

Word count: 3,787

Machine Learning Applications and Advancements in Alcohol Use Disorder: A Systematic Review

Authors

Myrna Hurtado PhD¹⁺, Anna Siefkas SM^{1,2+}, Misty M Attwood PhD^{1*}, Zohora Iqbal PhD¹, Jana Hoffman PhD¹

¹Dascena, Inc., Houston, TX, United States.

²Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, United States.

⁺These authors contributed equally to the work

* Corresponding author

Email: mattwood@dascena.com

12333 Sowden Rd Suite B PMB 65148

Houston, Texas 77080-2059

(510) 826-9508

Myrna Hurtado ORCID: 0000-0003-0704-8384

Anna Siefkas ORCID: 0000-0001-8379-6523

Misty M Attwood ORCID: 0000-0002-1832-7728

Zohora Iqbal ORCID: 0000-0001-7065-8367

Jana Hoffman ORCID: 0000-0002-7745-3900

Running title: Machine learning in alcohol use disorder

Conflict of Interest: MH, AS, ZI, MMA, and JH are or have been employees or contractors of Dascena (Houston, Texas, United States).

Funding: The authors received no specific public funding for this work.

ABSTRACT

Background: Alcohol use disorder (AUD) is a chronic mental disorder that leads to harmful, compulsive drinking patterns that can have serious consequences. Advancements are needed to overcome current barriers in diagnosis and treatment of AUD.

Objectives: This comprehensive review analyzes research efforts that apply machine learning (ML) methods for AUD prediction, diagnosis, treatment and health outcomes.

Methods: A systematic literature review was conducted. A search performed on 12/02/2020 for published articles indexed in Embase and PubMed Central with AUD and ML-related terms retrieved 1,628 articles. We identified those that used ML-based techniques to diagnose AUD or make predictions concerning AUD or AUD-related outcomes. Studies were excluded if they were animal research, did not diagnose or make predictions for AUD or AUD-related outcomes, were published in a non-English language, only used conventional statistical methods, or were not a research article.

Results: After full screening, 70 articles were included in our review. Algorithms developed for AUD predictions utilize a wide variety of different data sources including electronic health records, genetic information, neuroimaging, social media, and psychometric data. Sixty-six of the included studies displayed a high or moderate risk of bias, largely due to a lack of external validation in algorithm development and missing data.

Conclusions: There is strong evidence that ML-based methods have the potential for accurate predictions for AUD, due to the ability to model relationships between variables and reveal trends in data. The application of ML may help address current underdiagnosis of AUD and support those in recovery for AUD.

Keywords: alcohol use disorder; machine learning; predictive models; decision support; systematic review; alcohol misuse

INTRODUCTION

Alcohol misuse is characterized by unhealthy drinking patterns, such as binge drinking and heavy alcohol use, that increases the risk of alcohol use disorder (AUD). (1) AUD is strongly associated with morbidity and mortality, and a major public health burden globally.(2) One study reported 93,296 deaths per year in the United States (U.S.) due to excessive alcohol consumption, with an average of 29 years of life lost per early death.(3) More than 99 million disability-adjusted life-years were attributable to alcohol use in 2016,(2) and alcohol misuse is considered to be one of the leading causes of preventable deaths in the U.S.(4) Two main challenges associated with combating AUD are underdiagnosis and unsuccessful treatment outcomes. Although the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force has recommended screening in primary care settings to identify and curtail unhealthy alcohol use,(5) alcohol misuse screening rates remain low.(6) Data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System revealed that low rates arise predominantly from missed screening opportunities during primary care visits rather than inadequate access to healthcare.(7) Relapse is quite common among individuals with AUD; 40% to 60% of patients relapse within the first year after treatment completion.(8) Diagnosis of, and accurate predictions for, individuals with AUD are crucial for successful treatment outcomes as well as prevention of other resultant morbidities.

The application of artificial intelligence, and specifically machine learning (ML) in healthcare, have the potential to revolutionize approaches in medicine.(9) ML has been leveraged to improve disease prediction and detection, medical imaging, drug discovery and development, genetic analysis, treatment courses, and outcomes predictions.(9,10) ML in healthcare settings may be used to support clinicians in the decision-making process by providing accurate, timely, unbiased,

and convenient access to data and analysis. ML methods may also be applied in AUD research. We have previously developed ML for the accurate and early prediction of septic shock(11), and mortality(12) for the AUD population in the intensive care unit. The purpose of this systematic review is to evaluate the use of ML to enhance current diagnostic and outcome prediction approaches for individuals with alcohol misuse and AUD. Definitions of AUD-related terms(13) and ML can be found in Box 1.

Alcohol consumption

Alcohol use disorder (AUD): A brain disorder that results in compulsive drinking despite negative consequences on social life, employment and health. Also referred to as alcoholism, alcohol dependence, addiction or abuse.

Binge drinking: Drinking patterns that result in a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.08% or higher.

Heavy alcohol use: Drinking more than 3 drinks in any given day or exceeding more than 7 drinks a week for women or more than 4 drinks in any given day or more than 14 drinks a week for men.

Machine learning

An artificial intelligence technique to develop computer algorithms that analyze and learn from patterns in prior data to predict outcomes.

Box 1: Definitions of alcohol use disorder-related terms.

METHODS

Systematic searches for studies of machine learning applications in AUD in the electronic databases PubMed Central and Embase were conducted by AS on December 2nd, 2020 in accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.(14) The search parameters included all studies published prior to the search date and included the search terms “alcohol related disorder” and relevant synonyms coupled with “machine learning” and relevant synonyms (Supplementary Table 1).

Search strategy and selection criteria

Search results were collected in Google Sheets, and duplicates were first removed in the Zotero reference manager (Corporation for Digital Scholarship, VA, U.S.). Title and abstract screening were conducted by 4 individuals: AS, AGS, NZ, and ZI, where each entry was independently screened by two reviewers. All disagreements were screened by a third reviewer whose input served as a tiebreaker. Full text screening was then conducted by MH, MMA, AGS, and AS, where each manuscript was screened by two reviewers independently, and disagreements were again screened by a third reviewer. For each study, the following information was collected by ZI, DE, MH, and MMA: study design, study aim, results, and clinical impact.

Studies were included if the aims included the following topics: (i) alcohol withdrawal; (ii) genetics or genome-wide association study (GWAS); (iii) diagnosis, treatment, prediction of AUD as the primary disorder; (iv) prediction of AUD treatment-seeking behavior, recovery, or treatment outcome; (v) AUD prediction or identification using experimental data; and (vi) alcohol and drug use. Studies were excluded if they were animal research, did not examine AUD as the primary disorder but rather examined related disease states where AUD was a risk phenotype/predictor, did not use ML or only used conventional statistical methods, published in a non-English language, were presented in conference abstracts and poster presentations, or were review articles, meta-analyses, opinions, or editorials, or if full-text for the study could not be found. ML generates predictive patterns from relationships between variables, while conventional statistical methods draw inferences. (Figure 1)




Figure 1. Flow diagram of the article selection process following PRISMA guidelines. Abbreviations: Alcohol use disorder (AUD); electroencephalography (EEG); machine learning (ML); magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

Risk of bias assessment

Risk of bias was assessed based on the following criteria: source of data, missing data in sample, lack of external validation, or other apparent sources of risk of bias. For each of these criteria, the reviewer scored the study as “low”, “moderate” or “high” based on the possibility of bias; details on how the risk of bias and overall score was determined may be found in Supplementary Table 2.

RESULTS

A total of 1,628 studies were extracted from our search and after the removal of 138 duplicate articles, 1,490 were screened by title and abstract (see Figure 1 for article screening process). Following screening, 1,186 articles were excluded because they did not pertain to the diagnosis or

treatment of AUD or mention the use of ML. The remaining 304 articles were screened by full-text reviews. A total of 70 studies met our inclusion criteria and were included in our review. The summarized study aims and clinical impacts are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. Additional study characteristics such as type of ML algorithm, sample size, type of data, ethnicity/race, age, gender, comparator and/or competitor can be found in Supplementary Table 3. The included studies apply a variety of different ML techniques and utilize electronic health records (EHR), genetic, neuroimaging, psychometric, and internet-based data to make predictions with regard to AUD and AUD-related outcomes (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Overview of the types of data utilized and brief descriptions of the various applied machine learning methods in our selected studies for predictions on alcohol use disorder and related outcomes. Abbreviations: electroencephalography (EEG); electronic health record (EHR); functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI); genome wide association study (GWAS); machine learning (ML); magnetic resonance imaging (MRI); polygenic risk score (PRS).

