

Length-of-Stay Risk and Care-Pathway Transportability

Abstract

A central question for immune-state and tumor evidence synthesis is not simply whether an output is accurate, but whether it survives scrutiny of transportability. This literature-based conceptual analysis does not report a new experiment. The focal evidence concerns why autoimmune activity can persist or recur when conventional inflammation suppression does not durably change underlying cellular and tissue states. Transportability concerns the changes between a development setting and an intended use setting. Population composition, measurement, practice, and resource availability may all change. Describe the target setting before importing a model. Compare calibration, error types, and downstream decisions, including subgroups whose meaning differs between settings. The proposed comparison concerns hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites; it would test whether the specific failure scenario is detected without erasing legitimate uncertainty. Implications are restricted to the evidence roles relevant to immune-state and tumor evidence synthesis, leaving broader efficacy and deployment claims unresolved.

The failure scenario

The most informative comparison in immune-state and tumor evidence synthesis may occur before a score is calculated. Decisions about hospital processes, clinical predictors, and validation sites already determine what the score will mean. Consider the possibility of one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment. This is a proposed stress scenario, not an observed event reported by the cited studies. Its purpose is to expose which evidence contract would be violated even if the final output looked plausible. For tissue contexts, clinical endpoints, and mechanistic claims, the relevant claim must identify its population or artifact class, its time window, and the action it is supposed to support. A failure at any of these levels may persist even after a local technical improvement. The analysis therefore treats published methods as bounded evidence and asks how their limitations interact with this particular decision. An operational analogy is useful only if it keeps those limitations visible.

Transportability concerns the changes between a development setting and an intended use setting. Population composition, measurement, practice, and resource availability may all change. External validation at one site tests only part of that space. In this article, the relevant contrast is hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites. The proposed counterexample of one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment puts that contrast under pressure. Describe the target setting before importing a model. Compare calibration, error types, and downstream decisions, including subgroups whose meaning differs between settings. A favorable finding would show that the intended interpretation of validation sites remains defensible when hospital processes is perturbed under the specified conditions. An unfavorable finding should narrow the claim rather than be discarded as an inconvenient case.

The strongest comparison would isolate the disputed transition in hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites. The proposed counterexample, one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment, identifies what should not be accepted as equivalent evidence. The input record should retain enough information to decide which part of that scenario violates the intended contract. That includes the original source type, measurement or artifact status, and the reason the proposed interpretation exceeds its support. The evaluator would compare the system's response with a qualified judgment made without seeing that response. Disagreement should be classified rather than erased by rewriting the prompt. External validation at one site tests only part of that space. A useful negative result would show that the interface

cannot preserve this distinction under realistic use; a useful positive result would demonstrate preservation on independent cases rather than merely on the example used to develop the rule. The primary source remains relevant through its particular contribution: The set-point framing asks whether durable remission requires changing a coupled metabolic state rather than only lowering an inflammatory marker. That contribution should be retained even if the integrated workflow fails. Conversely, successful integration would not remove the source's limitations or turn a proposed extension into an already observed result. This asymmetric interpretation protects both the literature and the user from an unjustified all-or-nothing verdict.

Reading the literature by evidence type

A useful boundary case is supplied by *Resetting Immunometabolic Set Points in Autoimmune Disease*, concerned with why autoimmune activity can persist or recur when conventional inflammation suppression does not durably change underlying cellular and tissue states (Xiao Yu et al. 2026e). Its methodological basis is a conceptual review proposing immunometabolic set points across immune and tissue compartments. The accessible evidence is specific: the review integrates cellular metabolism, nutrient/oxygen conditions, mitochondrial stress, and stromal metabolites as candidate mechanisms of persistence. The set-point framing asks whether durable remission requires changing a coupled metabolic state rather than only lowering an inflammatory marker. A unifying set point is a hypothesis, not an already validated clinical measurement or an established therapeutic protocol. Reading the work through transportability changes the evaluation question: the issue is whether hospital processes supports the intended interpretation of validation sites, rather than whether the reported method is impressive in its original task.

