

Al/ML-enabled Pharmacometrics Workflows

Machine Learning-empowered Model Selection and Fast Screening of Covariates in Population Modeling

Nadia Terranova, PhD

Scientific Director, Head of Quantitative Pharmacology Advanced Data Analytics Translational Medicine / Quantitative Pharmacology

IQ Workshop on AI/ML for D3 September 15, 2022



Why do we need to bring model-informed drug development to the next level? Towards MIDD 2.0

- Growth in multimodal, multisource, heterogeneous data
 - Clinical, RWD
 - Omics, images, ...
 - Wearable devices
 - ...







- Demands
 - Personalized Healthcare
 - Deliver more medicines at less cost





7 3

TxM pillars innovatively support forward- and back-translation Advanced Analytics – Strategic Enablers



Machine Intelligence to advance MIDD at various levels



with the courtesy of James Lu, Genentech

5

Population model building is a step-by-step process towards a "fit-for-purpose" model **Standard PMX Workflow**



7 6

Population model building is a step-by-step process towards a "fit-for-purpose" model **Standard PMX Workflow**



AI/ML-enabled Pharmacometrics Workflows | Nadia Terranova | September 15, 2022

Population model building is a step-by-step process towards a "fit-for-purpose" model **Standard PMX Workflow**



8

Increasing efficiency in Pharmacometrics model selection with ML/DL AI/ML-enabled PMX Workflow



Increasing efficiency in Pharmacometrics covariate screening with ML/DL AI/ML-enabled PMX Workflow

E. Sibieude, A. Khandelwal, J.S. Hesthaven, P. Girard, N. Terranova. *Fast screening of covariates in population models empowered by machine learning*. J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 2021

PMX and ML methods were assessed in scenarios with different levels of complexity **Simulated use cases**

Starting from **one-compartment population PK model** with oral absorption, **3800 virtual populations** were generated across 38 scenarios differing in the number of true and false covariates, covariates correlation, effect size and shrinkage

Scenario	#CAT	#COT	#CAF	#COF
Scenario 1	0	1	1	1
Scenario 2	1	1	1	1
Scenario 3	1	1	3	5
Scenario 4	1	2	3	5
Scenario 5	1	3	5	10
Scenario 6	2	2	5	10

Small Effect (<20%)	High Effect (>40%)
а	b
С	d
е	f
	Small Effect (<20%) a c

Scenarios 7a and 7b with higher shrinkage (30%-65%) had reduced samples

CAT: categorical true, COT: continuous true, CAF: categorical false, COF: continuous false

After selection of covariates, F1 scores and ROC can be computed **Evaluation metrics**

Importance scores were used to perform covariate selection for ML methods

- The performance of ML methods was assessed with **AUROC** (area under the ROC)
- **F1 scores** were computed to compare selection results across PMX and ML methods

AUROC shows high ML performance across methods for most cases **Example of scenario 6 (2 CAT, 2 COT, 5 CAF, 10 COF)**

- Covariate almost perfectly separable in two classes (True and False) in case of high effect (b, c, d).
- Difficulty to select covariates in case of small effect.
- Similar accuracy but NN did slightly better.
- AUROCs obtained by the ML methods are very good (> 0.90 on average)

RF: Random Forest; NN: Neural Network; SVM: Support Vector Machine

True Positive Rate

ML&PMX-based identification of prognostic and predictive factors of longterm overall survival and tumor growth dynamics **Avelumab JAVELIN Gastric trial**

Superior survival prior to 12 months for chemotherapy continuation arms and better long-term survival for maintenance avelumab arm

Is there a subpopulation that could benefit from avelumab?

