International Journal of Biology and Life Sciences
ISSN: 2957-9511 | Vol. 13, No. 3, 2026

Research Progress on Prognostic Prediction Models for Veno-Arterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation (VA-ECMO)

Zhiyuan Huang, Chen Yi *

Department of Critical Care Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinan University, Guangzhou Guangdong, 510632, China
*** Corresponding author:** Chen Yi (Email: hh136326@163.com)

Abstract: Veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (VA-ECMO), a critical life-support technology for refractory cardiogenic shock and cardiac arrest, has seen a significant increase in utilization over the past decade. However, its high medical costs, complex operational requirements, and substantial mortality rate necessitate precise prognostic tools for clinical decision-making. This article systematically reviews the recent advancements in prognostic prediction models for VA-ECMO, focusing on the paradigm shift from traditional scoring systems to machine learning and deep learning models. Traditional prediction models, such as the SAVE score and SOFA score, are developed based on logistic regression and Cox regression. While offering strong clinical interpretability, they possess inherent limitations. Machine learning models (e.g., logistic regression, random forest, deep neural networks) demonstrate superior predictive performance by processing complex non-linear relationships. Multicenter validation studies underscore the importance of model generalizability. Lactate, age, and albumin have been identified as key predictive factors across multiple studies. Future directions should concentrate on prospective multicenter research, the development of dynamic prediction models, and the implementation of standardized reporting guidelines to facilitate the clinical translation and application of VA-ECMO prognostic prediction models.

Keywords: Veno-arterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation; Prognostic Prediction; Machine Learning; Risk Stratification; Prediction Model.

1. Introduction

Veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (VA-ECMO), a crucial life-support technology for critically ill patients, is increasingly utilized in the treatment of refractory cardiogenic shock, cardiac arrest, and post-cardiotomy shock [1-5]. However, VA-ECMO is associated with high medical costs, complex procedures, and mortality rates reaching up to 40%, underscoring the critical need for accurate prognostic tools to predict patient outcomes [4-11]. The evolution of prognostic prediction models has progressively shifted from traditional scoring systems towards more advanced machine learning and deep learning methodologies [10-11].

Traditional prognostic prediction models for VA-ECMO are primarily constructed using statistical methods, among which the SAVE (Survival After Veno-Arterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation) score is particularly notable [13, 14]. The SAVE score, specifically designed for VA-ECMO patients, integrates clinical parameters such as age, weight, and cardiac arrest, and has been validated to possess high predictive ability for in-hospital mortality in extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation (ECPR) patients, achieving an area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) of up to 0.873 [13]. For instance, one study found that SAVE scores were significantly higher in the survival group of ECPR patients compared to the non-survival group (-1.6±4.2 vs. -9.4±5.3), and the SAVE score was identified as an independent risk factor for prognosis in ECPR patients (OR=1.454) [15].

Beyond the SAVE score, other scoring systems widely applied in critically ill patients, such as the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score, Simplified Acute Physiology Score II (SAPS II), and Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) score, are also used to assess disease severity and prognosis in VA-ECMO patients [16, 17]. For example, one study aimed to evaluate the predictive ability of APACHE-II, SOFA, Cardiac Surgery Score (CASUS), and SAVE scores for outcomes in VA-ECMO patients [17]. Furthermore, the LOVE (Long-Term Outcome After VA-ECMO) score utilizes Cox regression models to analyze long-term survival data, providing a tool for assessing long-term prognosis in VA-ECMO patients [5].

Although traditional scoring systems are widely applied clinically and offer strong interpretability, their limitations are increasingly apparent [5]. Firstly, these models are often developed from single-center retrospective data with limited sample sizes, thereby restricting their generalizability [7, 16]. Secondly, traditional models typically employ linear assumptions, making it difficult to capture the complex non-linear relationships and interactions among variables relevant to VA-ECMO prognosis [4]. Thirdly, traditional models mostly rely on static data and cannot dynamically reflect changes in a patient's condition over time. This limitation is particularly significant in the context of VA-ECMO, where patient status can change rapidly, thereby restricting predictive accuracy [5]. A systematic review noted that among 58 published ECMO prediction models, 80.7% used specific analytical methods, but most models were deficient in terms of sample size, multicenter validation, and dynamic data analysis [7]. These limitations have prompted researchers to explore more advanced modeling approaches, such as machine learning and deep learning techniques [4].

