critical illness (Silva et al., 2012; Harutyunyan et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2025). Large critical care datasets such as MIMIC and eICU allow these models to be developed and evaluated across different time periods, recording systems, and hospitals (Johnson et al., 2016b, 2023; Pollard et al., 2018).

However, clinical records capture not only physiology but also how patients are observed. Similar recorded values may arise from very different measurement histories, differing in when and how often observations are made. Such differences may reflect clinical concern, treatment protocols, or local monitoring and documentation practices. Therefore, the resulting observation patterns can themselves carry predictive information, a phenomenon described as informative presence or informative observation (Agniel et al., 2018; Sisk et al., 2021). This information has also been incorporated directly into clinical time-series models such as GRU-D, which uses missingness and the time elapsed since previous observations as model inputs (Che et al., 2018).

The extent to which this second source of predictive signal generalises across clinical settings is less certain. A patient's physiological trajectory is expected to retain broadly similar meaning across settings, whereas the

pattern by which that trajectory is observed is partly determined by the local environment. Models may therefore learn associations between measurement behaviour and outcome that are useful where they are developed but weaken or differ elsewhere. This concern has previously been described for informative missingness, where predictive performance depends on the stability of the underlying measurement process between development and deployment (Groenwold, 2020). More recent work found that observation-pattern features reduced the transportability of sepsis mortality models and added little beyond creatinine trajectories for ICU acute kidney injury prediction (Yamamoto et al., 2026; Zou et al., 2026).

Cross-setting differences in performance are challenging to interpret because several aspects of the data may change simultaneously: the patient population, the variables available, and when or how often they are recorded (Riley et al., 2016; Pajouheshnia et al., 2019). The predictive value of a longitudinal record may depend not only on how many observations it contains, but also on when they occur. The same number of measurements may be clustered near the time of prediction, separated by a period of sparse observation, or distributed across the preceding history. It remains unclear whether temporal placement matters independently of observation quantity and whether models that explicitly encode observation patterns are particularly sensitive to such differences.

2. Objective

At a 48-hour ICU prediction landmark, the study addressed three primary questions. First, do longitudinal physiological summaries improve mortality prediction beyond a latest-value snapshot? Second, do observation patterns add further predictive information, and does that information persist across settings? Third, when the number of observations is held constant, does their placement in time affect performance? Subsequent local-development, explanatory, and adaptation analyses examined possible explanations for these differences and whether performance could be recovered when observation availability changed.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Prediction task and study overview

The task was to predict in-hospital mortality 48 hours after ICU entry. Inputs comprised the ICU record available up to that point; patients with stays shorter than 48 hours were excluded from the prediction population. The study used MIMIC-III version 1.4, which spans the transition from the earlier CareVue system to MetaVision; MIMIC-IV version 3.1, which contains additional MetaVision data from the same institution; and eICU version 2.0, a multicentre database compiled through the Philips eICU programme (Johnson et al., 2016a, 2024; Pollard et al., 2019). Throughout, CareVue and MetaVision refer to the corresponding MIMIC-III cohorts, while MIMIC-IV is referred to separately.

Nested representations progressively incorporated more of each patient's record: first the latest recorded state, then longitudinal summaries of physiological severity, trajectory, and variability, and finally summaries of observation patterns. Generalisation within the same institution was evaluated across different recording periods and systems using the MIMIC datasets. Models were then fitted using all MetaVision patients and evaluated on MIMIC-IV and eICU using the same harmonised feature set. Subsequent restriction experiments removed observations from each patient's record and rebuilt the representations, varying both how many observations were retained and when during the 48-hour window they occurred.

3.2. Populations and evaluation settings

All cohorts were restricted to patients aged 18 years or older. The CareVue cohort comprised 12,518 eligible patients. Models were fitted on the complete cohort and evaluated on all 7,762 eligible MetaVision patients. MIMIC-IV ICU stays were restricted to those whose earliest possible calendar year was 2013 or later to avoid overlap with the MIMIC-III recording period. MetaVision models were trained on all 7,762 eligible patients and evaluated on all 21,682 eligible MIMIC-IV patients. Complete selection details are provided in the Supplementary Material.

