InSilicoVA

Samuel Clark



In collaboration with the WHO VA Reference Group Columbus, Ohio November, 2018

Outline

Background

Conceptual Description of InSilicoVA

3 InSilicoVA Summary

InSilicoVA builds on NBC and InterVA to address:

 Uncertainty – do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources
 - SCI from physicians (like InterVA)

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources
 - SCI from physicians (like InterVA)
 - SCI in the form of deaths with known cause

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources
 - SCI from physicians (like InterVA)
 - SCI in the form of deaths with known cause
 - De-biased physician-coded VA causes

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources
 - SCI from physicians (like InterVA)
 - SCI in the form of deaths with known cause
 - De-biased physician-coded VA causes

InSilicoVA builds on NBC and InterVA to address:

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources
 - SCI from physicians (like InterVA)
 - SCI in the form of deaths with known cause
 - De-biased physician-coded VA causes

InSilicoVA is essentially naive Bayes in a statistical framework (and a bunch of other nice features)

InSilicoVA builds on NBC and InterVA to address:

- Uncertainty do away with 'indeterminate' cause and replace with '(very) uncertain' cause and corresponding uncertainty in related CSMFs
- Use information on absence of symptoms
- Use a variety of SCI from different of sources
 - SCI from physicians (like InterVA)
 - SCI in the form of deaths with known cause
 - De-biased physician-coded VA causes

InSilicoVA is essentially naive Bayes in a statistical framework (and a bunch of other nice features)

Developed by our team [1, 2]



Conceptual Description of InSilicoVA

InSilicoVA Summary

A statistical-computational algorithm that

 At the individual level identifies a distribution of probabilities associated with each cause

- At the individual level identifies a distribution of probabilities associated with each cause
- At the population level identifies a distribution of counts of deaths for each cause

- At the individual level identifies a distribution of probabilities associated with each cause
- At the population level identifies a distribution of counts of deaths for each cause
- Links the two so that they are consistent with each other

- At the individual level identifies a distribution of probabilities associated with each cause
- At the population level identifies a distribution of counts of deaths for each cause
- Links the two so that they are consistent with each other
- Through these distributions quantifies uncertainty at both levels, again so that each is consistent with the other

- At the individual level identifies a distribution of probabilities associated with each cause
- At the population level identifies a distribution of counts of deaths for each cause
- Links the two so that they are consistent with each other
- Through these distributions quantifies uncertainty at both levels, again so that each is consistent with the other

A statistical-computational algorithm that

- At the individual level identifies a distribution of probabilities associated with each cause
- At the population level identifies a distribution of counts of deaths for each cause
- Links the two so that they are consistent with each other
- Through these distributions quantifies uncertainty at both levels, again so that each is consistent with the other

Uncertainty: if we are not sure about a cause at the individual level then we cannot be sure about that cause at the population level ...

Start with the population

 Imagine a vector of 3 CSMFs consisting of decimal numbers that add to 1.0 - e.g. [0.20, 0.50, 0.30]

Start with the population

- Imagine a vector of 3 CSMFs consisting of decimal numbers that add to 1.0 - e.g. [0.20, 0.50, 0.30]
- Now imagine a similar but slightly different CSMF vector ...
 [0.15, 0.55, 0.30]

Start with the population

- Imagine a vector of 3 CSMFs consisting of decimal numbers that add to 1.0 - e.g. [0.20, 0.50, 0.30]
- Now imagine a similar but slightly different CSMF vector ...
 [0.15, 0.55, 0.30]
- And now imagine many (e.g. 1,000) slightly different but similar CSMF vectors

Start with the population

- Imagine a vector of 3 CSMFs consisting of decimal numbers that add to 1.0 - e.g. [0.20, 0.50, 0.30]
- Now imagine a similar but slightly different CSMF vector ...
 [0.15, 0.55, 0.30]
- And now imagine many (e.g. 1,000) slightly different but similar CSMF vectors
- These form a distribution of the CSMFs with variation (uncertainty)

Turning to the individual deaths

 Assume that you have a rough guess of the CSMFs for the population that includes the deaths

