

Bayesian Nested Latent Class Models for Cause-of-Death Assignment using Verbal Autopsies Across Multiple Domains

Zehang Richard Li¹, Zhenke Wu², Irena Chen², and Samuel J. Clark³

¹Department of Statistics, University of California, Santa Cruz

²Department of Biostatistics, University of Michigan

³Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University

February 16, 2024

Abstract

Understanding cause-specific mortality rates is crucial for monitoring population health and designing public health interventions. Worldwide, two-thirds of deaths do not have a cause assigned. Verbal autopsy (VA) is a well-established tool to collect information describing deaths outside of hospitals by conducting surveys to caregivers of a deceased person. It is routinely implemented in many low- and middle-income countries. Statistical algorithms to assign cause of death using VAs are typically vulnerable to the distribution shift between the data used to train the model and the target population. This presents a major challenge for analyzing VAs as labeled data are usually unavailable in the target population. This article proposes a Latent Class model framework for VA data (LCVA) that jointly models VAs collected over multiple heterogeneous domains, assign cause of death for out-of-domain observations, and estimate cause-specific mortality fractions for a new domain. We introduce a parsimonious representation of the joint distribution of the collected symptoms using nested latent class models and develop an efficient algorithm for posterior inference. We demonstrate that LCVA outperforms existing methods in predictive performance and scalability. Supplementary materials for this article and the R package to implement the model are available online.

Keywords: Domain adaptation; Data shift; Classification; Mixture model; Dependent binary data; Quantification learning.

This work was supported by a seed grant from Michigan Institute of Data Science, grants K01HD078452, R01HD086227, and R21HD095451 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD).

1 Introduction

Data describing cause of death is an essential component for understanding the burden of disease, emerging health needs, and effect of public health interventions. Few low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) have systems that produce high quality cause of death statistics. Only about two-thirds of the deaths worldwide are registered and up to half of these deaths are either not assigned a cause or assigned only an ill-defined cause (World Health Organization, 2021). In many populations not served by official medical certification of causes, a technique known as verbal autopsy (VA) has been routinely used to infer causes of death. VA is a survey-based method whereby a structured questionnaire is conducted to a family member or a caregiver of a recently deceased person after a suitable mourning period. The VA interview collects information about the circumstances, signs, and symptoms leading up to the death. It is routinely used by researchers in Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) including the INDEPTH network (Sankoh and Byass, 2012) and the ALPHA network (Maher et al., 2010), multi-country research projects (Nkengasong et al., 2020; Breiman et al., 2021), and national scale surveys in many LMICs.

Data collected by VAs are analyzed either by a panel of physicians or with statistical algorithms. The physician review approach can be effective if resources permit (Lozano et al., 2011), but it is expensive and rarely possible for timely monitoring of cause-specific mortality. On the other hand, statistical methods have been widely used to automate the cause-of-death assignment from VA data (e.g., Byass et al., 2003; Miasnikof et al., 2015; Serina et al., 2015; McCormick et al., 2016). These algorithms aim to construct a high-dimensional classifier for cause-of-death assignment at the individual level, and obtain population-level cause-specific mortality fraction (CSMF) estimates, i.e., the distribution of deaths due to each possible causes.

There are many methodological challenges for cause-of-death assignment algorithms to be successfully deployed in practice. First, all existing VA algorithms assume that there is a single training dataset or domain knowledge base from which the relationship between symptoms and causes can be learned. In most situations where VA is used, local deaths from the target population with known causes are extremely rare. High-quality VA data with reference causes are usually only available outside of the target population, and may consist of data collected from several distinct study populations. This leads to the *data shift* problem, where the source and target domain data may have different marginal and conditional distributions (Moreno-Torres et al., 2012), and it could significantly bias the cause-of-death assignment and CSMF quantification. The issue of data shift received little discussion in the midst of developments of automated VA cause-of-death assignment algorithms in the last decade. The recent work of Datta et al. (2021) and Fiksel et al. (2021) are the first to address this issue by calibrating model predictions to additional local validation data with known causes of death. When no validation data exist, however, all existing VA methods are vulnerable to data shift. To our knowledge, there is no literature that characterizes the different joint distributions of symptoms and causes across heterogeneous domains or leverages such information for cause-of-death assignment.

Second, existing VA methods used by practitioners typically assume that symptoms are conditionally independent given the underlying cause of death as it reduces model complexity and computation cost significantly (Byass et al., 2003; Miasnikof et al., 2015; McCormick et al., 2016). More recently, several approaches have been proposed to account for symptom dependence using latent Gaussian models with sparse or low-rank representations (Li et al., 2020; Kunihaman et al., 2020; Moran et al., 2021). It has been shown that incorporating symptom dependence in a parsimonious fashion usually improves the accuracy of both in-

dividual cause-of-death assignment and the population-level CSMF estimation. However, the inferred dependence relationship among the continuous latent variables is difficult to interpret, as they do not correspond to the dependence of the observed binary symptoms (Li et al., 2020). In addition, the computation required to estimate the high-dimensional latent Gaussian mixtures can take hours or days to complete, which makes these methods difficult as a routinely used tool in low-resource settings.

In this paper, we address these challenges by developing a novel Latent Class model framework for VA data (LCVA). A key feature of LCVA is that we estimate a common collection of latent symptom profiles across data collected from different populations. This leads to an explicit domain adaptation strategy for classifying out-of-domain deaths that takes into account the similarity between the target population and the existing training datasets. We introduce a sparse parameterization to further reduce the dimensionality of the latent symptom profiles and it facilitates direct interpretations of the conditional independence relationship among the observed symptoms. Furthermore, our inference procedure is an order of magnitude faster than the existing methods using latent Gaussian models to capture symptom dependence.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the background of existing VA methods and their implications under data shift. Section 3 proposes the nested latent class model approach for cause-of-death assignment. Section 3.1 discusses the model with one training dataset. Section 3.2 extends the model to the scenario where training data consist of deaths from multiple domains. Section 3.3 develops an efficient Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm for posterior sampling. Section 4 demonstrates the proposed model under various realistic scenarios using the Population Health Metrics Research Consortium (PHMRC) gold-standard VA dataset. Section 5 concludes the paper

and discusses future directions.

2 Domain adaption in cause-of-death assignment

The domain adaptation problem refers to the situation where a statistical learning model trained on one labeled dataset needs to be generalized to the target dataset, or target domain, drawn from a different distribution and with insufficient labeled data (Daume III and Marcu, 2006). Learning from data collected in different domains is an active area of research in computer science and has been explored in various applications including natural language processing (Ramponi and Plank, 2020), visual classification (Wang and Deng, 2018), sentiment prediction (Glorot et al., 2011), and more recently in prediction problems in public health and clinical settings (Rehman et al., 2018; Mhasawade et al., 2020; Laparra et al., 2020).

The discussion of generalizability in verbal autopsy studies goes back to the early work of King and Lu (2008), where the authors developed a constrained least square model trained on hospital deaths with known causes and subsequently applied to classifying community deaths. Let X_i denote the vector of symptoms for individual i and Y_i denote the corresponding cause of death. For simplicity, let us assume for now that there are two datasets: a training dataset $\mathcal{T}$ with both X_i and Y_i known, and a target dataset $\mathcal{T}_0$ where only X_i is observed. King and Lu (2008) makes the assumption that $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y) = p_{\mathcal{T}}(X|Y)$. This assumption implies that the difference in the joint distribution of $p(X, Y)$ between the two domains can be fully explained by the difference in $p(Y)$, since $p(X, Y) = p(Y)p(X|Y)$. This type of data shift with domain-specific $p(Y)$ and domain-invariant $p(X|Y)$ is also known as *label shift* or *prior shift* (Storkey, 2009).

