

Patient digital twins: an introduction based on a scoping review

David Drummond, PhD, Department of Pediatric Pulmonology and Allergology, University Hospital Necker-Enfants Malades, AP-HP, Paris, France; Université Paris Cité, Paris, France; Inserm UMR 1138, INRIA, HeKA team, Centre de Recherche des Cordeliers, F-75006 Paris, France

Apolline Gonsard, MD, Department of Pediatric Pulmonology and Allergology, University Hospital Necker-Enfants Malades, AP-HP, 149 rue de Sèvres 75015, Paris, France.

Corresponding author: David Drummond, PhD
Department of Paediatric Pulmonology and Allergology, University Hospital Necker-Enfants Malades, AP-HP, 149 rue de Sèvres 75015, Paris, France.
+33 1 87 89 20 28
david.drummond@aphp.fr

Patient digital twins: an introduction based on a scoping review

SUMMARY (160 words)

The concept of digital twins, widely adopted in industry, is entering healthcare. In this scoping review, we analysed definitions and characteristics of patient digital twins being developed for clinical use. Searching for studies claiming digital twin development/evaluation until August 2023, we identified 86 articles representing 80 unique claimed digital twins, nearly all (98%) in preclinical phases. From the analysis of definitions and characteristics, we propose to define patient digital twin as “a viewable digital replica of a patient, organ, or biological system that contains multidimensional, patient-specific information”. Two main forms were found: simulation digital twins using computational modelling of patient anatomy/physiology to run personalised outcome predictions and therapy evaluations, mostly for one-time assessments; and monitoring digital twins harnessing aggregated patient data for continuous risk/outcome forecasting over time and care optimisation. As patient digital twins rapidly emerge, the proposed definitions and subtypes offer a framework to guide research into realising the potential of these personalised, integrative technologies to advance clinical care.

Keywords

Patient simulation; computer-assisted navigation; cyber-physical systems; telemonitoring; prediction; personalised medicine; systematic review

Patient digital twins: an introduction based on a scoping review

INTRODUCTION

Each industrial revolution has transformed the practice of medicine. The first two led to the development of new techniques for the industrial collection of new data (biological, imaging, etc.) on the human body. The third - or digital - revolution transformed this analogue data into digital data, accelerating the exchange of information, and allowing the emergence of computer models to propose a diagnosis, establish a prognosis, and recommend a treatment.¹

For some contemporaries, we are currently in the midst of the fourth industrial revolution, which is the merging of the physical and digital worlds, based on three pillars: the Internet of Things, increasing connectivity, and machine learning-based decisions.^{2,3}

Digital twins are an emblematic illustration of the applications of this new industrial revolution. Michael Grieves introduced the concept in 2002 as a system consisting of a physical product, its virtual counterpart and two-way data exchange between the two entities.⁴ However, the term “digital twin” was first used and defined in 2010 by NASA engineers as “an integrated multi-physics, multi-scale, probabilistic simulation of a vehicle or system that uses the best available physical models, sensor updates, fleet history, etc., to mirror the life of its flying twin”.⁵ Following the popularisation of the concept of the fourth industrial revolution in 2015, digital twins attracted interest from all industries.³ With the objective of reducing production times through monitoring, coordination and control of production systems, the manufacturing industry became the most active sector in terms of research and implementation of digital twins.⁶ Digital twins also extended to construction, energy, transport, smart cities, agriculture, education and health.⁶

In the health sector, the concept of digital twins attracted interest from industry, scientists, clinicians and patients.^{7,8} Besides digital twins of hospitals, there is a strong rationale for the development of digital twins of patients, as these systems could offer personalised medicine through information gathered by the Internet of Things, real-time adaptation of treatments through efficient connectivity, and even automation of certain aspects of medical management through predictions based on machine learning.⁹ An increasing number of scientific publications claim to be developing or to have developed "digital twins" of organs, physiological systems, or patients. However, when the term "digital twin" is used in this context, it remains unclear if it corresponds to the definitions used in industry, or whether unique concepts and characteristics emerge for patient digital twins.

The three previous systematic literature reviews related to digital twins in health did not focus on patient digital twins.^{10–12} To contribute to the understanding of patient digital twins, we conducted a scoping review to systematically map research in this area. The following research question was formulated: "What are the definitions and characteristics of digital twins provided by research teams developing patient digital twins for clinical applications, as reported in the scientific literature?"

METHODS

We conducted this scoping review in accordance with the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) guidelines for scoping reviews^{13,14} and reported it following the Scoping Review Extension of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-ScR) checklist.¹⁵ The authors received training on the methodology of scoping reviews using the JBI Reviewers' Manual 2020.¹⁶ We registered the protocol for this review at the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/7tw8/>).

Search Strategy

We created search strategies with a medical librarian to identify published articles on patient digital twins. We initially searched MEDLINE via PubMed. The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles and the MeSH terms describing those articles informed development of a full search strategy. We adapted this search strategy for each included database and information source, namely: PubMed, Scopus, Embase, IEEE Web of Science, and Google Scholar. When searching Google Scholar, we used incognito mode to minimize effects of past search histories and screened the first 500 results. Full search strategy is reported in the appendix (pp3-4).

Selection process

We collated the identified citations from the comprehensive search and uploaded them into Rayyan, an online review tool.¹⁷ Two independent reviewers (DD, AG) removed duplicates and screened titles and abstracts for inclusion based on the predefined criteria described below. All screening was performed in a masked, duplicate fashion. Any disagreements between reviewers were resolved through discussion. Reasons for exclusion at the stage of full-text screening were recorded.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included peer-reviewed research articles in which the authors claimed to be developing or to have developed/tested a digital twin in healthcare, subsequently referred to as a 'claimed digital twin' (CDT). Only literature published in English, French, or German was included up to August 31 2023. Finally, to match the context of this review, we restricted included research to articles focused on developing or testing digital twins specifically representing patients, or components of patients.

