International Journal of General Medicine

Dovepress
Taylor & Francis Group

Open Access Full Text Article

LETTER

Critical Gaps in ARDS Prediction Models: A Call for Clinical Pragmatism [Letter]

Jiayan Li

Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou, 310053, People's Republic of China

Correspondence: Jiayan Li, Email 470389781@qq.com

Dear editor

The study investigating dynamic immune indicator changes as predictors of ARDS in septic ICU patients, published in the *International Journal of General Medicine*,[1] merits commendation for its ambition to advance predictive biomarkers. However, its conclusions warrant critical re-evaluation due to methodological shortcomings, biological oversimplifications, and unresolved barriers to clinical implementation.

Methodological Limitations: Overfitting and Narrow Generalizability

External validation of sepsis-related ARDS predictive models using the MIMIC-IV database consistently demonstrates AUC reduction to 0.7–0.8,[2] underscoring the biological implausibility of Lu et al's reported nomogram (AUC 0.998) in heterogeneous sepsis populations. Such extreme performance likely reflects overfitting to the single-center Chinese cohort (n=1836), given regional variations in sepsis etiology, treatment protocols, and demographic profiles. Critical omissions include external validation, calibration testing (eg, Hosmer–Lemeshow statistics), and early timepoint analysis (eg, 24-hour cytokine surges). Excluding days 1–2 immune dynamics ignores IL-6/TNF-α-driven endothelial injury, which precedes 60–70% of sepsis-related ARDS cases within 48–72 hours.[3] Temporal myopia compromises predictive relevance for time-sensitive interventions like lung-protective ventilation.

Biological Paradoxes: Immunosuppression Misinterpretation

The assertion that immune suppression (eg, reduced $CD4^+$, CD8+, T_{reg} counts) protects against ARDS contradicts established pathophysiology. ARDS patients exhibit immunosuppressive states marked by lymphopenia and hypogammaglobulinemia, reflecting compensatory anti-inflammatory response syndrome (CARS) rather than adaptive protection. Immunomodulatory therapies (eg, corticosteroids, tocilizumab) further confound associations, as these agents suppress lymphocyte counts by 30–50% independent of ARDS risk.[4] Framing immune paralysis as "protective" ignores its role in secondary infection susceptibility and unresolved alveolar inflammation.

Clinical Barriers: Timing, Feasibility, and Confounding

Practical implementation faces three obstacles: 1) delayed biomarker sampling (days 3–7) postdates critical intervention windows; 2) resource-intensive flow cytometry/immunoglobulin panels limit usability in low-resource settings; and 3) unaddressed confounders (eg, survivorship bias, hospital-acquired pneumonia) risk misclassification. The model's exclusion of ventilator-induced biases (eg, stroke volume variation inaccuracy under ≤6 mL/kg tidal volumes) further reduces applicability to modern ICUs. Without prospective validation incorporating early timepoints, cost-effectiveness analyses, and confounder adjustment, clinical utility remains unproven.

Received: 19 June 2025
Accepted: 10 July 2025
Published: 29 July 2025

Discussion

To transition from academic novelty to clinical impact, ARDS prediction frameworks must undergo fundamental redesign prioritizing three pillars: temporal urgency, biological dynamism, and contextual generalizability.

Firstly, predictive algorithms must incorporate point-of-care biomarkers (eg, CRP/PCT ratios, lactate clearance) that provide actionable data within the critical 6-hour therapeutic window for ARDS prevention. Delays inherent in batch immune profiling render current models retrospective rather than prospective tools.

Secondly, statistical approaches must evolve from static snapshots to kinetic analyses – tracking cytokine trajectories (eg, IL-6 doubling time) and lymphocyte subset slopes that better reflect the dynamic interplay between pro-inflammatory and compensatory anti-inflammatory responses.[5] This shift acknowledges that immune exhaustion in sepsis follows predictable temporal phases rather than discrete day-specific measurements.

Finally, validation strategies must encompass multicenter cohorts reflecting global sepsis heterogeneity, including viral/bacterial etiologies, varying antimicrobial stewardship practices, and resource availability gradients. Until models demonstrate portability across high-income and low-resource settings while integrating real-time data streams, they will remain laboratory curiosities rather than bedside necessities.

Until these gaps are addressed, this work remains a proof-of-concept – not a paradigm shift.

Disclosure

The author declares no conflicts of interest in this communication.

References

1. Lu X, Chen Y, Zhang G, Zeng X, Lai L, Qu C. Dynamic immune indicator changes as predictors of ARDS in ICU patients with sepsis: a retrospective study. *Int J Gen Med*. 2025;18:1163–1172. PMID: 40051893; PMCID: PMC11882469. doi:10.2147/IJGM.S501252
2. Chen Y, Zong C, Zou L, et al. A novel clinical prediction model for in-hospital mortality in sepsis patients complicated by ARDS: a MIMIC IV database and external validation study. *Heliyon*. 2024;10(13):e33337. PMID: 39027620; PMCID: PMC467048. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33337
3. Villar J, Herrán-Monge R, González-Higueras E, et al. Genetics of Sepsis (GEN-SEP) network. Clinical and biological markers for predicting ARDS and outcome in septic patients. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):22702. PMID: 34811434; PMCID: PMC8608812. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-02100-w
4. Cui Z, Wang L, Li H, Feng M. Study on immune status alterations in patients with sepsis. *Int Immunopharmacol*. 2023;118:110048. PMID: 36989895. doi:10.1016/j.intimp.2023.110048
5. Yang AC, Ma WM, Chiang DH, et al. Early prediction of sepsis using an XGBoost model with single time-point non-invasive vital signs and its correlation with C-reactive protein and procalcitonin: a multi-center study. *Intellig Med*. 2025;11:100242. doi:10.1016/j.ibmed.2025.100242

https://doi.org/10.2147/IJGM.S548340