arXiv:1904.01125v1 [stat.ML] 1 Apr 2019

The Impact of Extraneous Variables on the Performance of Recurrent Neural Network Models in Clinical Tasks

Eugene Laksana, BS, Melissa Aczon, PhD, Long Ho, BS,
Cameron Carlin, MS, David Ledbetter, BS, Randall Wetzel, MBBS
The Laura P. and Leland K. Whittier Virtual Pediatric Intensive Care Unit
Children's Hospital Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, United States

Abstract

Electronic Medical Records (EMR) are a rich source of patient information, including measurements reflecting physiologic signs and administered therapies. Identifying which variables are useful in predicting clinical outcomes can be challenging. Advanced algorithms, such as deep neural networks, were designed to process high-dimensional inputs containing variables in their measured form, thus bypass separate feature selection or engineering steps. We investigated the effect of extraneous input variables on the predictive performance of Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) by including in the input vector extraneous variables randomly drawn from theoretical and empirical distributions. RNN models using different input vectors (EMR variables only; EMR and extraneous variables; extraneous variables only) were trained to predict three clinical outcomes: in-ICU mortality, 72-hour ICU re-admission, and 30-day ICU-free days. The measured degradations of the RNN's predictive performance with the addition of extraneous variables to EMR variables were negligible.

Introduction

Electronic Medical Records (EMR) are increasingly adopted by hospitals[1], resulting in a potential wealth of data for clinical and machine learning research. A patient's EMR contains comprehensive records of their vital signs, laboratory test results, medications and interventions. Many of these variables may be unrelated to a particular outcome of interest, and in this sense, may be considered *extraneous features* or *noise* for the purposes of modeling that outcome.

Deep learning (DL) algorithms such as Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) were designed to extract salient information from high-dimensional data: the hidden units of each layer are features derived from the input variables to that layer during model training[2], and this process may be thought of as feature engineering, but automated within the neural network. Combined with regularization techniques such as LASSO regularization, dropout, and recurrent dropout, DL-based models can be robust even when using very high-dimensional input vectors[3–5]. With their feedback loop architecture, RNNs integrate newly acquired data with information retained from previous times to make their decisions. These characteristics make them attractive and suitable for processing evolving streams of clinical data, as evidenced by their increasing use in medical applications[6–10].

Despite the growing popularity of RNNs with clinical data, there is a paucity of literature about the effect of potentially irrelevant data on RNN performance. We sought to assess this effect by adding extraneous data to RNN model inputs and evaluating the resulting performance.

Related Works

Several studies have examined the effect of removing variables and measuring the subsequent effect on model performance. Working on the premise that removing irrelevant or redundant data increases learning accuracy, Khalid, et. al. surveyed several automated feature selection and extraction methods for dimensionality reduction[11].

Motivated by lowering patient discomfort and financial costs, AlNuaimi, et. al investigated the effect of reducing the number of lab tests on model performance[12]. Starting with 35 lab variables as the original inputs for modeling patient deterioration, they repeatedly lowered the number of input variables and employed feature selection algorithms to identify the optimal set of variables. They reported that the Naive Bayes algorithm displayed discrimination improvements when a smaller subset of input features was used. In contrast, the discrimination of the Random Forest, J48 Decision Tree, and Sequential Minimal Optimization models were not improved by the reduction of input data. The study showed that different algorithms respond differently to feature set reduction, and that, excepting Naive Bayes, this reduction neither degraded nor improved their performance.

We previously reported performance comparisons of logistic regression, multilayer perceptron and RNN models for in-ICU mortality using different subsets of EMR variables: physiologic measurements (vital signs and lab tests) only, therapies only, and all combined[13]. Correlations exist amongst all the variables, and therefore redundancy likely exists when all variables are used. Regardless of algorithm, performance minimally decreased (less than 1% decrease in AUC) when model input was reduced from all variables to physiologic variables only. Across the three algorithms, performance decreased significantly when model input was limited to therapy variables only. These results indicated that the physiologic variables contained most of the relevant information for mortality risk and that the therapy variables contained redundant information, but algorithm performance did not degrade when therapy variables were included in the model.

