

Machine Learning Algorithms for Neurosurgical Preoperative Planning: A Comprehensive Scoping Review of the Literature

Jhon E. Bocanegra-Becerra¹; Julia Sader Neves Ferreira²; Gabriel Simoni³; Anthony Hong⁴; Wagner Rios-Garcia⁵; Mohammad Mirahmadi Eraghi⁶; Adriam M. Castilla-Encinas⁷; Jhair Alejandro Colan⁸; Rolando Rojas-Apaza⁹; Emanuel Eduardo Franco Pariasca Trevejo¹⁰; Raphael Bertani¹¹; Miguel Angel Lopez-Gonzalez¹²

1. Academic Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru
2. Santo Amaro University, Brazil
3. Centro Universitário de Várzea Grande, Várzea Grande, MT, Brasil
4. University of Costa Rica, Costa Rica
5. Facultad de Medicina Humana, Universidad Nacional San Luis Gonzaga, Ica, Peru
6. Student Research Committee, School of Medicine, Islamic Azad University, Qeshm International Branch, Qeshm, Iran
7. Sociedad Científica de San Fernando, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, Peru
8. School of Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, PA, USA
9. Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital Edgardo Rebagliati Martins. Essalud, Lima, Peru
10. Grupo de Inteligencia Artificial PUCP-IA-PUCP, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Peru (PUCP), Lima, Perú
11. Department of Neurosurgery, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil
12. Department of Neurosurgery, Loma Linda University Medical Center, Loma Linda, CA, USA

Keywords: Machine Learning; Neurosurgery; Spine Surgery; Artificial Intelligence

PROSPERO registry number: CRD42024510340

Abstract

Introduction

Preoperative neurosurgical planning is a keen step to avoiding surgical complications, reducing morbidity, and improving patient safety. The incursion of machine learning (ML) in this domain has recently gained attention, given the notable advantages in processing large data sets and potentially generating efficient and accurate algorithms in patient care.

Objective

To evaluate the evolving applications of ML algorithms in the preoperative planning of brain and spine surgery.

Methods

In accordance with the Arksey and O'Malley framework, a scoping review was conducted using three databases (Pubmed, Embase, and Web of Science). Articles that described the use of ML for preoperative planning in brain and spine surgery were included. Relevant data were collected regarding the neurosurgical field of application, patient baseline features, disease description, type of ML technology, study's aim, preoperative ML algorithm description, and advantages and limitations of ML algorithms.

Results

Our search strategy yielded 7,407 articles, of which 8 studies (5 retrospective, 2 prospective, and 1 experimental study) satisfied the inclusion criteria. Clinical information from 518 patients (62.7% female; mean age: 44.8 years) was used for generating ML algorithms, including convolutional neural network (14.3%), logistic regression (14.3%), random forest (14.3%), and other algorithms (Table 1). Neurosurgical fields of applications included functional neurosurgery (37.5%), tumor surgery (37.5%), and spine surgery (25%). The main advantages of ML included automated processing of clinical and imaging information, selection of an individualized patient surgical approach and data-driven support for treatment decision-making. All studies reported technical limitations, such as long processing time, algorithmic bias, limited generalizability, and the need for database updating and maintenance.

Conclusion

ML algorithms for preoperative neurosurgical planning are being developed for efficient, automated, and safe treatment decision-making. Enhancing the robustness, transparency, and understanding of ML applications will be crucial for their successful integration into neurosurgical practice.