Exclusion criteria were: (1) animal studies, abstracts only, conference papers, reviews, editorials or correspondence, non-peer-reviewed articles; (2) studies in languages other than English, French, or German; (3) studies unrelated to health; (4) digital twins not representing patients or part of a patient; and (5) studies limited to proposing a framework for a digital twin with no case study.

Data charting

Two reviewers (DD, AG) jointly developed a data charting form using Microsoft Excel to determine which variables to extract. For each included study, we extracted the following characteristics: study title, publication year, first author name, country of the corresponding author, and journal. We compiled the definitions of digital twins provided by the study authors and summarised their various dimensions (e.g. digital replica, high-fidelity representation, two-way data exchange). Drawing from NASA's digital twin definition, we assessed whether the developed digital twins were multi-scale, integrated multi-physics modelling, and multiple data sources. We incorporated additional descriptors specific to digital twins for patient care, including medical discipline, organs/systems represented, categorisation of whether the models constituted anatomical representations (e.g. 3D) and/or models of physiological systems, and the study's objective (simulation, prediction, monitoring, visualisation, generation of synthetic patients). Technical digital twin characteristics extracted included: types of patient data used, approach used (mechanistic, data-driven, hybrid), whether the digital twin included analytics and advanced visualisation, constituted a model for simulations versus a simulation itself, capacity and frequency of updates, inclusion of none, one-way or two-way data exchange with the patient, and for two-way exchange, the nature of feedback (recommendation or other type). Finally, we determined the clinical research phase of each digital twin by deriving the clinical research

phases developed for artificial intelligence in medicine.¹⁸ Additional information on each variable is presented in appendix (pp 5-6).

To ensure consistency, two reviewers (AG, DD) independently extracted data from the first 10 articles prior to full data extraction. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion. Following this pilot extraction and adaptation of the data charting form, we extracted data from the remaining studies in a masked, duplicate manner. Studies not meeting inclusion criteria were excluded. Any disagreements between reviewers were resolved through discussion.

Unsupervised classification of claimed digital twins

To perform unsupervised classification of CDT, we analysed dissimilarities by employing the Gower distance metric on a subpart of our dataset (the variables included are marked with an asterisk in appendix 2 (pp 5-6)).¹⁹ The optimal cluster count was identified using the Partitioning Around Medoids (PAM) method, guided by silhouette width analysis across 2 to 10 clusters.²⁰ We then employed t-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) for dimensionality reduction to facilitate visualisation in a 2D space. These analyses were performed in R (v.4.2.3) with the packages cluster, Rtsne, and ggplot2. We finally compared the characteristics of the CDTs of each cluster using the package gtsummary.

RESULTS

Characteristics of included studies

A total of 7,224 citations were identified from the search strategies (Figure 1). After removing duplicates and screening titles and abstracts, 154 articles were examined in full-text, and 68 were excluded (see appendix pp 7-11 for a full list of excluded full text reviews

with exclusion reasons). Finally, 86 articles^{21–106} representing 80 unique CDTs were included in this scoping review. The full results, with individual data for each study, can be viewed in tabular form at the following address: <https://osf.io/7twm8/>.

The first publications of CDTs appeared in 2019. Since then, publication volume increased yearly from 3 papers in 2019 rising to 23 in 2022 and 32 papers in the partial 2023 year (appendix p 12). Though incomplete, 2023 totals through August 31 still reflect rising publication volume.

The included publications originated from 22 countries (appendix p 12). The United States of America was the most common country of origin, with 22 articles (25% of included publications). At the continental level, Europe was leading with 43 publications (49%), followed by North America with 25 (29%), and Asia with 16 (18%). No articles from South America or Africa were found.

Definitions of digital twin provided by authors

Definitions of "digital twin" were provided in 55 articles (63% of publications, appendix pp 13-16). Among articles with definitions, a digital twin was defined as a digital replica of a real object in 42 publications (76%), with real-time update in 23 (42%), a patient-specific approach in 13 (24%), and a two-way communication between the real and the digital object in 8 (15%) (Figure 2).

Medical domains

Of the 80 CDT identified, 48 (60%) represented specific organs or anatomical regions, while 11 (14%) embodied biological systems (e.g. immune system). The remaining 21 (26%)

publications described other types of CDT (e.g. systems for emotion recognition, foetal heart monitoring, etc.). Among the 48 publications with CDT representing specific organs, the most widely modelled organs were the heart (15 CDT, 31%), the bones and joints (10, 21%), the lung (6, 12%), and the arteries (5, 10%) (Figure 3 and appendix p 17). Three (6%) CDT involved multiple organs. Among the 11 CDT representing biological systems, the endocrine (4, 36%) and the immune system (3, 27%) were the most widely involved (appendix p 17). The most highly represented medical disciplines were cardiology (16 CDT, 20%), oncology (10, 13%) and orthopaedics (9, 11%) (appendix p 18).

Characteristics of the claimed “digital twins”

The patient data used to develop and/or run the 80 unique CDT encompassed: data from clinical notes (15 CDT, 19% of publications), laboratory test results (13 CDT, 16%), medical imaging exams (35 CDT, 44%), wearable device data (12 CDT, 15%), and other data modalities such as ECG, optical tracking, diet data, intra-operative haemodynamic measurements, in 32 CDT (40%) (appendix p 19). Multimodal data incorporation, synthesising various data types and sources, was present in 39 (49%) CDT. Nearly all CDTs (78, 98%) involved data analytics and 29 (36%) some form of advanced visualisation. Eight (10%) CDT involved multiphysics, and nine (11%) were multi-scale. In terms of implementation, 40 (50%) CDT followed a mechanistic approach, 22 (28%) a data-driven approach, 17 (21%) combined both approaches, and one (1%) none of these approaches. Most of the CDT developed (56, 70%) corresponded to models for simulation, and not simulations themselves.

In terms of medical approach, 10 (12%) CDT were categorised as anatomical, 22 (28%) as physiological, and 28 (35%) combined anatomical and physiological features. The objectives

of CDTs were prediction (61 CDTs, 76%), simulation (52 CDTs, 65%), monitoring (11 CDTs, 14%), visualisation (10 CDTs, 12%) and generation of synthetic patient data (8 CDTs, 10%).

