Bangladesh Crit Care J September 2025; 13 (2): 67-69

From the Desk of the Editor

Artificial Intelligence in Critical Care: Promise and Peril at Bedside

Mehnaz Ferdous

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3329/bccj.v13i2.84406

The Intensive Care Unit (ICU) represents medicine's most data-rich, time-sensitive environment, where split-second decisions can mean the difference between life and death. It is here, amidst the constant hum of monitors and the weight of clinical urgency, that artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as both a beacon of hope and a source of considerable controversy. As we stand at this technological crossroads, it becomes imperative to examine both the transformative potential and the sobering limitations of AI in critical care. The most compelling case for AI in critical care lies in its capacity to process vast quantities of physiological data in real-time, potentially identifying deteriorating patients' hours before human clinicians might recognize the subtle patterns[1,2].

Modern ICU patients generate thousands of data points hourly through continuous monitoring, laboratory results, and clinical observations – a volume that overwhelms even the most experienced intensivist. AI-powered Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) have shown remarkable promise in sepsis detection, arguably one of critical care's most pressing challenges[3-6]. These systems can analyze complex patterns across multiple variables, potentially flagging the early stages of sepsis when interventions are most effective.

The implications are profound: sepsis affects millions globally each year, and delayed recognition significantly increases mortality risk. Beyond sepsis, AI applications in mechanical ventilation optimization, fluid management, and medication dosing represent areas where algorithmic precision could enhance human clinical judgment[2,4]. The technology's ability to minimize cognitive bias and consider numerous variables simultaneously offers a compelling supplement to traditional clinical reasoning.

Critical Care Medicine is practiced under extreme stress, with sleep-deprived clinicians making complex decisions amid information overload. AI systems, theoretically immune to fatigue and emotional stress, could serve as tireless sentinels, maintaining vigilance when human attention wavers[2,4]. This is not about replacing physicians but augmenting their capabilities during medicine's most demanding moments.

Despite theoretical advantages, AI's integration into critical care has been "slow, stuttering and uneven," as recent research indicates[1]. A fundamental challenge lies in the lack of generalizability across diverse clinical settings. Models trained on specific datasets often struggle to perform accurately in varied populations, limiting their real-world applicability[2,4].

This limitation is particularly concerning in critical care, where patient populations can vary dramatically between institutions. An AI system trained on data from a tertiary academic medical center may perform poorly in a community hospital serving a different demographic. The heterogeneous nature of critical illness makes creating universally applicable models extraordinarily challenging[1,2].

Perhaps nowhere is the consequence of algorithmic error more pronounced than in the ICU. Recent studies have highlighted a concerning trend: high rates of false positives in AI sepsis detection systems[5,6]. These false alarms can lead to unnecessary interventions, antibiotic overuse, and clinical decision fatigue – a phenomenon where providers begin to ignore alerts due to their frequency and unreliability.

More troubling still, recent research from the University of Michigan suggests that some widely used AI tools for sepsis detection may be unable to differentiate high- and low-risk patients before they receive treatments, calling into question the fundamental premise of early detection algorithms[6].

The inability to explain AI decision-making processes poses significant ethical and practical challenges in critical care[2,4]. When an algorithm recommends a particular intervention, clinicians must understand the reasoning to make informed decisions about whether to follow the recommendation. The "black box" nature of many machine learning models creates tension with the transparency and accountability that medical decision-making demands.

The unique environment of the ICU presents obstacles to AI implementation that are less relevant in other healthcare settings. The time-critical nature of intensive care leaves little room for system failures or delays[2,3]. Integration with existing electronic health records, workflow disruption during implementation, and the need for extensive staff training all represent significant barriers to successful deployment.

The implementation of AI in critical care raises profound questions about the nature of medical decision-making and the physician-patient relationship[2,4]. How do we maintain the human elements of compassion, clinical intuition, and individualized care while embracing algorithmic assistance? The challenge lies not merely in developing effective AI tools but in ensuring they enhance rather than diminish the art of medicine.

Furthermore, issues of equity and access must be addressed[2]. Will AI-enhanced critical care become another factor contributing to healthcare disparities, available only in well-resourced institutions? The technology's development and validation require diverse datasets and careful attention to bias to ensure equitable outcomes across all populations.

Received : August 25, 2025; Accepted : August 30, 2025

The evidence suggests that AI in critical care is neither the panacea some proponents claim nor the threat some critics fear. Instead, it represents a powerful tool that, like any medical intervention, requires careful study, thoughtful implementation, and ongoing evaluation.

Success will depend on several critical factors:

a) **Rigorous Validation:** AI systems must undergo the same rigorous testing as any medical intervention, with large-scale randomized controlled trials (RCTs) demonstrating clinical benefit, not just statistical performance metrics[1-3].

b) **Transparency and Explainability:** Future AI systems must provide clear reasoning for their recommendations, allowing clinicians to understand and evaluate algorithmic suggestions. Explainable AI (XAI) is essential for improving trust, oversight, and clinical adoption[4-6].

c) **Continuous Learning and Adaptation:** AI systems must be designed to learn and adapt to new environments and populations, with mechanisms for ongoing validation and recalibration to prevent model drift and performance degradation[7-9].

d) **Human-Centered Design:** Technology must be designed around clinical workflows and decision-making processes, not the reverse. Co-design with clinicians ensures usability and effective integration into practice[10-12].

e) **Ethical Framework:** Clear guidelines for AI use in critical care must address issues of accountability, consent, and equity. Ethical frameworks are needed to safeguard transparency, fairness, and responsibility in deployment[13-16].