A large collection of VA algorithms, however, took a more generic classification per-

spective. They first learn a model $p_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X)$ with the training data and then apply the classifier to observations from the target domain for cause-of-death assignment. The generalizability of this approach relies on the assumption that $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(Y|X) = p_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X)$. That is, the difference in the joint distribution of $p(X, Y)$ across domains are fully explained by different symptom distribution $p(X)$. This type of data shift is also known as *covariate shift* (Shimodaira, 2000). Under this assumption, the target CSMF can be estimated by simple aggregation of individual classifications, i.e.,

$$\hat{p}_{\mathcal{T}_0}(Y) = \int_x \hat{p}_{\mathcal{T}_0}(Y|X=x)p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(x)dx = \int_x \hat{p}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X=x)p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(x)dx \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{p}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X_i).$$

Algorithms that make the implicit assumption on covariate shift include some of the most widely adopted VA models, such as InterVA (Byass et al., 2003), Tariff (Serina et al., 2015), Naive Bayes Classifier (Miasnikof et al., 2015), as well as many others in the literature applying off-the-shelf classification models on VA data (e.g., Flaxman et al., 2011; Blanco et al., 2020).

The classification models under the covariate shift assumption is easy to design and implement, but difficult to justify in the context of VA. As pointed out by King and Lu (2008), symptoms collected by VA are the consequences of the underlying causes of death. When data are generated with this logic, the covariate shift assumption is almost always violated as $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(Y|X)$ and $p_{\mathcal{T}}(Y|X)$ are different even when $p(X|Y)$ is the same across domains. This natural data generating process has been used much more frequently in the recent development of Bayesian methods for VA data, together with the prior shift assumption of $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y) = p_{\mathcal{T}}(X|Y)$. The first Bayesian hierarchical model for cause-of-death assignment, InSilicoVA (McCormick et al., 2016), proposed to use non-informative priors to model $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(Y)$ in the target population and strong informative priors to shrink $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y)$ to the observed $p_{\mathcal{T}}(X|Y)$ calculated from training data or provided by domain

experts. This framework was later extended to include more flexible characterizations of $p(X|Y)$, using latent Gaussian graphical models (Li et al., 2020) and factor models (Kunihama et al., 2020; Moran et al., 2021). While Kunihama et al. (2020) and Moran et al. (2021) treated the cause of death of all observations as drawing from the same distribution, they can be readily adapted to have different $p(Y)$ in different populations.

The prior shift assumption, however, can still be overly simplistic in practice. Figure 1 illustrates an example from the PHMRC gold-standard VA dataset (Murray et al., 2011a) discussed in Section 4. It shows the proportion of deaths with a ‘yes’ response in two symptoms, *having trouble breathing* and *drinking alcohol*, conditional on the ten causes of death with most observations, for each of the six study sites in the dataset. Strong domain heterogeneity can be observed from the site-specific empirical response probabilities $p(X|Y)$. While some of these reporting patterns may be explained by the presence of confounding factors (Moran et al., 2021), we usually do not have enough data to identify or adjust for all potential confounders, many of which may be unobservable. When $p(X|Y)$ vary across domains, the choice of training data could have strong implications for out-of-domain predictions.

A line of research closely related to this paper is the calibration models developed in Datta et al. (2021) and Fiksel et al. (2021). The focus of these methods are fundamentally different from our work. They consider a different scenario where the cause of death is known for a small sample of observations $\mathcal{T}'_0$ from the target population, and assume that $p_{\mathcal{T}'_0}(X|Y) = p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y)$, i.e., prior shift may exist between the labeled and unlabeled deaths from the same population. It can be shown that this assumption is sufficient to de-bias a classifier trained on $\mathcal{T}$ and applied to $\mathcal{T}_0$, using the labeled target population data $\mathcal{T}'_0$. The advantage of such calibration methods is that they circumvent the need to identify and




Figure 1: Empirical proportion of ‘yes’ response in two symptoms, drinking alcohol (left), and having trouble breathing (right), among deaths due to different causes of death in the six study sites in the PHMRC gold-standard dataset. Gray color indicates no collected death due to a given cause in a given site.

parameterize transportable component of the joint distribution from the training domains to the target domain. The cost, however, is the requirement for additional local data with known causes, which is usually impractical in resource-constrained settings. Moreover, the estimation of the transition matrix of the predicted cause of death is challenging when there are many potential causes of death. For a small number of local labeled data, Datta et al. (2021) and Fiksel et al. (2021) recommend grouping the causes of death into a handful of broad categories in the analysis. It remains an open problem to estimate the CSMF for longer cause lists with limited calibration data.

The focus of this paper is to develop a general framework to characterize domain heterogeneity and leverage such information when assigning causes of death for out-of-domain observations, without additional calibration data. Unlike the majority of the existing VA

models, we allow both $p(Y)$ and $p(X|Y)$ to vary across domains. The key to our modeling approach is a latent class model representation (Goodman, 1974) that assumes *source component shift* for data across different domains (Storkey, 2009). That is, we assume that there is a latent variable Z that renders $p_{\mathcal{T}}(X|Y, Z) = p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y, Z)$. This assumption can be considered as an extension of prior shift on the latent space. It allows us to combine data from multiple domains with domain-specific $p(X, Y)$ efficiently when assigning cause of death for unlabeled deaths in a new domain. We discuss our proposed model in more details in the next section.

3 Nested latent class models for VA data

In this section, we present the nested latent class model for VA data, LCVA. We first introduce a single-domain latent class model, and then extend it to jointly model data from multiple domains.

3.1 The single-domain model

Let $Y_i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ denote the categorical cause of death for the i -th death and $X_i \in \{0, 1\}^p$ denote the p -dimensional reported binary symptom vector. We focus on binary symptoms here but the model can be extended to categorical symptom with more than two levels. We begin by assuming that each cause of death can be further divided into K sub-categories and each individual is associated with a latent class $Z_i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. We assume reported symptoms are independent draws from a Bernoulli distribution given both the cause of death Y_i and the latent class membership Z_i , i.e.,

$$X_{ij}|Y_i = c, Z_i = k \sim \text{Bern}(\theta_{ckj}), \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

We treat the cause of death and latent class indicator as random variables and let

$$Y_i \sim \text{Cat}(\boldsymbol{\pi}),$$

$$Z_i|Y_i = c \sim \text{Cat}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_c).$$

For deaths due to each cause of death, $p(X_i|Y_i = c) = \sum_k \lambda_{ck} \prod_{j=1}^p \theta_{ckj}^{x_{ij}} (1 - \theta_{ckj})^{1-x_{ij}}$. Conditional dependence among symptoms are introduced by marginalizing out the latent class indicators. With sufficiently many latent classes, this representation is flexible enough to represent any multivariate discrete distribution (Dunson and Xing, 2009). We treat the latent class Z as defined within each cause of death and both latent indicators Z and Y need to be estimated for a new death. This nested formulation allows the model to be sufficiently expressive for deaths from each cause.

The naive factorization of the joint distribution of (X, Y, Z) requires $CK(p + 1) - 1$ parameters. This can be computationally challenging for VA data, as the number of symptoms p and the size of cause list C are usually large while sample size is typically small to moderate. We adopt a sparsity-inducing prior to model the response probabilities θ_{ckj} proposed by Zhou et al. (2015). We let

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{ckj} &= \delta_{ckj} \phi_{ckj} + (1 - \delta_{ckj}) \gamma_{cj}, & \delta_{ckj} &\sim \text{Bern}(\tau_c), \\ \phi_{ckj} &\sim \text{Beta}(1, \nu_\phi), & \gamma_{cj} &\sim \text{Beta}(a_\gamma, b_\gamma), & \tau_c &\sim \text{Beta}(1, \nu_\tau) \end{aligned}$$

where δ_{ckj} is a binary indicator specifying whether $p(X_{ij}|Y_i = c, Z_i = k)$ is affected by the latent class membership or takes the baseline response probability γ_{cj} . For each cause c , this prior encourages the associated latent classes $k = 1, \dots, K$ to have similar response profiles that differ only in a subset of symptoms $\{j, \delta_{ckj} \neq 0\}$. Thus it significantly improves the efficiency of the latent representation when K is large. In the original proposal of Zhou et al. (2015), the baseline response vector is set to fixed values in advance. Here we model the

baseline response probabilities γ_{cj} in a data adaptive fashion, as the baseline distribution of $p(X_{ij}|Y_i = c)$ is generally unknown and hard to specify. In certain situations, we may have external information on such conditional distributions in the form of physician provided domain knowledge (McCormick et al., 2016; Li et al., 2020) which may be used to construct informative priors on γ_{cj} . Here we use non-informative priors with $\nu_\phi = a_\gamma = b_\gamma = 1$.

