

## **Applications of Machine Learning in Decision Analysis for Dose Management for Dofetilide**

Andrew E. Levy, MD<sup>1</sup>; Minakshi Biswas, MD<sup>1</sup>; Rachel Weber, BS<sup>2</sup>; Khaldoun Tarakji, MD<sup>3</sup>; Mina Chung, MD<sup>3</sup>; Peter A. Noseworthy, MD<sup>4</sup>; Christopher Newton-Cheh, MD, MPH<sup>5</sup>; Michael A. Rosenberg, MD<sup>1,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Cardiology, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, USA

<sup>2</sup>Division of Biostatistics and Informatics, Colorado School of Public Health, Aurora, CO, USA

<sup>3</sup>Center for Atrial Fibrillation, Section of Cardiac Pacing and Electrophysiology, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Cleveland, OH, USA

<sup>4</sup>Robert D. and Patricia E. Kern Center for the Science of Health Care Delivery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

<sup>5</sup>Cardiovascular Research Center, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

<sup>6</sup>Colorado Center for Personalized Medicine, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, USA

## Abstract

Initiation of the antiarrhythmic medication dofetilide requires an FDA-mandated 3 days of telemetry monitoring due to heightened risk of toxicity within this time period. Although a recommended dose management algorithm for dofetilide exists, there is a range of real-world approaches to dosing the medication. In this multicenter investigation, we examined the decision process for dose adjustment of dofetilide during the observation period using machine-learning approaches, including supervised, unsupervised, and reinforcement learning applications. Logistic regression approaches identified any dose-adjustment as a strong negative predictor of successful loading (i.e., discharged on dofetilide) of the medication (OR 0.19, 95%CI 0.12 – 0.31,  $p < 0.001$  for discharge on dofetilide), indicating that these adjustments are strong determinants of whether patients “tolerate” the medication. Using multiple supervised approaches, including regularized logistic regression, random forest, boosted gradient decision trees, and neural networks, we were unable to identify any model that predicted dose adjustments better than a naïve approach. A reinforcement-learning algorithm, in contrast, predicted which patient characteristics and dosing decisions that resulted in the lowest risk of failure to be discharged on the medication. Future studies could apply this algorithm prospectively to examine improvement over standard approaches.

## Introduction

Decision analysis is an emerging field that uses outcomes from different decision approaches to guide future decision-making<sup>1</sup>. In many cases, medical decisions can be formulated as Markov-decision processes (MDPs), in which a given state of conditions can predict future states based on a model for decision-making<sup>2</sup>. Reinforcement learning, a subset of machine learning (ML), expands on MDPs by embedding reward-based feedback into decision outcomes so that an optimal decision approach, termed the policy, can be identified<sup>3</sup>. In recent years, this approach has achieved supra-human success rates in video and board games, among other applications<sup>4, 5</sup>.

Reinforcement learning is one of three main categories of ML gaining popularity in medical applications, the other two being supervised and unsupervised learning<sup>6</sup>. Supervised applications use an example dataset to learn general rules (an algorithm) about the relationship of predictor variables (termed “features”) to an outcome of interest (termed a “label”). These general rules can then be applied to a new dataset to predict outcomes. Unsupervised learning, in contrast, does not use labelled outcomes and, instead, discovers relationships between different features on its own. The discovery process often restructures data into new classes, “shrinking” and consolidating features for more nimble use in supervised applications. In many applications, these methods complement each other, but whereas supervised and unsupervised methods lead to *descriptive* analyses, *feedback* from outcomes allows reinforcement learning to produce *prescriptive* analyses<sup>7</sup>. For this reason, reinforcement learning holds great promise as a tool to enrich clinical decisions. Currently, however, there are relatively few published applications in healthcare<sup>8, 9</sup>.

Dofetilide is a common antiarrhythmic medication primarily used to treat atrial fibrillation. It is one of the few anti-arrhythmic medications other than amiodarone that has been approved for use in patients with coronary artery disease or cardiomyopathy. A known effect of the drug, however, is QT prolongation. Due to the risk of resultant fatal arrhythmias, the FDA has mandated a 3-day monitoring period for drug initiation<sup>10</sup>. There is a recommended algorithm for making dose adjustments during initiation, but these adjustments are still made at the treating provider’s discretion<sup>10, 11</sup>. In this investigation, we examine the patterns of dofetilide dose adjustment and the role of machine learning to develop algorithms aimed at successful initiation of the medication.

