

Identifying conditions in Europe

In a typical European data source based on electronic records, data may be only collected when a patient visits a primary care practice, or only when patients visit a hospital for inpatient care. When conducting a multi-national, multi-database study in Europe, medical conditions may be identified by different case identification algorithms. A process, called *component strategy*, was developed and tested in two European projects: EMIF and ADVANCE

An acute non-communicable disease:

acute myocardial infarction AMI is a cardiac emergency, which requires immediate medical attention and may lead to death before access to a medical facility. Six data sources from five European countries participating in the EMIF project were used. The one year cumulative incidence of new AMI cases in 2012 among subjects aged 45+, with at least two year of look-back and no previous record of an AMI diagnosis, was computed.

An infectious disease: bordetella pertussis

Pertussis is an infectious disease of the respiratory tract, caused by the bacterium *Bordetella pertussis*. Only a specific laboratory tests can ascertain the specific microorganism responsible for the infection. National notifications of cases to the public health authority are reported annually by EU/EEA countries to the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). In five databases participating in the ADVANCE project incidence rates per 100,000 person-years during the year 2012 and during the year 2014 were computed in the population aged 0-14 years. The incidence rates of the notified cases in the three countries were computed from the ECDC database.

A chronic disease: type 2 diabetes mellitus

T2DM is a chronic metabolic disease which needs diagnostic follow-up and, at a more advanced stage, regular pharmaceutical treatment with hypoglycemic drugs. T2DM care is typically provided by primary care physicians. In six population-based data sources from four European countries participating in the EMIF project prevalence of the cohorts at 1st January 2012 was computed in the adult population (16+).

Rosa Gini¹, Giuseppe Roberto¹, Caitlin Dodd², Kaatje Bollaerts³, Alessandro Pasqua⁴, Lars Pedersen⁵, Miguel Angel Mayer⁶, Ron Herings⁷, David Ansell⁸, Sulev Reisberg⁹, Lara Tramontan¹⁰, Gino Picelli¹¹, Consuelo Huerta¹², Elisa Martin-Merino¹², Talita Duarte-Salles¹³, Gianfranco Spiteri¹⁴, Emmanouela Sdona¹⁴, Paul Avillach¹⁵, Peter Rijnbeek², Miriam Sturkenboom^{3,16}

1) Osservatorio di Epidemiologia, Agenzia regionale di sanità della Toscana, Florence, Italy; (2) Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Arhus, Denmark; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (3) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (5) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (5) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (5) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (4) Health Search, Utrecht, Netherlands; (5) P-95, Leuven, Belgium; (5) P-Improvement Network, Cegedim Strategic Data Medical Research Ltd, London, UK; (9) Quretec, Software Technology and Applications Competence Center, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia; (10) Arsenal. IT Consortium, Veneto's Research Ltd, London, UK; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (11) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (11) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medical Research Institute Jordi Gol, Barcelona, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (11) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medical Research Institute Jordi Gol, Barcelona, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medical Research Institute Jordi Gol, Barcelona, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medical Research Institute Jordi Gol, Barcelona, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medical Research Institute Jordi Gol, Barcelona, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Agencia Espaola de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios, Madrid, Spain; (14) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Pedianet, Padua, Italy; (12) Padua, Italy; (12) Padua, Italy; (13) Padua, Italy; (14) Padua, European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, Sweden; (15) Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School & Children's Hospital Informatics Program, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA; (16) University Utrecht Medical Center, Utrecht, The Netherlands



Component	Concept set	Data domain	Data provenance	Inpatient diagnosis-	
PC diagnosis	(AMI)	Diagnosis	Primary care practice	ER diagnosis-	
Specialist diagnosis	(AMI)	Diagnosis	Specialist practice		
Inpatient diagnosis	(AMI)	Diagnosis	Hospital	Cause of death-	
ER diagnosis	(AMI)	Diagnosis	Emergency room	PC OR inpatient diagnosis-	
Cause of death	(AMI)	Diagnosis	Death registry	Inpatient/ER OR death-	

Data domain

Result from test

Component	Concept set	Data doma
PC diagnosis, specific	(Bordetella pertussis)	Diagnosis
PC diagnosis, unspecified	d(Pertussis)	Diagnosis
Laboratory results	(Positive result from a bordetella pertussis test)	Result from
Symptoms	(Symptoms of pertussis)	Symptoms

