

# STAT 778 Final Project: Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018

Tom Wallace

April 22, 2018

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Overview

This paper documents a simulation study based on Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018. It gives some background on their method; presents a software program coded in C; and conducts a simulation study using this program.

### 1.2 Background

Overdispersion refers to a situation in which the variance of a dataset exceeds that expected under the assumed statistical distribution. Overdispersion is common in count data. As a motivating example, consider the Poisson distribution. A single parameter determines both the mean and variance: i.e., for  $X \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ ,  $\mu = \sigma^2 = \lambda$ . As a consequence, if the mean and variance differ in a dataset, the researcher cannot adjust parametric assumptions for without also affecting the other. If not addressed, overdispersion results in distorted test statistics and estimated standard errors. Clinical trials often feature count data: e.g., a trial of an anti-epilepsy treatment may use *number of seizures over study period* as the outcome variable. The serious consequences of statistical error in such settings demands a rigorous method for dealing with overdispersion. Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018 is a new entry to the large literature on this topic. In particular, it presents methods for calculating statistical power and sample size in the presence of misspecified variance.

## 2 Methods

The following is a brief summary of the methods proposed in Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018. The reader is encouraged to consult their paper for the necessary details. All notation here follows that used in the original paper.

Consider a randomized control trial featuring  $n$  subjects. Subjects are randomly assigned to a treatment or control group. Let  $n_i$  be the sample size of

the  $i$ th group, with  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Let  $X_{ij}$  be an indicator variable of subject  $j$ 's group assignment.  $X_{ij} = 0$  indicates assignment to the control group. Let  $Y_{ij}$  be a count variable for patient  $j$  in group  $i$  over the follow-up period  $[0, T_{ij}]$ . The expected value of  $Y_{ij}$  is affected by a rate parameter  $\lambda_i$ . The goal is to estimate the effect of treatment via a Poisson model

$$\lambda_i = \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij})$$

but  $\lambda$  is overdispersed.

Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018 propose a procedure for determining sample size and power in the presence of overdispersion. The basic idea is that we assume there is some true variance function  $V$  but this function is unknown. In practice we use working variance function  $\tilde{V}$ . We don't actually know if we have properly specified the true variance function and so would like sample size and power calculations that are robust to misspecification.

Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018 employ a Wald-type test statistic using the sandwich-type robust variance estimator under the null hypothesis:

$$Z = \frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{\sqrt{n^{-1}\hat{W}_0}} \quad (1)$$

They propose that the asymptotic power of the test using  $Z$  with two-sided significance level  $\alpha$  is:

$$\Pr(Z > z_{1-\alpha/2}) = 1 - \Phi\left(z_{1-\alpha/2}\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{W}_0}{\tilde{W}_1}} - \sqrt{n}\frac{\beta_1}{\sqrt{\tilde{W}_1}}\right) \quad (2)$$

The sample size that provides power greater than or equal to  $1 - \beta$  is

$$n \geq \frac{(z_{1-\alpha/2}\sqrt{\tilde{W}_0} + z_{1-\beta}\sqrt{\tilde{W}_1})^2}{(\log(\lambda_2/\lambda_1))^2} \quad (3)$$

The reader should consult Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018 to understand these equations, as space constraints disallow a full explanation here. Their chief claim is that these methods are robust to misspecification of variance.

### 3 Software Program

#### 3.1 Overview

We can empirically test these methods by the following procedure.

- Randomly generate data that is overdispersed according to some true variance function; that has true treatment effect  $\exp(\beta_1)$ ; and that has sample size equal to that recommended by (3) for the desired power  $1 - \beta$  calculated using (2).

- Conduct a test of  $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$  vs.  $H_1 : \beta_1 \neq 0$  using (1). Record whether a type II error occurred.
- Conduct many iterations of the previous two steps. Calculate the proportion of type II errors:

$$\bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \beta_{(t)}$$

where  $\beta_{(t)}$  is an indicator of whether a type II error occurred for trial  $t$  and  $N$  is the total number of iterations.

- Compare  $1 - \bar{\beta}$  to the asymptotic power calculated using (2). We hope that  $1 - \bar{\beta} \approx 1 - \beta$ .

We conduct this procedure for multiple different true variance functions and working variance functions and effect sizes. If the empirical power  $1 - \bar{\beta}$  matches the asymptotic power across all specifications, we conclude that the claims of Igeta, Takahashi, and Matsui 2018 are correct and that their methods are robust.

### 3.2 Technical Details

The software program carries out the testing strategy outlined above. Source code is contained in `final.c`. The program requires the GNU Scientific Library (GSL), an open-source numerical library. It can be obtained from [www.gnu.org/software/gsl](http://www.gnu.org/software/gsl); or, it can be installed from most standard Linux package managers. An example command to achieve the latter is:

```
sudo apt-get install gsl-bin libgsl-dev
```

Compilation of `final.c` is best achieved in two steps. First, use the below command to compile the program but not link it. You may need to change the argument passed to the `-I` flag to wherever the `gsl` header files live on your computer.

```
gcc -I/usr/include -c final.c
```

This command should create an object file `final.o`. Link this object file to relevant libraries with the following command. You may need to change the argument passed to the `-L` flag to wherever `libgsl` lives on your computer.

```
gcc -L/usr/lib final.o -o final -lgsl -lgslcblas -lm
```

Once successfully compiled, the program can be executed. It does not require any arguments. Output is comma-separated text printed to `stdout`. You likely want to pipe this output to a text file, as per the following command:

```
./final > output.csv
```

## 4 Simulation Study

### 4.1 Settings

The rate of event incidence in the control group,  $\lambda_1$ , is 1.25. Equivalently, this corresponds to  $\beta_0 = 0.22314$  in  $\exp(\beta_0)$ . The allocation ratio is equal across groups (i.e.  $q_1 = q_2 = 0.5$ ). The follow-up period  $\tau$  is 1 year. Some subjects drop out early. Time to dropout follows an exponential distribution with parameter value 0.356, such that about 30% of subjects drop out early. So in practice the observed follow-up time  $T$  is the minimum of time to dropout and  $\tau$ .

The tested values for true relative risk (effect size)  $\exp(\beta_1)$  are  $\exp(\beta_1) = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} = 0.4|0.6|0.8$ . The desired power is 90% across all specifications. The power for a particular true effect size (per above) is calculated using (2). The number of observations is computed using (3).

The true variance function is

## 5 Conclusion

## 6 References

- [1] Masataka Igeta, Kunihiro Takahashi, and Shigeyuki Matsui. “Power and sample size calculation incorporating misspecifications of the variance function in comparative clinical trials with over-dispersed count data”. In: *Biometrics* (2018). DOI: 10.1111/biom.12878.