- Parametric time-to-event modeling for OS
- Modeling of tumor growth dynamics
- Identification of prognostic and predictive factors informed by ML

N. Terranova, J. French, H. Dai, M. Wiens,... & K. Venkatakrishnan. *Pharmacometric modeling and machine learning analyses of prognostic and predictive factors in the JAVELIN Gastric 100 phase III trial of avelumab.* CPT: PSP 2022

Disease models of OS and tumor growth dynamics were developed by integrating time-invariant and time-varying covariates efficiently informed by ML

OS: Overall Survival; TGD: Tumor Growth Dynamics

Take home message

ML enables

automatic model selection and fast covariate screening, great efficiency with large datasets or complex models

Take home message

ML enables

automatic model selection and fast covariate screening, great efficiency with large datasets or complex models

87 AI/ML-enabled Pharmacometrics Workflows| Nadia Terranova | September 15, 2022

ML methods are significantly faster than traditional PMX **Computational costs**

	SCM	COSSAC	SVM Lin	SVM RBF	RF	NN
Simple Scenario (≤5 covariates)	9.5 (4.8)	3.6 (1.7)	0.08 (0.06)	0.13 (0.09)	0.10 (0.02)	2.3 (0.29)
Complex Scenario (≥15 covariates)	87.6 (33.0)	13.0 (3.3)	0.55 (0.16)	0.68 (0.13)	0.16 (0.08)	7.75 (0.26)
Overall median	27.1 (40.3)	7.4 (5.2)	0.3 (0.2)	0.41 (0.2)	0.12 (0.06)	3.4 (2.4)

Average computational cost in hours

SCM, COSSAC and NN had parallelization of runs with multiple CPUs

LASSO (not shown) has runtimes comparable to SCM

- COSSAC runs 3.5 times faster than SCM
- ML runs from 8 (NN) to 225 (RF) times faster than SCM
- ML runs from 2 (NN) to 61 (RF) times faster than COSSAC

Similar results were obtained in a real data involving a complex PK model **Real use case**

The developed framework was used on a clinical dataset of cetuximab PK.

- 30 covariates tested on clearance and central volume: patient-related factors (e.g., age, sex, creatinine clearance), therapy related-factors (e.g., co-medication), disease-related measurements (e.g., amphiregulin, interleukin-8).
- Base PK model: two-compartment model with Michaelis-Menten and linear elimination (Grisic et al. 2020)

Covariates selections were consistent across methods

ML-based selection was performed in less than 10 minutes

No comparison could be made with SCM as runtime exceeded 19 days

Results were similar across methods with ML providing slightly higher accuracy **F1 results across methods**

ML approaches						
	RF	NN	SVM Linear	SVM RBF		
#scenario F1=1	18	16	15	16		
Average F1 score	0.87 ± 0.06	0.89 ± 0.06	0.86 ± 0.05	0.86 ± 0.06		

PMX approaches						
	SCM	SCM_TR	COSSAC	COSSAC_TR		
#scenario F1=1	0	0	0	0		
Average F1 score	0.84 ± 0.06	0.75 ± 0.07	0.79 ± 0.05	0. 72 ± 0.06		

Results showed

- ML, COSSAC and SCM very close in terms of accuracy (ML slightly better), but perfect selection (F1=1) is achieved by ML only
- COSSAC_TR, SCM_TR presented lower F1 as expected.
- The covariate effect size is the main driver of differences in accuracy across scenarios.
- Noise (#false covariates) has no impact on the results.
- Correlation between the covariates has no impact.
- Shrinkage has an impact.

In average ML outperforms PMX methods, and only ML algorithms made perfect selection across the 100 datasets.

RF: Random Forest; NN: Neural Network; SVM: Support Vector Machine

ML methods enable efficient and accurate model building **Results summary**

- ML provides a clear benefit for the fast screening of a larges set of covariates with accuracy comparable/higher to SCM and COSSAC, and huge gain in runtimes (0.25-3 hours for ML vs. 15-73 hours for PMX)
 - As expected, scenarios with small effects size led to worst results for all the methods (1a, 1e, 5a).
 - Correlation between the covariates and number of false covariates have not a major impact on the selection.

 The developed ML framework can be used to optimize population modeling in case of large set of covariates and then inform subsequent PMX model building steps towards a more clinical interpretation of the covariates.

Take home message

ML enables

automatic model selection and fast covariate screening, great efficiency with large datasets or complex models

Acknowledgements

- Emeric Sibieude
- Pascal Girard, Akash Khandelwal
- Karthik Venkatakrishnan
- Lisa Benincosa
- Jonathan French, Matthew Wiens and Metrum team
- Avelumab Project Team

Take home message

ML enables

automatic model selection and fast covariate screening, great efficiency with large datasets or complex models

ML-based model prediction of PK, PD, ...