

Sepsis Prediction Using Graph Convolutional Networks over Patient–Feature–Value Triplets

Bozhi Dan¹, Di Wu^{1,4*}, Ji Xu², Xiang Liu^{3,4}, Yiziting Zhu^{3,4}, Xin Shu^{3,4}, Yujie Li^{3,4}, Bin Yi^{3,4}

¹ College of Computer and Information Science, Southwest University, Chongqing 400715, China

² State Key Laboratory of Public Big Data, Guizhou University, Guiyang 550025, China.

³ Department of Anesthesiology, Southwest Hospital, Third Military Medical University (Army Medical University), Chongqing, China.

⁴ Key Laboratory of Perioperative Multi-organ Protection and Intelligent Anesthesia of Chongqing Municipal Health Commission, Chongqing, China

*wudi1986@swu.edu.cn

Abstract

In the intensive care setting, sepsis continues to be a major contributor to patient illness and death; however, its timely detection is hindered by the complex, sparse, and heterogeneous nature of electronic health record (*EHR*) data. We propose *Triplet-GCN*, a single-branch graph convolutional model that represents each encounter as patient–feature–value triplets, constructs a bipartite *EHR* graph, and learns patient embeddings via a Graph Convolutional Network (*GCN*) followed by a lightweight multilayer perceptron (*MLP*). The pipeline applies type-specific preprocessing—median imputation and standardization for numeric variables, effect coding for binary features, and mode imputation with low-dimensional embeddings for rare categorical attributes—and initializes patient nodes with summary statistics, while retaining measurement values on edges to preserve “who measured what and by how much.” In a retrospective, multi-center Chinese cohort ($N = 648$; 70/30 train–test split) drawn from three tertiary hospitals, *Triplet-GCN* consistently outperforms strong tabular baselines (KNN, SVM, XGBoost, Random Forest) across discrimination and balanced error metrics, yielding a more favorable sensitivity–specificity trade-off and improved overall utility for early warning. These findings indicate that encoding *EHR* as triplets and propagating information over a patient–feature graph produce more informative patient representations than feature-independent models, offering a simple, end-to-end blueprint for deployable sepsis risk stratification.

Index Terms

Sepsis prediction; GCN; MLP; Heterogeneous feature handling; Patient–Feature–Value Triplets

I. INTRODUCTION

Sepsis is closely associated with substantial increases in both morbidity and mortality among critically ill patients [1], [2], and timely identification is essential to prevent subsequent organ dysfunction and death. [3], [4]. Driven by the rapid advances in big data [5]–[28] and artificial intelligence technologies [29]–[55], electronic health records in intensive care units contain vast amounts of patient information, which brings unique possibilities as well as huge obstacles to the development of early warning systems for diseases. Despite the increasing availability of electronic health records (*EHR*), early warning remains challenging because these data are high-dimensional, sparse, and heterogeneous, evolving across physiological, laboratory, and treatment domains. [56]

Conventional machine-learning approaches—such as Random Forests, XGBoost, Support Vector Machines, Naïve Bayes, and logistic regression—typically treat *EHR* variables as independent tabular features [57]–[63]. This independence assumption overlooks relational dependencies between patients and clinical attributes, limiting a model’s capacity to capture cross-feature interactions and hindering generalization across diverse patient populations.

In response to these challenges, we introduce a triplet-based graph convolutional framework for sepsis prediction from *EHR* data [64]. Each encounter is transformed into a set of (patient, feature, value) triplets that naturally encode associations between individuals and their observed clinical attributes. We then construct a bipartite graph in which patients and features are distinct node types connected by weighted edges representing measured values; a Graph Convolutional Network (*GCN*) aggregates signals from each patient’s feature neighbors to learn patient-level embeddings, which are passed to a compact multilayer perceptron (*MLP*) for risk estimation.

The proposed approach offers a unified and interpretable way to integrate structured *EHR* information into a graph representation, capturing both intra-patient and inter-patient dependencies while remaining lightweight enough for practical deployment. Conceptually, our model preserves the crucial semantics of ‘who measured what and by how much.’ The bipartite

This work was supported in part by the New Chongqing Youth Innovation Talent Project and under Grant CSTB2024NSCQ-QCXM0035, in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62576289, 62176070), and in part by the Key Clinical Research Incubation Project (No.202411TZDA02) of Southwest Hospital, Chongqing, China.

graph structure directly links a patient (the “who”) to a clinical variable (the “what”), while the edge weight represents the specific measurement (the “by how much”). This preserves the original interaction in a relational form that *GCN* are designed to exploit; empirically, it provides a principled basis for comparison against strong tabular baselines, including Random Forests, XGBoost, and Support Vector Machines. This work contributes to the growing literature on graph-based clinical prediction by demonstrating that triplet-level *EHR* graph modeling can enhance the expressive power of *GCN* for medical risk prediction.