2. Application of Machine Learning and Deep Learning Models

With the advancement of big data and computational

technologies, machine learning (ML) algorithms are increasingly being applied in the medical field, particularly for VA-ECMO prognosis prediction [10, 11, 12, 18, 19]. Leveraging their ability to handle complex non-linear relationships, perform automatic feature selection, and process high-dimensional data, ML models can identify the most important predictors of prognosis from a large set of clinical variables [20-29].

2.1. Advantages of Machine Learning Algorithms

Compared to traditional statistical methods, machine learning algorithms do not require strict linear assumptions and can more effectively capture complex interactions among variables [4, 11, 12]. For example, algorithms such as Random Forest (RF) [2, 5] and Deep Neural Networks (DNN) [2, 8] can automatically handle non-linear relationships and interaction effects between variables, thereby improving predictive accuracy [4]. Additionally, some machine learning algorithms, like LightGBM and CatBoost, can effectively handle missing data and class imbalance issues, further enhancing model robustness [2, 4].

2.2. Major Machine Learning Models and Performance Comparison

Recent studies have compared the performance of different machine learning algorithms in predicting VA-ECMO prognosis. A multicenter retrospective study including 280 VA-ECMO patients developed and validated six machine learning models: Logistic Regression (LR), Random Forest (RF), Deep Neural Networks (DNN), Support Vector Machine (SVM), LightGBM, and CatBoost [4]. Using Lasso regression, the study identified nine key predictors: age, body mass index (BMI), bicarbonate (HCO_3^-), lactate (Lac), mean arterial pressure (MAP), albumin (Alb), prothrombin time (PT), Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), and Simplified Acute Physiology Score II (SAPS II). In internal validation, the logistic regression model performed best, with an AUC of 0.86 (95% CI: 0.77-0.93), accuracy of 0.76, sensitivity of 0.73, specificity of 0.79, and F1-score of 0.73, outperforming more complex models (RF: AUC=0.79; DNN: AUC=0.78; SVM: AUC=0.76). External validation results also confirmed the good generalizability of the logistic regression model, achieving an AUC of 0.75 (95% CI: 0.56-0.92) [4]. This suggests that in specific clinical scenarios, relatively simple models may also possess good utility.

Another study compared three algorithms—Random Forest, Back-Propagation Neural Network (BPNN), and Decision Tree—and found that the Random Forest model exhibited excellent predictive performance on the test set, with an accuracy of 98.7%, sensitivity of 100%, and specificity of 92.9% [11]. Stephens et al., utilizing data from 18,167 patients in the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization (ELSO) registry, developed the ECMO PAL scoring system. Based on deep neural network training, this system demonstrated superior performance in predicting in-hospital mortality compared to existing ECMO survival scoring systems [10].

2.3. Deep Learning and Interpretability

Deep learning models, such as Deep Neural Networks (DNNs), show significant potential in VA-ECMO prognosis prediction [4, 10]. DNNs can automatically learn high-level features from data through multiple neural network layers and handle complex relationships among numerous variables. However, deep learning models are often considered "black boxes" due to their opaque decision-making processes, which limits their widespread adoption in clinical practice. To enhance model interpretability, researchers have introduced SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) analysis [29]. SHAP values quantify the contribution of each feature to individual predictions, providing both global and local explanations. In the aforementioned multicenter study, SHAP analysis identified lactate, age, and albumin as key predictors of mortality risk in VA-ECMO patients. Specifically, lactate and age were positively correlated with mortality risk, while albumin was negatively correlated [4]. This finding not only increases model transparency but also suggests potential targets for clinical intervention.

3. Multicenter Studies and Model Validation

The generalizability of a prognostic prediction model is crucial for assessing its clinical utility. Early models were often based on single-center data, suffering from issues like small sample sizes and selection bias, which limited their applicability in other institutions [7, 16]. In recent years, the increase in multicenter collaborative research has enabled the development of prediction models based on data from multiple centers, better reflecting variations in clinical practice across different institutions and thus possessing enhanced generalizability [4, 8].

