

TRIALSCOPE: A Unifying Causal Framework for Scaling Real-World Evidence Generation with Biomedical Language Models

Javier González^{1*}, Cliff Wong¹, Zelalem Gero¹, Jass Bagga¹, Risa Ueno²⁺,
 Isabel Chien²⁺, Eduard Oravkin³⁺, Emre Kiciman¹, Aditya Nori¹, Roshanthi
 Weerasinghe⁴, Rom S. Leidner⁴, Brian Piening⁴, Tristan Naumann¹,
 Carlo Bifulco⁴, Hoifung Poon^{1*}

November 7, 2023

Abstract

The rapid digitization of real-world data offers an unprecedented opportunity for optimizing healthcare delivery and accelerating biomedical discovery. In practice, however, such data is most abundantly available in unstructured forms, such as clinical notes in electronic medical records (EMRs), and it is generally plagued by confounders. In this paper, we present TRIALSCOPE, a unifying framework for distilling real-world evidence from population-level observational data. TRIALSCOPE leverages biomedical language models to structure clinical text at scale, employs advanced probabilistic modeling for denoising and imputation, and incorporates state-of-the-art causal inference techniques to combat common confounders. Using clinical trial specification as generic representation, TRIALSCOPE provides a turn-key solution to generate and reason with clinical hypotheses using observational data. In extensive experiments and analyses on a large-scale real-world dataset with over one million cancer patients from a large US health-care network, we show that TRIALSCOPE can produce high-quality structuring of real-world data and generates comparable results to marquee cancer trials. In addition to facilitating in-silicon clinical trial design and optimization, TRIALSCOPE may be used to empower synthetic controls, pragmatic trials, post-market surveillance, as well as support fine-grained patient-like-me reasoning in precision diagnosis and treatment.

1 Introduction

Real-world evidence (RWE) refers to the use of real-world data (RWD) routinely collected from clinical sources such as electronic medical records (EMRs) to generate clinical evidence about the benefits or risks of medical treatments. RWE represents a promising direction to augment randomized controlled trials (RCTs), as recognized by various regulatory bodies, *e.g.*, see FDA’s Real World Evidence Program (FDA, 2018) and NICE (NICE, 2022). A recent example of success is the use of RWE in the label expansion of Ibrance (PAL,

*Correspondence: Gonzalez.Javier@microsoft.com, hoifung@microsoft.com

+Work done at Microsoft


¹Microsoft

²Cambridge University

³University of Oxford

⁴Providence Genomics

Figure 1: *De-identified medical journey of a lung cancer patient. Real-world data is mostly unstructured and manual curation is hard to scale. A: Each bar represents a clinical note. B, C, D: Example synthetic notes with key information such as diagnosis and outcome. E: Distribution of the most abundant note types in our real-world dataset.*




a cyclin-dependent kinase 4/6 inhibitor) to treat male breast Cancer (Bartlett et al., 2019), for which RCTs are infeasible given the rarity of this disease.

Randomized controlled trials are expensive and time-consuming to run. By comparison, real-world data is essentially free and available at a much larger scale. In addition to covering rare diseases such as male breast cancer, real-world data also can offer a more faithful representation of underserved subpopulations (Sharma and Palaniappan, 2021), as well as longitudinal outcomes beyond the typical duration of a trial (Fritzsche et al., 2022). However, RWE studies also pose major challenges. The majority of real-world data is unstructured, such as clinical notes, for which manual curation is difficult to scale (Figure 1). Real-world data is also plagued by problems such as data quality, data heterogeneity and confounders, which affect its regulatory validity and hinder overall adoption (Nazha et al., 2021).

In this paper, we propose TRIALSCOPE, a unifying framework for automating population-level real-world evidence generation from electronic medical records. TRIALSCOPE uses clinical trial specification as the representation language for clinical hypotheses and formulates real-world evidence generation as virtual trial simulation. TRIALSCOPE consists of five main components: (i) a data structuring pipeline base on large language models; (ii) a probabilistic latent variable model for data denoising and imputation; (iii) a

Figure 2: *TRIALSCOPE* is an end-to-end causal framework for scaling clinical trial simulation and real-world evidence generation from electronic medical records (EMRs). Trial specification serves as a unifying representation for clinical research hypotheses. **A:** Biomedical language models scale the structuring of EMR texts. **B:** Probabilistic latent-variable models provide a principled way for data denoising and imputation. **C:** Assembling a virtual cohort for the given clinical research hypothesis is akin to clinical trial matching. **D:** Applying a causal Cox survival model with inverse propensity weighting helps alleviate confounders. **E:** Validation test suite to assess simulation quality.




patient triaging pipeline for assembling a virtual cohort by identifying real-world patients according to target trial specification; (iv) a causal model for simulating the target trial; (v) a set of validation tests to assess whether a simulation can be trusted or not. See Figure 2.

Prior works such as Liu et al. (2021) also explore clinical trial simulation using real-world data, but they rely on available structured databases such as Flatiron (Health, 2023), which require laborious manual curation by hundreds of abstractors with clinical expertise. TRIALSCOPE instead leverages the rapid progress in generative AI, especially biomedical language models, to scale real-world data structuring, thus unlocking the use of much more abundant unstructured real-world data (Head et al., 2015; Schuemie et al., 2020b,c). Specifically, we follow prior work Preston et al. (2023) in using popular models such as PubMedBERT (Gu et al., 2021) and OncoBERT (Preston et al., 2023) for structuring clinical notes, and will explore the most recent advances such as GPT-4 (Wong et al., 2023) in future work.

To combat data quality challenges, we incorporate state-of-the-art probabilistic methods such as Mattei and Frelsen (2019) for data denoising and imputation. Real-world data is observational and can be plagued by confounders (Schuemie et al., 2020a). We thus incorporate state-of-the-art causal survival analysis methods based on the potential outcome framework to alleviate common confounding factors (Imbens and Rubin, 2015; Dahabreh et al., 2022).

We apply TRIALSCOPE to a large-scale retrospective study of real-world lung cancer patients from a large integrated delivery network (IDN) comprising healthcare systems in five western US states. The

Figure 3: Selection process for the clinical trials used in our simulation. We included all seven trials explored by Liu et al. (2021). Additionally, we conduct an exhaustive search of *ClinicalTrials.gov* with eligible trials for advanced non-small cell lung cancer, with “other filters” to only include standard two-arm trials with active control and sufficient real-world instances in our Providence dataset.



initial results are promising. Automatic curation based on biomedical language models produces large increase of available real-world data points, and causal correction substantially reduces confounder effects. Consequently, we show that TRIALSCOPE can simulate prominent lung Cancer RCTs with high fidelity. We also conduct thorough ablation studies to better understand key components of TRIALSCOPE and establish best practices for RWE generation from EMRs.

RCTs still offer more definite evidence if available (Nichols et al., 2019; Young and Karr, 2011; Lawlor et al., 2004), but RWE represents a promising direction for augmenting RCTs and accelerating biomedical discovery (Concato and Corrigan-Curay, 2022). By scaling RWE generation from real-world patient data, TRIALSCOPE can facilitate a wide-range of applications such as in-silico trial design and optimization, synthetic control, pragmatic trials, post-market surveillance, as well as support fine-grained patient-like-me reasoning in precision diagnosis and treatment.

2 Results

Prior work has explored clinical trial simulation using structured databases (Liu et al., 2021), which requires expensive and time-consuming manual curation. In this paper, we instead explore end-to-end clinical trial simulation using real-world data directly from electronic medical records (EMRs). Following prior work such as Liu et al. (2021), we focus on advanced non-small cell lung cancer (aNSCLC) given its prevalence and high mortality rate. See Supplementary Materials B for the oncotree identifiers of this category.

For real-world data, we use the cancer patient cohort from a large US Health Network (Preston et al.,

2023). For clinical trials, we conducted an exhaustive search in `ClinicalTrials.gov` for eligible standard two-arm trials with sufficient support in our dataset (see [Figure 3](#)). In addition to all seven trials considered in [Liu et al. \(2021\)](#), we have identified four new trials that have not been explored in prior work, with the full list being: FLAURA, CHECKMATE057, CHECKMATE078, KEYNOTE010, OAK, KEYNOTE024, KEYNOTE033, LUXLUNG6, CHECKMATE057017, EMPHASIS and NCT02604342¹ (no code name available).