## **Methods**

### Study population

The Antiarrhythmic Drug Genetic (AADGEN) study is a multi-center collaboration that includes investigators from the Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH, Boston, MA), Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (Boston, MA), the Boston-area Veterans Affairs Medical Center (West Roxbury, MA), the Cleveland Clinic (Cleveland, OH), the Mayo Clinic (Rochester, MN), and the University of Colorado Hospital (Aurora, CO). Patients were enrolled from July 7, 2014 to September 19, 2018, with the inclusion criterion being any patient admitted to in-patient telemetry for monitoring of initiation of dofetilide. The exclusion criteria included failure to provide written informed consent and failure to obtain a pre-dofetilide ECG. Massachusetts General Hospital served as the study's coordinating center for this investigation. Internal Review Board approval was obtained at all enrolling centers. This study is a sub-study of a larger investigation into the genetic predictors of cardiac repolarization and drug toxicity of antiarrhythmic medications (Clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT02439658).

Demographic and clinical information were obtained on all study participants that included age, height, weight, body mass index (BMI), medications, past medical and cardiac history, including history of pacemaker/defibrillator, atrial fibrillation, ventricular fibrillation, left ventricular function from transthoracic echocardiogram, recent lab values including creatinine, potassium, and magnesium, and electrocardiograms that include underlying rhythm, rate, and relevant intervals (PR, QRS, QT). QT interval was corrected for heart rate using Fridericia's formula<sup>12</sup>. The timing of electrical cardioversion was also recorded.

The outcome of interest was successful discharge on dofetilide at any dose after at least 5 administrations. Data for all participants was collected retrospectively, after completion of the hospitalization; no clinical adjustments or changes were made by treating physicians as part of this investigation. Data was maintained in a centralized RedCap database managed by the study coordinating center at MGH.

### Data Processing

Prior to analysis, quality control was performed by study investigators, with manual review of outlier values for ECG parameters (i.e., QTc > 600 ms) and for discordant data values (e.g., PR interval on an ECG with rhythm listed as 'atrial fibrillation'). When resolution or validation was not possible, values were replaced as missing. Summary and descriptive statistics are based on analysis of non-missing data; only 4.2% of the total dataset was missing. Due to the restrictions of machine-learning algorithms for complete datasets, missing values needed to be imputed with the median for numerical and integer values and most common for categorical. Categorical variables were also coded using 'one-hot' encoding and numerical variables were rescaled using min-max rescaling. Dose adjustments were only included if they were a decrease in dose from a higher dose, as FDA guidelines for dofetilide initiation are for starting at the highest dose based on kidney function, and adjusting downward based on the QT changes on ECG; as such, any dose increase during the hospitalization was off-label. Based on this criterion, 14 patients who underwent dose increases were excluded. For all model evaluations, data was split into training (80% of total data) and testing sets (20% of total data) at the patient level.

### Unsupervised Analysis

For unsupervised analysis, we first performed principal component analysis. Based on these plots, we determined that 8 clusters captured > 90% of the variability in the data. We then used a K-means approach to create these clusters for use in subsequent reinforcement learning analyses.

### Supervised Analysis

Basic stepwise logistic regression was performed for successful initiation of dofetilide using a p value for exclusion of 0.05. Based on the observation that dose adjustments were a significant predictor of successful initiation, we used ensemble methods to develop predictive models of dose adjustment process. These models included L1 regularized logistic regression, random forest classification, a boosted decision tree classifier, support vector classification (radial basis function kernel), and K-nearest neighbors classification with a maximum of 10 neighbors. Comparison measures included accuracy, precision and recall scores, F<sub>1</sub>-score<sup>13, 14</sup>, and area under ROC curve.

### Reinforcement Learning

We next applied reinforcement learning using the SARSA algorithm (state–action–reward–state–action) for selecting dose adjustments based on a negative reward for unsuccessful initiation<sup>15</sup>. We applied two broad approaches to creation of action-value estimates (i.e., Q values)<sup>16</sup>. First, we defined 8 states created using K-means clustering from all clinical features (Table 4), and performed tabular updates to a Q table based on dynamic programming (step-by-step updates). Alternatively, we performed linear function approximation for the Q values using linear weights (termed ‘Q learning’<sup>17</sup>), with updates using stochastic gradient descent based on experience<sup>15</sup>. The available actions in the Q value estimates included ‘continue the same dose’ or ‘decrease the dose’. The reward was -10 for doses leading to stopping of the medication (last dose before stopping) and 0 for all other doses.

