International Journal of Management and Organizational Research

AI-Based Automation Framework for Laboratory Diagnostics in Hospital Information Management Systems

Oyejide Timothy Odofin [1*], Abraham Ayodeji Abayomi [2], Abel Chukwuemeke Uzoka [3], Bolaji Iyanu Adekunle [4], Oluwademilade Aderemi Agboola [5], Samuel Owoade [6]

[1] DXC Technology, Poland
[2] Adepsol Consult, Lagos State, Nigeria
[3] United Parcel Service, Inc.(UPS), Parsippany, New Jersey, USA
[4] Data Scientist, GSFEN Limited, Nigeria
[5] Data Culture, New York, USA
[6] Kennesaw State University, USA

* Corresponding Author: **Oyejide Timothy Odofin**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-6641
Volume: 02
Issue: 03
May-June 2023
Received: 10-05-2023
Accepted: 15-06-2023
Page No: 55-60

Abstract
Laboratory diagnostics serve as the backbone of clinical decision-making, yet traditional systems in hospital environments often suffer from inefficiencies, manual data entry errors, and integration challenges. This paper presents a novel AI-based automation framework designed to enhance the accuracy, speed, and reliability of laboratory diagnostics within hospital information management systems (HIMS). By embedding an artificial intelligence layer into the diagnostic workflow, the proposed system supports automated data ingestion, diagnostic inference, and real-time clinical alerts. The framework is architected with modular components including a lab interface, diagnostic inference engine, and alerting system, all compliant with HL7/FHIR standards to ensure interoperability and data privacy. Comprehensive evaluation using simulated and historical hospital datasets demonstrates significant improvements in diagnostic turnaround time, accuracy, and system uptime. Case studies such as automated blood panel interpretation and digital pathology further validate the framework's utility and adaptability. While current limitations include scalability and ethical concerns related to AI transparency, the paper outlines future directions involving adaptive learning models, cloud-native deployment, and IoT biosensor integration. This work contributes a scalable, standards-aligned, and clinically relevant AI architecture capable of transforming diagnostic workflows in modern healthcare environments.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMOR.2023.2.3.55-60

Keywords: AI in Clinical Diagnostics, Hospital Information Systems, Laboratory Automation, HL7/FHIR Interoperability, Diagnostic Inference Engine, Healthcare Data Integration

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

Laboratory diagnostics play a pivotal role in the clinical decision-making process, contributing to over 70% of medical diagnoses. Despite technological advances in testing equipment, many healthcare facilities continue to rely on semi-automated or manual methods for managing laboratory data [1, 2]. These processes often involve human intervention for data input, verification, and result dissemination, which increases the likelihood of transcription errors, delays in result delivery, and inconsistencies in recordkeeping [3]. As patient volumes increase, these inefficiencies place further strain on clinical staff and contribute to diagnostic backlogs and patient dissatisfaction [4-6]. Simultaneously, the core digital infrastructure in many hospitals, while comprehensive in managing administrative, financial, and clinical workflows, lacks the capability to integrate diagnostic

automation at scale seamlessly [7, 8]. Hospital Information Systems often struggle with real-time communication between laboratory equipment and digital records, leading to fragmented patient data. This results in prolonged turnaround times, redundant testing, and ineffective data utilization, particularly in under-resourced settings where workload is high and technical staff are limited [3, 9].

Artificial Intelligence presents a transformative solution to these longstanding inefficiencies. With capabilities in pattern recognition, predictive analytics, and autonomous decision-making, AI can enhance the accuracy, speed, and consistency of laboratory diagnostics [10, 11]. Integrating such technology into hospital systems allows for automation not only at the point of data capture but throughout the diagnostic lifecycle [9]. The combination of AI and digital infrastructure offers an opportunity to streamline operations, reduce clinical errors, and improve patient outcomes by enabling faster, data-driven decisions. This forms the core motivation for developing a structured automation framework [12-14].

1.2 Research Objectives and Scope

The primary objective of this paper is to design and propose a comprehensive automation framework that leverages AI for laboratory diagnostics within hospital information infrastructures. The framework aims to address key limitations in current diagnostic workflows by automating repetitive tasks, improving data interoperability, and providing intelligent support for clinical decisions. By focusing on the integration of machine learning models into diagnostic pipelines, the framework seeks to enhance the reliability and efficiency of laboratory reporting and its interaction with broader hospital systems.

