



Table 1 The MI-CLAIM checklist

From: [Minimum information about clinical artificial intelligence modeling: the MI-CLAIM checklist](#)

Before paper submission			
Study design (Part 1)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
The clinical problem in which the model will be employed is clearly detailed in the paper.	✓	1	
The research question is clearly stated.	✓	1	
The characteristics of the cohorts (training and test sets) are detailed in the text.	✓	1 and 2	
The cohorts (training and test sets) are shown to be representative of real-world clinical settings.	□		
The state-of-the-art solution used as a baseline for comparison has been identified and detailed.	□		
Data and optimization (Parts 2, 3)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
The origin of the data is described and the original format is detailed in the paper.	✓	1 and 4	
Transformations of the data before it is applied to the proposed model are described.	✓	1 and 2	
The independence between training and test sets has been proven in the paper.	□		
Details on the models that were evaluated and the code developed to select the best model are provided.	✓	2	
Is the input data type structured or unstructured?	✓Structured □ Unstructured		
Model performance (Part 4)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
The primary metric selected to evaluate algorithm performance (e.g., AUC, F-score, etc.), including the justification for selection, has been clearly stated.	✓	1 and 2	
The primary metric selected to evaluate the clinical utility of the model (e.g., PPV, NNT, etc.), including the justification for selection, has been clearly stated.	□		
The performance comparison between baseline and proposed model is presented with the appropriate statistical significance.	□		
Model examination (Part 5)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
Examination technique 1 ^a	✓	2	
Examination technique 2 ^a	✓	3	
A discussion of the relevance of the examination results with respect to model/algorithm performance is presented.	✓	3	
A discussion of the feasibility and significance of model interpretability at the case level if examination methods are uninterpretable is presented.	✓	3 and 4	
A discussion of the reliability and robustness of the model as the underlying data distribution shifts is included.	✓	3	
Reproducibility (Part 6): choose appropriate tier of transparency			Notes
Tier 1: complete sharing of the code		✓	Github
Tier 2: allow a third party to evaluate the code for accuracy/fairness; share the results of this evaluation		□	
Tier 3: release of a virtual machine (binary) for running the code on new data without sharing its details		□	
Tier 4: no sharing		□	

PPV, positive predictive value; NNT, numbers needed to treat.

^aCommon examination approaches based on study type: for studies involving exclusively structured data, coefficients and sensitivity analysis are often appropriate; for studies involving unstructured data in the domains of image analysis or natural language processing, saliency maps (or equivalents) and sensitivity analyses are often appropriate.

[Back to article page >](#)

About Nature Portfolio

About us
Press releases
Press office
Contact us

Discover content

Journals A-Z
Articles by subject
protocols.io
Nature Index

Publishing policies

Nature portfolio policies
Open access

Author & Researcher services

Reprints & permissions
Research data
Language editing
Scientific editing
Nature Masterclasses
Research Solutions

Libraries & institutions

Librarian service & tools
Librarian portal
Open research
Recommend to library

Advertising & partnerships

Advertising
Partnerships & Services
Media kits
Branded content

Professional development

Nature Awards
Nature Careers
Nature Conferences

Regional websites

Nature Africa
Nature China
Nature India
Nature Japan
Nature Middle East