Screening for AUD

Five of the 70 studies included in this review aimed to simplify mass screening for AUD by using electronically available data for alcohol misuse identification. Among them, three studies used only data readily available in EHR, including structured data and non-structured clinical notes interpreted through natural language processing (NLP) for identifying alcohol misuse.(15–17) Highest performance was achieved using a logistic regression model (accuracy 0.91) with 25 input features collected via NLP.(17) The other two studies utilized social media platforms to screen for alcohol misuse-related behaviors. ML models were developed to classify binge drinking tweets(18) or Instagram posts(19) to identify risk of alcohol and/or drug misuse. However, largely due to ambiguities in assessing tweets, differentiating genuine and non-genuine users was difficult and affected the models' accuracy (0.67 ± 0.05).

Diagnosis/identification/discrimination of AUD

A substantial number of the studies focused on AUD diagnosis. These studies utilized a variety of data types, including laboratory measurements from blood tests, polysomnography, functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), electroencephalography (EEG), and genotypic and/or phenotypic data. Single, indirect biomarker-based blood tests are not considered accurate for AUD diagnosis;(20) however, combinations of biomarkers used together with ML classified alcohol misuse successfully.(21–23) A combination of 2-5 biomarkers were analyzed using decision trees, artificial neural networks (NNs), and multivariate unequal dispersed class models. All three studies found mean corpuscular volume of red blood cells and gamma glutamyltransferase to be important features in their final models.

ML methods were developed to differentiate AUD and non-AUD individuals using neurobiological data. Polysomnographic data and neurobiological data were analyzed using feed-forward NNs, achieving 98% accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity, and demonstrating that alcohol addiction correlates with deep sleep impairment.(24) This research also reported that importance of features varied between men, women, and mixed sex groups.(24)

Most ML-based studies in the field of neuroimaging for AUD diagnosis fell into two major categories: identifying AUD from differences in structural data, network connectivity, or brain volume based on neuroimaging(25–32), and identifying AUD from EEG data where features were derived from electrical signals.(33–44) ML models based on neuroimaging was predominantly trained with MRI data collected from dozens of participants with or without AUD or known alcohol-dependent behaviors.(25–32) Of these studies, several have developed and tested models based solely on structural and/or network connectivity data collected by fMRI, thereby identifying potential neuroimaging markers of alcohol dependency detected by standard imaging techniques.(25,28,30) Others have supplemented neuroimaging with other data sources and variables to refine diagnostic accuracy; these included neuropsychological scoring (variables of memory span and scored results of the visual span test), psychosocial factors related to behavior and environment (history of substance use, relationship and friendship status, personality traits, and emotional traits), and human immunodeficiency virus-AUD comorbid status.(26,27,32) Two neuroimaging studies by Wang et al. outperformed other contemporary studies with similar dataset sizes; one study detected AUD by identifying features weighted by a convolutional NN trained from 160 images and tested on 159,(29) another study assigned feature weights via a transfer learning model trained on 100 images and tested on 135.(31)

AUD diagnostic models that are based on EEG data appear to outperform those based on neuroimaging data, although a direct comparison is not possible because of variation in reported performance metrics and incomplete records of data missingness. Utilizing EEG data, relatively high diagnostic accuracy ranging from 80-99% was reported, in comparison to neuroimaging studies ranging from 67-87% accuracy, with the exception of Wang et al.'s imaging-based algorithms achieving 97% accuracy.(29,31,33–46) Studies using EEG features have consistently shown strong results when employing support vector machine (SVM) or least-squares support vector machine (LS-SVM) architecture, although methods for extracting and decomposing EEG features have differed widely.(33,34,37,38,40–46) Other studies developed and tested multiple models from the same datasets of extracted EEG features, with SVM, LS-SVM, and convolutional NN-based architectures generally yielding the most reliable results.(37,39,42,44–46) Strong performance was also demonstrated from 10-fold cross-validation test data collected from single channels and even single electrodes, with Hussain et al. reporting AUROC values of 0.976 to 0.998 from multi-scale entropy- and fast multi-scale entropy-based models using data from the C3 central electrode and Kumar et al. reporting an SVM-based model's classification accuracy of 88% using data from only the F4 channel.(37,45)

ML using genotypic and phenotypic data has been useful to comprehensively analyze large datasets in AUD research. Phenotypic analysis was explored by Li et al. and Falk et al. using NNs for AUD diagnosis, where features of drinking patterns and its effects and phenotypic variables resulted in 95% prediction accuracy.(47,48) Yu et al. studied microsatellite markers to evaluate the linkage between AUD and specific genomic regions.(49) Chen et al. used single nucleotide

polymorphisms (SNPs) combined with age, education level, and marital status to create a personalized approach to discriminate between alcohol dependent and non-alcohol dependent patients.(50) Another study demonstrated that salivary microRNAs (miRNAs) may potentially be used to recognize alcohol dependence (AD).(51)

Predicting AUD severity

Beyond AUD diagnosis, assessment of AUD severity is a critical area of research. Fede et al. examined the association of AUD severity as measured via Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) and differences in patient neurobiology by applying ML to MRI scans.(52) Their results indicated an ML model based on resting state-connectivity features can best distinguish varying levels of AUD severity, and can potentially be used as neuroimaging biomarkers for clinical evaluation.

Risk factors for alcohol use

Analysis of risk factors for AUD using ML was also investigated. Particularly, in genetics, random forest analyses with and without X chromosome data produced variable importance estimates for X chromosome variants when biological sex was associated with AUD.(53) Sex differences in the heritability of alcohol misuse was previously demonstrated.(54,55) However, most ML models incorporating genetic data did not correctly model the effects of the X chromosome SNPs for several reasons: X chromosome data were routinely excluded from GWAS(56); the number of X chromosome copies is confounded with sex necessitating special analysis; and incorporation of X chromosome inactivation into statistical analysis remains difficult because its mechanisms are not yet fully understood.(57)

Predicting future alcohol use

Predicting future development of AUD using ML is an active area of research. A comprehensive prospective study conducted by King, et al., developed a logistic regression model to predict future occurrence of hazardous drinking.(58) The model identified sex, age, country, AUDIT score, panic syndrome, and lifetime alcohol problem as risk factors, and resulted in a c-index value of 0.78 in the external validation test set of non-AUD Chilean drinkers. In a separate study, SNPs were used to predict who is likely to develop AUD and identify biomarkers that indicate a predisposition to AUD.(59) Results demonstrated that models that combined genetic and electrophysiology features achieved higher accuracy compared to one-dimensional models.

Prediction of treatment outcomes

While majority of the studies included in this review aimed to predict and diagnose alcohol misuse, 19 studies focused on prediction of AUD treatment outcome,(60–78) and one study was directed at identifying treatment seeking AUD patients.(79) Several studies developed ML methods to predict relapse,(60,61,64–66,69) most of which reported demographic data, behavioral and psychological measures, alcohol consumption, and dependence severity measures as important predictors. Methods to predict AUD treatment outcomes after cognitive behavioral therapy reported moderate accuracy.(60,61,69) Symons et al. 2019(61) and 2020(60) reported that their ML models outperformed clinical judgment for predicting treatment outcome when given the same data, including drinking-related measures, demographic, and psychological assessment data. However, these models yielded poor sensitivities, ranging from 8 - 43%. Treatment outcome

predictions based on data from a self-help intervention internet diary(62) or a smartphone application(68) have demonstrated high accessibility.

ML methods were used to make accurate predictions of health-related outcomes for AUD patients as well, including risk of withdrawal seizures and mortality. Models assessing risk of alcohol withdrawal seizures using homocysteine data(70,71) and prediction of alcohol withdrawal severity(72) may help clinicians determine treatment course. Survival prediction models using ML algorithms were also developed for alcohol-dependent patients with severe liver disease(73) or drug intoxication(74) upon hospital admission based on demographic data, clinical variables, and medical history. The ML model developed by Lapuerta et al.(73) outperformed the Maddrey score(80) in predicting survival of severe liver disease patients (ROC area of 81.5% vs. 73.8%).

