

#### Learning spatiotemporal piecewise-geodesic trajectories from longitudinal manifold-valued data

Juliette Chevallier, Stéphane Oudard, Stéphanie Allassonnière

#### ▶ To cite this version:

Juliette Chevallier, Stéphane Oudard, Stéphanie Allassonnière. Learning spatiotemporal piecewisegeodesic trajectories from longitudinal manifold-valued data. Neural Information Processing Systems, Dec 2017, Long Beach, United States. hal-01646617v1

#### HAL Id: hal-01646617 https://hal.science/hal-01646617v1

Submitted on 23 Nov 2017 (v1), last revised 12 Dec 2017 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



#### Overview

We introduce a **hierarchical model** which allows to estimate both a group-representative piecewisegeodesic trajectory in the **Riemannian** space of shape and inter-individual variability. Following the approach of [3], we estimate a **representative piecewise-geodesic trajectory** of the global progression and together with **spacial and temporal inter-individual variabilities**. We first introduce our model in its most generic formulation and then make it explicit for RECIST [4] score monitoring, *i.e.* for one-dimension manifolds and piecewise-logistically distributed data.

# Medical context – RECIST score

- New anti-angiogenic therapies. Patients suffering from the metastatic kidney cancer take a drug each day [1];
- Tumoral growth. The RECIST score (Response Evaluation Criteria In Solid Tumors) is a set of published rules that measures the tumoral growth;
- *Patient's response.* The response to a given treatment has generally two distinct phases: first, tumor's size reduces; then, the tumor grows again;
- Moreover, a practical question is to quantify the correlation between both phases and to accurately determine when the patient's response escape to treatment.



Figure 1: After 600 iterations. First 8 patients among the 176

**Longitudinal dataset**: Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  individuals and  $(k_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1,n \rrbracket}$ , we observe the sequences  $t = (t_{i,j})_{j \in \llbracket 1,k_i \rrbracket}^{i \in \llbracket 1,n \rrbracket} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and  $y = (y_{i,j})_{i \in [1,k_i]}^{i \in [1,n]} \in \mathbb{R}^{kd}$  where  $k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i$ .

Data points are seen as noisy samples along trajectories.

Real data consists of RECIST scores of a drove of 176 patients of the HEGP, with an average of 7 visits per subjects (min:3, max:22).

# Learning spatiotemporal piecewise-geodesic trajectories from longitudinal manifold-valued data

Juliette Chevallier, Stéphane Oudard and Stéphanie Allassonnière

# CMAP, École polytechnique – Oncology departement, HEGP – CRC, Université Paris Descartes

### Mixed-effects model for piecewise-geodesically distributed data

Group-representative trajectory  $\gamma_0$ . Given  $m \in$  $\mathbb{N}^*$  and  $t_R = \left(-\infty < t_R^1 < \ldots < t_R^{m-1} < +\infty\right)$ , we build  $\gamma_0$  in order it to be geodesic on each  $[t_R^{\ell-1}, t_R^{\ell}]$ .

• Let  $M_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  a geodesically complete manifold,  $(\bar{\gamma}_0^\ell)_{\ell \in [\![1,m]\!]}$  a family of geodesics on  $M_0$  and  $(\phi_0^\ell)_{\ell \in [\![1,m]\!]}$ a family of isometries defined on  $M_0$ ;

$$\forall \ell \in [1, m] \text{ we set } M_0^\ell = \phi_0^\ell(M_0) \text{ and } \gamma_0^\ell = \phi_0^\ell \circ \bar{\gamma}_0^\ell;$$

**3** A piecewise-geodesic curve. We define  $\gamma_0$  as

$$\gamma_0 = \gamma_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{]-\infty, t_R^1]} + \sum_{\ell=2}^{m-1} \gamma_0^{\ell} \mathbb{1}_{]t_R^{\ell-1}, t_R^{\ell}]} + \gamma_0^m \mathbb{1}_{]t_R^{m-1}, +\infty[};$$

• Boundary conditions. We impose boundary conditions on the rupture times to ensure continuity.