3.1. Importance of Multicenter Data

A multicenter study including 280 VA-ECMO patients combined data from the Second Affiliated Hospital of Guangxi Medical University and the MIMIC-IV database as the training and internal validation sets, using data from the First People's Hospital of Yulin as an external validation set. This design effectively evaluates model performance across different populations, enhancing generalizability. The results showed that the logistic regression model maintained good performance in both internal and external validation, with AUCs of 0.86 and 0.75, respectively, indicating robust predictive ability [4].

3.2. Model Validation Methods and Metrics

Model validation primarily includes internal validation (e.g., cross-validation, bootstrap resampling) and external validation (using data from different time periods or different institutions) [4, 7]. An ideal validation strategy should include both internal and external validation to comprehensively assess the model's calibration (agreement between predicted probabilities and observed outcomes) and discrimination (ability to distinguish between patients with different outcomes). For calibration assessment, calibration plots and the Brier score are commonly used to measure the agreement between predicted probabilities and actual outcomes. Multicenter studies showed that the logistic regression model had the lowest Brier score (0.1496), indicating the most reliable predicted probabilities [4]. For clinical utility assessment, decision curve analysis (DCA) evaluates the net benefit of the model at different threshold probabilities, informing clinical decision-making. Research indicated that the logistic regression model provided the highest net benefit across most threshold probabilities [4].

4. Predictors and Feature Engineering

The accuracy of VA-ECMO prognostic prediction models heavily depends on the selection of predictors and the strategies used for feature engineering.

4.1. Identification of Key Predictors

Multiple studies have identified a range of key predictors using traditional statistical and machine learning methods [30-37]. Lactate level, as a marker of inadequate tissue perfusion, has been consistently identified as one of the most important predictors across studies [36, 37]. High lactate levels (>9 mmol/L) are significantly associated with mortality and are also valuable for prognostic assessment [34, 37]. For instance, a study on VA-ECMO treatment in cardiogenic shock patients found a strong correlation between lactate levels and patient prognosis [34, 36].

Age is another important predictor [35, 38, 41]. Multiple studies indicate a positive correlation between age and mortality risk, with elderly patients (>60 years) having significantly higher mortality rates compared to younger patients [9, 33]. For example, data from the VERGE (VA ECMO Registry of Germany) registry showed that the median age of VA-ECMO patients in 2022 was 60 years, with an in-hospital survival rate of 42% [38]. Furthermore, albumin level, a marker of nutritional status and inflammatory response, is negatively correlated with mortality risk [4]. Other important predictors include prothrombin time (PT), Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), and Simplified Acute Physiology Score II (SAPS II) [4]. A retrospective study also found that hypoalbuminemia at 24 hours post-VA-ECMO initiation, high procalcitonin (PCT) at 24 hours, low hemoglobin at 72 hours, high lactate at 72 hours, prolonged ECMO support duration, concomitant continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) during treatment, and failure to successfully wean from ECMO were all independent risk factors influencing patient prognosis [15].

4.2. Feature Engineering Strategies

Feature engineering is a critical step in developing machine learning models, encompassing feature selection, missing data handling, and data transformation [22, 25]. In VA-ECMO prognosis prediction, common methods include Lasso regression and recursive feature elimination. Lasso regression, through its regularization penalty mechanism, can automatically select the most important variables for prediction while mitigating multicollinearity issues. For handling missing data, common approaches include deleting variables with a high proportion of missing values (e.g., >30%) and applying multiple imputation techniques for the remaining missing values [4]. Additionally, to address class imbalance issues, techniques like Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE) can be employed to improve the model's ability to identify the minority class [24].

5. Challenges and Future Directions

Although significant progress has been made in research on VA-ECMO prognostic prediction models, several challenges remain [39]. First, data quality and standardization are prominent issues; data collection standards and quality vary across institutions, affecting the reliability of model training and validation [4]. Second, most models are developed using retrospective data, introducing potential selection and information biases, necessitating validation through large-scale, multicenter prospective studies [47]. Third, while complex machine learning models may offer high predictive accuracy, the "black box" nature of their decision-making processes limits clinician trust and acceptance; therefore, enhancing model interpretability is crucial [18, 19]. Fourth, existing research primarily focuses on in-hospital mortality, with a lack of prediction models for patients' post-discharge quality of life and long-term outcomes [40].

Future research on VA-ECMO prognostic prediction models should focus on the following directions:

Multicenter Prospective Studies:** Conducting large-scale, multicenter prospective cohort studies to improve data quality and model generalizability [48]. International collaborative platforms like the ELSO (Extracorporeal Life Support Organization) registry will play a key role in this process [10, 19, 41].

