

Bayesian model selection in logistic regression for the detection of adverse drug reactions

Matthieu Marbac¹, Pascale Tubert-Bitter¹, and Mohammed Sedki*^{1,2}

¹ UMR 1181 B2PHI Inserm, Institut-Pasteur and Université Versailles St Quentin.

² Université. Paris-Sud.

Received XX XX XX, revised XX XX XX, accepted XX XX XX

Published online XX XX XX

Summary

Motivation: Spontaneous adverse event reports have an high potential for detecting adverse drug reactions. However, due to their dimension, the analysis of such databases requires statistical methods. In this context, disproportionality measures can be used. Their main idea is to project the data onto contingency tables in order to measure the strength of associations between drugs and adverse events. However, due to the data projection, these methods are sensitive to the problem of co-prescriptions and masking effects. Recently, logistic regressions have been used with a Lasso type penalty to perform the detection of associations between drugs and adverse events. On different examples, this approach limits the drawbacks of the disproportionality methods, but the choice of the penalty value is open to criticism while it strongly influences the results. *Results:* In this paper, we propose to use a logistic regression whose sparsity is viewed as a model selection challenge. Since the model space is huge, a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm carries out the model selection by maximizing the BIC criterion. Thus, we avoid the calibration of penalty or threshold. During our application on the French pharmacovigilance database, the proposed method is compared to well established approaches on a reference data set, and obtains better rates of positive and negative controls. However, many signals (*i.e.* specific drug-event associations) are not detected by the proposed method. So, we conclude that this method should be used in parallel to existing measures in pharmacovigilance.

Availability: Code implementing the proposed method is available in R on request from the corresponding author.

Key words: Binary data, logistic regression, Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, model selection, pharmacovigilance, spontaneous reporting.

1 Introduction

To obtain approval, drugs go through many premarket safety tests, but adverse drug reactions may not be detected during these experiments. Many national or international regulatory agencies have thus introduced pharmacovigilance systems collecting spontaneously reported adverse events. Post-approval drug safety surveillance relies on these reported cases for suspecting that some drugs induce adverse events. They provide huge binary databases that describe each individual by its drug consumption and its adverse events. Although spontaneous reporting systems suffer from many biases (Almenoff *et al.*, 2007), they have permitted early identification of associations between drugs and adverse events (Szarfman *et al.*, 2002). In order to assist pharmacovigilance experts in managing such databases, statistical methods aiming to put the light on unexpected associations have been proposed.

The most classical methods are based on *disproportionality measures* and use data projections onto *contingency tables*. Among them, the most popular are: the Proportional Reporting Ratio (Evans *et al.*, 2001), the Reporting Odds Ratio (Van Puijenbroek *et al.*, 2002), the Bayesian Confidence Propagation Neural Network (Bate *et al.*, 1998) and the Gamma Poisson Shrinkage (DuMouchel, 1999). All of these methods

* Corresponding author: e-mail: mohammed.sedki@u-psud.fr, Phone: +33 145 595 214

use a specific statistic which requires a threshold for detecting associations between drugs and adverse events. The disproportionality measure is computed for each drug-event pair in the database and compared to the threshold. Moreover, the data projections onto the contingency tables provide good computational performances. However, these projections involve some weakness against the problems of co-prescriptions and masking effects from highly reported associations for some drugs (Caster *et al.*, 2010). None of these methods is defined as the reference approach. Due to the shortage of the gold standard sets, their comparison remains a challenging issue.

The shrinkage *logistic regression* is an interesting alternative to the methods based on data projections onto contingency tables. In this spirit, Caster *et al.* (2010) propose to model the probability of an adverse event conditionally on the drug consumptions by a sparse logistic regression whose sparsity is imposed by a *Lasso type penalty* (Tibshirani, 1996). In this context, drug j and adverse event h are claimed to be associated when the coefficient related to drug j in the regression of adverse event h is strictly positive — since, in this case, the adverse event occurs more often with the consumption of this drug. However, the choice of the penalty value is a crucial and very difficult task. Indeed, the penalty value directly influences the signal detection. Caster *et al.* (2010) propose to use the same penalty for all the regressions. Moreover, they set the penalty value in order to obtain the same number of signals as a disproportionality method. A more rigorous method, but more computationally demanding, could consist in setting the penalty value by cross-validation where the penalty is set for minimizing the misclassification error. However, as shown during our numerical application, this approach obtains poor results notably due to the database sparsity. Recently, Harpaz *et al.* (2013) have used a full logistic regression in a two-step procedure where the first step consists in empirically selecting a subset of candidate drugs.

