Welcome to Phenotype Phebruary: Week 4 update
Welcome to Phenotype Pfebruary!

Team:
It's finally arrived. That wonderful month when you can put all your troubles aside, cast off those New Year's resolutions you've already failed at, enjoy the freezing cold Northeastern US weather or the Australian heat, and JUST FOCUS ON PHENOTYPING!

28 days, 28 phenotypes. That's our target for OHDSI in 2022. Are you ready?

For those who missed it, our OHDSI community call recording is here where I tried to provide a little background and motivation for this big community push together.

But to summarize it here: phenotypes are the foundational element in almost every real-world analysis we do in OHDSI, they are the natural bridge between our standardized data (the OMOP CDM) and our standardized analytics (such as ATLAS and the HADES packages). The reliability of the evidence we generate often lives and dies by the quality of the phenotypes that we use as inputs of indications, exposures, outcomes, and other features that we put into our analyses. And yet, across the broader research enterprise, the science of phenotype development and evaluation is relatively immature. The world doesn't yet have consensus best practices to design phenotypes, doesn't have agreed standardized tools to build phenotypes, doesn't have consistent, reproducible methods to evaluate phenotypes. Our phenotypes are fraught with substantial measurement error; we know we likely have suboptimal sensitivity, specificity, and positive predictive value, yet we don't consistently estimate the measurement error and even more rarely integrate measurement error into our analyses. No large-scale regression or fancy deep learning model is sufficient to solidify the house of cards that our analyses rest upon if we have suspect phenotypes.
Phenotype Phebruary Daily Updates

“Phenotype Phebruary” is a community-wide initiative to both develop and evaluate phenotypes for health outcomes that could be investigated by the community. Patrick Ryan introduced this initiative in both a video presentation and a forum post, and each of the conversations around the “28 phenotypes for 28 days” are being held within the OHDSI forums.

This page will provide direct links to each forum post, which is where conversations around each specific phenotype should be held.

Please be active in these discussions. What ways can you contribute?

1. Join the conversation
   - Discussions will be here on forums.ohdsi.org
   - Each day will be a new thread
     - Ex: Look for: “Phenotype Phebruary Day 1 – Type 2 diabetes mellitus”
   - Explore the definitions and review the results provided
   - Reply with your thoughts, reflections, insights and question

https://ohdsi.org/phenotype-phebruary/
### Phenotype Phebruary

February 2022: Every day, a new phenotype will be developed and evaluated following OHDSI best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus</td>
<td>2 Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus</td>
<td>3 Atrial Fibrillation</td>
<td>4 Multiple myeloma</td>
<td>5 Alzheimer’s disease</td>
<td>6 Hemorrhagic events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
<td>8 Kidney Stones</td>
<td>9 Delirium Azza Shoaibi</td>
<td>10 Systemic lupus erythematosus Joel Swerdel</td>
<td>11 Suicidal thoughts Azza Shoaibi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hypertension Gowtham Rao</td>
<td>15 Acute myocardial infarction Gowtham Rao</td>
<td>16 Heart failure Gowtham Rao</td>
<td>17 Cardiomyopathy Gowtham Rao</td>
<td>18 Multiple sclerosis Azza Shoaibi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Prostate cancer Asieh Goolzar</td>
<td>22 HIV Rupa Makadia</td>
<td>23 Hidradenitis suppurativa Jill Hardin</td>
<td>24 Anaphylaxis Erica Voss</td>
<td>25 Depression Tiffany Callahan, Juan Banda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Developmental disabilities Claudia Pulgarin</td>
<td>29?!?!?! Acute Kidney Injury Marcela Rivera, David Vizcaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Non-small-cell lung cancer Asieh Goolzar</td>
<td>27 Drug-induced liver injury Anna Ostropelets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another beautiful day in Phenotype February... 2.22.22! Today’s phenotype will be HIV, or human immunodeficiency virus. The virus itself is relatively “new” when we think about some of the phenotypes that we have already explored. This virus has a history within the United States (and developed nations) to carry some social and cultural constructs that have shaped the lives of many from the 1980’s to now. While this disease was life threatening, it has become more manageable with advances in modern medication. A shoutout to @stephenfortin in helping develop this phenotype with me. As always let’s start with the clinical definition...

Clinical Definition: According to the CDC, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) is defined as a virus spread by contact of certain body fluids, which attacks the body’s immune system, specifically CD4 cells. The virus is most commonly spread through unprotected sex (e.g., without a condom or preventative HIV medicines), or sharing of injection drug equipment. HIV reduces the number of CD4 cells in the body thereby weakening an individual’s immune system and rendering them more susceptible to opportunistic infection and cancer. Left untreated, HIV can lead to acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS).

Diagnosis: The only method to determine HIV status is through screening tests. HIV tests are available at many medical clinics, substance abuse programs, community health centers, and hospitals. Home testing kits are also available at many pharmacies or online. Several types of HIV tests exist, including nucleic acid tests (NAT), antigen/antibody tests, and antibody tests.

Prognosis and Treatment: Without treatment, the average survival of individuals with AIDS is approximately 3 years; however, the occurrence of opportunistic infection decreases life expectancy without treatment to 1 year. That being said, taking HIV medicine (i.e., antiretroviral therapy) may enable individuals with HIV to live long and healthy lives, and prevent the transmission of HIV to their sexual partners. In addition, certain measures can decrease the risk getting HIV through sex or injection drug equipment, including pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP).

As we read this definition, there are some key aspects to consider in developing this phenotype. This is an incurable disease BUT it can be suppressed (sometimes all the way to being undetectable by laboratory tests). The only way to know if someone has the disease is by performing a test and the disease must be managed by drugs. These are some important factors to consider because some of these items (laboratory measurements, diagnosis, and drugs) can vary in many observational databases.
Phenotype February Day 23- Hidradenitis Suppurativa

Jill_Hardin

Phenotype February Day 23 – Hidradenitis Suppurativa

Today is the 23rd of February and I will be sharing findings from the Hidradenitis Suppurativa (HS) Phenotype. I collaborated with @JoelSwerdel to develop this immunology phenotype. To be clear we did not have a specific use case for application of the HS phenotype.

Since I suspect many collaborators may not know what this phenotype entails, I'll start with a clinical overview.

Hidradenitis suppurativa (HS) is a chronic, recurring, inflammatory disease of the skin. Clinically, subjects have nodules, draining skin tunnels (sinus tracts), abscesses, and bands of severe scar formation in the intertriginous skin areas such as axillary, groin, perianal, perineal, and inframammary regions (Ali Khan A et al). HS typically begins in the second or third decade of life (Ali Khan A et al; Liy_Wong C et al). Patients with HS suffer from metabolic, psychiatric, and autoimmune disorders (Tri H et al). Treatment is based on severity of symptoms with wound care, pain management, topical or oral antibiotics, debridement as needed.

