

BIOS668 HW8
Sara O'Brien
4/12/23

Honor Code: On my honor, I have neither given no received unauthorized aid on this assignment. *Sara O'Brien*

Q1. Cross-over design

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS SECTION

Study Design

This study explores whether treatment A is superior to treatment B in treating a specific disease. We hypothesize that treatment A will result in a larger improvement in the biomarker measurement compared to treatment B. The study has a randomized 2x2 cross-over design. Subjects were randomized in a 1:1 ratio to either treatment group A or treatment group B for 5 days, then had a washout period of 3 days, and finally received the opposite treatment for another 5 days.

Sample Size and Power

Assuming a true mean difference between groups of 0.8, between-subject standard deviations of 0.5 and 1.0 under the two treatment arms respectively, a correlation of 0.15 between the within-subject measurements, a sample size of 14 per treatment arm is required to achieve a power of 0.80 at a two-sided significance level of 0.10. We assume no missing or drop-out subjects.

See SAS Code:

```
12 proc power;  
13 twosamplemeans test=diff  
14 alpha=0.10  
15 power=0.80  
16 meandiff=0.80  
17 stddev=0.8043997  
18 npergroup = .  
19 sides=2;  
20 run;
```

Fixed Scenario Elements	
Distribution	Normal
Method	Exact
Number of Sides	2
Alpha	0.1
Mean Difference	0.8
Standard Deviation	0.8044
Nominal Power	0.8
Null Difference	0

Computed N per Group	
Actual Power	N per Group
0.820	14

Analysis plan

The primary outcome of this study in the biomarker measurement captured at 2 days after each treatment cycle. The analysis of the primary outcome will compare the mean difference in biomarker measurements between treatment A and B using a paired t-test. Using a variance for the paired difference for each subject, a one sample Z-test will test whether the paired differences are from a normal distribution with mean 0. This analysis will test for carry over effects and operate under an assumption of normality and constant mean. No interim analysis is planned. All analyses will be conducted using SAS software.

Simulation

To verify our sample size and power calculation, we can conduct a simulation study. We will simulate data under the assumed conditions and evaluate the power of the statistical test using the sample size calculated above. In the following code, we generate 1000 simulated data sets and calculate the p-value of the paired t-test for each data set. We check our power by determining the number of p-values less than our significance threshold and divide by the number of simulations. Since the power and type I error are close to what we expect, our sample size is appropriate.

```

104 # Parameters
105 set.seed(730317945) # for reproducibility
106 n_sims <- 1000 # number of simulations
107 n <- 14 # sample size per group
108 alpha <- 0.1 # significance level
109 power <- 0.8 # desired power
110 sd_a <- 0.5 # between-subject standard deviation for treatment A
111 sd_b <- 1.0 # between-subject standard deviation for treatment B
112 corr <- 0.15 # correlation between within-subject measurements
113 meandiff <- 0.8 # true mean difference
114 sd_within <- sqrt((sd_a^2 + sd_b^2 - 2*corr*sd_a*sd_b)/(2*(1-corr))) # within-subject std
115
116 # Simulation
117 delta <- meandiff / sd_within
118 n_total <- 2 * n
119 n_per_group <- n
120 power_actual <- replicate(n_sims, {
121   # Simulate Data
122   d <- data.frame(
123     subject = rep(1:n, 2),
124     treatment = rep(c("A", "B"), each = n),
125     outcome = rnorm(n_total, mean = c(meandiff, 0), sd = sd_within)
126   )
127
128   # Compute Test Statistic and P-value
129   res <- t.test(d$outcome ~ d$treatment, paired = TRUE, alternative = "greater")
130
131   # Determine if Null Hypothesis is Rejected
132   res$p.value <- alpha
133 })
134
135 actual_power <- 1 - mean(power_actual)

```

Power: 0.896

Q2. Cluster randomized design

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS SECTION

Study Design

This study explores whether teaching two types of cooking habits in communities will have different consequences on the occurrence of salmonella among children. The study is a cluster randomized controlled trial. The intervention, an educational program for the cooking habit (A or B), was delivered at the community level and observations were made on children at the individual level.