In this paper, the signal detection is performed by a *model selection* step which avoids the use of any threshold or the calibration of the penalty. In this context, a model of a logistic regression determines the coefficients which are not zero. In a Bayesian framework, the best model has the highest posterior probability but this amount is not explicit. It is also useful to approximate its logarithm by the Bayesian Information Criterion (Schwarz, 1978). Therefore, the signal detection consists in selecting the model which maximizes the BIC criterion. Unfortunately, the number of competing models is too huge for applying an exhaustive approach which computes the BIC criterion for each competing model. Therefore, the model selection is carried out by a *Metropolis-Hastings algorithm* (Robert and Casella, 2004) which performs a random walk through the models of interest. This algorithm is classically used for finding the maximum of a function even on a discrete space. In our context, the mode of its stationary distribution corresponds to the model maximizing the BIC criterion. Thus, we were able to develop an efficient algorithm by taking advantage of some features of the data.

In this paper, we compare our model-based procedure to the four disproportionality methods implemented in the R package *PhViD* and to the Lasso logistic regression implemented in the R package *glmnet*. We use the database arisen from the French pharmacovigilance which received roughly 20,000 suspected adverse drug reactions per year from 2000 to 2010. Comparison between pharmacovigilance procedures is a difficult task. In this paper, we focus on the four adverse events described in the Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership (OMOP) reference set (Ryan *et al.*, 2013) and on their 145 relating drugs. To our knowledge, it is the only reference set recently formed with positive and negative controls to address the issue of methods assessment in pharmacovigilance.

This article is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the parsimonious version of the logistic regression. Section 3 introduces the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm devoted to the model selection. Section 4 compares the proposed method to four disproportionality methods and to the Lasso logistic regression. Section 5 discusses the limitations and scope of the proposed approach.

2 Parsimonious logistic regression

2.1 Spontaneous reporting database

Spontaneous reporting databases describe n individuals by their consumptions of p drugs and by the presence or absence of d adverse events. For the purpose of logistic regression, in this article, we consider one adverse event at a time that we denote by the binary vector $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{B}^n$ where $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$. More specifically, $y_i = 1$ if individual i suffers from this adverse event and $y_i = 0$ otherwise. In the regression context, explanatory variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ indicate the presence or the absence of drug consumptions. Binary vector $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip}) \in \mathbb{B}^p$ indicates the drug consumption of individual i since $x_{ij} = 1$ if individual i takes drug j and $x_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

2.2 Logistic regression

The probability of the adverse event given the drug consumption is assumed to follow a *logit regression*. Model $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p) \in \mathbb{B}^p$ defines which drugs influence the appearance of the adverse event, since $\gamma_j = 1$ if the coefficient of the regression related to drug j is unconstrained (*i.e.* defined on \mathbb{R}) while $\gamma_j = 0$ if this coefficient is zero. The indices of the drugs having a non-zero (respectively zero) coefficient are grouped into the set $\mathcal{D}_\gamma = \{j : \gamma_j = 1\}$ (respectively $\mathcal{D}_\gamma^c = \{j : \gamma_j = 0\}$).

For model γ , the *logit* relationship is

$$\ln \frac{\mathbb{P}(y_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\beta})}{1 - \mathbb{P}(y_i = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\beta})} = \beta_0 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_\gamma} \beta_j x_{ij}, \quad (1)$$

$\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p) \in \Omega_\gamma$ being the vector of regression coefficients for which many coefficients are constrained by γ to be zero, since

$$\Omega_\gamma = \{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} : \forall j \in \mathcal{D}_\gamma^c, \beta_j = 0\}. \quad (2)$$

Thus, the drugs suspected to induce the adverse event are those belonging to \mathcal{D}_γ and having a positive coefficient in the regression (*i.e.* $\beta_j > 0$).