The SARSA algorithm<sup>15</sup> updates a Q table with expected reward values based on state and action selected based on the following variation of the Bellman equation<sup>15</sup>:

$$Q_{\text{new}}(S_t, A_t) = Q_{\text{old}}(S_t, A_t) + \alpha * [(R_t + \gamma * Q(S_{t+1}, A_{t+1})) - Q_{\text{old}}(S_t, A_t)]$$

The Q table was initialized at 0 for all values, with gamma (discount factor) of different values ranging from 0.1 to 1.0, and alpha (learning rate) of 0.1. Of note, a gamma close to 1 puts more weight on future states and rewards while a gamma of close to 0 tends to put more weight on immediate rewards. Reinforcement learning algorithms were fitted with the testing set (see above) and compared with actual decisions on the held-out test set.

### Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis, including chi-square for categorical and t-test for continuous comparison, as well as univariate logistic regression, was performed using Stata IC, Version 15.1 (StataCorp, LLC, College Station, TX). Machine learning, including unsupervised, supervised, and reinforcement learning algorithms, were performed using Python 3, running scripts on Jupyter notebook (v5.0.0) deployed via Anaconda Navigator, on a MacPro laptop computer (High Sierra, v10.13.6). Primary source of machine learning packages was *scikit-learn* (see *Supplemental Methods* for details).

### **Results**

The baseline characteristics of the cohort are shown in Table 1. A total of 356 subjects were enrolled, with successful initiation (discharged on dofetilide) in 310 (87.1%) and unsuccessful in 44. Use of calcium channel blockers and initial dose of dofetilide were different between patients with successful vs. unsuccessful initiation of dofetilide, although none of these p values reached statistical significance after Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing ( $\alpha = p/(\# \text{ of rows in Table 1}) = 0.05/24 = 0.002$ ). There were no other differences in baseline parameters between patients.

Figure 1 shows representative dosing approaches for dofetilide, as well as timing of cardioversions. The most common dose regimens included subjects with no adjustments throughout the 5-6 dose course in order to obtain a steady-state of the medication. Stepwise univariate regression was performed for successful initiation across the course of dofetilide initiation, which revealed that dose number, dose amount, dose adjustment, ejection fraction, history of heart failure, sinus rhythm, QRS, QTc, presence of a pacemaker, and coronary artery disease were predictors of successful discharge on dofetilide at  $p < 0.05$  (Table 2). The strongest predictors for successful initiation of dofetilide (i.e., discharge on the medication) were starting dose of 500 mcg (OR 5.0, 2.5-10.0,  $p < 0.001$ ) and dose adjustment during initiation (OR 0.19, 0.21-0.31,  $p < 0.001$ ), which was a negative predictor. Because it had such a strong effect, we selected dose adjustment as the target for machine learning approaches.

Unsupervised analysis was performed across 25 predictors, in which we noted that the first two principal components (PCs) accounted for 65.0% of the total variance (Figure 2A), with over 90% of the total variance explained by the first 8 PCs. Qualitative assessment of these PCs revealed that there was apparent clustering along the first PC into 6 groups, which likely represent the dose number (Figure 2B).

None of the supervised analyses resulted in improvement in identification of a medication adjustment by providers over a naïve approach (always no adjustment), as shown in Table 3.

After training the model on the training set (80% of data), the accuracy of a tabular reinforcement-learning model for predicting actual decisions on the testing set (20%) was good, with only 25/410 (6.1%) disagreement noted. Sensitivity analysis using a range of learning rates ( $\alpha$ ) and discount rates ( $\gamma$ ) had no impact on the accuracy of

prediction; only the absolute Q values changed (not relative values). The least disagreement was observed in the Q table cluster with the smallest (most negative) values for rewards.

A linear reinforcement-learning policy function was able to achieve equal accuracy to tabular learning for certain hyper-parameter choices (alpha and gamma). Unlike the tabular learning model, however, the linear model was highly labile depending on hyper-parameter choices (Supplemental Figure 1). These models also had unstable weight estimates (See Supplemental Table 1) across parameters.