ML approaches have also impacted the prediction of subgroups of individuals who may benefit from specific pharmacotherapy.(75–78) Laska et al. focused on identifying responders to Gabapentin Enacarbil Extended-Release using demographic, substance use indicators, and psychiatric characteristics.(77) Other researchers utilized genetic information: Hou et al. and Wei et al. examined SNPs to identify subgroups that will benefit from ondansetron treatment for AUD.(75,76) Lin et al. investigated how *OPRM1* promoter CpG site methylation affects relapse in individuals taking naltrexone for alcohol dependence.(78)

AUD in adolescents

Consumption of alcohol during adolescence may disrupt neurodevelopmental trajectories.(81) Several ML studies have incorporated multifactorial neurological characteristics as well as

demographic, behavioral, cognitive, and clinical features to identify risk factors and predict AUD in adolescents. Squeglia et al. employed ML on multiple data sources in a longitudinal study of substance-naive adolescents to identify predictors of alcohol use by age 18, half of which were sMRI and fMRI variables.(82)

Additional studies used multiple algorithms to investigate the interaction of features that are specific for alcohol use in adolescents. These studies identified risk factors (83–85) or predicted alcohol misuse (86) in adolescents using combinations of demographic, psychopathological and personality data, socioeconomic data, and cognitive measures. The influence of peers and parents, and respondents' sex (male) had the highest impact on substance use initiation during childhood for Mexican youths.(84) In contrast, personality and psychopathology factors yielded the highest prediction accuracy indices in a prospective study of Canadian and Australian adolescents.(86) Particularly, personality traits such as disorderliness and extravagance was correlated with both current and future adolescent binge drinkers.(85)

Neuroimaging was also used in a unique study that investigated potential biomarkers of resilience to alcohol misuse in youths. Weidacker et al. concluded that grey matter myelinations (myeloarchitecture) could be a potential protective biomarker, as greater baseline myeloarchitecture predicted a lower risk for harmful alcohol use at two-year follow-up.(87)

Impulsivity is another aspect of interest for AUD prediction in adolescents. Sex-dependent differential trajectories of impulsivity in high school students may increase an individual's susceptibility to substance use disorder, including alcohol.(88) Ruan et al. found that impulsivity

did not decline [as in normal development] for adolescents who initiated binge drinking.(89) Other studies showed that AUD could be predicted using impulsivity variables based on brain activity, personality, and psychological factors(90) and that not all facets of impulsivity may be associated with AUD.(91)

Overall, 66 of the 70 the studies included in this review exhibited a moderate or high risk of bias, predominantly from a lack of external validation in algorithm development, and missing data (Supplementary Table 4). 25 (35.7%) of studies included in this review were scored as a high risk of bias, 41 (58.6%) as a moderate risk of bias, and 4 (5.7%) as a low risk of bias in our analysis.

DISCUSSION

This systematic literature review presents the current state of research for ML for alcohol misuse, AUD, and AUD-associated consequences. To our knowledge this is the first systematic review to provide an overview of ML-based techniques for alcohol misuse and AUD. While it is not possible to directly compare all of the included studies because of differences in the parameters, cohorts, type of data, and assessment approaches used, overall this overview demonstrates encouraging results for the use of ML for the identification and treatment of individuals with AUD-related predictions. This review highlights research that used readily available EHR data and neuroimaging data to accurately identify and diagnose individuals with AUD, including adolescents at high risk. Several genetic-based studies demonstrate the potential of using ML to analyze genetic variations for personalized treatments or prediction of the risk of AUD. We also identified several ML-based studies that use clinical measures to predict effectiveness of a particular treatment plan, risk stratify patients to improve health outcomes, and determine potential

relapse. These diverse ML-based studies identified numerous significant variables for AUD and AUD-related predictions (Figure 3).




Figure 3. Summary of significant predictors for alcohol use disorder-related predictions identified in our systematic review. Abbreviations: Alcohol use disorder (AUD); DNA methylation (DNAm); liver transplantation (LT); microRNA (miRNA).

The use of ML to assist in diagnosis and risk assessment in healthcare is potentially powerful, given the rich and variable data sources available. Use of multiple data sources in ML, including neuroimaging, electrophysiological, cognitive, genetic, socioecological, psychological, and demographic data, facilitates better classification accuracy in numerous studies in comparison to single dimensional data.(85,92) Multi-dimensional modeling may better identify the underlying pathophysiology of a complex disease such as AUD, and may lead to improved prediction methods for diagnosis, risk stratification of patients, and healthcare resource allocation. ML may reveal data relationships or potential predictors not previously known in the field, such as specific measures of impulsivity, SNPs, or laboratory measures associated with AUD. These findings can be used to

identify significant areas to investigate for future AUD research to address current barriers, such as treatment utilization rates and AUD relapse.

Implementing ML methods may reach larger, currently underserved patient populations. ML-based tools that use readily available EHR data may cost-effectively diagnose AUD with no additional burden on the clinician and may increase the low AUD screening rates.(6) ML in combination with other modern technologies like social media and internet based self-help tools may be useful to those who might otherwise go undiagnosed or not seek treatment. Top reported reasons for not seeking AUD treatment are a ‘lack of problem awareness’, ‘stigma or shame’, ‘encounter barriers’, and ‘cope alone’.(93) Convenient ML-based tools that rely on easily accessible EHR data or internet data such as the ones described in this review have the potential to overcome these limitations by screening more of the public or providing a more anonymous means of receiving care for those whose shame prevents them from seeking treatment.

Genetic and neuroimaging-based studies showed considerable innovation in the field because they may provide clinicians with methods to predict AUD and treatment outcomes without relying on largely biased and unreliable self-reported patient behavior.(94) As genetic and neuroimaging techniques develop and data become more widely available,(95) the accuracy of predicting AUD with increasingly innovative ML approaches will likely continue to improve over time. These methods can be efficiently integrated into contemporary healthcare delivery information systems. The outstanding sensitivity and high to very high specificity of the neuroimaging-based algorithms (MRI-based methods sensitivity: 97%, specificity: 97%(29,31); EEG-based methods sensitivity:

90-99.99%, specificity: 82-99.97%(33–35,38,40,41,44)) show their potential to assist clinicians in diagnosing and intervening in AUD development.

These findings also emphasize that ML methods are well equipped to address the multi-faceted nature of alcohol use and the complexity of pathological behavior in adolescents. Diverse risk factors are potentially influential in children and adolescents at different ages, where they exhibit nuanced individual differences in maturity and development. As the use of ML techniques to develop computerized tests is an emerging trend in mental health,(96) these studies affirm the potential of using ML algorithms in the development of versatile computerized tests for the broad screening of high-risk adolescents in both clinical and school settings. From a clinical perspective, this would allow the early identification and intervention of at-risk adolescents, conceivably mitigating future harm caused by alcohol misuse.

Most of our selected studies exhibited a high or moderate risk of bias. Future studies in this field may aim to reduce bias by assessing algorithm performance in external dataset validations. Some algorithms did not achieve sufficient performance to be implemented in healthcare. Future work may also include refining ML techniques and enhanced research efforts in this field to work towards integration of these models into routine clinical care.

There are several limitations in our systematic review. The screening process included determining whether a study's methods were considered to be ML or conventional statistics at our discretion, potentially introducing bias in screening. The risk of bias assessment and potential bias sources were also manually determined for each study. Several of the included studies did not use a

comparator for reference on ML models' performance, therefore it was not possible to determine if those studies improved predictions compared to current methods.