We also expect deaths due to different causes to exhibit varying levels of complexity in the reported symptoms. For example, distribution of symptoms among deaths from external causes (e.g., drowning) might require fewer parameters to characterize than those from deaths due to infectious diseases. Instead of specifying different latent class size K for each cause, the complexity of the latent symptom profiles are governed by the cause-specific sparsity level τ_c . We use a non-informative prior on τ_c with $\nu_\tau = 1$. We note that the sparsity induced by the mixture prior on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ does not perform variable selection, but rather it aims to reduce the number of parameters by identifying symptoms that are conditional independent of others. When $\{\delta_{c1j}, \dots, \delta_{cKj}\}$ are all 0's for symptom j and cause c , it implies that symptom j is independent of all other symptoms given cause c . The conditional independence model assumed by the InSilicoVA algorithm can be thought of as the extreme case where $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{0}$.

To complete the hierarchical specification with priors for the latent parameters, we consider the stick-breaking prior for the mixing weights $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and a Dirichlet prior on the CSMF, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{ck} = V_{ck} \prod_{l < k} (1 - V_{cl}), \quad V_{ck} \sim \text{Beta}(1, \omega_c),$$

$$\omega_c \sim \text{Gamma}(a_\omega, b_\omega), \quad \boldsymbol{\pi} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}).$$

With a training dataset $\mathcal{T} = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)\}$, the posterior predictive distribution for the cause of death of a single new data point $(X^{(0)}, Y^{(0)})$ from the same population can

be readily computed by

$$p(Y^{(0)} = c|X^{(0)}, \mathcal{T}) = \int p(Y^{(0)} = c|X^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{T})d(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

VAs are most commonly used to determine the CSMF of a target population. Consider a target dataset $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{\mathbf{x}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{(0)}\}$ with unknown cause of death, we assume the same data generating process with target-specific distributions of causes of death and latent classes,

$$Y_i^{(0)} \sim \text{Cat}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)}),$$

$$Z_i^{(0)}|Y_i^{(0)} = c \sim \text{Cat}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_c^{(0)}),$$

$$X_{ij}^{(0)}|Y_i^{(0)} = c, Z_i^{(0)} = k \sim \text{Bern}(\theta_{ckj}).$$

For the prior on the target CSMF, we let $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)})$. We consider two different specifications for $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y)$:

1. *Constant weights*: The most restrictive parameterization is to assume only *prior shift* exists across the domains. That is, we let $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y) = p_{\mathcal{T}}(X|Y)$, or equivalently, $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \sim p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{T})$.
2. *New weights*: We relax the *prior shift* assumption by allowing the target dataset to have a different composition over the latent classes learned in the training domain. In other words, we assume $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(X|Y, Z) = p_{\mathcal{T}}(X|Y, Z)$ only. The new mixing weights can be estimated with the same prior as in the first stage, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)} \sim V_{ck}^{(0)} \prod_{l < k} (1 - V_{cl}^{(0)}), \quad V_{ck}^{(0)} \sim \text{Beta}(1, \omega_c^{(0)}),$$

$$\omega_c^{(0)} \sim \text{Gamma}(a_\omega, b_\omega), \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{T}).$$

In both cases, we fix the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to its posterior distribution given the training data $\mathcal{T}$. This two-stage procedure has several advantages. First, users of the algorithm do

not need to have access to the entire training dataset, which could be large or restricted to be shared. The posterior summaries of the latent parameters serve as the role of symptom-cause-information (SCI) (Clark et al., 2018) in this case and can be distributed more easily. Second, we can improve the exploration of parameter space by running multiple chains in parallel, leading to a better approximation of $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{T})$ and avoiding the unlabeled data to form its own mixtures away from the clusters in the labeled data (Adams and Ghahramani, 2009). Third, while fitting the latent class model on the labeled data is computationally fast, separating out this training step can further reduce the computational cost for practitioners.

3.2 The multi-domain model

When training data are collected from a single domain, only one set of mixing weights can be inferred. Thus the mixing weights in the target domain are treated either as the same as those from the training domain, or as independent random variables. When the training data consist of observations from multiple domains, however, we can leverage the estimated collection of mixing weights to improve out-of-domain prediction. Consider a training dataset consisting of observations from G distinct domains. We use D_i to denote the domain membership for the i -th observation so that $D_i \in \{1, \dots, G\}$. The domain-specific data generating process can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i | D_i = g &\sim \text{Cat}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(g)}), \\ Z_i | Y_i = c, D_i = g &\sim \text{Cat}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_c^{(g)}), \\ X_{ij} | Y_i = c, Z_i = k &\sim \text{Bern}(\theta_{ckj}). \end{aligned}$$

That is, we assume there are K latent symptom profiles nested within each of the C causes across all domains, but the distribution of the causes and latent classes are domain-specific.

The domain-specific distributions of $p(X|Y)$ illustrated earlier can then be explained by different mixing over latent classes. Similar to the single-domain model, we put independent stick breaking priors on the domain-specific weights and Dirichlet priors for the CSMF, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{ck}^{(g)} = V_{ck}^{(g)} \prod_{l < k} (1 - V_{cl}^{(g)}), \quad V_{ck}^{(g)} \sim \text{Beta}(1, \omega_c^{(g)}),$$

$$\omega_c^{(g)} \sim \text{Gamma}(a_\omega, b_\omega), \quad \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(g)} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(g)}).$$

When performing cause-of-death assignment for a target domain without labeled death, the estimation of the mixing weights $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ should ideally borrow information from the collection of mixing weights $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(g)}\}_{g=1, \dots, G}$ in the training domains. Let $D_i = 0$ denote the target domain. We let $\lambda_{ck}^{(0)} = \sum_{g=1}^G \eta_{cg} \lambda_{ck}^{(g)}$. That is, we assume the deaths from the new domain can be modeled as a mixture of deaths from the observed domains. Compared to putting independent priors on $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ and estimating it without constraints, this parameterization allows the cause-of-death classification to be less sensitive to small and noisy target domain data. Specifically, we consider the following two strategies to parameterize $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$:

1. *Domain-level mixture:* We fix $\boldsymbol{\eta}_c = \boldsymbol{\eta}$ to be the same for each cause $c = 1, \dots, C$ and let $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_\eta)$. That is, the relationship between the new mixing weights $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ and the existing weights $\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(G)}\}$ does not vary across causes of death.
2. *Domain-cause-level mixture:* We let $\boldsymbol{\eta}_c \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_\eta \mathbf{m}_c)$, where m_{cg} is the fraction of deaths from domain g among all deaths due to cause c . The domain-cause-level mixture allows cause-specific shrinkage of mixing weights so that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_c^{(0)}$ is encouraged to be more similar to those weights in domains with larger sample sizes for cause c .

With a sufficient number of latent classes, both the single-domain and multi-domain models can capture the data distribution in the training data equally well. The advantage

of the multi-domain model, however, is in the out-of-domain prediction, as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ can be estimated with more flexibility. The weighted mixture representations could also quantify the similarity between the target and existing training domains in terms of the decomposition of latent classes within causes, as discussed in Section 4.

Lastly, we note that data collected through VA inevitably contain a high proportion of missing responses due to the respondents not knowing whether certain symptoms exist or not willing to talk to the interviewer about them. Some of the missing symptoms can be deterministically inferred by the logic of the questionnaire whereas most of them are difficult to impute systematically. We assume these missing responses are missing at random, i.e., the probability of the missing data mechanism depends on observed data but not on missing values. This is a standard assumption made by existing VA algorithms (McCormick et al., 2016; Kunihaman et al., 2020; Moran et al., 2021) and allows us to avoid building another imputation model, which is extremely challenging to specify and validate in practice. Under the missing at random assumption, we can conduct inference on model parameters using only the observed data. More discussions on this assumption can be found in Kunihaman et al. (2020).