Among the 64 (80% of total) patient-specific CDTs, 44 (69%) were static models, whereas 20 (31%) were designed as dynamic models with regular data inputs or outputs on a daily, hourly, or real-time basis (appendix p 20).

Data flow topology characterises the exchange of information between patient and digital twin. Thirteen (16%) CDTs involved no flow from patient to their virtual counterpart; 58 (73%) used one-way flow from patient to their virtual counterpart; and 9 (11%) enabled two-way data flow between patient and their virtual counterpart (Figure 2). Within the nine two-way digital twins, automated feedback occurred via recommendations to the patient or the physician in six cases and via direct feedback during surgical navigation in three cases.

Finally, regarding the clinical research phase of the CDTs, 78 (98%) were categorised as phase 0 or 1 (pre-clinical phases) and only 2 (2%) involved clinical assessments and thus reached phase 2. No CDT corresponded to phases 3 or 4.

Unsupervised classification of claimed digital twins

Three clusters were identified using the PAM method (Figure 4, appendix p 21).

Cluster 1 included 43 unique CDTs, which corresponded to patient-specific organs or systems models for simulations and predictions. Indeed, 42 (98%) were models to perform simulations, of an organ or system in 42 (98%) cases, and these were anatomical and/or physiological models in 43 (100%) cases relying on a mechanistic approach in 41 (95%)

cases. The output of these CDT was patient-specific in 42 (98%) cases, and their use was planned for one-time use in 36 (84%) cases rather than for dynamic use.

Cluster 2 included 22 CDTs and mainly corresponded to prediction models and monitoring systems. In this category, the CDT most often did not involve an anatomical or physiological model of the patient (18 CDTs, 82%). The approach was mainly data-driven (20 CDTs, 91%). These CDTs were often dynamic (13 CDTs, 59%), and provided feedback in 5 (23%) cases.

Cluster 3 included 15 CDTs and usually corresponded to models not linked to patients but designed for research. Indeed, in this group, only one (7%) CDT was patient-specific⁶³. Most CDTs were models for simulation (12, 80%) and involved a mechanistic approach (9 CDTs, 60%). Examples of such CDTs are models of the immune response to vaccines,⁶² but also CDTs that corresponded to the generation of synthetic patients for in-silico trials¹⁰³ (5 CDTs, 33%).

DISCUSSION

This systematic review highlights the growing interest in the concept of patient digital twins while at the same time revealing the lack of a uniform vision of this same concept among research teams.

The publication of scientific articles on digital twins across all sectors has experienced exponential growth, starting from one article in 2014 to more than 1,000 articles per year in 2022, predominantly in the manufacturing industry.^{107,108} Studies focusing on the development and/or evaluation of patient digital twins emerged later, from 2019 onwards, but have seen the same growth, particularly in Europe and North America.

Despite growing interest, there is no consensus definition of the digital twin concept. Depending on the research teams and fields of application, the definitions and characteristics of digital twins differ,¹⁰⁸ and this is also reflected in our study, with a diversity of definitions and types of CDTs.

If one were to strictly import the digital twin definition used by Michael Grieve⁴ and NASA⁵ from the manufacturing industry and aerospace sector to patients, a digital twin of a patient would be an integrated multi-scale, probabilistic simulation of a patient that uses the best available models, sensor updates, medical history, etc., to mirror the health status of the patient in real-time and act on them. But this definition is not currently achievable since no patient digital twin is able to capture the complexity of the human body in real time. Indeed, creating a patient's digital twin is different from creating a digital twin of an object like an airplane. An airplane is designed and developed entirely by humans, who have mastery over the composition and physical properties of each part of an airplane, the assembly of all these parts, and the interaction of the whole. In contrast, we still have an imperfect understanding of the functioning of the human body and the interaction of its different organs and systems. It is therefore simpler to model an airplane than the human body with a high degree of fidelity and in a multiscale way. It is also easier to integrate additional sensors and actuators on an airplane's controls than to have patients continuously wear or have implanted sensors or actuators to obtain the two-way, real-time data exchange between the plane or patient and their digital twin. Moreover, while the digital twin of the airplane relies essentially on the physical properties of the aircraft, the digital twin of a patient will have to go beyond anatomical and physiological models of the patient's various organs and systems to include models of the patient's cognitive and emotional functioning.¹⁰⁹ Finally, concerning the practical use of the terms "patient digital twin", they must be able to echo patients' own perceptions of what a digital twin is. These terms are not neologisms, but each refers to

concepts already used in everyday language by patients. Because twin refers to a multiple birth, it is likely that the patient pictures a digital twin as a realistic avatar of themselves in the same health state. This implies that in the mind of a clinician or patient not well-versed in computer science, the first representation of a patient digital twin will be that of a 3D representation of the patient's body and its functioning.

For all these reasons, the concept of a digital twin, which is appropriate in manufacturing, could be considered inappropriate in medicine. However, on the basis of the various articles in this review, we believe that this concept actually corresponds to current advances brought by the multiplication of data sources, data analysis and the visualisation of patients' state of health. It could also be a useful educational tool for the communication with patients when discussing models and predictions made from their data. Since it is currently not feasible to bring together all the characteristics of the digital twin in manufacturing, we propose the following definition of a patient digital twin: “A patient digital twin is a viewable digital replica of a patient, organ, or biological system that contains multidimensional, patient-specific information”.

