# A Comparison of Approaches for Unplanned Sample Size Changes in Phase II Clinical Trials

Molly Olson molly.a.olson@vanderbilt.edu Advisor: Tatsuki Koyama

Vanderbilt University
Department Of Biostatistics

June 13, 2017

#### Outline

Background and Introduction

Motivation

Deviation from Planned Sample Sizes in Second Stage

Deviation from planned sample sizes in first stage

#### Phase II Trials

- ▶ Phase I: Evaluate safety and dose
- ▶ Phase II: Evaluate initial effect to determine phase III trial
- ▶ Phase III: Evaluate efficacy
- ▶ Phase II Two-stage
  - ▶ Mitigate the risk of exposure
  - ▶ Don't want to "waste" resources

#### Two-stage Phase II Trial

 $H_0: p \le p_0, H_1: p > p_1$ 

- 1. stage 1:  $n_1$  patients are enrolled
  - ▶  $X_1 \sim \text{Binomial}(n_1, p) = \# \text{ of successes in first stage}$
- 2. If number of responses is  $r_1$  or fewer, trial stopped for futility
- 3. Otherwise, stage 2:  $n_2$  patients are enrolled  $(n_t = n_1 + n_2$  total patients now)
  - $X_2 \sim \text{Binomial}(n_2, p) = \# \text{ of successes in second stage}$ 
    - $X_t = X_1 + X_2$
- 4. If number of responses is  $r_t$  or fewer, lack of efficacy concluded
- 5. Otherwise efficacy concluded
- $\triangleright p_0, p_1, n_1, n_t, r_1, r_t, \alpha, \beta$  are design parameters
- ▶  $n_1, n_t, r_1, r_t$  are chosen so that type I error rate is less than  $\alpha$  and the type II error rate is less than  $\beta$ .

## Types of Two-Stage Designs

- Simon introduced Optimal and Minimax criteria for good designs
  - $\triangleright$  Optimal minimizes the expected sample size under  $H_0$
  - ▶ Minimax minimizes the maximum sample size
- ▶ Jung et al. introduced Admissible designs
  - ▶ Compromise between Optimal and Minimax
  - Similar maximum sample sizes as Minimax
  - $\triangleright$  Similar expected sample size under  $H_0$  as Optimal
- ► Suppose  $H_0: p_0 \le 0.25, H_1: p_1 > 0.4, \alpha = 0.05, \beta = 0.2$

Design	$n_t$	$n_1$	$r_1$	$r_t$	$EN_0$	$PET_0$
Optimal	71	20	5	23	39.5	0.617
Minimax	60	51	16	20	52	0.886
Admissible	63	25	6	21	41.7	0.561

## Deviation from the design

- ► Attain different enrollment than planned in first and/or second stage
- ▶ Why would we deviate?
  - Unanticipated recruitment speed
  - ► Unanticipated drop out rates
  - ▶ Delay in communication for multi-center trials
  - Ethical considerations
  - Shopping for sponsors
- Nice properties go out the window
- Currently, common practice is to treat attained sample size as planned
- ▶ Leads to invalid inference
- Hypothesis testing is not straightforward

## Setting the Scene

- ▶ Goal is to make a decision
- ▶ How do we do this if our attained sample size is different than planned?
- P-value calculations are complicated we don't consider these solutions
- ► Consider prespecified "redesigns" recalculating critical values
- Primary focus on deviation in first stage

# Deviation from Planned Sample Sizes in Second Stage

- ▶ Over-enrollment in first stage: perform interim analysis on the planned number of first stage, adjust testing procedure for attained second stage
- ▶ Under-enrollment: just wait
- ▶ Literature exists for point estimation, calculation of p-values when stage II differs (Review: Porcher *et al.*)
- ▶ P-values in two-stage trials depend on planned design and attained data, complicated when attained SS differ than planned [Koyama and Chen]