Within each source cohort, all representations used the same five outcome-stratified folds for internal evaluation and out-of-fold calibration. Final source models were fitted on the complete eligible cohort. Local eICU hospital-grouped cross-validation was repeated across 20 allocations, with performance and paired effects averaged equally across allocations.

Table 1: Eligible MIMIC cohorts and the eICU evaluation population. Age is reported as median (interquartile range) in years. CareVue, MetaVision, and MIMIC-IV relate to the same institution. Seven eICU test records have sex outside the female/male categories shown. The separate 10,909-patient adaptation population is not included.

Cohort	Patients	Deaths (%)	Age	Female	Hospitals
CareVue	12,518	1,733 (13.8)	67 (53–78)	5,488	1
MetaVision	7,762	1,005 (12.9)	66 (54–79)	3,485	1
MIMIC-IV	21,682	2,978 (13.7)	67 (56–77)	9,387	1
eICU	43,878	5,393 (12.3)	66 (55–77)	19,909	204

Table 2: Nested information representations. Feature counts are reported before categorical variables are expanded during encoding. Shared counts indicate the subset retained after harmonisation between MetaVision and eICU.

Tier	Interpretation	MIMIC	Shared	Information added
R0	Baseline	10	10	Static inputs and latest values of six physiological variables.
R1	Snapshot	43	42	Additional scalar values, urine output, and ventilation indicators.
R2	Trajectory	335	334	Physiological severity, trend, and variability summaries.
R3	Observation patterns	524	514	Measurement frequency, timing, and observation-pattern summaries.
R4	Rich summary	940	918	Additional physiological and observation summaries.

The eICU cohort additionally required a recorded hospital outcome. One hospital admission was selected per person, followed by the earliest ICU stay within that admission, after which eligibility was assessed. The cohort comprised 54,787 patients across 205 hospitals, of which 10,909 were reserved for supporting adaptation and 43,878 across 204 hospitals for external testing. Calibration and test sets were disjoint, although the same hospitals could contribute to both. Cohort details are shown in Table 1.

For the external analysis, the representation hierarchy and harmonisation decisions were fixed before eICU performance was examined. Models trained on the MetaVision cohort were applied to the MIMIC-IV and eICU evaluation cohorts without further tuning or refitting. Later explanatory and adaptation analyses were conducted after the initial external results were known and are therefore treated as post-hoc supporting analyses. Models trained within eICU were evaluated using hospital-grouped folds to distinguish poor transfer from a lack of locally useful information.

3.3. Model inputs and representations

The five nested representations (R0–R4) are shown in Table 2. R0 provides a minimal baseline. R1 is a snapshot of the patient's state at 48 hours, based largely on the latest recorded values and other scalar inputs. R2 adds longitudinal summaries of physiological severity, trend, and variability, forming the trajectory representation. R3 additionally describes how the patient was observed, including how often and when measurements were recorded. R4 adds a broader set of physiological and observation summaries. Each tier contains the preceding tier.

The R2–R1 comparison examines whether longitudinal physiological information improves prediction beyond the latest recorded state. The R3–R2 comparison assesses whether information about how and when measurements were recorded adds further predictive value. Given that each tier changes the size and structure of the model input, affecting interactions and regularisation, these comparisons assess the added value of each representation as a whole rather than the isolated effect of the newly added features.

For external transfer, variables were harmonised between MetaVision and eICU using reviewed mappings of database tables, variable definitions, and units. Models using the shared feature set were fitted on MetaVision and evaluated in both MIMIC-IV and eICU. Because no equivalent eICU definition of a ventilation episode could be established, ventilation and dependent predictors were excluded from the shared representations rather than inferred. Complete feature definitions, mappings, missingness rules, and exclusions are provided in the Supplementary Material.

3.4. Observation restriction and timing analyses

Observation restrictions were applied by removing selected recorded measurements, after which all summaries and derived predictors were rebuilt. A removed measurement therefore no longer contributed to derived features such as the mean, slope, maximum, observation count, or time since the last measurement. Static inputs were left unchanged.