## Discussion

In this investigation of decision-making surrounding dofetilide initiation, we examined several approaches for evaluating dose adjustment decisions. It is important to note that while dofetilide initiation is performed in the hospital primarily for safety reasons (adverse event monitoring), the goal of these admissions is successful initiation of the drug (discharge on dofetilide) while minimizing the risk of subsequent TdP or potentially fatal ventricular arrhythmias<sup>11</sup>. With this in mind, there are important insights to be drawn from this novel application of advanced analytics and machine learning to decision-making surrounding dofetilide initiation.

First, it was evident from several models that making dose adjustments, particularly at later time points, was associated with less probability of successful initiation of the medication. This association was evident in both simple logistic regression models, as well as reinforcement-learning models in which the cluster with the most negative reward (#5) was composed of doses at a later state in the hospitalization (dose 4-5 vs. 1-2), and of smaller size. This finding suggests that making a decision to lower the dose of dofetilide in a patient who has already received 3-4 doses and is already on a lower dose (250 or 125mcg) is very unlikely to result in successful initiation. While further work is needed to validate these models prospectively, this finding could have an important impact on reducing healthcare costs. It would save time and money to stop the initiation process early in a patient in whom the probability of successful initiation is unlikely, rather than staying another day or night in the hospital, or perhaps start at a lower dose in patients at higher risk of an unsuccessful initiation.



Second, we found that none of the supervised learning algorithms were able to improve prediction about providers' dose decisions based on the clinical information available. In other words, we were unable to 'mimic' the decisions of providers using a statistical model when it came to making dose adjustments of dofetilide. This finding suggests that future efforts based on a gold standard of human decision-making may not lead to the desired outcomes of creating a computer algorithm to replace humans in the process, and that focusing efforts on approaches using reinforcement learning may be a better option.

The key difference of reinforcement learning is that it allows the computer to 'learn' its own approach to obtain a given reward, rather than relying on human behavior as the gold standard. This finding has already been noted in creation of algorithms to win at the board game Go<sup>4, 18</sup>, in which the AlphaGo algorithm based on supervised learning of human decisions<sup>18</sup> was bested by the AlphaGoZero algorithm, which learned entirely on its own, without attempting to replicate human decisions<sup>4</sup>. Reinforcement learning is only in its infancy in applications outside of computer games<sup>5</sup>, but there is clearly an opportunity for this approach to greatly improve on clinical decision-making. A number of investigators have recently used this approach to enhance decision-making in clinical care<sup>19</sup>, including in the intensive care unit<sup>20</sup>.

Finally, our study also highlighted a key limitation in applications of machine learning in healthcare data, in which the practical process of data and technology integration limits the ability to build better learning systems. This study was entirely observational, which is in great contrast with most other reinforcement learning applications in which the learning agent is able to practice and improve its policy based on interaction with the environment. A key principle in reinforcement learning is exploration<sup>15</sup>, in which better policies can be found by randomly attempting a new action that has been found to already provide the best reward. Without the ability to act on behalf of the policies learned, we were unable to determine if these actions are truly the optimal ones, or if there are conditions in which a decision to change the dose (perhaps at an earlier time in the loading course) could result in a greater likelihood of successful initiation. Whether this limitation was also responsible for the lack of convergence we observed using linear function approximation, which has been described in other circumstances<sup>21, 22</sup>, remains to be determined. Only through future prospective applications

can we verify that the approach applied in this study is the best method to maximize likelihood of successful dofetilide initiation.

### Limitations

There were a number of key limitations in this study. First, we did not examine long-term outcomes, including recurrence of AF or drug toxicity, including *torsade de pointes*. This latter limitation is of obvious importance, as the ultimate goal of the 3-day monitoring period is to prevent toxicity<sup>11</sup>; however, there are benefits to identification of factors and approaches to maximize safe initiation of dofetilide as we identified, which can lead to improved patient satisfaction and cost savings. A second limitation was that our investigation was limited to the modest number of covariates collected on patients undergoing dofetilide initiation. To truly capture the benefits of many methods of machine learning, particularly deep learning, we would need to have a much larger number of patients and variables to include in the model. In the future, through more efficient data collection and storage, especially of high-density data such as telemetry information, we will be able to further leverage these 'big data' methods to improve healthcare decision-making<sup>23, 24</sup>. Finally, as discussed above, we were unable to prospectively apply and further improve the policy models developed from the observations in this data. Future implementations of these models within a reinforcement learning framework will be needed to determine if this approach is optimal, or if there are better algorithms for ensuring safe and efficient initiation of dofetilide and other medications.