We found a total of 18,038 aNSCLC patients that received the treatment in at least one of the arms in any of the selected trials. Patients were included in the analysis if they were diagnosed with lung cancer (as per the international classification of diseases and had pathology consistent with NSCLC) with stage IIIA, IIIB, IIIC, IVA or IVB.

Patients were excluded if they had more than two years between diagnosis and treatment or they had inconsistent start and diagnosis dates. See [Section 4.3](#) for details on data processing. [Section 2.1](#) contains the results on the quality of the EMRs representation as well as indications of how structured attributes were validated.

Our automatic curation pipeline would convert scanned reports to text, structure clinical text using biomedical language models, and then combine with available structured data to generate structured representation of patient journeys ([Figure 1](#)).

In this section, we first assess the quality of our automatic curation pipeline in structuring EMRs. We then assess the quality of in end-to-end clinical trial simulation from EMRs. For clinical trials with published hazard ratio (HR), assessment can be done by comparing our simulated HR against the reference HR. For trials that don't have published HR yet, we develop a validation test suite to assess if our causal assumptions, which can serve as a proxy for the trustworthiness of our simulation.

2.1 Automatic curation of electronic medical records

Manual curation by trained abstractors could take hours for a single cancer patient, as estimated by subject matter experts. TRIALSCOPE instead adopts an end-to-end automatic curation pipeline that produces structured patient data from raw EMRs, including scanned reports and free-text notes (see [Figure 4](#)).


[Table 1](#) summarizes the approach taken to extract each group of attributes (attribute-level details given when needed) as well as the ground truth data used to validate the extraction. See [Supplementary A](#) for further details.

Validation of conventional information extraction pipeline: For relatively simple attributes such as ECOG score, medications, and PD-L1 immunohistochemistry (IHC) biomarkers (relevant for immunotherapy trials), we use a conventional information extraction pipeline. Specifically, it uses customized spaCy sentence segmentation and NLTK for tokenization. For attribute extraction, it uses domain-specific rules to identify relevant entities, potential relations and determine if they are positive assertions. See [Section 4.4](#) for details.

For ECOG evaluation, we constructed a gold test set by randomly selecting 565 progress notes for as many cancer patients and asked a domain expert to manual extract all performance status mentions, resulting in 77 unique patient performance status gold labels (not all notes contain performance status). To ensure generalizability, the test set was chosen so there is no cross contamination from notes used to develop the domain-specific extraction rules.

¹Code as available in `ClinicalTrials.gov`

Figure 4: *Our automatic curation pipeline for structuring EMRs. A: Scanned reports are converted to text by state-of-the-art OCR models and clinical text in turn is structured using a combination of biomedical language models and conventional information extraction systems. B: Structured and normalized patient data is stored in a SQL database that is regularly updated. C: Trial specification serves as a unifying representation of research hypotheses. Trial eligibility criteria are structured similarly and represented by logic statements. D: Virtual cohort is assembled akin to clinical trial matching. E: The resulting structured real-world dataset ready for trial simulation and real-world evidence generation.*



For PD-L1 biomarkers, we randomly sampled 298 cancer patients and exhaustively identified PD-L1 mentions by a domain expert, including PD-L1 expression levels and the score type (combined positive score, tumor proportion score), resulting in 173 unique patient-expression level-score type relations. The test set was similarly chosen to avoid contamination from extraction-rule development. Table 2 (bottom part) shows that our information extraction pipeline can attain highly accurate curation of simple attributes.

Validation of the biomedical language model pipeline: For more challenging attributes such as tumor site, histology, and staging, extraction may require synthesizing multiple notes in longitudinal patient records and combat prevalent linguistic variations and ambiguities. Consequently, we build on Preston et al. (2023) and leverage advanced biomedical language models such as PubMedBERT (Gu et al., 2021) and OncoBERT (Preston et al., 2023) for automatic structuring from EMRs. Following Preston et al. (2023), we use available Cancer Registry test data for validation. Table 2 (top part) shows generally high test accuracy for these attributes.

Structured data only vs. structured data + free text: Combining structured and free-text EHRs into a unique extraction pipeline increases both speed and scope. Beyond having a way to rapidly extract new data, key attributes like ECOG and certain biomarkers are often not readily available in structured form. Also by combining structured and unstructured data we can augment the number of patients in our studies. Figure 5 shows the available unique patients in the dataset that can be extracted for (lung) cancer event, ECOG and two medications (Pembolizumab and Cisplatin). We compare these with available records in these variables by only using the structured data, only free-text data and the union of both. Using free-text

	Structured data pipeline	Conventional information extraction	Biomedical language models	Ground truth
Biomarkers				Expert labelled data
<i>All (see Sup. Mat. A)</i>	✓	✓		-
Demographics				
<i>All (see Sup. Mat. A)</i>	✓			-
Diagnosis				
<i>CNS Metastasis</i>	✓			Diagnosis code
<i>ECOG</i>		✓		Expert labelled
<i>Histology</i>	✓		✓	Cancer Registry
<i>Staging (Clinical)</i>	✓		✓	Cancer Registry
<i>Staging (Pathologic)</i>	✓		✓	Cancer Registry
<i>Tumor site</i>	✓		✓	Cancer Registry
<i>Diagnosis date</i>	✓		✓	Cancer Registry
Lab tests				
<i>All (see Sup. Mat. A)</i>	✓			Hospital lab results
Pre-treatment				
<i>All (see Sup. Mat. A)</i>	✓	✓		Expert labelled data
Outcomes				
<i>All (see Sup. Mat. A)</i>	✓			-
Treatment				
<i>Line of Therapy</i>		✓		Guidelines
<i>Medication</i>	✓	✓		Expert labelled data
<i>Start date</i>	✓	✓		Expert labelled data
<i>End date</i>	✓	✓		Expert labelled data

Table 1: *Patient attributes used in this work, with structuring provenances, and reference ground truth data for development validation. The tick mark in the “Structured data pipeline” column indicates that the corresponding structured attribute exists in EMRs, although in practice its value often may not be populated.*


Biomedical language model pipeline	AUPRC	AUROC	Accuracy	Problem Formulation
Group stage (clinical)	91.7	96.6	85.5	Multi-class classification
Group stage (pathologic)	93.7	96.8	87.8	Multi-class classification
Tumor Site	76.7	99.3	69.1	Multi-class classification
Histology	87.2	99.4	81.2	Multi-class classification
Diagnosis date (case finding)	-	-	97.3	Binary classification
Information extraction pipeline	Precision	Recall	F1	Problem Description
Medication and Prior T.	92.3	87.1	89.6	Binary classification
ECOG	100.0	96.2	98.1	Relation Extraction
PD-L1 Biomarker	97.5	89.6	93.4	Relation Extraction

Table 2: *Cancer patient attributes used in this work, with test results for automatic curation in TRI-ALSCOPE. **Top:** Test results for biomedical language models from [Preston et al. \(2023\)](#). **Bottom:** Test results for conventional information extraction.*

expands both the patient attributes that we have access to (like ECOG that is only accessible via free-text) and the number of patients.

To evaluate our pipeline, we sampled 565 cancer patients who had active cancer after that date and selected one progress note per patient within nine months after that date. An expert manually annotated those progress notes and labeled 79 notes with an explicit performance status score. The average word length per progress note in this test set is 1015.2 word tokens

Figure 5: **A:** Comparison of cancer events, ECOG, and two medications (Dozetacel and Cisplatin) for the accessible sample sizes in the Providence dataset when using only structured data, free-text and the combination of the two. **B:** Effect of correcting the simulators by confounders in all the trials. We show the absolute difference between the HR in the original trial and the estimation with and without IPSW. The estimation of the HR benefits or remain the same in all the trials when confounders are added to the models.



2.2 Simulation of advanced non-small cell lung Cancer trials

We used TRIALSCOPE to simulate a total of 11 previously-published aNSCLC clinical trials. The goal is to evaluate if the evidence produced by TRIALSCOPE is consistent with already-validated biomedical evidence. We used the Hazard ratio (HR) for the overall survival between the treatment and control as the key metric to evaluate the success of each simulation (George et al., 2020).

Several pre-processing steps and filters are applied to the structured data to guarantee that the RCT and the simulations are as comparable as possible. This includes a step for missing data imputation and other data cleaning steps. The details can be found in Sections 4.3 and Section 4.5.