To vary observation quantity, observations were randomly thinned to approximately 50% of the original count, then further thinned to 25%. To isolate the effect of timing, the number of retained observations was held constant for each patient and variable. Those observations were then selected either at random, preferentially from the most recent measurements, or spread across the recorded interval. A separate experiment removed all observations from the final 12 hours and compared performance with random removal of the same number of observations. This allowed the effect of measurement timing to be assessed separately from observation quantity. Randomised restrictions were repeated over ten shared iterations. Each timing restriction was applied to the frozen shared R1–R4 models, with the corresponding inputs rebuilt each time.

3.5. Model fitting, adaptation, and supporting analyses

CareVue and MetaVision development used five outcome-stratified, patient-level folds. Preprocessing and model fitting were performed separately within each training fold and uncalibrated out-of-fold predictions provided internal evaluation. Intercept-only and Platt calibration adjustments were estimated from out-of-fold predictions and source outcomes. Final models were fitted on the complete eligible source cohort for cross-cohort evaluation. Uncalibrated predictions were used for the primary comparisons, with calibrated external results for MetaVision models reported separately. Sensitivity to model choice was assessed by fitting R1–R3 models to the MetaVision population using histogram gradient boosting, depth-two XGBoost, random forest, and penalised logistic regression.

Three techniques were examined for adapting models to changes in observation availability. First, models were retrained using records with the same observation restriction applied at evaluation. Second, existing models were recalibrated using intercept-only or slope-and-intercept corrections fitted to eICU calibration patients with either complete records or records subjected to the same restriction as the evaluation data. Third, eICU calibration data were used to combine R2 and R3 predictions, allowing the contribution of R3 beyond R2 to adapt to the observation restriction.

Post-hoc analyses also examined transfer in the reverse direction. Shared R1–R3 models were trained on eICU populations varying in sample size and hospital diversity, then evaluated unchanged in MetaVision and MIMIC-IV to examine these factors separately. A further sensitivity analysis examined ventilation harmonisation. Full specifications are provided in the Supplementary Material.

3.6. Evaluation

Mean log loss was the primary metric. AUROC, Brier score, calibration, and sensitivity at a fixed 10% alert capacity were secondary measures. For paired comparisons, negative log-loss differences favour the named candidate.

Confidence intervals were estimated using paired bootstrap resampling. For the principal eICU comparisons, hospitals were resampled to account for within-hospital clustering. Results were reported using both patient- and equal-hospital weighting. Internal source comparisons used fixed out-of-fold predictions, with patients resampled for paired confidence intervals. Losses were averaged across restriction iterations. Local eICU estimates were additionally averaged equally across hospital allocations, with each sampled patient or hospital retained across all allocations in which it appeared.

To assess sensitivity to the MetaVision training sample, models were refitted on 30 bootstrap resamples of the source cohort and evaluated on the fixed eICU test set. A joint analysis combined these refits with 10,000 hospital-level resamples of eICU to assess variation in source fitting and target-hospital composition. For supporting analyses, p values were adjusted using Holm's method within defined comparison families. Full statistical specifications are provided in the Supplementary Material.

4. Results

4.1. Physiological trajectories improved prediction and transferred more consistently

The trajectory representation (R2) improved on the snapshot (R1) across the MIMIC evaluations (Figure 1). In MIMIC-IV, adding longitudinal summaries increased AUROC from 0.8514 to 0.8726 and reduced log loss by 0.01298. Adding observation-pattern features (R3) further increased AUROC to 0.8803, while R4 provided little additional improvement.

Table 3: External performance of MetaVision-trained models in MIMIC-IV (n = 21,682) and eICU (n = 43,878). Results use uncalibrated predictions, with negative paired log-loss differences favouring the richer representation. Unadjusted 95% CIs use patient bootstrapping for MIMIC-IV and hospital bootstrapping for eICU.