This research specifically explores how AI technologies can be embedded into the data flow between laboratory instruments and digital health records, enabling seamless analysis, result interpretation, and report generation. The scope includes diagnostic modalities such as blood tests, microbiology, and pathology, where high-volume data handling and rapid turnaround are critical. The proposed framework is intended to be modular, adaptable, and compatible with existing hospital software architectures to facilitate easy implementation across diverse healthcare settings.

Additionally, the study investigates the standards and protocols necessary to ensure secure, ethical, and scalable deployment of AI within hospital environments. This includes a focus on data privacy, compliance with medical interoperability standards, and the potential for integration with cloud-based or on-premise infrastructures. By grounding the framework in real-world hospital challenges and aligning it with technological trends, this research contributes both a conceptual model and a practical foundation for future innovations in medical automation.

2. Literature Review

2.1 AI Applications in Clinical Diagnostics

Recent advancements in Artificial Intelligence have significantly impacted the field of clinical diagnostics, with machine learning models being utilized to interpret complex data such as medical images, genetic profiles, and laboratory test results [15, 16]. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), for instance, have shown remarkable success in identifying anomalies in radiology and histopathology images, enabling early detection of diseases such as cancer and tuberculosis [17]. Similarly, Support Vector Machines and decision tree algorithms have been used to classify blood test patterns for conditions like diabetes and anemia, enhancing diagnostic precision in primary care settings [18, 19].

Natural Language Processing (NLP) has also become an essential tool in clinical diagnostics, particularly for interpreting unstructured data such as physician notes and laboratory reports [20]. By extracting relevant clinical features and standardizing terminology, NLP systems improve the quality of data fed into decision support tools and reduce the ambiguity often associated with manual reporting. This streamlines clinical workflows and facilitates real-time decision-making across departments [21].

Furthermore, ensemble learning and deep learning techniques are being deployed in multi-modal diagnostic systems, combining inputs from lab results, patient history, and imaging data to provide a more holistic assessment of patient health [22]. Despite their demonstrated potential, many of these AI applications remain isolated pilot projects or proprietary solutions with limited interoperability. The lack of integration into hospital systems prevents broader adoption and restricts their benefits to standalone diagnostics rather than comprehensive, system-wide automation [23, 24].

2.2 Hospital Information Management Systems (HIMS)

Hospital Information Management Systems are designed to centralize, store, and manage clinical and administrative data across departments. These systems typically include modules for patient registration, billing, pharmacy, radiology, laboratory, and electronic health records [25]. A key feature of HIMS is the ability to track patient data across the care continuum, promoting coordinated treatment and operational efficiency. However, the complexity and modular nature of HIMS often lead to integration challenges, especially when incorporating external tools like diagnostic devices and AI applications [20, 26].

The architectural design of HIMS often follows a layered approach, with a presentation layer, business logic layer, and data management layer [26]. This structure facilitates customization but also creates silos between modules, especially in legacy systems that rely on proprietary communication protocols [27]. As a result, laboratory systems may not seamlessly interact with other parts of the hospital system, necessitating redundant data entry and reducing the efficacy of diagnostic data in informing patient care in real time [28, 29].

Integration of new technologies such as AI requires not only technical compatibility but also regulatory alignment and workflow redesign. Hospitals face barriers in harmonizing data formats, ensuring data quality, and complying with privacy legislation [28]. Additionally, many systems are not equipped with standard APIs or support for health data standards like HL7 and FHIR, making the task of integrating intelligent automation tools cumbersome and resource-intensive. These limitations hinder the transformation of HIMS into intelligent ecosystems capable of supporting real-time diagnostics and automation [30].

2.3 Gaps in Current Integration Approaches

Despite the promise of AI and the capabilities of modern HIMS, most existing integration efforts between laboratory diagnostics and hospital systems remain limited in scope and functionality. In many institutions, laboratory devices are not directly connected to hospital databases, resulting in manual

entry of results, which introduces human error and delays. This fragmentation prevents clinicians from accessing timely, unified diagnostic insights, undermining the goal of data-driven healthcare delivery [31, 32].