Material and Methods

Clinical Data Sources

Data were extracted from de-identified observational clinical data collected in Electronic Medical Records (EMR, Cerner) in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU) of Children's Hospital Los Angeles (CHLA) between January 2009 and October 2017. A patient record included static information such as demographics, diagnoses, and discharge disposition at the end of an ICU episode. An *episode* is defined as a contiguous admission in the PICU; a patient may have multiple episodes. Each episode also contained irregularly, sparsely and asynchronously *charted* measurements of physiologic observations (e.g. heart rate, blood pressure), laboratory results (e.g. creatine, glucose level), drugs (e.g. epinephrine, furosemide) and interventions (e.g. intubation, oxygen level). Episodes without discharge disposition were excluded, leaving 7,356 patients with 9,854 episodes.

Prior to any of the computational experiments, the episodes were randomly partitioned into datasets for model training (60%), validation for hyper-parameter tuning (20%), and performance evaluation (20%). To prevent biasing performance evaluation metrics, partitioning was done such that all episodes from a single patient belonged to only one of these sets.

Target Variables

We were interested in predicting three clinical outcomes:

1. **Mortality**: This binary task predicts in-ICU survival or death. The top portion of Table 1 summarizes the number of episodes and mortality rates in the three datasets (training, validation and testing).

2. **72-hour ICU Re-admission**: This binary task predicts whether or not a patient was re-admitted to the ICU within 72 hours after physical discharge. Episodes where patients died, were transferred to other ICUs, or were moved to a different hospital were excluded from this experiment. The middle portion of Table 1 describes this outcome in the three datasets after the exclusion criteria were applied.

3. **30-day ICU-free Days**: This regression task predicts the number of days that a patient was not in the ICU in the 30-day window following a particular time of interest. A patient who died within that window was assigned 0 ICU-free days. Episodes where patients were transferred to the operating room, another ICU, or another hospital were excluded from this experiment. The bottom portion of Table 1 describes this outcome in the three datasets after the exclusion criteria were applied. Note that the number of ICU-free days was computed at different time points after ICU admission.

Input Variables

To leverage existing deep learning frameworks, each patient episode's data were first converted to a matrix format illustrated in Figure 1. Details of this conversion process, which includes z-normalization and forward-fill imputation, are described in previous work[7,13]. A list of all 392 variables in this baseline matrix (whose rows we refer to as *EMR variables* in the remainder of this paper) can be found in the Appendix. To simulate extraneous, i.e. irrelevant, features as model inputs, rows containing *artificial* data were generated by randomly drawing values from two categories of distributions.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of datasets used for each clinical outcome.

	Train	Valid	Test
Mortality			
# Episodes	5913	1979	1962
Mortality rate	4.19%	3.39%	4.33%
72-hour ICU Re-admission			
# Episodes	5556	1883	1839
Re-admission rate	2.21%	1.81%	2.28%
Median length of stay (hours)	51.9	56.6	53.2
30-day ICU-Free Days			
# Episodes	5828	1953	1934
Mean ICU-Free days			
@ 3rd hour	24.91	25.10	24.71
@ 6th hour	25.02	25.20	24.83
@ 9th hour	24.13	25.28	24.90
@ 12th hour	25.20	25.33	24.94
@ 24th hour	25.03	25.12	24.65

1. **Theoretical**: normal, log-normal, multivariate-normal, exponential, and power function distributions.
2. **Empirical**: population-level distributions of each of the 392 variables in the original patient matrix. Feature generation from these distributions is formulized in Algorithm 1.

At each time point in a patient episode matrix, three draws of artificial data were generated from each distribution. This process generated 1191 rows of *extraneous* features ((5 theoretical x 3) + (392 empirical x 3)) for each patient episode. Three different types of inputs were then used to train models: EMR variables only, EMR and extraneous variables, and extraneous variables only. In the second type, the 1191 rows of extraneous variables were appended to the original patient episode matrix, i.e. they comprised 75% of the input data.