Cohort	Model	Log loss	AUROC	Brier	Intercept	Slope
MIMIC-IV	R1	0.29589	0.85140	0.08970	0.298	1.196
	R2	0.28291	0.87258	0.08659	0.546	1.272
	R3	0.27519	0.88026	0.08431	0.504	1.265
eICU	R1	0.30116	0.80666	0.08895	-0.089	1.055
	R2	0.29194	0.82397	0.08616	0.043	1.141
	R3	0.29182	0.82292	0.08670	0.047	1.078

Cohort	Difference	Weighting	Estimate	95% CI
MIMIC-IV	R2–R1	Patient	−0.01298	−0.01529 to −0.01074
	R3–R2	Patient	−0.00772	−0.00955 to −0.00583
eICU	R2–R1	Patient	−0.00922	−0.01148 to −0.00704
	R2–R1	Equal hospital	−0.01133	−0.01619 to −0.00651
	R3–R2	Patient	−0.00012	−0.00206 to +0.00208
	R3–R2	Equal hospital	+0.00188	−0.00172 to +0.00571

The benefit of longitudinal information persisted when the model was transported from MetaVision to eICU. In the 43,878-patient external test set, log loss was 0.30116 for R1 and 0.29194 for R2, with corresponding AUROCs of 0.80666 and 0.82397 (Table 3). The paired loss difference was −0.00922 with patient weighting (95% CI −0.01148 to −0.00704), compared with −0.01133 with equal-hospital weighting (95% CI −0.01619 to −0.00651). R2 achieved lower log loss than R1 in 82.3% of the 79 hospitals with at least 100 patients, 20 deaths, and 20 survivors, compared with 70.6% across all 204 hospitals.

The same pattern held across source refits and most model choices. R2 outperformed R1 in all 30 MetaVision bootstrap refits. Histogram boosting, depth-two XGBoost, and random forest reproduced the direction of the external result, with both boosting models also doing so under equal-hospital weighting. Penalised logistic regression was the exception, with external performance worsening as richer representations were added.

4.2. Observation-pattern information was predictive but transferred less consistently

In MIMIC-IV, adding observation-pattern features (R3) improved prediction beyond the trajectory representation (R2), reducing log loss by 0.00772. In contrast, R3 did not clearly improve prediction after transfer to eICU, where log loss was 0.29182 for R3 and 0.29194 for R2, with corresponding AUROCs of 0.82292 and 0.82397. The patient-weighted R3–R2 loss difference was −0.00012 (95% CI −0.00206 to +0.00208), with a similar result under equal-hospital weighting (Table 3). Results varied across hospitals, with 54.4% of the 79 larger hospitals and 51.5% of all hospitals favouring R3.

R3 outperformed R2 in 10 of the 30 MetaVision bootstrap resamples, with a median loss difference of +0.00064 (10th–90th percentile −0.00152 to +0.00371). When source refitting and target-hospital resampling were combined, the patient-weighted difference ranged from −0.00363 to +0.00596. By comparison, the corresponding R2–R1 range remained below zero (−0.01477 to −0.00490), indicating that the R3 increment was less consistently favourable across source fits and target-hospital compositions.

Post-hoc reverse-transfer analysis supported this source dependence. In models trained in eICU, R3 improved on R2 both in held-out eICU hospitals and after transfer to the MetaVision (−0.00811) and MIMIC-IV cohorts (−0.00767). Reducing the eICU training population to match the size of the 7,762-patient MetaVision source cohort weakened this increment, particularly in MIMIC-IV. Among these reduced samples, restricting training to 6–7 hospitals did not consistently worsen transfer. In these experiments, source sample size appeared more consequential than the number of training hospitals.

4.3. When measurements occurred mattered independently of how many were retained

Holding observation count constant revealed that measurement timing itself affected prediction (Figure 2). Observations spread through the 48-hour window outperformed random retention in all four external representations, with differences in log loss ranging from −0.00703 for R2 to −0.03280 for R3. Retaining the most




Figure 1: Incremental value of physiological trajectories (R2–R1; A) and observation patterns (R3–R2; B) across evaluation settings. Points show patient-weighted log-loss differences with 95% paired-bootstrap CIs, using patient resampling for MIMIC and hospital resampling for eICU. Negative differences favour the richer representation.




Figure 2: External eICU effects of observation timing at matched observation counts. A: most recent observations versus random retention. B: observations spread through the window versus random retention. C: final 12-hour outage versus matched random removal. Negative differences favour recent or spread retention, while positive outage differences indicate worse performance. Points show patient-weighted log-loss differences averaged across restriction iterations, with 95% hospital-bootstrap CIs.

recent observations improved all four representations. Removing the final 12 hours was harmful in every tier compared with matched random removal (+0.00822 for R2 to +0.01947 for R3).