CONCLUSIONS

Here we presented a systematic literature review on the use of ML-based techniques for AUD and AUD-related consequences concerning health, treatment, recovery, and prevention. This systematic review summarizes the current state of research and identifies future research opportunities for AUD. The research presented has established the versatility and usefulness of ML in AUD, utilizing data from highly diverse sources (including EHR, neuroimaging, genetic, and psychometric data) to generate accurate classification and predictions. Although further investigation and refinement is needed, available evidence suggests that ML-based tools for clinical practice in AUD show promise.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

MH performed full text screening, created figures, extracted data, and contributed to the writing. AS conceived the study, designed the search strategy, performed title/abstract screening, performed full text screening, and edited the manuscript. MMA performed full text screening, created tables and figures, extracted data, and contributed to the writing. ZI performed title/abstract screening, extracted data, and contributed to the writing. DE extracted data and contributed to the writing. JH provided oversight and leadership responsibility. All authors verify that they had full access to the data in this systematic review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge Dr. Nicole S. Zelin and Dr. Abigail Green-Saxena for their assistance with title and abstract screening. Figure 2 was created with BioRender.com.

DATA SHARING

Data are based on the reported findings of published articles listed in the tables and are available online.

REFERENCES

1. Understanding Alcohol Use Disorder | National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) [Internet]. [cited 2022 May 1]. Available from: <https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/brochures-and-fact-sheets/understanding-alcohol-use-disorder>
2. The global burden of disease attributable to alcohol and drug use in 195 countries and territories, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2018 Dec;5(12):987–1012.
3. Esser MB, Sherk A, Liu Y, Naimi TS, Stockwell T, Stahre M, et al. Deaths and Years of Potential Life Lost From Excessive Alcohol Use — United States, 2011–2015. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020 Jul 31;69(30):981–7.
4. The US Burden of Disease Collaborators. The State of US Health, 1990-2016: Burden of Diseases, Injuries, and Risk Factors Among US States. *JAMA*. 2018 Apr 10;319(14):1444–72.
5. US Preventive Services Task Force. Screening and Behavioral Counseling Interventions to Reduce Unhealthy Alcohol Use in Adolescents and Adults: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA*. 2018 Nov 13;320(18):1899–909.
6. McKnight-Eily LR, Liu Y, Brewer RD, Kanny D, Lu H, Denny CH, et al. Vital Signs: Communication Between Health Professionals and Their Patients About Alcohol Use — 44 States and the District of Columbia, 2011. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2014 Jan 10;63(1):16–22.
7. Naimi TS, Town M, Mokdad AH, Brewer RD. Health Care Access Among U.S. Adults Who Drink Alcohol Excessively: Missed Opportunities for Prevention. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2006 Mar 15;3(2):A53.
8. McLellan AT, Lewis DC, O'Brien CP, Kleber HD. Drug dependence, a chronic medical illness: implications for treatment, insurance, and outcomes evaluation. *JAMA*. 2000 Oct 4;284(13):1689–95.
9. Jayatilake SMDAC, Ganegoda GU. Involvement of Machine Learning Tools in Healthcare

- Decision Making. *J Healthc Eng*. 2021 Jan 27;2021:6679512.
10. Bohr A, Memarzadeh K. The rise of artificial intelligence in healthcare applications. *Artif Intell Healthc*. 2020;25–60.
 11. Calvert J, Desautels T, Chettipally U, Barton C, Hoffman J, Jay M, et al. High-performance detection and early prediction of septic shock for alcohol-use disorder patients. *Ann Med Surg*. 2016 Jun 1;8:50–5.
 12. Calvert JS, Price DA, Chettipally UK, Barton CW, Feldman MD, Hoffman JL, et al. A computational approach to early sepsis detection. *Comput Biol Med*. 2016 Jul 1;74:69–73.
 13. Drinking Levels Defined | National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 7]. Available from: <https://www.niaaa.nih.gov/alcohol-health/overview-alcohol-consumption/moderate-binge-drinking>
 14. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021 Mar 29;372:n71.
 15. Bonnell LN, Littenberg B, Wshah SR, Rose GL. A machine learning approach to identification of unhealthy drinking. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2020;33(3):397–406.
 16. Afshar M, Phillips A, Karnik N, Mueller J, To D, Gonzalez R, et al. Natural language processing and machine learning to identify alcohol misuse from the electronic health record in trauma patients: development and internal validation. *J Am Med Inform Assoc JAMIA*. 2019 01;26(3):254–61.
 17. To D, Sharma B, Karnik N, Joyce C, Dligach D, Afshar M. Validation of an alcohol misuse classifier in hospitalized patients. *Alcohol*. 2020;84((To D.; Joyce C.; Afshar M., majid.afshar@lumc.edu) Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University Chicago, Maywood, IL, United States):49–55.
 18. Crocamo C, Viviani M, Bartoli F, Carrà G, Pasi G. Detecting binge drinking and alcohol-related risky behaviours from twitter’s users: An exploratory content-and topology-based analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* [Internet]. 2020;17(5). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2003865143&from=export>
 19. Hassanpour S, Tomita N, DeLise T, Crosier B, Marsch LA. Identifying substance use risk based on deep neural networks and Instagram social media data. *Neuropsychopharmacol Off Publ Am Coll Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2019;44(3):487–94.
 20. Arnts J, Vanlerberghe BTK, Roozen S, Crunelle CL, Masclee AAM, Olde-Damink SWM, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Biomarkers of Alcohol Use in Patients With Liver Disease: A Systematic Review. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2021 Jan;45(1):25–37.
 21. Maurelli G, Di Giulio M. Artificial neural networks for the identification of the differences between “light” and “heavy” alcoholics, starting from five nonlinear biological variables. *Subst Use Misuse*. 1998;33(3):693–708.
 22. Dinevski D, Povalej P, Kravos M. Intelligent data analysis for the diagnosis of alcohol dependence syndrome. *J Int Med Res*. 2011;39(3):988–1000.
 23. Pirro V, Oliveri P, Scutteri B, Salvo R, Salomone A, Lanteri S, et al. Multivariate strategies for screening evaluation of harmful drinking. *Bioanalysis*. 2013;5(6):687–99.
 24. Lewenstein K, Ślubowska E, Hawłas HJ. Alcohol addiction diagnosis on the basis of the polysomnographic parameters. *Pol J Med Phys Eng*. 2020;26(3):161–7.
 25. Guggenmos M, Scheel M, Sekutowicz M, Garbusow M, Sebold M, Sommer C, et al. Decoding diagnosis and lifetime consumption in alcohol dependence from grey-matter pattern information. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2018;137(3):252–62.
 26. Kamarajan C, Ardekani BA, Pandey AK, Kinreich S, Pandey G, Chorlian DB, et al. Random forest classification of alcohol use disorder using fMRI functional connectivity, neuropsychological functioning, and impulsivity measures. *Brain Sci* [Internet]. 2020;10(2). Available from:

- <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2003822789&from=export>
27. Gowin JL, Manza P, Ramchandani VA, Volkow ND. Neuropsychosocial markers of binge drinking in young adults. *Mol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2020;((Gowin J.L., joshua.gowin@cuanschutz.edu) Department of Radiology, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, United States). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2004903156&from=export>
 28. Hahn S, Mackey S, Cousijn J, Foxe JJ, Heinz A, Hester R, et al. Predicting alcohol dependence from multi-site brain structural measures. *Hum Brain Mapp* [Internet]. 2020;((Hahn S., saahn@uvm.edu; Mackey S.; Orr C.; Allgaier N.; Garavan H.) Department of Psychiatry, University of Vermont College of Medicine, Burlington, VT, United States). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2006973801&from=export>
 29. Wang SH, Xie S, Chen X, Guttery DS, Tang C, Sun J, et al. Alcoholism identification based on an Alexnet transfer learning model. *Front Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2019;10(APR). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L628245662&from=export>
 30. Zhu X, Du X, Kerich M, Lohoff FW, Momenan R. Random forest based classification of alcohol dependence patients and healthy controls using resting state MRI. *Neurosci Lett*. 2018 May 29;676:27–33.
 31. Wang SH, Lv YD, Sui Y, Liu S, Wang SJ, Zhang YD. Alcoholism Detection by Data Augmentation and Convolutional Neural Network with Stochastic Pooling. *J Med Syst*. 2017 Nov 17;42(1):2.
 32. Adeli E, Zahr NM, Pfefferbaum A, Sullivan EV, Pohl KM. Novel Machine Learning Identifies Brain Patterns Distinguishing Diagnostic Membership of Human Immunodeficiency Virus, Alcoholism, and Their Comorbidity of Individuals. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging*. 2019 Jun;4(6):589–99.
 33. Acharya UR, Sree SV, Chattopadhyay S, Suri JS. Automated diagnosis of normal and alcoholic EEG signals. *Int J Neural Syst*. 2012 Jun;22(3):1250011.
 34. Bae Y, Yoo BW, Lee JC, Kim HC. Automated network analysis to measure brain effective connectivity estimated from EEG data of patients with alcoholism. *Physiol Meas*. 2017 May;38(5):759–73.
 35. Mumtaz W, Vuong PL, Xia L, Malik AS, Rashid RBA. An EEG-based machine learning method to screen alcohol use disorder. *Cogn Neurodyn*. 2017;11(2):161–71.
 36. Padma Shri TK, Sriraam N. Pattern recognition of spectral entropy features for detection of alcoholic and control visual ERP's in multichannel EEGs. *Brain Inform*. 2017;4(2):147–58.
 37. Hussain L, Aziz W, Saeed S, Shah SA, Nadeem MSA, Awan IA, et al. Quantifying the dynamics of electroencephalographic (EEG) signals to distinguish alcoholic and non-alcoholic subjects using an MSE based K-d tree algorithm. *Biomed Tech*. 2018;63(4):481–90.
 38. Mehla VK, Singhal A, Singh P. A novel approach for automated alcoholism detection using Fourier decomposition method. *J Neurosci Methods* [Internet]. 2020;346((Mehla V.K.; Singhal A., amit.singhal@bennett.edu.in) Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, Bennett University, Greater Noida, India). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2007806451&from=export>
 39. Faust O, Yanti R, Yu W. Automated detection of alcohol related changes in electroencephalograph signals. *J Med Imaging Health Inform*. 2013;3(2):333–9.

40. Anuragi A, Singh Sisodia D. Alcohol use disorder detection using EEG Signal features and flexible analytical wavelet transform. *Biomed Signal Process Control*. 2019;52((Anuragi A.) Department of Information and Technology, National Institute of Technology Raipur, India):384–93.
41. Anuragi A, Sisodia DSS. Empirical wavelet transform based automated alcoholism detecting using EEG signal features. *Biomed Signal Process Control* [Internet]. 2020;57((Anuragi A.; Sisodia D.S.S., dssisodia.cs@nitrr.ac.in) National Institute of Technology Raipur, GE Road, Raipur, India). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2004141557&from=export>
42. Zhang H, Silva FHS, Ohata EF, Medeiros AG, Rebouças Filho PP. Bi-Dimensional Approach Based on Transfer Learning for Alcoholism Pre-disposition Classification via EEG Signals. *Front Hum Neurosci* [Internet]. 2020;14((Zhang H., zhanghongyi@xmut.edu.cn) School of Opto-Electronic and Communication Engineering, Xiamen University of Technology, Xiamen, China). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L633009774&from=export>
43. Kumar S, Ghosh S, Sinha RK. Using computational classifiers to detect chronic alcoholism. *J Clin Eng*. 2016;41(2):90–4.
44. Mumtaz W, Saad MNBM, Kamel N, Ali SSA, Malik AS. An EEG-based functional connectivity measure for automatic detection of alcohol use disorder. *Artif Intell Med*. 2018 Jan;84:79–89.
45. Kumar S, Ghosh S, Tetarway S, Sinha RK. Support vector machine and fuzzy C-mean clustering-based comparative evaluation of changes in motor cortex electroencephalogram under chronic alcoholism. *Med Biol Eng Comput*. 2015 Jul;53(7):609–22.
46. Zhu G, Li Y, Wen PP, Wang S. Analysis of alcoholic EEG signals based on horizontal visibility graph entropy. *Brain Inform*. 2014;1(1–4):19–25.
47. Li W, Haghighi F, Falk CT. Design of artificial neural network and its applications to the analysis of alcoholism data. *Genet Epidemiol*. 1999;17 Suppl 1:S223-228.
48. Falk CT. Diagnosis of alcoholism based on neural network analysis of phenotypic risk factors. *BMC Genet*. 2005 Dec 30;6 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S131.
49. Yu R, Shete S. Analysis of alcoholism data using support vector machines. *BMC Genet*. 2005 Dec 30;6 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S136.
50. Chen F, Xiao M, Chen C, Chen C, Yan Z, Han H, et al. Discrimination of alcohol dependence based on the convolutional neural network. *PLoS ONE* [Internet]. 2020;15(10 October). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2008446826&from=export>
51. Rosato AJ, Chen X, Tanaka Y, Farrer LA, Kranzler HR, Nunez YZ, et al. Salivary microRNAs identified by small RNA sequencing and machine learning as potential biomarkers of alcohol dependence. *Epigenomics*. 2019;11(7):739–49.
52. Fede SJ, Grodin EN, Dean SF, Diazgranados N, Momenan R. Resting state connectivity best predicts alcohol use severity in moderate to heavy alcohol users. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2019;22:101782.
53. Winham SJ, Jenkins GD, Biernacka JM. Modeling X Chromosome Data Using Random Forests: Conquering Sex Bias. *Genet Epidemiol*. 2016 Feb;40(2):123–32.
54. Hardie TL, Moss HB, Lynch KG. Sex Differences in the Heritability of Alcohol Problems. *Am J Addict*. 2008;17(4):319–27.
55. Prescott CA, Aggen SH, Kendler KS. Sex Differences in the Sources of Genetic Liability to Alcohol Abuse and Dependence in a Population-Based Sample of U.S. Twins. *Alcohol Clin*

- Exp Res. 1999;23(7):1136–44.
56. Wise AL, Gyi L, Manolio TA. eXclusion: Toward Integrating the X Chromosome in Genome-wide Association Analyses. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2013 May 2;92(5):643–7.
 57. Wu H, Luo J, Yu H, Rattner A, Mo A, Wang Y, et al. Cellular resolution maps of X-chromosome inactivation: implications for neural development, function, and disease. *Neuron.* 2014 Jan 8;81(1):103–19.
 58. King M, Marston L, Švab I, Maaros HI, Geerlings MI, Xavier M, et al. Development and validation of a risk model for prediction of hazardous alcohol consumption in general practice attendees: the predictAL study. *PLoS One.* 2011;6(8):e22175.
 59. Kinreich S, Meyers JL, Maron-Katz A, Kamarajan C, Pandey AK, Chorlian DB, et al. Predicting risk for Alcohol Use Disorder using longitudinal data with multimodal biomarkers and family history: a machine learning study. *Mol Psychiatry [Internet].* 2019;((Kinreich S., sivan.kinreich@downstate.edu; Meyers J.L.; Kamarajan C.; Pandey A.K.; Chorlian D.B.; Zhang J.; Pandey G.; Subbie-Saenz de Viteri S.; Pitti D.; Porjesz B.) Department of Psychiatry, State University of New York Downstate Medical Center, Brooklyn, NY, United States). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2003513272&from=export>
 60. Symons M, Feeney GFX, Gallagher MR, Young RM, Connor JP. Predicting alcohol dependence treatment outcomes: a prospective comparative study of clinical psychologists versus “trained” machine learning models. *Addict Abingdon Engl.* 2020;115(11):2164–75.
 61. Symons M, Feeney GFX, Gallagher MR, Young RM, Connor JP. Machine learning vs addiction therapists: A pilot study predicting alcohol dependence treatment outcome from patient data in behavior therapy with adjunctive medication. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 2019;99:156–62.
 62. Lindner P, Johansson M, Gajecki M, Berman AH. Using alcohol consumption diary data from an internet intervention for outcome and predictive modeling: a validation and machine learning study. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2020;20(1):111.
 63. Sekutowicz M, Guggenmos M, Kuitunen-Paul S, Garbusow M, Sebold M, Pelz P, et al. Neural Response Patterns During Pavlovian-to-Instrumental Transfer Predict Alcohol Relapse and Young Adult Drinking. *Biol Psychiatry.* 2019;86(11):857–63.
 64. Seo S, Mohr J, Beck A, Wüstenberg T, Heinz A, Obermayer K. Predicting the future relapse of alcohol-dependent patients from structural and functional brain images. *Addict Biol.* 2015;20(6):1042–55.
 65. Winterer G, Ziller M, Klöppel B, Heinz A, Schmidt LG, Herrmann WM. Analysis of quantitative EEG with artificial neural networks and discriminant analysis--a methodological comparison. *Neuropsychobiology.* 1998;37(1):41–8.
 66. Winterer G, Klöppel B, Heinz A, Ziller M, Dufeu P, Schmidt LG, et al. Quantitative EEG (QEEG) predicts relapse in patients with chronic alcoholism and points to a frontally pronounced cerebral disturbance. *Psychiatry Res.* 1998 Mar 20;78(1–2):101–13.
 67. Satapathy SK, Thornburgh C, Heda R, Jiang Y, Kedia SK, Nair SP, et al. Predicting harmful alcohol relapse after liver transplant: The HALT score. *Clin Transplant [Internet].* 2020;34(9). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L2005484086&from=export>
 68. Chih MY, Patton T, McTavish FM, Isham AJ, Judkins-Fisher CL, Atwood AK, et al. Predictive modeling of addiction lapses in a mobile health application. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 2014;46(1):29–35.
 69. Connor JP, Symons M, Feeney GFX, Young RM, Wiles J. The application of machine learning techniques as an adjunct to clinical decision making in alcohol dependence treatment. *Subst Use Misuse.* 2007;42(14):2193–206.