The relevant question in *Immune Niches in Brain Tumors: Glial-Immune Cell Interactions and Spatial Microdomains* is how spatial glial-immune interactions organize permissive and suppressive microdomains within brain tumors (Qian Guo et al. 2026). Its methodological basis is a review of astrocytes, microglia, oligodendrocyte-lineage cells, T cells, and myeloid cells across spatial tumor niches. The accessible evidence is specific: the abstract integrates cytokine, metabolic, hypoxic, and immunoediting mechanisms associated with immune suppression and exhaustion. It shifts attention from tumor-wide averages to interactions whose meaning depends on location and cell context. The review does not establish efficacy of a new intervention; co-location, state annotation, and functional interaction require different evidence. Reading the work through transportability changes the evaluation question: the issue is whether hospital processes supports the intended interpretation of validation sites, rather than whether the reported method is impressive in its original task.

A useful boundary case is supplied by *Splenic Extramedullary Granulopoiesis and Neutrophil States in Cancer Immunity: Systemic Immunosuppression and Therapeutic Resistance*, concerned with how splenic extramedullary granulopoiesis and neutrophil heterogeneity contribute to systemic cancer immunosuppression and resistance (Yidan Zhang et al. 2026). Its methodological basis is a review organized around stress-associated splenic blood-cell production and reprogrammed neutrophil states. The accessible evidence is specific: the official Cancer Bioscience recent-articles listing confirms the review's scope and emphasizes sustained stress and systemic reprogramming; no new patient cohort is inferred. The framing connects extra-tumoral immune production with local cancer resistance questions. The accessible summary cannot establish specific quantitative contributions, universal cell-state functions, or clinical effects of proposed targeting strategies. Reading the work through transportability changes the evaluation question: the issue is whether hospital processes supports the intended interpretation of validation sites, rather than whether the reported method is impressive in its original task.

The *Prediction of Extended Hospital Length of Stay in Patients after Endoscopic Endonasal Transsphenoidal Surgery for the Resection of Non-Functioning Pituitary Adenomas: A Dual-Center Retrospective Analysis* asks which retrospective clinical features predict extended hospital stay after

endoscopic endonasal surgery for nonfunctioning pituitary adenomas (Bibo Gao et al. 2026). Its methodological basis is a dual-center retrospective prediction analysis with a modeled extended-stay outcome and separate validation. The accessible evidence is specific: the accessible record describes a nomogram and a 100-patient validation sample; specific predictor effects and thresholds are not assumed. It treats hospitalization burden as an explicitly predicted outcome that can inform care-process evaluation. Length of stay includes organizational and discharge factors; it is not an interchangeable measure of tumor biology, surgical quality, or long-term recovery. The source supplies one part of the comparison involving hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites. Its evidence should retain its original unit and scope; the present synthesis proposes a connection without claiming that the paper directly tested this integrated workflow.

The relevant question in Towards Explainable RAG: Interpreting the Influence of Retrieved Passages on Generation is how generated answers can be interpreted through the influence of their retrieved passages (Yinghao. “Towards Explainable RAG: Interpreting the Influence of Retrieved Passages on Generation.” *2025 4th International Conference on Robotics Sang 2025). Its methodological basis is the supplied IEEE conference title frames passage-influence analysis for explainable retrieval-augmented generation; implementation particulars were unavailable. The accessible evidence is specific: the bibliographic item is located in the official IEEE record; no unverified attribution algorithm or benchmark result is inferred. It asks for traceability between particular retrieved evidence and generated statements instead of treating a bibliography as an explanation. Passage influence, citation support, causal explanation, and factual correctness are distinct properties; the accessible record cannot establish all of them. This source enters the present review as a methodological comparison for evidence processing, not as evidence about disease biology, patient outcomes, or clinical efficacy. The transferable question is whether hospital processes remains correctly interpreted after a computational choice involving validation sites. Its task-specific validation cannot be borrowed to validate the clinical claim.