Assuming that spontaneous reports consists of n i.i.d. observations, the *adverse event log-likelihood* related to model γ is written as

$$\ell_n(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i (\beta_0 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_\gamma} \beta_j x_{ij}) - \ln \left[1 + \exp \left(\beta_0 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_\gamma} \beta_j x_{ij} \right) \right]. \quad (3)$$

Obviously, the indices of \mathbf{x}_i impacting the log-likelihood value are those belonging to \mathcal{D}_γ . In practice, it is often more numerically efficient to compute the adverse event log-likelihood by using the unique profiles of observations impacting the likelihood. This weighted form of the log-likelihood is described in Appendix A.

From the database, the Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma$ is defined by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\gamma = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Omega_\gamma} \ell_n(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\beta}). \quad (4)$$

To assess (4), we need to solve the derivative likelihood equations using the classical Newton-Raphson method (see Nocedal and Wright (2006)). However, the MLE is well defined only if the overlapping conditions of Silvapulle (1981) are satisfied (see also the discussion of Owen and Roediger (2014)). Thus, for the binary variables, the MLE is well defined only if

$$\forall (h_y, h_x) \in \mathbb{B}^2, \forall j \in \mathcal{D}_\gamma, \exists i \in \mathcal{I}_{h_y} : x_{ij} = h_x, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{h_y} = \{i : y_i = h_y\}$. In a few words, (5) is equivalent to have at least one absence and one presence of drug consumption in both sets $\{x_{ij} \mid y_i = 0\}$ and $\{x_{ij} \mid y_i = 1\}$. To ensure that the MLE is well defined, this condition suggests us to do not take into account drugs that do not satisfy it.

3 Model selection by MCMC algorithm

3.1 Bayesian model selection

We define the set of the competing models Γ as the set of models $\gamma \in \mathbb{B}^p$ where (5) is satisfied. So,

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in \mathbb{B}^p \text{ such as (5) is satisfied for } \gamma\}. \quad (6)$$

In a Bayesian framework, the aim is to obtain the model having the highest posterior distribution $p(\gamma | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$. We assume that uniformity holds for the prior distribution $p(\gamma | \mathbf{x})$ of models $\gamma \in \Gamma$. So, we have

$$p(\gamma | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \propto p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma), \quad (7)$$

where $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma)$ is the *integrated likelihood* defined by

$$p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma) = \int_{\Omega_\gamma} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \beta) p(\beta | \mathbf{x}, \gamma) d\beta, \quad (8)$$

where $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \beta) = \exp(\ell_n(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \beta))$ is the likelihood related to model γ and where $p(\beta | \mathbf{x}, \gamma)$ is the prior distribution of β whose the support is included in Ω_γ . Since logarithm is monotone,

$$\arg \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} p(\gamma | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \ln p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma). \quad (9)$$

When the integrated likelihood has not a closed form, the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) is generally used. It is based on a second degree Laplace approximation of the logarithm of the integrated likelihood (Schwarz, 1978), and it is defined as

$$\mathbf{BIC}(\gamma) = \ell_n(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \hat{\beta}_\gamma) - \frac{\nu_\gamma}{2} \ln n, \quad (10)$$

where $\nu_\gamma = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^p \gamma_j$ is the degree of freedom for model γ . Therefore, we want to achieve γ^* which is the model maximizing the BIC criterion, so

$$\gamma^* = \arg \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \mathbf{BIC}(\gamma). \quad (11)$$

This criterion selects the model providing the best trade-off between its accuracy related to the data and its complexity.

Obviously, the number of competing models is too huge for applying an exhaustive approach (*i.e.* to compute the BIC criterion for each model). Therefore, the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm described in the following section is used to estimate γ^* .

3.2 Metropolis-Hastings algorithm for achieving γ^*

Model γ^* can be achieved through a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Robert and Casella, 2004), described in Algorithm 1, which performs a random walk over Γ . The unique invariant distribution of Algorithm 1 is proportional to $\exp(\mathbf{BIC}(\gamma))$. Therefore, γ^* is the mode of its stationary distribution.