The first advantage of this definition is that it can exclude what is not a patient digital twin: generic models of cells, tissues, organs, or biological systems not linked to a patient but used to study disease progression or drug development^{29,54,80}; pure cyber-physical systems, that is, systems such as implantable cardioverter-defibrillators, which do not use a representation of the patient and therefore not a “viewable” digital replica of the patient; digital patient data created from patient databases for in silico trials,^{47,99,103} often using generative adversarial networks, which we propose to call “synthetic patients” instead; data sets from another patient, similar to those of the index patient;⁷⁷ machine learning based classifiers, trained on a population to predict a diagnosis;⁶⁹ and patient models built from a single data source, such as demographic characteristics or imaging.^{31,47,49}

The second advantage of this definition is that it encompasses the two major trends in patient digital twins revealed by this study. On one hand, digital twins offering a high degree of fidelity, combining advanced anatomical and physiological models, based on mechanistic approaches or combining mechanistic and data-driven approaches.^{43,66,105} However, their limitation is their common reliance on hospital-acquired data such as imaging data (CT, MRI) or intraoperative haemodynamic data. They are therefore generally restricted to one-time purposes, and not in a dynamic form. On the other hand, digital twins corresponding to real-time representations of patients through home-based data collection via wearables, using machine learning techniques for analysis and alert detection.^{25,27} This type of digital twin is dynamic, can be two-way by giving recommendations to patients or by modifying a biological parameter of the patient via medical devices, but often offers little or no information on the patient's anatomy or physiology. For it to be differentiable from a cyber-physical system or a telemonitoring system, it must integrate different data sources, data analysis systems, and a visualisation of the patient organ, system or body. We thus propose two major categories of patient digital twins (Figure 5):

- Simulation patient digital twins: personalised, viewable digital replicas of patients' anatomy and physiology based on computational modelling to run simulations predicting outcomes in hypothetical scenarios or evaluating therapeutic approaches. These digital twins are mostly used for one-time assessments rather than continuous monitoring.
- Monitoring patient digital twins: personalised, viewable digital replicas of patients leveraging aggregated health data and analytics to enable continuous predictions of risks and outcomes over time and provide feedback for optimising care. These digital twins are mostly focused on continuous tracking rather than detailed mechanistic simulation.

As technical progress is made, it is likely that these two types of patient digital twins will converge, combining both mechanistic models and increasingly efficient continuous data collection and data-driven approaches.¹¹⁰ However, currently, only 14 CDTs from this review would meet the definition of patient digital twins combining multidimensional, patient-specific data, data analytics and advanced visualisation, all being simulation patient digital twins.^{23,34,37,43,48,57,58,61,66,70,88,98,105,106} Digital twins for surgical navigation systems are the most advanced, with three teams presenting patient digital twins combining both a mechanistic approach and dynamic real-time adaptation.^{58,88,106}

The main benefit expected from these patient digital twins is to offer increasingly personalised medicine, taking into account all the available data and patient-specific simulations and predictions. This would make it possible, for example, to choose the most appropriate drug treatment based on the patient's medical history, allergies, comorbidities and genetic profile;²² the most appropriate stent for the configuration of the aortic dilatation;²³ and the least risky surgical approach thanks to pre-operative simulations. But the benefits could also be for patient education and engagement: patients would interact with their digital replica to better understand their own body, health conditions, and influence of behaviours, and collaborate more with providers.

Strengths and limitations

The strength of this review is to be the first to have carried out a systematic analysis of the literature concerning patient digital twins, and to have been able to identify the major trends. We also acknowledge several limitations. The main one is that in the absence of a consensual definition of the digital twin concept, we chose to include all articles in which the authors claimed they had developed a digital twin or part of a digital twin. This has undoubtedly led us to not include some articles that meet the concept of a digital twin but did not use that

term, and to include some articles that in fact did not develop a digital twin but only a simple prediction model. Another limitation is that we realised that some characteristics of digital twins were not appropriate either because very industry-specific such as the “multiphysic” characteristic or because they did not allow us to be consistent in our assessment. For example, we often failed to determine whether the presented digital twin was at phase 0 or 1 of development and chose to merge these two categories as preclinical. Finally, we did not include articles written in languages other than English, French, or German, and this may have led to underrepresenting the work of some regions of the globe.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we propose that a patient digital twin be defined as “a viewable digital replica of a patient, organ, or biological system that contains multidimensional, patient-specific information”. We currently identify two categories, simulation patient digital twins and monitoring patient digital twins. In the future, we envisage a fusion of these two types of digital twins that will combine a high degree of fidelity based on anatomical and physiological models with real-time updating and feedback to the patient.

Contributors

DD led all aspects of the Review: conceptualisation, data curation (title and abstract screening, full-text screening, and data extraction), formal analysis, project administration, supervision, validation, and writing (original draft, review, and editing); AG was involved in conceptualisation, data curation (title and abstract screening, full-text screening, and data extraction), formal analysis, validation, and writing (review, and editing). All authors have had full access to the data and accept responsibility to submit for publication.

Declaration of interests

The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Funding

No funding was secured for this study.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the use of Claude 2.1, an artificial intelligence assistant created by Anthropic, for the translation of selected passages from French to English and the rewriting of these passages into academic English.

References

- 1 Drummond D. Between competence and warmth: the remaining place of the physician in the era of artificial intelligence. *NPJ Digit Med* 2021; **4**: 85.
- 2 Xu LD, Xu EL, Li L. Industry 4.0: state of the art and future trends. *International Journal of Production Research* 2018; **56**: 2941–62.
- 3 Schwab K. The Fourth Industrial Revolution. Crown, 2017.
- 4 Grieves M. Digital Twin: Manufacturing Excellence through Virtual Factory Replication. 2015; published online March 1.
- 5 Shafto M, Conroy M, Doyle R, *et al*. Modeling, Simulation, Information Technology and Processing Roadmap. 2010.
- 6 Singh M, Srivastava R, Fuenmayor E, *et al*. Applications of Digital Twin across Industries: A Review. *Applied Sciences* 2022; **12**: 5727.