Introduction

Preoperative neurosurgical planning helps avoid surgical complications, reduce morbidity, and increase patient safety.^{1–3} In addition, this surgical stage allows neurosurgeons to conceive contingency strategies.^{4,5} However, neurosurgical planning may require accurate analysis of multiple sources of information, such as diagnostic and functional study images.^{6,7} In this regard, machine learning (ML) algorithms offer the opportunity to process the required data efficiently for accurate and more personalized planning for each patient.^{8,9} They also produce correlations and patterns, and these results are used to predict future events.^{10,11} These techniques are used in tumor segmentation, epilepsy treatment, risk assessment, and ante position to surgical complications, among others.^{12,13}

Despite promising advances, integrating ML into neurosurgical practice faces several challenges.^{14–16} These include the need for extensive, quality data, algorithm development, and the need for rigorous regulatory validation and approval.^{17,18} In addition, the practical implementation of these algorithms in clinical settings requires ethics and consideration of workflow integration, user training, and patient safety.^{19–21}

While this artificial system is on the rise, addressing the aforementioned challenges will be essential for the continued evolution of ML applications in neurosurgical preoperative planning.²² Therefore, we aimed to conduct a scoping review to explore and evaluate the evolving applications of ML algorithms in brain and spine preoperative planning, highlighting their applications, limitations, and prospects.

Material and methods

Search Strategy and Study Selection

In accordance with the Arksey and O'Malley framework and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) extension for Scoping Reviews,²³ three databases (PubMed, EMBASE, and SCOPUS) were queried from the date of their inception until February 2024. A PROSPERO registration was procured (registration number: CRD42024510340)

The search strategy comprised the following MESH terms, keywords, and Boolean operators: ("machine learning" OR " ML" OR "artificial intelligence" OR "AI") AND ("planning" OR "planning" OR "pre-operative" OR "pre operative") and ("neurosurg*" OR "spine*" OR "spinal*"). Furthermore, all articles' Reference lists were also screened for additional studies and enhance the comprehensiveness of this study.

Two independent reviewers screened search results by title, abstract, and full text (W.R.G, A.M.C.E). Any discrepancies were resolved by consensus or consultation with a third reviewer (J.E.B.B). For the final report and statement of this scoping review, we utilized the PRISMA Checklist.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

We included original studies published in English that described the implementation of diverse ML algorithms in the preoperative planning of brain or spine surgeries. We excluded editorials, letters, commentaries, opinion pieces, conference abstracts, literature reviews, and articles incorporating ML into distinct categories different from pre-operative planning, such as diagnosis, risk factor prediction, or prognosis.

Data Extraction and Statistical Analysis

Three independent reviewers (J.E.B.B., W.R.G, A.) extracted the data in a standardized collection form. Data fields included a neurosurgical field of application, patient baseline features, disease description, type of ML technology, study's aim, preoperative ML algorithm description, and advantages and limitations of ML algorithms. The collected variables of interest were summarized as counts and proportions. Information was stored using Microsoft Excel® 2016, and descriptive statistics were performed using IBM SPSS version 29.

Expert Consultation

Quality assessment and evaluation of good practices in ML were thoroughly assessed by a ML engineer and data scientist from the Grupo de Inteligencia Artificial PUCP- IA-PUCP, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Peru (PUCP), Lima, Peru.

Results

Our search strategy yielded 7,407 articles, from which 1820 duplicate records were removed, and 5587 records underwent title and abstract screening. From these, 5563 were excluded, leaving 24 studies that were sought for retrieval, from which 2 reports were not retrieved, leaving 22 studies that underwent full-text assessment for eligibility. Ultimately, 8 studies (5 retrospective, 2 prospective, and 1 experimental study) met the inclusion criteria. The PRISMA flow chart that depicts the rigorous selection process is presented in **Figure 1**.

The characteristics of the included studies are summarized in **Table 1**. From these, individual studies were conducted in the USA, France, Turkey, Israel, and China, and 3 studies were from Germany. Neurosurgical fields of applications included functional neurosurgery (37.5%), tumor surgery (37.5%), and spine surgery (25%) (**Figure 2**). Clinical information from 518 patients (62.7% female; mean age: 44.8 years) was used for generating ML algorithms, including convolutional neural network (14.3%), logistic regression (14.3%), random forest (14.3%), and other algorithms (**Tables 2-3**). Based on the detailed information presented in Tables 2-3, the main advantages of ML have been summarized in three categories, including automated

processing of clinical and imaging information, selection of an individualized patient surgical approach, and data-driven support for treatment decision-making (**Figure 3**). Technical difficulties were reported by all studies, such as processing time, algorithmic bias, limited generalizability, and the need for database updating and maintenance.