Algorithm 1: Generating extraneous features

F = set of theoretical and empirical feature distributions
E = set of all episodes, with each episode being a matrix as described in Figure 1
for $f \in F$ **do**
  for $e \in E$ **do**
    $\|e\|$ = number of recordings in episode e
    for $i \in range(0, 3)$ **do**
      X = random draw of $\|e\|$ samples from f
      mask random values in X to emulate missing data frequency in f
      add X to e's feature set
    end
  end
end

Model Development and Assessment

RNN models with Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) architecture[14] were implemented and trained using the Keras Deep Learning library[15]. The models were trained to make predictions at each time point where a measurement was available. Model weights were derived from the training set, while hyper-parameters (Table 2) were optimized using the validation set. For each clinical outcome, three iterations of RNN model training were performed to better evaluate




Figure 1: Matrix representation for a single patient episode. A row of data corresponds to measured and imputed values of a single feature, while a column contains values of all features at a single point of time. Static information such as gender is repeated at each time point. Adapted with permission[7].

Table 2: Hyper-parameters of RNN models for the three clinical outcomes.

	Mortality	72-hour Readmission	ICU-Free Days
Number of LSTM Layers	3	2	2
Hidden Units in LSTM Layers	128, 256, 256	420, 375	512, 375
Batch Size	128	100	100
Learning Rate	1e-5	1e-4	1e-4
Loss	binary cross entropy	binary cross entropy	mean squared error
Optimizer	rmsprop	rmsprop	rmsprop
Dropout	0.2	0.2	0.2
Recurrent Dropout	0.2	0.2	0.2
Regularizer	1e-4	1e-4	1e-6
Output Activation	sigmoid	sigmoid	linear

performance, where each iteration was defined by a different random seed for model weight initialization.

To facilitate analysis, non-RNN models were also developed. The number of recorded measurements between ICU admission and a particular time of interest was used as an in-ICU mortality risk predictor at that specific time. For the 30-day ICU-free days task, the mean target value derived from the training set (see bottom portion of 'train' column in Table 1) was used as a baseline model.

The mortality models were assessed using area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) score at 3, 6, 9, 12, and 24 hours following ICU admission. For the 72-hour readmission task, the models were evaluated via AUC at the time of discharge from the ICU. The ICU-free days models were assessed by computing the mean absolute error (MAE) of their predictions at 3, 6, 9, 12, and 24 hours following ICU admission.

Results

All performance metrics reported here were computed on the test set. Table 3 displays the mean and standard deviation of model performance from the three training iterations for each outcome. Figure 2 illustrates mortality and ICU-free days model performances as a function of prediction hour.




Figure 2: Mortality model AUCs (left) and 30-day ICU-free days models' MAEs (right) with standard deviation lines plotted vs prediction time.

In-ICU Mortality Task. The RNN model using only the extraneous variables had the lowest discrimination, with AUCs ranging from 0.46 to 0.66 and peaking between the 6th and 9th hours. The simple model using only the number of measurements between ICU admission and prediction time achieved AUCs ranging from 0.66 to 0.81. The RNN model using only EMR variables had AUCs ranging from 0.870 (at the 3rd hour) to 0.935 (at the 24th hour). Adding extraneous variables to the EMR variables decreased the RNN's AUCs anywhere from 0.005 to 0.008, representing 0.57% to 0.89% degradation in performance. For all input types except for extraneous variables only, longer observation time resulted in higher AUCs.

72-Hour ICU Re-admission. The model using only the extraneous features attained an AUC of 0.489, while the model using only EMR variables had an AUC of 0.644. This AUC did not change when extraneous variables were added to the EMR variables.

30-Day ICU-Free Days. The MAE of the baseline reference value was about 5 days across all prediction times, corresponding to about 20% of the mean target value. The RNN model using only extraneous features reduced this baseline MAE by more than half a day, except at the 24th hour, where the difference was insignificant. The RNN model using only EMR features had MAE ranging from 3.3 to 3.7 days. Adding extraneous variables to the EMR features increased the MAE by small fractions of a day (0.056 to 0.133, representing 1.6% to 4% performance degradation); these two RNN models saw their MAE decrease with longer observation time.