- 7 Gonsard A, AbouTaam R, Prévost B, *et al.* Children's views on artificial intelligence and digital twins for the daily management of their asthma: a mixed-method study. *Eur J Pediatr* 2022; published online Dec 13. DOI:10.1007/s00431-022-04754-8.
- 8 Abdoul C, Cros P, Coutier L, *et al.* Parents' views on artificial intelligence for the daily management of childhood asthma: a survey. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract* 2020; published online Dec 5. DOI:10.1016/j.jaip.2020.11.048.
- 9 Coorey G, Figtree GA, Fletcher DF, *et al.* The health digital twin to tackle cardiovascular disease—a review of an emerging interdisciplinary field. *npj Digit Med* 2022; **5**: 1–12.
- 10 Xames MdD, Topcu TG. A Systematic Literature Review of Digital Twin Research for Healthcare Systems: Research Trends, Gaps, and Realization Challenges. *IEEE Access* 2024; **12**: 4099–126.
- 11 Sun T, He X, Li Z. Digital twin in healthcare: Recent updates and challenges. *Digit Health* 2023; **9**: 20552076221149651.
- 12 Coorey G, Figtree GA, Fletcher DF, *et al.* The health digital twin to tackle cardiovascular disease—a review of an emerging interdisciplinary field. *npj Digit Med* 2022; **5**: 1–12.
- 13 Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, *et al.* Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIM Evidence Synthesis* 2020; **18**: 2119.
- 14 Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, *et al.* Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JBIM Evid Synth* 2022; **20**: 953–68.
- 15 Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, *et al.* PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med* 2018; **169**: 467–73.
- 16 Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis. JBI, 2020. <https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL> (accessed Feb 8, 2024).
- 17 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* 2016; **5**: 210.
- 18 Park Y, Jackson GP, Foreman MA, Gruen D, Hu J, Das AK. Evaluating artificial intelligence in medicine: phases of clinical research. *JAMIA Open* 2020; **3**: 326–31.
- 19 Gower JC. Properties of Euclidean and non-Euclidean distance matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 1985; **67**: 81–97.
- 20 van der Laan M, Pollard K, Bryan J. A New Partitioning Around Medoids Algorithm. *UC Berkeley Division of Biostatistics Working Paper Series* 2002; published online Feb 1. <https://biostats.bepress.com/ucbbiostat/paper105>.
- 21 Chakshu NK, Carson J, Sazonov I, Nithiarasu P. A semi-active human digital twin model for detecting severity of carotid stenoses from head vibration-A coupled computational mechanics and computer vision method. *Int J Numer Method Biomed Eng* 2019; **35**: e3180.
- 22 Liu Y, Zhang L, Yang Y, *et al.* A Novel Cloud-Based Framework for the Elderly

- Healthcare Services Using Digital Twin. *IEEE Access* 2019; **7**: 49088–101.
- 23 Hemmler A, Reeps C, Lutz B, Gee MW. Der digitale Zwilling in der endovaskulären Versorgung. *Gefasschirurgie* 2019; **24**: 548–56.
- 24 Hirschvogel M, Jagschies L, Maier A, Wildhirt SM, Gee MW. An in silico twin for epicardial augmentation of the failing heart. *Int J Numer Method Biomed Eng* 2019; **35**: e3233.
- 25 Barricelli BR, Casiraghi E, Gliozzo J, Petrini A, Valtolina S. Human Digital Twin for Fitness Management. *IEEE Access* 2020; **8**: 26637–64.
- 26 Lal A, Li G, Cubro E, *et al.* Development and Verification of a Digital Twin Patient Model to Predict Specific Treatment Response During the First 24 Hours of Sepsis. *Crit Care Explor* 2020; **2**: e0249.
- 27 Shamanna P, Saboo B, Damodharan S, *et al.* Reducing HbA1c in Type 2 Diabetes Using Digital Twin Technology-Enabled Precision Nutrition: A Retrospective Analysis. *Diabetes Ther* 2020; **11**: 2703–14.
- 28 Goodwin GC, Seron MM, Mediolli AM, Smith T, King BR, Smart CE. A systematic stochastic design strategy achieving an optimal tradeoff between peak BGL and probability of hypoglycaemic events for individuals having type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 2020; **57**: 101813.
- 29 Subramanian K. Digital Twin for Drug Discovery and Development—The Virtual Liver. *J Indian Inst Sci* 2020; **100**: 653–62.
- 30 Sinisi S, Alimguzhin V, Mancini T, Tronci E, Mari F, Leeners B. Optimal Personalised Treatment Computation through In Silico Clinical Trials on Patient Digital Twins. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 2020; **174**: 283–310.
- 31 Fu W, Sharma S, Abadi E, *et al.* iPhantom: A Framework for Automated Creation of Individualized Computational Phantoms and Its Application to CT Organ Dosimetry. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform* 2021; **25**: 3061–72.
- 32 Béthencourt L, Dabachine W, Dejoux V, *et al.* Guiding Measurement Protocols of Connected Medical Devices Using Digital Twins: A Statistical Methodology Applied to Detecting and Monitoring Lymphedema. *IEEE Access* 2021; **9**: 39444–65.
- 33 Zhou C, Chase JG, Knopp J, *et al.* Virtual patients for mechanical ventilation in the intensive care unit. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 2021; **199**: 105912.
- 34 Camps J, Lawson B, Drovandi C, *et al.* Inference of ventricular activation properties from non-invasive electrocardiography. *Med Image Anal* 2021; **73**: 102143.
- 35 Barbiero P, Viñas Torné R, Lió P. Graph Representation Forecasting of Patient’s Medical Conditions: Toward a Digital Twin. *Front Genet* 2021; **12**: 652907.
- 36 Aubert K, Germaneau A, Rochette M, *et al.* Development of Digital Twins to Optimize Trauma Surgery and Postoperative Management. A Case Study Focusing on Tibial Plateau Fracture. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol* 2021; **9**: 722275.