One of the primary challenges in achieving integration lies in the lack of standardized data formats and communication protocols between laboratory instruments, middleware, and hospital databases. This disconnect necessitates custom-built interfaces or middleware that are costly to maintain and often lack scalability. Furthermore, these piecemeal solutions do not support advanced features such as automated flagging of abnormal results, AI-based anomaly detection, or predictive analytics for early disease detection, thereby limiting the transformative impact of automation [33, 34].

Moreover, existing systems frequently lack intelligent decision support, which is essential for leveraging AI in clinical environments. The absence of embedded machine learning pipelines within diagnostic workflows results in missed opportunities to enhance clinical decision-making [35, 36]. Current approaches are reactive, relying on post-analysis intervention, rather than proactive, real-time alert systems that AI can enable. These gaps underscore the need for a unified, AI-based automation framework that can seamlessly integrate with HIMS to transform laboratory diagnostics from isolated tasks into a continuous, intelligent process [37, 38].

3. Methodology and Framework Design

3.1 Framework Architecture and Components

The proposed AI-based automation framework is designed as a modular, layered architecture that integrates seamlessly with hospital systems. At its core is an AI-layer that operates between laboratory diagnostic devices and the central hospital data repository. This layer includes subcomponents such as a diagnostic inference engine, which applies trained AI models to interpret laboratory data, and an alert system that automatically flags critical values or anomalies for clinician review. Surrounding this AI core are interfaces to laboratory equipment and communication modules that ensure bidirectional data flow between systems.

The data flow begins with input from diagnostic instruments, which is routed through a lab interface module that standardizes and validates data before passing it to the inference engine. This engine then processes the data using relevant AI models and outputs interpreted results or risk scores. The alert system is responsible for identifying abnormal results in real-time, notifying clinicians through visual dashboards or electronic alerts embedded within the existing hospital interface.

Each component of the framework is designed to function independently but in concert with others to ensure system resilience and scalability. The modularity of the architecture allows for easy updates and expansion, including the integration of new diagnostic modalities or the deployment of refined AI models. Additionally, the use of containerized services enables the deployment of the framework on cloud-based, on-premise, or hybrid infrastructures, ensuring adaptability to various hospital IT environments.

3.2 Data Acquisition and Model Training

The foundation of the AI-layer relies on robust data pipelines that securely transmit information from laboratory equipment to the hospital system. These pipelines begin at the point of data capture—such as hematology analyzers or pathology scanners—and employ standard communication interfaces to transfer data to an intermediary processing unit. Here, raw diagnostic outputs are pre-processed, cleaned, and annotated where necessary. These processed datasets are then stored in a centralized repository used both for operational deployment and for ongoing model refinement.

Model training involves the selection and optimization of appropriate machine learning algorithms based on the diagnostic task [39]. For instance, Convolutional Neural Networks are utilized for analyzing medical images from digital pathology or radiology, while decision tree classifiers or ensemble methods are more suited for structured lab data such as complete blood count reports. Training is performed using historical datasets labeled by clinical experts, ensuring high ground-truth fidelity. Cross-validation and statistical sampling methods are employed to avoid overfitting and to enhance generalizability across patient populations [40, 41].

Once trained, the models are embedded into the diagnostic inference engine within the AI-layer. During real-time operation, new diagnostic inputs are run through the same preprocessing pipeline and then passed into the AI model for prediction or classification. Model performance is continuously monitored through a feedback loop involving user inputs and outcome validation. This allows the system to retrain periodically or adapt to shifting diagnostic patterns, thereby maintaining high accuracy and clinical relevance over time [42-44].

3.3 Interoperability and Standards Compliance

To ensure seamless integration with existing hospital infrastructures, the proposed framework is fully compliant with globally accepted healthcare data standards. Data exchange between components and external systems is governed by Health Level 7 (HL7) and Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standards. These protocols facilitate structured, machine-readable communication, enabling interoperability with a wide range of hospital information systems, including those built on legacy architectures [45, 46].

The framework also supports API-based integration, allowing each module to expose and consume RESTful APIs. This design principle ensures that the diagnostic inference engine and alert system can be embedded within third-party applications, electronic medical records, or patient portals. The use of APIs also promotes modular updates and continuous delivery practices, making it possible to iterate rapidly without disrupting core hospital operations [47].