We computed the HR for treatment after applying all the eligibility criteria of the trials as well as for the full cohort based on the drugs alone. In all the trials we used the same data processing pipeline and the same modelling approaches.

We used the Cox proportional hazards (CoxPH) model (Cox, 1972) in all the analysis. To account for biases due to the lack of randomization in the data, we used a CoxPH model where confounders are incorporated via inverse propensity score weighting (IPSW) with weights computed using logistic (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). See Section 4.6 for further technical details and references. All the trials were simulated with and without applying all their eligibility criteria. The results of the 11 simulated trials are summarized in Table 1.

Trial and E. Criteria		RCT		Simulation HR			
		HR	95%CI	HR	95%CI	C	T
FLAURA	Yes	0.63	(0.45, 0.88)	0.61	(0.46, 0.80)	268	200
	No			0.60	(0.49, 0.73)	576	312
CHECKMATE057	Yes	0.73	(0.59, 0.89)	0.80	(0.61, 1.05)	263	152
	No			1.04	(0.89, 1.22)	491.0	435
CHECKMATE078	Yes	0.68	(0.52, 0.9)	0.70	(0.51, 0.96)	194	111
	No			1.04	(0.88, 1.22)	492	439
KEYNOTE010	Yes	0.71	(0.58, 0.88)	0.70	(0.54, 0.91)	261	362
	No			0.89	(0.77, 1.04)	494	867
OAK	Yes	0.73	(0.62, 0.87)	0.63	(0.38, 1.06)	276	41
	No			0.71	(0.51, 0.99)	572	83
KEYNOTE024	Yes	0.63	(0.47, 0.86)	0.90	(0.70, 1.16)	180	410
	No			0.90	(0.78, 1.04)	606	1147
KEYNOTE033	Yes	0.75	(0.60, 0.95)	0.76	(0.59, 0.99)	230	360
	No			0.89	(0.76, 1.04)	492	862
LUXLUNG6	Yes	0.90	(0.71, 1.14)	1.05	(0.65, 1.69)	2621	37
	No			1.08	(0.78, 1.48)	5187	82
CHECKMATE017	Yes	0.59	(0.44, 0.79)	0.71	(0.52, 0.97)	197	111
	No			1.03	(0.87, 1.20)	492	437
EMPHASIS	Yes	?	?	0.76	(0.61, 0.95)	370	439
	No			0.85	(0.71, 1.02)	534	615
NCT02604342	Yes	?	?	0.32	(0.16, 0.64)	1774	26
	No			0.39	(0.23, 0.65)	2625	42

Table 1: *Simulation of the 11 selected single-drug trials using a CoxPH model with inverse propensity re-weighting. Each pair of rows in the table contains the results for one trial. Rows labelled with No are results with datasets of patients that were filtered only by line of therapy and the treatment and control drugs of the trial. Rows in the table labelled with Yes also exclude patients filtered using all the eligibility criteria. The Hazard Ratio (HR) and its 95% confidence interval are shown for the original RCTs and for the simulations that use the Providence dataset. The sample size of the treatment (T) and control (C) groups are also included. Note that the HR from the RCTs are only comparable to the simulation results in which patients are filtered by eligibility criteria (EC). We underline the cases in which the RCT and the simulation significantly overlap and the HR in the RCT sits within the simulation confidence interval. In italic we highlight cases where overlap exist but it is minimal.*

Overall success of the simulations: From the total of 11 trials, 2 did not report the HR due the lack of statistically significant results (not enough patients). In the remaining 9 trials, the simulations and the published trial are statistically equivalent in all cases. However, the evidence in the KEYNOTE024 trial is weaker.

Simulations vs. trials: The simulations and trials are consistent regardless of the value of the HR in the original publication. Trials like FLAURA (HR-RCT: 0.63², $n = 556$) or CHECKMATE057 (HR-RCT: 0.73, $n = 582$) with $HR < 1$ and were correctly simulated. The simulated HR for FLAURA was 0.61 ($n = 468$) and for CHECKMATE057 0.80 ($n = 415$). On the other hand, the LUXLUNG6 trial (HR-RCT: 0.9, $n = 364$) had a non-statistically equal-to-one HR. The simulations capture this effect with a value of $HR = 1.05$ ($n = 2658$). This is an important result. It highlights the correct alignment of the information provided by structuring the EMRs using language models with existing comparative evidence of lung cancer

²See Table 1 for 95% CI

treatments. This occurs in cases where differences between groups are significant and also when they are not.

Effects of the eligibility criteria: We compare simulation results with and without applying the eligibility criteria (using line of therapy only). The differences in the estimated HRs with and without using all criteria vary from trial to trial. In KEYNOTE024, the variation is minimal (HR-No-Criteria: 0.90, and $n=2753$; HR-with-Criteria: 0.90, $n=580$), whereas in the CHECKMATE057 the differences are larger (HR-no-Criteria: 1.04, $n=926$; HR-with-Criteria: 0.80, $n=415$). As pointed out by Liu et al. (2021), this provides evidence that for some trials the eligibility criteria can be relaxed while maintaining a similar level of significance in the results.

Effects of confounder correction: The effect of correcting the simulations using IPSW has a different effect depending on the trial. See Supplementary Materials F we include the simulation results without applying the correction. Figure 5 B) shows the differences for the absolute differences between the RCT HRs and the estimated HRs with and without the confounders correction in the Cox-PH model (when all the eligibility criteria are applied). Correcting for confounders moves the estimation of the HR towards the ground truth values in 8 of 9 cases with strong corrections in the CHECKMATE057 and OAK 6 trials. In LUXLUNG06 the correction does not have any effect in the result. These results are consistent with those of Zeng et al. (2022), where it is shown that confounding correction helps to reduce bias in survival models built with EMRs.

Trial simulation without baseline HR: Two of the selected trials, EMPHASIS and NCT02604342, did not report the HR. This is because these trials didn't manage to collect enough patients and had to be discontinued. This is a well known problem in clinical trials where a not-insignificant proportion of trials fail solely due to the inability to recruit eligible patients (Briel et al., 2021). We simulated these to forecast what the HR may have been in case the trial had been successfully enrolled/completed. Simulation of the EMPHASIS trial resulted in an HR of 0.76 and a 95% confidence interval of [0.61, 0.95] ($n=1009$) and the NCT0260434 resulted in an HR of 0.32 and a 95% confidence interval of [0.16, 0.64] ($n = 1800$). This exemplifies how RWE can be used as a way to collect early evidence of the result of a trial even before the first patients have been recruited.

2.3 Validation when a reference RCT is not available

Our simulations utilize causal assumptions (see Section 4.6) that are not readily verifiable from data. Comparing with the HR in the RCT is the ultimate validation. In cases where a reference HR is not available, we rely on a set of validation tests that aim to capture model behaviors that may indicate that some of the assumptions are broken. To illustrate this behaviours we use the EMPHASIS trial.

Our simulation for the EMPHASIS trials shows a $HR = 0.76$ (95%CI=[0.16, 0.64], $n = 809$). Because a reference HR is not available, we may assess other indicators of the goodness of this simulation, that can be carried out without knowing the trial HR.