3.3 Posterior inference

We have the following posterior for the training dataset $\mathcal{T} = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1, d_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n, d_n)\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\omega} | \mathcal{T}) &\propto \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i | \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(d_i)}) \sum_{z_i=1}^K \left(p(z_i | y_i, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(d_i)}) \prod_{j=1}^p p(x_{ij} | y_i, z_i, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \right) \\
&\times \prod_{c=1}^C \prod_{j=1}^p p(\gamma_{cj}) \prod_{c=1}^C \prod_{j=1}^p \prod_{k=1}^K p(\phi_{ckj}) p(\delta_{ckj} | \tau_c) \prod_{c=1}^C p(\tau_c) \\
&\times \prod_{g=1}^G p(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(g)}) p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(g)} | \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(g)}) p(\boldsymbol{\omega}^{(g)}).
\end{aligned}$$

The posterior distribution of the single-domain model is a special case with $G = 1$.

When performing cause-of-death assignment in the target domain, the posterior predictive distribution is

$$p(Y^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)} | X^{(0)}, \mathcal{T}) \propto \int \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i^{(0)} | \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)}) \sum_{\substack{z_i^{(0)}=1}}^K \left(p(z_i^{(0)} | y_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}) \prod_{j=1}^p p(x_{ij}^{(0)} | y_i^{(0)}, z_i^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right) \\ p(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)}) p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)} | \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(G)}, \boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\eta}) p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(G)}, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathcal{T}) d(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(G)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

The posterior distribution of the model parameters is not available in closed form, but we can easily draw posterior samples from a Gibbs sampler. The detailed procedure of fitting the model is described next.

Training stage: We first infer the parameters associated with the training data using the following steps.

1. Sample the latent class membership Z_i for $i \in \mathcal{T}$ with

$$p(Z_i = k | Y_i = c, D_i = g, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \propto \lambda_{ck}^{(g)} \prod_j \theta_{ckj}^{x_{ij}} (1 - \theta_{ckj})^{1-x_{ij}}.$$

2. Sample the stick-breaking parameters $\mathbf{V}^{(g)}$ and $\omega^{(g)}$ for $g = 1, \dots, G$. Denote $n_{ck}^{(g)} = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, Z_i=k, D_i=g}$. The full conditional is

$$V_{ck}^{(g)} | Y, Z, \boldsymbol{\omega}^{(g)} \sim \text{Beta}(1 + n_{ck}^{(g)}, \omega_c^{(g)} + \sum_{l>k} n_{cl}^{(g)}), \quad c = 1, \dots, C; k = 1, \dots, K-1,$$

$$\omega_c^{(g)} | \mathbf{V}^{(g)} \sim \text{Gamma}(a_\omega + K - 1, b_\omega - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \log(1 - V_{ck}^{(g)})), \quad c = 1, \dots, C.$$

3. Sample the response probabilities $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ after integrating out the latent binary indicators $\boldsymbol{\delta}$. The posterior conditional of θ_{ckj} is a mixture of Beta distribution and point mass at the baseline vector γ_{cj} . We let $n_{ckj1} = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, Z_i=k, X_{ij}=1}$ and $n_{ckj0} = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, Z_i=k, X_{ij}=0}$. The posterior conditional of θ_{ckj} is

$$p(\theta_{ckj} | \cdot) = \tilde{\pi}_{ckj} \text{Beta}(1 + n_{ckj1}, \nu_\phi + n_{ckj0}) + (1 - \tilde{\pi}_{ckj}) I(\gamma_{cj}),$$

where $I(\gamma_{cj})$ is the point mass at γ_{cj} . The mixing probability is

$$\tilde{\pi}_{ckj} = \frac{\tau_c B(1 + n_{ckj1}, \nu_\phi + n_{ckj0})}{\tau_c B(1 + n_{ckj1}, \nu_\phi + n_{ckj0}) + (1 - \tau_c) B(1, \nu_\phi) \gamma_{cj}^{n_{ckj1}} (1 - \gamma_{cj})^{n_{ckj0}}}.$$

4. Sample the latent binary indicators $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ from its full conditional, $\delta_{ckj} \sim \text{Bern}(\tilde{\pi}_{ckj})$.
5. Sample the sparsity level $\tau_c \sim \text{Beta}(1 + \sum_j \sum_k \delta_{ckj}, \nu_\tau + \sum_j \sum_k (1 - \delta_{ckj}))$.
6. Sample the baseline vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ from its full conditionals. Let $O_j = \{i, x_{ij} \text{ not missing}\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$,

we have

$$\gamma_{cj} | X, Y, Z, \boldsymbol{\delta} \sim \text{Beta}(a_\gamma + \sum_{i \in O_j} x_{ij} (1 - \delta_{y_i z_{ij}}), b_\gamma + \sum_{i \in O_j} (1 - x_{ij}) (1 - \delta_{y_i z_{ij}})),$$

7. Update the CSMF vector in each domain $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(g)} | Y$. Let $n_c^{(g)} = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, D_i=g}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(g)} | Y \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_\pi + n_1^{(g)}, \dots, \alpha_\pi + n_C^{(g)}).$$

When there exist observations from the training domains with unknown labels, the above posterior sampling procedure can be easily modified by updating the cause-of-death assignment and latent class indicator for each unlabeled data with

$$p(Y_i = c, Z_i = k | X_i, D_i = g) \propto \pi_c^{(g)} \sum_k \left(\lambda_{ck}^{(g)} \prod_j (\theta_{ckj})^{x_{ij}} (1 - \theta_{ckj})^{1-x_{ij}} \right).$$

Prediction stage: When performing cause-of-death assignment for the target dataset, we take the posterior draws of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ from the fitted model at the training stage and plug them into the sampling process of the new parameters. To further improve the posterior approximations in the training stage, we run the MCMC sampler in the training stage multiple times in parallel with different starting values and combine the posterior draws from these chains after suitable burn-in periods. At each iteration of the sampler of the prediction stage, we take a sample from the combined posterior draws of $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ uniformly. The sampler proceeds by iterating between the following steps:

1. Sample the cause-of-death assignments Y_i and latent class indicator Z_i . To facilitate easier computation, we augment the data with latent indicator $\tilde{D}_i \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ for observations from the target population and sample all latent indicators jointly with

$$p(Y_i = c, Z_i = k, \tilde{D}_i = g | X_i, D_i = 0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \pi_c^{(0)} \eta_{cg} \sum_k \left(\lambda_{ck}^{(g)} \prod_j (\theta_{ckj})^{x_{ij}} (1 - \theta_{ckj})^{1-x_{ij}} \right)$$

2. For the multi-domain model, update the domain similarity weights $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ with

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} | Y, \tilde{D} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_\eta + \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{D}_i=1}, \dots, \alpha_\eta + \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{D}_i=G})$$

for the domain-level mixture model, or with

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_c | Y, \tilde{D} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_\eta m_{c1} + \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, \tilde{D}_i=1}, \dots, \alpha_\eta m_{cG} + \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, \tilde{D}_i=G})$$

for the domain-cause-level mixture model.

3. Update the CSMF vector in the target domain $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)} | Y$ with

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(0)} | Y \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_\pi^{(0)} + n_1^{(0)}, \dots, \alpha_\pi^{(0)} + n_C^{(0)})$$

where $n_c^{(0)} = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{Y_i=c, D_i=0}$.

We note that the sampler proposed in this section enjoys significant advantage over models that use latent Gaussian representations to characterize symptom dependence (Li et al., 2020; Kuniyama et al., 2020; Moran et al., 2021). The classification stage of LCVA essentially reduces to allocating observations to CK latent classes with conditional independent response probabilities, which has the same order of computational complexity as the InSilicoVA algorithm (McCormick et al., 2016).

4 Results

In this section, we present results of our model evaluated on the PHMRC gold-standard VA dataset (Murray et al., 2011a). The PHMRC dataset has been used extensively in validating

and comparing VA cause-of-death assignment methods (McCormick et al., 2016; Kunihaman et al., 2020; Moran et al., 2021; Clark et al., 2018). It consists of 7,841 adult deaths collected from six study sites (Andhra Pradesh, India; Bohol, Philippines; Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; Mexico City, Mexico; Pemba Island, Tanzania; and Uttar Pradesh, India). All deaths occurred in health facilities and gold-standard causes are determined based on laboratory, pathology and medical imaging findings. The cause of death is coded into 34 categories, and we pre-process the raw dataset into 168 binary symptoms as described in McCormick et al. (2016).

