Bayesian "skew-shrinkage" regression: tool for transfer learning across large health databases

Akihiko Nishimura Department of Biostatistics



Biostatistics

Observational Health Data Sciences & Informatics

Map of Collaborators





LEGEND initiative to bring together health data

"Large-scale Evidence GEneration via Network of Databases" to compare second-line treatments for type-2 diabetes mellitus:





Journal of the American College of Cardiology Volume 84, Issue 10, 3 September 2024, Pages 904-917 © JACC-

Original Research

Comparative Effectiveness of Second-Line Antihyperglycemic Agents for Cardiovascular Outcomes: A Multinational, Federated Analysis of LEGEND-T2DM

Rohan Khera MD, MS ° ^{b c} 🐣 🖾 🌐 , Arva Aminorroava MD, MPH °, Lovedeep Singh Dhingra MBBS °, Phyllis M. Thangarai MD. PhD °, Aline Pedroso Camaraos PhD °, Fan Bu PhD^d, Xivu Dina MS^e, Akihiko Nishimura PhD^e, Tara V, Anand BS^F, Faaizah Arshad BS⁹, Clair Blacketer MPH ^h, Yi Chai PhD ¹, Shounak Chattopadhyay PhD ⁹, Michael Cook BSc ^e, David A. Dorr MD. MS^{-J}. Talita Duarte-Salles PhD^{kl}, Scott L. DuVall PhD^{mn}, Thomas Falconer MS^f. Ting E. French RN. CPHO ^{o p}. Elizabeth E. Hanchrow RN. MSN ^{o p}. Guneet Kaur MS ^q Wallis C.Y. Lau BSc. PhD ^{r s t u}, Jing Li MS ^v, Kelly Li BS ^g, Yuntign Liu MPH ^{a b}, Yuan Lu ScD ^a, Kenneth K.C. Man BSc. MPH. PhD ^{r s t u}, Michael E. Matheny MD. MS. MPH ^{o p} Nestoras Mathioudakis MD. MHS^W. Jody-Ann McLeagon MPH^f. Michael F. McLemore RN^{op} Evan Minty MD, MSc *, Daniel R, Morales MD 9, Paul Naay PhD *, Anna Ostropolets MD, PhD h Andrea Pistillo MSc ^k, Thanh-Phuc Phan MBA ^y, Nicole Pratt PhD ^z, Carlen Reves MD, PhD ^k Lauren Richter MD^f, Joseph S, Ross MD, MHS^{b oo}, Elise Ruan MD^f, Sarah L, Seager BS^{bb}, Katherine R. Simon AA ^{o p}. Benjamin Viernes PhD ^{m n}. Jianxiao Yana MS ^{cc}. Can Yin MS ^{dd}. Seng Chan You MD, PhD ee ff, Jin J, Zhou PhD 9 99, Patrick B, Ryan PhD f, Martiin J, Schuemie PhD hh Harlan M. Krumholz MD, SM ^{a b ii}, George Hripcsak MD, MS ^f Marc A. Suchard MD. PhD 9 m ii kk 😤 🖾 🤀

LEGEND initiative to bring together health data

Table 1 | Description of databases from the Observational Health Data Sciences and Informatics network included in the study.