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram. ML: machine learning




Figure 2. Distribution of Machine Learning Algorithms across Neurosurgical Specialties




Figure 3. Main advantages of using Machine Learning during preoperative neurosurgical planning



Table 1. Characteristics of included studies, demographics, and clinical information. AI: artificial intelligence; AIS: adolescent idiopathic scoliosis; CT: computed tomography; DBS: deep brain stimulation; DL: deep learning; ML: machine learning; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; PC: principal components; VS: vestibular schwannoma; 3D: Tridimensional.

Author, Year	Country	Study design	Neurosurgical specialty	Patients (n)	Male/ Female (n)	Age (mean) (years)	Neurological condition of study	ML subset	Aim of using ML preoperatively
Berlin, 2023 ²⁴	Germany	Retrospective	Spine	100	20/80	14.6	AIS	DL	Skeleton measurements (e.g., Cobb angle, coronal balance) relevant for AIS planning
Baxter, 2022 ²⁵	France	Experimental	Functional	17	10/7	NR	Neurological and neurodegenerative disorders	DL	Estimation of subthalamic nucleus localization for DBS stimulation
Dundar, 2022 ⁸	Turkey	Retrospective	Tumor	1	NR	NR	Intracranial tumors	ML	Select cranial surgery approaches based on individual anatomic features
Gadot, 2022 ²⁶	USA	Retrospective	Tumor	124	81/43	52.4	Vestibular schwannomas	ML	Decision-making for active treatment vs MRI surveillance for patients with vestibular schwannomas
Kamer, 2021 ²⁷	Germany	Retrospective	Spine	20	2/18	78.65	Non-or minimally-displaced fragility fractures of the sacrum	AI and CT based 3D statistical modeling	Planning of transsacral implant position
Coenen, 2019 ²⁸	Germany	Prospective	Functional	8	5/3	NR	Psychiatric disorders, specifically major depressive disorder and obsessive-compulsive disorder	ML	White matter tract tracking for DBS planning.
Gazit, 2016 ²⁹	Israel	Prospective	Functional	76	37/39	NR	Epilepsy	ML	Preoperative language area mapping
Zhai, 2021 ³⁰	China	Retrospective	Tumor	172	37/135	52.8	Meningioma	ML	Meningioma tumor consistency assessment prior to surgery

Table 2. Details related to ML algorithms, advantages and limitations. AI: artificial intelligence; CNN: convoluted neural networks; CT: computed tomography; DBS: deep brain stimulation; DL: deep learning; dMRI: Diffusion magnetic resonance imaging; ML: machine learning; HAMLET: Hierarchical Harmonic Filters for Learning Tracts from Diffusion MRI; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; STN: subthalamic nucleus; sIMFB: superolateral medial forebrain bundle

Author	Algorithm Type	Preoperative ML algorithm description	Advantages of using ML preoperatively	Limitations of ML algorithms
Berlin, 2023 ²⁴	CNN	Automated algorithm containing a DL-CNN to at first identify different anatomical structures in anteroposterior spine X-rays and subsequently compute parameters based on the network's output.	The reliability and speed offered by the AI-algorithm could contribute to the efficient analysis of large datasets (e.g., registry studies) and measurements in clinical practice.	The AI algorithm measured exclusively coronal parameters.
Baxter, 2022 ²⁵	CNN	Two-stage separable learning workflow for STN segmentation. The first part used a multiresolution CNN to determine an estimate of the subthalamic nucleus location, which was then used to heavily crop the input images to the much smaller region of interest. The second network then directly segmented these images using a U-Net style architecture.	Two-step segmentation significantly outperformed the comparative registration-based method currently used in clinics and approaches the fundamental limit on variability due to the image resolution. The human-computer interaction experiment showed that the additional interaction mechanism allowed by separating STN segmentation into two steps significantly improves the users' ability to correct errors and further improves performance.	The study coupled interaction for left and right STNs, which affected the timing and ease-of-use results.
Dundar, 2022 ⁸	Heuristic algorithm and Q-learning reinforcement learning algorithm	In the first stage, a heuristic algorithm was used with MRI data to compute optimal surgical paths, avoiding critical structures in the brain and selecting the best ones based on reward and penalties. In the second stage, the Q-learning reinforcement learning algorithm was employed with optimal linear paths as entry points. This algorithm searched for the best nonlinear routes, minimizing the risk of damage to critical brain structures	Personalized surgical planning with optimized, precise and accurate trajectories.	Manual segmentation and specification of anatomical points, difficulties with image fusion, lengthy processing time, and limited automatic segmentation.