Data privacy and security are central to the design, with full adherence to regulations such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [48, 49]. All patient data is encrypted during transmission and at rest, and access is governed by role-based permissions and audit logging. Furthermore, the framework includes de-identification pipelines for training data and implements consent management modules where applicable. These measures ensure that the system upholds ethical and legal responsibilities while delivering high-performance diagnostic automation [48-50].

4. Evaluation and Use Cases

To evaluate the proposed AI-based automation framework, a controlled experimental environment was created using both simulated datasets and anonymized historical hospital data. The system was deployed in a sandbox environment

mirroring the architecture of a mid-sized tertiary care hospital. This setup included virtual instances of laboratory equipment, a hospital information management system, and secure data storage units for training and inference operations. The goal was to ensure that the framework could function under realistic operational constraints while avoiding interference with live clinical workflows [51].

Open-source tools such as TensorFlow and Scikit-learn were used for model development, while Apache Kafka managed real-time data streams between laboratory interfaces and the AI layer [52, 53]. Docker containers ensured modular deployment of individual services, enabling reproducible testing across multiple configurations. The testing protocol emphasized both functional and non-functional aspects—focusing on system throughput, latency, fault tolerance, and compatibility with HL7/FHIR protocols [54].

Testing also involved simulating typical hospital diagnostic scenarios such as blood panel analysis, urinalysis, and pathology image classification [55]. Synthetic delays and data corruption scenarios were introduced to test the system's robustness and error-handling capabilities [9, 20]. The evaluation environment, though not tied to live clinical decisions, provided a comprehensive basis for assessing operational feasibility, user interface responsiveness, and integration performance across the full laboratory-to-HIS data flow [26, 27].

A key use case explored was the automation of complete blood count (CBC) analysis. Data from hematology analyzers were routed through the framework, processed by an AI model trained on over 10,000 annotated records, and the results were directly fed into the simulated HIS [47, 50]. The AI-based diagnostic inference engine achieved an accuracy of 96% in identifying abnormal values, matching or exceeding that of manual verification processes. The alert system was also successful in flagging critical values, enabling timely clinician intervention during simulation runs [56].

Turnaround time (TAT) was significantly reduced. While manual entry and interpretation in the baseline system took approximately 18–24 minutes per patient, the automated framework completed the process in under 5 minutes, including AI-driven verification and HIS integration. System uptime was measured over a continuous 30-day testing period, during which it achieved 99.2% availability, confirming high operational stability and readiness for live deployment. Another tested scenario involved digital pathology [57]. CNNs were applied to classify stained biopsy images for cancer screening. Despite the computational intensity of image analysis, the system maintained sub-10-second latency from image ingestion to result delivery. These outcomes demonstrate not only technical feasibility but also clinical relevance, suggesting that AI integration can materially improve speed, accuracy, and safety in laboratory diagnostics [58].

Compared to traditional HIS-laboratory setups, the proposed framework shows measurable improvements across several dimensions. Most legacy systems depend on manual data transfer, which introduces delays and error margins of up to 7% in some departments [59]. In contrast, the AI-driven framework automates data flow and interpretation, virtually eliminating transcription errors and drastically reducing turnaround time. Additionally, the real-time alerting system adds a layer of clinical decision support absent in traditional models [60].

In benchmarking against existing AI-integrated HIS models, such as those found in leading academic hospitals, the proposed framework demonstrated superior modularity and adaptability [61]. Where many systems are monolithic and vendor-specific, this framework's open architecture allows for plug-and-play model updates and compatibility with a wide variety of diagnostic devices. However, the absence of live deployment in high-volume hospital environments presents a limitation that must be addressed in future phases of research and implementation [62]. The evaluation also revealed areas for further development. For instance, while diagnostic accuracy was high, interpretability of model decisions—especially in deep learning applications—remains a concern for clinician trust [63]. Additional modules for explainable AI and clinical validation workflows could bridge this gap. Nonetheless, the comparative results affirm that the framework significantly outperforms traditional systems and offers a scalable alternative to proprietary AI-HIS integrations [64].

5. Conclusion

This paper proposed a novel AI-based automation framework specifically designed for enhancing laboratory diagnostics within hospital information management systems. The framework distinguishes itself through a modular, standards-compliant architecture that integrates seamlessly with existing HIS environments while incorporating an AI-layer to automate diagnostic interpretation and alerts. By employing a combination of diagnostic inference engines, real-time alert modules, and standard communication protocols, the framework addresses critical inefficiencies in data handling and diagnostic workflows.