We run several tests in order to investigate other sources of bias and variance in the simulation. Figure 6 shows all the tests that we carried out. First, we check the balancing between treatment and control groups before and after using the IPSW correction. We computed the standardized mean distance (SMD) for


		Simulation-T	Simulation-C	RCT-T	RCT-C
Counts		439	370	38	42
Age	Mean	66.09	69.22	66.7	70.1
	Median	67	69	NA	NA
	Min	35	32	44.4	53.3
	Max	92	95	82	84
Gender	Female	256 (58.31 %)	163 (44.05 %)	7 (18.4%)	7 (16.7%)
	Male	183 (41.69 %)	207 (55.95 %)	31 (81.6%)	35 (83.3%)
ECOG	0	29 (6.61 %)	59 (15.95 %)	12 (31.6%)	15 (35.7%)
	1	219 (49.89 %)	236 (63.78 %)	24 (63.2%)	22 (52.4%)
	2	191 (43.5%)	75 (20.27%)	2 (5.3%)	5 (11.9%)
Race	Asian	71 (16.17 %)	28 (7.57 %)	NA	NA
	Black/African American	12 (2.73 %)	8 (2.16 %)	NA	NA
	White/Caucasian	297 (67.65 %)	292 (78.92 %)	NA	NA
	Other	59 (13.46%)	42 (11.35%)	NA	NA
Smoking	No	342 (77.9 %)	206 (55.68 %)	16 (4.21%)	12 (28.6%)
	Yes	97 (22.1 %)	164 (44.32 %)	22(57.9%)	27 (64.3%)

Table 2: Summary statistics for the data in the original RCT publication and the simulation (Providence data) for the reported covariates in EMPHASIS (T=treatment, C=Control). NA stands for not available values. The two populations differ, which implies that the conclusions of the simulation cannot be extrapolated to the trial.

all confounders in both cases. The differences are close to zero when the IPSW correction is applied and remain large when it is not. This indicates that the differences between the groups due to factors beyond the treatment are properly corrected. Second, we check the percentage of the data that with non-null probability could have been selected for either of the control or treatment groups. The larger the set, the more suitable the dataset is for causal analysis as detailed in Oberst et al. (2020). In EMPHASIS, 93% of the patient data in the RWD for this trial satisfies this property. See Section 4.6 for further technical details and references. Third, we question the strength of the signal. We randomly permute the assignment to the treatment group 100 times and recompute the HR in each one of them. As expected, the signal vanishes when the patients are assigned randomly. Fourth, we test the robustness of the simulation when we add a new zero-mean Gaussian confounder in the analysis. We run several scenarios in which we systematically increase the standard deviation of the confounder in a grid of values between 0.1 and 5. We generate 100 replicates for each scenario and compute the 95% confidence interval for the replicates using the 5% and 95% percentiles. If the model is robust, adding this extra variable should not affect the estimation of the HRs and the variation should be minimal, which is what we observe in the experiment. Fifth, we compute the HR by randomly down-sampling the dataset and retain only 95, 90, 75, 50, and 25% of the patients (100 repetition in each scenario). A well-behaved simulator should provide the same average HR in all cases, with an increase in variance when the sample size decreases. Again this is what we observe in the case of EMPHASIS. In summary, this trial is an exemplar of how a simulation is expected to behave.

We also examine the summary statistics of the populations in the trial and simulation, which are expected to be similar if both studies are comparable. Table 2 (top part) contains summary statistics for all the variables available in the original publication. We observe that the two populations are in strong alignment in terms of the age variables but differ in the rest. Although the models and assumptions in the simulations are correct, as per the above-mentioned test, this implies that conclusions about the differential effect of

Figure 6: Results of the diagnostics test for the EMPHASIS trial. From left to right. Group Re-balancing: the standardized mean distance (SMD) for all covariates is close to zero after rebalancing the groups. Overlapping set: 99% of the RwD set had non zero probability of being selected for the treatment and control group. Placebo treatment: the signal in the simulation vanishes when the assignment to the treatment is randomly permuted (100 replicates per scenario). Random confounder: the estimation of the HR is robust against wrongly selected confounders that are unrelated with the treatment and the response. The figure shows the CI for the HR for a randomly generated Gaussian with mean zero and varying standard deviation (100 replicates per scenario). Down-sampling: the estimation of the HR is robust against sub-sampling. In average the same HR is observed even when only 25% of the sample is randomly selected and used to to simulate the trial (100 replicates per scenario).



the trial and control drugs can only be made for the population of patients characterized by the summary statistics in the simulation.

3 Discussion

We present TRIALSCOPE, a unifying causal framework for scaling clinical trial simulation and real-world evidence (RWE) generation directly from electronic medical records, where the bulk of information resides in unstructured data such as clinical notes. This represents a major advance compared to prior work that predominantly relies on manual curation, which is hard to scale to population-level RWE.

Our experimental results demonstrate that combining structuring capabilities powered by biomedical language models and causal inference capabilities can transform EMRs into a scalable real-world evidence generator, as signified by the efficacy in simulating representative lung cancer trials.

We believe that TRIALSCOPE can be used to improve clinical practice. Although the analysis presented in this paper are primarily retrospective, evidence about the comparative efficacy of drugs does not need to be limited to cases where a trial exists. With the increasing digitization of medical records TRIALSCOPE can be used as a tool to extract insights from EMRs. Any biomedical researcher can use TRIALSCOPE to generate knowledge at a speed that is at least an order of magnitude faster than the current state of the art, in which information in free text is, if not directly ignored, structured manually or with limited digital support. To our knowledge, TRIALSCOPE is the first framework able to incorporate the results of fully large language model-based structuring pipelines into causal inference applications via a reweighted Cox-PH model. Also, we believe that we are the first in combining this approaches with an exhaustive set

of diagnostics tools useful to add transparency when incorporating TRIALSCOPE in biomedical decision making pipelines.

However, TRIALSCOPE also has several limitations that we would like to discuss in detail. Not only because they can serve as a guide to use TRIALSCOPE responsibly, but also because they are the starting point for future research directions that can expand its current capabilities.

State of the art of language models: With the recent rapid development of artificial intelligence tools, language models like GPT-4 in particular ([OpenAI, 2023](#)), we envision that some of the components of TRIALSCOPE will rapidly evolve.

Extraction of the eligibility criteria: A bottleneck that limits the scalability of the current framework is that the extraction of the eligibility criteria is not automated. Automating this step will increase the scalability of the framework, making it possible to simulate hundreds of trials.

Distribution of the RCT population under the eligibility criteria: In general, the distribution of the population in the RCT is unknown. This limits our capacity to evaluate how the population of patients in the RWD setting is comparable to the trial. In this work we have used summary statistics of some key attributes, which is the only information that is available in published trials.

The CoxPH model: the causal modelling aspects of this work have been kept intentionally simple to increase transparency. However, the CoxPH has the draw back that with many covariates the proportional hazard assumption may be violated. Other models can be used, but at the time of doing we believed that the simplicity and transparency of the Cox model outweighed any alternative. Among the potential extensions that are worth considering are Cox models that are time dependent ([Agarwal et al., 2018](#)) or that model the confounding bias in the censoring mechanisms ([Chapfuwa et al., 2021](#)).

Causal interpretability of the Hazard ratio: It is important to remark that although we use the HR to test our ability to simulate a trial because it is publicly available with RCT results, the HR does not have a causal interpretation even under patients randomization ([Hernán, 2010](#)), the standard setup in RCTs. The reason for this is that although the distribution of the populations are the same at the beginning of the study (due to randomization or confounding correction) this is not necessarily true as time progresses and the two sub-populations may become less balanced due to the loss of patients. An alternative here is to use the Causal HR ([Axelrod and Nevo, 2022](#)), which addresses some of the potential issues.

Subgroup fairness: an interesting consideration when computing the HR for a particular population is the uniformity of the response. A HR can be significant for the patients involved in a trial, but nothing guarantees the uniformity of the response across sub-populations. Fairness considerations need to be taken into account to guarantee that no patient is left behind. This is an important problem that, although not main-stream in the clinical trials literature, has received some recent attention ([Chien et al., 2022](#)).

Simulation of combination trials: Combo trials are trials in which the treatment medication consist of a combination of drugs that are tested when they are administrated simultaneously. The simulation of combo trials was excluded from this analysis and requires further investigation. What we observed in the dataset

is that combo trials are harder to simulate than single drug trials, which is consistent with the results in [Liu et al. \(2021\)](#). A hypothesis for this phenomenon is related to the health state of the patients involved in the trials. Combo drugs are usually extreme treatments that are given to patients with very poor health, which may have an effect in the consistency and robustness of the results. This is an issue that we are planning to investigate in the future.

Robustness and missing confounders: All the confounders used in this work are based on previous analysis and ‘reasonable’ factors that can simultaneously affect the assignment to the treatment and the response. Direct collaboration with subject matter experts is needed in this step. In the future, however, work involving systematic ways and statistically grounded ways of identifying sources of confounding will be key for the general adoption of ours and other RWE tools.

Despite the many remaining challenges for extracting RWE from electronic medical records, this work is of the interest to medical practitioners as well as researchers in the area. We hope that the workflows presented here can serve as a reference for framing problems and answers in RWE in a scalable and transparent manner. Ultimately we hope that TRIALSCOPE can help to increase transparency in the use of RWE, speeding up its adoption and improving patients’ lives.