Dynamic Prediction Models:** The condition of VA-ECMO patients can change rapidly, making static models insufficient for clinical needs [42]. Developing prediction models capable of integrating time-series data and dynamic changes, allowing for updated predictions based on real-time data, would enhance clinical utility [18, 19, 42].

Integration of Machine and Deep Learning Techniques:** Exploring more advanced machine learning algorithms, such as transfer learning and reinforcement learning, to improve model performance in data-limited environments [10, 11, 12]. Simultaneously, strengthening research on explainable artificial intelligence to increase the transparency of complex models and promote clinical acceptance [18, 19].

Long-term Prognosis and Patient-Reported Outcomes:** Focusing on patients' long-term survival quality and functional outcomes, and developing prediction models that incorporate patient-reported outcomes to provide tools for comprehensively evaluating the effectiveness of VA-ECMO therapy [40].

Standardization and Clinical Implementation:** Establishing standardized reporting guidelines for the development of VA-ECMO prediction models to facilitate model comparison and clinical translation [39]. Concurrently, developing user-friendly clinical decision support systems to seamlessly integrate prediction models into clinical workflows.

6. Conclusion

The research on prognostic prediction models for VA-ECMO has undergone a significant evolution from traditional scoring systems to machine learning models. Traditional models like the SAVE score, while clinically interpretable, have limitations. In contrast, machine learning models (e.g., logistic regression, random forest, deep neural networks) demonstrate superior predictive performance by handling complex non-linear relationships. Multicenter validation studies have confirmed the importance of model generalizability, with lactate, age, and albumin consistently identified as key predictors across different models. Future development of VA-ECMO prognostic prediction models should concentrate on prospective multicenter research, the development of dynamic prediction models, the integration of machine and deep learning techniques, a focus on long-term outcomes, and the implementation of standardized reporting guidelines. Through continuous technological innovation and multidisciplinary collaboration, VA-ECMO prognostic prediction models hold the potential to provide more precise support for clinical decision-making, ultimately improving

patient outcomes.

References

[1] Yehya, N., Fazelinia, H., Lawrence, G. G., Spruce, L. A., Mai, M. V., Worthen, G. S., & Christie, J. D. (2021). Plasma Nucleosomes Are Associated With Mortality in Pediatric Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. Critical Care Medicine, 49(7), 1149–1158.

[2] Bartlett, R. H., Carlet, J., Cook, D., Gattinoni, L., Harvey, M., Jacobi, J., Parker, M. M., Sprung, C. L., Suter, P., Thompson, A., & Vincent, J.-L. (2023). The Impact of the Society of Critical Care Medicine's Flagship Journal: Critical Care Medicine: Reflections of Critical Care Pioneers. *Critical Care Medicine*, *51*(2), 164–181.

[3] Rabinowitz, E. J., Ouyang, A., Armstrong, D. R., Wallendorf, M., & Said, A. S. (2022). Poor Reliability of Common Measures of Anticoagulation in Pediatric Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation. *ASAIO Journal*, *68*(6), 850–858.

[4] Wang, S., Tao, S., Zhu, Y., Gu, Q., Ni, P., Zhang, W., Wu, C., Zhao, R., Hu, W., & Diao, M. (2025). AI-powered model for predicting mortality risk in VA-ECMO patients: a multicenter cohort study. *Scientific Reports*, *15*(1).

[5] Gao, H., & Lu, J. (2022). [Research progress on prognostic prediction models for patients undergoing extracorporeal membrane oxygenation]. [Original Chinese reference - Note: Needs verification]

[6] Huang, W., Guo, W., & Wang, L. (2022). [Research Progress of Survival Predictive Score in Veno-Arterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation]. [Original Chinese reference - Note: Needs verification]

[7] Pladet, L. C. A., Barten, J. M. M., Vernooij, L. M., Kraemer, C. V. E., Bunge, J. J. H., Scholten, E., Montenij, L. J., Kuijpers, M., Donker, D. W., Cremer, O. L., & Meuwese, C. L. (2023). Prognostic models for mortality risk in patients requiring ECMO. *Intensive Care Medicine*, *49*(2), 131–141.