At each iteration, the algorithm proposes to move into a neighbourhood of the current model. A neighbouring model is defined as copy of the current model where just a few elements are altered. Thus, at iteration $[r]$, the candidate $\tilde{\gamma}$ is equal to the current model $\gamma^{[r]}$ except for $\alpha \geq 1$ elements at the maximum. More specifically, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is uniformly sampled in $V_\alpha(\gamma^{[r]})$ where

$$V_\alpha(\gamma^{[r]}) = \left\{ \gamma : \sum_{j=1}^p |\gamma_j - \gamma_j^{[r]}| \leq \alpha \right\}. \quad (12)$$

In the application, we set $\alpha = 5$ to obtain good mixing properties. The candidate $\tilde{\gamma}$ is accepted with a probability equal to

$$\rho^{[r]} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{BIC}(\tilde{\gamma}))}{\exp(\mathbf{BIC}(\gamma^{[r]})}. \quad (13)$$

Note that we define that $\mathbf{BIC}(\gamma) = -\infty$ for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{B}^p \setminus \Gamma$. This algorithm performs R iterations and returns the model maximizing the BIC criterion. In practice, there may be almost absorbing states, so different initialisations of this algorithm ensure to visit γ^* .

Algorithm 1 Metropolis-Hasting performing the model selection

Initialisation $\gamma^{[0]}$ is uniformly sampled in Γ .

For $r = 1, \dots, R$.

Candidate step: $\tilde{\gamma}$ is uniformly sampled in $V_\alpha(\gamma^{[r]})$.

Acceptance/reject step: defined $\gamma^{[r]}$ with

$$\gamma^{[r]} = \begin{cases} \tilde{\gamma} & \text{with probability } \rho^{[r]} \\ \gamma^{[r-1]} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

End For

Return $\arg \max_{r=1, \dots, R} \mathbf{BIC}(\gamma^{[r]})$.

4 Results on real data set

In this section, after presenting the French pharmacovigilance database, the proposed method is compared to the others by using the OMOP set. Finally, specific comments are given for the proposed method.

4.1 Data

To evaluate and compare the performances of the competing methods, we use the OMOP (Ryan *et al.*, 2013) reference set of test cases that contains both positive and negative controls. Four adverse events (*i.e.* $d = 4$) were studied in this reference set : acute myocardial infarction (AMI), acute kidney injury (AKI), acute liver injury (ALI), and upper gastro-intestinal bleeding (GIB). There are three-hundred and ninety-nine test cases where 165 positive controls and 234 negative controls were identified across the four adverse events of interest. More details are given by Table 1. Ryan *et al.* (2013) indicate that the majority of positive controls for AKI and GIB were supported by randomized clinical trial evidence, while the majority of positive controls for ALI and AMI were only based on published case reports.

Table 1 Numbers of positive and negative controls for the four adverse event in the OMOP reference set.

control	AMI	GIB	ALI	AKI
positive	36	24	81	24
negative	66	67	37	64

Methods are compared on the data extracted from the French pharmacovigilance database where notifications have been collected from 2000 to 2010. The studied database contains $n = 219,340$ individuals notifications and the consumption informations concerning $p = 145$ drugs mentioned on the OMOP reference set. Therefore, $145 \times 4 = 580$ drug-event pairs are studied, among them 145 are positive controls (25%), 153 are negative controls (26%) and 282 have an unknown status (49%). More details are given in Table 2. The four studied adverse events occur 495 (AMI), 4746 (GIB), 10910 (ALI) and 5234 (AKI) times in the French pharmacovigilance database.

Table 2 Numbers of positive, negative and unknown signals for the four adverse event in the OMOP reference set and for the 145 drugs presented in both databases (OMOP and French pharmacovigilance).

	control	AMI	GIB	ALI	AKI
positive	29	20	75	21	
negative	43	46	22	42	
unknown	73	79	48	82	

4.2 Competing methods

Disproportionality-based methods We chose to compare our method with all the disproportionality methods implemented in the R package *PhViD* (Ahmed and Poncet, 2013) Thus, four disproportionality-based methods: the Proportional Reporting Ratio (PRR), the Reporting Odds Ratio (ROR), the Reporting Fisher Exact Test (RFET) (Ahmed *et al.*, 2010) and the FDR-based Gamma Poisson Shrinkage (GPS) (Ahmed *et al.*, 2009) are considered. The specific statistics are used with a threshold of 0.05 and are presented in Table 3. All methods are compared on the 580 drug-event pairs mentioned on the OMOP reference set.