R3 was more sensitive to measurement timing than R2. Compared with the corresponding effects in R2, recent and spread retention reduced log loss more for R3 (−0.03513 vs. −0.02576), while removing the final 12 hours increased it more (+0.01124), with all 95% CIs excluding zero under both weighting schemes. Analyses using MIMIC showed the same pattern, with R3 and R4 generally the most timing-sensitive representations.

4.4. Observation-pattern information remained predictive in local eICU models

To test whether the weak transported R3 result reflected a lack of useful observation-pattern information in eICU, the same representations were trained and evaluated locally using hospital-grouped cross-validation. On complete records, R3 improved on R2 by −0.00257 (95% CI −0.00370 to −0.00146), with similar findings under equal-hospital weighting. Observation-pattern information was therefore predictive in eICU despite transferring inconsistently.

The local benefit depended strongly on the available record. The R3–R2 difference changed from −0.00257 using complete inputs to −0.00042 at 50% retention, +0.00326 at 25% retention, and +0.01081 when the final 12 hours were removed (Figure 3A). Under stronger restrictions, the R3 increment therefore changed from beneficial to harmful.




Figure 3: Local eICU effects of changing observation availability. A: R2–R1 and R3–R2 differences when models trained on complete records are evaluated on complete or restricted records. B: R3–R2 differences before and after restriction-matched recalibration using a separate calibration cohort. Points show patient-weighted log-loss differences averaged across allocations, with 95% hospital-bootstrap CIs.

4.5. Matching the model to the changed observation regime recovered performance

Retraining R3 using 25% retained records restored its advantage over R2 under the same restriction. When evaluated at 25% retention, log loss was 0.01509 lower than for R3 trained on complete records and 0.00336 lower than for R2 retrained under the same restriction. However, when tested on complete records, the retrained R3 model had 0.01609 higher log loss than the model trained on complete data.

Recalibration using records subjected to the same restriction also restored the advantage of R3 over R2 at 25% retention. Matched slope/intercept calibration produced a difference of −0.00117 (95% CI −0.00184 to −0.00050). When the final 12 hours were removed, recalibration reduced but did not reverse the disadvantage of R3, which remained worse than R2 by +0.00392 (95% CI 0.00243 to 0.00552; Figure 3B).

Combining R2 and R3 predictions using the 10,909 eICU calibration patients improved on R3 recalibration by 0.00259 on complete records, 0.00541 at 50% retention, and 0.00757 at 25% retention. Allowing separate unconstrained coefficients for R2 and R3 had slightly lower mean loss, by a further 0.00121, 0.00101, and 0.00081, respectively. As observation availability decreased, the fitted update placed progressively less weight on R3 relative to R2, with the coefficient falling from 0.503 on complete records to 0.325 at 50% retention and 0.199 at 25% retention.

5. Discussion

The predictive value of longitudinal clinical records depended not only on patients' physiological trajectories, but also on how those trajectories were observed. Physiological summaries improved prediction consistently across recording eras and institutions, whereas the additional value of observation-pattern features was less reliably transferable. At matched observation counts, changes in measurement timing affected prediction, with observation-pattern representations substantially more sensitive than trajectory summaries. In locally developed eICU models, the incremental value of observation patterns changed from beneficial to harmful when measurement availability was restricted. Together, these findings identify the observation process as an important consideration in evaluating the robustness of clinical prediction models.

The less consistent external value of observation-pattern information did not mean that these features were inherently uninformative. In locally developed eICU models, they improved mortality prediction beyond physiological trajectories, consistent with previous studies of the prognostic value of laboratory testing patterns (Agniel et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2019). This advantage also persisted when eICU-trained models were transferred to MetaVision and MIMIC-IV, despite being less consistent in the reverse direction. Comparisons across training samples suggested that sample size was more consequential than hospital diversity, although these analyses cannot fully explain the asymmetry.