[8] Qian, S., Li, P., Hou, X., & Dong, N. (2025). Development and internal validation of the PROFIT and POSITIVE prognostic nomograms for patients undergoing VA-ECMO therapy. Scientific Reports, 15(1).

[9] Hashem, A., Mohamed, M. S., Alabdullah, K., Elkhapery, A., Khalouf, A., Saadi, S., Nayfeh, T., Rai, D., Alali, O., Kinzelman-Vesely, E. A., Parikh, V., & Feitell, S. C. (2023). Predictors of Mortality in Patients With Refractory Cardiac Arrest Supported With VA-ECMO: A Systematic Review and a Meta-Analysis. Current Problems in Cardiology, 48(6), 101658.

[10] Stephens, A. F., Šeman, M., Diehl, A., Pilcher, D., Barbaro, R. P., Brodie, D., Pellegrino, V., Kaye, D. M., Gregory, S. D., & Hodgson, C. (2023). ECMO PAL: using deep neural networks for survival prediction in venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Intensive Care Medicine, 49(9), 1090–1099.

[11] Braun, J., Sahli, S. D., Spahn, D. R., Röder, D., Neb, H., Lotz, G., Aser, R., Wilhelm, M. J., & Kaserer, A. (2023). Predicting Survival for Veno-Arterial ECMO Using Conditional Inference Trees—A Multicenter Study. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 12(19), 6243.

[12] Kresoja, K. P., Zweymer, U., Akin, I., Rassaf, T., Mahabadi, A. A., Lehmann, R., Eitel, I., Graf, T., Schuster, A., Skurk, C., Lurz, P., Schneider, S., Desch, S., Freund, A., & Thiele, H. (2024). Identifying prognostic factors in patients with cardiogenic shock undergoing VA-ECMO treatment: insights from ECLS-SHOCK using machine learning. European Heart Journal, 45(Supplement_1).

[13] Amin, F., Lombardi, J., Alhussein, M., Posada, J. D., Suszko, A., Koo, M., Fan, E., Ross, H., Rao, V., Alba, A. C., & Billia, F. (2021). Predicting Survival After VA-ECMO for Refractory Cardiogenic Shock: Validating the SAVE Score. CJC Open, 3(1), 71–81.

[14] Kosmopoulos, M., Bartos, J. A., & Yannopoulos, D. (2019). Abstract 210: Effects of Indication for Veno-Arterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation on Predictive Value of Save Score. Circulation, 140(Suppl_2).

[15] Ayyad, A., Fadel, R., Kollman, P., Parson, A., Almajed, M. R., Shadid, A. M., Jabri, A., Basir, M. B., & Alqarqaz, M. (2025). Surviving venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (VA-ECMO): The roles of severity scores and post-operative lactate clearance. Cardiovascular Revascularization Medicine, 76, 73–76.

[16] Fisser, C., Rincon-Gutierrez, L. A., Enger, T. B., Taccone, F. S., Broman, L. M., Belliato, M., Nobile, L., Pappalardo, F., & Malfertheiner, M. V. (2021). Validation of Prognostic Scores in Extracorporeal Life Support: A Multi-Centric Retrospective Study. Membranes, 11(2), 84.

[17] Sudarsanan, S., Sivadasan, P., Chandra, P., Omar, A. S., Atuel, K. L. G., Lone, H. U., Ragab, H. O., Ehsan, I., Carr, C. S., Pattath, A. R., Alkhulaifi, A. M., Shouman, Y., & Almulla, A. (2024). Comparison of Four Intensive Care Scores in Predicting Outcomes After Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation: A Single-center Retrospective Study. In Journal of Cardiothoracic and Vascular Anesthesia, 2024.

[18] Shou, B. L., Leng, A., Bachina, P., Kalra, A., Zhou, A. L., Whitman, G., & Cho, S.-M. (2025). A Novel, Interpretable Machine Learning Model to Predict Neurological Outcomes Following Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation. Neurocritical Care, 43(2), 403–413.

[19] Kalra, A., Bachina, P., Shou, B. L., Hwang, J., Barshay, M., Kulkarni, S., Sears, I., Eickhoff, C., Bermudez, C. A., Brodie, D., Ventetuolo, C. E., Kim, B. S., Whitman, G. J. R., Abbasi, A., & Cho, S.-M. (2024). Predicting Acute Brain Injury in Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation Patients with Tree-Based Machine Learning: Analysis of the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization Registry.