Sample size and power

Under cooking habit A, salmonella rates were assumed to be 30%. Under cooking habit B, salmonella rates were assumed to be 10%. The intra-cluster correlation was assumed to be about 0.10. This ICC is the result of the children living within a community sharing the same environment. About 150 children per community with n per group = $[(1.96+0.842)^2 * (0.3(0.7) + 0.1(0.9)) / (0.2^2 * (1+ (151)*0.1))]$ is required to achieve a power of 0.80 at a two-sided alpha level of 0.05. We assume no missing or drop-out subjects.

Analysis plan

The primary outcome of this study is the occurrence or disease event rate of a certain disease. The disease event rates will be determined in each of the clusters, or communities, and the differences in disease rates between the two intervention groups of each pair will be calculated. The model will adjust for ICC. The effect of the intervention will be tested using a paired t-test comparing the slopes in the two interventions. No interim analysis is planned.

Q3. Group-sequential design

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS SECTION

Study Design

This study explores whether treatment strategy A is equally effective or superior at treating malaria as treatment strategy B. The study is a multicenter, randomized (1:1), controlled, parallel group-sequential superiority trial.

Sample Size and Power

The malaria infection rate under treatment strategy A is assumed to be 0.50. The malaria infection rate under treatment strategy B is assumed to be 0.20. One interim analysis is planned after recruitment of 2/3 of the complete sample size to assess significance of findings. At sample size of 72 participants at interim and 107 participants total is needed to achieve a 0.80 at a two-sided alpha level of 0.05. We assume no missing or drop-out subjects.

```

97 proc seqdesign pss stopprob errspend;
98   *TwoSidedPocock: design nstages=X method=poc INFO = CUM(0.67 1.00)
99   alpha = 0.05 beta = 0.20;
100
101   TwoSidedOBrienFleming:
102   design nstages=2 method=obf INFO = CUM(0.67 1.00)
103   alpha = 0.025 beta = 0.20;
104
105   samplesize model=TWOSAMPLEFREQ(NULLPROP=0.50 PROP=0.20 TEST=PROP REF=NULLPROP weight=1);
106 run;

```

Sample Size Summary	
Test	Two-Sample Proportions
Null Proportion	0.5
Proportion (Group A)	0.2
Test Statistic	Z for Proportion
Reference Proportions	Null Ref
Max Sample Size	106.8294
Expected Sample Size (Null Ref)	106.6353
Expected Sample Size (Alt Ref)	92.51524
Weight (Group A)	1
Weight (Group B)	1

Sample Sizes (N)								
Two-Sample Z Test for Proportion Difference								
Stage	Fractional N				Ceiling N			
	N	N(Grp 1)	N(Grp 2)	Information	N	N(Grp 1)	N(Grp 2)	Information
1	71.58	35.79	35.79	71.5757	72	36	36	72.0000
2	106.83	53.41	53.41	106.8	108	54	54	108.0

Analysis Plan

The primary outcome of this study is the occurrence of malaria infection (infected or uninfected) post-treatment. The O'Brien-Fleming boundary will be used to evaluate the outcome. The boundary will be determined based on the planned interim analysis. If the boundary is crossed, the study will be stopped early. Otherwise, the study will continue until the planned sample size is reached.

Q4. Group-sequential design

Table 1

*	Values	$\alpha(0.2)$	$\alpha(0.4)$	$\alpha(0.6)$	$\alpha(0.8)$	$\alpha(1.0)$
1	OBf Boundary	4.56	3.23	2.63	2.28	2.04
	OBf α spending	0	0.001	0.004	0.013	0.025
2	Pocock Boundary	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41
	Pocock α spending	0.008	0.014	0.018	0.022	0.025

Table 2

*	Values	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5
1	OBf Boundary	4.56	3.23	2.63	2.28	2.04
	OBf $\alpha_1(t)$	0	0.001	0.004	0.013	0.025
2	Pocock Boundary	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41
	Pocock $\alpha_2(t)$	0.008	0.014	0.018	0.022	0.025
3	Haybittle Boundary	3	3	3	3	1.99

```

108 proc seqdesign pss stopprob errspend;
109   OneSidedPocock: design nstages=5 method=poc ALT=UPPER INFO = CUM(0.20 .40 .60 .80 1.000) alpha = 0.025 beta = 0.20;
110   OneSidedOBrienFleming: design nstages=5 method=obf ALT=UPPER INFO = CUM(0.20 .40 .60 .80 1.000) alpha = 0.025 beta = 0.20;
111   OneSidedHaybittle: design nstages=5 method=HP ALT=UPPER INFO = CUM(0.20 .40 .60 .80 1.000) alpha = 0.025 beta = 0.20;
112   OneSidedOBfAlpha: design nstages=5 method=ERRFUNCOBF ALT=UPPER INFO = CUM(0.20 .40 .60 .80 1.000) alpha = 0.025 beta = 0.20;
113   OneSidedPocockAlpha: design nstages=5 method=ERRFUNCPoc ALT=UPPER INFO = CUM(0.20 .40 .60 .80 1.000) alpha = 0.025 beta = 0.20;
114 run;