II. METHODOLOGY

We cast the *EHR* as a bipartite graph over patients and features, enabling relational reasoning while preserving measurement semantics through edge weights. The overall pipeline comprises: (i) type-specific preprocessing and triplet-to-graph construction; (ii) node initialization for patients and features; (iii) *GCN* message passing to obtain patient embeddings; and (iv) shallow *MLP* classification with a focal-loss objective.

A. Problem Setup and Cohort

Let $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ denote the set of patients and $\mathcal{F} = \{1, \dots, M\}$ the set of clinical features extracted from *EHR*. Each observation is represented as a triplet (i, f, x_{if}) , where x_{if} is the raw measurement (numeric, binary, or categorical) of feature f for patient i . The goal is to learn $h : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that maps each patient to the probability of sepsis.

Data were collected from three tertiary hospitals in China—Southwest Hospital (Third Military Medical University), Xuanwu Hospital (Capital Medical University), and West China Hospital (Sichuan University) [65]. We used a stratified 70/30 train–test split, maintaining an approximately 1:2 positive/negative ratio in both sets [66].

B. Triplet-to-Graph

We build a bipartite graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{W})$ with node set $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_P \cup \mathcal{V}_F$, where \mathcal{V}_P are patient nodes and \mathcal{V}_F are feature nodes [67], [68]. For each present (after imputation) measurement, we add an undirected edge $(i, f) \in \mathcal{E}$ between patient $i \in \mathcal{V}_P$ and feature $f \in \mathcal{V}_F$ with scalar weight $w_{if} \in \mathbb{W}$. Self-loops are attached to all nodes for numerical stability [69].

Let \hat{A} be the weighted adjacency with self-loops:

$$\hat{A}_{uv} = \begin{cases} w_{if}, & u = i \in \mathcal{V}_P, v = f \in \mathcal{V}_F, \\ w_{fi}, & u = f \in \mathcal{V}_F, v = i \in \mathcal{V}_P, \\ 1, & u = v, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We use the standard *GCN* “renormalization trick” with symmetric normalization:

$$\tilde{A} = D^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{A} D^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (2)$$

where the degree matrix D satisfies

$$D_{uu} = \sum_v \hat{A}_{uv} \quad (3)$$

This graph construction directly models the patient-feature-value triplet: the patient node i (the “who”) is connected to the feature node f (the “what”) by an edge whose scalar weight w_{if} represents the measurement value (the “by how much”). By encoding fine-grained measurements on the edges rather than just the nodes, this design preserves the original clinical semantics and enables meaningful message passing across these specific patient-feature relations.

C. Heterogeneous Feature Handling

EHR heterogeneity is addressed with type-specific preprocessing applied to the training split and then fixed.

1) *Numeric features*: Missing values are imputed with the feature-wise median; the result is standardized using training-set statistics:

$$\tilde{x}_{if} = \begin{cases} x_{if}, & \text{if observed,} \\ \text{median}_{\text{train}(f)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$$v_{if} = \frac{\tilde{x}_{if} - \mu_f}{\sigma_f} \quad (5)$$

where μ_f, σ_f are the training-set mean and standard deviation (with $\sigma_f \leftarrow 1$, if degenerate).

2) *Binary features*: We adopt effect coding without standardization:

$$v_{if} = \begin{cases} +1, & x_{if} = 1, \\ -1, & x_{if} = 0, \\ 0, & \text{missing.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$




Fig. 1. The GCN model framework.

3) *Categorical features (rare)*: Categorical attributes are imputed with the training-set mode and embedded via a learnable low-dimensional embedding $e(c) \in \mathbb{R}^4$. These embeddings are appended to the patient-node initializer. We additionally record a missingness indicator $m_{if} \in \{0, 1\}$ (1 if originally observed, 0 if imputed) to inform edge weighting.

D. Node Initialization

1) *Feature nodes*: Each feature f has a trainable embedding $z_f \in \mathbb{R}^{32}$, linearly projected to the GCN hidden size d : $h_f^{(0)} = \psi(z_f) \mathbb{R}^d$.