In conclusion, we found that although most patients admitted for initiation of dofetilide are able to successfully complete the loading protocol (i.e., discharged on dofetilide), reinforcement learning approaches to model dose adjustments offer promise to optimize decision making. Future investigations are needed to explore this emerging approach to machine learning and automated clinical decision support.

### **Acknowledgements**

This work was supported by grants from the NIH NHLBI (MAR: 5K23 HL127296, CNC: R01 HL 143070).

### **References**

1. Hogendoorn W, Moll FL, Sumpio BE and Hunink MG. Clinical Decision Analysis and Markov Modeling for Surgeons: An Introductory Overview. *Annals of surgery*. 2016;264:268-74.

2. Alagoz O, Hsu H, Schaefer AJ and Roberts MS. Markov decision processes: a tool for sequential decision making under uncertainty. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical Decision Making*. 2010;30:474-83.
3. Kaelbling LP, Littman ML and AW. M. Reinforcement Learning: A Survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*. 1996:237-85.
4. Silver D, Schrittwieser J, Simonyan K, Antonoglou I, Huang A, Guez A, Hubert T, Baker L, Lai M, Bolton A, Chen Y, Lillicrap T, Hui F, Sifre L, van den Driessche G, Graepel T and Hassabis D. Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*. 2017;550:354-359.
5. Mnih V, Kavukcuoglu K, Silver D, Rusu AA, Veness J, Bellemare MG, Graves A, Riedmiller M, Fidjeland AK, Ostrovski G, Petersen S, Beattie C, Sadik A, Antonoglou I, King H, Kumaran D, Wierstra D, Legg S and Hassabis D. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*. 2015;518:529-33.
6. Krittana Wong C, Zhang H, Wang Z, Aydar M and Kitai T. Artificial Intelligence in Precision Cardiovascular Medicine. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2017;69:2657-2664.
7. Johnson KW, Torres Soto J, Glicksberg BS, Shameer K, Miotto R, Ali M, Ashley E and Dudley JT. Artificial Intelligence in Cardiology. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;71:2668-2679.
8. Shortreed SM, Laber E, Lizotte DJ, Stroup TS, Pineau J and Murphy SA. Informing sequential clinical decision-making through reinforcement learning: an empirical study. *Machine learning*. 2011;84:109-136.
9. Prasad N, Cheng LF, Chivers C, Draugelis M and B. E. A reinforcement learning approach to weaning of mechanical ventilation in intensive care units. *arXiv* 2017; <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.06300>.
10. Tikosyn [Prescribing information]. 2011.
11. Naksuk N, Sugrue AM, Padmanabhan D, Kella D, DeSimone CV, Kapa S, Asirvatham SJ, Lee HC, Ackerman MJ and Noseworthy PA. Potentially modifiable factors of dofetilide-associated risk of torsades de pointes among hospitalized patients with atrial fibrillation. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. 2018.
12. Funck-Brentano C and Jaillon P. Rate-corrected QT interval: techniques and limitations. *Am J Cardiol*. 1993;72:17b-22b.
13. Chai KE, Anthony S, Coiera E and Magrabi F. Using statistical text classification to identify health information technology incidents. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*. 2013;20:980-5.
14. J D and M. G. The relationship between Precision-Recall and ROC curves. *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. 2006:233-40.
15. Sutton RS and AG B. *Reinforcement Learning*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2018.
16. Vassiliades V, Cleanthous A and Christodoulou C. Multiagent reinforcement learning: spiking and nonspiking agents in the iterated Prisoner's Dilemma. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*. 2011;22:639-53.
17. Qiao J, Wang G, Li W and Chen M. An adaptive deep Q-learning strategy for handwritten digit recognition. *Neural networks : the official journal of the International Neural Network Society*. 2018;107:61-71.
18. Silver D, Huang A, Maddison CJ, Guez A, Sifre L, van den Driessche G, Schrittwieser J, Antonoglou I, Panneershelvam V, Lanctot M, Dieleman S, Grewe D, Nham J, Kalchbrenner N, Sutskever I, Lillicrap T, Leach M, Kavukcuoglu K, Graepel T and Hassabis D. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*. 2016;529:484-9.
19. Yom-Tov E, Feraru G, Kozdoba M, Mannor S, Tennenholtz M and Hochberg I. Encouraging Physical Activity in Patients With Diabetes: Intervention Using a Reinforcement Learning System. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2017;19:e338.

