# Robust and fair time-to-event framework for predicting cancer-associated Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) using routinely-collected clinical and panel-sequencing data

Intae Moon<sup>1,3</sup>, Hyewon Jeong<sup>1</sup>, Alexander Gusev<sup>2,3</sup>, and Marzyeh Ghassemi<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Computer Science & Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA <sup>2</sup>Division of Population Sciences, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA <sup>3</sup>The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

### Motivation

- Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) is a frequent, yet **fatal complication in patients** with active cancer, especially while they are receiving chemotherapy.
- Accurate stratification of the VTE risk among patients with cancer may allow clinicians to improve clinical outcome while minimizing side effects due to overtreatment.
- A major challenge with accurately identifying patients at high risk for cancer-associated VTE lies in the **heterogeneity of the VTE** risk across diverse patient subpopulations.
- Our goal is to address the heterogeneity in cancers and improve the prediction accuracy of cancer-associated VTE across diverse patient groups defined by cancer types and demographics.

## Patient Analysis Cohort

- 16,833 ambulatory patients with cancer aged 18-80, who were treated and followed up at Dana-Farber Cancer Institute (DFCI) since June 1, 2015.
- None of these patients had an acute VTE episode in the six months leading up to their treatment.

#### **III.** Prediction of time-to-cancer associated VTE

- We utilized Cox Proportional Hazard model and DeepSurv (Katzman et al., 2018).
- We also plotted performance of **Khorana score**, the most widely utilized risk stratification tool for VTE (Khorana et al. 2008).
- We considered two feature sets: generic (clinical and treatment features without cancer groups, age, ethnicity, and sex) and personalized (all clinical and treatment features).
- Overall, a configuration with more features (i.e., personalized feature set) provides a better performance; but no single model configuration was universally beneficial to all groups we considered.



#### I. Heterogeneity of cancerassociated VTE incidence across diverse patient subgroups

• We utilized Aalen–Johansen estimator to estimate Cumulative Incidence Function (CIF) for VTE event for each group while considering all-cause mortality as a competing event.

• "Time zero" for each patient is the date they began their first treatment regimen.

We considered various subgroup including cancer groups, ethnicities, age groups, and **biological sexes**.

We observed highly heterogeneous VTE **incidence** across the considered patient subgroups.







#### **Ongoing and future work**

- predictions.
- configuration.







### **II.** Association of panel sequencing and clinical features with VTE

• We investigated **panel** sequencing somatic variant features (left), clinical features (middle) including cancer groups, lab tests, age, ethnicity, and biological sex, and finally **first** treatment regimens (right). To determine Hazard Ratio and pvalue of each feature. • For panel sequencing somatic variant features and clinical features, we iteratively ran univariate cause-specific Cox **Proportional Hazard** regression analysis. For treatment regimens, we ran multi-variable analysis adjusting for cancer groups and features for Khorana scores (clinical baseline for VTE).

Utilize advanced optimization techniques like **Distributionally Robust Optimization** (DRO) to encourage fairness in model

Propose a framework that effectively combines models based on their subgroup performances, aiming to **mitigate the** harms of any individual model

Outperform current state-of-the-arts for predicting VTE risks as well as **serve a** more diverse group of cancer patients.