2) *Patient nodes*: For each patient i , we compute summary statistics over incident values $\{v_{if}\}_f$:

$$s_i = [\text{mean}(v_{if}), \text{max}(v_{if}), \text{min}(v_{if}), \text{var}(v_{if})] \in \mathbb{R}^4 \quad (7)$$

We then concatenate the categorical embedding(s) $e(c_i)$ and map to \mathbb{R}^d via a linear projection ϕ :

$$h_i^{(0)} = \phi([s_i \parallel e(c_i)]) \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (8)$$

This design supplies patient nodes with coarse, patient-level context while leaving fine-grained measurement information on edges.

E. GCN Model

Figure 1 presents the proposed triplet-driven GCN. Patient-feature-value triplets are first encoded, then propagated through a graph convolutional network, and finally classified by a multilayer perceptron to estimate sepsis risk [70]–[72]. The model uses two GCN layers with LeakyReLU activations and dropout [73]. The first layer performs message passing with the normalized adjacency \tilde{A} ; the second incorporates a residual connection to stabilize optimization and retain low-level signals [74]–[76]. For each patient node [77], the embedding is the corresponding row of the final hidden matrix $H^{(2)}$:

$$H^{(1)} = \sigma(\tilde{A} H^{(0)} W^{(0)}) \quad (9)$$

$$H^{(2)} = \sigma(\tilde{A} H^{(1)} W^{(1)}) + H^{(1)} \quad (10)$$

F. Learning and Inference

Each patient embedding $h_i = H_i^{(2)}$ is passed to a shallow MLP to obtain a logit z_i and probability $p_i = \sigma(z_i)$. To address the issue of class imbalance while placing greater emphasis on hard-to-classify samples, we adopt the focal loss function [78]:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_{t,i} (1 - p_{t,i})^\gamma \log p_{t,i} \quad (11)$$

where $p_{t,i}$ denotes the predicted probability assigned to the ground-truth class of the i -th sample, $\gamma > 0$ is the focusing parameter, and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is a scalar scaling factor.

III. RESULTS

Table I presents a detailed comparison of the proposed *Triplet-GCN* model against a set of conventional machine-learning baselines evaluated on the same held-out test set [79], [80]. In terms of overall discriminative capacity, *Triplet-GCN* achieved an AUC of 90.72%, outperforming the strongest baseline (Random Forest, 89.52%) by 1.20 percentage points. This improvement in AUC indicates that *Triplet-GCN* is better able to separate septic from non-septic cases across a wide range of decision thresholds. With respect to sensitivity, *Triplet-GCN* attained a value of 60.94%, corresponding to an absolute increase of 1.56 percentage points over the best-performing baseline (Random Forest, 59.38%), suggesting enhanced ability to correctly identify true positive cases. Specificity reached 95.42%, which matches the highest specificity observed among the baselines (KNN, 95.42%), indicating that the proposed model preserves the strong capacity of existing methods to correctly classify non-septic patients.

Regarding positive predictive performance, *Triplet-GCN* obtained a precision (PPV) of 86.67%, exceeding the best baseline (KNN, 85.37%) by 1.30 percentage points, thereby reducing the proportion of false-positive alerts among predicted septic cases. The negative predictive value (NPV) was 83.33%, representing a 1.14 percentage point gain over the strongest baseline (Random Forest, 82.19%), which implies a more reliable exclusion of sepsis among patients predicted to be non-septic. Importantly, the F1 score, which jointly reflects precision and recall, reached 71.56% for *Triplet-GCN*, corresponding to an absolute improvement of 4.30 percentage points relative to the best baseline (Random Forest, 67.26%). This substantial gain in F1 demonstrates that *Triplet-GCN* achieves a more favorable balance between detecting true sepsis cases and limiting false alarms. Finally, the overall accuracy was 84.10%, which is 2.05 percentage points higher than the top baseline accuracy (KNN, 82.05%), further confirming the superior predictive performance of the proposed model.

Taken together, these consistent improvements across multiple complementary metrics indicate that modeling *EHR* data as patient–feature–value triplets and propagating information over a bipartite graph leads to more expressive and clinically informative patient representations than approaches that treat variables as independent tabular features. By capturing higher-order relationships between patients and their recorded measurements, *Triplet-GCN* enhances discriminative performance while achieving a favorable trade-off between false positives and false negatives in this retrospective cohort.

