|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref.** | **Processing pipeline** | **PH (min)** | **N x features** | **Data partition** | **Training**  **strategy** | **Different sensors** | **Model eval.** | **Eval. metrics** | **Ind./Gen.l/Both** |
| [1]  2019 | 1) Preprocessing: outliers, inter/extrapolation (<12 hrs),  data cleaning  2) Label transforms  3) Dilated-CNN  4) Postprocessing: skip connections and several operations (RelU, etc.)  CNN-model:  5 layers  Sliding-window of 16 (kernel)  1 single output  Many-to-one structure | 30, 60 | (? X 3) | * ABC4D 10 subjects. 6 consecutive months. 50% training, 90 days (90%-10% CV) and 50% test sets * Ohio: 6 subjects during 8 weeks. 40 days for training and 10 for testing. | X | Yes | Same subjects at a different time | RMSE  MARD  Time lag | General |
| [2]  2021 | 4 different approaches. Best was Seq-to-Seq LSTM  1 model-per-subject (4 different models per subject)  1) Data imputation (linar) until missing values > 6h, discarded  2) Data standardization  3) In the training split: data expansion to have more samples | 30,60 | (N x 14) | 12 subjects during 32 days: 24 days for training and 8 for validation+10 days of out-of-sample testing (OhioT1DM) | Grid search:  N = [72,144,288,576]  Nº CNN\_layers  Neurons in hidden  Loss function: WMSE | No |  | RMSE  MAE | Ind. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Only data from real patients have be considered

Only papers with comparison with the state-of-the-art were chosen, except for the cases with remarkable results

[1] <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8779644> GluNet

[2] <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1746809421005206>