The sources should be compared through the roles they play, not merged into a single performance claim. Resetting Immunometabolic Set Points in Autoimmune Disease addresses why autoimmune activity can persist or recur when conventional inflammation suppression does not durably change underlying cellular and tissue states (Xiao Yu et al. 2026e). By contrast, Towards Explainable RAG: Interpreting the Influence of Retrieved Passages on Generation addresses how generated answers can be interpreted through the influence of their retrieved passages (Yinghao. “Towards Explainable RAG: Interpreting the Influence of Retrieved Passages on Generation.” *2025 4th International Conference on Robotics Sang 2025). That difference matters for transportability: the evidence concerning hospital processes is not automatically evidence concerning validation sites. A successful software operation, a plausible mechanistic account, and a validated outcome are different achievements. Their integration may improve traceability, but it cannot create an unmeasured link. A coherent review should identify where the sources complement one another and where their scopes remain incompatible. Here the proposed failure scenario is one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment. The analytical value of that scenario is that it can occur without requiring any cited paper to be wrong: an otherwise valid local finding can be misused at a later interface. Preventing that misuse requires evidence about the interface itself, not simply a larger collection of local results.

Methods that constrain the claim

Medical machine learning must fit data provenance, care pathways, and prospective evaluation (Rajkomar, Dean, and Kohane 2019). The clinical relevance of a model depends on how its output changes a care process. Development data can contain information that becomes available only after the intended decision. A review must identify that availability boundary before comparing algorithms. Prospective use also changes who is measured and who is treated, so evaluation of a frozen historical dataset cannot establish the entire future workflow. The connection to length-of-stay risk and care-pathway transportability is a constraint on interpretation. It would be inappropriate to borrow the source's methodological authority as direct confirmation of the integrated domain claim.

Responsible health AI connects prediction with workflow, monitoring, and patient impact (Wiens et al. 2019). The point at which a model reaches practice is not the end of evaluation. New populations, changing measurements, and feedback can alter failure modes. A responsible deployment needs a route for recognizing deterioration and a person authorized to respond. Monitoring should be linked to feasible corrective actions; an alert that cannot change the workflow provides accountability only in a very limited sense. For the comparison involving hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites, the source supplies an analytical obligation. The review's proposed application remains a hypothesis, with the deliberately difficult scenario serving as a check on scope inflation.

Calibration separates discrimination from confidence used in clinical escalation (Guo et al. 2017). Discrimination and calibration deserve separate evaluation. A score can order cases well yet systematically overstate its certainty. Aggregate calibration can also hide local miscalibration near the threshold where action changes. An audit should retain predicted probabilities and observed outcomes rather than report only correct classifications, and it should evaluate calibration on data not reused to choose the correction. For the comparison involving hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites, the source supplies an analytical obligation. The review's proposed application remains a hypothesis, with the deliberately difficult scenario serving as a check on scope inflation.

BM25 remains an important lexical baseline for retrieval systems (Robertson and Zaragoza 2009). Lexical retrieval remains a useful baseline because it is explicit about matching the available terms. Semantic matching can add recall while confusing specialized senses that share broad context. A retrieval evaluation should include both exact-identifier and meaning-based cases. Comparing a new retriever with an appropriately tuned lexical baseline helps determine whether extra computation adds support rather than merely more plausible-looking passages. An implementation should expose this limitation to reviewers of tissue contexts, clinical endpoints, and mechanistic claims. The result and its evidence qualification should remain recoverable even when the interface condenses them into a short report.

Retrieval-augmented generation makes external evidence part of the generation process (Lewis et al. 2020). Making documents available to a generator changes its information access but does not guarantee that a statement is supported. A useful analysis separates document selection from generation conditioned on those documents. Missing evidence, irrelevant context, and selective quotation create different failures. The proposed workflow should preserve retrieved passages and evaluate claim support independently of fluency or the mere presence of citations. Within immune-state and tumor evidence synthesis, this distinction is relevant to transportability. The proposed failure scenario is one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment; its evaluation must preserve the original source's methodological scope.