We first construct two realistic scenarios with varying degrees of data shift and evaluate the proposed models in out-of-domain prediction, and compare with existing VA algorithms. Then we discuss and evaluate the proposed model in situations where additional local labeled data exist for calibration. In addition to the results presented in this section, we also performed simulation studies with synthetic data. Details and results of these simulations are presented in the Supplementary Materials.

4.1 Prediction for a synthetic domain

In our first evaluation, we create a synthetic new target domain by sampling from the PHMRC data. For each cause of death, we sample a subset of deaths from this cause with probability q , with q drawing from a mixture distribution of $0.5\text{Beta}(1, 5) + 0.5\text{Beta}(1, 20)$. This data generating process leads to the target CSMFs being concentrated on a subset of causes and different from the overall prevalence. We form the synthetic target domain with these sampled deaths and treat the rest of the deaths as the training data from the six original domains.

We consider both the single-domain (LCVA-S) models in Section 3.1 and the multi-

domain (LCVA-M) models in Section 3.2. We fit the proposed models with different choices of K . For the concentration parameters, we let $\alpha_\pi = \alpha_\eta = 1$, and $\alpha_\pi^{(0)} = 0.1n^{(0)}/C$. In the training stage, we ran six parallel MCMC chains with different starting values for 4000 iterations and discarded the first half of the chains as burn-in. In the prediction stage, we sampled the training parameters uniformly from the posterior samples and ran the prediction chain for 4000 iterations. First half of the chain were again discarded as burn-in.

We evaluate the performance of the proposed model based on the classification accuracy of the predicted top cause of death and the so-called ‘CSMF accuracy’ (Murray et al., 2011b), a widely used metric to compare the estimated CSMF vector with the truth. The CSMF accuracy metric is a form of the normalized absolute error (González et al., 2017). It measures the L_1 distance between the estimated and true CSMF, and is normalized to range between 0 (worst) and 1 (best). It is defined as $CSMF_{acc}(\hat{\pi}) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{c=1}^C |\hat{\pi}_c - \pi_c|}{2(1 - \min_c \pi_c)}$, where π_c is the true CSMF calculated by the empirical distribution in the test data.

We benchmark the performance of the proposed model to the InSilicoVA algorithm. InSilicoVA is one of the most widely adopted VA methods used in practice and has been shown to have better or comparable performance compared to other VA models in use (McCormick et al., 2016; Clark et al., 2018). We also compare with the more complicated Bayesian factor model proposed in (Kunihama et al., 2020), which models the joint distribution of symptoms using a latent Gaussian model. We fit all models on 50 splits of the data. For the InSilicoVA algorithm, we ran the MCMC for 4000 iterations. For the Bayesian factor model, we used 6 latent factors and ran the MCMC for 2500 iterations after discarding the first 500 samples as burn-in, and saved every fifth sample, as recommended in Kunihama et al. (2020).




Figure 2: CSMF accuracy (left) and individual top cause accuracy (right) of different models including InSilicoVA (INS), Bayesian factor model (BF), and four variations of LCVA under different choices of K from 2 to 12. Results across 50 train-target splits. Except for the single-domain model with new weights for the target domain, LCVA performs better in both metrics than InSilicoVA and Bayesian factor model. The multi-domain LCVA models show the highest accuracy.

Figure 2 shows the average classification accuracy and CSMF accuracy across the 50 synthetic datasets for the different models. On average, the two multi-domain LCVA models achieve the highest accuracy and outperform InSilicoVA and Bayesian factor model. The single-domain LCVA with independently estimated mixing weights, however, shows a quick drop in the predictive accuracy as K increases. It is clear that the latent class representation and the borrowing of information from the training mixing weights λ improve both the accuracy and stability of the out-of-domain classification.

4.2 Prediction for a new study site

For our second evaluation, we consider the task of out-of-domain prediction for each of the six study sites. We iteratively take one site as the target domain and the rest of the five sites as training domains. A summary of the true CSMFs for each site is included in the Supplementary Materials. As is shown in the previous subsection, the performance of LCVA does not vary much from different choices of K . We take $K = 3$ as it leads to good performance in both CSMF accuracy and individual assignment accuracy in the previous experiment. In addition to InSilicoVA and the Bayesian factor model, we also include comparisons with FARVA (Moran et al., 2021) with a binary covariate indicating age at death exceeding 65. The inclusion of covariates does not change the performance metric of FARVA by much in our experiments. Table 1 and 2 summarize the CSMF accuracy and top cause accuracy for the different models evaluated on the six sites respectively. The CSMF accuracy of the Bayesian factor model is exceptionally high in this experiment. This is not surprising as it assumes a common generating process for causes of deaths in both training and target domains. In the PHMRC data, the CSMFs in most domains are indeed similar, except for the site of Pemba, which has a much smaller sample size and different cause-of-death profile. Thus the stronger prior assumption leads to better estimation of the target CSMF. When CSMFs in the training and target domains are more different, we expect the performance of LCVA to be better, as demonstrated in the previous evaluation study and in the case of Pemba as target domain. Nevertheless, LCVA shows improved top cause prediction accuracy across all sites. There is no model that dominates the predictive metrics in all six experiments.

We now turn to the estimated latent classes and domain similarity parameters. As an example, we examine the experiment treating Pemba island as the target domain and

	Mexico	AP	UP	Dar	Bohol	Pemba
InSilicoVA	0.63	0.73	0.55	0.65	0.67	0.41
Bayesian Factor Model	0.79	0.82	0.82	0.75	0.78	0.57
FARVA	0.65	0.55	0.51	0.54	0.49	0.34
LCVA-S: constant weights	0.77	0.74	0.71	0.70	0.76	0.61
LCVA-S: new weights	0.74	0.68	0.71	0.64	0.77	0.52
LCVA-M: domain-level mixture	0.74	0.79	0.74	0.66	0.75	0.59
LCVA-M: domain-cause mixture	0.75	0.76	0.72	0.66	0.73	0.59

Table 1: CSMF accuracy of different models when predicting on different target sites. The top two highest algorithms are highlighted in bold in each scenario. LCVA demonstrates good performance that is significantly higher than InSilicoVA and FARVA. The relative performance of different versions of LCVA does not show a clear pattern.

	Mexico	AP	UP	Dar	Bohol	Pemba
InSilicoVA	0.23	0.33	0.24	0.26	0.27	0.28
Bayesian Factor Model	0.23	0.37	0.39	0.33	0.32	0.40
FARVA	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.07
LCVA-S: constant weights	0.29	0.37	0.38	0.32	0.34	0.45
LCVA-S: new weights	0.29	0.32	0.38	0.32	0.34	0.37
LCVA-M: domain-level mixture	0.28	0.41	0.40	0.32	0.34	0.44
LCVA-M: domain-cause mixture	0.29	0.40	0.40	0.32	0.33	0.43

Table 2: Individual-level top cause prediction accuracy of different models when predicting on different target sites. The top two highest algorithms are highlighted in bold in each scenario. LCVA demonstrates good performance across all scenarios. Overall, the two multi-domain LCVA achieve the highest accuracy on average.

the other five larger sites as training domains. As an illustration, we focus on the multi-domain LCVA with domain-level mixture model. It is worth noting that the estimated latent classes are subject to permutation and further research is needed to relate latent

classes with observable characteristics of the causes of death, but nevertheless, they still reveal interesting latent structures in these data. The top panel of Figure 3 shows the estimated conditional probabilities. We sort the symptoms by their largest conditional probabilities given a latent class, i.e., $\max_k \theta_{ckj}$, and show the conditional probabilities of the top 20 symptoms for the six most prevalent causes in Pemba. Within each cause of death, most of the symptom profiles are similar across latent classes. This indicates the conditional independence simplification is a useful approximation for many symptoms, as there is not enough signal in the data to estimate their dependence with other symptoms. Take deaths due to ‘other Non-Communicable Diseases (NCD)’ as an example to examine the key symptoms that differentiates the latent classes, the three latent symptom profiles differ most significantly on the response probabilities for the sex of the respondent, alcohol drinking and tobacco usage. The corresponding mixing weights are shown in the lower left panel of Figure 3. The first and third latent classes are more prevalent in the sites of Mexico city and Bohol, whereas the second latent class is more prevalent in the other four sites. This could be due to different mixing of specific NCDs or different reported prevalence of the risk behaviors in the two sites. We also observe that for simpler causes such as drowning, only one latent class is utilized due to the shrinkage effect of the priors. The shrinkage protects the model from overfitting on the noise in the training domains when K is large for a relatively simpler cause such as drowning. Finally, the estimated $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ in the lower right panel of Figure 3 shows that the most similar domain in terms of the latent mixing weights is Dar es Salaam, which is not surprising given both sites are in Tanzania.