**3** Last,  $\forall \ell \in [1, m]$  we set  $\gamma_i^{\ell} = \phi_i^{\ell} \circ \gamma_0^{\ell} \circ \psi_i^{\ell}$  and  $= \gamma_i^1 \mathbb{1}_{]-\infty,t_{R,i}^1]} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \gamma_i^{\ell} \mathbb{1}_{]t_{R,i}^{\ell-1},t_{R,i}^{\ell}]} + \gamma_i^m \mathbb{1}_{]t_{R,i}^{m-1},+\infty[};$ 

$$\gamma_i$$
 =

## Chemotherapy monitoring: Piecewise-logistic curve model



Figure 2: From average to individual path. Boundary conditions and transition from  $\gamma_0$  to  $\gamma_i$  through spacial and temporal warps.



### Parameters estimation with the MCMC-SAEM algorithm

### Existence of the MAP

Given the piecewise-geodesic model and the choice of probability distributions for the parameters and latent variables of the model, for any dataset (t, y), there exists  $\theta_{MAP} \in \operatorname{argmax} q(\theta|y)$ .

• Parameters. We assume that  $z_{pop} \sim \mathcal{N}(\overline{z_{pop}}, \Sigma_{pop})$ where  $\Sigma_{pop}$  is a diagonal matrix with small fixed entries [2] and that  $z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$  where  $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_6(\mathbb{R})$ . Let  $\theta = \left(\overline{\gamma_0^{\text{init}}}, \overline{\gamma_0^{\text{escap}}}, \overline{\gamma_0^{\text{fin}}}, \overline{t_R}, \overline{t_1}, \Sigma, \sigma\right);$ 

• Hierarchical model. Let  $z = (z_{pop}, z_i)_{i \in [1,n]}$ . We have

where

Individual trajectories  $(\gamma_i)_{i \in [\![1,n]\!]}$ . Let  $i \in [\![1,n]\!]$ . We build  $\gamma_i$  to derive from  $\gamma_0$  through spatiotemporal transformations.

• Time warps  $(\psi_i^{\ell})_{\ell \in [\![1,m]\!]}$ . We choose affine time warps constrains by the continuity of each individual paths;

• Space warps  $(\phi_i^{\ell})_{\ell \in [\![1,m]\!]}$  have to be defined in view of applications. We require  $\phi_i^{\ell} \circ \gamma_0^{\ell}(t_R^{\ell}) = \phi_i^{\ell+1} \circ \gamma_0^{\ell+1}(t_R^{\ell});$ 

• Gaussian noise.  $\forall j \in [1, k_i], y_{i,j} = \gamma_i(t_{i,j}) + \varepsilon_{i,j}$  where  $\varepsilon_{i,i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), \, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+.$ 

Our observations consist of patient's RECIST score over time. So, we set m = 2, d = 1 and  $M_0 = [0, 1]$  equipped with the logistic metric. Let  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $i \in [1, n]$ .

• Representative trajectory  $\gamma_0$ . Let  $\gamma_0^{\text{init}}, \gamma_0^{\text{escap}}, \gamma_0^{\text{fin}} \in \mathbb{R}$ . We map  $M_0$  onto  $\gamma_0^{\text{escap}}, \gamma_0^{\text{init}}$  and  $\gamma_0^{\text{escap}}, \gamma_0^{\text{fin}}$  through affine transformations and require that  $\gamma_0^1(t_0) = \gamma_0^{\text{init}} - \nu$ ,  $\gamma_0^1(t_R) = \gamma_0^2(t_R) = \gamma_0^{\text{escap}} + \nu \text{ and } \gamma_0^2(t_1) = \gamma_0^{\text{fin}} - \nu;$ 

• Time warps  $(\psi_i^1, \phi_i^2)$ . We set  $\alpha_i^{\ell} = e^{\xi_i^{\ell}}, \ell \in \{1, 2\}$ ;