TABLE I
COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF TRIPLET-GCN AND TRADITIONAL MACHINE-LEARNING MODELS.

Model	AUC (95% CI)	Sens. (%)	Spec. (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	F1 (%)	Acc. (%)
KNN	86.66	54.69	95.42	85.37	81.17	66.67	82.05
SVM	87.42	53.12	92.37	77.27	80.13	62.96	79.49
XGBoost	87.79	54.69	87.02	67.31	79.72	60.34	76.41
Random Forest	89.52	59.38	91.60	77.55	82.19	67.26	81.03
Triplet-GCN	90.72	60.94	95.42	86.67	83.33	71.56	84.10

IV. CONCLUSION

This study introduced *Triplet-GCN*, a lightweight graph-convolutional framework that models *EHR* as patient–feature–value triplets, propagates information over a patient–feature bipartite graph, and classifies patient embeddings with a compact *MLP*. By retaining the provenance and magnitude of measurements at the edge level, the method unifies heterogeneous variables in a single relational representation while remaining interpretable and practical for deployment [81], [82].

On a multi-institutional Chinese cohort, *Triplet-GCN* consistently outperformed strong tabular baselines across discrimination and balanced-error metrics, directly addressing the question of whether graph-based modeling of triplet-structured *EHR* yields tangible benefits for clinical risk stratification. The findings indicate that encoding relations at the edge level improves *GCN*-derived patient representations and enhances robustness to sparsity and heterogeneity in real-world data.

Looking ahead, we will pursue external and prospective validation and incorporate temporal dynamics to better capture disease trajectories, while preserving the simplicity and interpretability of the approach. These steps are natural extensions toward evaluating generalizability, operational readiness, and longitudinal risk modeling in clinical settings.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Singer, C. S. Deutschman, C. W. Seymour, and et al., “The third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (sepsis-3),” *JAMA*, 2016.
- [2] C. W. Seymour, V. X. Liu, T. J. Iwashyna, and et al., “Assessment of clinical criteria for sepsis: For the third international consensus definitions for sepsis and septic shock (sepsis-3),” *JAMA*, 2016.
- [3] L. Evans, A. Rhodes, W. Alhazzani, and et al., “Surviving sepsis campaign: International guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock 2021,” *Intensive Care Med.*, 2021.
- [4] K. H. Goh, L. Wang, A. Y. K. Yeow, and et al., “Artificial intelligence in sepsis early prediction and diagnosis using unstructured data in healthcare,” *Nat. Commun.*, 2021.