Following my fellow phenotypers, after we understood the clinical description, we worked with our internal expert Ms. Gayle Murray who generated a systematic literature review for HS. The literature review used the following terms:

(hidradenitis suppurativa'[MeSH Terms] OR (hidradenitis'[All Fields] AND "suppurativa'[All Fields]) OR hidradenitis suppurativa'[All Fields])

AND

(retrospective cohort'[All fields] OR "Epidemiology'[mhh]) OR "Epidemiologic Methods'[mhh] OR (phenotype[TIAB] OR (insurance OR claims))

AND

(((((((((((Medicaid OR (medicare)) OR (truven)) OR (Optum)) OR (Medstat)) OR (Nationwide Inpatient Sample)) OR (National Inpatient Sample)) OR (PharmMetrics)) OR (PHARMO)) OR (Validation study[Publication Type])) OR (positive predictive value)) OR (ICD-9[Title/Abstract])) OR (ICD-10[Title/Abstract])) OR (claims[Title/Abstract])) OR (insurance[Title/Abstract])) OR (General Practice)) OR (Family Practice)) OR (Gender)) OR (Age)) OR (Address))
Clinical Definition

One can find a nice, updated definition for anaphylaxis developed by the Anaphylaxis Committee of the World Allergy Organization (WAO) here:


They have revised the definition for anaphylaxis as:

Anaphylaxis is a serious systemic hypersensitivity reaction that is usually rapid in onset and may cause death. Severe anaphylaxis is characterized by potentially life-threatening compromise in breathing and/or the circulation, and may occur without typical skin features or circulatory shock being present. [1]

The paper also provides amended criteria for the diagnosis of anaphylaxis:

Table 3

Amended criteria for the diagnosis of anaphylaxis, proposed by the WAO Anaphylaxis Committee, 2019.

Anaphylaxis is highly likely when any one of the following 2 criteria are fulfilled:

1. Acute onset of an illness (minutes to several hours) with involvement of the skin, mucosal tissue, or both (e.g. generalized hives, pruritus or flushing, swollen lips-tongue-swallow)

AND AT LEAST ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

a. Respiratory compromise (e.g. dyspnea, wheeze-bronchospasm, stridor, reduced PEF, hypotension)

b. Reduced BP or associated symptoms of end-organ dysfunction (e.g. hypotonia [collapse], syncope, incontinence)

c. Severe gastrointestinal symptoms (e.g. severe crampy abdominal pain, repetitive vomiting)
Phenotype February Day 25 – Depression

Team Members: @Juan_Banda, @bill.baumgartner

The goal of our Phenotype February post was to construct, characterize, and compare depression cohorts built using rule-based and probabilistic/heuristic-based methods. It is our hope that by the end of this post we will have piqued your curiosity and demonstrated how these methods can be combined to create more robust phenotype definitions than when used independently.

Depression

Depression is the most common psychiatric disorder that affects the general population with over 264 million people worldwide currently living with depression (ADAA, 2022). Symptoms of depression vary widely based on sex and age. While primary care providers are familiar with the symptoms of depression, over 60% of primary care patients with a previous depression diagnosis also present with somatic symptoms like head and backache, and chronic pain, which makes detection of depression more difficult (PMID:16163400; PMID:10536124). Without screening, only 50% of patients with major depression will be identified (PMID:19040570). This is most often due to fear; patients often withhold information about their depressive symptoms out of fear of being stigmatized (PMID:21011763).

Phenotype February Objectives

Traditionally, computational phenotypes have largely been expert-defined and have leveraged structured EHR data. More recently, development has shifted towards automated machine learning-based approaches. Each of these approaches has its advantages and disadvantages and we have designed our Phenotype February exercise to compare two such methods. Our primary objective was to construct, characterize, and compare depression cohorts built using rule-based (Atlas – i.e., gold standard) and probabilistic/heuristic methods (APHRODITE – i.e., silver standard). Our secondary objective was to showcase how to use an OHDSI tool that has not yet been used in the prior Phenotype February posts.

Rule-Based Cohort Method - Atlas

Rather than build a new cohort, we searched Atlas (https://atlas-demo.ohdsi.org/) for existing cohorts using the keyword "depression" (which returned a total of 41 entries). We selected the LEGACY


Happy Saturday everyone!

It is non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) day.

I am presenting on behalf of a phantastic group: @dkosareva, @mgurley, @Ajit_Londhe, @CarolynB, Xerxes Pandole, and @shaw03. And special thanks to @Patrick_Ryan.

I am going to make a little bit of a change today and start talking about what we want to define today.

Our goal today is to come up with a phenotype for NSCLC. We would like to identify patients with a diagnosis of NSCLC, irrespective of the disease stage. We are also interested at all NSCLC patients (prevalent cases) and NOT newly diagnosed (incident) cases.

I have a very long summary of the clinical definition of NSCLC but I am afraid my summary will not do a fair job in describing the disease. NSCLC is not just one disease but many each with its own characteristics, risk factors, behaviors and treatments so I could not convince myself to share the long summary here with you. This Nature Review on NSCLC gives a good overview on the disease. Here, I will focus on a broad definition of the disease as it pertains to our phenotype of interest.

What is NSCL? NSCL is type of cancer that originates in the lung. NCI dictionary defines NSCL as “a group of lung cancers named for the kinds of cells found in the cancer and how the cells look under a microscope. The three main types of non-small cell lung cancer are adenocarcinoma (most common), squamous cell carcinoma, and large cell carcinoma. Non-small cell lung cancer is the most common of the two main types of lung cancer (non-small cell lung cancer and small cell lung cancer (SCLC)).”

Sounds simple and straightforward. All I need to do to find my cohort of NSCLC patients is to first identify tumors that originate in the lung (location or topology of the tumor) and then identify the subset of lung cancer patients with a specific tumor histology, namely adenocarcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma, and large cell carcinoma. The combination of topology-histology is what is called the base diagnosis and was introduced as a part of the Cancer Diagnosis Model in the Oncology Module.

Not that easy 😥

The ICD-9 and ICD-10 coding systems do not not distinguish between histological types. So we cannot really differentiate NSCLC from SCLC.
Phenotype Phebruary Day 27 - Drug-induced Liver Injury

In this post, we will focus on drug-induced liver injury (DILI) and adjudicating potential cases.

In short:

1. DILI is different from other conditions in the way that it is a) rare, b) condition of exclusion, c) has a potential causal relationship already embedded in the phenotype

2. In developing phenotype, we would optimize NFV rather than PPV; focus on defining the conditions of exclusion; maybe create several phenotypes to be used across the network since it's not clear if one phenotype would fit every data source

3. Case adjudication for finding new associations needs some smart methods since it's impossible to review thousands of patients

4. We lean towards trusting notes (unstructured data) more than a code for DILI in the structured data, but in fact inferring patient status is hard either way and is subjective.

5. Maybe, discontinuation of the drug after the liver injury can be a useful indicator but we need to figure out how to infer discontinuation reliably.