- Assume that you have a rough guess of the CSMFs for the population that includes the deaths
- Also assume you have a rough idea of how signs/symptoms (i.e.
 VA information) are related to causes of death

- Assume that you have a rough guess of the CSMFs for the population that includes the deaths
- Also assume you have a rough idea of how signs/symptoms (i.e.
 VA information) are related to causes of death
- For a given death with several signs/symptoms pointing to HIV, use what you know (above) and imagine that it is most reasonable to assign this death to HIV

- Assume that you have a rough guess of the CSMFs for the population that includes the deaths
- Also assume you have a rough idea of how signs/symptoms (i.e.
 VA information) are related to causes of death
- For a given death with several signs/symptoms pointing to HIV, use what you know (above) and imagine that it is most reasonable to assign this death to HIV
- Now introduce a small perturbation in your assumptions and make a new cause assignment for this death; this time it is assigned to TB, closely related and hard to distinguish from HIV

- Assume that you have a rough guess of the CSMFs for the population that includes the deaths
- Also assume you have a rough idea of how signs/symptoms (i.e.
 VA information) are related to causes of death
- For a given death with several signs/symptoms pointing to HIV, use what you know (above) and imagine that it is most reasonable to assign this death to HIV
- Now introduce a small perturbation in your assumptions and make a new cause assignment for this death; this time it is assigned to TB, closely related and hard to distinguish from HIV
- Now imagine doing this many times (e.g. 1,000) to produce many different but hopefully 'close' cause assignments



Bring the population and the individual deaths together

 We need the population-level CSMFs and the individual cause assignments to be consistent with one anther ...

- We need the population-level CSMFs and the individual cause assignments to be consistent with one anther ...
- And, we need the uncertainty inherent in cause assignment to be reflected in error bounds on the CSMFs

- We need the population-level CSMFs and the individual cause assignments to be consistent with one anther ...
- And, we need the uncertainty inherent in cause assignment to be reflected in error bounds on the CSMFs
- Imagine a joint distribution of CSMF vectors and individual cause assignments – potentially many dimensions, one for the CSMF vector and one for each individual death, or alternatively for a vector of cause assignments with one element per death

- We need the population-level CSMFs and the individual cause assignments to be consistent with one anther ...
- And, we need the uncertainty inherent in cause assignment to be reflected in error bounds on the CSMFs
- Imagine a joint distribution of CSMF vectors and individual cause assignments – potentially many dimensions, one for the CSMF vector and one for each individual death, or alternatively for a vector of cause assignments with one element per death
- This distribution describes how likely it is that a given CSMF vector is associated with a pattern of cause assignments across all individuals in the population

- We need the population-level CSMFs and the individual cause assignments to be consistent with one anther ...
- And, we need the uncertainty inherent in cause assignment to be reflected in error bounds on the CSMFs
- Imagine a joint distribution of CSMF vectors and individual cause assignments – potentially many dimensions, one for the CSMF vector and one for each individual death, or alternatively for a vector of cause assignments with one element per death
- This distribution describes how likely it is that a given CSMF vector is associated with a pattern of cause assignments across all individuals in the population
- You can easily imagine that only a few relatively similar CSMF vectors are compatible with a given pattern of cause assignments



How do we do this?

 Problem – we cannot observe either of the components of this distribution: CSMFs or cause assignments

How do we do this?

- Problem we cannot observe either of the components of this distribution: CSMFs or cause assignments
- Solution

How do we do this?

- Problem we cannot observe either of the components of this distribution: CSMFs or cause assignments
- Solution
 - Model both the CSMFs and the cause assignments so that they
 are consistent with one another use VA signs/symptoms and
 knowledge of the relationship between those and causes of death

How do we do this?

- Problem we cannot observe either of the components of this distribution: CSMFs or cause assignments
- Solution
 - Model both the CSMFs and the cause assignments so that they are consistent with one another – use VA signs/symptoms and knowledge of the relationship between those and causes of death
 - Use this model to characterize the joint distribution of CSMFs and cause assignments

InSilicoVA algorithm Intuition

How do we do this?