4 Methods

4.1 Human subjects/IRB, data security, and patient privacy

This work was performed under the guidance of an Institutional Review Board (IRB)-approved research protocol (Providence protocol ID 2019000204) and was conducted in compliance with Human Subjects research and clinical data management procedures—as well as cloud information security policies and controls—administered within Providence Health. All study data were integrated, managed and analyzed exclusively and solely on Providence-managed cloud infrastructure. All study personnel completed and were credentialed in training modules covering Human Subjects research, use of clinical data in research, and appropriate use of IT resources and IRB-approved data assets.

The patient data that we use comes from Providence Health & Services. Providence is a health care system operating multiple hospitals across seven states in the US. They employ around 120,000 caregivers serving in 52 hospitals and 1,085 clinics. Providence is the 10th largest hospital system in the US by number of hospitals (52) [hospitalmanagement \(2022\)](#). The Providence patient dataset used in this work consists of electronic medical records (EMR) from about 3.3 million patients. About 1 million of those patients are cancer patients. From this dataset we collected patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. For each patient we extracted clinical notes, history and physical notes, treatment plans, discharge summaries, etc. For each patient we also pull semi-structured information from the inpatient billing system as well as available information at the start of the treatment time. This includes cancer lab test results, staging, tumor description, date of diagnosis, date of death, date of the last follow-up for the selected patients. Demographics and other patient characteristics like age, gender, ethnicity are extracted from the structured patient data.

4.2 Trials selection

We followed a systematic approach to select the trials to simulate. We took the work from (Liu et al., 2021) as a reference. We considered for simulation all single-drug trials with at least 150 patients in both arms before any data filtering was applied published in this work (7 trials). We augmented this set by conducting our own search in `ClinicalTrials.gov`. Because this is an evolving dataset, we fixed our search to the 2023/03/08 and we used the following filters: Non-small Cell Lung Cancer trials (6344 studies), completed studies (2444 studies), that are interventional in phase III or IV (338 studies), with study protocols (48 studies) and that have two arms with different treatments with available reports and that were not already in the work by Liu et al. (2021) (45 studies). For consistency, we also selected trials with at least 150 patients in both arms before any data processing. This leads to a total of another 7 extra eligible trials. 3 of the total of 14 trials were not considered in the analysis because they had less than 20 patients per arm after applying all the eligibility criteria.

4.3 Study cohort

We build a cohort of patients per trial. We select all the patients that resemble as much as possible a population that could have been eligible for each trial while maximizing the number of patients per trial.

The database contains a total of one million patients, 18,038 of which received the control or target treatment in at least one of the analyzed trials. Patients were also selected according to the line of therapy of the trials. If the line of treatment was missing, this criteria was ignored and the patient added to the trial as in Liu et al. (2021).

Patients with inconsistent start diagnosis and death dates were removed as well as those individuals with more than two years between diagnosis and treatment. We remove all treatment patients who took the control drug during “trial” and the control patients that took the treatment drug. We also removed any duplicated patients with other data inconsistencies. Patients for which the event (death or last visit) was recorded in a time beyond the duration of the trial were corrected consider censored with a time event equal to the duration of the trial. All the data processing was done in `python` using `pandas`.

4.4 EMR structuring and representation

The choice of the method to structure each attribute in the dataset depends on the availability and quality of structured data, the difficulty of the task, and the importance of the data for our analysis. When we had the same information from several sources, we selected the value extracted using the method with higher confidence (typically the structured source).

Patient Demographics: Patient demographics refer to the date of birth, gender, race, ethnicity, vital status, last contact date, and death date. This information comes structured from the hospital’s internal records. However, for the death date, we extract this information from both the hospital records and social security death records. If a patient’s death information is not found, we extract the last contact date by using the latest date from all records for that patient.

Oncology: For oncology attributes (site, histology, staging, diagnosis date), we combined structured data from the cancer registry and predictions from self-supervised large language models (Preston et al., 2022).

The LLM model inputs include pathology reports, progress notes, imaging reports, encounter notes, diagnosis code description, Op Notes, and Surgery notes. The model predicts ICD-O-3 site and histology codes, which we then map to OncoTree IDs for clinical trial matching. To predict diagnosis date, we use the case-finding model only on pathology reports.

Biomarkers: Biomarkers are obtained in structured form but requires normalizing to three fields: gene/protein, variant, and variant type. For variant, we try to normalize to HGVS nomenclature when possible. However, some biomarkers are only available to us in unstructured form, such as pathology reports that contain third-party laboratory test results. For PD-L1 IHC expression results, we utilize an information extraction pipeline that contain 3 steps: entity extraction, relation extraction, and intent detection. The entity extraction step will extract PD-L1 test names such as combined positive score (CPS), Tumor Proportion Score (TPS). We also test result values such as negative, positive, high, low, a specific percentage value (e.g., 10%), or a range of percentage values (e.g., > 50%). We then apply relation extraction to determine if there is a relation between that PD-L1 test and the test result value. If so, we then classify the intent of that relation as to whether or not this patient actually has that biomarker relation. Oftentimes, patient notes may contain biomarker entities but the patient may not actually have that biomarker. The text may contain a description of the biomarker test, writing about a hypothetical situation, or negation. We do not extract the date of the PD-L1 measurement mentioned in the note but use the note date for the PD-L1 measurement. In future work, we will also extract the date associated with each PD-L1 measurement.

Treatment: Information about patients' medication is extracted from both structured and unstructured medical records. We use two sources of structured medication information –"Ordered-Meds" and "Administered-Meds". Ordered-Meds contains all medications ordered for a patient which may or may not have been administered to the patient. Administered-Meds are all medications that are given to the patient at the hospital and are of high confidence. Using medication descriptions from the structured data, we standardize each medication to the NCI(National Cancer Institute) Thesaurus concept ID. This standardization allows for a seamless use of drug synonyms, abbreviations, and collective names interchangeably. We rely on our medication extraction module to complement the structured medication information with data extracted from free clinical notes since not all patients have structured medication information and even those with structured medication information may not have a complete structured medication history. Clinical notes contain more comprehensive and detailed patient drug information but such information is buried in large unstructured formats and not easily accessible. Our treatment extraction pipeline to extract medication information from free clinical texts has the following modules:

- **Extract medications:** The first step in the pipeline, extracts medication mentions. These can be in short-forms, medication codes or any of the drug synonyms.
- **Extract attributes:** For each of the extracted medications, we find attributes from the span. The most important ones are dosage (amount of a medication used in each administration), frequency (how often each dose should be taken), mode (route for the medication), date (date of medication administration) and discontinuation/Substitution (whether the medication is still active or being discontinued/substituted)
- **Link Entities:** Here, each of the extracted attributes are linked to their corresponding medication

- **Determine Administration:** Using all the information above, this module determines whether the medication mentioned in the clinical note is administered to the patient or not. This is a challenge since medications can be mentioned in a clinical note as a suggestion, in reference to past history, or in a hypothetical framing.

Using the treatment extraction pipeline and the structured medication information, we have a complete treatment information about a patient. Each patient data will be enriched with details such as the list of all medications taken with dose/frequency/mode, date of each administration, when substitutions/discontinuations happened in the patient timeline.

Line of Therapy(LoT) Determining the LoT is critically important to assess a patient’s eligibility for a given clinical trial. However, there are not any universally accepted set of criteria to enumerate LoT. To alleviate this, we have adopted the guidelines suggested in the works of [Saini and Twelves \(2021\)](#) and [Meng et al. \(2021\)](#) to determine line of therapy. The following is the final guideline we have followed to determine LoT in our cohort of patients.

1. The First LoT is defined as the first SACT(systemic anti-cancer therapy) drug recorded after date of diagnosis.
2. If clinical progression of disease is documented, assign a new LoT to the next SACT.
3. If a SACT drug is discontinued and substituted by another drug of the same class, retain the same LoT.
4. If one or more new anti-cancer agent is added to an ongoing SACT, assign a new LoT.
5. If one or more anti-cancer agent is discontinued from an ongoing SACT, retain the same LoT for the remaining anti-cancer agents.

ECOG Performance status is mentioned only in the unstructured free text, particularly progress notes. We extract various various metrics mentioned such as Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG), Karnofsky Performance Status Scale (KPS), Lansky Performance Status Scale, and Palliative Performance Scale (PPS). We map these different metrics to ECOG for ease of comparison. This is extracted using our information extraction module similar to the PD-L1 extraction pipeline described above. We convert all the extracted metrics to ECOG.