Name of database	Abbreviation	Country of origin	Years of exposure included	No of participants
US national databases (claims data)				
IBM MarketScan Commercial Claims and Encounters Data	CCAE	USA	2011-21	265874
IBM Health MarketScan Multi-State Medicaid Database	MDCD	USA	2011-20	40 0 6 4
IBM Health MarketScan Medicare Supplemental and Coordination of Benefits Database	MDCR	USA	2011-21	43857
Optum Clinformatics Extended Data Mart - Date of Death	OCEDM	USA	2011-21	211877
Optum de-identified Electronic Health Record Dataset	OEHR	USA	2011-21	299008
US Open Claims	USOC	USA	2000-21	3 5 2 1 1 9 1
US health system databases (electronic health record data)				
Columbia University Irving Medical Centre	CUIMC	USA	2011-21	4561
Johns Hopkins Medicine	JHM	USA	2016-21	3759
Stanford Medicine	STARR	USA	2011-21	2993
Department of Veterans Affairs Healthcare System	VA	USA	2011-21	230019
Non-US databases (electronic health record data)				
Australia Longitudinal Patient Database Practice Profile	ALPD	Australia	2012-21	2322
France Longitudinal Patient Database	FLPD	France	2012-21	13270
Germany Disease Analyser	GDA	Germany	1992-21	32 4 4 2
Health Informatics Centre at the University of Dundee	HIC	Scotland	2011-21	5580
HKHA - Hong Kong Hospital Authority	HKHA	Hong Kong	2011-18	4614
UK-IQVIA Medical Research Data	IMRD	United Kingdom	2011-19	25 17 3
Information System for Research in Primary Care	SIDIAP	Spain	2011-21	61 382

Data from indiv health systems aren't big enough

••• <>	0	⊜ data.	ohdsi.org	¢		₫ 📟
LEGEND-T2DM (Class Cohorts					
Cohort Definition	C001: DBB41 m	ain(101100000)				
Concepts in Data Source	(i) C045: GLP1RA C089: SGLT2I m	main(201100000) nain(301100000)				
Orphan Concepts	C133: SU main	(401100000)				
Cohort Counts	Display Both Su	hierts Only 🔿 Rec	ords Only			
Incidence Rate	0	ojecu oniy 🕜 nee	ordsonny			
Time Distributions	1 Show 1000 \$	entries			Search:	2
Inclusion Rule Statistics	1 Cohort	÷		ЈНМ∲	U	S Open Claims
	Conore					e_ epen_ etailite t
Index Event Breakdown	All		All		All	
Index Event Breakdown Visit Context	1 All C001		All	931	All	957,634
Index Event Breakdown Visit Context	Contract All Cool Cool		All	931 723	All	957,634 287,861
Index Event Breakdown Visit Context Cohort Characterization	Construction All Cool Cods Cods Cods Cods		All	931 723 819	All	957,634 287,861 488,394
Index Event Breakdown Visit Context Cohort Characterization Temporal Characterization	All C001 C045 C089 C133		All	931 723 819 1,383	All	957,634 287,861 488,394 1,883,873
Index Event Breakdown Visit Context Cohort Characterization Temporal Characterization Compare Cohort Char.	Construction All Cool		All	931 723 819 1,383	All	957,634 287,861 488,394 1,883,873

Idea: Inform the model for a smaller "Database B" by transferring insights from the model trained on a larger "Database A."

Idea: Inform the model for a smaller "Database B" by transferring insights from the model trained on a larger "Database A."

As an example, consider a linear model for both Database A and B:

$$egin{aligned} y^{(A)} &= X^{(A)}eta^{(A)} + \epsilon^{(A)}, \ y^{(B)} &= X^{(B)}eta^{(B)} + \epsilon^{(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

Idea: Inform the model for a smaller "Database B" by transferring insights from the model trained on a larger "Database A."

As an example, consider a linear model for both Database A and B:

$$egin{aligned} y^{(A)} &= X^{(A)}eta^{(A)} + \epsilon^{(A)}, \ y^{(B)} &= X^{(B)}eta^{(B)} + \epsilon^{(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

We expect $\beta^{(A)}$ and $\beta^{(B)}$ to be correlated; i.e. the value of $\beta^{(A)}$, if known, provides information on $\beta^{(B)}$:

$$\left(oldsymbol{y}^{(A)},oldsymbol{X}^{(A)}
ight) \Rightarrow oldsymbol{eta}^{(A)} \Rightarrow oldsymbol{eta}^{(B)}.$$

1) Obtain the posterior of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(A)} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}^{(A)}, \boldsymbol{X}^{(A)};$