Table 3 Specific statistics of the disproportionality methods: statistics (Stat), minimal number of individuals having a drug-event pair to claim this pair as a signal (Min.) and reference (Ref.).

Method	Stat.	Min.	Ref.
PRR	p-value of rank	3	Evans <i>et al.</i> (2001)
ROR	p-value of rank	3	Van Puijenbroek <i>et al.</i> (2002)
RFET	mid-pvalue	1	Ahmed <i>et al.</i> (2010)
GPS	prob of H0	1	Ahmed <i>et al.</i> (2009)

Lasso-based logistic regressions The results of the Lasso method applied on logistic regressions are obtained with the R package *glmnet* (Friedman *et al.*, 2010). The penalty value is selected by cross-validation with ten folds to obtain the most parsimonious model among the models having best misclassification error. This method permits to find few signals since the selected penalty implies that only the intercept is not zero for only one adverse event (AMI). This example shows the difficulty for calibrating the Lasso-penalty. Indeed, the misclassification error is roughly constant according to the penalty value. This is due to the weak rate of notifications for one adverse event.

Model-based logistic regressions For each of the four adverse events, 100 random initialisations of Algorithm 1 with $\alpha = 5$ and $R = 5.10^3$ iterations have been done. The model maximizing the BIC criterion is returned. Table 4 presents the number of competing models for each adverse event, which corresponds to the dimension of Γ defined in (6).

Table 4 Number of drugs respecting (5) and number of competing models for each adverse event ($|\Gamma|$).

Adverse Event	AMI	GIB	ALI	AKI
Number of drugs respecting (5)	66	97	123	107
$ \Gamma $	2^{66}	2^{97}	2^{123}	2^{107}

4.3 Method comparison

Table 5 presents the rates of positive controls, of negative controls and of unknown signals detected by all the competing methods.

Table 5 Main results obtained by the competing methods ordered by their rate of positive controls: number of signals (NS), rate of positive controls (RPC), rate of negative controls (RNC) and rate of unknown signals (RUS).

Method	NS	RPC	RNC	RUS
Logistic BIC (Algorithm 1)	70	0.54	0.01	0.45
RFET	114	0.51	0.06	0.43
PRR	73	0.51	0.10	0.40
ROR	120	0.50	0.07	0.43
GPS	129	0.48	0.07	0.45
Lasso-CV	13	0.46	0.08	0.46

The proposed method obtains the best rates of positive controls and negative controls. It detects 70 signals while the Lasso-based method finds only 13 couples. The poor results of the Lasso are explained by the penalty values assessed by the misclassification error rate. Indeed, the resulting penalty values constrain all the coefficients to be zero for three adverse events. All the disproportionality methods obtain similar results. Despite that many signals are detected by these methods (between 73 and 129), their rates of positive and negative controls are worse than those resulting from the proposed method.

Since the proposed method obtains the best rates of positive and negative controls, we conclude that it is more precise for the signal detection. However, it finds less signals than the disproportionality methods. So, it permits the practitioner to focus on more probably related drug-event pairs. Moreover, some associations detected only by the disproportionality method could be due to the co-prescription phenomenon.

4.4 Specific comments about the proposed method

Table 6 indicates the computing time obtained by an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU 3.00 GHz and the number of times where the Algorithm 1 finds the best model.

Table 6 General results of Algorithm 1: number of times where γ^* has been found (model), number of signals (nb signals), number of positive controls, number of negative controls, computing time in minutes required for one Markov chain realization (time) and number of unique profiles for the best model (m_{γ^*}).