• Space warps  $(\phi_i^1, \phi_i^2)$ . Given  $(\rho_i^1, \rho_i^2, \delta_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , we set  $\phi_i^{\ell} \colon x \mapsto e^{\rho_i^{\ell}} (x - \gamma_0(t_R)) + \gamma_0(t_R) + \delta_i, \ \ell \in \{1, 2\}$ .

$$\begin{cases} y \mid z, \theta \sim \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{k_{i}} \mathcal{N}\left(\gamma_{i}(t_{i,j}), \sigma^{2}\right) \\ z \mid \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\overline{z_{\text{pop}}}, \Sigma_{\text{pop}}) \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \\ (\Sigma, \sigma) \sim \mathcal{W}^{-1}\left(V, m_{\Sigma}\right) \otimes \mathcal{W}^{-1}\left(v, m_{\sigma}\right) \end{cases}$$

$$V \in \mathcal{S}_{6}(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } v, m_{\Sigma}, m_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R} :$$

 $\in \mathcal{O}_6(\mathbb{K})$  and  $v, m_{\Sigma}, m_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{K}$ ;

We use a Symmetric Random Walk • Estimation. Hastings-Metropolis sampler in a stochastic version of the EM algorithm.

Synthetic data. Experiments are performed for the piecewise-logistic model.

Table 1: Mean (standard deviation) of relative error (expressed as a percentage) for the population parameters  $\overline{z_{pop}}$  and the residual standard deviation  $\sigma$  for 50 runs according to the sample size n.

n	50	100	150
$\overline{\gamma_0^{ ext{init}}}$	1.63 (1.46)	2.42 (1.50)	2.14(1.17)
$\overline{\gamma_0^{ ext{escap}}}$	9.45 $(5.40)$	9.07 (5.19)	11.40 (5.72)
$\overline{\gamma_0^{ ext{fin}}}$	6.23 (2.25)	7.82(2.43)	5.82 (2.55)
$\overline{t_R}$	11.58(1.64)	13.62 (1.31)	9.24 (1.63)
$\overline{t_1}$	4.41  (0.75)	5.27 (0.60)	$3.42 \ (0.71)$
$\sigma$	25.24(12.84)	10.35 (3.96)	2.83(2.31)



Figure 3: Individual random effects. Figure 3a:  $\xi_i^1$  and  $\xi_i^2$  against  $\tau_i$ . Figure 3b:  $\rho_i^1$  and  $\rho_i^2$  against  $\delta_i$ . In both figure, the color corresponds to the individual rupture time  $t_B^i$ .

50
40
30
20
10

Figure 4: Distribution of the individual rupture times  $t_B^i$ . In black bold line, the estimated average rupture time  $t_R$ .

This work was supported by the public grant Investissement d'Avenir, project ANR-11 LBX-0056-LMH, and the Fondation of Medical Research, project DBI20131228564.





#### **Experimental results**

**Real data.** Figure 1 illustrates the qualitative performance of the model on the first 8 patients. Individual



#### References

[1] Escudier, Porta, Schmidinger, Rioux-Leclercq, Bex, Khoo, Gruenvald, and Horwich, Renal cell carcinoma: Esmo clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Annals of Oncology **27** (2016), no. suppl 5, v58–v68.

[2] Kuhn and Lavielle, Maximum likelihood estimation in nonlinear mixed effects models, Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 49 (2005), no. 4, 1020–1038.

[3] Schiratti, Allassonniere, Colliot, and Durrleman, Learning spatiotemporal trajectories from manifold-valued longitudinal data, Neural Information Processing Systems 28, 2015.

[4] Therasse, Arbuck, Eisenhauer, Wanders, Kaplan, Rubinstein, Verweij, Van Glabbeke, van Oosterom, Christian, and Gwyther, New guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors, Journal of the National Cancer Institute **92** (2000), no. 3, 205–216.

#### Acknowledgements