Computational Considerations The proposed model is highly efficient in computation. Across the six out-of-domain prediction experiments, the InSilicoVA algorithm is the fastest to implement as the symptoms are treated as conditionally independent. It




Figure 3: Top: Posterior means of the conditional probabilities of observing the selected subset of symptoms given the top six causes of death in Pemba and latent class membership. Bottom: Posterior means of the mixing weights of latent classes by domain (left) and the posterior distribution of the similarity parameter η . Pemba island is the target domain.

required 20 seconds to run 1000 iterations of MCMC. For the LCVA with domain-level mixture, every 1000 iterations of MCMC required 53 seconds in the training stage, and 223 seconds in the prediction stage. For the same tasks and 1000 iterations of the MCMC, the Bayesian factor model used 4,275 seconds and the FARVA model used 17,422 seconds. The Bayesian factor model and FARVA are clearly not feasible as a routine method to use in resource-constrained settings. The LCVA requires the least additional computational cost among the methods that take into account symptom dependence and achieves the largest improvements to the accuracy of InSilicoVA. The computation time are all evaluated on a MacBook Pro with 2.6 GHz 6-Core Intel Core i7 processor and 32 GB memory.

4.3 Incorporating labeled data from the target domain

Finally, we consider the situation where a small subset of labeled data is available in the target domain. The LCVA model can incorporate such information naturally by skipping the sampling of Y_i in those cases. In practice, however, it can be computationally demanding to refit the model multiple times when new labels are collected. An alternative strategy is to calibrate the estimated CSMF to the known labels after a model is fit (Fiksel et al., 2021). Here we demonstrate how such calibration methods can further improve the performance of LCVA when additional data is available.

Denote the target population $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{U}$, where $\mathcal{L}$ are the data with labels and $\mathcal{U}$ are the data without labels. We fit the models ignoring the known labels in $\mathcal{L}$ and denote the predicted outcome as A . We use the calibration procedure proposed by Fiksel et al. (2021) to estimate the transition matrix $p_{\mathcal{L}}(A|Y)$ and de-bias the estimated $p_{\mathcal{T}_0}(Y)$. We take the six experiments of out-of-domain prediction in the previous scenario for example. We take the posterior means of the estimated individual cause-of-death probabilities from

InSilicoVA and LCVA with domain-level mixture as the input, and randomly select 30% of deaths in the target domain to reveal the true labels. We reduce the 34 causes into 11 broader categories to reduce the dimension of the transition matrix and calibrate the model outputs following Fiksel et al. (2021). The results over 50 randomly sampled $\mathcal{L}$ are summarized in Figure 4. With the 11-cause category, the CSMF accuracy of LCVA before the calibration is comparable to the calibrated InSilicoVA on half of the sites. With the additional information from the calibration process, the CSMF accuracy improves for both InSilicoVA and LCVA. This experiment demonstrates that LCVA can be used as a ‘plug-in’ algorithm in data analysis pipeline with additional calibration processes. Moreover, we note that the aggregation to coarser definition of causes is necessary for the calibration process with the limited labeled data. In practice, however, it is usually of interest to estimate CSMF for the finer cause list. The benefit of LCVA is more apparent in such situations. Detailed aggregation process and more calibration results with different levels of causes are included in the Supplementary Materials.

5 Discussion

Quantifying the population distribution of causes of death and assigning causes to specific deaths using VAs are challenging, especially when using information derived from non-local data sources. In this paper, we proposed a statistical framework for modeling VA data collected over multiple domains and quantifying the cause-of-death distributions for deaths in a new domain. The proposed model uses a parsimonious nested latent class model to characterize the joint distributions of symptoms given causes, which allows direct interpretation of the latent structure and faster computation relative to existing methods. We demonstrated how this framework can efficiently borrow information from multiple domains and




Figure 4: Comparison of LCVA-M with domain-level mixture and InSilicoVA when the cause of death of 30% of data in the target domain are known. The causes of deaths have been aggregated into 11 broad categories. The horizontal line indicates the CSMF accuracy of the two methods before calibrating to the labeled deaths. The box plot shows the distribution of the calibrated CSMF accuracy over 50 resampled labeled dataset.

improve out-of-domain predictive performance significantly with both synthetic and real data.

The proposed method could be extended in a few different ways. First, we have treated the domains as independent datasets in this paper. In many situations, data are collected over different sub-national regions and over time. Structural information about spatial and temporal correlation, as well as domain-level similarities could further improve the modeling of domain-specific distributions, as cause of death and latent class distributions are likely to vary smoothly across similar domains. In addition, symptom distributions

conditional on similar causes of death may also show similarities. Tree-based methods for domain adaptation can be a fruitful direction to explore such additional information (Wu et al., 2021). Second, it is an important question to evaluate the discriminative power of VA questions in assigning causes, and identify the questions that do not contribute to cause assignments across different domains. This can facilitate the design of shorter VA questionnaires in the future. The proposed framework can be extended to perform symptom selection by further shrinking the response probabilities across different causes of death to the same values. Third, while our model focuses on the prediction task, the discovery and inference of interpretable latent classes shared across different populations alone is a topic of significant practical interest (De Vito et al., 2019). It is a challenging task in the VA context, as the collected symptoms could be measured inconsistently across domains and subject to reporting biases. This is related to the discussion of transportability in the causal inference literature (Wu et al., 2019; Ackerman et al., 2019).

Finally, we conclude by highlighting two additional open questions. First, questions remain about the accuracy of labels in the training data. A common practice of collecting labeled VA data is by having physician experts read and assign a cause best describing the death either individually or through panel discussion. The final consensus causes of death are treated as the ground truth. However, many factors could contribute to the misclassification of deaths and lead to noise in these training labels. In particular, when a new disease emerges and limited information about the disease is known, such as during the early periods of the COVID-19 pandemic, higher rate of misclassification may be expected from the training labels. A key challenge, therefore, will be to identify latent classes that correspond to misclassified or unseen causes. Methods dealing with label noises in classification tasks (Liu and Guo, 2020; Liu, 2021) could potentially improve cause-of-death

assignment models and produce more realistic characterization of uncertainties. Second, a grand challenge with VA is to embed the analysis framework into the mortality surveillance system to detect changes and abnormalities. Modeling the temporal drift of the data distribution is highly useful for surveillance purposes. Covariate-dependent modeling (Moran et al., 2021) is also important in this context, as additional information from both the population mortality surveillance and individual deaths could further help understand transferability and explain changes in mortality profile. We leave these topics for future work.