Adverse Event	AMI	GIB	ALI	AKI
model	100	67	50	56
nb signals	9	10	26	25
positive controls	1	5	20	12
negative controls	1	0	0	0
time	1	3	3	5
m_{γ^*}	45	629	554	1024


The computing time has been strongly reduced by using the expression of the log-likelihood given in Appendix A. For example, by considering the best model resulting of the adverse event AMI where 9 variables have a non-zero coefficient, the database can be reduced to $m_{\gamma^*} = 45$ unique weighted individuals (see Appendix A). Moreover, since many different initialisations allow to find γ^* , the number of initialisations (set at 100 during the experiment) could be reduced. Finally, the list of the detected signals are presented in Appendix B.

4.5 Specific comments about the Lasso

We have seen that the Lasso obtains poor results when the penalty is determined according to the misclassification error. Caster *et al.* (2010) suggest to set the same penalty value for all the adverse events. Moreover, they use a disproportionality measure to evaluate the number of signals and thus to deduce the penalty value.

In order to investigate the Lasso approach features, we build a sequence of penalties to obtain different numbers of signals with the Lasso. The numbers of positive and negative controls resulting for each penalty values are indicated by the black lines of Figure 1.

Fig. 1 Rates of positive and negative controls obtained by the Lasso with different penalties (black curve) and obtained by the model maximizing the BIC criterion (red dots).



The results related to the model maximizing the BIC criterion are indicated by red dots. On Figure 1, it is very hard to find a penalty value from where results obtained a better trade off between the positive and the negative controls. If, for the same number of signals (70) as obtained by Algorithm 1, the Lasso approach presents slightly better performances, the corresponding penalty value does not result from an optimizing procedure. These figures can not be plotted in reality, since the nature of the signals are unknown. Thus, it seems more efficient to select the model maximizing the BIC criterion than to use a Lasso regression. Indeed, the penalty calibration is very difficult and the results related to the "best" penalty value are similar to those related to the model maximizing the BIC criterion. Moreover, this penalty value is not accessible in practice.


5 Discussion

In this paper, we have proposed a method for analysing individual spontaneous reporting databases, which also avoids the drawbacks of the disproportionality-based measures (co-prescription and masking effects). The signal detection is led throughout parsimonious logistic regressions whose sparsity degree is assessed as a model selection challenge. Therefore, we avoid the use of Lasso-type method that requires the challenging calibration of penalty. The combinatorial problem of model selection is bypassed by Metropolis-Hastings binary space sampling.

Despite to the difficulties for evaluating pharmacovigilance methods, the OMOP reference set of Ryan *et al.* (2013) gives us the opportunity to compare the proposed method to the reference approaches on real data. On these data, it appears to be relevant for the signal detection issue. However, many signals are not detected by our method. So, we conclude that this method should be used in parallel to existing measures in pharmacovigilance.

The proposed approach can manage the whole French pharmacovigilance database which consists of $n = 219,340$ individual notifications, $p = 2,114$ drugs and $d = 4,257$ adverse events. We have shown that the dimension of the model space is defined by the number of drugs verifying (5). Figure 2 presents the evolution of this number according to the headcount of the adverse events.

Fig. 2 Evolution of the number of drugs verifying (5) according to the headcount of the adverse event.



In the whole database, 75% of the adverse events can be associated to less than 42 drugs. For the adverse events which have less than 12 drugs verifying (5), we advise to use an exhaustive approach consisting of computing the BIC criterion for each competing models in Γ . The model selection on the whole French pharmacovigilance database is achieved at the cost of several days of computing time. The proposed approach can thus be used to investigate targeted adverse events. Finally, a preliminary drug selection could provide a reducing of computing time.

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to Ismaïl Ahmed for his useful advices. This work was supported by the French agency for drug safety.

References

- Ahmed, I. and Poncet, A. (2013). *PhViD: an R package for Pharmacovigilance signal Detection*. R package version 1.0.6.
- Ahmed, I., Haramburu, F., Fourrier-Réglat, A., Thiessard, F., Kreft-Jais, C., Miremont-Salamé, G., Bégaud, B., and Tubert-Bitter, P. (2009). Bayesian pharmacovigilance signal detection methods revisited in a multiple comparison setting. *Statistics in medicine*, **28**(13), 1774–1792.