Gadot, 2022 ²⁶	Decision tree and Random Forest	<p>Decision trees were trained to predict the decision of active treatment or surveillance based on preoperative variables. A random forest with 500 trees was used to predict the decision of active treatment versus surveillance in patients with vestibular schwannoma.</p> <p>These algorithms were trained and validated with the goal of identifying which preoperative variables had the most weight in the intervention decision and could be used to guide future surgical decision making.</p>	Accurate prediction of intervention, identification of predictive factors, personalized treatment, support in decision making and reduction of clinical variability.	Dependency on training data, interpretability, limited generalization, algorithmic bias, computational and resource requirements, and need for continuous update.
Kamer, 2021 ²⁷	Linear regression	Authors trained, validated, and tuned classification models for the binary existence of S1 corridors and regression models for the numeric PC scores and the S1 diameter as responses. Models were trained using supervised ML. Predictor variables were the features. Response variables were the binary existences of S1 corridors, the S1 corridor diameter, and the PC scores as mentioned above.	Improved and facilitated clinical evaluation, therapeutic decision-making, and treatment planning with lower treatment risks in patients affected by fragility fractures of the sacrum.	CTs with low image resolution (CTs with 2 and 2.5 mm in the z-axis (=patient axis) compromised data processing and analysis.
Coenen, 2019 ²⁸	Image segmentation-based algorithm	The HAMLET algorithm used harmonic filters and ML to identify and represent the sIMFB beam on individual dMRI images, facilitating preoperative surgical planning for DBS.	The algorithm provided a more accurate and objective representation of the sIMFB anatomy in each patient, and eliminated the subjectivity associated with manual and deterministic tractography methods. Thus, facilitating more refined surgical planning by identifying and excluding unwanted fibers, which may improve clinical outcomes for patients.	Training data dependence, interpretation of results, overfitting, need for updating and maintenance, risks of algorithmic bias, and computational and resource cost.
Gazit, 2016 ²⁹	Logistic regression	The probabilistic logistic regression algorithm was used to predict language lateralization in patients	The algorithm can improve the accuracy of diagnoses, optimize treatment plans, prevent	Data quality, overfitting, interpretability, data privacy and security, algorithmic bias,

		with epilepsy before brain surgery, using fMRI data and other clinical and neuropsychological measures. This approach provided an accurate, non-invasive assessment of language lateralization, which helped guide surgical planning and improve outcomes.	complications, and improve surgical outcomes, benefiting both patients and healthcare providers.	computational resources, domain specificity, ethical and regulatory concerns.
Zhai, 2021 ³⁰	Logistic regression, Random Forest, Nearest neighbor, Support Vector Machine, and Adaboost classifier	MRI and regions of interest were delineated in meningioma images. The, the algorithm were trained to obtain the predictive accuracy of each model in terms of under the curve (AUC), sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy on an independent test data set.	The use of algorithms offered several advantages such as individualized prediction, non-invasive, improved precision, and facilitated decision-making.	Interpretability, generalization, data collection, bias and equity, update and maintenance.

