#### **NISS-Merck Meet-Up**

#### Webinar

10 September 2019

#### To Be Or Not To Be (A Subgroup)



Stephen J. Ruberg, PhD President Analytix Thinking, LLC <u>AnalytixThinking@gmail.com</u> AnalytixThinking.blog



### Acknowledgement

My thinking on this problem has been significantly influenced by former colleagues at Lilly, most notably Lei Shen Rick Higgs Ilya Lipkovich









Alice: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"





Alice: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

**Cheshire Cat:** "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to."





Alice: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

**Cheshire Cat:** "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to."

Alice: "I don't much care where—"





Alice: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

**Cheshire Cat:** "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to."

Alice: "I don't much care where—"

**Cheshire Cat:** "Then it doesn't matter which way you go."





Alice: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

**Cheshire Cat:** "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to."

Alice: "I don't much care where—"

**Cheshire Cat:** "Then it doesn't matter which way you go."

Alice: "—so long as I get SOMEWHERE."





Alice: "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

**Cheshire Cat:** "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to."

Alice: "I don't much care where—"

**Cheshire Cat:** "Then it doesn't matter which way you go."

Alice: "—so long as I get SOMEWHERE."

**Cheshire Cat:** "Oh, you're sure to do that, if you only walk long enough."



**Key Messages** 

- 1. Be clear are your terminology
- 2. Be clear on your goals
- 3. Disciplined subgroup search (DSS)
- 4. Always do subgroup analysis identification
- 5. One last idea





#### Precision medicine Targeted therapy/therapeutics vs Personalized medicine

#### Targeted therapeutics = *patients like* YOU Personalized medicine = YOU



#### Precision medicine Targeted therapy/therapeutics vs Personalized medicine

#### Targeted therapeutics = *patients like* YOU Personalized medicine = YOU



A *targeted therapeutic* allows the sponsor to make a regulatory approved claim of an expected treatment effect (efficacy or safety):

✓ Where the indicated patient population is itself selected by a biochemical, genetic or imaging biomarker.

✓ Where a subgroup of the indicated patient population (selected based on a clinical, biochemical, genetic, or imaging biomarker) is expected to have a *differential treatment effect*.

✓ Where individualized dosing (dose and/or duration) is based on a biomarker responsive to treatment.



A *targeted therapeutic* allows the sponsor to make a regulatory approved claim of an expected treatment effect (efficacy or safety):

✓ Where the indicated patient population is itself selected by a biochemical, genetic or imaging biomarker.

✓ Where a subgroup of the indicated patient population (selected based on a clinical, biochemical, genetic, or imaging biomarker) is expected to have a *differential treatment effect*.

✓ Where individualized dosing (dose and/or duration) is based on a biomarker responsive to treatment.



# Targeted therapeutics means Finding subgroups

Stephen J. Ruberg & Lei Shen (2015) Personalized Medicine: Four Perspectives of Tailored Medicine, Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research, 7:3, 214-229.



3/6/2018

# 2. Clarifying Goals



**ANALYTIX THINKING, LLC (C) 2018** 

### 2. Clarifying Goals

# Targeted therapeutics means Finding subgroups

What's real versus what's spurious?



### 2. Clarifying Goals

#### Do you want to find a subgroup or not?

YES – Heterogeneity is my friend!I want to find a targeted therapeutic!



### **Clarifying Goals**

Do you want to find a subgroup or not?

YES – Heterogeneity is my friend!I want to find a targeted therapeutic!

NO – Heterogeneity is my enemy!
 I want the treatment effect to be homogeneous across subgroups.



# 3. Disciplined Subgroup Search (DSS)

Stephen J. Ruberg & Lei Shen (2015) Personalized Medicine: Four Perspectives of Tailored Medicine, Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research, 7:3, 214-229.



3/6/2018

**ANALYTIX THINKING, LLC (C) 2018** 

#### **Definition**

Disciplined Subgroup Search (DSS) is

- a systematic approach to subgroup identification having
- several characteristics that are quite distinct
  - from those of a traditional subgroup analysis
  - or post hoc exploratory analysis of subgroups.



#### **DSS characteristics**

- 1. Prespecification: the algorithm/methodology to be used for identifying subgroups, the list of biomarkers that form the covariate space to be searched, complexity of subgroup definitions (i.e., how many covariates are allowed to define the subgroup), as well as any other options/decisions that can be made in the analysis process.
  - In short, this is no different than prespecification of any important analysis in a Phase 3 trial that adheres to the ICH-E9 Guideline.