- Ahmed, I., Dalmasso, C., Haramburu, F., Thiessard, F., Broët, P., and Tubert-Bitter, P. (2010). False discovery rate estimation for frequentist pharmacovigilance signal detection methods. *Biometrics*, **66**(1), 301–309.
- Almenoff, J., Pattishall, E., Gibbs, T., DuMouchel, W., Evans, S., and Yuen, N. (2007). Novel statistical tools for monitoring the safety of marketed drugs. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, **82**(2), 157–166.
- Bate, A., Lindquist, M., Edwards, I., Olsson, S., Orre, R., Lansner, A., and De Freitas, R. (1998). A bayesian neural network method for adverse drug reaction signal generation. *European journal of clinical pharmacology*, **54**(4), 315–321.
- Caster, O., Norén, G., Madigan, D., and Bate, A. (2010). Large-scale regression-based pattern discovery: The example of screening the who global drug safety database. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal*, **3**(4), 197–208.
- DuMouchel, W. (1999). Bayesian data mining in large frequency tables, with an application to the fda spontaneous reporting system. *The American Statistician*, **53**(3), 177–190.
- Evans, S., Waller, P., and Davis, S. (2001). Use of proportional reporting ratios (prrs) for signal generation from spontaneous adverse drug reaction reports. *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, **10**(6), 483–486.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **33**(1), 1–22.
- Harpaz, R., DuMouchel, W., LePendu, P., Bauer-Mehren, A., Ryan, P., and Shah, N. (2013). Performance of Pharmacovigilance Signal-Detection Algorithms for the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, **93**(6), 539–546.
- Nocedal, J. and Wright, S. (2006). *Numerical optimization*. Springer series in operations research and financial engineering. Springer, New York, NY, 2. ed. edition.
- Owen, A. B. and Roediger, P. A. (2014). The sign of the logistic regression coefficient. *The American Statistician*, **68**(4), 297–301.
- Robert, C. and Casella, G. (2004). *Monte Carlo statistical methods*. Springer Verlag.
- Ryan, P., Schuemie, M., Welebob, E., Duke, J., Valentine, S., and Hartzema, A. (2013). Defining a reference set to support methodological research in drug safety. *Drug safety*, **36**(1), 33–47.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics*, **6**(2), 461–464.
- Silvapulle, M. (1981). On the existence of maximum likelihood estimators for the binomial response models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, **43**(3), pp. 310–313.
- Szarfman, A., Machado, S., and Oneill, R. (2002). Use of screening algorithms and computer systems to efficiently signal higher-than-expected combinations of drugs and events in the us fdas spontaneous reports database. *Drug Safety*, **25**(6), 381–392.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, **58**(1), 267–288.
- Van Puijbroek, E., Bate, A., Leufkens, H., Lindquist, M., Orre, R., and Egberts, A. (2002). A comparison of measures of disproportionality for signal detection in spontaneous reporting systems for adverse drug reactions. *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, **11**(1), 3–10.

A Weighted form of the adverse event log-likelihood

Obviously, the coordinates of \mathbf{x}_i impacting the log-likelihood value are those belonging to \mathcal{D}_γ . For each observation \mathbf{x}_i , we denote by $\mathbf{x}_i^\gamma \in \mathbb{B}^{|\gamma|}$, where $|\gamma| = \sum_{j=1}^p \gamma_j$, the vector containing the elements of \mathbf{x}_i impacting the log-likelihood (*i.e.* the vector composed with the elements of \mathbf{x}_i such as index belongs to \mathcal{D}_γ). Thus, for each $j = 1, \dots, |\gamma|$:

$$x_{ij}^\gamma = x_{ij_0} \text{ with } j_0 = \min \left\{ j' : \sum_{j''=1}^{j'} \gamma_{j''} = j \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, many individual profiles $(\mathbf{x}_i^\gamma, y_i)$ occur many times in the database. We denote by m_γ the number of different profiles impacting the log-likelihood of model γ . The profile i is denoted by $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\gamma, \tilde{y}_i^\gamma)$ and its weight is denoted by w_i^γ . Thus, (3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_n(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}, \gamma, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m_\gamma} w_i^\gamma \tilde{y}_i^\gamma (\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{|\gamma|} \beta_j \tilde{x}_{ij}^\gamma) \\ &\quad - w_i \ln \left[1 + \exp \left(\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{|\gamma|} \beta_j \tilde{x}_{ij}^\gamma \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where β_j^γ is the j -th element which is not zero in β , so for each $j = 1, \dots, |\gamma|$:

$$\beta_j^\gamma = \beta_{j_0} \text{ with } j_0 = \min \left\{ j' : \sum_{j''=1}^{j'} \gamma_{j''} = j \right\}. \quad (16)$$

In practice, it is often more numerically efficient to compute the adverse event log-likelihood by using (15) than by using (3).