Table 3. Prevalence of Machine Learning Algorithms in Neurosurgical Preoperative Planning

Algorithm description	n (%)
Logistic Regression	2 (14.3)
Convolutional Neural Network	2 (14.3)
Random Forest	2 (14.3)
Decision Tree	1 (7.1)
Heuristic Algorithm	1 (7.1)
Nearest Neighbor	1 (7.1)
Q-learning Reinforcement Learning Algorithm	1 (7.1)
Support Vector Machine	1 (7.1)
Magnetic resonance segmentation-based algorithm	1 (7.1)
Adaboost classifier	1 (7.1)
Linear regression	1 (7.1)

Discussion

In this study, the dynamic integration of ML is explored in neurosurgical planning, which is a field critical for enhancing patient safety and surgical precision. As dissected the use of various ML algorithms across eight studies involving 518 patients, it becomes evident that ML brings forth substantial advantages alongside significant challenges.

Advantages and Prospects of ML Algorithms in Neurosurgical Planning

The profound impact of ML in neurosurgery lies in its ability to transform preoperative planning through a host of advantages, which this review details meticulously. Primarily, ML facilitates highly personalized surgical strategies. Algorithms such as convolutional neural networks, logistic regression, and random forests have the capability to process complex datasets and tailor surgical approaches to the specific anatomical and pathological characteristics of individual patients.²⁴ This level of customization is paramount in neurosurgery, where the accuracy of the surgical approach can drastically affect patient outcomes.

Furthermore, ML significantly automates the processing of clinical data. This automation is a critical advancement as it alleviates the manual burden on neurosurgeons by quickly and accurately sifting through large volumes of patient data to extract relevant insights.²⁵ Such efficiency not only speeds up the preoperative planning process but also enhances the reliability of the outcomes, reducing the likelihood of errors that might occur with manual data handling.^{8,25}

Additionally, ML algorithms excel in supporting complex decision-making processes.^{8,25} They provide neurosurgeons with enhanced analytical capabilities, presenting data-derived insights and predictive analytics that help in making more informed, strategic decisions about surgical approaches and

interventions.^{8,25} For instance, algorithms can predict the risk of specific preventable complications based on patient data, thereby aiding surgeons in choosing the safest and most effective surgical paths.^{26–28}

ML also plays a pivotal role in risk assessment.^{24,27} By identifying potential surgical complications before they occur, ML algorithms contribute to a proactive approach to surgical planning.^{26,28} This predictive capability is invaluable in neurosurgery, where preemptive identification of risk factors can lead to significant improvements in surgical safety and patient outcomes.^{29,30}

However, despite these substantial advantages, the implementation of ML in neurosurgery is not without its challenges.^{25,27} The success of ML algorithms depends heavily on the availability of extensive, high-quality data sets, which are often difficult to gather, particularly for less common conditions.^{25,27} Issues such as algorithmic bias and the challenge of generalizing results across diverse patient populations further complicate the effectiveness of ML applications.^{8,28,29} Moreover, the technical demands and resource intensity required to implement and maintain these systems pose significant hurdles, especially in settings with limited technological infrastructure.^{24,27}

In addition, the complexity of machine learning models can make them less accessible to clinicians without specialized training in data science, potentially hindering broader adoption and trust in these tools.⁸ Ethical considerations, such as patient consent and data privacy, along with the evolving regulatory environment for AI technologies, underscore the need for careful management of these innovative tools within clinical practice.²⁵

A notable example is the study by Baxter et al.,²⁵ which utilized a CNN in a two-stage separable learning workflow for subthalamic nucleus segmentation. The initial phase employed a multi-resolution CNN to estimate the nucleus's location, guiding the cropping of images to a smaller region for precise segmentation using a U-Net style architecture. This method outperformed traditional registration-based methods and included a human-computer interaction mechanism that significantly improved error correction by users. Therefore, the Baxter study illustrates the potential of ML to personalize surgical planning, enhancing surgical accuracy, minimizing risks, and tailoring interventions to specific anatomical details. Despite its success, this study also highlights the need for ongoing interaction and updates to ensure optimal algorithm performance. This necessity emphasizes the broader requirement for continuous maintenance, regular updates, and a collaborative approach involving clinicians and data scientists to ensure the efficacy and safety of these technologies in real-world settings.