- 1) Obtain the posterior of $oldsymbol{eta}^{(A)} \,|\, oldsymbol{y}^{(A)}, oldsymbol{X}^{(A)};$
- 2) Calculate the informed mean $\mu_j^{(B|A)}$ and std deviation $\sigma_j^{(B|A)}$ for $\beta_j^{(B)}$ according to the assumed correlation structure;

- 1) Obtain the posterior of $oldsymbol{eta}^{(A)} \,|\, oldsymbol{y}^{(A)}, oldsymbol{X}^{(A)};$
- 2) Calculate the informed mean $\mu_j^{(B|A)}$ and std deviation $\sigma_j^{(B|A)}$ for $\beta_j^{(B)}$ according to the assumed correlation structure;
- 3) Train the model B under prior $\beta_j^{(B)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_j^{(B|A)}, \sigma_j^{2(B|A)}\right)$.

High-dim, data-driven prediction/causal inference

	Domains	Counts	
		Hopkins	PharMetrics
	Condition	5,170	10,358
	Drug	1,685	2,118
	Measurement	1,334	940
	Procedure	1,137	4,479
Table: Counts of	Observation	359	876
covariates within each	Device	105	1,194
OMOP concept domains.	Race	6	0
	Gender	1	1
	Ethnicity	1	0
	Overall	9,798	19,967

Skew-shrinkage for high-dim transfer learning

Skew-shrinkage for high-dim transfer learning

Consider combining an informed prior with shrinkage by setting

$$\beta_{j,\,\rm sh}^{(B)} = \delta_j \beta_j^{(B)}$$

where $\delta_j = 0$ with probability $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta_j = 1$ otherwise.



Skew-shrinkage for high-dim transfer learning

Consider combining an informed prior with shrinkage by setting

$$\beta_{j,\,\rm sh}^{(B)} = \delta_j \beta_j^{(B)}$$

where $\delta_j = 0$ with probability $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta_j = 1$ otherwise.



(For computational efficiency, we use a continuous analogue.)

Demo: new skew-shrinkage feature in BayesBridge

```
skew_mean = np.array([0.1, 1.0, -0.3])
1
_{2} skew_sd = np.array([1.0, 0.1, 0.5])
3
  skew_prior = HorseshoePrior(
4
    skew_mean=skew_mean, # New!
5
    skew_sd=skew_sd, # New!
6
    regularizing_slab_size=1.
7
8)
9
10 linear_model = RegressionModel(y, X, family='linear')
  bridge = BayesBridge(linear_model, skew_prior)
11
12
13 post_samples, _ = bridge.gibbs(
   n_iter=1000, init={'global_scale': .01}
14
15)
```

Simple interface change, hard internal work

O OHDSI / bayes-bridge Q	+ • 0 n	e' 🖚
🗢 Code 💿 issues 🛞 🏦 Pull requests 🖓 Discussions 💿 Actions 🗄 Projects	🖾 Wiki 🗇 Security	
Comparing changes Deces two branches to see what's charged or to start a new put request. If you need to, you can also nore about diff comparisons.	compane ecross forks or	learn
û [bese: master™] 🔄 (compare: skew-shinkage ♥) 🛹 Able to merge. These branches can be au	tomatically merged.	
Discuss and review the changes in this comparison with others. Loarn about pull requests	Create pull rea	quest
◆ Commits 48 ③ Files changed 36	Eb 8-	ortibutors
- Commits on Feb 19, 2024		
Lay out signature of func to compute transposed fisher info add-eishimura authored and ehinandrew committed on Feb 19	@ 794266	
Implement transposed fisher into for sparse design matrix (1) chisandraw authored and aki-relationars committed on Feb 13	@ 988943	6 🔿
 Commits on Feb 21, 2024 		
Minor refactoring of transposed fisher info calc	Ø 63387	• •
Add option to include intercept in transp fisher info calc	@ ed1413	4 🔿
Refactor cholesky-based reg coef sampler	P 27cf48	a (O
Remove unnecessary path modification from tests	P 183439	4
Avoid unnecessary path mod by making regression test folder recogniza	() easter	•
Remove bad legacy variable names within CG sampler and related part	D 514c89	4 0
Rename «beta» as «coeff» in reg coef sampler module	C assur	
Refactor slightly to make a role of func more precise	P 107145	2 🔿
Update doc string for chol-based gaussian sampler	CP 082657	2 0
Add Woodbury-based gaussian sampler	Ø 149188	9 📀