In conclusion, AI in critical care is a technique that attempts to replicate human intelligence, analytical behavior, and decision-making ability[9] within the ICU environment. More specifically, AI allows computers to find patterns in a complex environment of multi-domain and multidimensional data, with the prerequisite that such patterns would not be recognized otherwise[10]. AI systems aim to assist healthcare providers in making time-critical clinical decisions, predicting patient outcomes, and improving overall patient care[11]. These systems are particularly valuable in critical care because nowhere else in the healthcare system are the challenges to create useful models with direct time-critical clinical applications more relevant[1,2,4].

As we navigate this technological frontier, we must remember that the ultimate measure of AI's success in critical care will not be computational elegance or algorithmic sophistication, but improved patient outcomes[1-3]. The question is not whether AI will transform critical care, where transformation is already underway. The question is whether we will be "good shepherds of their use and further development," ensuring that these powerful tools serve the fundamental mission of intensive care: preserving life and alleviating suffering in medicine's most critical moments[2,3].

Mehnaz Ferdous

Dr. Mehnaz Ferdous
MBBS MD (Critical Care Medicine)
Jr. Consultant, CCM
Unico Hospitals, Dhaka 1205, Bangladesh.
E-mail : dr.mehnaz@unicohospitals.com

References

1. Vincent JL, Creteur J, Einav S, Takala J. Use of artificial intelligence in critical care: opportunities and obstacles. *Crit Care*. 2024; 28:113. doi:10.1186/s13054-024-04860-z.

2. Mushtaq A, Tariq M, Ramakrishnan S. Artificial Intelligence in the Intensive Care Unit: Current Evidence on an Inevitable Future Tool. *Cureus*. 2024; 16(5):e60244. doi:10.7759/cureus.60244.

3. Leisman DE, Vincent JL, et al. Implementing Artificial Intelligence in Critical Care Medicine: a consensus of 22. *Crit Care*. 2025; 29:31. doi:10.1186/s13054-025-05532-2.

4. Zhang Y, Li Q, Wang H, et al. Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence in Intensive Care Medicine: Critical Recalibrations from Rule-Based Systems to Frontier Models. *J Clin Med*. 2025; 14(12):4026. doi:10.3390/jcm14124026.

5. Chen L, Zhang X, Wu J, et al. Harnessing artificial intelligence in sepsis care: advances in early detection, personalized treatment, and real-time monitoring. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2024; 11:1510792. doi:10.3389/fmed.2024.1510792.

6. Sendak MP, Ratliff W, Sarro D, et al. Real-world performance of a clinical decision support system optimized for sepsis detection. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2020; 202(12):1696-1705. doi:10.1164/rccm.202003-0451OC.

7. University of Michigan News. Widely used AI tool for early sepsis detection may be cribbing doctors' suspicions [Internet]. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan; 2025 [cited 2025 Aug 28]. Available from: https://news.umich.edu/widely-used-ai-tool-for-early-sepsis-detection-may-be-cribbing-doctors-suspicions/

8. Wong A, Otles E, Donnelly JP, et al. Artificial intelligence in sepsis early prediction and diagnosis using unstructured data in healthcare. *Nat Commun*. 2021; 12:711. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-20910-4.

9. Suresh V, Singh KK, Vaish E, Gurjar M, et al. Artificial Intelligence in the Intensive Care Unit: Current Evidence on an Inevitable Future Tool. *Cureus*. 2024; 16(5):e59797. doi:10.7759/cureus.59797.

10. Yoon JH, Pinsky MR, Clermont G. Artificial Intelligence in Critical Care Medicine. *Crit Care*. 2022; 26:75. doi:10.1186/s13054-022-03915-3.

11. Abdelbaky AM, Elmasry WG, Awad A, et al. Role of Artificial Intelligence in Critical Care Medicine: A Literature Review. *Cureus*. 2025; 17(8):e90149. doi:10.7759/cureus.90149.

12. McDermott MBA, Wang S, Marinsek N, et al. Reproducibility in machine learning for health research: still a ways to go. *Sci Transl Med*. 2021; 13(617):eabb1655.

13. Morley J, Floridi L, Kinsey L, Elhalal A. From what to how: an initial review of publicly available AI ethics tools, methods and research to translate principles into practices. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2020; 26(4):2141–68.

14. Nuffield Council on Bioethics. Artificial Intelligence (AI) in healthcare and research. 2018. https://www.nuffieldbioethics.org/wp-content/uploads/Artificial-Intelligence-AI-in-healthcare-and-research-1.pdf

15. Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nat Mach Intell*. 2019; 1:389–99.

16. Price WN, Gerke S, Cohen IG. Potential liability for physicians using artificial intelligence. *JAMA*. 2019;322(18):1765–6.