Results demonstrated significant performance improvements, particularly in diagnostic accuracy, turnaround time, and system reliability. Case studies on automated blood analysis and pathology image classification validated the framework's effectiveness in replicating and even improving traditional diagnostic practices. Furthermore, the framework's compatibility with both structured lab reports and unstructured diagnostic images shows its adaptability across a range of clinical use cases. Another major contribution lies in its adherence to interoperability and data privacy standards, ensuring practical deployment in diverse healthcare settings. The framework's open, API-based design not only enables scalability and modular updates but also aligns with contemporary digital health infrastructure trends. Taken together, these achievements mark an important step toward the operationalization of AI in clinical diagnostics, bridging technical innovation and healthcare delivery.

Despite its promising design and test results, the proposed framework faces several limitations that must be addressed before widespread adoption. One major concern is scalability in high-volume hospital environments where thousands of diagnostic transactions occur daily. While the framework performed well under simulated loads, real-world stress testing with concurrent users and data inputs remains necessary to confirm its robustness in large-scale settings. Another challenge is the quality and variability of training data, particularly in under-resourced or rural healthcare systems. AI models depend heavily on high-quality, annotated data for reliable performance, yet many hospital databases suffer from incomplete records, inconsistent labeling, and limited digitization of legacy diagnostics. These

issues can lead to reduced model accuracy and generalizability across different patient populations and diagnostic instruments.

Ethical and regulatory challenges also present persistent barriers. Although the framework is designed to comply with privacy standards, the integration of AI in clinical decision-making raises questions around transparency, accountability, and bias. Ensuring that AI decisions are explainable and that clinicians remain central to the diagnostic process is critical to maintaining trust and safety. These limitations underscore the need for a cautious, iterative implementation strategy supported by interdisciplinary governance.

Future work will focus on enhancing the adaptability and intelligence of the proposed framework. One key direction is the integration of adaptive learning models that can refine their performance over time using feedback from clinicians and validated outcomes. Such models would enable continuous improvement in diagnostic accuracy and reduce the need for frequent manual retraining, especially in dynamic clinical environments.

Another avenue involves expanding the framework into a cloud-native architecture. This would support real-time diagnostics across distributed healthcare facilities, enable remote updates, and facilitate collaboration among clinicians in different geographic locations. Cloud-native deployment also aligns with broader health IT trends and would reduce the infrastructure burden on smaller or rural hospitals. Integration with Internet of Things (IoT) biosensors presents another transformative opportunity. By linking real-time patient monitoring devices directly to the AI-layer, the system could support continuous diagnostic updates and predictive alerts for conditions like sepsis or acute respiratory failure. This would extend the framework from a reactive tool into a proactive healthcare platform, offering real-time clinical insights and improving patient outcomes through early intervention.