Recommendations and Analysis of Good Practices for Implementing ML Algorithms

It is important to note that regardless of the type of ML algorithm, authors are required to spend significant time validating and selecting the data for which the models are going to be trained. This implies that the retrieved information is representative of common clinical scenarios and not a pool of outliers. Moreover, it is advisable to leave a record of the authors who conducted these processes.³¹

In the case of poor-quality data (e.g., computed tomography scans with low image resolution), efforts must be made to optimize this crucial component, which can translate into a model yielding good performance.³²

□

Before an algorithm is applied, data processing, training, and evaluation must be documented, replicated, and approved by specialists. This allows individuals interested in the ML algorithm to conduct audits and ensure that the model is accurate rather than a result of chance. Additionally, it enhances transparency in the process to ascertain whether best practices were used and if a thorough analysis was performed to eliminate overfitting.³¹

Once the models have been trained, their predictions need to be evaluated to understand the situations in which they are most and least successful. This process should also be carried out using new data before retraining the model. Depending on the specific scenario, a policy needs to be established for retraining the model when its performance deteriorates.

Special care should be taken when using tree-type models – as in the case of Gadot et al.²⁶ – as they may have good performance but are prone to overfitting. In such scenarios, it is advisable to use ensemble algorithms, such as random forest, LightGBM, or XGBoost.³³

It is important that the person in charge of training the models defines and generates the interpretation mechanisms (preferably visually). For instance, in a decision tree algorithm, trees can be graphed to understand its decision-making process.³⁴ For convolutional neural networks, show heat maps in each prediction to understand which regions the algorithm focused on.³⁵ In linear or logistic regression algorithms, evaluate the coefficients and intercept. In the “K Nearest Neighbor” algorithm, show which are the neighbors on which the algorithm bases its prediction.³⁶ For more complex algorithms, the use of SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) can be recommended to explain the result of the algorithm and even to evaluate how the features influence the model predictions.³⁷

Finally, it's crucial to ensure that the features used in training the models are ethically balanced to avoid introducing biases, such as in gender or age groups. This is important because certain medical conditions may have a higher correlation or prevalence in specific demographic cohorts.

In summary, while machine learning offers transformative potential for neurosurgical preoperative planning, realizing this potential requires navigating a landscape filled with both technological promise and significant challenges. Enhancing the robustness, transparency, and accessibility of ML applications will be crucial for their successful integration into neurosurgical practice, ensuring they improve patient care while adhering to the highest standards of ethical medical practice.

Conclusion

ML algorithms for preoperative neurosurgical planning are being developed for efficient, automated, and safe treatment decision-making. Enhancing the robustness, transparency, and understanding of ML applications will be crucial for their successful integration into neurosurgical practice.