Discussion

Including extraneous variables alongside true EMR variables, with the extraneous features comprising 75% of the input, degraded the RNN's performance only slightly: less than 1% on the in-ICU mortality and re-admission tasks, and 2%-4% on the 30-day ICU-free days task. Even on the third task, the difference meant small fractions in absolute days. These results demonstrate the RNN's ability to manage extraneous information when predicting the clinical outcomes. Incorporating techniques such as dropout, recurrent dropout, and LASSO regularization help mitigate overfitting effects when high dimensional data are involved[3,4]. Recent work has even suggested that, when done properly, adding noise to models can be a regularization technique[16].

Not surprisingly, among the RNN models, those using only extraneous variables as inputs had the worst performance across all outcomes. The RNN model using only extraneous variables to predict ICU re-admission displayed random discrimination. The RNN model using only extraneous variables to predict ICU-free days performed about the same or slightly better than the baseline reference, indicating that this RNN model learned the population mean. For the in-ICU mortality task, the RNN model using only extraneous variables performed better than random (AUC > 0.5). Previous research has shown that nurse charting frequencies reflect clinicians' anticipation of clinical outcome[17,18]. These findings are consistent with the range of AUCs (0.65 to 0.81) from a classifier that used only the number of recorded measurements between ICU admission and prediction time (fourth row of Table 3a). By construction, the temporal sampling of the extraneous features matched the temporal sampling of the charted measurements, which

Table 3: Model performances on the three target outcomes

Input \ Hour	3	6	9	12	24
Extraneous only	0.463 ±0.015	0.654 ±0.011	0.657 ±0.003	0.627 ±0.009	0.585 ±0.017
EMR only	0.875 ±0.003	0.911 ±0.005	0.913 ±0.004	0.921 ±0.005	0.942 ±0.005
EMR + Extraneous	0.870 ±0.010	0.903 ±0.004	0.906 ±0.003	0.914 ±0.003	0.935 ±0.004
Recording freq.	0.656 ±0.000	0.722 ±0.000	0.750 ±0.000	0.756 ±0.000	0.809 ±0.000

(a) Mortality Model AUC

Input	AUC±std
Extraneous only	0.489 ±0.008
EMR only	0.644 ±0.016
EMR + Extraneous	0.644 ±0.017

(b) 72-Hour Readmission Model AUC

Input \ Hour	3	6	9	12	24
Extraneous only	4.397 ±0.009	4.373 ±0.016	4.416 ±0.024	4.512 ±0.026	5.153 ±0.150
EMR only	3.683 ±0.036	3.502 ±0.061	3.419 ±0.081	3.345 ±0.108	3.326 ±0.173
EMR + Extraneous	3.754 ±0.015	3.560 ±0.009	3.475 ±0.009	3.478 ±0.033	3.429 ±0.100
Target mean from train set	5.088 ±0.000	5.099 ±0.000	5.113 ±0.000	5.124 ±0.000	5.166 ±0.000

(c) 30-Day ICU-Free Days Model MAE (in days)

may explain the better than random performance of the RNN mortality model that used only extraneous features. This would suggest that the RNN learned some correlation between charting frequency and mortality risk from random values that had nothing to do with an individual patient but, when presented as a sequence, implicitly contained nurse charting frequency for that patient.

This study is limited by the single-center nature of the data used in the experiments. Future work will extend these experiments to other clinical tasks and algorithms, such as the multilayer perceptron, random forest, and logistic regression, to assess these algorithms' robustness against extraneous or superfluous data.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that RNN models with LSTM architecture can robustly manage high-dimensional data even when the majority of that data contain irrelevant information. The experiments focused on three clinical outcomes: in-ICU mortality, 72-hour ICU re-admission, and ICU-free days. RNNs can be trained for these clinically relevant tasks without model developers spending additional meticulous efforts on feature selection.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the L. K. Whittier Foundation for supporting this work.

References

1. Henry J, Pylypchuk Y, Searcy T, Patel V. Adoption of electronic health record systems among US non-federal acute care hospitals: 2008-2015. ONC Data Brief. 2016;35:1–9.

2. LeCun Y, Bengio Y, Hinton G. Deep learning. nature. 2015;521(7553):436.

3. Trevor H, Robert T, JH F. The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction. New York,

NY: Springer; 2009.

