

A Comparative Analysis of Bayesian Sampling Methodologies for Design Space Identification in Quality by Design (QbD) Approach

DENIZ AKINC ABDULHAYOGLU JEAN-FRANÇOIS MICHIELS

NCS - 2024

Wiesbaden

September 25-27, 2024

Disclaimer

This presentation is intended to communicate PharmaLex's capabilities which are backed by the author's expertise. However, [PharmaLex GmbH] and its parent, Cencora, Inc., strongly encourage readers to review the references provided with this presentation and all available information related to the topics mentioned herein and to rely on their own experience and expertise in making decisions related thereto as the presentation may contain certain marketing statements and does not constitute legal advice.

Design Space Identification in QbD approach

Design Space Identification in QbD approach

Cencord

Design Space - 2 factors example

Design Space Identification in QbD approach

Cencord

Likelihood Prior Posterior $Pr(D|\Theta, M) Pr(\Theta|M)$ $Pr(\Theta|\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{M}) =$ $Pr(D|M)$ Evidence

Bayes' Theorem

Motivation: Sampling Posterior

Prior

Sampling directly from the likelihood $\mathcal{L}(\Theta)$ is hard.

MCMC: Solving a Hard Problem once. (Markov Chain Monte Carlo)

Cencord

Motivation: Sampling Posterior

Comparison of Nested Sampling vs. MCMC Sampling

Source: Handley, Will (2023)

MCMC

- Single "walker"
- Explores posterior
- Fast, if proposal matrix is tuned

Nested Sampling

- Ensemble of "live points"
- Scans from prior to peak of likelihood
- Might be slower, no tuning required

Advantages and disadvantages of Nested Sampling

- Does not need gradients
- Ensemble sampler
- Multimodal exploration
- Can characterize complex uncertainties in real-time
- Can allocate samples much more efficiently in some cases
- Very parallelizable
- Possesses well-motivated stopping criteria (Skilling 2006; Speagle 2020)
- Can help perform model selection

Advantages Disadvantages

- Can not use gradients as "naturally" as HMC.
- Implementations require a prior transform.
- Slow (but steady) and runtime sensitive to size of prior.
- Sampling is more involved.

The main goal of using gradients is to improve dimensionality scaling / reliability

Examples on Statistical Inference

 $Y_i = \alpha - \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3$ $-\beta_4X_1X_3+\beta_5X_2X_2+\varepsilon_i$

Computation Duration with dynesty <2.5min

Computation Duration with PyMC3 <9min

Example on Design Space Computation

For a simple case study with two design variables, $d := (d1; d2)$ and a single CQA, s.

$$
s = \theta d_1^2 + d_2
$$

with the model parameter θ . The goal is to characterize the probabilistic DS inside the knowledge space $K := [-1, 1]^2$ imposed by the following CQA limits:

 $0.2 < s < 0.75$

$$
\mathcal{D}_{\text{nom}} := \{d \in [-1,1]^2 : 0.20 \le d_1^2 + d_2 \le 0.75\}
$$
\n
$$
\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)
$$
\n
$$
\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{D}_{\alpha} := \{d \in [-1,1] : \mathbb{P}\left[0.20 \le \theta d_1^2 + d_2 \le 0.75 \mid \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\theta}, \sigma_{\theta})\right] \ge \alpha\}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{D}_{\alpha} := \{d \in [-1,1] : \mathbb{P}\left[0.20 \le \theta d_1^2 + d_2 \le 0.75 \mid \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\theta}, \sigma_{\theta})\right] \ge \alpha\}
$$
\n
$$
= \left\{d \in [-1,1] : \text{erf}\left(\frac{0.75 - \mu_{\theta}d_1^2 - d_2}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_{\theta}d_1^2}\right) - \text{erf}\left(\frac{0.20 - \mu_{\theta}d_1^2 - d_2}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_{\theta}d_1^2}\right) \ge 2\alpha\right\}
$$
\nReliability
\nvalue
\nMonte Carlo (Algorithm 1) sampling (Algorithm 2)
\nUncertainty scenario: $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$

Conclusions

To summarize, Nested Sampling is an attractive algorithm framework for Bayesian inference and design space computation because

- it explores the parameter space globally,
- it handles multi-modal distributions and phase transitions well,
- it initializes and terminates at a well-defined point without cumbersome supervision, and
- it leverages efficient strategies from Bayesian parameter estimation for generating replacement proposals during the DS characterization.
- it is effective for larger DS characterization with a handful of process parameters, in the presence of a complex dynamic model and realistic model uncertainty.
- it can even be competitive of MCMC with optimization methods relying on process flexibility concepts, even in low-dimensional DS characterization problems

Further Studies

- High Dimensional experiments:
- Advanced kinetic models based on ordinary differential equations
- Multimodal and mixture models

Thank you!

Jean-François Michiels

Associate Director Cencora PharmaLex Data Strategy & Quantitative Sciences

Deniz Akinc

Senior Manager Cencora PharmaLex Data Strategy & Quantitative Sciences

References

- 1. ICH Q8 (R2) Pharmaceutical development Scientific guideline
- 2. Skilling, J. (2006). Nested sampling for general Bayesian computation.
- 3. Kusumo, K. P., Gomoescu, L., Paulen, R., García Muñoz, S., Pantelides, C. C., Shah, N., & Chachuat, B. (2019). Bayesian approach to probabilistic design space characterization: A nested sampling strategy. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, *59*(6), 2396-2408.
- 4. Kusumo, Kennedy P., et al. "Nested Sampling Strategy for Bayesian Design Space Characterization." *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. Vol. 48. Elsevier, 2020. 1957-1962.
- 5. Speagle, J. S. (2020). dynesty: a dynamic nested sampling package for estimating Bayesian posteriors and evidences. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, *493*(3), 3132-3158.