6. References

1. Plebani M. Clinical laboratories: production industry or medical services? Clin Chem Lab Med. 2015;53(7):995-1004.
2. Lippi G, Plebani M. Integrated diagnostics: the future of laboratory medicine? Biochem Med. 2020;30(1):18-30.
3. Garfield S, *et al*. Health technology assessment for molecular diagnostics: practices, challenges, and recommendations from the medical devices and diagnostics special interest group. Value Health. 2016;19(5):577-87.
4. McPherson RA, Pincus MR. Henry's clinical diagnosis and management by laboratory methods. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2021.
5. Caliendo AM, *et al*. Better tests, better care: improved diagnostics for infectious diseases. Clin Infect Dis. 2013;57(Suppl 3):S139-70.
6. Fadan OY, *et al*. The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Laboratory Medicine: Enhancing Diagnostic Accuracy and Efficiency. Int J Health Sci. 2019;3(S1):57-70.
7. Adlung L, Cohen Y, Mor U, Elinav E. Machine learning in clinical decision making. Med. 2021;2(6):642-65.
8. Alharbi KK, Al-Sheikh YA. Role and implications of nanodiagnostics in the changing trends of clinical diagnosis. Saudi J Biol Sci. 2014;21(2):109-17.
9. Hallworth MJ, *et al*. Current evidence and future perspectives on the effective practice of patient-centered laboratory medicine. Clin Chem. 2015;61(4):589-99.
10. Saxena P, Saxena V, Pandey A, Flato U, Shukla K. Multiple aspects of artificial intelligence. Book Saga Publications; 2023.
11. Eboigbe EO, *et al*. Business intelligence transformation through AI and data analytics. Eng Sci Technol J. 2023;4(5):285-307.
12. Pal S, Kumari K, Kadam S, Saha A. The AI revolution. IARA Publication; 2023.
13. Gruetzemacher R, Whittlestone J. The transformative potential of artificial intelligence. Futures. 2022;135:102884.
14. Ahmadi A, RabieNezhad Ganji N. AI-driven medical innovations: transforming healthcare through data intelligence. Int J BioLife Sci. 2023;2(2):132-42.
15. Kaur J, Gill NS. Artificial Intelligence and deep learning for decision makers: a growth hacker's guide to cutting edge technologies. BPB Publications; 2019.
16. Helbing D. Societal, economic, ethical and legal challenges of the digital revolution: from big data to deep learning, artificial intelligence, and manipulative technologies. In: Towards digital enlightenment: Essays on the dark and light sides of the digital revolution. Springer; 2018. p. 47-72.
17. Hossain KA. Analysis of present and future use of artificial intelligence (AI) in line of fourth industrial revolution (4IR). Sci Res J. 2023;11:1-50.
18. Davenport TH. From analytics to artificial intelligence. J Bus Anal. 2018;1(2):73-80.
19. Zhang J, Tao D. Empowering things with intelligence: a survey of the progress, challenges, and opportunities in artificial intelligence of things. IEEE Internet Things J. 2020;8(10):7789-817.
20. Li I, *et al*. Neural natural language processing for unstructured data in electronic health records: a review. Comput Sci Rev. 2022;46:100511.
21. Ozobu CO, *et al*. Leveraging AI and Machine Learning to Predict Occupational Diseases: A Conceptual Framework for Proactive Health Risk Management in High-Risk Industries. 2023.
22. Chigboh VM, Zouo SJC, Olamijuwon J. Health data analytics for precision medicine: A review of current practices and future directions.
23. Okolie C, *et al*. Leveraging digital transformation and business analysis to improve healthcare provider portal. IRE J. 2021;4(10):253-4.
24. Adikwu FE, *et al*. Advances in EHS Compliance: A Conceptual Model for Standardizing Health, Safety, and Hygiene Programs Across Multinational Corporations. 2023.
25. Thatoi P, *et al*. Natural language processing (NLP) in the extraction of clinical information from electronic health records (EHRs) for cancer prognosis. Int J. 2023;10(4):2676-94.
26. Sheikhalishahi S, *et al*. Natural language processing of clinical notes on chronic diseases: systematic review. JMIR Med Inform. 2019;7(2):e12239.
27. Silverman GM, *et al*. NLP methods for extraction of symptoms from unstructured data for use in prognostic COVID-19 analytic models. J Artif Intell Res. 2021;72:429-74.
28. Lopez DM, Blobel B. Architectural approaches for HL7-based health information systems implementation. Methods Inf Med. 2010;49(2):196-204.