- [5] D. Wu, Z. Li, Z. Yu *et al.*, "Robust low-rank latent feature analysis for spatio-temporal signal recovery," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 11, 2023.
- [6] D. Wu, M. Shang, X. Luo *et al.*, "An l1- and l2-norm oriented latent factor model for recommender systems," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 5775–5788, 2022.
- [7] D. Wu, Y. He, and X. Luo, "A graph-incorporated latent factor analysis model for high-dimensional and sparse data," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Topics Comput.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 907–917, 2023.
- [8] X. Luo, Y. Zhong, Z. Wang, and M. Li, "An alternating-direction-method-of-multipliers-incorporated approach to symmetric non-negative latent factor analysis," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 4826–4840, 2023.
- [9] J. Chen, Y. Yuan, and X. Luo, "Sdgnn: Symmetry preserving dual stream graph neural networks," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, 2024.
- [10] X. Luo, H. Wu, Z. Wang, J. Wang, and D. Meng, "A novel approach to large-scale dynamically weighted directed network representation," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 9756–9773, 2022.
- [11] Y. Yuan, Y. Wang, and X. Luo, "A node-collaboration-informed graph convolutional network for highly-accurate representation to undirected weighted graph," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 3845–3858, 2024.
- [12] X. Luo, Y. Zhou, Z. Liu, and M. Zhou, "Fast and accurate non-negative latent factor analysis on high-dimensional and sparse matrices in recommender systems," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 3897–3911, 2023.
- [13] D. Wu, Y. He, X. Luo *et al.*, "A latent factor analysis-based approach to online sparse streaming feature selection," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. Syst.*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 6744–6758, 2022.
- [14] T. Chen, W. Yang, Z. Zhang, and X. Luo, "An efficient industrial robot calibrator with multi-planer constraints," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, 2024.
- [15] X. Luo, M. Chen, H. Wu, Z. Liu, H. Yuan, and M. Zhou, "Adjusting learning depth in non-negative latent factorization of tensors for accurately modeling temporal patterns in dynamic qos data," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 2142–2155, 2022.
- [16] D. Wu, P. Pang, Y. He, and X. Luo, "A double-space and double-norm ensembled latent factor model for highly accurate web service qos prediction," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 802–814, 2023.
- [17] J. Chen, K. Liu, X. Luo, Y. Yuan, K. Sedraoui, Y. Al-Turki, and M. Zhou, "A state-migration particle swarm optimizer for adaptive latent factor analysis of high-dimensional and incomplete data," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, 2024.
- [18] Y. Zhou, Z. Liu, X. Luo, L. Hu, and M. Zhou, "Generalized nesterov's acceleration-incorporated, non-negative and adaptive latent factor analysis," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 2809–2823, 2022.
- [19] Z. Li, S. Li, and X. Luo, "A novel machine learning system for industrial robot arm calibration," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. II, Exp. Briefs*, 2023.
- [20] J. Li, F. Tan, C. He, Z. Wang, H. Song, P. Hu, and X. Luo, "Saliency-aware dual embedded attention network for multivariate time-series forecasting in information technology operations," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 4206–4217, 2024.
- [21] Z. Luo, X. Jin, Y. Luo, Q. Zhou, and X. Luo, "Analysis of students' positive emotion and smile intensity using sequence-relative key-frame labeling and deep-asymmetric convolutional neural network," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, 2024.
- [22] P. Huang and X. Luo, "Fdts: A feature disentangled transformer for interpretable squamous cell carcinoma grading," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, 2024.
- [23] Y. Zhong, K. Liu, S. Gao, and X. Luo, "Alternating-direction-method-of-multipliers-based adaptive nonnegative latent factor analysis," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Topics Comput.*, 2024.
- [24] W. Qin, X. Luo, and M. Zhou, "Adaptively-accelerated parallel stochastic gradient descent for high-dimensional and incomplete data representation learning," *IEEE Trans. Big Data*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 92–107, 2024.
