# Improving risk prediction in heart failure using multivariate analysis techniques from high energy physics

Eric D. Adler MD<sup>1</sup>, Adriaan A. Voors MD<sup>2</sup>, Liviu Klein MD, MS<sup>8</sup>, Fima Macheret MD<sup>7</sup>, Oscar O. Braun MD<sup>3</sup>, Marcus A. Urey MD<sup>1</sup>,

Wenhong Zhu PhD<sup>6</sup>, Iziah Sama PhD<sup>2</sup>, Matevz Tadel PhD<sup>5</sup>, <u>Claudio Campagnari PhD<sup>4</sup></u>, Barry Greenberg MD<sup>1</sup>, Avi Yagil PhD<sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, UC San Diego, USA

<sup>2</sup> University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Departments of Clinical Sciences, Cardiology, Lund University and Skåne University Hospital, Lund, Sweden

<sup>4</sup> Physics Department, UC Santa Barbara, USA

<sup>5</sup> Physics Department, UC San Diego, USA

<sup>6</sup>Altman Clinical and Translational Research Institute (ACTRI), UC San Diego, USA

<sup>7</sup> Department of Medicine, Divisions of Hospital Medicine and Biomedical Informatics, UC San Diego, USA

<sup>8</sup> Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, UC San Francisco, USA

Conversations between exp high energy physicists and clinical cardiologists:

- Attempts to predict heart failure (HF) mortality using clinical variables or risk scores have not been very successful
- Fails in one or more of the following ways:
  - limited predictive power (poor AUC, typically < 0.7)
  - loss of accuracy when applied to other cohorts or populations
  - dependence on variables that are subjective or not readily available

#### There are many many risk-scores on the market to the point that "risk-score fatigue" is prevalent

# Today's buzzword...Machine Learning (ML)

- In HEP have been using (simple) ML for > 20 years to categorize "events" or "objects" as "signal" vs. "background"
  - Event = final state of decay or of interaction
  - Object = electrons, photons, bottom quarks, etc
- Can our experience be brought to bear?
  - Signal/Background → Early death/Long term Survival

# **Primary Objective**

Define a risk score aiming to avoid common pitfalls by:

- Using strict data collection and cleanup methodology that ensures maintaining the correlations that define the physical state of the system (patient) within a relatively limited period of time
- Having precise definitions of outcomes.
- <u>Avoiding imputation</u> by requiring all covariates used in the creation of the model to be present.
- <u>Limiting the number of inputs to a small number of widely</u> <u>available covariates</u> that are checked routinely in HF patients.
- <u>Capturing the multi-dimensional correlations</u> between the covariates and the outcomes.

# Methods and Study definition

- Retrospectively extracted <u>de-identified</u> EMR of patients in the UCSD health system with 1<sup>st</sup> recorded diagnosis of Heart Failure.
- •Used an iterative process to select a minimal, most common, and discriminating set of variables (only 8)
  - HEP software, TMVA in CERN Root package
- For patient to be included in the analysis <u>all</u> variables needed to be present using data collected over a <u>narrow time window</u> (<7 days)
- Excluded patients: over 80, with an ICD, with indication of Sepsis
  - Minimize dilution of outcomes

# **Statistics**

#### Comments:

- Low statistics compared to typical HEP problem
- Dirty data, big loss from missing variables
  - Systematics?
- Extracting data from the EMR was a bit of an "adventure"



#### Cartoon of samples definition



# **Input Variables**

- Low risk cohort Red Black - High risk cohort

Important: No "silver bullet":

- No single discriminating variable.
- Each shows some separation.
- But poor AUC, individually.

Key is the combination and correlations between the whole set



15

60

22 24 26

Albumin [g/dL]

80

70

90 100

28

### **MARKER-HF** Training and Performance

A Boosted Decision Tree algorithm was used (200 trees, maximum depth of 2) to derive a model and relate variables to the known outcome using the training subset of the sample only. \*Similar results obtained with ANN)



### Does it make sense clinically?

Does a high score corresponds to abnormal values of the measured inputs??

- Input variables plotted against the mean score
- The yellow bands represent the normal ranges.

➔ NOT an explicit input to the model. "Learned" by the training



#### Comparisons with similar risk scores



IMRS: *American Journal of Medicine*, 122(6)L550-558, 2009

GWTG: Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes, 3(1):25-32, 2010

## Reproducibility with patients not from UCSD

- "Local" bias of studies major concern in medical field
- Applied model derived on UC San Diego patients on patients from
  - UC San Francisco EMR
  - BIOSTAT-CHF
    - A study from 69 centers in 11 EU countries
- <u>AUC is statistically consistent in the 3</u> <u>cohorts of patients</u>





#### **Comparing NT-proBNP and Marker-HF**

Amino-terminal pro-B-type natriuretic peptide, (NT-proBNP) is a well validated biomarker associated with HF



### Other features that did not have time to cover

Consistent performance in

- Men vs. Women
- As a function of ethnicity
- As a function of age
- For in- vs. out-patients (proxy for health status)
- Patients with pulmonary edema vs. other HF diagnoses
- No detectale bias due to excluding patients with missing variables

# Conclusion

- Succeeded in designing predictive risk score algorithm for HF using ML
- Key features, some based on HEP experience
  - Tight data collection requirements → Clean training/testing samples
  - Clear definition of outcomes using the extrema
  - Automatic inclusion of correlations (potentially non-linear)
- Paper submitted to medical journal
- Starting to think about further studies, still in cardiology, e.g., can we predict which patients will suffer major bleeding with anticoagulants?