[20] Lee, Y. C., Cha, J., Shim, I., Park, W.-Y., Kang, S. W., Lim, D. H., & Won, H.-H. (2023). Multimodal deep learning of fundus abnormalities and traditional risk factors for cardiovascular risk prediction. Npj Digital Medicine, 6(1).

[21] Kim, J. S., Kwon, D., Kim, K., Lee, S. H., Lee, S.-B., Kim, K., Kim, D., Lee, M. W., Park, N., Choi, J. H., Jang, E. S., Cho, I. R., Paik, W. H., Lee, J. K., Ryu, J. K., & Kim, Y.-T. (2024). Machine learning-based prediction of pulmonary embolism to reduce unnecessary computed tomography scans in gastrointestinal cancer patients: a retrospective multicenter study. Scientific Reports, 14(1).

[22] Teng, X., Han, K., Jin, W., Ma, L., Wei, L., Min, D., Chen, L., & Du, Y. (2024). Development and validation of an early diagnosis model for bone metastasis in non-small cell lung cancer based on serological characteristics of the bone metastasis mechanism. eClinicalMedicine, 72, 102617.

[23] Antony, B., Blau, H., Casiraghi, E., Loomba, J. J., Callahan, T. J., Laraway, B. J., Wilkins, K. J., Antonescu, C. C., Valentini, G., Williams, A. E., Robinson, P. N., Reese, J. T., Murali, T. M., & Chute, C. (2023). Predictive models of long COVID. eBioMedicine, 96, 104777.

[24] Gurcan, F., & Soylu, A. (2024). Learning from Imbalanced Data: Integration of Advanced Resampling Techniques and Machine Learning Models for Enhanced Cancer Diagnosis and Prognosis. Cancers, 16(19), 3417.

[25] Xiong, P., Chen, J., Zhang, Y., Shu, L., Shen, Y., Gu, Y., Liu, Y., Guan, D., Zheng, B., & Yang, Y. (2024). Predictive modeling for eosinophilic chronic rhinosinusitis: Nomogram and four machine learning approaches. iScience, 27(2), 108928.

[26] Wang, M., Feng, Z., Zhou, L., Zhang, L., Hao, X., & Zhai, J. (2021). Computed-Tomography-Based Radiomics Model for Predicting the Malignant Potential of Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors Preoperatively: A Multi-Classifier and Multicenter Study. Frontiers in Oncology, 11.

[27] Hyndman, M. E., Paproski, R. J., Kinnaird, A., Fairey, A., Marks, L., Pavlovich, C. P., Fletcher, S. A., Zachoval, R., Adamcova, V., Stejskal, J., Aprikian, A., Wallis, C. J. D., Pink, D., Vasquez, C., Beatty, P. H., & Lewis, J. D. (2024). Development of an effective predictive screening tool for prostate cancer using the ClarityDX machine learning platform. Npj Digital Medicine, 7(1).

[28] Yan, P., Duan, S.-B., Luo, X.-Q., Zhang, N.-Y., & Deng, Y.-H. (2022). Development and validation of a deep neural network–based model to predict acute kidney injury following intravenous administration of iodinated contrast media in hospitalized patients with chronic kidney disease: a multicohort analysis. Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation, 38(2), 352–361.

[29] Hsu, W., Ko, A., Weng, C., Chang, C., Jan, Y., Lin, J., Chien, H., Lin, W., Sun, F., Wu, K., & Lee, J. (2023). Explainable machine learning model for predicting skeletal muscle loss during surgery and adjuvant chemotherapy in ovarian cancer. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle, 14(5), 2044–2053.

[30] Zhu, J., Guo, D., Liu, L., & Zhong, J. (2023). Serum Galectin-3 Predicts Mortality in Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation Patients. Cardiology Research and Practice, 2023, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/3917156.

[31] Goncalves Teixeira, P. M., Passos Silva, M., Mbala, D., Ana Canelas, M., Varela, M., Raquel Barbosa, A., Guerreiro, C., Mosalina, A., Dias, T., Queiros, P., Fontes-Carvalho, R., Ponte, M., Dias, A., Caeiro, D., & Braga, P. (2019). P5739Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation in Cardiogenic Shock: exploring prognostic variables and risk prediction tools. European Heart Journal, 40(Supplement_1).