If that sounds interesting, read on.

DILI is a good example of a condition that perfectly fits observational research. Since it's so rare, it is rarely captured in small size clinical trials, which points out the need for post-marketing research.

It used to be the most frequently cited reason for drug withdrawal (up to 32% of drug withdrawals, recently decreased following FDA statements). We know about an increased risk of DILI for some of the drugs (e.g., acetaminophen, amoxicillin-clavulanate, antiepileptics). There are many outdated stats regarding DILI prevalence and proportion in liver disorders, but what we know for sure is that it varies geographically and is more common in adults.

Presentation: can mimic both acute and chronic liver diseases, both hepatocellular and cholestatic. Can be symptomatic or only include asymptomatic liver test abnormalities. If symptoms are present, they include malaise, low-grade fever, anorexia, nausea, vomiting, right upper quadrant pain, jaundice, acholic stools, or dark urine.
Hello everyone.

I volunteer with disability groups. Many of the persons I guide during activities have become my closest friends. So, I have witnessed their struggles navigating the healthcare system. When we talk about outcomes, quality of care, and equity, we should be thinking about this special group too. But, in order to include persons with disabilities in our research projects, we need phenotypes.

As an aside, WHO approved the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Are we thinking about adding this classification?

Creating a disability phenotype is complicated. CDC defines disability as any condition of the body or mind that makes it more difficult for the person with the condition to do certain activities and interact with the world around them. Impairments might affect a person’s vision, movement, thinking, remembering, learning, communicating, hearing, mental health, and social relationships. I thought about working on developmental disabilities, instead of disabilities in general. But this does not reduce the complexity of developing this phenotype. For reference, developmental disabilities are disabilities that begin during the developmental period, and usually last throughout a person’s lifetime.

Focusing on one disability might be something that can more easily be done. So, today I am focusing on severe visual impairment and blindness in children.

Clinical description

Here is a comprehensive review on vision and vision impairment. The Lancet Global Health Commission on Global Eye Health: vision beyond 2020

Vision impairment occurs as a result of a disruption of the structural and physiological integrity of the eyes, brain, and/or their connections. A person who is severely visually impaired or blind is one who has impairment of visual functioning even after treatment and/or standard refractive correction. Distance visual acuity is the most common measure of visual function. In the US, the legal definition of blindness is best-corrected vision of 20/200 or worse in the better seeing eye, or visual field constriction to less than 20 degrees. On the other hand, WHO defines severe vision impairment as best corrected vision of
Phenotype February Day 29 - Acute Kidney Injury

Even though February ended, we don’t see a good reason to stop this great exercise of building phenotypes and the discussions with the community. Today @david_vizcaya and I want to start the discussion about AKI. We want to thank the Phenotype Development and Evaluation workgroup and especially @Gowtham_Rao, @Evan_Minty, @jswerdel, for their input in refining the clinical definition, and how to implement it in Atlas, and @lee_evans for troubleshooting Atlas and Cohort Diagnostics so we could run these in our internal DBs.

Development of a cohort definition for acute kidney injury:

Acute kidney injury affects 1 in 5 adults and 1 in 3 children worldwide during a hospital episode of care according to a comprehensive meta-analysis using the KDIGO definition referred in the text below (Susantitaphong et al. World Incidence of AKI: A Meta-Analysis. CJASN Sep 2013, 8 (B) 1482-1493, DOI: 10.2215/CJN.00710113). Epidemiological evidence suggests that even mild, reversible AKI has important clinical consequences including an increased mortality. Therefore, many efforts have been made over the last two decades to reach a consensus on the AKI definition and to raise awareness to improve diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. We should expect variability of diagnosis and availability of lab values associated to AKI and it would be an interesting exercise to see their evolution using OHDSI tools.

Develop a shared clinical understanding of the phenotype

Authoritative consensus document. There is international consensus definitions and clinical guidelines maintained by an organization named Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO). We based this definition on it.

Clinical definition

Overview

Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) is one of many acute kidney diseases and disorders (AKD) in which slow deterioration of kidney function or persistent kidney dysfunction is associated with an irreversible loss of kidney cells and nephrons, which can lead to chronic kidney disease (CKD). According to the KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline for Acute Kidney Injury, AKI is a common, harmful and potentially treatable disease defined by an abrupt decrease in kidney function that includes, but is not limited to, acute kidney failure (previously called acute renal failure). The etiology of AKI encompasses specific kidney conditions (e.g., sepsis, crush injuries, oliguria/anuria, etc.) and non-kidney conditions (e.g., heart failure, renal transplant, and immune-complex glomerulonephritis).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Neutropenia</td>
<td>8 Kidney Stones</td>
<td>9 Delirium</td>
<td>10 Systemic Lymphoma</td>
<td>11 Suicidal Thoughts</td>
<td>12 Parkinson's Disease</td>
<td>13 Attention deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Hypertension</td>
<td>15 Acute Myocardial Infarction</td>
<td>16 Heart failure</td>
<td>17 Cardiomyopathy</td>
<td>18 Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>19 Triple Negative Breast Cancer</td>
<td>20 Pulmonary Hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Prostate</td>
<td>22 HIV</td>
<td>23 Hidradenitis</td>
<td>24 Anaphylaxis</td>
<td>25 Depression</td>
<td>26 Non-small Cell Lung Cancer</td>
<td>27 Drug-induced Liver Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Developmental disability</td>
<td>29 Acute Kidney Injury</td>
<td>Marcela Rivera, David Vizcaya</td>
<td>Erica Voss</td>
<td>27 Depression</td>
<td>20 Pulmonary Hypertension</td>
<td>27 Drug-induced Liver Injury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How can you get involved in Phenotype Phebruary?

• Join the conversation!
  – Discussions will be on forums.ohdsi.org
  – Each day will be a new thread, all threads available via: https://ohdsi.org/phenotype-phebruary/
  – Explore the definitions and review the results provided
  – Reply with your thoughts, reflections, insights and questions

• Evaluate the cohort definitions in your data!
  – Execute cohort definitions and CohortDiagnostics in your CDM
  – Share insights you learn from your data on the forums
  – Share results to compile across the network on data.ohdsi.org

• Lead a discussion!
  – Add your own phenotype discussion above and beyond those scheduled to be led by the community
Phenotype Phebruary resources

• [https://atlas-phenotype.ohdsi.org/](https://atlas-phenotype.ohdsi.org/)
  – ATLAS instance for OHDSI Phenotype Development WG to share cohort definitions
  – Want to get read access to this ATLAS instance?
    Fill out form here: [https://forms.gle/6fxcZFyufhL39pLj7](https://forms.gle/6fxcZFyufhL39pLj7)

• [https://data.ohdsi.org/phenotypePhebruary/](https://data.ohdsi.org/phenotypePhebruary/)
  – CohortDiagnostics instance that we’ll be results each day from Phenotype Phebruary evaluations

• [https://github.com/ohdsi-studies/PhenotypePhebruary](https://github.com/ohdsi-studies/PhenotypePhebruary)
  – Git repository where we can share code to run CohortDiagnostics

• Phenotype Development and Evaluation WG
How can you get involved in Phenotype Phebruary?