This dependence on the development population is consistent with Nestor et al. (2019), who demonstrated the sensitivity of clinical prediction models to changes in documentation practices, and Groenwold (2020), who highlighted the risks of relying on informative missingness when measurement processes change. More directly, Yamamoto et al. (2026) reported weaker transportability associated with observation-process features in sepsis mortality prediction, while Zou et al. (2026) found limited additional value beyond physiological trajectories in ICU acute kidney injury prediction. Together, these findings suggest that observation patterns can provide useful prognostic information, but their incremental value depends partly on the development population and may not persist across clinical settings.

The predictive value of longitudinal records depended not only on the quantity of available measurements, but also on when they were recorded. Retaining observations spread across the recorded history improved prediction relative to random retention, whereas removing the final 12 hours consistently worsened it. The observation-pattern representation was particularly sensitive to these changes, suggesting greater dependence on the measurement schedule. These findings complement earlier work on explicitly modelling observation gaps in clinical time series (Che et al., 2018) and support concerns about robustness when missingness patterns change (Rockenschaub et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2023). Nonetheless, these retrospective restrictions do not establish how changes in actual clinical monitoring would affect prediction.

The adaptation analyses suggest that sensitivity to changing observation regimes may be mitigated, but not eliminated. Retraining on restricted records restored the advantage of R3 over R2 under the same conditions, at the expense of performance on complete records. Recalibration recovered a modest benefit under random thinning, but not following a terminal outage. Combining R2 and R3 predictions provided further improvement, with less weight placed on observation-pattern information as availability declined. These findings are consistent with previous work on clinical prediction model updating and recalibration (Steyerberg et al., 2004; Van Calster et al., 2019). The differences in recovery across restrictions also highlight the importance of accounting for local clinical practices and the nature of distributional change when adapting models (Kappen et al., 2012; Davis et al., 2019). The incomplete recovery of performance parallels Guo et al. (2022), who found that domain adaptation did not consistently improve robustness under temporal dataset shift.

More broadly, external validation in a new patient population may be insufficient to establish the sensitivity of a model to changing measurement conditions. Variations in observation timing and availability can affect performance independently of population differences. Evaluating models under such changes may therefore complement conventional validation, particularly for those that explicitly represent observation patterns.

Several aspects of the study design strengthen the interpretation of these findings. Evaluation across different recording eras and a large multicentre cohort allowed the consistency of predictive information to be assessed across clinical settings. Local development and reverse-transfer analyses helped distinguish poor transportability from a lack of useful predictive information. By holding observation counts constant, the timing experiments also distinguished the effects of measurement timing from those of observation quantity. Finally, repeated source-model refitting and hospital-level resampling assessed the sensitivity of the external findings to variation in model development and target-hospital composition.

Nevertheless, several limitations should be considered. Differences in performance across databases cannot be attributed to observation practices alone, given variation in patient populations, clinical practice, and variable definitions despite harmonisation. Comparisons between nested representations also assess their overall predictive value rather than isolating the contribution of individual features, since model fitting and interactions change as predictors are added. Furthermore, the observation restrictions were simulated by removing existing measurements, rather than reproducing changes in clinical monitoring, where decisions about when and how often to measure patients depend on their condition. The analysis was also restricted to patients remaining in intensive care at 48 hours, limiting generalisation to other prediction times and populations. Finally, the contrasting findings from penalised logistic regression suggest that the observed relationships may not extend to all model classes.

Future research should examine how changes in clinical monitoring and recording practices affect model performance in routine care. This would help establish whether the sensitivity observed under simulated restrictions also occurs under real-world conditions. Further work could identify which aspects of observation behaviour, including measurement frequency, recency, and prolonged gaps, are most sensitive to changes in clinical setting, and whether their predictive value differs across physiological variables or patient groups. Adaptation strategies should also be tested in new clinical settings, particularly where limited local data are available for model updating. Finally, extending these analyses to other prediction landmarks and outcomes could clarify when observation-pattern information provides a sufficiently reliable benefit to justify its inclusion in clinical prediction models.

6. Conclusion

Longitudinal physiological summaries improved ICU mortality prediction more consistently across settings than explicit observation-pattern features. Although observation patterns provided useful predictive information in locally developed models, their additional value was less reliable across development populations and changes in measurement availability. The timing of measurements also affected performance independently of their number, with models incorporating observation patterns particularly sensitive to these changes. Model adaptation recovered some of the lost performance, but did not fully overcome the effects of changing measurement availability. These findings suggest that external validation of clinical prediction models should consider not only differences in patient populations, but also the stability of the measurement processes supplying their inputs.