70. Kurth C, Wegerer V, Degner D, Sperling W, Kornhuber J, Paulus W, et al. Risk assessment of alcohol withdrawal seizures with a Kohonen feature map. *NeuroReport*. 2001;12(6):1235–8.
71. Hillemacher T, Frieling H, Wilhelm J, Heberlein A, Karagülle D, Bleich S, et al. Indicators for elevated risk factors for alcohol-withdrawal seizures: an analysis using a random forest algorithm. *J Neural Transm Vienna Austria* 1996. 2012 Nov;119(11):1449–53.
72. Burkhardt G, Adorjan K, Kambeitz J, Kambeitz-Illankovic L, Falkai P, Eyer F, et al. A machine learning approach to risk assessment for alcohol withdrawal syndrome. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2020 Jun 1;35:61–70.
73. Lapuerta P, Rajan S, Bonacini M. Neural networks as predictors of outcomes in alcoholic patients with severe liver disease. *Hepatology*. 1997;25(2):302–6.
74. Choi Y, Boo Y. Comparing Logistic Regression Models with Alternative Machine Learning Methods to Predict the Risk of Drug Intoxication Mortality. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020 Jan 31;17(3).
75. Hou J, Seneviratne C, Su X, Taylor J, Johnson B, Wang XQ, et al. Subgroup Identification in Personalized Treatment of Alcohol Dependence. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2015;39(7):1253–9.
76. Wei Y, Liu L, Su X, Zhao L, Jiang H. Precision medicine: Subgroup identification in longitudinal trajectories. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2020;29(9):2603–16.
77. Laska EM, Siegel CE, Lin Z, Bogenschutz M, Marmar CR. Gabapentin Enacarbil Extended-Release Versus Placebo: A Likely Responder Reanalysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2020;44(9):1875–84.
78. Lin Y, Kranzler HR, Farrer LA, Xu H, Henderson DC, Zhang H. An analysis of the effect of mu-opioid receptor gene (OPRM1) promoter region DNA methylation on the response of naltrexone treatment of alcohol dependence. *Pharmacogenomics J*. 2020;20(5):672–80.
79. Lee MR, Sankar V, Hammer A, Kennedy WG, Barb JJ, McQueen PG, et al. Using Machine Learning to Classify Individuals With Alcohol Use Disorder Based on Treatment Seeking Status. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2019;12((Lee M.R., leemary@mail.nih.gov; Sankar V.; Hammer A.; Leggio L.) Section on Clinical Psychoneuroendocrinology and Neuropsychopharmacology, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, United States):70–8.
80. Monsanto P, Almeida N, Lrias C, Pina JE, Sofia C. Evaluation of MELD score and Maddrey discriminant function for mortality prediction in patients with alcoholic hepatitis. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 2013 Aug;60(125):1089–94.
81. Squeglia LM, Jacobus J, Tapert SF. Chapter 28 - The effect of alcohol use on human adolescent brain structures and systems. In: Sullivan EV, Pfefferbaum A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology* [Internet]. Elsevier; 2014 [cited 2021 Sep 22]. p. 501–10. (Alcohol and the Nervous System; vol. 125). Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444626196000288>
82. Squeglia LM, Ball TM, Jacobus J, Brumback T, McKenna BS, Nguyen-Louie TT, et al. Neural Predictors of Initiating Alcohol Use During Adolescence. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2017 Feb 1;174(2):172–85.
83. García EG, López RJ, Moreno JJM, Abad AS, Blasco BC, Pol AP. The methodology of Data Mining. An application to alcohol consumption in teenagers. *Adicciones*. 2009;21(1):65–80.
84. Vázquez AL, Domenech Rodríguez MM, Barrett TS, Schwartz S, Amador Buenabad NG, Bustos Gamiño MN, et al. Innovative Identification of Substance Use Predictors: Machine Learning in a National Sample of Mexican Children. *Prev Sci Off J Soc Prev Res*. 2020;21(2):171–81.
85. Whelan R, Watts R, Orr CA, Althoff RR, Artiges E, Banaschewski T, et al. Neuropsychosocial profiles of current and future adolescent alcohol misusers. *Nature*.

- 2014 Aug 14;512(7513):185–9.
86. Afzali MH, Sunderland M, Stewart S, Masse B, Seguin J, Newton N, et al. Machine-learning prediction of adolescent alcohol use: a cross-study, cross-cultural validation. *Addict Abingdon Engl*. 2019;114(4):662–71.
 87. Weidacker K, Kim SG, Buhl-Callesen M, Jensen M, Pedersen MU, Thomsen KR, et al. The prediction of resilience to alcohol consumption in youths: insular and subcallosal cingulate myeloarchitecture. *Psychol Med*. 2020;((Weidacker K.; Kim S.-G.; Voon V.) Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom):1–11.
 88. Martinez-Loredo V, Fernandez-Hermida JR, De La Torre-Luque A, Fernandez-Artamendi S. Trajectories of impulsivity by sex predict substance use and heavy drinking. *Addict Behav*. 2018;85:164–72.
 89. Ruan H, Zhou Y, Luo Q, Robert GH, Desrivieres S, Quinlan EB, et al. Adolescent binge drinking disrupts normal trajectories of brain functional organization and personality maturation. *NeuroImage Clin*. 2019;22:101804.
 90. O'Halloran L, Rueda-Delgado LM, Jollans L, Cao Z, Boyle R, Vaughan C, et al. Inhibitory-control event-related potentials correlate with individual differences in alcohol use. *Addict Biol [Internet]*. 2020;25(2). Available from: <https://www.embase.com/search/results?subaction=viewrecord&id=L626964066&from=export>
 91. O'Halloran L, Pennie B, Jollans L, Kiiski H, Vahey N, Rai L, et al. A Combination of Impulsivity Subdomains Predict Alcohol Intoxication Frequency. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2018;42(8):1530–40.
 92. Yang H, Liu J, Sui J, Pearlson G, Calhoun VD. A Hybrid Machine Learning Method for Fusing fMRI and Genetic Data: Combining both Improves Classification of Schizophrenia. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2010 Oct 25;4:192.
 93. Probst C, Manthey J, Martinez A, Rehm J. Alcohol use disorder severity and reported reasons not to seek treatment: a cross-sectional study in European primary care practices. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2015 Aug 12;10:32.
 94. Devaux M, Sassi F. Social disparities in hazardous alcohol use: self-report bias may lead to incorrect estimates. *Eur J Public Health*. 2016 Feb;26(1):129–34.
 95. White T, Blok E, Calhoun VD. Data sharing and privacy issues in neuroimaging research: Opportunities, obstacles, challenges, and monsters under the bed. *Hum Brain Mapp [Internet]*. [cited 2021 Sep 29];n/a(n/a). Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hbm.25120>
 96. Gibbons RD, Hooker G, Finkelman MD, Weiss DJ, Pilkonis PA, Frank E, et al. The CAD-MDD: A Computerized Adaptive Diagnostic Screening Tool for Depression. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2013 Jul;74(7):669–74.