Dense retrieval provides semantic matching but must be compared with strong lexical baselines (Karpukhin et al. 2020). Semantic retrieval can connect questions and passages whose wording differs. That advantage should be tested against cases where wording differs because the underlying population or

mechanism differs. Retrieval accuracy is not identical to answer accuracy, and neither automatically establishes evidence eligibility. A good evaluation retains the ranked candidates so later errors can be localized to retrieval rather than attributed to the generator by default. An implementation should expose this limitation to reviewers of tissue contexts, clinical endpoints, and mechanistic claims. The result and its evidence qualification should remain recoverable even when the interface condenses them into a short report.

Replication and transparent workflows are prerequisites for reliable biomedical claims (National Academies 2019). Reproducing a calculation and independently replicating a finding are different achievements. Recoverable data and code allow one to inspect the first; independent observations and design choices inform the second. A review should avoid calling several reanalyses of one dataset separate replications. Clear reporting of analysis changes also makes a failed replication informative instead of allowing it to disappear as an implementation dispute. Within immune-state and tumor evidence synthesis, this distinction is relevant to transportability. The proposed failure scenario is one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment; its evaluation must preserve the original source's methodological scope.

FAIR principles support reusable cohorts, signals, and analysis metadata (Wilkinson et al. 2016). Reusable evidence needs more than a downloadable file. Identifiers, metadata, provenance, and meaningful access conditions help another researcher determine what an artifact contains and whether it can answer a new question. Reuse does not mean universal permission or universal scientific comparability. The information needed to judge those boundaries should travel with the artifact rather than remain in private workflow knowledge. An implementation should expose this limitation to reviewers of tissue contexts, clinical endpoints, and mechanistic claims. The result and its evidence qualification should remain recoverable even when the interface condenses them into a short report.

Causal inference requires a clearly specified intervention, time order, and exchangeability assumptions (Hernán and Robins 2020). A prediction can be accurate without identifying what an intervention would change. A useful causal analysis begins by defining the hypothetical comparison, eligibility, and time zero. Its assumptions concern the process generating exposure and observation, not merely the flexibility of a fitted model. In this review, causal vocabulary is appropriate only when that comparison can be specified and defended. The connection to length-of-stay risk and care-pathway transportability is a constraint on interpretation. It would be inappropriate to borrow the source's methodological authority as direct confirmation of the integrated domain claim.

Epidemiologic design makes confounding, selection, and measurement error part of interpretation (Rothman, Greenland, and Lash 2008). Confounding, selection, and measurement error are distinct problems and need not move an estimate in the same direction. An analysis should describe them before deciding which adjustment is adequate. A larger dataset can reduce random error while leaving systematic error almost untouched. Precision should therefore be interpreted alongside the quality of the design and the eligibility of its population. This is methodological support for examining transportability, not a claim that the source studied immune-state and tumor evidence synthesis. A separate application-specific test is required at the interface described in this review.

Research design and stopping conditions

The question left open by the literature is whether the intended distinction survives independent checking. Describe the target setting before importing a model. Compare calibration, error types, and downstream decisions, including subgroups whose meaning differs between settings. These procedures are proposed, not completed. The case set would include the scenario of one hospital's discharge threshold exported without adjustment, with its validity judged independently of the system's response. The relevant comparison axes are hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites.

A discriminating protocol would specify a preferred interpretation and at least one credible alternative before choosing measurements. It would include negative controls and observations that could favor the alternative. Reviewers would classify whether disagreement concerns data quality, model structure, or the scientific question itself. The comparison should reduce uncertainty about that distinction rather than add more observations equally compatible with every account.

For the immune review, proposed mechanisms should be tested in their stated compartments and disease settings. Spatial association, state annotation, and intervention response would be judged separately. A useful result could expose a missing bridge in the integrated account. It would not need to confirm every part of the preferred narrative to improve scientific understanding.