• Join the conversation!
  – Discussions will be on forums.ohdsi.org
  – Each day will be a new thread, all threads available via: https://ohdsi.org/phenotype-phebruary/
  – Explore the definitions and review the results provided
  – Reply with your thoughts, reflections, insights and questions

• Evaluate the cohort definitions in your data!
  – Execute cohort definitions and CohortDiagnostics in your CDM
  – Share insights you learn from your data on the forums
  – Share results to compile across the network on data.ohdsi.org

• Lead a discussion!
  – Add your own phenotype discussion above and beyond those scheduled to be led by the community
Phenotype February Day 1 – Type 2 diabetes mellitus

Patrick Ryan

Today, we’ll be using OHDSI tools to develop and evaluate cohort definitions for the phenotype target of Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM).

Clinical description:

The American Diabetes Association (ADA) “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes” is a tremendous resource to learn more about diabetes for those interested. It classifies diabetes into the following general categories:

1. Type 1 diabetes (due to autoimmune β-cell destruction, usually leading to absolute insulin deficiency, including latent autoimmune diabetes of adulthood)
2. Type 2 diabetes (due to a progressive loss of adequate β-cell insulin secretion frequently on the background of insulin resistance)
3. Specific types of diabetes due to other causes, e.g., monogenic diabetes syndromes (such as neonatal diabetes and maturity-onset diabetes of the young), diseases of the exocrine pancreas (such as cystic fibrosis and pancreatitis), and drug- or chemical-induced diabetes (such as with glucocorticoid use, in the treatment of HIV/AIDS, or after organ transplantation)
4. Gestational diabetes mellitus (diabetes diagnosed in the second or third trimester of pregnancy that was not clearly overt diabetes prior to gestation)

It provides objective diagnostic criteria based on readily-accessible laboratory measures used in routine practice. “Diabetes can be diagnosed based on plasma glucose criteria, either the fasting plasma glucose (FPG) value or the 2-h plasma glucose (2-h PG) value during a 75-g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT), or A1C criteria.”

The epidemiology and disease natural history of T2DM has been extensively characterized in the literature. Common symptoms of T2DM onset include thirst, frequent urination, weight loss. Common ‘risk factors’ include age, obesity, hypertension and hyperlipidemia. Management of T2DM can include lifestyle modifications, including diet and exercise, as well as pharmacologic treatment (with notable drugs including metformin, Sulfonylureas, Sodium Glucose Co-Transporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors, Glucagon-like Peptide-1 Receptor Agonists (GLP1RA), Dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor (DPP4I), Thiazolidinediones, and insulin). Long-term complications associated with T2DM can include cardiovascular events (ischemic heart disease, stroke), diabetic retinopathy, kidney failure, and amputation. The incidence of T2DM has been increasing over time. Current prevalence estimates of
Welcome everyone to Day 2 of Phenotype Phebruary! I hope you enjoyed reading the kick-off to the discussion of phenotyping Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus on Day 1, and encourage you to join that conservation. Meanwhile, here, I hope to stimulate another discussion, this one on Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus (T1DM).

Now admittedly, I wasn't planning to consider T1DM as a phenotype to work through during the month, because I thought it might be too close in spirit to T2DM. However, the community spoke loudly in their voting, with over 20 individuals asking to explore T1DM, putting it in the top 5 of desired targets, so here we are.

And since we did T2DM yesterday, I figured today's a good opportunity stay in this related space, but highlight some different insights and observations that arise from going through the OHDSI phenotype development and evaluation process.

Clinical description:

As with T2DM, we can look to the American Diabetes Association (ADA) 'Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes' to provide a helpful frame of reference for the disease. ADA classifies diabetes into the following general categories:

- Type 1 diabetes (due to autoimmune β-cell destruction, usually leading to absolute insulin deficiency, including latent autoimmune diabetes of childhood)
- Type 2 diabetes (due to a progressive loss of adequate b-cell insulin secretion frequently on the background of insulin resistance)
- Specific types of diabetes due to other causes, e.g., monogenic diabetes syndromes (such as neonatal diabetes and maturity-onset diabetes of the young), diseases of the exocrine pancreas (such as cystic fibrosis and pancreatitis), and drug- or chemical-induced diabetes (such as with glucocorticoid use, in the treatment of HIV/AIDS, or after organ transplantation)
- Gestational diabetes mellitus (diabetes diagnosed in the second or third trimester of pregnancy that was not clearly overt diabetes prior to gestation)

Here, I find the ADA's discussion about the evolving landscape of T1DM and T2DM quite informative:
Phenotype Phebruary Day 3 - Atrial Fibrillation

Patrick Ryan

Today, I'd like to take a little side step from the problem of creating phenotypes de novo, and talk about how to try to implement a phenotype algorithm using OHDSI tools based on an existing description from some external material, just as a publication. I'll use the phenotype of Atrial Fibrillation to demonstrate some tips and tricks, but I hope you'll see that the steps I'll follow here are completely transportable to whatever phenotype you may want to be working on.

Clinical description:

Atrial fibrillation (AFib) is an abnormal heart rhythm, often with irregular beats in the atrial chamber. The CDC has a nice animated gif to illustrate what this means: [Atrial Fibrillation](https://www.cdc.gov). Initial symptoms of AFib may include feeling of irregular heartbeat or palpitations, lightheadedness, fatigue, dyspnea, and chest pain. AFib is frequently comorbid with other cardiovascular conditions, such as hypertension, coronary artery disease, and pericarditis. Patients with AFib are at higher risk of cardiovascular complications, including heart failure and ischemic stroke. AFib is most commonly diagnosed with electrocardiogram, though echocardiogram can also be used to evaluate AFib and valvular defects. AFib can be classified as: 'first detected', 'paroxysmal', 'persistent', 'longstanding persistent', and 'permanent' based on the frequency and duration of abnormal heartbeat episodes. Common pharmacologic treatment options include beta blockers, calcium channel blockers, amiodarone, and anticoagulants (such as warfarin, heparin, or a direct oral anticoagulant (DOAC) such as apixaban, rivaroxaban, and dabigatran). Other treatments can include electrical cardioversion and catheter or surgical ablation. AFib is more common in men than women, and the risk of AFib increases with age.

**Phenotype development:**

AFib is a common target for investigation in observational databases, both as a disease that impacts future outcomes and also as an indication for various treatments that are regularly evaluated for comparative effectiveness and safety.

