

Supplementary Material: Prediction of the onset of
cardiovascular diseases from electronic health records using
multi-task gated recurrent units

Fernando Andreotti, Frank S. Heldt, Basel Abu-Jamous, Ming Li,
Avelino Javier, Oliver Carr, Stojan Jovanovic,
Nadezda Lipunova, Benjamin Irving, Rabia T. Khan, Robert Dürichen

July 14, 2020

1 MT attention GRU (MT-Att-GRU) model and hyperparameter tuning




Figure 1: Representation of MT-Att-GRU model.

The proposed model receives a padded sequence of n_{pad} observation days and $n_{features}$ for each sample patient P . The underlying model contains n_L gated recurrent unit (GRU) network recurrent layers each with n_{units} hidden units, on top of which we use Luong’s attention mechanism [LPM15] assigns weights to each observed timestep (i.e. day). Lastly, a fully connected layer with sigmoid activation and $n_{out} = 4$ nodes, one for each time horizon (i.e. 1, 3, 12 and > 12 months), was used. Within each GRU layer a recurrent L2 regularisation was applied with weight l_2 and recurrent activation σ_g . Layer normalisation was used after each recurrent activation, followed by a dropout layer with probability p_{drop} . Were trained with the *adam* optimizer with learning rate l_r , early stopping (penalty of 10 epochs without improvement) and binary cross entropy as loss function.

All GRU-based models were optimized using a Bayesian optimisation scheme. Optimisation parameters are described in Table 1. Search used 50 iterations and 20 epochs. The final model then was evaluated on a 5-fold cross-validation procedure with 100 epochs for training.

Table 1: Hyperparameters of the proposed neural network searched using Bayesian optimisation.

Hyperparameter	Brief Description	Search Range
n_{pad}	Number of observed days for padding	[1, 100]
n_L	Number of recurrent layers	{1, 2, 3}
n_{units}	Number of hidden units in each recurrent layer	[16, 128]
n_{pad}	Number of observation days for padding	[10, 100]
p_{drop}	Dropout rate	[0, 0.5]
l_r	Learning Rate	$[10^4, 10^2]$
l_2	L2 regularisation	$[10^4, 10^1]$

2 Additional Results

The results for logistic regression (LR) classification using different number of past observation days are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Performances of Logistic Regression variants in predicting myocardial infarction and ischemic stroke throughout all time horizons. Shown are average and standard deviation of area under the curve (AUC), sensitivity (Sen), and precision (Prec) of 5-fold cross validation. Best average results per time horizon and disease are highlighted in bold.

Time horizon	Method	Myocardial Infarction			Stroke		
		AUC	Sen	Prec	AUC	Sen	Prec
1 month	MT GRU	0.763 ± 0.032	0.694 ± 0.124	0.138 ± 0.016	0.722 ± 0.014	0.608 ± 0.087	0.188 ± 0.035
	LR(1)	0.702 ± 0.054	0.772 ± 0.136	0.657 ± 0.062	0.694 ± 0.036	0.649 ± 0.143	0.687 ± 0.069
	LR(50)	0.702 ± 0.054	0.772 ± 0.136	0.657 ± 0.062	0.597 ± 0.028	0.546 ± 0.134	0.631 ± 0.020
3 months	LR(100)	0.599 ± 0.034	0.650 ± 0.161	0.589 ± 0.014	0.695 ± 0.039	0.649 ± 0.143	0.69 ± 0.072
	MT GRU	0.773 ± 0.010	0.707 ± 0.061	0.355 ± 0.043	0.734 ± 0.025	0.698 ± 0.069	0.371 ± 0.018
	LR(1)	0.740 ± 0.024	0.678 ± 0.094	0.693 ± 0.020	0.719 ± 0.015	0.712 ± 0.036	0.667 ± 0.025
12 months	LR(50)	0.740 ± 0.024	0.678 ± 0.094	0.693 ± 0.020	0.679 ± 0.032	0.699 ± 0.092	0.641 ± 0.034
	LR(100)	0.715 ± 0.010	0.689 ± 0.075	0.677 ± 0.017	0.720 ± 0.015	0.720 ± 0.028	0.664 ± 0.026
	MT GRU	0.811 ± 0.018	0.794 ± 0.045	0.594 ± 0.041	0.801 ± 0.010	0.765 ± 0.065	0.637 ± 0.033
> 12 months	LR(1)	0.758 ± 0.005	0.660 ± 0.034	0.714 ± 0.014	0.751 ± 0.010	0.747 ± 0.086	0.681 ± 0.025
	LR(50)	0.758 ± 0.005	0.660 ± 0.034	0.714 ± 0.014	0.737 ± 0.018	0.691 ± 0.064	0.692 ± 0.034
	LR(100)	0.772 ± 0.018	0.715 ± 0.053	0.724 ± 0.008	0.751 ± 0.010	0.729 ± 0.099	0.692 ± 0.032
	MT GRU	0.897 ± 0.015	0.779 ± 0.023	0.847 ± 0.027	0.849 ± 0.009	0.774 ± 0.030	0.768 ± 0.018
> 12 months	LR(1)	0.785 ± 0.008	0.706 ± 0.026	0.717 ± 0.020	0.767 ± 0.011	0.715 ± 0.022	0.700 ± 0.013
	LR(50)	0.785 ± 0.008	0.706 ± 0.026	0.717 ± 0.020	0.785 ± 0.017	0.686 ± 0.055	0.745 ± 0.017
	LR(100)	0.819 ± 0.014	0.749 ± 0.040	0.767 ± 0.026	0.768 ± 0.010	0.724 ± 0.030	0.699 ± 0.012

2.1 Area under the curve plots for different time horizons

Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for all time horizons are shown for both myocardial infarction (MI) and stroke cohorts on Fig. 2 and Fig. 3.




Figure 2: MI cohort average ROC and standard deviation brackets for the proposed models in comparison to LR with either 1, 50, or 100 number of observation days and QRISK to predict the risk of having myocardial infarction. Predicted time horizons shown (a) 1, (b) 3, (c) 12, and (d) > 12 months. Shaded areas represent the standard deviation based on 5-fold cross-validation.




Figure 3: Ischaemic stroke cohort average ROC and standard deviation brackets for the proposed models in comparison to LR with either 1, 50, or 100 number of observation days and QRISK to predict the risk of having stroke. Predicted time horizons shown (a) 1, (b) 3, (c) 12, and (d) > 12 months. Shaded areas represent the standard deviation based on 5-fold cross-validation.

2.2 Feature Importance

Permutation feature importance for both cohorts presented in Fig. 4.




Figure 4: Comparison of feature importance across (a) MI and (b) stroke. Figures show results of MT GRU approach with a > 12 months time horizon. In (a) asterisks mark significance from zero with t-test p-value thresholds of 5% (*) and 1% (**). At most, the top 10 features for each category is shown.

Whole bibliography

[LPM15] Thang Luong, Hieu Pham, and Christopher D. Manning. “Effective Approaches to Attention-based Neural Machine Translation”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2015, pp. 1412–1421.