What remains unverified

Access limits are material for Towards Explainable RAG: Interpreting the Influence of Retrieved Passages on Generation. Where only bibliographic scope or a limited abstract is available, the discussion does not assign unverified datasets, algorithms, effect sizes, or clinical recommendations. This review is a bounded conceptual synthesis rather than a systematic review with an exhaustive search protocol. It cannot establish the effectiveness of the proposed integrated workflow. Its specific contribution is to articulate how transportability changes the interpretation of hospital processes, clinical predictors, validation sites. Technical sources support computational comparisons only; they do not validate biological mechanisms or patient benefit. Reviews and correspondence retain their publication roles and are not counted as new experiments. Proposed stress cases are illustrative, not observed failures attributed to the papers. Future work should therefore test the weakest inference described here, preserve contrary results, and disclose the cost of checking rather than treating additional automation as intrinsically beneficial.

Conclusion

Hospital processes deserves to remain distinguishable from validation sites. That distinction is the central safeguard identified by this review. Describe the target setting before importing a model. Compare calibration, error types, and downstream decisions, including subgroups whose meaning differs between settings. The primary source remains bounded by its own design: A unifying set point is a hypothesis, not an already validated clinical measurement or an established therapeutic protocol. Further work should test the comparison on independent cases, measure correction and review costs, and retain failed transitions as evidence. Until then, the integrated account is a research agenda rather than a new empirical guarantee.

References

1. Yu, Xiao, et al. “Resetting Immunometabolic Set Points in Autoimmune Disease.” *Journal of Translational Autoimmunity*, vol. 13, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtauto.2026.100391>.
2. Guo, Qian, et al. “Immune Niches in Brain Tumors: Glial-Immune Cell Interactions and Spatial Microdomains.” *Acta Neuropathologica Communications*, vol. 14, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40478-026-02373-0>.
3. Zhang, Yidan, et al. “Splenic Extramedullary Granulopoiesis and Neutrophil States in Cancer Immunity: Systemic Immunosuppression and Therapeutic Resistance.” *Cancer Bioscience*, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbs.2026.100009>.
4. Gao, Bibo, et al. “The Prediction of Extended Hospital Length of Stay in Patients after Endoscopic Endonasal Transsphenoidal Surgery for the Resection of Non-Functioning Pituitary Adenomas: A Dual-Center Retrospective Analysis.” *Cancers*, vol. 18, no. 10, 2026, <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers18101582>.
5. Sang, Yinghao. “Towards Explainable RAG: Interpreting the Influence of Retrieved Passages on Generation.” *2025 4th International Conference on Robotics, Artificial Intelligence and Intelligent Control (RAIIC)*, IEEE, 2025, pp. 397-400, <https://doi.org/10.1109/raaic65850.2025.11170170>.
6. Rajkomar, Alvin, Jeffrey Dean, and Isaac Kohane. “Machine Learning in Medicine.” *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 380, 2019, pp. 1347-58.
7. Wiens, Jenna, et al. “Do No Harm: A Roadmap for Responsible Machine Learning for Health Care.” *Nature Medicine*, vol. 25, 2019, pp. 1337-40.
8. Guo, Chuan, et al. “On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks.” *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017, pp. 1321-30.
9. Robertson, Stephen, and Hugo Zaragoza. “The Probabilistic Relevance Framework: BM25 and Beyond.” *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2009, pp. 333-89.
10. Lewis, Patrick, et al. “Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, 2020, pp. 9459-74.
11. Karpukhin, Vladimir, et al. “Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering.” *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2020, pp. 6769-81.
12. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Reproducibility and Replicability in Science*. National Academies Press, 2019.
13. Wilkinson, Mark D., et al. “The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship.” *Scientific Data*, vol. 3, 2016, article 160018.
14. Hernán, Miguel A., and James M. Robins. *Causal Inference: What If*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2020.
15. Rothman, Kenneth J., Sander Greenland, and Timothy L. Lash. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd ed., Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.