```

The SEQDESIGN Procedure	
Design: OneSided Pocock	
Design Information	
Statistic Distribution	Normal
Boundary Scale	Standardized Z
Alternative Hypothesis	Upper
Early Stop	Reject Null
Method	Pocock
Boundary Key	Both
Number of Stages	5
Alpha	0.025
Beta	0.2
Power	0.8
Max Information (Percent of Fixed Sample)	122.8573
Null Ref ASN (Percent of Fixed Sample)	121.3371
Alt Ref ASN (Percent of Fixed Sample)	79.91228

Boundary Information (Standardized Z Scale)			
Null Reference = 0			
Stage	Information Level	Alternative Reference	Boundary Values Upper
	Proportion	Upper	Alpha
1	0.2000	1.38873	2.41317
2	0.4000	1.96396	2.41317
3	0.6000	2.40535	2.41317
4	0.8000	2.77746	2.41317
5	1.0000	3.10530	2.41317

Error Spending Information			
Stage	Information Level	Cumulative Error Spending Upper	
	Proportion	Beta	Alpha
1	0.2000	0.00000	0.00791
2	0.4000	0.00000	0.01376
3	0.6000	0.00000	0.01827
4	0.8000	0.00000	0.02193
5	1.0000	0.20000	0.02500

The SEQDESIGN Procedure	
Design: OneSided O'Brien Fleming	
Design Information	
Statistic Distribution	Normal
Boundary Scale	Standardized Z
Alternative Hypothesis	Upper
Early Stop	Reject Null
Method	O'Brien-Fleming
Boundary Key	Both
Number of Stages	5
Alpha	0.025
Beta	0.2
Power	0.8
Max Information (Percent of Fixed Sample)	102.8411
Null Ref ASN (Percent of Fixed Sample)	102.4734
Alt Ref ASN (Percent of Fixed Sample)	81.75701

Boundary Information (Standardized Z Scale)			
Null Reference = 0			
Stage	Information Level	Alternative Reference	Boundary Values Upper
	Proportion	Upper	Alpha
1	0.2000	1.27058	4.56174
2	0.4000	1.79687	3.22564
3	0.6000	2.20071	2.63372
4	0.8000	2.54116	2.28087
5	1.0000	2.84110	2.04007

Error Spending Information			
Stage	Information Level	Cumulative Error Spending Upper	
	Proportion	Beta	Alpha
1	0.2000	0.00000	0.00000
2	0.4000	0.00000	0.00063
3	0.6000	0.00000	0.00445
4	0.8000	0.00000	0.01279
5	1.0000	0.20000	0.02500

The SEQDESIGN Procedure	
Design: OneSided Haybittle-Peto	
Design Information	
Statistic Distribution	Normal
Boundary Scale	Standardized Z
Alternative Hypothesis	Upper
Early Stop	Reject Null
Method	Haybittle-Peto
Boundary Key	Both
Number of Stages	5
Alpha	0.025
Beta	0.2
Power	0.8
Max Information (Percent of Fixed Sample)	101.5469
Null Ref ASN (Percent of Fixed Sample)	101.3161
Alt Ref ASN (Percent of Fixed Sample)	85.94106

Boundary Information (Standardized Z Scale)			
Null Reference = 0			
Stage	Information Level	Alternative Reference	Boundary Values Upper
	Proportion	Upper	Alpha
1	0.2000	1.26255	3.00000
2	0.4000	1.78552	3.00000
3	0.6000	2.18681	3.00000
4	0.8000	2.52511	3.00000
5	1.0000	2.82316	1.99005

Error Spending Information			
Stage	Information Level	Cumulative Error Spending Upper	
	Proportion	Beta	Alpha
1	0.2000	0.00000	0.00135
2	0.4000	0.00000	0.00246
3	0.6000	0.00000	0.00337
4	0.8000	0.00000	0.00413
5	1.0000	0.20000	0.02500