

OMOP and Mini-Sentinel Collaborations Supporting Routine Prospective Surveillance

Jennifer Nelson¹, Mini-Sentinel
David Madigan², OMOP

January 31, 2013

1. Group Health Research Institute and University of Washington
2. Columbia University

Some history...

- ❑ OMOP began its activities in 2007
 - Characterize the effectiveness of different epidemiological and statistical methods for estimating the effects of medical products using large-scale observational data
- ❑ Mini-Sentinel got underway at the end of 2009
 - Create an active surveillance system, including routine prospective safety monitoring, for FDA-regulated medical products using electronic health care data
- ❑ Key area of shared interest and research
 - Developing and evaluating methods for active surveillance
 - Identify and address barriers and challenges

Methodological challenges

- All the usual observational study biases...and more
- New purpose
 - Rapid detection of safety signals as product uptake occurs
 - Scaled up to monitor many, diverse medical products
- New setting (not a research environment)
 - Unpredictable uptake rate, composition of users over time
 - Distributed data environment, constrains analytics
- New data sources
 - Data are dynamic, data quality needs constant study
 - Heterogeneity across sites is large, must be addressed

Collaborative methods vision

- ❑ Leaders from both OMOP and Mini-Sentinel involved in crafting the original Mini-Sentinel methods agenda
 - Methods for generating hypotheses
 - Methods for refining and testing hypotheses
 - Methods to evaluate and improve method performance
- ❑ Mini-Sentinel investigators have spent 3 years systematically implementing aspects of this plan
- ❑ One such activity was led by OMOP and helped evaluate and push forward self-controlled methods for use in Mini-Sentinel

Self-controlled methods workgroup

- Open methods questions in safety surveillance setting
 - When are self-controlled methods advantageous over other designs?
 - What extensions are desirable (e.g., Bayesian, multi-drug)?
 - What is the opportunity for multi-drug outcome-focused active surveillance vs surveillance of a target drug?
- Specific working group aims
 - Describe key differences, strengths, and limitations of self-controlled case series (SCCS) vs case-crossover designs
 - Overview the usage of case-based designs in published studies
 - Assess OMOP's multi-drug SCCS and other new SCCS developments
 - Make recommendations to Mini-Sentinel

Other Mini-Sentinel methods work groups

- How can we systematize and expedite the selection of an appropriate surveillance design?
- What data and analysis methods are best-suited for use in Mini-Sentinel's distributed data setting?
- How can sequential testing methods be best adapted to achieve rapid detection while minimizing errors?
- What methods should be conducted to further evaluate a signal generated by routine surveillance?

Current status: Mini-Sentinel

- ❑ Mini-Sentinel work has culminated in development of a Routine Prospective Surveillance plan and methods
 - OMOP leaders have participated in this work
- ❑ Designed to conduct semi-automated, prospective surveillance to complement protocol-based evaluations
 - Less resource intensive, less control of systematic biases
 - Ability to generate potential signals for further assessment
- ❑ Created a methods toolbox, diverse and flexible options
 - ❑ Some are methods or variants of those assessed by OMOP
 - ❑ Includes self-controlled, matching, regression approaches

Current status: OMOP

- ❑ Completed two large-scale experiments to evaluate competing methods for estimating the effects of medical interventions
- ❑ Developed a process for choosing the optimal customized analytic method for a given context
- ❑ Developed approaches for calibrating p-values and confidence intervals to deliver correct the correct Type I error rate and coverage properties
- ❑ Developed a Bayesian framework for synthesizing empirical evidence

Current status: Joint Collaborations

- ❑ Since June 2012: Mini-Sentinel developing and testing code for use in Routine Prospective Surveillance
 - Continued participation by and input from OMOP
- ❑ Sept 2012: Joint OMOP/Mini-Sentinel meeting
 - Synthesized prior work, generated ideas for future joint work
 - Ideas leverage experience and expertise of OMOP and Mini-Sentinel and improve Routine Prospective Surveillance plans
- ❑ Oct-Dec 2012: FDA input obtained, ideas refined
- ❑ Early January 2013: OMOP/Mini-Sentinel leaders met again with FDA to select topic to be pursued together
 - Design and implement a methods performance evaluation

Performance evaluation plans

- ❑ Review existing evaluation work
 - ❑ Current suite of OMOP experimental results
 - ❑ Simulation evaluations conducted within Mini-Sentinel
- ❑ Identify key gaps in of the performance of existing Routine Prospective Surveillance methods
- ❑ Develop an evaluation framework and metrics to assess these unanswered performance aspects
- ❑ Identify appropriate setting to conduct the evaluation
- ❑ Design and implement the performance evaluation to address these gaps using the developed metrics

Next steps

- ❑ Continued participation by OMOP in Mini-Sentinel's existing Routine Prospective Surveillance group
- ❑ New joint working group has been formed to develop the scope of work, timeline, and required resources for the OMOP/Mini-Sentinel method performance evaluation project
- ❑ Specific OMOP/Mini-Sentinel research projects getting underway