20. Komorowski M, Celi LA, Badawi O, Gordon AC and Faisal AA. The Artificial Intelligence Clinician learns optimal treatment strategies for sepsis in intensive care. *Nat Med*. 2018;24:1716-1720.
21. Boyan JAaM, Andrew W. Generalization in reinforcement learning: Safely approximating the value function. *NIPS*. 1995:pp. 369–376.
22. Tsitsiklis JNaVR, Benjamin. An analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*. 1997;42:674–690.
23. Attia ZI, Sugrue A, Asirvatham SJ, Ackerman MJ, Kapa S, Friedman PA and Noseworthy PA. Noninvasive assessment of dofetilide plasma concentration using a deep learning (neural network) analysis of the surface electrocardiogram: A proof of concept study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13:e0201059.
24. Sugrue A, Kremen V, Qiang B, Sheldon SH, DeSimone CV, Sapir Y, Striemer BL, Brady P, Asirvatham SJ, Ackerman MJ, Friedman P and Noseworthy PA. Electrocardiographic Predictors of Torsadogenic Risk During Dofetilide or Sotalol Initiation: Utility of a Novel T Wave Analysis Program. *Cardiovascular drugs and therapy / sponsored by the International Society of Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy*. 2015;29:433-41.

**Table 1. Baseline demographics**

		Successful initiation (N = 310)	Unsuccessful initiation (N = 44)	P value
Age (Mean ± SD)		66.6 ± 10.7	67.7 ± 9.7	0.53
Female Sex (%)		91 (29.4%)	18 (40.9%)	0.12
BMI (Mean ± SD)		30.2 ± 7.2	29.6 ± 7.5	0.57
History of:				
	AF	297 (95.8%)	44 (100%)	0.17
	VT	12 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	0.18
	PPM	20 (6.5%)	3 (6.8%)	0.93
	ICD	20 (6.5%)	3 (6.8%)	0.93
	HTN	142 (45.8%)	18 (40.9%)	0.54
	DM	38 (12.2%)	3 (6.8%)	0.29
	CAD	68 (21.9%)	7 (15.9%)	0.36
	CHF	35 (11.3%)	8 (18.2%)	0.19
LV EF (%)		54.8 ± 12.3	50.9 ± 16.2	0.10
Medications:				
	Beta blockers	117 (57.1%)	27 (61.4%)	0.59
	Calcium channel blockers	67 (21.6%)	17 (38.6%)	0.01
Baseline lab values:				
	Potassium	4.3 ± 0.47	4.4 ± 0.36	0.28
	Magnesium	2.0 ± 0.26	2.0 ± 0.19	0.98
	Creatinine	1.01 ± 0.25	1.04 ± 0.28	0.46
Baseline ECG:				
	Sinus Rhythm (%)	114 (37.8%)	12 (27.3%)	0.18
	HR	80.8 ± 20.5	86.3 ± 24.0	0.11
	PR	179.2 ± 40.8	190.2 ± 56.9	0.39
	QRS	102.4 ± 25.8	98.8 ± 25.1	0.38
	QT	428.2 ± 50.4	436.5 ± 59.4	0.33
	QTc	445.0 ± 39.2	451.9 ± 39.2	0.25
Initial Dose				
	500 mcg	227 (73.5%)	25 (56.8%)	0.02
	250 mcg	74 (24.0%)	16 (36.4%)	-
	125 mcg	4 (1.3%)	3 (6.8%)	-

Note: Dose excludes 4 patients with different starting dose than listed. Chi-square for dose based on distribution of all doses. None of the values reached statistical significance based on  $p < 0.002$  (Bonferroni correction).