- 37 Förster KM, Roth CJ, Hilgendorff A, Ertl-Wagner B, Flemmer AW, Wall WA. In silico numerical simulation of ventilator settings during high-frequency ventilation in preterm infants. *Pediatr Pulmonol* 2021; **56**: 3839–46.
- 38 Shamanna P, Joshi S, Shah L, *et al.* Type 2 diabetes reversal with digital twin technology-enabled precision nutrition and staging of reversal: a retrospective cohort study. *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol* 2021; **7**: 21.
- 39 Hernigou P, Olejnik R, Safar A, Martinov S, Hernigou J, Ferre B. Digital twins, artificial intelligence, and machine learning technology to identify a real personalized motion axis of the tibiotalar joint for robotics in total ankle arthroplasty. *Int Orthop* 2021; **45**: 2209–17.
- 40 Shamanna P, Dharmalingam M, Sahay R, *et al.* Retrospective study of glycemic variability, BMI, and blood pressure in diabetes patients in the Digital Twin Precision Treatment Program. *Sci Rep* 2021; **11**: 14892.
- 41 Golse N, Joly F, Combari P, *et al.* Predicting the risk of post-hepatectomy portal hypertension using a digital twin: A clinical proof of concept. *J Hepatol* 2021; **74**: 661–9.
- 42 Cho S-W, Byun S-H, Yi S, *et al.* Sagittal Relationship between the Maxillary Central Incisors and the Forehead in Digital Twins of Korean Adult Females. *J Pers Med* 2021; **11**: 203.
- 43 Gillette K, Gsell MAF, Prassl AJ, *et al.* A Framework for the generation of digital twins of cardiac electrophysiology from clinical 12-leads ECGs. *Med Image Anal* 2021; **71**: 102080.
- 44 Gillette K, Gsell MAF, Bouyssier J, *et al.* Automated Framework for the Inclusion of a His-Purkinje System in Cardiac Digital Twins of Ventricular Electrophysiology. *Ann Biomed Eng* 2021; **49**: 3143–53.
- 45 Conte Alcaraz J, Moghaddamnia S, Peissig J. Efficiency of deep neural networks for joint angle modeling in digital gait assessment. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing* 2021; **2021**: 10.
- 46 van Osta N, Kirkels FP, van Loon T, *et al.* Uncertainty Quantification of Regional Cardiac Tissue Properties in Arrhythmogenic Cardiomyopathy Using Adaptive Multiple Importance Sampling. *Front Physiol* 2021; **12**: 738926.
- 47 Gonzalez-Abril L, Angulo C, Ortega J-A, Lopez-Guerra J-L. Generative Adversarial Networks for Anonymized Healthcare of Lung Cancer Patients. *Electronics* 2021; **10**: 2220.
- 48 Gerach T, Schuler S, Fröhlich J, *et al.* Electro-Mechanical Whole-Heart Digital Twins: A Fully Coupled Multi-Physics Approach. *Mathematics* 2021; **9**: 1247.
- 49 Geissler F, Heiß R, Kopp M, *et al.* Personalized computed tomography - Automated estimation of height and weight of a simulated digital twin using a 3D camera and artificial intelligence. *Rofo* 2021; **193**: 437–45.
- 50 Allen A, Siefkas A, Pellegrini E, *et al.* A Digital Twins Machine Learning Model for Forecasting Disease Progression in Stroke Patients. *Applied Sciences* 2021; **11**: 5576.

- 51 Elayan H, Aloqaily M, Guizani M. Digital Twin for Intelligent Context-Aware IoT Healthcare Systems. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 2021; **8**: 16749–57.
- 52 Tardini E, Zhang X, Canahuate G, *et al.* Optimal Treatment Selection in Sequential Systemic and Locoregional Therapy of Oropharyngeal Squamous Carcinomas: Deep Q-Learning With a Patient-Physician Digital Twin Dyad. *J Med Internet Res* 2022; **24**: e29455.
- 53 Tai Y, Zhang L, Li Q, *et al.* Digital-Twin-Enabled IoMT System for Surgical Simulation Using rAC-GAN. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 2022; **9**: 20918–31.
- 54 Schütt M, O’Farrell C, Stamatopoulos K, *et al.* Simulating the Hydrodynamic Conditions of the Human Ascending Colon: A Digital Twin of the Dynamic Colon Model. *Pharmaceutics* 2022; **14**: 184.
- 55 Hernigou P, Safar A, Hernigou J, Ferre B. Subtalar axis determined by combining digital twins and artificial intelligence: influence of the orientation of this axis for hindfoot compensation of varus and valgus knees. *Int Orthop* 2022; **46**: 999–1007.
- 56 Ahmadian H, Mageswaran P, Walter BA, *et al.* Toward an artificial intelligence-assisted framework for reconstructing the digital twin of vertebra and predicting its fracture response. *Int J Numer Method Biomed Eng* 2022; **38**: e3601.
- 57 Azzolin L, Eichenlaub M, Nagel C, *et al.* Personalized ablation vs. conventional ablation strategies to terminate atrial fibrillation and prevent recurrence. *Europace* 2023; **25**: 211–22.
- 58 Qin Y, Ma M, Shen L, Wang H, Han J. Virtual and Real Bidirectional Driving System for the Synchronization of Manipulations in Robotic Joint Surgeries. *Machines* 2022; **10**: 530.
- 59 Venkatapurapu SP, Iwakiri R, Udagawa E, *et al.* A Computational Platform Integrating a Mechanistic Model of Crohn’s Disease for Predicting Temporal Progression of Mucosal Damage and Healing. *Adv Ther* 2022; **39**: 3225–47.
- 60 Ahmadian H, Mageswaran P, Walter BA, *et al.* A digital twin for simulating the vertebroplasty procedure and its impact on mechanical stability of vertebra in cancer patients. *Int J Numer Method Biomed Eng* 2022; **38**: e3600.
- 61 Poletti G, Antonini L, Mandelli L, *et al.* Towards a Digital Twin of Coronary Stenting: A Suitable and Validated Image-Based Approach for Mimicking Patient-Specific Coronary Arteries. *Electronics* 2022; **11**: 502.
- 62 Zohdi TI. Machine-learning and digital-twins for rapid evaluation and design of injected vaccine immune-system responses. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* 2022; **401**: 115315.
- 63 Bahrami F, Rossi RM, Defraeye T. Predicting transdermal fentanyl delivery using physics-based simulations for tailored therapy based on the age. *Drug Deliv* 2022; **29**: 950–69.
- 64 Sharotry A, Jimenez JA, Mediavilla FAM, Wierschem D, Koldenhoven RM, Valles D. Manufacturing Operator Ergonomics: A Conceptual Digital Twin Approach to Detect

