Efficient and robust transfer learning of optimal individualized treatment regimes with right-censored survival data

Pan Zhao
April 18, 2023
joint work with Julie Josse (Inria) and Shu Yang (NCSU)

https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.05491
Caring for the Individual Patient: Understanding Heterogeneous Treatment Effects

- one-size-fits-all approaches are inadequate
- treatments should be tailored to individuals based on heterogeneity of clinical characteristics and their personal preferences

\(^a\) National Academy of Medicine, 2018

An individualized treatment regime (ITR) is a (deterministic) decision rule that assigns personalized treatments based on patients’ individual characteristics
Cures enhances our ability to modernize clinical trial designs, including use of real-world evidence: \(^a\)

Electronic health record (EHR) data, medical claims data, product or disease registry data, etc. \(^b\)

---

\(^a\) 21st Century Cures Act, 2016
\(^b\) FDA Guidance

Complementary features of different data sources:

**Randomized control trial:**
- gold standard (internal validity)
- restrictive inclusion/exclusion criteria, etc.

**Observational study (RWD):**
- representative of target pop. (external validity)
- confounding bias
Transfer learning

Cannot directly apply the RCT-optimal ITR on another population

**Covariate shift** between the RCT and target population

Dash line: RCT-optimal ITR. Blue line: target optimal ITR. Red points: positive treatment effects
Summary of contributions

• Heterogeneity within and across populations

• Data integration: e.g. combining randomized trials and observational data (target)

   Goal: learn the optimal ITR that generalizes well to the target population (transfer learning)

• For interpretability and transparency, use parametric (linear) ITRs (true optimal ITR not necessarily parametric)

• Clinical outcome: right-censored survival data

• Construction of efficient and robust estimators using semi-parametric efficiency theory
Large literature on optimal ITR using trial or observational data:

- Q-learning (Robins 2004)
- A-learning (Murphy 2003)
- Direct value search (Zhang et al. 2012)
- Classification perspective (Zhao et al. 2012)
- Tree or list-based ITRs (Laber & Zhao 2015)
- Survival data (Goldberg & Kosorok 2012)

Transfer learning / generalizability ...

- Distributionally robust optimization (Mo et al. 2021)
- Sensitivity analysis (Sahoo et al. 2022)
- Combine trials and observational studies (Colnet et al. 2023)

Limitations: only use a single data; few development for survival data
Setup: vanilla causal survival analysis

Data:

- covariates $X \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, treatment $A \in \mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$
- $T(a)$ potential outcome of survival time under treatment $a$
- censoring time $C$, observed time $U = \min\{T, C\}$, event indicator $\Delta = I\{T \leq C\}$

Consider some deterministic transformation function $y(\cdot)$

- survival probability at time $t$: $y(T) = I\{T \geq t\}$
- restricted mean survival time (RMST): $y(T) = \min(T, L)$ with some pre-specified maximal time horizon $L$
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Data:
- covariates $X \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, treatment $A \in \mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$
- $T(a)$ potential outcome of survival time under treatment $a$
- censoring time $C$, observed time $U = \min\{T, C\}$, event indicator $\Delta = I\{T \leq C\}$

Consider some deterministic transformation function $y(\cdot)$

- survival probability at time $t$: $y(T) = I\{T \geq t\}$
- restricted mean survival time (RMST): $y(T) = \min(T, L)$ with some pre-specified maximal time horizon $L$

Under classical causal assumptions: consistency, positivity, unconfoundedness, conditionally independent censoring,

$\Rightarrow$ Identification of $E[y(T(a))]$ by the outcome regression (OR), inverse probability weighting (IPW), and also doubly robust (DR) formulas
Setup: ITR and value function

ITR $d(x) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ a mapping from the covariate space $\mathcal{X}$ to the treatment space $\mathcal{A}$

Define the potential outcome $T(d)$ under any ITR $d \in \mathcal{D}$:

$$T(d) = d(X)T(1) + (1 - d(X))T(0),$$

$\Rightarrow$ The value function of $d$ is $V(d) = E[y(T(d))]$

$\Rightarrow$ The optimal ITR is $d^{opt} = \arg \max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} V(d)$
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ITR $d(x): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ a mapping from the covariate space $\mathcal{X}$ to the treatment space $\mathcal{A}$