- Problem we cannot observe either of the components of this distribution: CSMFs or cause assignments
- Solution
 - Model both the CSMFs and the cause assignments so that they are consistent with one another – use VA signs/symptoms and knowledge of the relationship between those and causes of death
 - Use this model to characterize the joint distribution of CSMFs and cause assignments
 - This distribution cannot be defined analytically, but we can approximate it by taking a sample

InSilicoVA algorithm Intuition

How do we do this?

- Problem we cannot observe either of the components of this distribution: CSMFs or cause assignments
- Solution
 - Model both the CSMFs and the cause assignments so that they are consistent with one another – use VA signs/symptoms and knowledge of the relationship between those and causes of death
 - Use this model to characterize the joint distribution of CSMFs and cause assignments
 - This distribution cannot be defined analytically, but we can approximate it by taking a sample
 - Marginal distributions from this sample approximate the distributions of CSMFs and cause assignment for individual deaths

Symptom-Cause Information in InSilicoVA

SCI appear in InSilicoVA in exactly the same way as it does in naive Bayes – in the form of $\Pr(s|c)$ in the full naive Bayes relationship,

$$\Pr(c|\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\Pr(c) \prod_{s} \Pr(s|c)^{s} (1 - \Pr(s|c))^{1-s}}{\sum_{c} \Pr(c) \prod_{s} \Pr(s|c)^{s} (1 - \Pr(s|c))^{1-s}}$$

The Pr(s|c) can come from either physicians or a 'gold standard' dataset, including de-biased physian-coded VAs

Symptom-Cause Information in InSilicoVA

SCI appear in InSilicoVA in exactly the same way as it does in naive Bayes – in the form of $\Pr(s|c)$ in the full naive Bayes relationship,

$$\Pr(c|\mathbf{s}) = \frac{\Pr(c) \prod_{s} \Pr(s|c)^{s} (1 - \Pr(s|c))^{1-s}}{\sum_{c} \Pr(c) \prod_{s} \Pr(s|c)^{s} (1 - \Pr(s|c))^{1-s}}$$

The Pr(s|c) can come from either physicians or a 'gold standard' dataset, *including de-biased physian-coded VAs*

InSilicoVA can also use other kinds of SCI such as deaths with VA symptoms and a cause assigned through another mechanism

Background

Conceptual Description of InSilicoVA

 Provides estimates of **both** individual-level probabilities of dying from each cause and population level CSMFs

- Provides estimates of **both** individual-level probabilities of dying from each cause and population level CSMFs
- Both come from the same joint distribution so they are by definition consistent with one another

- Provides estimates of **both** individual-level probabilities of dying from each cause and population level CSMFs
- Both come from the same joint distribution so they are by definition consistent with one another
- Both are reported as distributions so there is a metric of uncertainty for both

- Provides estimates of **both** individual-level probabilities of dying from each cause and population level CSMFs
- Both come from the same joint distribution so they are by definition consistent with one another
- Both are reported as distributions so there is a metric of uncertainty for both
- It builds on InterVA and utilizes the same data and expert knowledge, i.e. if you can run InterVA4 now, then you can also run InSilicoVA

- Provides estimates of **both** individual-level probabilities of dying from each cause and population level CSMFs
- Both come from the same joint distribution so they are by definition consistent with one another
- Both are reported as distributions so there is a metric of uncertainty for both
- It builds on InterVA and utilizes the same data and expert knowledge, i.e. if you can run InterVA4 now, then you can also run InSilicoVA
- There is an open-source, publicly available R package to run it https://cran.r-project.org/package=InSilicoVA

- Provides estimates of **both** individual-level probabilities of dying from each cause and population level CSMFs
- Both come from the same joint distribution so they are by definition consistent with one another
- Both are reported as distributions so there is a metric of uncertainty for both
- It builds on InterVA and utilizes the same data and expert knowledge, i.e. if you can run InterVA4 now, then you can also run InSilicoVA
- There is an open-source, publicly available R package to run it https://cran.r-project.org/package=InSilicoVA
- Paper published in a respected statistics journal (JASA) that describes it fully and fairly compares its performance to other algorithms [2]

References I

- [1] Samuel J Clark, Tyler McCormick, Zehang Li, and Jon Wakefield. Insilicova: A method to automate cause of death assignment. Working Paper 133, Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences (CSSS), University of Washington, https://www.csss.washington.edu/Papers/wp133.pdf, 2013.
- [2] Tyler H McCormick, Zehang Richard Li, Clara Calvert, Amelia C Crampin, Kathleen Kahn, and Samuel J Clark. Probabilistic cause-of-death assignment using verbal autopsies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(515):1036–1049, 2016.