#### **DSS characteristics**

**2. Adjusting for multiplicity:** how statistical significance (i.e., *p*-values) of a subgroup finding will be adjusted for multiplicity. [Also consider Bayesian approaches.]

**3. Bias correction:** how estimates of treatment effect are corrected for bias due to the selection bias associated with searching multiple subgroups.



#### **DSS characteristics**

**4. Biomarker effects:** allows for separating prognostic biomarker effects from predictive biomarker effects.

**5. Interactions:** allows for multiple biomarkers to be included in the definition of a subgroup.

**6. Partition:** allows for identification of a cut-off value for a continuous biomarker that separates smaller treatment effects from larger treatment effects.





# 4. Always Do Subgroup Identification (DSS)



**ANALYTIX THINKING, LLC (C) 2018** 

#### "Always do subgroup *analysis*, but never believe them."

Attributed to Sir Richard Peto

Professor of Medical Statistics and Epidemiology

University of Oxford, England







Do You Want To Find a Subgroup or Not?

"Routine" baseline factors

NO

Playing "defense"

Avoid trying to explain away (unusual?) findings

Use DSS !!





3/6/2018

"The figure ... illustrates principal results for a wide variety of subgroup comparisons, including US vs. non-US populations (the latter of which was not pre-specified). The combined endpoints of all-cause mortality plus all-cause hospitalization and of mortality plus heart failure hospitalization showed consistent effects in the overall study population and the subgroups, including women and the US population. However, in the US subgroup and women, overall mortality and cardiovascular mortality appeared less affected. Analyses of female and US patients were carried out because they each represented about 25% of the overall population. Nonetheless, subgroup analyses can be difficult to interpret, and it is not known whether these represent true differences or chance effects."

Bringing data to life

From US Label for Toprol-XL

#### **Ticagrelor Example**



3/6/2018

#### Always do subgroup identification !!!

#### What if DSS had been formally done?

- Often subgroups defined by baseline factors are described in the protocol (e.g. gender, race, baseline severity, etiology, etc.?
- What if the subgroup identification search methodology was pre-specified?
- What if *adjusted* p-values and effect estimates were calculated?
- Would these surprising findings not be so surprising anymore?



Do You Want To Find a Subgroup or Not?



3/6/2018

Bringing data to life.

#### Ramucirumab vs Placebo in HCC (REACH) Lancet Onc, 2015; 16, 859-870

#### Do You Want To Find a Subgroup or Not?

в	Ramu	Ramucirumab group		o group
	n	Events (n)	n	Events (n)
Overall	283	218	282	224
Sex				0020073
Male	236	182	242	191
Female	47	36	40	33
Age (years)				
<65	150	124	162	127
≥65	133	94	120	97
Geographical region				
North and South America	32	17	33	23
Europe	125	97	123	97
East Asia	126	104	126	104
Cause of liver disease				
Hepatitis B	100	80	101	84
Hepatitis C	77	58	77	62
Other	106	80	104	78
Extrahepatic metastases				
Yes	207	157	200	162
No	76	61	82	62
Macrovascular invasion				
Yes	82	69	79	67
No	201	149	203	157
BCLC score				
В	33	25	34	25
C	250	193	248	199
ECOG PS				
0	159	115	153	118
1	124	103	129	106
Discontinuation of sorafenib				
Progressive disease	246	188	239	189
Toxicity	37	30	43	35
α-fetoprotein (ng/mL)				
<400	160	116	150	108
≥400	119	99	131	116
1				



Many baseline factors, biomarkers, med Hx, etc.

Playing "offense"

Seeking to explain findings

Use DSS !!











Use DSS !!

Bringing data to life.





#### Always do subgroup identification !!!

#### What if DSS had been formally done in REACH?

- What if the AFP subgroup was pre-specified along with other subgroups?
- What if the subgroup identification search methodology was pre-specified?
- What if *adjusted* p-values and effect estimates were calculated?
- What if they were still significant and meaningful?



#### Always do subgroup identification !!!

#### What if DSS had been formally done in REACH?

- What if the AFP subgroup was pre-specified along with other subgroups?
- What if the subgroup identification search methodology was pre-specified?
- What if *adjusted* p-values and effect estimates were calculated?
- What if they were still significant and meaningful?

#### But ... DSS is hard !!!!!

The \$1,000,000,000 [read billion] question ...

Could ramucirumab have been approved in the targeted subgroup based on REACH in 2015 using DSS instead of

- Spending 3 years, and
- Many, many millions of dollars, and
- Tens of thousands of patients not having access to an effective medication?



The \$1,000,000,000 [read billion] question ...