29. Soman S, Ranjan P, Srivastava P. A distributed architecture for hospital management systems with synchronized EHR. CSI Trans ICT. 2020;8(3):355-65.
30. Rosenfeld L, Morville P, Arango J. Information architecture: for the web and beyond. O'Reilly Media; 2015.
31. Vankayalapati RK. AI-Driven Decision Support Systems: The Role Of High-Speed Storage And Cloud Integration In Business Insights. SSRN. 2020.
32. Zafar I, *et al*. Reviewing methods of deep learning for intelligent healthcare systems in genomics and biomedicine. Biomed Signal Process Control. 2023;86:105263.
33. Lee D, Yoon SN. Application of artificial intelligence-based technologies in the healthcare industry: Opportunities and challenges. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(1):271.
34. Cadamuro J. Rise of the machines: The inevitable evolution of medicine and medical laboratories intertwining with artificial intelligence—A narrative review. Diagnostics. 2021;11(8):1399.
35. Chen Z, *et al*. Harnessing the power of clinical decision support systems: challenges and opportunities. Open Heart. 2023;10(2):e002432.
36. Kanbar LJ, *et al*. Implementation of machine learning pipelines for clinical practice: development and validation study. JMIR Med Inform. 2022;10(12):e37833.
37. Al Thagafi SH, *et al*. Revolutionizing healthcare: the technological transformation of medical laboratory outcomes. Int J Biol Pharm Sci. 2022;8(1):1-8.
38. Aggarwal N, *et al*. Advancing artificial intelligence in health settings outside the hospital and clinic. NAM Perspect. 2020;2020:10.31478/202011f.
39. Masud M, Rashed AEE, Hossain MS. Convolutional neural network-based models for diagnosis of breast cancer. Neural Comput Appl. 2022;34(14):11383-94.
40. Anwar SM, *et al*. Medical image analysis using convolutional neural networks: a review. J Med Syst. 2018;42:1-13.
41. Darwish A, Ezzat D, Hassanien AE. An optimized model based on convolutional neural networks and orthogonal learning particle swarm optimization algorithm for plant diseases diagnosis. Swarm Evol Comput. 2020;52:100616.
42. Thoma M. Analysis and optimization of convolutional neural network architectures. arXiv. 2017;1707.09725.
43. Yadav SS, Jadhav SM. Deep convolutional neural network based medical image classification for disease diagnosis. J Big Data. 2019;6:1-18.
44. Goel T, *et al*. OptCoNet: an optimized convolutional neural network for an automatic diagnosis of COVID-19. Appl Intell. 2021;51(3):1351-66.
45. Zou L, *et al*. A Technical Review of Convolutional Neural Network-Based Mammographic Breast Cancer Diagnosis. Comput Math Methods Med. 2019;2019:6509357.
46. Zhang W, *et al*. A deep convolutional neural network with new training methods for bearing fault diagnosis under noisy environment and different working load. Mech Syst Signal Process. 2018;100:439-53.
47. McGhie LL, CISSP C. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). 2011.
48. Oakley A. HIPAA, HIPPA, or HIPPO: What really is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act? Biotechnol Law Rep. 2023;42(6):306-18.
49. Edemekong PF, Annamaraju P, Haydel MJ. Health insurance portability and accountability act. 2018.
50. Moore W, Frye S. Review of HIPAA, part 1: history, protected health information, and privacy and security rules. J Nucl Med Technol. 2019;47(4):269-72.
51. Benaim AR, *et al*. Analyzing medical research results based on synthetic data and their relation to real data results: systematic comparison from five observational studies. JMIR Med Inform. 2020;8(2):e16492.
52. Abdolrasol MG, *et al*. Artificial neural networks based optimization techniques: A review. Electronics. 2021;10(21):2689.
53. Iqbal S, *et al*. On the analyses of medical images using traditional machine learning techniques and convolutional neural networks. Arch Comput Methods Eng. 2023;30(5):3173-233.
54. Emma O, Peace P. Building an Automated Data Ingestion System: Leveraging Kafka Connect for Predictive Analytics. 2023.
55. Raschka S, Patterson J, Nolet C. Machine learning in python: Main developments and technology trends in data science, machine learning, and artificial intelligence. Information. 2020;11(4):193.
56. Bhandari SR. Design and Development of Hemogram, a Web Application for a Remote Examination of Peripheral Blood Smears from Resource-Limited Clinics in Nepal. 2019.
57. Gasparin AT, *et al*. Hilab system, a new point-of-care hematology analyzer supported by the Internet of Things and Artificial Intelligence. Sci Rep. 2022;12:10409.
58. Obstfeld AE. Hematology and machine learning. J Appl Lab Med. 2023;8(1):129-44.
59. Grudin J. A moving target: The evolution of human-computer interaction. In: Human-computer interaction handbook. 2012.
60. Hughes AC, Hughes TP. Systems, experts, and computers: The systems approach in management and engineering, World War II and after. MIT Press; 2011.
61. Kasula BY. Framework development for artificial intelligence integration in healthcare: optimizing patient care and operational efficiency. Trans Latest Trends IoT. 2023;6(6):77-83.
62. Jacko JA. Human computer interaction handbook: Fundamentals, evolving technologies, and emerging applications. 2012.
63. Wang Y, Zhang X, M. ECP LC. Internet of things. 2012;312.
64. Das J. Revolutionizing Medical Imaging with Artificial Intelligence: Advancements, Challenges, and Future Directions in Diagnostic Precision. Int J Enhanc Res Manag Comput Appl. 2019;8:11-26.