**Table 2. Association with successful loading of dofetilide**

	<b>OR</b>	<b>CI</b>	<b>p value</b>
<b>500mcg dose*</b>	5.0	2.5 – 10.0	<0.001
<b>250 mcg dose*</b>	1.5	0.8 – 2.9	0.21
<b>Dose number</b>	1.3	1.1 – 1.5	0.001
<b>Dose adjustment</b>	0.19	0.12 – 0.31	< 0.001
<b>Sinus rhythm</b>	2.8	1.8 – 4.2	< 0.001
<b>PPM</b>	3.3	1.4 – 7.4	0.004
<b>LVEF</b>	1.03	1.01 – 1.05	0.001
<b>CHF</b>	1.8	1.0 – 3.0	0.04
<b>QRS</b>	1.02	1.01 – 1.03	0.001
<b>QTc</b>	0.992	0.987 – 0.997	0.002
<b>CAD</b>	0.33	0.19 – 0.59	< 0.001

Univariate logistic regression results for associations with successful loading of dofetilide. Dose number refers to the dose of dofetilide given in the course of loading (i.e., 1-6), dose adjustment is any decrease in dose from prior. PPM = Presence of a pacemaker; LVEF = Left ventricular ejection fraction (by transthoracic echocardiogram); CHF = Congestive Heart Failure; QRS = QRS interval; QTc = Corrected QT interval; CAD = Coronary artery disease. \*Comparison is with 125mcg dose.

**Table 3. Supervised Learning approaches to decision-making**

	<b>Accuracy</b>	<b>Precision Score</b>	<b>Recall Score</b>	<b>F1 Score</b>	<b>AUC</b>
Naïve Classifier	0.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
L1 Logistic Regression	0.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Random Forest Classifier	0.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Boosted Decision Tree	0.93	0.5	0.03	0.065	0.52
SVM with RBF kernel	0.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
KNN (k = 1)	0.86	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.54
KNN (k = 10)	0.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5

SVM = Support vector machine, RBF = Radial basis function, KNN = K-nearest neighbor classification

**Table 4. Cluster characteristics**

Cluster	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Number</b>	241	229	255	287	369	251	184	221
<b>Dose number (% of dose)</b>	2-125 (51.9%) 3-116 (48.1%)	4-229 (100%)	1- 255 (100%)	5-166 (57.9%) 6-121 (42.2%)	5-167 (45.3%) 6-202 (54.7%)	3-135 (53.8%) 4-116 (46.2%)	2-98 (53.3%) 3-86 (46.7%)	1-99 (44.8%) 2-122 (55.2%)
<b>Dose amount</b>	500mcg-241 (100%)	500mcg-182 (82.0%) 250mcg-40 (18.0%)	500mcg-255 (100%)	500mcg-287 (100%)	250mcg-218 (79.9%) 125mcg-55 (20.1%)	250mcg-197 (84.6%) 125mcg-36 (15.5%)	500mcg-184 (100%)	250mcg-188 (90.8%) 125mcg-19 (9.2%)
<b>Age (years)</b>	62.6 ± 10.5	64.6 ± 10.8	64.6 ± 10.2	64.9 ± 9.8	68.0 ± 10.9	70.1 ± 10.2	67.3 ± 8.3	70.8 ± 10.6
<b>Female Sex</b>	55 (22.8%)	48 (21.0%)	64 (25.1%)	61 (21.3%)	138 (37.4%)	113 (45.0%)	44 (23.9%)	99 (44.8%)
<b>Sinus Rhythm</b>	125 (52.3%)	158 (70.5%)	93 (37.1%)	229 (80.6%)	284 (79.8%)	125 (51.4%)	87 (48.1%)	86 (40.4%)
<b>Heart rate (bpm)</b>	74.7 ± 17.0	68.2 ± 15.4	80.7 ± 20.1	65.9 ± 13.6	70.0 ± 17.6	73.6 ± 18.5	71.9 ± 16.5	78.5 ± 21.0
<b>QRS</b>	100.0±21.2	103.7±24.1	102.8±24.9	104.3±24.8	100.9±24.0	102.5±30.9	107.5±38.3	103.3±26.5
<b>QTc</b>	465.1±34.5	469.5±35.1	443.7±35.6	468.6±35.2	477.1±39.0	486.1±42.2	463.1±36.6	466.6±46.7
<b>Creatinine</b>	0.96±0.21	1.00±0.25	0.98±0.22	0.98±0.23	1.04±0.27	1.07±0.28	0.99±0.22	1.09±0.31
<b>Beta Blocker</b>	122 (50.6%)	113 (49.3%)	144 (56.5%)	162 (56.5%)	217 (58.8%)	173 (68.9%)	108 (58.7%)	138 (62.4%)
<b>CCB</b>	39 (16.2%)	54 (23.6%)	53 (20.8%)	59 (20.6%)	90 (24.4%)	57 (22.7%)	59 (32.1%)	61 (27.6%)
<b>CHF</b>	12 (5.0%)	17 (7.4%)	27 (10.6%)	24 (8.4%)	54 (14.6%)	47 (18.7%)	26 (14.1%)	39 (17.7%)
<b>CAD</b>	24 (10.0%)	31 (13.5%)	47 (18.4%)	47 (16.4%)	88 (23.9%)	79 (31.5%)	49 (26.6%)	58 (26.2%)
<b>HTN</b>	0 (0%)	81 (35.4%)	106 (41.6%)	121 (42.2%)	182 (49.3%)	139 (55.4%)	184 (100%)	110 (49.8%)
<b>DM</b>	12 (5.0%)	22 (9.6%)	31 (12.2%)	35 (12.2%)	42 (11.4%)	33 (13.2%)	41 (22.3%)	23 (10.4%)
<b>PPM</b>	14 (5.8%)	14 (6.1%)	15 (5.9%)	20 (7.0%)	25 (6.8%)	16 (6.4%)	14 (7.6%)	13 (5.9%)
<b>ICD</b>	11 (4.6%)	12 (5.2%)	16 (6.3%)	16 (5.6%)	22 (6.0%)	22 (8.8%)	11 (6.0%)	18 (8.1%)
<b>LVEF</b>	54.6 ± 12.6	54.7 ± 12.3	54.3 ± 13.0	54.4 ± 13.0	54.5 ± 12.1	53.9 ± 13.0	53.6 ± 13.0	54.3 ± 13.1