B Signals detected by the proposed methods

Table 7 presents the couples between a drug and an adverse events detected by the proposed method.

Table 7 List of the signals detected by the proposed method.

Adverse event	ATC	Headcount	β_j	Omop control
AMI	L03AB07	7	2.92	unknown
ALI	J05AE09	36	2.85	positive
AMI	N02CC03	6	2.6	positive
ALI	L01BB03	8	2.51	positive
AKI	M01AE09	46	2.27	unknown
ALI	C02KX01	65	2.25	positive
AMI	M01AH01	21	2.05	unknown
AMI	L01BC05	10	1.85	unknown
GIB	M01AC01	138	1.84	positive
AMI	J05AF05	92	1.84	unknown
GIB	B01AC04	523	1.77	positive
AKI	J05AF07	144	1.76	unknown
GIB	B01AC07	31	1.67	unknown
AKI	C09AA05	353	1.66	unknown
AKI	C09AA03	165	1.66	positive
AKI	C09CA08	35	1.65	positive
ALI	L02BB01	10	1.61	positive
ALI	J05AG01	297	1.55	positive
ALI	J02AC03	117	1.54	positive
AKI	C09AA02	146	1.51	positive
GIB	M01AE03	276	1.5	positive
AKI	C09AA10	38	1.49	unknown
AKI	N05AD08	10	1.48	unknown
AKI	L04AD01	91	1.38	positive
GIB	M01AE02	52	1.34	positive
ALI	J01XE01	52	1.33	positive
ALI	J04AB02	538	1.31	positive
AKI	C09CA07	34	1.31	positive
AKI	M01AE03	250	1.31	positive
AMI	L04AB02	13	1.29	unknown
AKI	L01BA01	129	1.28	unknown
ALI	A03AX13	26	1.25	unknown
ALI	A07EC01	71	1.24	unknown
AKI	L01BC05	57	1.18	unknown
AKI	C09CA06	139	1.16	positive
GIB	M01AH01	98	1.15	unknown
ALI	J02AC02	22	1.15	positive
AMI	B01AC04	24	1.14	unknown
ALI	J04AC01	359	1.08	positive
AKI	C09AA06	25	1.06	unknown
AKI	C09AA01	61	1.02	positive
ALI	N03AF01	248	0.99	positive
AKI	M01AE02	43	0.99	positive
ALI	D01AE15	77	0.98	positive
AMI	J05AF02	30	0.98	negative
ALI	L03AB07	27	0.98	positive
ALI	J02AC01	188	0.97	positive
ALI	G03CA03	76	0.96	unknown
AKI	J04AB02	104	0.96	unknown
GIB	A12BA01	155	0.94	positive
AKI	J01MA02	147	0.87	unknown
AMI	J05AF06	44	0.83	unknown
ALI	L01BA01	186	0.81	positive
AKI	M04AA01	220	0.77	positive
AKI	C03AA03	430	0.73	positive
AKI	M01AH01	72	0.68	unknown
GIB	C08DB01	81	0.63	unknown
AKI	A12BA01	154	0.62	unknown
ALI	A10BF01	36	0.61	unknown
AKI	M01AC01	47	0.59	positive
ALI	N03AG01	298	0.56	positive
ALI	J01MA06	60	0.54	positive
ALI	N05BA05	147	0.53	unknown
ALI	J05AF07	177	0.49	positive
ALI	M04AA01	216	0.45	positive
AKI	J01MA01	109	0.43	unknown
GIB	C08CA01	126	0.37	unknown
ALI	N06AB04	117	0.36	unknown
GIB	C09AA05	148	0.35	unknown
ALI	M01AE03	200	0.31	unknown
ALI	J01MA02	202	0.31	positive