- [25] X. Luo, Z. Liu, L. Jin, Y. Zhou, and M. Zhou, "Symmetric non-negative matrix factorization-based community detection models and their convergence analysis," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 1203–1215, 2022.
- [26] H. Wu, Y. Qiao, and X. Luo, "A fine-grained regularization scheme for nonnegative latent factorization of high-dimensional and incomplete tensors," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, 2024.
- [27] X. Luo, J. Chen, Y. Yuan, and Z. Wang, "Pseudo gradient-adjusted particle swarm optimization for accurate adaptive latent factor analysis," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. Syst.*, 2023.
- [28] Y. Yuan, J. Li, and X. Luo, "A fuzzy pid-incorporated stochastic gradient descent algorithm for fast and accurate latent factor analysis," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 445–459, 2024.
- [29] W. Yang, S. Li, and X. Luo, "Data-driven vibration control: A review," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, 2024.
- [30] F. Bi, T. He, Y. S. Ong, and X. Luo, "Graph linear convolution pooling for learning in incomplete high-dimensional data," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 2024.
- [31] J. Yan, L. Jin, X. Luo, and S. Li, "Modified rnn for solving comprehensive sylvester equation with tdoa application," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 2023.
- [32] X. Xu, M. Lin*, X. Luo, and Z. Xu, "Hr-st-lr: A hessian regularization spatio-temporal low rank algorithm for traffic data imputation," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 11 001–11 017, 2023.
- [33] M. Lin, J. Liu, H. Chen, X. Xu, X. Luo, and Z. Xu, "A 3d convolution-incorporated dimension preserved decomposition model for traffic data prediction," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, 2024.
- [34] X. Liao, K. Hoang, and X. Luo, "Local search-based anytime algorithms for continuous distributed constraint optimization problems," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, 2024.
- [35] D. Wu and X. Luo, "Robust latent factor analysis for precise representation of high-dimensional and sparse data," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 796–805, 2021.
- [36] D. Wu, X. Luo, M. Shang *et al.*, "A data characteristic aware latent factor model for web services qos prediction," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 2525–2538, 2022.
- [37] X. Luo, L. Wang, P. Hu, and L. Hu, "Predicting protein–protein interactions using sequence and network information via variational graph auto-encoder," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform.*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 3182–3194, 2023.
- [38] D. Wu, Z. Li, F. Chen *et al.*, "Online sparse streaming feature selection with gaussian copula," *IEEE Trans. Big Data*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 92–107, 2024.
- [39] W. Li, R. Wang, and X. Luo, "A generalized nesterov-accelerated second-order latent factor model for high-dimensional and incomplete data," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [40] D. Wu, X. Luo, Y. He *et al.*, "A prediction-sampling-based multilayer-structured latent factor model for accurate representation to high-dimensional and sparse data," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 3845–3858, 2024.
- [41] J. Chen, R. Wang, D. Wu, and X. Luo, "A differential evolution-enhanced position-transitional approach to latent factor analysis," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Topics Comput. Intell.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 389–401, 2023.
- [42] T. Chen, S. Li, Y. Qiao, and X. Luo, "A robust and efficient ensemble of diversified evolutionary computing algorithms for accurate robot calibration," *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 73, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [43] N. Zeng, X. Li, P. Wu, H. Li, and X. Luo, "A novel tensor decomposition-based efficient detector for low-altitude aerial objects with knowledge distillation scheme," *IEEE/CAA J. Autom. Sinica*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 487–501, 2024.
- [44] X. Chen, X. Luo, L. Jin, S. Li, and M. Liu, "Growing echo state network with an inverse-free weight update strategy," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 753–764, 2023.