Smoking history: Smoking history or status for patients was extracted from available data about patient diagnosis, represented by ICD-10 codes. As shown previously by ([Wiley et al., 2013](#)), the specificity of using ICD-9 codes was high, “indicating the exceptional utility of these codes for identifying true smokers” and supporting “the use of these codes for the identification of smokers for clinical studies”. However, using NLP on clinical notes combined with the ICD-9 codes resulted in higher sensitivity, as discussed by ([Wang et al., 2016](#)), which we will explore in future work. These ICD-9 codes (305.1 Tobacco use disorder, and V15.82 Personal history of tobacco use) were converted to ICD-10, by including more specific codes that represent “tobacco”, ”smoking”, “nicotine”, “cigarettes” use/abuse while filtering out instances of explicitly

non-smoking use like “chewing tobacco”. Other codes that indicate use or abuse of tobacco currently or in the past, in addition to chronic exposure of environmental smoke were also included.

CNS metastasis: Patients with Central nervous system (CNS) metastasis, also referred to as brain metastasis in our dataset, were collected by filtering for ICD-10 code C79.31 (Secondary malignant neoplasm of brain) from patient history (Eichler and Lamont, 2009) reported that the code for secondary brain or spinal cord neoplasms, 198.3 (converts approximately to ICD-10-CM C79.31), had good recall (sensitivity), precision (positive predictive value), and specificity for identifying patients with brain metastases. The precision and specificity increased when the code recurred on different days.

Laboratory tests: Laboratory test results are typically found in structured form (between 69.3 % to 76.9 %) and thus we have not extracted this from the unstructured text, even though it is also commonly mentioned there. We filtered commonly encountered lab test names for each lab test type from our dataset, and categorized each test into one of three standard units: Upper limits of normal (ULN), grams per deciliter (g/dL), count per microliter (/muL). We then converted the values to the required units. To calculate ULN we took the value of the lab and divided it by the higher limit of normal reference range. Each lab test had between 2.7 million to 4.99 million entries, in our final dataset. We also converted other fluid measurement units to g/dL or count/microliter.

4.5 Missing values

We used a hybrid approach to deal with missing data. This is due to the structure of the missingness and their numbers across the dataset. In the structured dataset there are missing values in the line of therapy, start, diagnosis and end date and in all of the lab tests. The missing values in the laboratory tests variables (ALT, AST, hemoglobin, etc.), smoking and CNS metastasis are imputed using an in-house implementation of the approach by Mattei and Frelsen (2019). The line of therapy is missing in 90% of the patients. Following Liu et al. (2021), we only filter it in patients in which it is available. Patients with missing or incoherent dates are removed from the dataset.

We deal with the missingness of the categorical variables via a one-hot encoding. All the data included in the trials in this study were imputed simultaneously. The dimension of the latent variable was fixed to six. The width of the multi-layer perceptron in the variational auto-encoder was fixed to 32 and the decoder and we used a depth of 3 layers with ReLU activation functions. The training was carried out for 500 epochs and we used 100 samples for estimating the distribution of the unobserved data given the observed data. The imputation of the missing data was done as described in Mattei and Frelsen (2019).

4.6 Causal Survival analysis

Survival outcomes and treatments: Survival outcomes are defined as (Y_i, D_i) . $D_i \in \{0, 1\}$ represents the death event based on the follow up of the patient. $Y_i \in \mathcal{Z}^+$ represents the observed survival time, in days, since the start of the therapy. Y_i is computed as $Y_i = \min(T_i, C_i)$ where T_i is the time of death and C_i is the censoring time. To make the simulation of the trials as accurate as possible we use the duration of the trial as censoring time for those patients with a larger duration. When the event *death* is observed, Y_i accounts for the number of days between the start of therapy and the event. When death is not observed,

the last contact date with the patient is used and considered censored. The treatment that the patient receives is denoted by $W_i \in \{0, 1\}$. This is a binary variable because we only consider two-arm trials in this work but this can be generalized further.

Covariates selection: The covariates of the model are described by X_i and include age, gender smoking, histology, CNS metastasis, ECOG score, race, hemoglobin, lymphocytes, ALT, AST, ALP and the days between diagnostics and treatment. In cases in which a covariate is part of the eligibility criteria of the trial, these are not included in the analysis. **Assumptions:** Simulating a trial requires some assumptions that

we make explicit here. We follow the standard potential outcomes point of view and we refer to [Imbens and Rubin \(2015\)](#) for further details. We also recommend [Dahabreh et al. \(2022\)](#) for a review on assumptions combining experimental and observational studies.

1. *Conditional exchangeability*, $Y(W = w) \perp W | \mathbf{X}$, for $a = 0, 1$ where $Y(W = w)$ is the potential outcome of an individual assigned to group $W = w$. This assumption specifies that the right confounders have been observed, which implies that conditioning on X the outcome of the treatment of an individual once it has received a treatment is independent of the selection mechanism (a randomized experiment can be simulated).
2. *Positive support*, $P(X) > 0$. All eligible individuals can be selected for the study.
3. *Overlap*, $1 > P(W = 1 | X) > 0$. All the eligible individuals have a non-null probability of being selected as cases and controls.
4. *Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA)*. There is no interference between patients. The SUTVA assumption it is two assumptions rolled into one. First, it states that the potential outcomes for any patient do not vary with the treatments assigned to other units (patients are independent in their responses). Second, for each unit, there are no different forms or versions of each treatment level that lead to different potential outcomes (the treatment is always the same). Note that SUTVA does not say anything about how the treatment assigned to one unit affects the treatment assigned to another unit.
5. *Trial population match*, $P_{RCT}(X) = P_{RWD}(X)$. When the goal is to simulate the result of a previous trial, the distribution of the confounders in the observational study and in the trial should be the same.

Assumptions 2-5 can be tested from observation data. Assumption 1 cannot, but we can find indications in the data that the confounders in the data are removing the right biases. See bellow for a list of data driven tests that are used to validate these hypothesis, to the extent of what is possible to do with observational data.

Confounding bias corrections: To evaluate the balancing between treatments and control we compute the propensity score (PS). The PS of a patient i is defined as

$$e(X_i) = \mathbb{P}(W_i | X_i)$$

It captures the probability taking the treatment W_i in the presence of the confounders X_i . In balanced randomized experiments it holds that $e(X_i) = 0.5$ for all patients (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 2006). The propensity score is a balancing score. This means that by conditioning on the propensity score it is expected for the distribution of observed covariates to be the same in the treatment and the control groups. Propensity scores are commonly used to reduce the bias due to confounding in observational studies by re-weighting the observations in the model of the outcomes. The weights of individuals with a propensity score close to 1 or 0 is reduced. These are individuals whose assignment is identified to be heavily affected by the presence of the values of the confounding variables. On the other hand, individuals with propensity score close to 0.5 are over-weighted because their assignment is independent of the covariates, as it is the case in RCTs where individuals are assigned randomly to cases and controls. In the TRIALSCOPE codebase, the propensity scores are computed with a logistic regression. We used the `LogisticRegression` class in `scikit-learn`³.

Survival models: The hazard rate of an individual, denoted usually by $h(t|X, W)$ is the rate in which that a patient will die at time t in the presence of the covariates X and treatment W . In survival analysis, the Hazard Ratio for the treatment is defined as

$$HR(t) = \frac{h(t|X, W = 1)}{h(t|X, W = 0)}, \quad (1)$$

which accounts for the relative risk of death at time t between the treatment and control groups Hernán (2010).