Declarations

This study involved secondary analysis of de-identified clinical records from MIMIC-III, MIMIC-IV, and eICU. The MIMIC databases were developed with institutional ethics approval and waivers of informed consent. The eICU database was de-identified in accordance with HIPAA requirements. Data were accessed under the applicable credentialing and data-use agreements.

The datasets analysed in this study are available through PhysioNet: MIMIC-III version 1.4, MIMIC-IV version 3.1, and eICU version 2.0. Access requires completion of the relevant training and acceptance of the PhysioNet data-use agreements. The analysis code is available on GitHub and archived on Zenodo (doi:10.5281/zenodo.23741499). Full results data are available on Zenodo (doi:10.5281/zenodo.23741580).

This research received no external funding and the author declares no competing interests. The author was responsible for study conception, methodology, software development, data analysis, interpretation, and manuscript preparation.

During the preparation of this manuscript, OpenAI's ChatGPT was used to assist with grammatical proofreading and refactoring of analysis code originally written by the author. All changes were reviewed by the author, who takes full responsibility for the final manuscript and analyses.

References

Agniel, D., Kohane, I.S., Weber, G.M., 2018. Biases in electronic health record data due to processes within the healthcare system: retrospective observational study. BMJ 361, k1479. doi:10.1136/bmj.k1479.

Che, Z., Purushotham, S., Cho, K., Sontag, D., Liu, Y., 2018. Recurrent neural networks for multivariate time series with missing values. Scientific Reports 8, 6085. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24271-9.

Davis, S.E., Greevy, R.A., Fonnesbeck, C., Lasko, T.A., Walsh, C.G., Matheny, M.E., 2019. A nonparametric updating method to correct clinical prediction model drift. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association 26, 1448–1457. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocz127.

Groenwold, R.H.H., 2020. Informative missingness in electronic health record systems: the curse of knowing. Diagnostic and Prognostic Research 4, 8. doi:10.1186/s41512-020-00077-0.

Guo, L.L., Pfohl, S.R., Fries, J., et al., 2022. Evaluation of domain generalization and adaptation on improving model robustness to temporal dataset shift in clinical medicine. Scientific Reports doi:10.1038/s41598-022-06484-1.

Harutyunyan, H., Khachatrian, H., Kale, D.C., Ver Steeg, G., Galstyan, A., 2019. Multitask learning and benchmarking with clinical time series data. Scientific Data 6, 96. doi:10.1038/s41597-019-0103-9.

Johnson, A., Bulgarelli, L., Pollard, T., Gow, B., Moody, B., Horng, S., Celi, L.A., Mark, R., 2024. MIMIC-IV. PhysioNet. URL: https://physionet.org/content/mimiciv/3.1/, doi:10.13026/kpb9-mt58. version 3.1.

Johnson, A., Pollard, T., Mark, R., 2016a. MIMIC-III Clinical Database. PhysioNet. URL: https://physionet.org/content/mimiciii/1.4/, doi:10.13026/C2XW26. version 1.4.

Johnson, A.E.W., Bulgarelli, L., Shen, L., et al., 2023. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. Scientific Data 10, 1. doi:10.1038/s41597-022-01899-x.

Johnson, A.E.W., Pollard, T.J., Shen, L., Lehman, L.W.H., Feng, M., Ghassemi, M., Moody, B., Szolovits, P., Celi, L.A., Mark, R.G., 2016b. MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. Scientific Data 3, 160035. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.35.

Kappen, T.H., Vergouwe, Y., van Klei, W.A., van Wolfswinkel, L., Kalkman, C.J., Moons, K.G.M., 2012. Adaptation of clinical prediction models for application in local settings. Medical Decision Making 32, E1–E10. doi:10.1177/0272989X12439755.