Could ramucirumab have been approved in the targeted subgroup based on REACH in 2015 instead of

- Spending 3 years, and
- Many, many millions of dollars, and

Tens of thousands of patients not having access to an effective medication?

#### Is DSS a billion dollars hard?!?!?!?



#### "Always do subgroup *identification using DSS* so the results are more believable."

**Steve Ruberg** 

Your Run-of-the-Mill Statistician





**ANALYTIX THINKING, LLC (C) 2018** 

Suppose there are **100** potential predictive biomarkers that could be important for a new treatment.



Suppose there are **100** potential predictive biomarkers that could be important for a new treatment.

Observed p-value = 0.0001 for one biomarker ■ Bonferroni adjusted p-value ≤ 100 \* 0.0001 = 0.01



Suppose there are **100** potential predictive biomarkers that could be important for a new treatment.

Observed p-value = 0.0001 for one biomarker ■ Bonferroni adjusted p-value ≤ 100 \* 0.0001 = 0.01

**EUREKA!** We have discovered a novel biomarker-defined subgroup.



#### **ARE YOU SURE?**



#### **ARE YOU SURE?**

Suppose further pr(success ... finding a biomarker)  $= pr(at least one H_0 is false) = 0.20$ Prior on H\_0 is true (none are predictive) = 0.80



#### **ARE YOU SURE?**

Suppose further pr(success ... finding a biomarker)  $= pr(at least one H_0 is false) = 0.20$ Prior on H\_0 is true (none are predictive) = 0.80

Uniform prior per biomarker = 0.20/100 = 0.002



- Let  $p_0$  = prior probability that  $H_0$  is false (e.g. the biomarker is predictive)
- Let p = observed p-value for test statistics for  $H_0$
- Bayes factor\*  $[-e \times p \times \ln(p)]^{-1}$  can be used to give an upper bound on the posterior probability that H<sub>0</sub> is false



\*Sellke et al (2001) Calibration of p Values for Testing Precise Null Hypotheses. The American Statistician, February 2001, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp 62-71.

- Let  $p_0$  = prior probability that  $H_0$  is false (e.g. the biomarker is predictive)
- Let p = observed p-value for test statistics for  $H_0$
- Bayes factor\*  $[-e \times p \times \ln(p)]^{-1}$  can be used to give an upper bound on the posterior probability that H<sub>0</sub> is false
- Posterior probability\*\* for H<sub>0</sub> being false (p<sub>1</sub>) is (upper bound)

$$p_{1} \leq \{1 + [(1-p_{0})/p_{0}] \times [-e \times p \times \ln(p)] \}^{-1}$$

$$p_{1} \leq \{1 + [(1-p_{0})/p_{0}] \times [-e \times p \times \ln(p)] \}^{-1}$$
Prior New Data

\*Sellke et al (2001) Calibration of p Values for Testing Precise Null Hypotheses. The American Statistician, February 2001, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp 62-71. \*\*If p < 1/e = .368



#### **ARE YOU SURE?** Suppose further pr(success ... finding a biomarker) = pr(at least one $H_0$ is false) = 0.20 Prior on $H_0$ is true (none are predictive) = 0.80 Uniform prior per biomarker = 0.20/100 = 0.002Bayesian posterior $pr(H_0 \text{ is false}) \leq 0.44$ .

Berger J.O., Wang X., Shen L. (2014). A Bayesian approach to subgroup identification. *J Biopharm Stat*, 24(1), 110-29.

AnalytixThinking.blog





"Always use *Bayesian thinking* when doing subgroup identification so you can quantify how believable the results are."

Steve Ruberg

Your Run-of-the-Mill Bayesian Statistician





ANALYTIX THINKING, LLC (C) 2018

#### Subgroup identification is the HOLY GRAIL.

Not surprisingly, that makes it **the hardest problem there is**.

- Size of the subgroup (10, 20, ... 50%)
- Differential effect in the subgroup (5, 15, 25%)
- No. of biomarkers (3, 10, 100, 1000, ... 10<sup>6</sup>)
- No. of biomarkers defining the subgroup (1,2,3, ...)
- Nature of biomarker effect (step or smooth curve)
- Size of the clinical trial (100, 250, 500, 1000/group)



# ALWAYS do subgroup identification ... To find or not to find ... Disciplined Subgroup Search

(replication and biological plausibility are very important)



### ALWAYS do subgroup identification ... To find or not to find ... Disciplined Subgroup Search

When I see a **significant subgroup finding**, I always ask ...

"I wonder what their prior was?"



# **THANK YOU**