We use the Cox Proportional Hazards model (Cox-PH) Cox (1972) to perform the survival analysis. This model assumes that

$$h(t|X) = h_0(t) \exp \left(b_w W + \sum_{j=1}^p b_j X_j \right), \quad (2)$$

where $h_0(t)$ is known as the baseline-hazard, b_w is the parameter accounting for the effects of the treatment and b_j is accounting for the effect of the j th covariate. The particular factorization of Cox-PH allows to associate each parameter of the model with the HR of each covariate. In particular, the HR for the treatment is,

$$HR = \exp(b_w),$$

which is independent of the time due to the structure of the CoxPH model. In our experiments we use the the class `CoxPHFitter` from the library `lifelines`⁴. We use two different approaches to compute the Hazard Ratio:

- Unadjusted Cox proportional hazard (**CoxPH-U**): This model is used a baseline. No confounding correction is used. We use the target treatment W as covariates. The reported HR is the exponential of the target treatment parameter.
- Cox proportional hazard with inverse propensity re-weighting (**CoxPH-IPSW**): We compute the Hazard ratio using a CoxPH model trained on W using a inverse propensity treatment weighting (Cole

³<https://scikit-learn.org/>

⁴<https://lifelines.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

and Hernán, 2004). The weights for each patient are obtained as

$$w_i = \frac{W_i}{e(X_i)} + \frac{(1 - W_i)}{1 - e(X_i)}$$

Simulation validation tests: for each trial we performed a series of tests to guarantee the stability and coherence of the results. Causal assumptions like the conditional exchangeability cannot be tested with observational data only. However a sensitivity analysis of the HR with respect to several varying aspects in the data can help to identify potential issues. In our study we performed the following analysis:

- **Randon Confounder:** We add a simulated confounder to the problem by randomly generating data from a Gaussian variable with mean zero and variance θ . We recompute the *HR* for a grid of 10 values on $\theta \in [0.1, 5]$. Each experiment is repeated 300 times. *Expected positive test result:* No statistical variation of the Hazard Ratio across different values of θ . This test aims to test the stability of the chosen confounders.
- **Placebo treatment:** We randomly permute the assignment to the treatment. We repeat the experiment 300 times. *Expected positive test result:* The newly computed Hazard ratios are not statistically significant ($HR = 1$). This test aims to validate that the quality of the signal.
- **Downsampling.** We select samples of decreasing sizes with replacement and we recompute the HRs. We take subsamples of size 90, 75, 50 and 25% of the original dataset. We repeat each experiment 30 times. *Expected positive test result:* Same average HR in each scenario with an increase in variance when the sample size decreases. This test aims to capture the stability of the results and its consistence under random variations in the sample.

Beyond indications for potentially missing confounders, it is important to evaluate that given the chosen confounders the balancing between the groups has been carried out correctly and that the structure of the data allows for causal analysis. To evaluate this issues we perform the following tests:

- **Groups Rebalancing):** To test for the quality of the signal, and how imbalances between eh groups are corrected when using the IPSW approach, We compute the standard mean difference for all the confounders with and without re-weighting for the treatment and control groups. *Expected positive test result:* Re-weighting makes the differences between the treatment and control groups close to zero in all confounding variables.
- **Overlapping sets.** We test that all patients have a non-negative probability of being assigned to either of the two groups. We we use the method described in Oberst et al. (2020) and the available in dowhy⁵ (Sharma and Kiciman, 2020). *Expected positive test result:* A large percentage of the same (> 95%) satisfies the condition. This test aims to capture the overlap of cases and controls (the more overlap we have the better the data are for causal analysis).

The HR is a quantity that describe a population of individuals characterized by $P(X)$. Therefore, for the HRs in the RCT and the observational to be comparable it is needed that $P_{RCT}(X) = P_{RWE}(X)$. Filtering

⁵<https://github.com/py-why/dowhy>

patients in the observational dataset according to the eligibility criteria only guarantees that the support of these two densities are the same so further validation is needed. Unfortunately, data from the RCT are rarely available. To test this assumptions we use the summary statistics that we published together with the RCTs and we compare those with the equivalent values in the structured EMRs.

5 Data and code availability

The EMR data for this study are not made publicly available due to privacy and compliance considerations established by the research protocol. The EMR data cannot be redistributed beyond those who have obtained a Material Transfer Agreement. Instead, we have provided a detailed description of the data selection pipeline and processing in Section 4.4. Queries about these data should be directed to the corresponding authors indicated above. The biomedical language models and its pretraining algorithm are detailed in Gu et al. (2021) and are publicly available⁶.

References

- Agarwal, P., Moshier, E., Ru, M., Ohri, N., Ennis, R., Rosenzweig, K., and Mazumdar, M. (2018). Immortal time bias in observational studies of time-to-event outcomes: Assessing effects of postmastectomy radiation therapy using the national cancer database. *Cancer control : journal of the Moffitt Cancer Center*, 25(1):1073274818789355.
- Axelrod, R. and Nevo, D. (2022). A sensitivity analysis approach for the causal hazard ratio in randomized and observational studies. *Biometrics*, 10.1111/biom.13797.
- Bartlett, C. H., Mardekian, J., Yu-Kite, M., Cotter, M. J., Kim, S., Decembrino, J., Snow, T., Carson, K. R., Motyl Rockland, J., Kraus, A. L., Wilner, K. D., Oharu, N., Schnell, P., Lu, D. R., and Tursi, J. (2019). Real-world evidence of male breast cancer (bc) patients treated with palbociclib (pal) in combination with endocrine therapy (et). *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 37(15_suppl):1055–1055.
- Briel, M., Elger, B., McLennan, S., et al. (2021). Exploring reasons for recruitment failure in clinical trials: a qualitative study with clinical trial stakeholders in switzerland, germany, and canada. *Trials*, 22:844.
- Chapfuwa, P., Assaad, S., Zeng, S., Pencina, M. J., Carin, L., and Henao, R. (2021). Enabling counterfactual survival analysis with balanced representations. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pages 133–145. ACM.
- Chien, I., Deliu, N., Turner, R., Weller, A., Villar, S., and Kilbertus, N. (2022). Multi-disciplinary fairness considerations in machine learning for clinical trials. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, FAccT '22*, page 906–924, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Cole, S. R. and Hernán, M. A. (2004). Adjusted survival curves with inverse probability weights. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 75(1):45–49.
- Concato, J. and Corrigan-Curay, J. (2022). Real-world evidence — where are we now? *New England Journal of Medicine*, 386(18):1680–1682. PMID: 35485775.

⁶<https://aka.ms/pubmedbert>

- Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 34(2):187–220.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Steingrimsson, J. A., Robins, J. M., and Hernán, M. A. (2022). Randomized trials and their observational emulations: a framework for benchmarking and joint analysis.
- Eichler, A. F. and Lamont, E. B. (2009). Utility of administrative claims data for the study of brain metastases: a validation study. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*, 95:427–431.
- FDA (2018). Framework for FDA’s Real-World Evidence Program.
- Fritzsching, B., Contoli, M., Porsbjerg, C., Buchs, S., Larsen, J. R., Elliott, L., Rodriguez, M. R., and Freemantle, N. (2022). Long-term real-world effectiveness of allergy immunotherapy in patients with allergic rhinitis and asthma: Results from the react study, a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*, 13:100275.
- George, A., Stead, T. S., and Ganti, L. (2020). What’s the risk: Differentiating risk ratios, odds ratios, and hazard ratios? *Cureus*, 12.
- Gu, Y., Tinn, R., Cheng, H., Lucas, M., Usuyama, N., Liu, X., Naumann, T., Gao, J., and Poon, H. (2021). Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Trans. Comput. Healthcare*, 3(1).
- Head, M., Holman, L., Lanfear, R., Kahn, A., and Jennions, M. (2015). The extent and consequences of p-hacking in science. *PLoS Biol*, 13(3):e1002106.
- Health, F. (2023). Clinico-genomic database. <https://flatiron.com/real-world-evidence/clinico-genomic-database-cgdb>.
- Hernán, M. (2010). The hazards of hazard ratios. *Epidemiology*, 21(1):13–15. Erratum in: *Epidemiology*. 2011 Jan;22(1):134. PMID: 20010207; PMCID: PMC3653612.
- hospitalmanagement (2022). Top ten largest health systems in the us by number of hospitals affiliated.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, USA.
- Lawlor, D. A., Davey Smith, G., Bruckdorfer, K. R., Kundu, D., and Ebrahim, S. (2004). Those confounded vitamins: what can we learn from the differences between observational versus randomised trial evidence? *The Lancet*, 363(9422):1724–1727.
- Liu, R., Rizzo, S., Whipple, S., Pal, N., Lopez Pineda, A., Lu, M., Arnieri, B., Capra, W., and Zou, J. (2021). Evaluating eligibility criteria of oncology trials using real-world data and ai. *Nat Commun*, 12(592):629–633.
- Mattei, P.-A. and Frellsen, J. (2019). MIWAE: Deep generative modelling and imputation of incomplete data sets. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R., editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4413–4423. PMLR.