4. Srivastava N, Hinton G, Krizhevsky A, Sutskever I, Salakhutdinov R. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. The Journal of Machine Learning Research. 2014;15(1):1929–1958.

5. Gal Y, Ghahramani Z. A theoretically grounded application of dropout in recurrent neural networks. In: Advances in neural information processing systems; 2016. p. 1019–1027.

6. Lipton ZC, Kale DC, Elkan C, Wetzel R. Learning to diagnose with LSTM recurrent neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:151103677. 2015;.

7. Aczon M, Ledbetter D, Ho L, Gunny A, Flynn A, Williams J, et al. Dynamic mortality risk predictions in pediatric critical care using recurrent neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:170106675. 2017;.

8. Rajkomar A, Oren E, Chen K, Dai AM, Hajaj N, Hardt M, et al. Scalable and accurate deep learning with electronic health records. npj Digital Medicine. 2018;1(1):18.

9. Liang Z, Zhang G, Huang JX, Hu QV. Deep learning for healthcare decision making with EMRs. In: Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM), 2014 IEEE International Conference on. IEEE; 2014. p. 556–559.

10. Saqib M, Sha Y, Wang MD. Early Prediction of Sepsis in EMR Records Using Traditional ML Techniques and Deep Learning LSTM Networks. In: 2018 40th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC). IEEE; 2018. p. 4038–4041.

11. Khalid S, Khalil T, Nasreen S. A survey of feature selection and feature extraction techniques in machine learning. In: Science and Information Conference (SAI), 2014. IEEE; 2014. p. 372–378.

12. Al Nuaimi N, Masud M, Mohammed F. Examining The Effect of Feature Selection on Improving Patient Deterioration Prediction. International Journal of Data Mining & Knowledge Management Process. 2015 11;5:13–33.

13. Ho LV, Ledbetter D, Aczon M, Wetzel R. The Dependence of Machine Learning on Electronic Medical Record Quality. In: AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings. vol. 2017. American Medical Informatics Association; 2017. p. 883.

14. Hochreiter S, Schmidhuber J. Long short-term memory. Neural computation. 1997;9(8):1735–1780.

15. Chollet F. Keras (2.2.2). GitHub; 2018.

16. Noh H, You T, Mun J, Han B. Regularizing Deep Neural Networks by Noise: Its Interpretation and Optimization. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems; 2017. p. 5109–5118.

17. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. The Milbank memorial fund quarterly. 1966;44(3):166–206.

18. Donabedian A. The quality of care: how can it be assessed? Jama. 1988;260(12):1743–1748.

Appendix

Table 4: EMR variables (demographics, vitals and labs) in patient episode matrix. Demographics such as gender and race/ethnicity were encoded as binary variables.

Demographics and Vitals			
Age	Sex_F	Sex_M	race_African American
race_Asian/Indian/Pacific Islander	race_Caucasian/European Non-Hispanic	race_Hispanic	race_unknown
Abdominal Girth	FLACC Pain Face	Left Pupillary Response Level	Respiratory Effort Level
Activity Level	FLACC Pain Intensity	Level of Consciousness	Respiratory Rate
Bladder pressure	FLACC Pain Legs	Lip Moisture Level	Right Pupil Size After Light
Capillary Refill Rate	Foley Catheter Volume	Mean Arterial Pressure	Right Pupil Size Before Light
Central Venous Pressure	Gastrostomy Tube Volume	Motor Response Level	Right Pupillary Response Level
Cerebral Perfusion Pressure	Glascow Coma Score	Nasal Flaring Level	Sedation Scale Level
Diastolic Blood Pressure	Head Circumference	Near-Infrared Spectroscopy SO2	Skin Turgor_edema
EtCO2	Heart Rate	Nutrition Level	Skin Turgor_turgor
Extremity Temperature Level	Height	Oxygenation Index	Systolic Blood Pressure
Eye Response Level	Hemofiltration Fluid Output	PaO2 to FiO2	Temperature
FLACC Pain Activity	Intracranial Pressure	Patient Mood Level	Verbal Response Level
FLACC Pain Consolability	Left Pupil Size After Light	Pulse Oximetry	WAT1 Total
FLACC Pain Cry	Left Pupil Size Before Light	Quality of Pain Level	Weight