As a case in point, just PubMed "atrial fibrillation" AND "(claims" OR "electronic health records")" and you'll see >1,000 articles! You'll find many recent observational studies in high-profile journals. Articles like Ray et al, "Association of Rivaroxaban vs Apixaban With Major Ischemic or Hemorrhagic Events in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation", in *JAMA* Dec 2021 (which seems like a nice target for an OHDSI replication, wink wink @goldazar). Or Kim et al, "Machine Learning Methodologies for Prediction of..."
Phenotype Phebruary Day 4- Multiple Myeloma

Welcome to Phenotype Phebruary Day 4! We've discussed phenotyping metabolic diseases (T2DM and T1DM) and a cardiovascular disease (AFib), so let's turn our attention to a different disease area that is a particularly active focus for many community collaborators - oncology. OHDSI's Oncology workgroup has made good progress in thinking about advances in the OMOP CDM and OHDSI vocabularies to accommodate the study of cancers and their treatments. Another key opportunity, that I know @agolozzi is quite keen to lead within the Oncology WG, is developing phenotype algorithms for each cancer target, and evaluating those algorithms across a diverse array of databases that could potentially be used to generate evidence, including administrative claims, electronic health records, specialty oncology EHRs, and cancer registries. Phenotype Phebruary seems the perfect time to get community collaboration toward this objective, starting today with Multiple Myeloma.

Clinical description:

Multiple myeloma is a type of blood cancer that affects plasma cells. Malignant white blood cells develop in bone marrow, suppressing healthy plasma cells that produce antibodies against infection. Malignant plasma cells produce M protein, which can cause tumors, kidney damage, bone destruction and impaired immune function. They also cause decreased production of red blood cells and platelets, which can result in anemia and bleeding.

Multiple myeloma is diagnosed based on plasmacytoma identified on biopsy, >30% malignant plasma cells in bone marrow aspiration, evaluated levels of M protein from protein electrophoresis in the blood or urine, osteolytic lesions observed on imaging, and IgG or IgA antibody levels in the blood. Additional diagnostics tests may include measurement of Beta2-microglobulin level. Management of multiple myeloma typically requires pharmacologic treatment with proteasome inhibitors (including bortezomib, carfilzomib, ixazomib), immunomodulatory drugs (like lenalidomide, pomalidomide, thalidomide), steroids (dexamethasone, prednisone), monoclonal antibodies (such as elotuzumab, daratumumab, isatuximab, belantamab), and chemotherapy (doxorubicin, melphalan, cyclophosphamide, bendamustine, vincristine). Autologous stem cell transplant may be considered for those eligible. Patients may also be treated with bisphosphonates to reduce risk of bone loss.

Multiple myeloma is more common in men than women, more common in Black or African American than whites, more common in older ages (with most cases occurring after 40 years old).
Phenotype Phebruary Day 5- Alzheimer’s Disease

Patrick_Ryan

Clinical description:
Alzheimer’s disease is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder and the most common cause of dementia (loss of cognitive functions interfering with daily activities), representing 60-80% of cases (according to Alzheimer’s Association). Initial symptoms of Alzheimer’s disease may be short-term memory loss and other difficulties associated with mild cognitive impairment, such as word-finding, visual/spatial issues, and general confusion. Diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease may involve neurological exam, including brain MRI or CT scans, to identify other potential causes of dementia other than Alzheimer’s, and mental cognitive status tests. Drugs approved for use in Alzheimer’s disease include cholinesterase inhibitors (such as donepezil, galantamine, or rivastigmine) and memantine, which are primarily aimed at treating cognitive symptoms. In 2021, aducanumab was approved by US FDA on the basis of clinical trial data suggesting reduction of amyloid beta plaque. Alzheimer’s disease risk increases with age, with most cases detected after 65 years old. Prevalence of AD is higher in females than males, though that is attenuated by female longer life span. It is one of leading causes of death globally, and second-leading cause in high-income countries (WHO).

Phenotype development:
I’ve mentioned in prior posts that a valuable starting point for phenotype development can be the published literature, and I’ve shown how you - provided that a journal article supplied enough details - you can replicate their algorithms using OHDSI tools. But I want to take a digression here for a little rant: if observational researchers all need to develop phenotypes to conduct our analyses and should all review prior literature as part of our research process, then why is so hard to search for publications of observational research and extract out the phenotypes that were previously used? If phenotypes are so central to the integrity of our research, then as a research community, why do we accept short freetext descriptions of phenotypes in manuscripts, sometimes without list of codes and often without a complete specification of the logic that was used to implement them? And for those of us promoting increased transparency, when we try to add additional detail in supplemental materials, why do we often format it in ways that make it painful for others to re-use without extensive manual curation? When I...
Phenotype Phebruary Day 6- Hemorrhagic events

Patrick_Ryan

Welcome to Phenotype Phebruary Day 6!

Up to this point, we’ve discussed phenotype targets that are generally considered chronic diseases (T2DM, T1DM, AFib, multiple myeloma, Alzheimer’s). As such, our focus has been primarily on identifying cohort entry, with the supposition that once a person enters the cohort, they remain in that health state until the end of their observation.

Today, I’d like to talk about creating a cohort definition that allows for a person to enter and exit the cohort multiple times. We’ll use hemorrhagic events and bleeding-related hospitalizations as our example. This will subsume a couple phenotypes high on the OHDSI wish list: hemorrhagic stroke and gastrointestinal bleeding.

Our motivating use case: In our AFib discussion, we noted a recent paper by Ray et al, "Association of Rivaroxaban vs Apixaban With Major Ischemic or Hemorrhagic Events in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation", in JAMA in Dec 2021. In that study, the target and comparator populations were persons with AFib with DOAC exposure, so we should be clear how we could use our AFib cohort, interact it with a new user drug cohort, and identify the patients eligible to be analyzed. That was the easy part, now we’ll tackle the trickier bit: finding the outcomes for those patients. In their publication, Ray et al classify and define ischemic and hemorrhagic events, with ischemic strokes and systemic embolisms, and hemorrhagic events including hemorrhagic strokes and bleeding-related hospitalizations. Today, I’ll just focus on that second aspect.

Clinical description:

I had fun looking for a clinical definition to report here without sounding stupid. Medlineplus gave me this: "Bleeding is the loss of blood". Google’s healthbox provides defines bleeding (aka hemorrhage) as "the release of blood from a broken blood vessel, either inside or outside the body". Perhaps not terribly informative.

In part, it’s because it’s an ill-specified phenotype target: hemorrhage can be the result from a broad constellation of injuries, can occur anywhere throughout the body, and can have consequences that vary from inconsequential/self-remedying to fatal. External bleeding is usually easy to detect (look for red), and if that does not resolve after a few minutes of applying pressure may require to seek medical attention. Internal bleeding may be initially asymptomatic, but initial signs can include hypotension, abnormal heart rate or breathing, drowsiness or loss of consciousness, in addition to observing blood
Phenotype Phebruary Day 7 - Neutropenia

Patrick_Ryan 0

Can you believe that the end of week 1 of Phenotype Phebruary is already here? Time flies when you're having fun.

