

# Bayesian Clinical Trials

## Sample Size for Binomial Proportions

## Sample size based on interval widths

What sample size is needed to provide sufficient information to specify the true difference between two proportions  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  to within a total  $100(1-\alpha)$  interval width of given percentage points (say  $w$ )?

$$n = 4Z_{1-\alpha/2}^2 \frac{[\pi_1(1-\pi_1) + \pi_2(1-\pi_2)]}{w^2}$$

This formula requires point estimates of  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  while a better summary of the available information is a distribution over a range of values.

# Bayesian approach

Let  $\theta$  in  $\Theta$  the parameter of interest. We recall that the posterior distribution is

$$f(\theta|x) = \frac{L(x|\theta) g(\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} L(x|\theta) g(\theta) d\theta}$$

and depends on the data  $x$ , which is of course unknown at the planning stages of the experiment. The predictive distribution is

$$f(x) = \int_{\Theta} L(x|\theta) g(\theta) d\theta$$

Typically, we wish a highest posterior density (HPD) or other posterior credible interval of length  $I$  that covers  $\theta$  with probability  $(1 - \alpha)$ . HPD are optimal in the sense that they lead to the smallest sample sizes for any given coverage.

## Criteria based on HPD (Joseph et al, 1997)

- ▶ ACC: controls the coverage rate of fixed length credible intervals over the predictive distribution of the data
- ▶ ALC: controls the length of credible intervals with a fixed coverage rate over the predictive distribution of the data.
- ▶ WOC: guarantees that the desired coverage rate and interval length over all (or a subset of) possible datasets.

# Average Coverage Criterion (ACC)

The ACC sample size is the smallest integer such that for a fixed nominal interval length  $l$  the expected coverage level is at least  $1 - \alpha$ , where expectation is taken over the marginal distribution of  $x$ :

$$\int \left( \int_{a(x,n)}^{a(x,n)+l} f(\theta|x) d\theta \right) f(x) dx \geq 1 - \alpha$$

where  $a(x, n)$  is the lower limit of the HPD interval of length  $l$  for the posterior density.

# Average Length Criterion (ALC)

The ALC sample size is the smallest integer such that for a fixed nominal coverage level  $1 - \alpha$  the expected length is at most  $l$ , where expectation is taken over the marginal distribution of  $x$ . The ALC has a two-step formula. The first step is to find the HPD length  $l'(x, n)$  that satisfies

$$\int_{a(x,n)}^{a(x,n)+l'(x,n)} f(\theta|x) d\theta = 1 - \alpha$$

Then choose the minimum  $n$  that satisfies:

$$\int l'(x, n) f(x) dx \leq l$$

# Worst Outcome Criterion (WOC)

The WOC sample size is determined by the smallest integer  $n$  such that

$$\inf \left( \int_{a(x,n)}^{a(x,n)+I} f(\theta|x) d\theta \right) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

## Comparison between ALC, ACC and WOC (Cao et al, 2009)

- ▶ Because most researchers tend to report the length of the confidence interval of a fixed coverage, instead of the coverage of the interval of a fixed length, the ALC is more conventional than the ACC.
- ▶ WOC provides a conservative sample size and can give more assurance than the “average” assurances provided by the ACC and ALC criteria.
- ▶ When a posterior density has the common density shape of concave flat tails and convex steep center, the nominal coverage  $1 - \alpha$  will determine the relative difference between the ALC sample size and the ACC sample size. A “small”  $\alpha$  implies that ACC needs a larger sample size than the ALC. It is the opposite for “bigger”  $\alpha$ .



# The difference of two binomial proportions

Let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be the total number of successes out of  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  trials from independent binomial experiments with parameters  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ , respectively. We can choose two independent beta priors

$$g(\pi_1) = \text{Beta}(c_1, d_1) = B(c_1, d_1)^{-1} \pi_1^{c_1-1} (1 - \pi_1)^{d_1-1}$$

$$g(\pi_2) = \text{Beta}(c_2, d_2) = B(c_2, d_2)^{-1} \pi_2^{c_2-1} (1 - \pi_2)^{d_2-1}$$

for  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ , respectively - each conjugate to the binomial likelihood - so the posterior distribution is the product of two Beta distributions:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\pi_1, \pi_2 | x_1, x_2, n_1, n_2) &= \\ &= \frac{\prod_{i=1}^2 \pi_i^{c_i+x_i-1} (1 - \pi_i)^{d_i+n_i-x_i-1}}{B(c_1 + x_1, d_1 + n_1 - x_1) B(c_2 + x_2, d_2 + n_2 - x_2)} \end{aligned}$$

and the predictive distribution is the product of two betabinomial distributions:

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_1, x_2) &= \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^2 [B(c_i + x_i, d_i + n_i - x_i) B(c_i, d_i)]^{-1} \pi_i^{c_i + x_i - 1} (1 - \pi_i)^{d_i + n_i - x_i - 1} \end{aligned}$$

We make a change of variable as  $\theta = \pi_2 - \pi_1$  and the posterior becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\pi_1, \theta | x_1, x_2, n_1, n_2) &\propto \\ &\propto \pi_1^{c_1 + x_1 - 1} (1 - \pi_1)^{d_1 + n_1 - x_1 - 1} (\pi_1 - \theta)^{c_2 + x_2 - 1} (1 - \pi_1 + \theta)^{d_2 + n_2 - x_2 - 1} \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the marginal posterior distribution of  $\theta$  is

$$f(\theta | x_1, x_2, n_1, n_2) = \int_{\max(0, \theta)}^{\min(\theta + 1, 1)} f(\pi_1, \theta | x_1, x_2, n_1, n_2) d\pi_1$$

- ▶ ACC sample size for  $\theta$  is the minimum  $n$ :

$$\sum_{x_1=0}^n \sum_{x_2=0}^n \int_{a(x_1, x_2)}^{a(x_1, x_2) + l} f(\theta | x_1, x_2, n) d\theta \quad p(x_1, x_2) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

- ▶ ALC sample size for  $\theta$  is the minimum  $n$ :

$$\sum_{x_1=0}^n \sum_{x_2=0}^n l'(x_1, x_2) p(x_1, x_2) \leq l$$

where  $l'(x_1, x_2)$  is the HPD length that satisfies:

$$\int_{a(x_1, x_2)}^{a(x_1, x_2) + l'(x_1, x_2)} f(\theta | x_1, x_2, n) d\theta = 1 - \alpha$$

- ▶ WOC sample size for  $\theta$  is the minimum  $n$ :

$$\int_{a(x_1^*, x_2^*)}^{a(x_1^*, x_2^*) + l} f(\theta | x_1^*, x_2^*, n) d\theta \geq 1 - \alpha$$

where  $x_1^*$  and  $x_2^*$  are the numbers of successes that maximize the length of the HPD interval.

# References

- ▶ Joseph L, du Berger R, Bélisle P. Bayesian and mixed Bayesian/likelihood criteria for sample size determination. Stat Med 1997; 16(7): 769-781.
- ▶ Cao J, Lee JJ, Alber S. Comparison of Bayesian sample size criteria: ACC, ALC, and WOC. J Stat Plan Inference 2009; 139(12):4111-4122.