



SHAREABLE PDF

Reply to “COVID-19 prediction models should adhere to methodological and reporting standards”

Guangyao Wu¹, Henry C. Woodruff ^{1,2}, Avishek Chatterjee¹ and Philippe Lambin ^{1,2}

Affiliations: ¹The D-Lab, Dept of Precision Medicine, GROW - School for Oncology, Maastricht University Medical Center+, Maastricht, The Netherlands. ²Dept of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, GROW- School for Oncology and Developmental Biology, Maastricht University Medical Center+, Maastricht, The Netherlands.

Correspondence: Guangyao Wu, The D-Lab, Dept of Precision Medicine, GROW - School for Oncology, Maastricht University Medical Center+, 6229 ER, Maastricht, The Netherlands. E-mail: g.wu@maastrichtuniversity.nl



@ERSpublications

It is hard to follow a standardised methodology for prediction models, while researchers should adhere to generally accepted reporting standards according to research needs and journal submission requirements <https://bit.ly/30zfMIw>

Cite this article as: Wu G, Woodruff HC, Chatterjee A, *et al.* Reply to “COVID-19 prediction models should adhere to methodological and reporting standards”. *Eur Respir J* 2020; 56: 2002918 [<https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.02918-2020>].

This single-page version can be shared freely online.

From the authors:

We would like to thank G.S. Collins, M. van Smeden, and R.D. Riley for their commentary on the design, analysis, and reporting of our article [1]. However, their comments seem to stem from a traditional biostatistics angle rather than from a translational research machine-learning approach and the overwhelming majority of criticisms arise from either misunderstandings or misreading.