In the first six days, I tried to initiate conversations around phenotyping diseases that were primarily defined by condition occurrence records (T2DM, T1DM, AFib, multiple myeloma, Alzheimer's, bleeding). But there continues to be a lot of interest in our community in using measurement values as part of the phenotyping process. So, today, let's talk about Neutropenia.

Clinical description:

Neutropenia is abnormally low count of neutrophils in the blood. Neutrophils are the primary circulating white blood cells and function as part of the immune system to respond to inflammation and bacterial infections. So, persons with neutropenia are at increased risk of infection. While neutropenia itself can be asymptomatic, symptoms often manifest as a result of an infection, and can include fever, pain in swallowing or gums, or skin abscesses. Neutropenia can be congenital or acquired, and acute or chronic, and is known to be associated with various conditions and attributed to drug exposure. While neutropenia is specifically referred to decreased neutrophils, other conditions are known to observe neutropenia in conjunction with other phenomena. Pancytopenia is decrease in red blood cells, white blood cells, and platelets. Leukopenia is low white blood cells of any time, which generally is inclusive of neutropenia.

Neutropenia can be diagnosed by measurement of neutrophils. One diagnostic criteria for severe neutropenia is absolute neutrophil count (ANC) < 500 cells per microliter of blood, while moderate neutropenia can be identified by ANC between 500-1000 cells per microliter, and mild neutropenia is classified as ANC between 1000 - 1500 cells per microliter. Severe neutropenia poses the greater infection risk, and is often where medical attention is recommended. However, since severe neutropenia is rare, it can be difficult to identify and classification, even with ease of measurement from a complete blood count test. Additional bone marrow biopsy may be required as a diagnostic procedure.

Treatment for neutropenia can include granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF), including filgrastim, and antibiotics to manage bacterial infections.
Phenotype Phebruary Day 8 - Kidney Stones

Team:

Patrick Ryan

For those who missed any of the fun in Phenotype Phebruary Week 1, here’s a page with a running inventory of the phenotype conversations we’ve started: Phenotype Phebruary Daily Updates – OHDSI

As we embark on Week 2 of Phenotype Phebruary, I decided to select a phenotype that was highly voted on by our community that was more surprising to me. I don’t know why kidney stones were of such interest to so many of you, but the community has spoken and I like the challenge of coming up with a fun and compelling story to promote phenotyping, so here goes...

Clinical description:

Kidney stone disease occurs when a calculus develops in the urinary tract, often starting in the kidney and passing through the ureters, bladder and urethra. This phenomenon, also known as nephrolithiasis or urolithiasis, can be asymptomatic if the kidney stones are small enough. However, the size, shape and composition of calculi can vary substantially, and larger stones can create obstructions at any stage across the urinary tract. Such blockages can cause acute pain, typically presenting in the lower back or abdomen, and may also cause painful urination or hematuria. Kidney stones are typically diagnosed by symptoms, urine tests and imaging. Treatment often is based on patient symptoms. Pain management and hydration can allow some stones to pass spontaneously. Drugs to expedite passage, such as alpha blockers and calcium channel blockers, can be considered. Shock wave lithotripsy can be used in some circumstances to break stone into smaller pieces. Surgical removal via nephrolithotomy or ureteroscopy may be indicated depending on stone size and patient comorbidities and pain intensity.

Phenotype development:

One of the surprising statistics that I read across many different references was the notion that half of the people who have had a kidney stone will have another 10 years. This number was thrown around in many publications, and yet most cited the same seminal paper: Uribarri et al, "The first kidney stone", from BMJ in 1989. That paper provides a review of past studies that examined recurrence of kidney stones, providing their Table 1 compilation of the identified studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Reference)</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>Cumulative Recurrence Rate %</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
<th>Cumulative Recurrence Rate %</th>
<th>10 Years</th>
<th>Cumulative Recurrence Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phenotype Phebruary Day 9 - Delirium [From Azza Shoaib] 

Gowtham Rao

Posting on behalf of @AzzaShoaibi 

(the forum does not allow new users to post images or links)

Team:

Day 9 of Phenotype Phebruary. I happen to be the bravest to pick a date for my phenotype that ends

Patrick amazing dense posts and start an era of "OK" Phenotype Phebruary posts. I hope that you will still find my input useful.

Today, I'll try to start a conversation of the phenotype that came to us during phenotype development and evaluation workgroup office hours. Our friend Aize wanted to know how can we phenotype delirium in observational data. Together we started the process of: 1. Decide on the clinical description of delirium. 2. Accumulate prior knowledge on the phenotype. 3. Select initial concept set (codes) using Phoebe and Atlas. Those 3 steps took place during last week office hour. I then took the action of completing the next steps of 4. Build one or more cohort definition using atlas. 5. Evaluate and iterate on the definition using cohort diagnostics. I will summaries my learnings today to Aize and you all, hoping that this will start a useful discussion.

Clinical description:

My favorite paper that summarized what delirium is and what we know about it is here: Burns, A., Gallagher, A., & Byrne, J. (2004). Delirium. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 75(3), 362-367, but here is a quick overview of some points that I found relevant to the phenotyping exercise.

Delirium, or a confused mental state, occurs suddenly. A person has a change in mental status and acts disoriented and distracted. Delirium is more common in older adults, especially those with dementia, and people who need hospitalization. Prompt treatment is essential in helping a person with delirium recover. Delirium happens when a person has sudden confusion or a sudden change in mental status. The person may have trouble paying attention or thinking clearly. They may act disoriented or distracted. Delirium is more severe than having a "senior moment" — the minor problems people have with memory and understanding as they get older. It requires treatment and often hospitalization. Delirium is not a disease. It's a changed mental state. Because delirium is temporary, it's hard to know exactly how many people develop it. Researchers estimate that hospital delirium affects 15% to 50% of people. Below is the exact clinical criteria for delirium by DSM-IV to guide our way.
In this edition to Phenotype Ph小时内，I’d like to discuss the work of @Jill_Hardin and I did for developing phenotype algorithms in the immunology space for systemic lupus erythematosus.

Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is a chronic autoimmune disease of unknown origin. Clinical manifestations include fatigue, arthralgia, and involvement of nearly all organ systems, particularly cardiac and renal (Jump et al., Greco et al., Miner et al., Danila et al.) A review by Stoppan and Petri of research on multi-country incidence rate estimates found the incidence rate of SLE to be between 1-5 cases per 100,000 person-years (PY).