References

1. Dalton J, Mohamed A, Akioyamen N, Schwab FJ, Lafage V. PreOperative Planning for Adult Spinal Deformity Goals: Level Selection and Alignment Goals. *Neurosurgery Clinics of North America*. 2023;34(4):527-536. doi:10.1016/j.nec.2023.06.016
2. Risholm P, Golby AJ, Wells WM. Multi-Modal Image Registration for Pre-Operative planning and Image Guided Neurosurgical Procedures. *Neurosurg Clin N Am*. 2011;22(2):197-206. doi:10.1016/j.nec.2010.12.001
3. Beyer J, Hadwiger M, Wolfsberger S, Bühler K. High-quality multimodal volume rendering for preoperative planning of neurosurgical interventions. *IEEE Trans Vis Comput Graph*. 2007;13(6):1696-1703. doi:10.1109/TVCG.2007.70560
4. Yildirim MS, Schmidbauer VU, Micko A, et al. Multi-Dynamic-Multi-Echo-based MRI for the Pre-Surgical Determination of Sellar Tumor Consistency: a Quantitative Approach for Predicting Lesion Resectability. *Clin Neuroradiol*. Published online April 19, 2024. doi:10.1007/s00062-024-01407-1
5. Mahvash M, Maslehaty H, Jansen O, Mehdorn HM, Petridis AK. Functional magnetic resonance imaging of motor and language for preoperative planning of neurosurgical procedures adjacent to functional areas. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. 2014;123:72-77. doi:10.1016/j.clineuro.2014.05.011
6. Stippich C, Kress B, Ochmann H, Tronnier V, Sartor K. [Preoperative functional magnetic resonance tomography (fMRI) in patients with rolandic brain tumors: indication, investigation strategy, possibilities and limitations of clinical application]. *Rofo*. 2003;175(8):1042-1050. doi:10.1055/s-2003-40920
7. De Rosa A, Guizzardi G, Moncada M, et al. Ultrasound-Oriented Surgical Planning ("UOSP") for Intracranial Lesions: A Systematic Integration to the Standard Preoperative Planning. *World Neurosurgery*. 2023;170:e766-e776. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2022.11.122
8. Dundar TT, Yurtsever I, Pehlivanoglu MK, et al. Machine Learning-Based Surgical Planning for Neurosurgery: Artificial Intelligent Approaches to the Cranium. *Front Surg*. 2022;9. doi:10.3389/fsurg.2022.863633
9. Kocak B, Durmaz ES, Ates E, et al. Radiogenomics of lower-grade gliomas: machine learning-based MRI texture analysis for predicting 1p/19q codeletion status. *Eur Radiol*. 2020;30(2):877-886. doi:10.1007/s00330-019-06492-2
10. Buchlak QD, Esmaili N, Leveque JC, et al. Machine learning applications to clinical decision support in neurosurgery: an artificial intelligence augmented systematic review. *Neurosurg Rev*. 2020;43(5):1235-1253. doi:10.1007/s10143-019-01163-8
11. Buchlak QD, Esmaili N, Leveque JC, Bennett C, Farrokhi F, Piccardi M. Machine learning applications to neuroimaging for glioma detection and classification: An artificial intelligence augmented systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*. 2021;89:177-198. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2021.04.043
12. Munsell BC, Wee CY, Keller SS, et al. Evaluation of machine learning algorithms for treatment outcome prediction in patients with epilepsy based on structural connectome data. *NeuroImage*. 2015;118:219-230. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.06.008
13. Senders JT, Staples PC, Karhade AV, et al. Machine Learning and Neurosurgical Outcome Prediction: A Systematic Review. *World Neurosurgery*. 2018;109:476-486.e1. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2017.09.149
14. Kazemzadeh K, Akhlaghdoust M, Zali A. Advances in artificial intelligence, robotics, augmented and virtual reality in neurosurgery. *Front Surg*. 2023;10. doi:10.3389/fsurg.2023.1241923
15. Mofatteh M. Neurosurgery and artificial intelligence. *AIMS Neurosci*. 2021;8(4):477-495. doi:10.3934/Neuroscience.2021025