- Biomechanical Fatigue. *IEEE Access* 2022; **10**: 12774–91.
- 65 Zhang J, Tai Y. Secure medical digital twin via human-centric interaction and cyber vulnerability resilience. *Connection Science* 2022; **34**: 895–910.
- 66 Jung A, Gsell MAF, Augustin CM, Plank G. An Integrated Workflow for Building Digital Twins of Cardiac Electromechanics-A Multi-Fidelity Approach for Personalising Active Mechanics. *Mathematics (Basel)* 2022; **10**: 823.
- 67 Li X, Lee EJ, Lilja S, *et al.* A dynamic single cell-based framework for digital twins to prioritize disease genes and drug targets. *Genome Medicine* 2022; **14**: 48.
- 68 Silfvergren O, Simonsson C, Ekstedt M, Lundberg P, Gennemark P, Cedersund G. Digital twin predicting diet response before and after long-term fasting. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2022; **18**: e1010469.
- 69 Chakshu NK, Nithiarasu P. An AI based digital-twin for prioritising pneumonia patient treatment. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H* 2022; **236**: 1662–74.
- 70 Wu C, Jarrett AM, Zhou Z, *et al.* MRI-Based Digital Models Forecast Patient-Specific Treatment Responses to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. *Cancer Res* 2022; **82**: 3394–404.
- 71 Kim J-K, Lee S-J, Hong S-H, Choi I-Y. Machine-Learning-Based Digital Twin System for Predicting the Progression of Prostate Cancer. *Applied Sciences* 2022; **12**: 8156.
- 72 Doste R, Lozano M, Jimenez-Perez G, *et al.* Training machine learning models with synthetic data improves the prediction of ventricular origin in outflow tract ventricular arrhythmias. *Front Physiol* 2022; **13**: 909372.
- 73 Ang CYS, Lee JWW, Chiew YS, *et al.* Virtual patient framework for the testing of mechanical ventilation airway pressure and flow settings protocol. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 2022; **226**: 107146.
- 74 Al-Zyoud I, Laamarti F, Ma X, Tobón D, El Saddik A. Towards a Machine Learning-Based Digital Twin for Non-Invasive Human Bio-Signal Fusion. *Sensors (Basel)* 2022; **22**: 9747.
- 75 Bahrami F, Rossi RM, De Nys K, Defraeye T. An individualized digital twin of a patient for transdermal fentanyl therapy for chronic pain management. *Drug Deliv Transl Res* 2023; **13**: 2272–85.
- 76 Cen S, Gebregziabher M, Moazami S, Azevedo CJ, Pelletier D. Toward precision medicine using a “digital twin” approach: modeling the onset of disease-specific brain atrophy in individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Sci Rep* 2023; **13**: 16279.
- 77 Xu Q, Kowalski J. myCMIE: My cancer molecular information exchange. *iScience* 2023; **26**: 107324.
- 78 O’Hara RP, Meijborg VMF, Jelvehgaran P, *et al.* Site-specific prolongation of repolarization prevents postmyocardial infarction tachycardia. *Heart Rhythm O2* 2023; **4**: 466–8.

- 79 Thamotharan P, Srinivasan S, Kesavadev J, *et al.* Human Digital Twin for Personalized Elderly Type 2 Diabetes Management. *J Clin Med* 2023; **12**: 2094.
- 80 Maksymenko K, Clarke AK, Mendez Guerra I, Deslauriers-Gauthier S, Farina D. A myoelectric digital twin for fast and realistic modelling in deep learning. *Nat Commun* 2023; **14**: 1600.
- 81 Yang P-C, Rose A, DeMarco KR, *et al.* A multiscale predictive digital twin for neurocardiac modulation. *J Physiol* 2023; **601**: 3789–812.
- 82 Chasseloup E, Hooker AC, Karlsson MO. Generation and application of avatars in pharmacometric modelling. *J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn* 2023; **50**: 411–23.
- 83 Reimann A-M, Schalk E, Jost F, *et al.* AML consolidation therapy: timing matters. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2023; **149**: 13811–21.
- 84 Zhu L, Lu W, Soleimani M, Li Z, Zhnag M. Electrical Impedance Tomography Guided by Digital Twins and Deep Learning for Lung Monitoring. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement* 2023; published online July 24. DOI:10.1109/TIM.2023.3298389.
- 85 Cappon G, Vettoretti M, Sparacino G, Favero SD, Facchinetti A. ReplayBG: A Digital Twin-Based Methodology to Identify a Personalized Model From Type 1 Diabetes Data and Simulate Glucose Concentrations to Assess Alternative Therapies. *IEEE transactions on bio-medical engineering* 2023; **70**. DOI:10.1109/TBME.2023.3286856.
- 86 Montgomery L, Willing R, Lanting B. Virtual Joint Motion Simulator Accurately Predicts Effects of Femoral Component Malalignment during TKA. *Bioengineering (Basel)* 2023; **10**: 503.
- 87 Dubs L, Charitatos V, Buoso S, *et al.* Assessment of extracranial carotid artery disease using digital twins - A pilot study. *NeuroImage Clinical* 2023; **38**. DOI:10.1016/j.nicl.2023.103435.
- 88 Sayaka S, Noriyuki S, Ryosuke S, *et al.* Proposal of Simulation-Based Surgical Navigation and Development of Laparoscopic Surgical Simulator that Reflects Motion of Surgical Instruments in Real-World. *International Journal of Automation Technology* 2023; **17**: 262–76.
- 89 Maleki A, Crispino E, Italia SA, *et al.* Moving forward through the in silico modeling of multiple sclerosis: Treatment layer implementation and validation. *Computational and structural biotechnology journal* 2023; **21**. DOI:10.1016/j.csbj.2023.05.020.
- 90 Moztarzadeh O, Jamshidi M, Sargolzaei S, *et al.* Metaverse and Healthcare: Machine Learning-Enabled Digital Twins of Cancer. *Bioengineering (Basel, Switzerland)* 2023; **10**. DOI:10.3390/bioengineering10040455.
- 91 Moztarzadeh O, Jamshidi M, Sargolzaei S, *et al.* Metaverse and Medical Diagnosis: A Blockchain-Based Digital Twinning Approach Based on MobileNetV2 Algorithm for Cervical Vertebral Maturation. *Diagnostics (Basel, Switzerland)* 2023; **13**. DOI:10.3390/diagnostics13081485.

