A Really Awesome MLHC Article

Firstname Lastname   name@email.edu *Department of Health Research*
University of Awesome
Some Fair City, State, Country

Firstname Lastname   name@email.edu *Department of Health Research*
University of Other Kinds of Awesome
Some Fair City, State, Country

Editor: Editor's name

Abstract

Summary of the article. Be sure to highlight the technical significance and clinical relevance.

1. Introduction

Tells us a bit about the problem. Recent advances in machine learning (**?**) have resulted in great things happening in healthcare. In particular, **?** describes a spiffy technique to save even more lives. In this work, we...

As you talk away, keep in mind that MLHC papers are meant to be read by computer scientists and clinicians. In the later sections, you might have to use some medical terminology that a computer scientist may not be familiar with, and you might have to use some math that a clinician might not be familiar with. That's okay, as long as you've done your best to make sure that the core ideas can be understood by an informed reader in either community. And certainly this introduction should be readable by all! In fact, every introduction should have the following two sections:

Technical Significance   Give us a few sentences about what methods you extend. You'll have a more detailed related work, but for now you should tell us what is your key technical contribution. Make sure you follow up with details in the methods section and appendices. *Lack of technical details, such that the methods can be verified, is a major reason that otherwise strong-looking papers are scored low/rejected.*

Clinical Relevance   Give us a few sentences about how your work is going to improve healthcare. MLHC is not interested in another DNN on another clinical data set; this part must convince a clinician that your work matters. *Unclear clinical contributions are a major reason that otherwise strong-looking papers are scored low/rejected.*

2. Cohort

Describe the cohort. Give us the details of any inclusion/exclusion criteria, what data were extracted, how features were processed, etc. In fact, you probably will want headings for

2.1. Cohort Selection

with choice of criteria and basic numbers, as well as any relevant information about the study design (such how cases and controls were identified, if appropriate),

2.2. Data Extraction

with what raw information you extracted or collected, including any assumptions and imputation that may have been used, and

2.3. Feature Choices

with how you might have converted the raw data into features that were used in your algorithm.

The goal is to provide enough detail so that someone could replicate the study. For more clinical application papers, each of the sections above might be several paragraphs because we really want to understand the setting.

For the submission, please do *not* include the name of the institutions for any private data sources. However, in the camera-ready, you may include identifying information about the institution as well as should include any relevant IRB approval statements.

3. Methods

Tell us your techniques! If your paper is develops a novel machine learning method or extension, then be sure to give the technical details—as you would for a machine learning publication—here and, as needed, in appendices. If your paper is developing new methods, this section might be several pages.

If you are combining existing methods, then you don't need to provide a ton of detail: feel free to just cite other packages and papers and tell us how you put them together.

4. Results

4.1. Evaluation Approach/Study Design

Before jumping into the results: what exactly are you evaluating? Tell us (or remind us) about your study design and evaluation criteria.

4.2. Results on Application A

Give us some numbers about how well your awesomeness works, especially in comparison to some baselines. You should provide a summary of the results in the text, as well as in tables (such as table 1) and figures (such as figure 1).

You may use subfigures/wrapfigures so that figures don't have to span the whole page or multiple figures are side by side.

4.3. Results on Application B

Did more than one experiment type? Sweet!

Table 1: These are our results.

Us	Top Score
Baseline	Less Impressive Score

Figure 1: Feeling awesome.

5. Discussion and Related Work

This is where you give us some technical understanding about why your awesomeness is awesome, and maybe even some times when it isn't so we know when we should be using it. Discuss both technical and clinical implications, as appropriate.

Make sure you also put your awesomeness in the context of related work. Who else has worked on this problem, and how did they approach it? What makes your direction interesting or distinct?

Appendix A.

Some more details about those methods, so we can actually reproduce them. After the blind review period, you could link to a repository for the code also.