Component	Concept set	Data domain	Data provenance	Inpatient diagnosis-	
PC diagnosis	(T2DM)	Diagnosis	Primary care practice	Laboratory values-	
Inpatient diagnosis	(T2DM)	Diagnosis	Hospital		
Laboratory results	(Positive result from a T2DM test)	Result from test	Primary care practice	-Validated algorithm	
NIAD	(Non-insulin antidiabetic drugs)	Drug	Primary care practice or pharmacy	NIAD OR validated algorithm-	
					0 1 2

Data provenance

Primary care practice

Primary care practice

Primary care practice

Primary care practice

Application

In order to implement the component analysis in the OHDSI ecosystem, information on data provenance should be standardized. In a first attempt, a simple classification in primary care practice, specialist practice, hospital, emergency room, and death registry, may lead to interpretable information. The impact of using SNOMED CT instead of UMLS should be assessed. The possibility of incorporating free text keywords in OHDSI concept sets should be explored in European data sources.

Interpreting the effect of different concept sets, data domains and data provenances in cohorts from heterogeneous European data sources: examples of component strategy application from the EMIF and the ADVANCE projects

Define component algorithms

Case-finding algorithms are split in simpler algorithms, each defined by a triple. The Unified Medical Language System (UMLS) was used to project concept sets to local terminologies and free text keywords.

All the data sources extract all the available components and compute the occurrence of components and of meaningful compositions in the study population. Occurence is represented in the graphs below which enable comparisons. As an example of comparison: when a composite algorithm A **OR** B is represented, the share of the pink bar accounts for the share of subjects that would not be captured if B was not available: under suitable assumptions, this provides an estimate of sensitivity of A.



PC diagnosis, specific-PC diagnosis, unspecified Laboratory results-PC specific OR unspecified diagnosis Lab OR PC diagnosis-PC diagnosis OR symptoms-

PC diagnosis-

Specialist diagnosis-



Extract, compose and compare

The nature of the disease under study is an important factor in the sensitivity and/or positive predictive value of a component. The systematic creation and comparison of component-based algorithms could be useful in the OHDSI ecosystem to empower the validity and efficiency of the data extraction. A systematic approach is needed in OHDSI to address the impact of the phenotypic definitions in a multi-database setting on study results.

OHDSI Europe Symposium. Rotterdam, The Netherlands. March 23rd-24th, 2018.





Decide which data-source tailored composite algorithm should be used. Obtain information on validity. Design sensitivity analyses using other algorithms.

Record linkage DBs could extract diagnoses from inpatient, emergency care and death registry: they probably captured most of the cases in the underlying populations, although PPV of diagnoses may vary according to data provenance. Variability in cumulative incidence in primary care DBs was possibly due to different local recording habits, such as use of free text. In one of the four primary care DBs, it was possible to extract diagnoses from inpatient care as well: assuming consistent PPV of primary and inpatient care diagnoses, sensitivity of primary care records was less than 60%.

In three data sources the IRs obtained by combining cohorts of specific and unspecified diagnoses were compatible with the notification, taking into account some misclassification in the unspecified diagnosis. In one data source the estimate was much higher, which might indicate under -notification of suspected cases not finally confirmed to the relevant public health authority, or a higher rate of misclassification in the unspecified diagnosis in this data source. In another database, a high number of cases was recorded in the symptoms component, which in this data source was identified by a very specific string of free text ('tos perusoide') and the pooled estimate was compatible with the notification. In all the databases the percentage of cases recorded with a specific diagnosis was very low. The percentage of cases confirmed by a record of a positive diagnostic test was negligible in all the three databases where this data domain was available.

T2DM diagnoses in primary care could be extracted from 3 data sources, where a validated algorithm was also available. Between 54% and 76% of the cases detected by the validated algorithms were users of NIAD. The record linkage DBs could only extract diagnoses from inpatient care, which yielded non-realistically low prevalences. In those data sources, the component of NIAD may be used to detect T2DM cases: the sensitivity may be estimated between 54% and 76% from primary care DBs.