Update default choice of and rec for reg coef sampler	g rraes	\diamond
Comment on solpy sparse mat behavior that makes profiling result diff	(J) 28(829)	0
mmits on Feb 28, 2024		
Move prizer module into own directory	P #506640	\diamond
Reparate out (in a quick-dirty manner) prior to general and bridge-sp 📼		\diamond
Comment out test failing due to RegressionCoefPrior now having Bridge 📼	GP 7c4e839	\diamond
Revert "Comment out test failing due to RegressionCoefPrior now havin 📼	@ sarsur	\diamond
weert "Separate out (in a quick-dirty manner) prior to general and b 📧	(P 080366	0
Addity Gibbs update order in prep for alternative collapsed update of	() birolog	\diamond
mprove modularity of gibbs in prep for supporting horseshoe	(C +756345	0
Addify pikg design to prep for integration of skew horseshoe ali-nishimura committed on Feb 28	(D 4afocka	0
Wert Gibbs update order for bridge & Adjust it for horseshoe 📧	(D \$143851	0
revent accessing attribute specific to bridge prior adi-mishimura committed on Feb 28	@ 6734040	0
ndicate initialization option unsupported under horseshoe	@ ce557ee	0
Pass around rand generator instance from BayesBridge	@ ecer2d3	0
New local scale update to (future) BridgePrior class	P 7277240	0
change the name of the log function imported from libc.math to log_c grace003 surfaced and aki-mishimara committed on Feb 28	@ 4d16597	0
edd the customized log function with a built-in bound check	🖓 eferadi	0
dd the helper function for the unskewed horseshoe local scale sampler	C 2353143	0
replement the update_local_scale function for the unskewed horsehoe p	Ø 48e8ea7	0

🕼 etfaebt 🔿

Incorporate Woodbury-based gaussian sampler into BayesBridge class

🚳 eki-nishimura committed on Feb 21

n process3 antrard and ad-abbreas constitud on hit 23

Application: Hopkins EHR meets LEGEND-T2DM

Goal: Compare four classes of second-line T2DM treatment for their cardio-vascular effectiveness and safety.

Here we focus on GLP-1 receptor agonists and DPP-4 inhibitors.

Application: Hopkins EHR meets LEGEND-T2DM

Goal: Compare four classes of second-line T2DM treatment for their cardio-vascular effectiveness and safety.

Here we focus on GLP-1 receptor agonists and DPP-4 inhibitors.

Data: IQVIA PharMetrics (source) and Hopkins EHR (destination)

- ▶ DPP-4 users: 10,203 in PharMetrics and 1,003 in Hopkins
- ► GLP-1 users: 9,220 in PharMetrics and 1,032 in Hopkins

Result of "internal" transfer within IQVIA data

Result of "internal" transfer within IQVIA data

We used 80% of the IQVIA data as "Database A," 10% as "Database B," and the rest for calculating out-of-sample AUC:

Result of "internal" transfer within IQVIA data

We used 80% of the IQVIA data as "Database A," 10% as "Database B," and the rest for calculating out-of-sample AUC:

Data fraction (sample size)	W/o transfer	With transfer
10% ($n_B = 1,942$)	0.766	0.773
$3\% (n_B = 587)$	0.724	0.747
2% ($n_B = 387$)	0.701	0.745
$1\% (n_B = 193)$	0.634	0.747

Comparison of estimates w/o vs. with transfer



Acknowledgments

In collaboration with







(lead),