16. Awuah WA, Adebuseye FT, Wellington J, et al. Recent Outcomes and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning in Neurosurgery. *World Neurosurgery: X*. 2024;23:100301. doi:10.1016/j.wnsx.2024.100301
17. Mirchi N, Warsi NM, Zhang F, et al. Decoding Intracranial EEG With Machine Learning: A Systematic Review. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2022;16. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2022.913777
18. Khan DZ, Luengo I, Barbarisi S, et al. Automated operative workflow analysis of endoscopic pituitary surgery using machine learning: development and preclinical evaluation (IDEAL stage 0). *J Neurosurg*. Published online November 5, 2021:2021.6.JNS21923. doi:10.3171/2021.6.JNS21923
19. Foster KR, Koprowski R, Skufca JD. Machine learning, medical diagnosis, and biomedical engineering research - commentary. *Biomed Eng Online*. 2014;13:94. doi:10.1186/1475-925X-13-94
20. Jumah F, Raju B, Nagaraj A, et al. Uncharted Waters of Machine and Deep Learning for Surgical Phase Recognition in Neurosurgery. *World Neurosurgery*. 2022;160:4-12. doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2022.01.020
21. Merkaj S, Bahar RC, Zeevi T, et al. Machine Learning Tools for Image-Based Glioma Grading and the Quality of Their Reporting: Challenges and Opportunities. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2022;14(11):2623. doi:10.3390/cancers14112623
22. Adida S, Legarreta AD, Hudson JS, et al. Machine Learning in Spine Surgery: A Narrative Review. *Neurosurgery*. 2024;94(1):53. doi:10.1227/neu.0000000000002660
23. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32. doi:10.1080/1364557032000119616
24. Berlin C, Adomeit S, Grover P, et al. Novel AI-Based Algorithm for the Automated Computation of Coronal Parameters in Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis Patients: A Validation Study on 100 Preoperative Full Spine X-Rays. *Global Spine J*. Published online January 28, 2023:21925682231154543. doi:10.1177/21925682231154543
25. Baxter JSH, Jannin P. Combining simple interactivity and machine learning: a separable deep learning approach to subthalamic nucleus localization and segmentation in MRI for deep brain stimulation surgical planning. *J Med Imaging (Bellingham)*. 2022;9(4):045001. doi:10.1117/1.JMI.9.4.045001
26. Gadot R, Anand A, Lovin BD, Sweeney AD, Patel AJ. Predicting surgical decision-making in vestibular schwannoma using tree-based machine learning. *Neurosurg Focus*. 2022;52(4):E8. doi:10.3171/2022.1.FOCUS21708
27. Kamer L, Noser H, Arand C, Handrich K, Rommens PM, Wagner D. Artificial intelligence and CT-based 3D statistical modeling to assess transsacral corridors and plan implant positioning. *J Orthop Res*. 2021;39(12):2681-2692. doi:10.1002/jor.25010
28. Coenen VA, Bewernick BH, Kayser S, et al. Superolateral medial forebrain bundle deep brain stimulation in major depression: a gateway trial. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019;44(7):1224-1232. doi:10.1038/s41386-019-0369-9
29. Gazit T, Andelman F, Glikmann-Johnston Y, et al. Probabilistic machine learning for the evaluation of presurgical language dominance. *J Neurosurg*. 2016;125(2):481-493. doi:10.3171/2015.7.JNS142568
30. Zhai Y, Song D, Yang F, et al. Preoperative Prediction of Meningioma Consistency via Machine Learning-Based Radiomics. *Front Oncol*. 2021;11:657288. doi:10.3389/fonc.2021.657288
31. Makarov VA, Stouch T, Allgood B, Willis CD, Lynch N. Best practices for artificial intelligence in life sciences research. *Drug Discov Today*. 2021;26(5):1107-1110. doi:10.1016/j.drudis.2021.01.017

32. Chi J, Zhang Y, Yu X, Wang Y, Wu C. Computed Tomography (CT) Image Quality Enhancement via a Uniform Framework Integrating Noise Estimation and Super-Resolution Networks. *Sensors (Basel)*. 2019;19(15):3348. doi:10.3390/s19153348
33. Zhang D, Gong Y. The Comparison of LightGBM and XGBoost Coupling Factor Analysis and Prediagnosis of Acute Liver Failure. *IEEE Access*. 2020;8:220990-221003. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3042848
34. Laabs BH, Westenberger A, König IR. Identification of representative trees in random forests based on a new tree-based distance measure. *Adv Data Anal Classif*. 2024;18(2):363-380. doi:10.1007/s11634-023-00537-7
35. Cao J, Wu C, Chen L, Cui H, Feng G. An Improved Convolutional Neural Network Algorithm and Its Application in Multilabel Image Labeling. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*. 2019;2019(1):2060796. doi:10.1155/2019/2060796
36. Uddin S, Haque I, Lu H, Moni MA, Gide E. Comparative performance analysis of K-nearest neighbour (KNN) algorithm and its different variants for disease prediction. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):6256. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-10358-x
37. Mihirette S, Tan Q. SHAP Algorithm for Healthcare Data Classification. In: García Bringas P, Pérez García H, Martínez de Pisón FJ, et al., eds. *Hybrid Artificial Intelligent Systems*. Springer International Publishing; 2022:363-374. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-15471-3_31