- 92 Viola F, Del Corso G, De Paulis R, Verzicco R. GPU accelerated digital twins of the human heart open new routes for cardiovascular research. *Scientific reports* 2023; **13**. DOI:10.1038/s41598-023-34098-8.
- 93 Lee J-H, Lee H-L, Park I-Y, On S-W, Byun S-H, Yang B-E. Effectiveness of creating digital twins with different digital dentition models and cone-beam computed tomography. *Sci Rep* 2023; **13**: 10603.
- 94 Straughan R, Kadry K, Parikh SA, Edelman ER, Nezami FR. Fully automated construction of three-dimensional finite element simulations from Optical Coherence Tomography. *Comput Biol Med* 2023; **165**: 107341.
- 95 Batagov A, Dalan R, Wu A, Lai W, Tan CS, Eisenhaber F. Generalized metabolic flux analysis framework provides mechanism-based predictions of ophthalmic complications in type 2 diabetes patients. *Health Inf Sci Syst* 2023; **11**: 18.
- 96 Sarp S, Kuzlu M, Zhao Y, Gueler O. Digital Twin in Healthcare: A Study for Chronic Wound Management. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform* 2023; **27**: 5634–43.
- 97 Zhang Y, Deng Y, Zhang X, Jiao P, Zhang X, Zhao Z. DT-CTNet: A clinically interpretable diagnosis model for fetal distress. *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control* 2023; **86**: 105190.
- 98 Azzolin L, Eichenlaub M, Nagel C, *et al.* AugmentA: Patient-specific augmented atrial model generation tool. *Comput Med Imaging Graph* 2023; **108**: 102265.
- 99 Lin T-Y, Chiu SY-H, Liao L-C, Chen SL-S, Chiu H-M, Chen TH-H. Assessing overdiagnosis of fecal immunological test screening for colorectal cancer with a digital twin approach. *NPJ Digit Med* 2023; **6**: 24.
- 100 Manocha A, Afaq Y, Bhatia M. Digital Twin-assisted Blockchain-inspired irregular event analysis for eldercare. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 2023; **260**: 110138.
- 101 Kirkels FP, van Osta N, Rootwelt-Norberg C, *et al.* Monitoring of Myocardial Involvement in Early Arrhythmogenic Right Ventricular Cardiomyopathy Across the Age Spectrum. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2023; **82**: 785–97.
- 102 Avanzato R, Beritelli F, Lombardo A, Ricci C. Heart DT: Monitoring and Preventing Cardiac Pathologies Using AI and IoT Sensors. *Future Internet* 2023; **15**: 223.
- 103 Susilo ME, Li C-C, Gadkar K, *et al.* Systems-based digital twins to help characterize clinical dose-response and propose predictive biomarkers in a Phase I study of bispecific antibody, mosunetuzumab, in NHL. *Clin Transl Sci* 2023; **16**: 1134–48.
- 104 Comte N, Pujades S, Courvoisier A, *et al.* Multi-Modal Data Correspondence for the 4D Analysis of the Spine with Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis. *Bioengineering (Basel)* 2023; **10**: 874.
- 105 Strocchi M, Longobardi S, Augustin CM, *et al.* Cell to whole organ global sensitivity analysis on a four-chamber heart electromechanics model using Gaussian processes emulators. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2023; **19**: e1011257.
- 106 Shu H, Liang R, Li Z, *et al.* Twin-S: a digital twin for skull base surgery. *Int J*

Comput Assist Radiol Surg 2023; **18**: 1077–84.

107 Wang J, Li X, Wang P, Liu Q. Bibliometric analysis of digital twin literature: a review of influencing factors and conceptual structure. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 2024; **36**: 166–80.

108 Liu X, Jiang D, Tao B, *et al.* A systematic review of digital twin about physical entities, virtual models, twin data, and applications. *Advanced Engineering Informatics* 2023; **55**: 101876.

109 Wang B, Zhou H, Li X, *et al.* Human Digital Twin in the context of Industry 5.0. *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing* 2024; **85**: 102626.

110 Corral-Acero J, Margara F, Marciniak M, *et al.* The ‘Digital Twin’ to enable the vision of precision cardiology. *Eur Heart J* 2020; **41**: 4556–64.

Figure legends

Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart

Figure 2: Dimensions of digital twins included in definitions provided by authors (grey) and included in the claimed digital twins (black). Created with Biorender.

Figure 3: Distribution of organs/systems modelled in the claimed digital twins identified. Created with Biorender. n = 48 claimed digital twin representing specific organs

Figure 4: Clusters of claimed digital twins identified. Each point and its associated number correspond to one study and its study identification number.

Figure 5: Proposed definitions and characteristics of patient digital twins. Created with Biorender. PDT: Patient digital twin

7224 potentially eligible records
identified through database
search

2846 Scopus
1874 Web of Science
795 Embase
528 IEEE
681 Pubmed
500 Google scholar

3123 duplicates records removed

4101 records screened

3943 records excluded

158 reports sought for retrieval

4 reports not retrieved

154 full text articles assessed for
eligibility

68 Full-text articles excluded

- 21** Wrong study type
- 2** Retracted articles
- 3** Articles not peer reviewed
- 17** No claimed digital twin
- 20** Not a patient digital twin
- 5** Development limited to a framework or a technology

86 studies included in review
80 unique claimed digital twins
included