References

- Ackerman, B., Siddique, J., and Stuart, E. A. (2019). Transportability of outcome measurement error correction: from validation studies to intervention trials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10722*.
- Adams, R. P. and Ghahramani, Z. (2009). Archipelago: nonparametric Bayesian semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1–8.
- Blanco, A., Perez, A., Casillas, A., and Cobos, D. (2020). Extracting cause of death from verbal autopsy with deep learning interpretable methods. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*.
- Breiman, R. F., Blau, D. M., Mutevedzi, P., Akelo, V., Mandomando, I., Ogbuanu, I. U., Sow, S. O., Madrid, L., El Arifeen, S., Garel, M., et al. (2021). Postmortem investigations and identification of multiple causes of child deaths: An analysis of findings

- from the Child Health and Mortality Prevention Surveillance (CHAMPS) network. *PLoS medicine*, 18(9):e1003814.
- Byass, P., Huong, D. L., and Van Minh, H. (2003). A probabilistic approach to interpreting verbal autopsies: methodology and preliminary validation in Vietnam. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 31(62 suppl):32–37.
- Clark, S. J., Li, Z. R., and McCormick, T. H. (2018). Quantifying the contributions of training data and algorithm logic to the performance of automated cause-assignment algorithms for Verbal Autopsy. *arXiv: 1803.07141*.
- Datta, A., Fiksel, J., Amouzou, A., and Zeger, S. L. (2021). Regularized Bayesian transfer learning for population level etiological distributions. *Biostatistics*, 22(4):836–857.
- Daume III, H. and Marcu, D. (2006). Domain adaptation for statistical classifiers. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 26:101–126.
- De Vito, R., Bellio, R., Trippa, L., and Parmigiani, G. (2019). Multi-study factor analysis. *Biometrics*, 75(1):337–346.
- Dunson, D. B. and Xing, C. (2009). Nonparametric Bayes modeling of multivariate categorical data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(487):1042–1051.
- Fiksel, J., Datta, A., Amouzou, A., and Zeger, S. (2021). Generalized Bayes quantification learning under dataset shift.
- Flaxman, A. D., Vahdatpour, A., Green, S., James, S. L., and Murray, C. J. (2011). Random forests for verbal autopsy analysis: multisite validation study using clinical diagnostic gold standards. *Population health metrics*, 9(1):29.

- Glorot, X., Bordes, A., and Bengio, Y. (2011). Domain adaptation for large-scale sentiment classification: A deep learning approach. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*, pages 513—520.
- González, P., Castaño, A., Chawla, N. V., and Coz, J. J. D. (2017). A review on quantification learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 50(5):1–40.
- Goodman, L. (1974). Exploratory latent structure analysis using both identifiable and unidentifiable models. *Biometrika*, 61(2):215–231.
- King, G. and Lu, Y. (2008). Verbal autopsy methods with multiple causes of death. *Statistical Science*, 100(469).
- Kunihama, T., Li, Z. R., Clark, S. J., and McCormick, T. H. (2020). *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 14(1):241–256.
- Laparra, E., Bethard, S., and Miller, T. A. (2020). Rethinking domain adaptation for machine learning over clinical language. *JAMIA open*, 3(2):146–150.
- Li, Z. R., McComick, T. H., and Clark, S. J. (2020). Using Bayesian latent gaussian graphical models to infer symptom associations in verbal autopsies. *Bayesian Analysis*, 15(3):781–807.
- Liu, Y. (2021). Understanding instance-level label noise: Disparate impacts and treatments. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6725–6735. PMLR.
- Liu, Y. and Guo, H. (2020). Peer loss functions: Learning from noisy labels without knowing noise rates. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6226–6236. PMLR.
- Lozano, R., Lopez, A. D., Atkinson, C., Naghavi, M., Flaxman, A. D., and Murray, C. J.

- (2011). Performance of physician-certified verbal autopsies: multisite validation study using clinical diagnostic gold standards. *Population Health Metrics*, 9(1):1–13.
- Maher, D., Biraro, S., Hosegood, V., Isingo, R., Lutalo, T., Mushati, P., Ngwira, B., Nyirenda, M., Todd, J., and Zaba, B. (2010). Translating global health research aims into action: the example of the alpha network. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, 15(3):321–328.
- McCormick, T. H., Li, Z. R., Calvert, C., Crampin, A. C., Kahn, K., and Clark, S. J. (2016). Probabilistic cause-of-death assignment using verbal autopsies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(515):1036–1049.
- Mhasawade, V., Rehman, N. A., and Chunara, R. (2020). Population-aware hierarchical Bayesian domain adaptation via multi-component invariant learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pages 182–192.
- Miasnikof, P., Giannakeas, V., Gomes, M., Aleksandrowicz, L., Shestopaloff, A. Y., Alam, D., Tollman, S., Samarikhalaj, A., and Jha, P. (2015). Naive Bayes classifiers for verbal autopsies: comparison to physician-based classification for 21,000 child and adult deaths. *BMC Medicine*, 13(1):1.
- Moran, K. R., Turner, E. L., Dunson, D., and Herring, A. H. (2021). Bayesian hierarchical factor regression models to infer cause of death from verbal autopsy data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*.
- Moreno-Torres, J. G., Raeder, T., Alaiz-Rodríguez, R., Chawla, N. V., and Herrera, F. (2012). A unifying view on dataset shift in classification. *Pattern recognition*, 45(1):521–530.

- Murray, C. J., Lopez, A. D., Black, R., Ahuja, R., Ali, S. M., Baqui, A., Dandona, L., Dantzer, E., Das, V., Dhingra, U., et al. (2011a). Population health metrics research consortium gold standard verbal autopsy validation study: design, implementation, and development of analysis datasets. *Population health metrics*, 9(1):27.
- Murray, C. J., Lozano, R., Flaxman, A. D., Vahdatpour, A., and Lopez, A. D. (2011b). Robust metrics for assessing the performance of different verbal autopsy cause assignment methods in validation studies. *Population Health Metrics*, 9(1):28.
- Nkengasong, J., Gudo, E., Macicame, I., Maunze, X., Amouzou, A., Banke, K., Dowell, S., and Jani, I. (2020). Improving birth and death data for african decision making. *The Lancet Global Health*, 8(1):e35–e36.
- Ramponi, A. and Plank, B. (2020). Neural unsupervised domain adaptation in NLP – a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.00632*.
- Rehman, N. A., Aliapoulios, M. M., Umarwani, D., and Chunara, R. (2018). Domain adaptation for infection prediction from symptoms based on data from different study designs and contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.08835*.
- Sankoh, O. and Byass, P. (2012). The INDEPTH network: filling vital gaps in global epidemiology. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 41(3).
- Serina, P., Riley, I., Stewart, A., James, S. L., Flaxman, A. D., Lozano, R., Hernandez, B., Mooney, M. D., Luning, R., Black, R., et al. (2015). Improving performance of the Tariff method for assigning causes of death to verbal autopsies. *BMC Medicine*, 13(1):1.
- Shimodaira, H. (2000). Improving predictive inference under covariate shift by weighting the log-likelihood function. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 90(2):227–244.

- Storkey, A. (2009). When training and test sets are different: characterizing learning transfer. *Dataset shift in machine learning*, 30:3–28.
- Wang, M. and Deng, W. (2018). Deep visual domain adaptation: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 312:135–153.
- World Health Organization (2021). WHO civil registration and vital statistics strategic implementation plan 2021-2025.
- Wu, X., Braun, D., Kioumourtzoglou, M.-A., Choirat, C., Di, Q., and Dominici, F. (2019). Causal inference in the context of an error prone exposure: air pollution and mortality. *The annals of applied statistics*, 13(1):520.
- Wu, Z., Li, Z. R., Chen, I., and Li, M. (2021). Tree-informed Bayesian multi-source domain adaptation: cross-population probabilistic cause-of-death assignment using verbal autopsy. *arXiv preprint*.
- Zhou, J., Bhattacharya, A., Herring, A. H., and Dunson, D. B. (2015). Bayesian factorizations of big sparse tensors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(512):1562–1576.

A Additional results on synthetic datasets

We simulate deaths from 5 training domains with known causes-of-death and one target domain without labeled data. We let $C = 20$ and $S = 50$. We consider two distributions of samples in the training domains: (1) 2,000 deaths in each domain and (2) a total of 5,000 deaths unevenly distributed across the training domains with 70% of deaths in one domain and the rest evenly distributed across the other 4 domains. In each case, we consider four different data generating processes for $\lambda^{(g)}$:

1. Single domain with conditional independent symptoms: We let $K = 1$ and $\lambda_{c1}^{(g)} = 1$. That is, we assume the distribution of $p(X, Y)$ is the same in all the five domains and that the symptoms are conditionally independent given the causes;
2. Single domain: We let $\lambda^{(g)} = \lambda$ for all sites with $K = 10$ latent classes and draw $\lambda_c \sim \text{Dirichlet}(1)$ for each cause of death independently;
3. Independent domains: We let $\lambda_c^{(g)} \sim_{iid} \text{Dirichlet}(0.1)$ for all training and target domains. The Dirichlet prior encourages the weights to concentrate on a small number of latent classes. The target domain could contain latent classes that are rarely represented in the training domains in this case;
4. Dependent domains: We let $\lambda_c^{(g)} \sim_{iid} \text{Dirichlet}(0.1)$ for all training domains. For each cause of death c , we generate $\lambda^{(0)}$ as the average of two training sites with $\lambda_c^{(0)} = 0.5\lambda_c^{(g_{c1})} + 0.5\lambda_c^{(g_{c2})}$ for two randomly sampled $g_{c1}, g_{c2} \in \{1, \dots, G\}$. The mixing weights of the target domain are correlated with the mixing weights of a subset of the training domains within deaths due to each cause in this case.