All values listed at mean ± SD or number (%). Sinus rhythm = sinus or atrial paced rhythm (not atrial fibrillation/flutter); CCB = Calcium channel blocker; CHF = heart failure; CAD = coronary artery disease; HTN = hypertension; DM = diabetes mellitus; PPM = pacemaker present; ICD = implantable cardioverter-defibrillator present; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction based on transthoracic echocardiography



**Table 5. Q table.** Expected reward for each action for each cluster. Based on  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\gamma = 0.2$ . Listed is also cluster where clinical decision was different from maximum from Q table (total 25).

<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Keep Dose</b>	<b>Lower Dose</b>	<b>Different choice</b>
<b>1</b>	0.0	0.0	3
<b>2</b>	-0.0057	0.0	4
<b>3</b>	0.0	0.0	3
<b>4</b>	-0.00002	0.0	2
<b>5</b>	-0.227	-2.26	1
<b>6</b>	-0.021	0.0	4
<b>7</b>	0.0	0.0	3
<b>8</b>	-0.00015	0.0	5

**Figure 1. Dose Patterns of Dofetilide.** Includes the most common dose patterns. Excludes 29 subjects with excessive missing or atypical dose regimens (i.e., increases in dose). Bottom row is subjects with incomplete dosing due to lack of initiation of dofetilide. The numbers provided during doses are the number of electrical cardioversion procedures performed after that specific dose.

**Figure 2. A.** Cumulative and per-component variance explained for each sequential principal component (PC). **B.** Scatter plot of the first two PCs, with dose adjustments labeled in green (other in red).

Number	Dose 1	Dose 2	Dose 3	Dose 4	Dose 5	Dose 6	Total	No CV
150		1	4	11	9		25	125
52	1			5	4		10	42
2			1				1	1
11				3	1		4	7
14							0	14
15			1	1			2	13
11				2			2	9
3					1		1	2
3							0	3
1							0	1
5			1	1			2	3
2					1		1	1
1							0	1
2							0	2
1							0	1
1							0	1
2					1		1	1
44		1		5	2		8	36

 500 mcg

 250 mcg

 125 mcg

Figure 1. Dose Patterns of Dofetilide.

Figure 2A.

## 2 component PCA




Figure 2 B.

# Principal Component Analysis

## Variance Explained by PC