Extra Slides

InSilicoVA algorithm – Sampling Intuition

Sample the joint distribution of CSMFs and individual cause assignments:

- Select initial CSMFs just a place to start
- ② Using naive Bayes relationship and SCI, calculate the probabilities of the symptoms recorded for each death, and use those along with the current CSMFs (from previous step) to draw a new cause for each death from multinomial distribution (can mix in some deaths with known cause)
- Ocunt the current deaths by cause, and use those counts to draw a new set of CSMFs from Dirichlet distribution
- Repeat many times ...

InSilicoVA algorithm – Sampling Intuition

Sample the joint distribution of CSMFs and individual cause assignments:

- Select initial CSMFs just a place to start
- Using naive Bayes relationship and SCI, calculate the probabilities of the symptoms recorded for each death, and use those along with the current CSMFs (from previous step) to draw a new cause for each death from multinomial distribution. (can mix in some deaths with known cause)
- Count the current deaths by cause, and use those counts to draw a new set of CSMFs from Dirichlet distribution
- Repeat many times ...

With enough repetitions, the sample is a good representation of the joint distribution

Step 2 is where observed symptoms and SCI affect the logic of **InSilicoVA**



Notation

- Deaths: $y_j \in \{0,1\} \ j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}$
- Sign/symptoms: $s_k \in \{0,1\}$ $k \in \{1,...,K\}$
- Causes: $c_n \ n \in \{1, ..., N\}$
- For individual j, probability of cause n: ℓ_{jn} $j \in \{1, ..., J\}, n \in \{1, ..., N\}$
- Cause-specific death count (CSDC): m_n $n \in \{1, ..., N\}$
- Cause-specific mortality fraction (CSMF): f_n $n \in \{1, ..., N\}$

 For each death y_j, VA interview produces a binary-valued vector of signs/symptoms

$$\{s_{j1},s_{j2},\ldots s_{jk}\}$$

 For each death y_j, VA interview produces a binary-valued vector of signs/symptoms

$$\{s_{j1}, s_{j2}, \dots s_{jk}\}$$

 A fixed probbase, a K × N matrix of conditional probabilities derived either from physicians' opinions about how likely a given sign/symptom is for a death resulting from a given cause, or from a 'gold standard' dataset containing VA symptoms and causes of death assigned through an independent mechanism (e.g. de-biased physician coding)

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Pr(s_1|c_1) & \Pr(s_1|c_2) & \cdots & \Pr(s_1|c_N) \\ \Pr(s_2|c_1) & \Pr(s_2|c_2) & \cdots & \Pr(s_2|c_N) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Pr(s_K|c_1) & \Pr(s_K|c_2) & \cdots & \Pr(s_K|c_N) \end{bmatrix}$$

• We are interested in the joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y})

- We are interested in the joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y})
- Model \vec{F} conditional on \vec{Y}

$$\vec{F}|\vec{Y}\sim \text{Dirichlet}(\vec{M})$$
 (1)

where

$$m_n = \sum_{j=1}^{J} [\mathbf{y}_j = c_n]$$
, using Iverson's bracket notation: $[\alpha] = \begin{cases} 1, \alpha \text{ true} \\ 0, \alpha \text{ false} \end{cases}$

which ties the CSMFs (\vec{F}) to the individual cause assignments

- We are interested in the joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y})
- Model \vec{F} conditional on \vec{Y}

$$\vec{F}|\vec{Y} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\vec{M})$$
 (1)

where

$$m_n = \sum_{j=1}^{J} [y_j = c_n]$$
, using Iverson's bracket notation: $[\alpha] = \begin{cases} 1, \alpha \text{ true} \\ 0, \alpha \text{ false} \end{cases}$

which ties the CSMFs (\vec{F}) to the individual cause assignments

• Model y_i conditional on \vec{F} and \vec{S}_i :

$$y_j|(\vec{F},\vec{S}_j) \sim \text{Multinomial}(\vec{L}_j)$$
 (2)