Nestor, B., McDermott, M.B.A., Boag, W., Berner, G., Naumann, T., Hughes, M.C., Goldenberg, A., Ghassemi, M., 2019. Feature robustness in non-stationary health records: Caveats to deployable model performance in common clinical machine learning tasks, in: Proceedings of the 4th Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference, PMLR. pp. 381–405. URL: https://proceedings.mlr.press/v106/nestor19a.html.

Pajouheshnia, R., van Smeden, M., Peelen, L.M., Groenwold, R.H.H., 2019. How variation in predictor measurement affects the discriminative ability and transportability of a prediction model. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 105, 136–141. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.09.001.

Pollard, T., Johnson, A., Raffa, J., Celi, L.A., Badawi, O., Mark, R., 2019. eICU Collaborative Research Database. PhysioNet. URL: https://physionet.org/content/eicu-crd/2.0/, doi:10.13026/C2WM1R. version 2.0.

Pollard, T.J., Johnson, A.E.W., Raffa, J.D., Celi, L.A., Mark, R.G., Badawi, O., 2018. The eICU collaborative research database, a freely available multi-center database for critical care research. Scientific Data 5, 180178. doi:10.1038/sdata.2018.178.

Riley, R.D., Ensor, J., Snell, K.I.E., Debray, T.P.A., Altman, D.G., Moons, K.G.M., Collins, G.S., 2016. External validation of clinical prediction models using big datasets from e-health records or IPD meta-analysis: opportunities and challenges. BMJ 353, i3140. doi:10.1136/bmj.i3140.

Rockenschaub, P., Xian, Z., Zamanian, A., Piperno, M., Ciora, O.A., Pachl, E., Ahmidi, N., 2024. Robust prediction under missingness shifts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16484. URL: https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16484, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2406.16484.

Silva, I., Moody, G., Scott, D.J., Celi, L.A., Mark, R.G., 2012. Predicting in-hospital mortality of ICU patients: The PhysioNet/Computing in Cardiology Challenge 2012. Computing in Cardiology 39, 245–248. URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3965265/.

Sisk, R., Lin, L., Sperrin, M., Barrett, J.K., Tom, B., Diaz-Ordaz, K., Peek, N., Martin, G.P., 2021. Informative presence and observation in routine health data: A review of methodology for clinical risk prediction. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association 28, 155–166. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocaa242.

Steyerberg, E.W., Borsboom, G.J.J.M., van Houwelingen, H.C., Eijkemans, M.J.C., Habbema, J.D.F., 2004. Validation and updating of predictive logistic regression models: a study on sample size and shrinkage. Statistics in Medicine 23, 2567–2586. doi:10.1002/sim.1844.

Sun, H., Kang, M., Zhang, H., Jia, J., Wang, Q., 2025. Machine learning for predicting mortality in intensive care unit patients: A prognostic performance systematic review and meta-analysis. Nursing in Critical Care 30, e70206. doi:10.1111/nicc.70206.

Van Calster, B., McLernon, D.J., van Smeden, M., Wynants, L., Steyerberg, E.W., 2019. Calibration: the Achilles heel of predictive analytics. BMC Medicine 17, 230. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1466-7.

Yamamoto, R., Wu, F., Sprehe, L.K., Abeer, A., Celi, L.A., Tohyama, T., 2026. Observation-process features are associated with larger domain shift in sepsis mortality prediction: a cross-database evaluation using MIMIC-IV and eICU-CRD. medRxiv preprint. URL: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.64898/2026.04.05.26350209v1, doi:10.64898/2026.04.05.26350209. version 1; not peer reviewed.

Zhang, Z., Goyal, H., Lange, T., Hong, Y., 2019. Healthcare processes of laboratory tests for the prediction of mortality in the intensive care unit: a retrospective study based on electronic healthcare records in the USA. BMJ Open 9, e028101. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028101.

Zhou, H., Balakrishnan, S., Lipton, Z., 2023. Domain adaptation under missingness shift, in: Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pp. 9577–9606. URL: https://proceedings.mlr.press/v206/zhou23b.html.

Zou, J., Wang, H., Xin, Z., Zhou, Q., Chen, J., Huang, J., 2026. From predictive signal to deployable value: EHR measurement-process features in ICU AKI prediction. International Journal of Medical Informatics 221, 106668. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2026.106668. published online 18 August 2026.