- Meng, W., Mosesso, K. M., Lane, K. A., Roberts, A. R., Griffith, A., Ou, W., Dexter, P. R., et al. (2021). An automated line-of-therapy algorithm for adults with metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: Validation study using blinded manual chart review. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 9(10):e29017.
- Nazha, B., Yang, J. C.-H., and Owonikoko, T. K. (2021). Benefits and limitations of real-world evidence: lessons from egfr mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer. *Future Oncology*, 17(8):965–977.
- NICE (2022). Nice Real world evidence framework. *NICE report. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence*.
- Nichols, A. C., Theurer, J., Prisman, E., Read, N., Berthelet, E., Tran, E., Fung, K., de Almeida, J. R., Bayley, A., Goldstein, D. P., Hier, M., Sultanem, K., Richardson, K., Mlynarek, A., Krishnan, S., Le, H., Yoo, J., MacNeil, S. D., Winkvist, E., Hammond, J. A., Venkatesan, V., Kuruvilla, S., Warner, A., Mitchell, S., Chen, J., Corsten, M., Johnson-Obaseki, S., Eapen, L., Odell, M., Parker, C., Wehrli, B., Kwan, K., and Palma, D. A. (2019). Radiotherapy versus transoral robotic surgery and neck dissection for oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (orator): an open-label, phase 2, randomised trial. *The Lancet Oncology*, 20(10):1349–1359.
- Oberst, M., Johansson, F., Wei, D., Gao, T., Brat, G., Sontag, D., and Varshney, K. (2020). Characterization of overlap in observational studies. In Chiappa, S. and Calandra, R., editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108, pages 788–798. PMLR.
- OpenAI (2023). Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Preston, S., Wei, M., Rao, R., Tinn, R., Usuyama, N., Lucas, M., Gu, Y., Weerasinghe, R., Lee, S., Piening, B., Tittel, P., Valluri, N., Naumann, T., Bifulco, C., and Poon, H. (2023). Toward structuring real-world data: Deep learning for extracting oncology information from clinical text with patient-level supervision. *Patterns (N Y)*, 4(4):100726.
- Preston, S., Wei, M., Rao, R., Tinn, R., Usuyama, N., Lucas, M., Weerasinghe, R., Lee, S., Piening, B., Tittel, P., Valluri, N., Naumann, T., Bifulco, C., and Poon, H. (2022). Towards structuring real-world data at scale: Deep learning for extracting key oncology information from clinical text with patient-level supervision.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (2006). *The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects*, page 170–184. Cambridge University Press.
- Saini, K. S. and Twelves, C. (2021). Determining lines of therapy in patients with solid cancers: a proposed new systematic and comprehensive framework. *British Journal of Cancer*, 125(2):155–163.
- Schuemie, M., Cepeda, M., Suchard, M., Yang, J., Tian, Y., Schuler, A., Ryan, P., Madigan, D., and Hripcsak, G. (2020a). How confident are we about observational findings in healthcare: A benchmark study. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2(1).


- Schuemie, M., Ryan, P., Pratt, N., Chen, R., You, S., Krumholz, H., Madigan, D., Hripcsak, G., and Suchard, M. (2020b). Large-scale evidence generation and evaluation across a network of databases (legend): assessing validity using hypertension as a case study. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*, 27(8):1268–1277.
- Schuemie, M., Ryan, P., Pratt, N., Chen, R., You, S., Krumholz, H., Madigan, D., Hripcsak, G., and Suchard, M. (2020c). Principles of large-scale evidence generation and evaluation across a network of databases (legend). *J Am Med Inform Assoc*, 27(8):1331–1337.
- Sharma, A. and Kiciman, E. (2020). Dowhy: An end-to-end library for causal inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04216*.
- Sharma, A. and Palaniappan, L. (2021). Improving diversity in medical research. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers*, 7(74).
- Wang, L., Ruan, X., Yang, P., and Liu, H. (2016). Comparison of three information sources for smoking information in electronic health records. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*, 15:237–242.
- Wiley, L. K., Shah, A., and Xu, H. e. a. (2013). Icd-9 tobacco use codes are effective identifiers of smoking status. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*, 20:652–658.
- Wong, C., Zheng, S., Gu, Y., Mounq, C., Abel, J., Usuyama, N., Weerasinghe, R., Piening, B., Naumann, T., Bifulco, C., and Poon, H. (2023). Scaling clinical trial matching using large language models: A case study in oncology. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. Machine learning for healthcare*, 219:1–18.
- Young, S. S. and Karr, A. (2011). Deming, data and observational studies. *Significance*, 8(3):116–120.
- Zeng, J., Gensheimer, M. F., Rubin, D. L., Athey, S., and Shachter, R. D. (2022). Uncovering interpretable potential confounders in electronic medical records. *Nat Commun*, 12(1014).

A Data base schema

The file `DataBaseSchema.xls` contains the details of all the variables used in this work, their type, description and, when relevant, the units in which they have been recorded.


B Oncology tree for advanced non-small-cell lung Cancer types

Figure 7: *Oncology tree of the types of Cancer that we have considered in this work.* Source: <http://oncotree.mskcc.org/>




C Missing data imputation

Figure 8: *Imputation results for the KEYNOTE10 trial. A: Heatmap of the values extracted from the laboratory text. In this dataset there is 35% of missing data in these variables. B: Imputed dataset using a latent variable model. See Section 4 for details. C: Validation of the imputation approach. Once the matrix of laboratory test has been imputed we artificially inject missing values in the same proportion to those originally in the dataset and we repeat the reconstruction procedure. Horizontal axis contains the true laboratory tests values of the missing (log scale). Vertical axis contains imputed values (log scale).*




D Patients filters

Figure 9: Percentage of patients filtered by each eligibility criteria in all the selected trials. This figure contains the filters over the originally 18 trials selection following the selection process in Figure 3.



E Drugs

Figure 10: Summary of the number of patients taking each drug in the database



F Simulation results with no confounding correction

Trial name and dataset		RCT		Simulation			
		HR	95%CI	HR	95%CI	C	T
FLAURA	Yes	0.63	(0.45, 0.88)	0.59	(0.45, 0.76)	268	200
	No			0.58	(0.48, 0.70)	576	312
CHECKMATE057	Yes	0.73	(0.59, 0.89)	0.73	(0.57, 0.93)	263	152
	No			1.05	(0.90, 1.22)	491	435
CHECKMATE078	Yes	0.68	(0.52, 0.90)	0.72	(0.54, 0.97)	194	111
	No			1.05	(0.90, 1.23)	492	439
KEYNOTE010	Yes	0.71	(0.58, 0.88)	0.73	(0.60, 0.90)	261	362
	No			0.85	(0.74, 0.97)	494	867
OAK	Yes	0.73	(0.62, 0.87)	0.59	(0.36, 0.96)	276	41
	No			0.66	(0.48, 0.92)	572	83
KEYNOTE024	Yes	0.63	(0.47, 0.86)	0.91	(0.71, 1.17)	188	474
	No			0.94	(0.82, 1.08)	664	1394
KEYNOTE033	Yes	0.75	(0.60, 0.95)	0.77	(0.63, 0.95)	255	437
	No			0.83	(0.74, 0.95)	556	1070
LUXLUNG6	Yes	0.9	(0.71, 1.14)	1.05	(0.71, 1.55)	2621	37
	No			1.18	(0.91, 1.53)	5187	82
CHECKMATE017	Yes	0.59	(0.44, 0.79)	0.74	(0.55, 0.99)	197	111
	No			1.04	(0.89, 1.21)	492	437
EMPHASIS	Yes	?	?	0.69	(0.58, 0.82)	37	439
	No			0.71	(0.61, 0.82)	534	615
NCT02604342	Yes	?	?	0.38	(0.20, 0.72)	1774	26
	No			0.44	(0.27, 0.71)	2625	42

Table 3: Simulation of the 11 selected single-drug trials using a CoxPH model without adjustment.

G Diagnostics and summary statistics

Figure 11: Results of the diagnostics test for FLAURA, CHECKMATE057 and KEYNOTE078




Figure 12: Results of the diagnostics test for KEYNOTE010, OAK, KEYNOTE24 and KEYNOTE033




Figure 13: Results of the diagnostics test for HECKMATE017 and EMPHASIS




Figure 14: Results of the diagnostics test for LUXLUNG6 and NCT02604342. Overlapping and downsampling test are not shown due to the limited sample size of these trials. Only rebalancing test are shown due to the small sample size of these cohorts.