Labs			
ABG Base excess	CBG PCO2	GGT	Neutrophils %
ABG FiO2	CBG PO2	Glucose	PT
ABG HCO3	CBG TCO2	Haptoglobin	PTT
ABG O2 sat	CBG pH	Hematocrit	Phosphorus level
ABG PCO2	CSF Bands%	Hemoglobin	Platelet Count
ABG PO2	CSF Glucose	INR	Potassium
ABG TCO2	CSF Lymphs %	Influenza Lab	Protein Total
ABG pH	CSF Protein	Lactate	RBC Blood
ALT	CSF RBC	Lactate Dehydrogenase Blood	RDW
AST	CSF Segs %	Lactic Acid Blood	Reticulocyte Count
Albumin Level	CSF WBC	Lipase	Schistocytes
Alkaline phosphatase	Calcium Ionized	Lymphocyte %	Sodium
Amylase	Calcium Total	MCH	Spherocytes
Anti-Xa Heparin	Chloride	MCHC	T4 Free
B-type Natriuretic Peptide	Complement C3 Serum	MCV	TSH
BUN	Complement C4 Serum	MVBG Base Excess	Triglycerides
Bands %	Creatinine	MVBG FiO2	VBG Base excess
Basophils %	Culture Blood	MVBG HCO3	VBG FiO2
Bicarbonate Serum	Culture CSF	MVBG O2 Sat	VBG HCO3
Bilirubin Conjugated	Culture Fungus Blood	MVBG PCO2	VBG O2 sat
Bilirubin Total	Culture Respiratory	MVBG PO2	VBG PCO2
Bilirubin Unconjugated	Culture Urine	MVBG TCO2	VBG PO2
Blasts %	Culture Wound	MVBG pH	VBG TCO2
C-Reactive Protein	D-dimer	Macrocytes	VBG pH
CBG Base excess	ESR	Magnesium Level	White Blood Cell Count
CBG FiO2	Eosinophils %	Metamyelocytes %	
CBG HCO3	Ferritin Level	Monocytes %	
CBG O2 sat	Fibrinogen	Myelocytes %	

Table 5: EMR Variables (drugs and interventions) in baseline patient episode matrix.