#### Koyama and Chen

- ▶ Koyama and Chen, StatMed, 2008
- ▶ Notation:
  - ▶ Planned design parameters:  $n_1, n_t, n_2 = n_t n_1 r_1, r_t, \alpha, \beta$ .
  - Attained design parameters:  $n_1, n_t^*, n_2^* = n_t^* - n_1, r_1, r_t^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*$
- ▶ Let first stage remained as planned and change testing procedure in stage II
- ▶ Calculate new critical value,  $r_t^*$ , by finding maximum integer s.t.

$$P[X_2^* \ge r_t^* | X_1 = x_1] \le P[X_2 \ge r_t | X_1 = x_1]$$
  
 $X_2^* \sim \text{Binomial}(n_2^*, p_0)$ 

Leviation from Planned Sample Sizes in Second Stage

## Koyama and Chen

- Results in controlled unconditional type I error rate new CV gives more conservative conditional type I error rate
- ▶ New critical value depends on number of positive responses

#### Zeng et al.

- ▶ Zeng et al., StatMed, 2015
- ► Attempts to maximize unconditional power while controlling type I error
- ▶  $r_2^*$  new stage II critical value and  $r_t^* \equiv r_2^* + x_1$
- ▶ Second stage CV is integer that maximizes unconditional power while subject to type I error  $\leq \alpha$
- ► Theoretically possible, computationally difficult. No closed form solution.
- Propose normal approximation to ease computation of power
- ▶ Math (Lagrange multipliers, derivatives, substitution, searching over  $\lambda$ s)
- ▶ Solve an ugly equation for  $r_2^*$

Leviation from Planned Sample Sizes in Second Stage

#### Zeng et al.

$$\left(\frac{1}{p_0(1-p_0)} - \frac{1}{p_1(1-p_1)}\right) r_2^{*2} - \frac{2n_2^*(p_0-p_1)}{(1-p_0)(1-p_1)} r_2^* + \frac{n_2^{*2}(p_0-p_1)}{(1-p_0)(1-p_1)} - 2n_2^* log\left(\frac{\lambda a(x_1)}{b(x_1)}\right) = 0$$

$$a(x_1) = \binom{n_1}{x_1} p_0^{x_1} (1-p_0)^{n_1-x_1}$$

$$b(x_1) = \binom{n_1}{x_1} p_1^{x_1} (1-p_1)^{n_1-x_1}$$
(1)

 $\lambda$  is the Lagrange multiplier.

# Deviation from planned sample sizes in first stage

- ► SWOG:
  - $\alpha = 0.05, \beta = 0.1$
  - ▶ Interim:  $H_0: p = p_1, H_1: p < p_1$ , stop if p-value is significant at 0.02-level
  - ► Stage II:  $H_0: p = p_0, H_1: p > p_0$
- ► Green and Dahlberg, StatMed, 1992
  - ▶ Use SWOG, but use attained sample size
  - ► Test stage II at 0.055 level
- ▶ Unclear how to generalize
- ► Arbitrary and lacks theoretical justification [Li et al.]

## Deviation from planned sample sizes in first stage

- ▶ Chen and Ng, StatMed, 1998
- ► Consider range of sample sizes
- ► Search these ranges for the Minimax or Optimal design that satisfy error constraints using the average PET and EN
- ▶ Limitation: attained sample sizes may fall outside of ranges
- ► Limitation: average probabilities rather then actual for attained SS

#### Chang et al.

- ▶ Chang et al. Biometrics & Biostatistics, 2015
- Recall:  $n_1, n_t, r_1, r_t, p_0, p_1, \alpha, \beta$
- Notation:  $n_1^{**}, n_2^{**}$  attained sample sizes
- Notation:  $s_1, s_t$  new critical values
- Choose  $s_1$  by first using  $\beta$ -spending function

$$\beta(m) = \begin{cases} \beta_1 m / n_1 & \text{if } m \le n_1 \\ \beta_1 + (\beta - \beta_1)(m - n_1) / n_2 & \text{if } m > n_1 \end{cases}$$

- ▶ Integer s.t. type II error probability given  $s_1, n_1^{**}$  is closest to  $\beta(n_1^{**})$
- ▶ Choose  $s_t$  s.t. type I error  $\leq \alpha$

## Olson and Koyama



## Title

## Title