As @Patrick_Ryan has provided an excellent review of the details of the phenotype algorithm development process, I’ll build on that to demonstrate how we used the process for our cohort definitions. We first conducted a literature search for phenotype algorithms for SLE. From those resources we determined the codes used in prior studies. We used those as a starting point and entered those into the wonderful PHOEBE tool developed by @costropiata. The final concept set was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Concept Name</th>
<th>Concept Text</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Standard Concept</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Tandem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>459155</td>
<td>SLE Associated Autoimmune Disease R</td>
<td>Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Associated Arthritis and Rheumatism</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499158</td>
<td>SLE Associated Autoimmune Disease R</td>
<td>Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Associated Arthritis and Rheumatism</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499159</td>
<td>SLE Associated Autoimmune Disease R</td>
<td>Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Associated Arthritis and Rheumatism</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We then began building our cohort definitions. We were concerned about possible index date misclassification as prior research had indicated that there may be a long period between first symptoms and first diagnosis. We used the spectacular Cohort Diagnostics tool (thank you @Govind_Rao) to examine the conditions and drugs in the time prior to an initial diagnosis of SLE and found in the IBM Commercial Claims and Encounters dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariate Name</th>
<th>Start -30 to end -1</th>
<th>Start -30 to end -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>condition_occurrence: Essential hypertension (320128)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition_occurrence: Malignant (4272240)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition_occurrence: Inflammatory dermatosis (45766734)</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition_occurrence: Joint pain (70774)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phenotype Phebruary Day 11 - Suicide attempts

Gowtham Rao

Azza Shoaiib

Hi team, it’s me again @AzzaShoaiib using @Gowtham_Rao account. This is day 11 of Phenotype Phebruary and I would like to start a discussion about suicide attempt. This is a phenotype that I worked on with my dear friend @conovermitch. In today’s post I will demonstrate:

1. how important it is to learn from what others already did (literature) as a primary input into the phenotyping process
2. how it is possible to incorporate other’s findings into OHDSI phenotyping practices and tools
3. How we can but not necessarily should use ‘source codes’ when developing phenotypes using OHDSI tools.

**Suicide attempt/self-harm (clinical description):**
One of the biggest challenges when working on this phenotype is agreeing on the target/clinical description. Suicide is a major public health concern and there is a big debate on what is the right target for studies looking at suicide as a target (study population) or an outcome. There is multiple overlapping but different constructs/terms like: Self-harm, suicide attempt, suicide ideation/thoughts, suicidality overall, suicidal behavior.

The table below from INTRODUCTION - Screening for Suicide Risk in Primary Care - NCBI Bookshelf provides a nice summary of the clinical definitions of these terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>Death caused by self-directed injurious behavior with any intent to die as a result of the behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempt</td>
<td>A nonfatal self-directed potentially injurious behavior with any intent to die as a result of the behavior. A suicide attempt may or may not result in injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal self-directed violence</td>
<td>Behavior that is self-directed and deliberately results in injury or the potential for injury to oneself. There is evidence, whether implicit or explicit, of suicidal intent. This encompasses suicide deaths and suicide attempts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suicidal behavior and preparatory acts</td>
<td>Acts or preparation toward making a suicide attempt, but before potential for harm has begun. This can include anything beyond a verbalization or thought, such as assembling a method (e.g., buying a gun, collecting pills) or preparing for one's death by suicide (e.g., writing a suicide note, giving things away).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal ideation</td>
<td>Passive thoughts about wanting to be dead or active thoughts about killing oneself, not necessarily resulting in an attempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Phenotype Phebruary Day 12 - Parkinson's disease & parkinsonism

It's been a while since we've seen @allanwudd — their last post was 5 months ago.

I'd like to introduce thoughts from our joint team (at UCLA and Northwestern University) on Parkinson's disease and parkinsonism. Thanks to @Patrick Ryan for encouragement to participate even as we have yet to setup our own OMOP-CDM instance.

Goal: to develop and evaluate algorithms (and impact of criteria used within them) that assess incidence and prevalence of:
- Parkinson's disease (PD) and
- Neurodegenerative parkinsonism disorders (PD included)

Clinical description

Parkinson's disease (PD) is a neurodegenerative disease that has been estimated to be increasing in prevalence based on large scale epidemiologic work. It is the most frequent form of neurodegenerative parkinsonism, itself a subset of parkinsonism syndromes. More details below.

PD is considered the condition when there is specific degeneration of the substantia nigra dopaminergic (DA) neurons over time producing the disease. It is estimated that well over 50% of DA cells will degenerate before clinical symptoms appear. This is the classic and core definition, however, increasingly there is appreciation of that PD itself is a multisystem disorder with involvement of other neurotransmitters and other systems within and not within the nervous system (often noted as non-motor symptoms – constipation, cognitive impairment, sleep disorders, autonomic dysfunction, depression, anxiety etc).

PD is the most common form of neurodegenerative parkinsonism (80-85%).

Neurodegenerative parkinsonisms (other than PD) are defined by having parkinsonism plus other neurologic systems that are affected by degeneration besides the specific PD degeneration described above. There will be described in more detail below – and include progressive supranuclear palsy (PSP), multiple systems atrophy (MSA), corticobasal degeneration (CBD) and others. Frequently, patients with neurodegenerative parkinsonism may be diagnosed with PD early on before neurodegenerative features become sufficiently prominent for clinical diagnosis over time. If patients have a clear diagnosis of PSP or MSA (for example), those are not considered PD, but are within neurodegenerative parkinsonism.
Today, while many in the US are preparing for their Super Bowl football/commercial viewing parties, I’d like to discuss phenotyping Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). This is work that several colleagues (@ericvoss @weave17 @Jilt_Hardin @connoveritch) and I conducted over the past couple years that yielded a bunch of lessons learned the hard way. But the experience gave us insights to some complementary recommended practices that I’ve carried forward in my own research, so I thought I’d walk through the development process to show the pitfalls and ways to overcome them.

Clinical description:

Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a neurodevelopmental disorder characterized by patterns of inattention or impulsive behaviors that interfere with functions. ADHD can be classified by the most common symptoms, be it ‘predominantly inattentive’ presentation - where patients may struggle to organize or complete tasks, follow directions, or remember details of daily activities - or ‘predominantly hyperactive-impulsive’ presentation - where patients are constantly moving around or talking or interrupting when not appropriate. ADHD is most commonly diagnosed in childhood (though can occur with onset in adults), through physician examination and evaluation of ADHD symptoms over time and its impact in social settings (and ruling out alternative diagnosis from other mental health disorders or environmental factors). Management of ADHD may involve behavioral therapy or pharmacologic treatment (including stimulants such as methylphenidate, amphetamine, lisdexamfetamine, and non-stimulants such as atomoxetine and guanfacine).

Phenotype development:

Let’s follow some of the practices we’ve discussed on prior threads. We’ll start with PHOEBE to find our starting point in the OHDSI vocabulary.
On Valentine's week – let's start the cardiovascular phenotypes. This week – we will work on:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Acute myocardial infarction</td>
<td>Heart failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowtham Rao</td>
<td>Gowtham Rao</td>
<td>Gowtham Rao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Happy Valentine's day @AzzaShoaibi

I decided to change the pattern of how we have been posting on the forums based on the feedback @ the OHDSI Phenotype Development and Evaluation workgroup (please join here 🌐). The feedback was – this is intimidating, too long and I don’t know if a new contributor can do this.