Using Bayes' Rule the components of \vec{L}_j in equation 2 are

$$\ell_{jn} = \Pr(y_{j} = c_{n} | \vec{S}_{j}) = \frac{\Pr(\vec{S}_{j} | y_{j} = c_{n}) \Pr(y_{j} = c_{n})}{\Pr(\vec{S}_{j})}$$

$$= \frac{\Pr(y_{j} = c_{n}) \Pr(\vec{S}_{j} | y_{j} = c_{n})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\Pr(y_{i} = c_{n}) \Pr(\vec{S}_{j} | y_{j} = c_{n})\right)}$$

$$\ell_{jn} = \frac{f_{n} \prod_{k=1}^{S} \Pr(s_{jk} | y_{j} = c_{n})^{s_{jk}} \left[1 - \Pr(s_{jk} | y_{j} = c_{n})\right]^{(s_{jk} - 1)}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(f_{n} \prod_{k=1}^{S} \Pr(s_{jk} | y_{j} = c_{n})^{s_{jk}} \left[1 - \Pr(s_{jk} | y_{j} = c_{n})\right]^{(s_{jk} - 1)}\right)}$$
(3)

In the last step, we use f_n (from \vec{F}) for $\Pr(y_j = c_n)$ which ties the individual cause assignments back to the CSMFs

InSilicoVA algorithm - equations and computation 4 Computation

• Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler

InSilicoVA algorithm - equations and computation 4 Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by

Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by
 - Assuming a reasonable starting value for \vec{F} , use equation 2 to draw a cause for each death

Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by
 - Assuming a reasonable starting value for \vec{F} , use equation 2 to draw a cause for each death
 - Use these cause assignments in equation 1 to draw a new CSMF vector F

InSilicoVA algorithm - equations and computation 4 Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by
 - Assuming a reasonable starting value for \vec{F} , use equation 2 to draw a cause for each death
 - ② Use these cause assignments in equation 1 to draw a new CSMF vector \vec{F}
 - 3 Use this new \vec{F} in equation 2 to draw a new cause for each death, etc... repeat these two steps *many* times

InSilicoVA algorithm - equations and computation 4 Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by
 - Assuming a reasonable starting value for \vec{F} , use equation 2 to draw a cause for each death
 - ② Use these cause assignments in equation 1 to draw a new CSMF vector \vec{F}
 - ① Use this new \vec{F} in equation 2 to draw a new cause for each death, etc... repeat these two steps *many* times
- After both \vec{F} and \vec{Y} have settled into a stationary distribution, take a number of samples from a large number of steps and record the values of \vec{F} , \vec{Y} , \vec{L}

Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by
 - Assuming a reasonable starting value for \vec{F} , use equation 2 to draw a cause for each death
 - ② Use these cause assignments in equation 1 to draw a new CSMF vector \vec{F}
 - ① Use this new \vec{F} in equation 2 to draw a new cause for each death, etc... repeat these two steps many times
- After both \vec{F} and \vec{Y} have settled into a stationary distribution, take a number of samples from a large number of steps and record the values of \vec{F} , \vec{Y} , \vec{L}
- These samples approximate the joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) and the \vec{L} that go along with them

Computation

- Take sample from joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) using a Gibbs sampler
- The model defines the conditional distributions we need, proceed by
 - **1** Assuming a reasonable starting value for \vec{F} , use equation 2 to draw a cause for each death
 - Use these cause assignments in equation 1 to draw a new CSMF vector F
 - ① Use this new \vec{F} in equation 2 to draw a new cause for each death, etc... repeat these two steps many times
- After both \vec{F} and \vec{Y} have settled into a stationary distribution, take a number of samples from a large number of steps and record the values of \vec{F} , \vec{Y} , \vec{L}
- These samples approximate the joint distribution (\vec{F}, \vec{Y}) and the \vec{L} that go along with them
- Summarize the margins of the sampled \vec{F} , \vec{Y} and \vec{L} as necessary to produce desired outputs