TABLES

Table 1. Summary of reviewed articles pertaining to screening for AUD and diagnosis/identification/discrimination of AUD.

First Author, Year	Study Design	Study Aim	Results	Clinical Impact
Screening for AUD				

Afshar 2019	Retrospective	Identify patients with alcohol misuse in trauma patients	AUC: 0.78; SENS: 56%; SPEC: 88.9%	Clinical notes are rich in data and NPL is viable method for alcohol misuse identification
To 2020	Retrospective	Identify patients with alcohol misuse in trauma patients	AUC: 0.91; SENS: 88%; SPEC: 78%; PPV: 85%; NPV: 82%	Clinical notes are rich in data and NPL is viable method for alcohol misuse identification
Bonnell 2020	Retrospective	Clinical prediction rules for unhealthy drinking	AUC 0.78; Accuracy: 76%; SENS: 50%; SPEC: 88%; PPV: 55%; NPV: 83%	Provides a cost effective method to screen for unhealthy drinkers using commonly collected data
Hassanpour 2019	Retrospective	Identify potential substance misuse behavior	AUC: 0.65	Assessing social media content may enable large scale screening of alcohol misuse.
Crocamo 2020	Retrospective	Identify potential binge drinkers	AUC: 0.73-0.76	Surveillance of tweets may identify unreported binge drinkers for preventive/intervention programs.
Diagnosis/identification/discrimination of AUD				
Maurelli 1998	Retrospective	Discriminate between light and heavy drinkers	Accuracy (weighted mean): MetaNet: 93%; Squash ANN: 87%; Logicon Projection ANN: 87%	Results indicate gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase and aspartate transaminase have highest impact on discriminating light and heavy drinkers
Dinevski 2011	Retrospective	Identify patients with alcohol dependence syndrome	Combined Accuracy: ~85%; SENS: >90%; SPEC: ~80%	Using a combination of GDLH, GGT and MCV improves accuracy of alcohol dependence syndrome diagnosis
Pirro 2013	Retrospective	Screen for harmful drinking in large population	Evaluation Set: SENS: 91%; SPEC: 90%	Multivariate analysis of indirect biomarkers improved diagnostic performance
Lewenstein 2020	Retrospective	Diagnose alcoholism	Correctness (all dataset): 89%; (by gender): 97%	Alcohol addiction causes deep sleep impairment and ANN demonstrated important inputs differ for men and women
Guggenmos 2018	Retrospective	Classification of AUD versus non-AUD	Accuracy: 74%	Grey matter pattern information as measured by MRI can help classify AUD / non-AUD and potentially predict severity
Kamarajan 2020	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 77%	AUD can be characterized by alterations in specific brain networks and poor neuropsychological functioning
Gowin 2020	Retrospective	Classification of binge drinking	Best model: Neuropsychosocial: AUC: 0.86	Combining fMRI with psychosocial data improves accuracy in classification of binge drinking
Hahn 2020	Retrospective	Classification model for AUD	AUC: 0.77 (test set)	Multi-site data with varied underlying class distributions yield well validated results for AUD classification
Wang 2019	Retrospective	Classification model for AUD	Accuracy: 97%; F1: 97%; SENS: 97%; SPEC: 97%; Precision: 97%	Transfer learning yields highly accurate classification accuracy compared to other MRI-based diagnosis models
Zhu 2018	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 67-87%; Precision: 70-91%	Within-network functional connectivity yielded most accurate AUD classification
Wang 2017	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 97%; SENS: 97%; SPEC: 97%	Pooling techniques facilitates outstanding accuracy

Adeli 2019	Retrospective	Differentiate AUD and AUD+HIV patients from healthy controls	Accuracy: 78% (AUD+HIV patients)	LR algorithm is able to differentiate AUD+HIV patients from AUD-only / healthy controls
Bae 2017	Retrospective	Diagnose AUD	Accuracy: 90%; SENS: 95%; SPEC: 82%	SVM models based on EEG data can accurately classify AUD
Acharya 2012	Retrospective	Diagnose AUD	Accuracy: 92%; SENS: 90%; SPEC: 93%	SVM models based on EEG data can accurately classify AUD
Mehla 2020	Retrospective	Diagnose AUD	Accuracy: 99-98%; SENS: 99-99%; SPEC: 99-97%	SVM models based on Fourier intrinsic band functions calculated from EEG data can be used to classify AUD
Hussain 2018	Retrospective	Diagnose AUD	AUC: 0.998 (C3 electrode with fMSE K-d)	fMSE outperforms MSE for K-d classification algorithm
Padma Shri 2017	Retrospective	Classification of AUD patients from healthy controls	Accuracy: 94%	k-NN classification with top-25 features from EEG data can accurately classify AUD
Mumtaz 2017	Retrospective	Classification of AUD patients from healthy controls	Accuracy: 89%; SENS: 89%; SPEC: 91%; F-measure 0.9	SVM models based on EEG data can accurately classify AUD
Mumtaz 2018	Retrospective	Diagnose AUD	Accuracy: 98%; SENS: 99%; SPEC: 95%; F-measure 0.97 (best model tested)	SVM classification outperforms LR and NB architecture when classifying AUD
Kumar 2016	Retrospective	Identify chronic alcoholism	Accuracy: 80% (SVM-data from the Fz channel)	SVM classification is sufficient to classify chronic alcoholism from EEG data alone
Kumar 2015	Retrospective	Identify chronic alcoholism	Accuracy: 88% (SVM-data from the F4 channel)	SVM classification is promising to develop non-invasive automated diagnostic system for chronic AUD
Zhang 2020	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 95%; Precision: 96%; F-score 0.95; Recall 95%	Combination approach outperforms traditional methods by up to 8%, showing utility for computer-aided AUD diagnoses
Anuragi 2019	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 99%; SENS: 99%; SPEC: 99%	LS-SVM architecture with polynomial kernel outperforms other models and LS-SVM with linear kernel
Anuragi 2020	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 99%; SENS: 98%; SPEC: 99%; Precision: 99%; F-measure 0.99; MCC: 98%	LS-SVM architecture with polynomial kernel outperforms other models and LS-SVM with linear kernel
Faust 2013	Retrospective	Classification of AUD	Accuracy: 92% (FSC)	Higher order spectra cumulants analyzed by FSC can be used to classify AUD
Zhu 2014	Retrospective	Classification of AUD patients from healthy controls	Accuracy: 96% (13-dimension HVGE model)	HVGE method accurately differentiates AUD from non-AUD patients using EEG data
Chen 2020	Prospective	Discriminate alcohol-dependent patients (AD) from non-alcohol-dependent control group	AUC: 0.87 - 0.92	First to propose feature fusion based on SNPs, age, education, and marital status using the GS-SVM and CNN algorithms to determine alcohol-dependent patients
Yu 2005	Retrospective	Classification of marker sets with AD	N/A	SVM is an effective approach for association analysis, data reduction, and pattern recognition when a given dataset is large

Rosato 2019	Prospective	Prediction of biomarkers	Accuracy: 72 - 79%	First evidence that salivary miRNAs are AD biomarkers
Falk 2005	Retrospective	Recognize complex phenotypic patterns associated with alcoholism	Reliability: 95%	A reliable alcoholism diagnosis may be reached from risk factors and phenotypic measurements
Li 1999	Retrospective	Identify phenotypic contributors to AUD: 1) relationship between intermediate phenotypes and affection status; and 2) degree of identical-by-descent and their affection status	Prediction rate: 65-75%; SENS/SPEC: 50-80%	ANN helped identify important phenotypic contributors in alcoholism; requires further analysis. IBD identified same marker as previous studies as well as new markers, requires further investigation

Table 2. Summary of reviewed articles pertaining to: predicting AUD severity; risk factors for alcohol use; predicting future alcohol use; prediction of treatment outcomes; predicting treatment seeking behavior; and AUD in adolescents.