Drugs			
Acetaminophen/Codeine_inter	Clonazepam_inter	Ipratropium Bromide_inter	Oseltamivir_inter
Acetaminophen/Hydrocodone_inter	Clonidine HCl_inter	Isoniazid_inter	Oxacillin_inter
Acetaminophen_inter	Cyclophosphamide_inter	Isradipine_inter	Oxcarbazepine_inter
Acetazolamide_inter	Desmopressin_inter	Ketamine_cont	Oxycodone_inter
Acyclovir_inter	Dexamethasone_inter	Ketamine_inter	Pantoprazole_inter
Albumin_inter	Dexmedetomidine_cont	Ketorolac_inter	Penicillin G Sodium_inter
Albuterol_inter	Diazepam_inter	Labetalol_inter	Pentobarbital_inter
Allopurinol_inter	Digoxin_inter	Lactobacillus_inter	Phenobarbital_inter
Alteplase_inter	Diphenhydramine HCl_inter	Lansoprazole_inter	Phenytoin_inter
Amikacin_inter	Dobutamine_cont	Levalbuterol_inter	Piperacillin/Tazobactam_inter
Aminophylline_cont	Dopamine_cont	Levetiracetam_inter	Potassium Chloride_inter
Aminophylline_inter	Dornase Alfa_inter	Levocarnitine_inter	Potassium Phosphat e_inter
Amlodipine_inter	Enalapril_inter	Levofloxacin_inter	Prednisolone_inter
Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid_inter	Enoxaparin_inter	Levothyroxine Sodium_inter	Prednisone_inter
Amoxicillin_inter	Epinephrine_cont	Lidocaine_inter	Propofol_cont
Amphotericin B Lipid Complex_inter	Epinephrine_inter	Linezolid_inter	Propofol _inter
Ampicillin/Sulbactam_inter	Epoetin_inter	Lisinopril_inter	Propranolol HCl_inter
Ampicillin_inter	Erythromycin_inter	Lorazepam_inter	Racemic Epi_inter
Aspirin_inter	Factor VII_inter	Magnesium Sulfate_inter	Ranitidine_inter
Atropine_inter	Famotidine_inter	Meropenem_inter	Rifampin_inter
Azathioprine_inter	Fentanyl_cont	Methadone_inter	Risperidone_inter
Azithromycin_inter	Fentanyl_inter	Methylprednisolone_inter	Rocuronium_inter
Baclofen_inter	Ferrous Sulfate_inter	Metoclopramide_inter	Sildenafil_inter
Basiliximab_inter	Filgrastim_inter	Metronidazole_inter	Sodium Bicarbonate_inter
Budesonide_inter	Fluconazole_inter	Micafungin_inter	Sodium Chloride_inter
Bumetanide_inter	Fluticasone_inter	Midazolam HCl_cont	Sodium Phosphate_inter
Calcium Chloride_cont	Fosphenytoin_inter	Midazolam HCl_inter	Spironolactone_inter
Calcium Chloride_inter	Furosemide_cont	Milrinone_cont	Sucralfate_inter
Calcium Gluconate_inter	Furosemide_inter	Montelukast Sodium_inter	Tacrolimus_inter
Carbamazepine_inter	Gabapentin_inter	Morphine_cont	Terbutaline_cont
Cefazolin_inter	Ganciclovir Sodium_inter	Morphine_inter	Tobramycin_inter
Cefepime_inter	Gentamicin_inter	Mycophenolate Mofetl_inter	Topiramate_inter
Cefotaxime_inter	Glycopyrrolate_inter	Naloxone HCL_cont	Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole_inter
Cefoxitin_inter	Heparin_cont	Naloxone HCL_inter	Ursodiol_inter
Ceftazidime_inter	Heparin_inter	Nifedipine_inter	Valganciclovir_inter
Ceftriaxone_inter	Hydrocortisone_inter	Nitrofurantoin_inter	Valproic Acid_inter
Cephalexin_inter	Hydromorphone_cont	Nitroprusside_cont	Vancomycin_inter
Chloral Hydrate_inter	Hydromorphone_inter	Norepinephrine_cont	Vasopressin_cont
Chlorothiazide_inter	Ibuprofen_inter	Nystatin_inter	Vecuronium_inter
Ciprofloxacin HCL_inter	Immune Globulin_inter	Octreotide Acetate_cont	Vitamin K_inter
Cisatracurium_cont	Insulin_cont	Olanzapine_inter	Voriconazole_inter
Clindamycin_inter	Insulin_inter	Ondansetron_inter	

Interventions			
Abdominal X Ray	Diversional Activity_tv	NIV Mode	Range of Motion Assistance Type
Arterial Line Site	ECMO Hours	NIV Set Rate	Sedation Intervention Level
CT Abdomen Pelvis	EPAP	Nitric Oxide	Sedation Response Level
CT Brain	FiO2	Nurse Activity Level Completed	Tidal Volume Delivered
CT Chest	Gastrostomy Tube Location	O2 Flow Rate	Tidal Volume Expiratory
Central Venous Line Site	HFOV Amplitude	Oxygen Mode Level	Tidal Volume Inspiratory
Chest Tube Site	HFOV Frequency	Oxygen Therapy	Tidal Volume Set
Chest X Ray	Hemofiltration Therapy Mode	PEEP	Tracheostomy Tube Size
Comfort Response Level	IPAP	Peak Inspiratory Pressure	Ventilator Rate
Continuous EEG Present	Inspiratory Time	Peritoneal Dialysis Type	Ventriculostomy Site
Diversional Activity_books	MRI Brain	Pharmacological Comfort Measures Given	Visitor Mood Level
Diversional Activity_music	Mean Airway Pressure	Position Support Given	Visitor Present
Diversional Activity_play	Mechanical Ventilation Mode	Position Tolerance Level	Volume Tidal
Diversional Activity_toys	MultiDisciplinaryTeam Present	Pressure Support	