[32] Cheewatanakornkul, S., Duangpakdee, P., Khwannimit, B., Bhurayanontachai, R., Geater, S. L., & Geater, A. F. (2023). Validation of the prognostic scoring system for in-hospital mortality prediction in cardiogenic shock patients requiring veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Asian Cardiovascular and Thoracic Annals, 31(4), 321–331.

[33] Laimoud, M., Alanazi, M., Maghirang, M., Machado, P., Hakami, E., Lo, G., & Al-Halees, Z. (2025). Predictors of mortality in patients with cardiogenic shock and veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation.

[34] Dettling, A., Kellner, C., Sundermeyer, J., Beer, B. N., Besch, L., Bertoldi, L. F., Blankenberg, S., Dauw, J., Eckner, D., Eitel, I., Graf, T., Horn, P., Jozwiak-Nozdrzykowska, J., Kirchhof, P., Kluge, S., Krais, J., von Lewinski, D., Linke, A., Luedike, P., ... Mangner, N. (2025). Incidence and predictors of weaning failure from veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation therapy in patients with cardiogenic shock. European Journal of Heart Failure, 27(5), 832–841.

[35] Jin, Y., Gao, P., Zhang, P., Bai, L., Li, Y., Wang, W., Feng, Z., Wang, X., & Liu, J. (2022). Mortality prediction in pediatric postcardiotomy veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation: A comparison of scoring systems. Frontiers in Medicine, 9.

[36] Presume, J., Gomes, D. A., Albuquerque, F., Lopes, P., Bello, A. R., Brizido, C., Strong, C., Ferreira, J., Mendes, M., Neves, J. P., & Tralhao, A. (2023). Validation of SAVE score and the value of serum lactate in patients admitted for cardiogenic shock treated with VA-ECMO. European Heart Journal, 44(Supplement 2).

[37] Laimoud, M., Machado, P., Lo, M. G., Maghirang, M. J., Hakami, E., & Qureshi, R. (2024). The Absolute Lactate Levels Versus Clearance for Prognostication of Post-Cardiotomy Patients on Veno-Arterial ECMO. ESC Heart Failure, 11(6), 3511–3522.

[38] Wengenmayer, T., Staudacher, D. L., Philipp, A., Tigges, E., Dettling, A., Busse, H., Kriege, M., Padberg, J.-S., Voigt, I., Scherer, C., Graf, T., Scharpf, D., Noack, P., Britsch, S., Michels, G., Lunz, D., Müller, T., Springer, A., ... Lindner, S. (2025). Clinical use and predictors of outcome in venoarterial extracorporeal membrane (VA ECMO): insights from VERGE (VA ECMO Registry of Germany). Clinical Research in Cardiology, 114(10), 1377–1387.

[39] Shah, N., & Said, A. S. (2021). Extracorporeal Support Prognostication—Time to Move the Goal Posts? Membranes, 11(7), 537.

[40] Berger, R., Nemeth, A., Sandoval Boburg, R., Vöhringer, L., Lausberg, H. F., Acharya, M., Schlensak, C., & Popov, A.-F. (2022). Long-Term Follow-Up of Survivors of Extracorporeal Life Support Therapy for Cardiogenic Shock: Are They Really Survivors? Medicina, 58(3), 427.

[41] Acharya, D., Manandhar-Shrestha, N., Leacche, M., Rajapreyar, I., William, P., Kazui, T., Hooker, R., Tonna, J., Jovinge, S., & Loyaga-Rendon, R. (2023). Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation as a bridge to advanced heart failure therapies. The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation, 42(8), 1059–1071.

[42] Lakatos, B. K., Ladányi, Z., Fábián, A., Ehrenberger, R., Turschl, T., Bagyura, Z., Evrard, B., Vandroux, D., Goudelin, M., Lindner, S., Britsch, S., Dürschmied, D., Zima, E., Csikós, G. R., Túróczi, Z., Soltész, Á., Németh, E., Kovács, A., Édes, F. I., & Merkely, B. (2024). Non-invasive assessment of left ventricular contractility by myocardial work index in veno-arterial membrane oxygenation patients: rationale and design of the MIX-ECMO multicentre observational study. Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine, 11.