

## 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The research question is clearly stated.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The characteristics of the cohorts (training and test sets) are detailed in the text.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The cohorts (training and test sets) are shown to be representative of real-world clinical settings.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The state-of-the-art solution used as a baseline for comparison has been identified and detailed.	<input type="checkbox"/>		

## Before paper submission

Study design (Part 1)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
<b>Data and optimization (Parts 2, 3)</b>	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
The origin of the data is described and the original format is detailed in the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Transformations of the data before it is applied to the proposed model are described.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The independence between training and test sets has been proven in the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Details on the models that were evaluated and the code developed to select the best model are provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Is the input data type structured or unstructured?	<input type="checkbox"/> Structured <input type="checkbox"/> Unstructured		
<b>Model performance (Part 4)</b>	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>		

## Before paper submission

Study design (Part 1)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The performance comparison between baseline and proposed model is presented with the appropriate statistical significance.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Model examination (Part 5)	Completed: page number		Notes if not completed
Examination technique 1 <sup>a</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Examination technique 2 <sup>a</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
A discussion of the relevance of the examination results with respect to model/algorithm performance is presented.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
A discussion of the feasibility and significance of model interpretability at the case level if examination methods are uninterpretable is presented.	<input type="checkbox"/>		
A discussion of the reliability and robustness of the model as the underlying data distribution shifts is included.	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Before paper submission		
Study design (Part 1)	Completed: page number	Notes if not completed
<b>Reproducibility (Part 6): choose appropriate tier of transparency</b>		<b>Notes</b>
Tier 1: complete sharing of the code	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tier 2: allow a third party to evaluate the code for accuracy/fairness; share the results of this evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tier 3: release of a virtual machine (binary) for running the code on new data without sharing its details	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tier 4: no sharing	<input type="checkbox"/>	

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

<sup>a</sup>Common 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 >](#)