Define the potential outcome $T(d)$ under any ITR $d \in \mathcal{D}$:

$$T(d) = d(X)T(1) + (1 - d(X))T(0),$$

$\Rightarrow$ The value function of $d$ is $V(d) = E[y(T(d))]$

$\Rightarrow$ The optimal ITR is $d^{\text{opt}} = \arg\max_{d \in \mathcal{D}} V(d)$

Consider a class of parametric ITRs $d_\eta$, indexed by $\eta$. Let $V(\eta) = V(d_\eta)$. We focus on linear ITRs:

$$\mathcal{D}_\eta = \{d_\eta : d_\eta(X) = I\{\eta^T \tilde{X} \geq 0\}, |\eta_{p+1}| = 1\},$$

where $\tilde{X} = (1, X^T)^T$

Population parameter $\eta^*$ indexing the optimal ITR:

$$\eta^* = \arg\max V(\eta),$$

and the optimal value function is $V(\eta^*)$
Setup: illustration of data structure

2 data sources: RCT (source) and observational data (target)

Target super population

(unknown) **Source sampling** $I_S$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete source sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${T_i(1), T_i(0), X_i, I_{S,i} = 1, I_{T,i} = 0}_{i=1}^n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treatment assignment $A$
Censoring $C$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed source sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${X_i, A_i, U_i, \Delta_i, I_{S,i} = 1, I_{T,i} = 0}_{i=1}^n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(known) **Target sampling** $I_T$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete target sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${T_i(1), T_i(0), X_i, I_{S,i} = 0, I_{T,i} = 1}_{i=n+1}^{n+m}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed target sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>${X_i, I_{S,i} = 0, I_{T,i} = 1}_{i=n+1}^{n+m}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed time $U = \min\{T, C\}$, event indicator $\Delta = I\{T \leq C\}$
Identification assumptions for generalization

Assume standard causal assumptions hold for the RCT (source), and

- **Survival mean exchangeability**
  \[ E[y(T(a)) \mid X, I_S = 1] = E[y(T(a)) \mid X] \text{ for every } a \in A, \]

- **Positivity of Source Inclusion**
  \[ 0 < Pr(I_S = 1 \mid X) < 1 \text{ almost surely}, \]

- **Known target design**
  The target sample design weight
  \[ e(x) = 1/Pr(I_T = 1 \mid X = x) \text{ is known by design.} \]

In our framework, we have the key identity that for any \( g(X) \)

\[
E \left[ \frac{I_S}{\pi_S(X)} g(X) \right] = E[I_T e(X)g(X)] = E[g(X)],
\]

where \( \pi_S(X) = Pr(I_S = 1 \mid X) \) is the sampling score.

⇒ this motivates the **calibration weighting** (CW) approach.
Identification results for generalization

The value function $V(d)$ can be identified by the IPW formulas:  

$$E \left[ \frac{I_S}{\pi_S(X)} \frac{I\{A = d(X)\}}{\pi_d(X)} \frac{\Delta y(U)}{Sc(U \mid A, X)} \right],$$ 

IPSW/CW naive IPW

and the OR formulas:

$$E[I_T e(X)] E[y(T) \mid A = d(X), X, I_S = 1],$$  

ORt target Outcome Regression in source

$$E \left[ \frac{I_S}{\pi_S(X)} E[y(T) \mid A = d(X), X, I_S = 1] \right],$$  

CW-OR

$^1\pi_d(x) = Pr(A = d(x) \mid X = x, I_S = 1), \ Sc(t \mid a, x) = Pr(C > t \mid A = a, X = x)$
**Calibration weighting**

Assign weights $q$ to subjects in the source to empirically match the target population

Convex optimization problem:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i \log q_i$$

subject to the balancing constraint:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i g(X_i) = \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+m} e(X_i) g(X_i)$$

and $q_i > 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i = 1$.

- other objective functions can be used
- specify $g(x)$: mean and higher order moments; sieve approximation
- favorable robustness
An efficient and robust estimation procedure

We also derive the efficient influence function (EIF) of $V(d)$:

- construction of efficient estimator: **Augmented Calibration Weighting (ACW)** not displayed for simplicity
- **double robustness**: consistent under $\mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2$
- **cross-fitting** procedure for flexible ML methods

4 nuisance parameters:

$\mathcal{M}_1$ survival outcome model: $\mu(a, x) = E[y(T) \mid A = a, X = x]$

$\mathcal{M}_2$

- treatment assignment: $\pi_A(x) = Pr(A = 1 \mid X = x)$
- source sampling: $\pi_S(x) = Pr(I_S = 1 \mid X = x)$
- censoring: $S_C(t \mid a, x) = Pr(C > t \mid A = a, X = x)$