Predicting AUD severity				
Fede 2019	Retrospective	Classification and prediction of alcohol use severity	R ² : 0.33; RMSE: 8.04 (validation set)	rs-fMRI data may be useful to diagnose and predict AUD
Risk factors for alcohol use				
Winham 2016	Retrospective	Explore genetic influences on alcohol dependence; Estimation of X chromosome SNP effects in RF algorithm	N/A	Provide a powerful multimarker approach for genetic analysis that accommodates X chromosome data in an unbiased way
Predicting future alcohol use				
King 2011	Prospective	Develop risk model for future development of hazardous drinking in safe drinkers	C-index: All European: 0.84; Chile: 0.78	Risk factors for predicting hazardous alcohol consumption in safe drinkers include sex, age, country, baseline AUDIT score, panic syndrome and lifetime alcohol problem
Kinreich 2019	Retrospective	Identify who is prone to develop AUD and the biomarkers that indicate a predisposition to AUD	AUC: 0.84 - 0.99	First ML prediction model for those with predisposition to develop AUD using multidimensional features while considering gender and ancestry
Prediction of treatment outcomes				
Symons 2020	Prospective	Predict treatment outcome	AUC: 0.64; Accuracy: 70%; SENS: 26%; SPEC: 90%	ML methods may assist clinical staff in their assessments of AUD patients post-treatment.
Symons 2019	Retrospective	Predict treatment outcome	AUC: 0.49; Accuracy: 74%; SENS: 31%; SPEC: 89%	ML methods may assist clinical staff in their assessments of AUD patients post-treatment.
Lindner 2020	Prospective	Predict treatment success outcomes in AUD individuals	Accuracy: 48-64%	Self-help internet intervention data such as this may be used to predict treatment outcomes on a group level.

Sekutowicz 2019	Retrospective	Prediction of alcohol relapse at future follow-up	Accuracy: 71%	Neural responses measured by fMRI could predict prognosis of future harmful drinking behavior
Seo 2015	Retrospective	Predict risk of relapse in alcohol-dependent patients	Balanced accuracy: 79%; SENS: 90%; SPEC: 69%	ML methods that use neuroimaging features may be more powerful predictors for relapse than other clinical data.
Winterer 1998 A	Retrospective	Predict risk of relapse in alcohol-dependent patients after detoxification	Overall classification rate: 83%	Use of QEEG data by ML methods may assist in predicting relapsers and abstainers after detoxification
Winterer 1998 B	Retrospective	Predict risk of relapse in alcohol-dependent patients after detoxification	Overall classification rate: 85%	Use of QEEG data by ML methods may assist in predicting relapsers and abstainers after detoxification.
Satapathy 2020	Retrospective	Predict risk of alcohol relapse and graft survival	AUC 0.79	The HALT score may assist clinicians to identify patients in need of liver transplants at risk of alcohol relapse
Chih 2014	Prospective	Predict risk of relapse in AUD recovery patients	AUC: 0.83-0.91	Use of a smartphone application can accurately predict relapse risk and increase accessibility to individuals recovering from AUD
Connor 2007	Retrospective	Predict abstinence in AUD patients	Accuracy: 73-77%	Use of accurate ML methods may assist in abstinence prediction and resource allocation
Kurth 2001	Retrospective	Predict the risk of alcohol withdrawal seizures	SENS: 83%; SPEC: 94%	Use of a ANN model may identify patients at risk of alcohol withdrawal seizures upon admission to detoxification units
Hillemacher 2012	Retrospective	Identify potential predictive markers of alcohol withdrawal seizures	AUC: 0.829	RF models can predict the risk of alcohol withdrawal seizures
Burkhardt 2020	Retrospective	Predict risk of alcohol withdrawal severity, delirium tremens, and withdrawal seizures	Balanced accuracy 39-75%	Prediction of alcohol withdrawal outcomes may assist clinicians with treatment decisions
Lapuerta 1997	Retrospective	Predict survival in AUD hospital patients with severe liver disease	AUC: 78-84%	ANNs may be applied to risk stratify alcoholic patients with severe liver disease upon hospital admission
Choi 2020	Retrospective	Predict intoxication mortality risk	AUC 0.76-0.85	ML models have the potential to accurately predict drug-induced mortality for proper risk stratification and treatment of patients
Hou 2015	Retrospective	Identify subgroups that will benefit from ondansetron treatment for AUD	Treatment effect: 22%	ML models may identify genotype-based subgroups likely to benefit from pharmacotherapy for AUD
Wei 2020	Retrospective	Identify subgroups that will benefit from ondansetron treatment for AUD	Rand index: 0.85-0.96; Total hit rate: 0.88-0.94	ML models may identify genotype-based subgroups likely to benefit from pharmacotherapy for AUD
Laska 2020	Retrospective	Identify likely responders to Gabapentin Enacarbil Extended-Release treatment for AUD	Pearson's r: 0.42	RF models may predict likely responders for AUD pharmacotherapy treatment to enhance success
Lin 2020	Retrospective	Predict relapse in individuals taking naltrexone for alcohol dependence	Prediction error rate: 66%	RF models may enhance decision making for AUD treatment by predicting risk of relapse
Predicting treatment seeking behavior				

Lee 2019	Retrospective	Classification of individuals as AUD treatment or non-treatment seeking	Accuracy: 78-86%	ADT models may be used to identify significant treatment seeking variables to focus on in future research
AUD in adolescents				
Squeglia 2017	Prospective	Predict alcohol use initiation by age 18	Accuracy: 74%; SENS:74%; SPEC:73%	ML algorithm is able to generate individual-level predictions of who is at an elevated risk for initiating alcohol use during adolescence
Whelan 2014	Prospective	Predict alcohol use initiation by age 18	N/A	ML algorithm is able to identify a generalizable risk profile for alcohol misuse initiation
Afzali 2019	Retrospective	Prediction of adolescent alcohol use	AUC: 0.86 - 0.87	Presents evidence of possibility to develop and implement computerized screening software that predicts the risk of substance use among adolescents
Ruan 2019	Prospective	Stratify adolescent drinkers according to their onset of binge drinking	N/A	New evidence for disrupted brain functional organization in adolescents who participate in binge drinking behaviors and highlighted a negative feedback loop that interacted with impulsivity
Vázquez 2020	Prospective	Identification of substance use predictors	AUC: 0.65 - 0.76	Variables identified as being of high importance within the current study may assist in screening and connecting at risk Mexican children with targeted substance use prevention services
García 2009	Retrospective	Provide methodological knowledge of data mining in alcohol consumption and personality variables	Accuracy: 64% (ANN)	Provide information on use of data mining in alcohol consumption and personality traits
Weidacker 2020	Prospective	Prediction of alcohol consumption in youths and biomarkers of resilience	R ² : <0.05; p>0.30	Identifies potential protective biomarkers that predict resilience to alcohol misuse in youths, providing novel identifiers for early intervention
O'Halloran 2020	Prospective	Classification of links between impulsivity and alcohol misuse	Pearson's r = 0.28; p = 0.03	Inhibitory control event related potentials are robustly correlated individual differences in alcohol use
O'Halloran 2018	Prospective	Prediction of alcohol intoxication frequency and alcohol consumption frequency from impulsivity traits	r = 0.38; median p = 0.0003	Intoxication frequency was significantly predicted by the impulsivity variables
Martinez-Loredo 2018	Prospective	Identify trajectories of impulsivity and sensation seeking and explore their relationship with substance use and heavy drinking.	OR: 1.31 - 12.70 (males); 1.83 - 8.71 (females)	The screening of impulsivity courses linked to high-risk substance use would allow healthcare providers to implement tailored selective preventive strategies

Abbreviations: Artificial intelligence (AI); Alcohol use disorder (AUD); Alternating decision tree (ADT); Aspartate aminotransferase (AST); Artificial neural network (ANN); Alcohol Use Disorder Identification test (AUDIT); Convolutional neural network (CNN); Electroencephalographic (EEG); Functional MRI (fMRI); Fuzzy sugeno classifier (FSC); Gamma-

glutamil transpeptidasis (GGT); Harmful Alcohol use post-Liver Transplantation (HALT); Horizontal visibility graph entropy (HVGE); Logistic regression (LR); Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI); Naïve Bayes (NB); Neural network (NN); Single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP); Support vector machine (SVM); Random forest (RF); Resting-state functional MRI (rsfMRI).