So – instead of one long one per day post, I am going to break it down into multiple posts per day – hopefully this will make it easier to read.

I am going to try to use this cardiovascular week related posts to assert/express some of the best practice opinions that we have developed at the OHDSI Phenotype Development and Evaluation workgroup with focus on all the steps that needs to be done PRIOR to touching Atlas or creating code sets + the importance of such pre work.
Phenotype Phebruary Day 15 - Acute Myocardial Infarction

Gowtham_Rao

Part of the Valentines week

As described in the hypertension post I start with my notes - sources from medical text books

The phrase Acute Myocardial Infarction - is ambiguous and I read three related chapters in the text book and summarized them as my notes below

Chronic Stable Angina, Unstable Angina, Non ST Segment Elevation of Myocardial Infarction, ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction

Chowtham_Rao

Chronic Stable Angina, Unstable Angina, Non ST Segment Elevation of Myocardial Infarction, ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction

Chronic Stable Angina:
Overview:
most common clinical manifestation of coronary artery disease (CAD) - imbalances between myocardial metabolic O2 demand vs supply commonly because of atherosclerotic coronary artery obstruction.
Presentation:
Associated with exertion or emotional upset
Relieved quickly by rest or nitroglycerin
Assessment:
History of established risk factors: Cigarette smoking, hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, diabetes, obesity
EKG - maybe normal
Phenotype Phebruary Day 16 - Heart Failure (Chronic Heart Failure, Acute Decompensated HF, Cor-Pulmonale)

Gowtham_Rao

Reserved - for summary

Gowtham_Rao

Clinical description - Chronic Heart Failure

Chronic Heart Failure
Overview: Abnormal cardiac function or structure that results in clinical symptoms (e.g. dyspnea, fatigue) and
This is a complex clinical idea - and I have found conflicting ways in authoritative sources have defined it. This makes it difficult to phenotype. Can we phenotype Cardiomyopathy? A general principle that we follow - if we cannot come to shared understanding of what the phenotype is - by authoring a clear clinical description - then we probably cannot phenotype it?

I started by reviewing authoritative sources (Harrison’s text book, Uptodate) and put my notes here. Because of the wide variation, I struggled because the sub-types were truly different clinical ideas and considering them as one broad “cardiomyopathy” seemed not appropriate.

Because I felt like I was stuck - I went to Atlas and did a lexical search and found that there were many concept id’s for the idea of cardiomyopathy with two of them accounting for almost all of the concept id. These two were also non specific - and different from the contemporary classification of dilated cardiomyopathy, restrictive cardiomyopathy and hypertrophic cardiomyopathy.

I then investigated the trends in use of such codes in various data sources, see ARES reports for concept id and found that their utilization changed (increased dramatically) after 2016 (in US datasets) when the switch happened from ICD9-CM to ICD10-CM.
Phenotype Phebruary Day 18 -Multiple sclerosis

Gowtham_Rao

Hi team,

wow it’s day 18 already! and it’s me again @azzashoaibi and again using @Gowtham_Rao account. Today, I would like to start a discussion about the phenotype- Multiple sclerosis. Some of the material discussed here is captured from a prior work by @Jill_Hardin and @rmakadia!

You all now learned from @Gowtham_Rao the importance of clinical description! so let’s start MS clinical description.

Clinical description:
you can find the following definition by the national institute of Neurological disorder and stroke, Multiple Sclerosis Information Page | National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

Overview:
An unpredictable disease of the central nervous system, multiple sclerosis (MS) can range from relatively benign to somewhat disabling to devastating, as communication between the brain and other parts of the body is disrupted. Many investigators believe MS to be an autoimmune disease – one in which the body, through its immune system, launches a defensive attack against its own tissues. In the case of MS, it is the nerve-insulating myelin that comes under assault. Such assaults may be linked to
Phenotype Phebruary Day 19 - Triple negative breast cancer

First I want to thank everyone for the informative phenotype discussions so far. I have learned a lot from reading them.

Along with lots of help from my colleagues Darya Kosareva and @agolozar I have created a few cohort definitions for triple negative breast cancer to share. In the process I have learned some lessons about the importance of understanding the vocabulary and how clinical concepts are recorded in actual data. I’d like to summarize the cohorts first then put the clinical definition and references in the next post. Keep in mind that I rely on others for clinical expertise since I have no clinical training and have been lucky to have many people around me with significant clinical expertise.

Triple negative breast cancer (TNBC) is an aggressive form of breast cancer that is estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR) negative, and HER2 negative. There are few treatment options and the prognosis is bad. I’m trying to identify incident cases of TNBC. I’ll put a more complete clinical description in the next post.

Initially I expected standardization to allow for the creation of one cohort definition that captures persons meeting a particular phenotype definition across a network of databases without having direct access to the data or knowing how the source data was recorded. This expectation is based on two assumptions...
Putting the PH in PHenotype PHebraury: Day 20

---

Evan_Minty

If you thought you were going to get out of PHebraury, without PH, well, you haven’t been paying attention. Without further ado I introduce to the reader: **Pulmonary Hypertension**.

I’ve reached out to and involved a friend and colleague, Jason Weatherald (not yet on the forums but joining soon). Some of you might recognize his name, we’ve been working together with Patrick Alba, Scott Duvall, and others at the VA, as well as Jose Posada on the Covid Prone NLP study. Jason is a pulmonologist who did his fellowship in pulmonary hypertension, he’s just relocated to the U of Alberta (in Edmonton) from Calgary, although we won’t hold that against him.

Frankly, for many of these descriptions, I feel like I should have received CME credit for reading them (looking at you in particular, @Allen Wu). As an internist, I vowed to love all my children organ systems equally, however I do think the gauntlet has been thrown down to convince the audience that the heart and lungs are at least as cool as the brain.

There’s another method to this madness, in that Jason and I have been discussing and think there’s exceptional alignment between the capacities and interest of the OHDSI community, and the RWE research needs within pulmonary HTN, so part of this is to generate some interest in a really interesting area of pathophysiology and emerging therapeutics, and lead some work in this area.
Hi everyone,

It is Phenotype Phenbruary-Day 21 and it is time to talk about prostate cancer. Some of the materials I am presenting here are based on previous works from the PIONEER study-a-thon, the Oncology WG (specifically the work @mgurley is leading on deriving initial disease episode from discrete diagnosis and an amazing discussions and team work. A shout out to Danya Kosareva, @Ajit_Londhe and the Amgen team, @mmayer, @mgurley, @Adam_Black.

Clinical Definition
Prostate cancer is a cancer of the prostate gland, an organ of the male reproductive system located below the bladder and surrounding the urethra. It is the second most common malignancy in men and the fifth leading cause of death worldwide. Median age at diagnosis is approximately 67 years.

Clinical Presentation
- Most prostate cancer patients are asymptomatic at the time of diagnosis and are diagnosed during screening.
- Local growth of the tumor can lead to symptoms of urinary obstruction including urgency.