- [45] D. Wu, X. Luo, M. Shang *et al.*, “A deep latent factor model for high-dimensional and sparse matrices in recommender systems,” *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern. Syst.*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 4285–4296, 2021.
- [46] D. Wu, Y. Hu, K. Liu *et al.*, “An outlier-resilient autoencoder for representing high-dimensional and incomplete data,” *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Topics Comput.*, 2024.
- [47] Z. He, M. Lin, and X. Luo, “Structure-preserved self-attention for fusion image information in multiple color spaces,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 8778–8790, 2024.
- [48] D. Wu, W. Sun, Y. He, Z. Chen, and X. Luo, “Mkg-fenn: A multimodal knowledge graph fused end-to-end neural network for accurate drug-drug interaction prediction,” in *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 38, no. 9, 2024, pp. 10 216–10 224.
- [49] D. Wu, Y. Hu, K. Liu, J. Li, X. Wang, S. Deng, N. Zheng, and X. Luo, “An outlier-resilient autoencoder for representing high-dimensional and incomplete data,” *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Topics Comput. Intell.*, 2024.
- [50] D. Wu, P. Zhang, Y. He, and X. Luo, “Mmlf: Multi-metric latent feature analysis for high-dimensional and incomplete data,” *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 575–588, 2024.
- [51] X. Luo, Z. Li, W. Yue, and S. Li, “A calibrator fuzzy ensemble for highly-accurate robot arm calibration,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 2024.
- [52] X. Luo, H. Wu, and Z. Li, “Neulft: A novel approach to nonlinear canonical polyadic decomposition on high-dimensional incomplete tensors,” *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 6148–6166, 2023.
- [53] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, M. Shang, and Z. Wang, “A kalman-filter-incorporated latent factor analysis model for temporally dynamic sparse data,” *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 5788–5801, 2023.
- [54] W. Li, X. Luo, H. Yuan, and M. Zhou, “A momentum-accelerated hessian-vector-based latent factor analysis model,” *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 830–844, 2023.
- [55] M. D. Holmes and J. L. Baker, “Bias and fairness in ai models for critical care,” *Intensive Care Med.*, vol. 48, pp. 345–353, 2022.
- [56] E. G. Bignami, M. Berdini, M. Panizzi, and *et al.*, “Artificial intelligence in sepsis management: An overview for clinicians,” *J. Clin. Med.*, 2025.
- [57] H. Shanmugam, L. Airen, and S. Rawat, “Machine learning and deep learning models for early sepsis prediction: A scoping review,” *Indian J. Crit. Care Med.*, 2025.
- [58] M. Y. Yadgarov, G. Landoni, L. B. Berikashvili, and *et al.*, “Early detection of sepsis using machine learning algorithms: A systematic review and network meta-analysis,” *Front. Med.*, 2024.
- [59] M. Rosnati and V. Fortuin, “Mgp-attcn: An interpretable machine learning model for the prediction of sepsis,” *PLOS ONE*, 2021.
- [60] D. Zhang, Y. Pu, Y. Hu, and *et al.*, “An interpretable deep-learning model for early prediction of sepsis in the emergency department,” *Patterns*, 2021.
- [61] S. P. Shashikumar, Q. Li, G. D. Clifford, and S. Nemat, “Deepaise: An interpretable and recurrent neural survival model for early prediction of sepsis,” *Artif. Intell. Med.*, 2021, also arXiv:1908.04759.
- [62] M. Moor, B. Rieck, M. Horn, and *et al.*, “Predicting sepsis using deep learning across international sites: A retrospective development and validation study,” *eClinicalMedicine*, 2023.
- [63] H. Wang, D. Pounds, W. Zhang, and *et al.*, “Early sepsis prediction using publicly available data: High-performance ai/ml models with first-hour clinical information,” *Diagnostics*, 2025.
- [64] O. O. Komolafe, Z. Mei, D. M. Zarate, and G. W. Spangenberg, “Early prediction of sepsis: Feature-aligned transfer learning,” *arXiv:2505.02889*, 2025.
- [65] A. Zhou, B. Raheem, R. Kamaleswaran, and Y. Xie, “Sepsyn-olep: An online learning-based framework for early sepsis prediction with uncertainty quantification using conformal prediction,” *arXiv:2503.14663*, 2025.
- [66] C.-H. Chang, X. Wang, and C.-C. Yang, “Explainable ai for fair sepsis mortality predictive model,” *arXiv:2404.13139*, 2024.
- [67] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, “Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2017.
- [68] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Liò, and Y. Bengio, “Graph attention networks,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2018.
- [69] T. Y. Lin, P. Goyal, R. Girshick, K. He, and P. Dollár, “Focal loss for dense object detection,” in *Proc. ICCV*, 2017.
- [70] S. Parisot and *et al.*, “Disease prediction using graph convolutional networks: Application to autism spectrum disorder and alzheimer’s disease,” *Med. Image Anal.*, 2018.
- [71] B. Aldughayfiq, F. Ashfaq, N. Z. Jhanjhi, and M. Humayun, “Capturing semantic relationships in electronic health records using knowledge graphs: An implementation using mimic iii dataset and graphdb,” *Healthcare*, 2023.
- [72] H. Lu and S. Uddin, “A weighted patient network-based framework for outcome prediction of chronic diseases using graph neural networks,” *Sci. Rep.*, 2021.
- [73] H. N. Cho, Y.-H. Kim, and *et al.*, “Heterogeneous graph construction and hinsage learning from electronic medical records,” *Sci. Rep.*, 2022.
- [74] Z. Liu, X. Li, H. Peng, and *et al.*, “Heterogeneous similarity graph neural network on electronic health records,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Big Data*, 2020.
- [75] H. O. Boll and *et al.*, “Graph neural networks for clinical risk prediction based on electronic health records: A survey,” *J. Biomed. Inform.*, 2024.
- [76] M. M. Li, K. Huang, and M. Zitnik, “Graph representation learning in biomedicine and healthcare,” *Nat. Biomed. Eng.*, 2022.
- [77] T. H. Chan, G. Yin, K. Bae, and L. Yu, “Multi-task heterogeneous graph learning on electronic health records,” *Neural Netw.*, 2024, also arXiv:2408.07569.
- [78] J. Jung, M. Choe, K. Agarwal, and N. Dhanasekaran, “Graphehr: Heterogeneous graph neural network for electronic health records,” *preprint*, 2024.
- [79] X. He and *et al.*, “Heterogeneous graph neural network-based prediction of immune-related adverse events,” *Sci. Rep.*, 2025.
- [80] A. Tariq, L. Lancaster, P. Elugunti, and *et al.*, “Graph convolutional network-based fusion model to predict risk of hospital acquired infections,” *J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc.*, 2023.
- [81] G. Donabauer, A. Rath, A. Caplunik-Pratsch, and *et al.*, “Ai modeling for outbreak prediction: A graph-neural-network approach for identifying vancomycin-resistant enterococcus carriers,” *PLOS Digit. Health*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. e0000821, 2025.
- [82] R. Gouareb, A. Bornet, D. Proios, and *et al.*, “Detection of patients at risk of multidrug-resistant enterobacteriaceae infection using graph neural networks: A retrospective study,” *Health Data Sci.*, vol. 3, p. 0099, 2023.