Doubly robustness, semiparametric efficiency hold for general ITR $d$ without parametric restriction
Assume \( S(t; \eta) = Pr(T(d_\eta) > t) \) is twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of \( \eta^* \), and the margin condition \( Pr(0 < |\eta^T \tilde{X}| < \delta) = O(\delta) \), \(^2\) we have

\[
\begin{align*}
&\cdot \hat{S}(t; \eta) \to S(t; \eta) \text{ for any } \eta \text{ and } 0 < t \leq L \\
&\cdot \sqrt{N} \left\{ \hat{S}(t; \eta) - S(t; \eta) \right\} \text{ converges weakly to a mean zero Gaussian process for any } \eta \\
&\cdot N^{1/3} \| \hat{\eta} - \eta^* \|_2 = O_p(1) \\
&\cdot \sqrt{N} \left\{ \hat{S}(t; \hat{\eta}) - S(t; \eta^*) \right\} \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_{t,1})
\end{align*}
\]

Under certain conditions, same results hold for the cross-fitted estimator.

Readily extended to a broad class of functionals of survival distributions (Yang et al. 2021)

\(^2\)There exists some constant \( \delta_0 > 0 \) such that the big-\( O \) term is uniform in \( 0 < \delta < \delta_0 \)
In comparison with $\hat{V}_{DR}$ the standard doubly robust estimator using only source sample:

1) When **covariate distributions of the source and target populations are the same**, both $\sqrt{N}\{\hat{V}_{DR}(\eta) - V(\eta)\}$ and $\sqrt{N}\{\hat{V}_{CF}(\eta) - V(\eta)\}$ are asymptotically normal with mean zero and same variance.

2) If $d^{opt} \in D_\eta$, i.e., $d^{opt} = d_{\eta^*}$, then despite covariate shift
   - both the maximizers of $\hat{V}_{DR}(\eta)$ and $\hat{V}_{CF}(\eta)$ converge to $\eta^*$,
   - however, $\hat{V}_{DR}(\eta)$ is a biased estimator of $V(\eta)$.  

Simulations: (semi)parametric models

O: outcome
S: source sampling
A: treatment assignment
C: censoring
T/W: correctly/mis-specified

Different methods:
- Naive: source only
- weighting: IPSW, CW-IPW
- outcome regression: CW-OR, ORt
- ACW: our proposal
Simulations: machine learning methods

Random forest (grf) for nuisance parameters estimation
Sample size: $n \sim 3000$, $m \sim 8000$
Sodium bicarbonate therapy for patients with severe metabolic acidaemia in the intensive care unit

- **BICAR-ICU**: multi-center, open-label, randomized controlled, phase 3 trial
- **OS**: prospective, multiple-center observational study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEPSIS</th>
<th>AKIN</th>
<th>SOFA</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICAR-ICU</strong> (n = 387)</td>
<td>236 (60.98%)</td>
<td>181 (46.77%)</td>
<td>10.12 (3.72)</td>
<td>237 (61.24%)</td>
<td>63.95 (14.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OS</strong> (m = 193)</td>
<td>99 (51.30%)</td>
<td>75 (38.86%)</td>
<td>9.10 (4.54)</td>
<td>122 (63.21%)</td>
<td>62.73 (17.49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of baseline characteristics of the BICAR-ICU trial sample and the OS sample. Mean (standard deviation) for continuous and number (proportion) for the binary covariate.
Real data application

We consider the class of linear ITRs that depend on five variables

\[ \mathcal{D} = \{ I \{ \eta_1 + \eta_2 \text{SEPSIS} + \eta_3 \text{AKIN} + \eta_4 \text{SOFA} + \eta_5 \text{SEX} + \eta_6 \text{AGE} > 0 \} : \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_6 \in \mathbb{R}, |\eta_6| = 1 \}, \]

with the aim to maximize the RMST within 28 days in ICU stay.

- estimated optimal ITR \( \hat{\eta}_{ACW} = (22.9, -36.1, 87.4, -9.8, 33.7, 1.0)^T \)
- estimated value function \( \hat{V}(\hat{\eta}_{ACW}) = 19.52 \) days, with 95% confidence interval [17.74, 21.30]
- RCT-optimal ITR \( \hat{V}(\hat{\eta}_{DR.RCT}) = 15.37 \)