The cause-of-death distributions are generated with independent $\pi^{(g)} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(0.5)$ for each domain, and the response probabilities are independently generated by $\theta_{ckj} \sim$

Beta(1,1). The symptoms are generated with the proposed latent class model with 10 latent classes. We further randomly mask 30% of the symptoms as missing.

In each scenario, we fit the proposed latent class model by either treating the training data as from a single domain (LCVA-S) or from multiple domains (LCVA-M). For the single domain model, we treat $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ as either the same parameter as mixing weights of the pooled data, or a free parameter estimated from the data, as described in Section 3.1 of the main manuscript. For the multi-domain model, we consider the two shrinkage parameterizations discussed in Section 3.2 of the main manuscript. The LCVA is fitted with a misspecified number of latent classes, $K = 5$. For all algorithms, we ran the MCMC chain for 4,000 iterations in the training stage and discarded the first half as burn-in. The 2,000 draws of the parameters are used in the prediction stage and the first half of the chains are again discarded. To benchmark the performance with state-of-the-art VA algorithms, we compare these metrics with InSilicoVA, which assumes symptoms are conditionally independent.

Figure 5 shows the performance of the algorithms. For the first case, all models achieves almost perfect prediction. The performance of InSilicoVA drops significantly in the latter three cases where the symptoms are dependent. Within the four parameterizations of LCVA, the single domain model with constant weight achieves better prediction accuracy in Case 2 when only prior shift exists, and the single domain model with new weights for the target domain performs slightly better in Case 3. Overall, the performance of the four variations of LCVA are mostly comparable across the simulation scenarios, and are consistently better than InSilicoVA.




Figure 5: CSMF accuracy (top row) and individual cause-of-death classification accuracy (bottom row) for the four simulation scenarios. LCVA performs significantly better than InSilicoVA. The different variations of LCVA perform similarly across the scenarios with relatively small differences depending on the similarity of the target and training domains.

B Additional results on PHMRC dataset

In this section, we present additional details and results for the analysis of the PHMRC dataset discussed in the main manuscript. Figure 6 shows the empirical distribution of the causes in the six study sites in the PHMRC data, which we treat as the true CSMFs in our evaluation.

Figure 7 shows the difference of the CSMF accuracy and top cause accuracy of LCVA and InSilicoVA, when compared to the Bayesian factor model across 50 simulated datasets, for the synthetic domain experiment discussed in Section 4.1 of the main manuscript. The improvement over the Bayesian factor model is not sensitive to the choice of K , and both the Bayesian factor model and the multi-domain LCVA improves from the InSilicoVA significantly in terms of these two metrics. Figure 8 and Figure 9 shows the CSMF accuracy and top cause accuracy of the four variants of LCVA under different choices of K in the six out-of-domain prediction experiments discussed in Section 4.2. The main manuscript presents the results for $K = 3$. There are some variations in the two metrics when K varies, but again not significantly, except for the single-domain LCVA with new weights estimated without shrinking to existing mixing weights, which is as expected since this model has the most free parameters and is more prone to overfitting. Overall, the performance of the LCVA does not change dramatically as K varies. It remains a future work to determine the best choice of K for a given dataset.

Figure 10 to 15 shows the posterior means of the estimated conditional probabilities of observing each symptom given cause of death and the latent class membership.




Figure 6: True CSMFs in the six study sites in the PHMRC data.




Figure 7: Difference of the CSMF accuracy and top cause accuracy from LCVA and InSilicoVA, compared to the Bayesian factor model in the first evaluation study. The vertical bars correspond to 90% uncertainty interval across the 50 datasets.




Figure 8: CSMF accuracy of LCVA under different choices of K . The dashed horizontal line represent the CSMF accuracy of the InSilicoVA algorithm.




Figure 9: Top cause prediction accuracy of LCVA under different choices of K . The dashed horizontal line represent the top cause accuracy of the InSilicoVA algorithm.




Figure 10: Posterior means of the conditional probabilities of observing all symptoms given causes of death and latent class membership.




Figure 11: Posterior means of the conditional probabilities of observing all symptoms given causes of death and latent class membership.




Figure 12: Posterior means of the conditional probabilities of observing all symptoms given causes of death and latent class membership.




Figure 14: Posterior means of the conditional probabilities of observing all symptoms given causes of death and latent class membership.

C Additional calibration results when limited target data is available

In this section, we present additional results on the analysis of calibrating LCVA and InSilicoVA with additional labeled data from the target domain. Table 3 shows the three levels of the cause list we use in the calibration process. The algorithms are fitted on the original 34 cause and the individual level predictions are aggregated to the other two broader categories. The result with the 11-cause list is presented in the main manuscript. Figure 16 compares the calibrated CSMF accuracy on the original 34-cause list. LCVA before calibration achieves higher CSMF accuracy than the calibrated InSilicoVA in four of the six sites. Figure 17 compares the calibrated CSMF accuracy on the broader 5-cause list. In this case, the performance of the calibrated methods are similar, which is as expected as the 5 by 5 classification error can be estimated with high precision given 30% of labeled target domain data. This analysis suggest that our approach to directly model the joint distribution of symptoms across domains is beneficial both with and without labeled data from the target domain, with the greatest improvements from the conditional independence model when the number of causes to consider is large.

34 Causes	11 Causes	5 Causes
Acute Myocardial Infarction	Disease of the Circulatory System	Circulatory
Other Cardiovascular Diseases	Disease of the Circulatory System	Circulatory
Stroke	Disease of the Circulatory System	Circulatory
Bite of Venomous Animal	External	External
Drowning	External	External
Falls	External	External
Fires	External	External
Homicide	External	External
Other Injuries	External	External
Poisonings	External	External
Road Traffic	External	External
Suicide	External	External
AIDS	Infectious and Parasitic Diseases	Infectious
Diarrhea/Dysentery	Infectious and Parasitic Diseases	Infectious
Malaria	Infectious and Parasitic Diseases	Infectious
Other Infectious Diseases	Infectious and Parasitic Diseases	Infectious
Pneumonia	Infectious and Parasitic Diseases	Infectious
TB	Infectious and Parasitic Diseases	Infectious
Maternal	Maternal	Maternal
Cirrhosis	Gastrointestinal disorders	Non-Communicable
Epilepsy	Mental and Nervous System Disorders	Non-Communicable
Breast Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Cervical Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Colorectal Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Esophageal Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Leukemia/Lymphomas	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Lung Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Prostate Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Stomach Cancer	Neoplasms	Non-Communicable
Diabetes	Nutritional and Endocrine Disorders	Non-Communicable
Other Non-communicable Diseases	Other Noncommunicable Diseases	Non-Communicable
Renal Failure	Renal Disorders	Non-Communicable
Asthma	Respiratory disorders	Non-Communicable
COPD	Respiratory disorders	Non-Communicable

Table 3: Two levels of aggregation of the 34 causes of death in the PHMRC dataset in the calibration analysis.




Figure 16: Comparison of LCVA-M with domain-level mixture and InSilicoVA when the cause of death of 30% of data in the target domain are known. The CSMF accuracy is evaluated on the original 34 causes. The horizontal line indicates the CSMF accuracy of the two methods before calibrating to the labeled deaths. The box plot shows the distribution of the calibrated CSMF accuracy over 50 resampled labeled dataset.




Figure 17: Comparison of LCVA-M with domain-level mixture and InSilicoVA when the cause of death of 30% of data in the target domain are known. The causes of deaths have been aggregated into 5 broad categories. The horizontal line indicates the CSMF accuracy of the two methods before calibrating to the labeled deaths. The box plot shows the distribution of the calibrated CSMF accuracy over 50 resampled labeled dataset.