snSMART Design in Rare Disease Research: Motivated by ARAMIS

Kelley M Kidwell, PhD

University of Michigan

January 2020

Other Members of the Team



Tom Braun



Roy Tamura



Boxian Wei

Yan-Cheng Chao

Motivating Setting: Isolated Skin Vasculitis

- Cutaneous vasculitis lesions can be pruritic, painful, and cosmetically disturbing
- Can ulcerate causing infection and scarring
- Associated with discomfort and psychosocial impact
- Chronic, relatively stable disease



Motivation for Design

- **No placebo**: inability to enroll, difficulty blinding, no clear favorite drug
- Individuals are guaranteed to be on **at least 1 drug**
- Individuals move to a different drug if they do not respond to the first drug
- Individuals can stay on a drug if they respond to in in the first stage
- Drugs involved effective in 1 stage period, no carryover effects

ARAMIS: **A RA**ndomized **M**ulticenter study for Isolated **S**kin vasculitis

R

- <u>NCT02939573</u>
- 1/2017-present
- 1 stage = 6 month
- 90 participants
- International
- <u>Outcome</u>: complete or significant response to treatment defined by number of lesions and physician and patient scales



General Small n, Sequential, Multiple Assignment, Randomized Trial



Assumptions

- 3 active treatments
- Primary Interest: Stage 1 outcome
- No carryover effects
- Binary Outcome
- Chronic, stable disease

Crossover vs. snSMART

*Goal: to compare treatments within person

*Washout period is required

*All individuals receive (a different) treatment in second stage regardless of response to previous treatment *Sequential randomization

*Find 1 overall best treatment

*Goal: to compare treatments between patients

*No washout period is required

*Only individuals who do not respond to previous treatment receive a different subsequent treatment

SMART vs. snSMART

*Goal: to construct or compare dynamic treatment regimens (tailored sequences of treatments)

*Any sample size, often larger

*Re-randomization endpoint is an intermediate endpoint; does not have to be overall outcome *Sequential randomization

*Subsequent randomization depends on response to previous treatment *Goal: to compare treatments by pooling data from all stages to find 1 superior treatment

*Small sample size (e.g. <200)

*Re-randomization endpoint is the same as the overall outcome

ARAMIS setting

- Primary Goal: compare treatments by pooling data from both stages to find 1 optimal treatment
 - Does Azathioprine, Dapsone, or Colchicine have the best 6 month response rate?

Outcome: Binary

• Measured at the end of stage 1 (e.g., 6 months) and stage 2 (e.g., 12 months)



Bayesian Joint Stage Model

- Uses all data from both stage 1 and 2 in estimation and inference
- Incorporates investigators' opinions about response rates (prior distributions)
- Links data from stage 1 and 2 using "linkage parameters"assumptions
- Stage 1 outcome is Bernoulli and stage 2 outcome is modeled conditionally on stage 1 outcome using "linkage parameters"

Bayesian Joint Stage Model

 $Y_{i1k} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_k)$ $Y_{i2k'} \mid Y_{i1k}, \pi_k \sim \text{Bernoulli}((\beta_1 \pi_k)^{Y_{i1k}} (\beta_0 \pi_{k'})^{1-Y_{i1k}})$

- Response rate for treatment k: π_k ; ith patient at the jth stage
- β₀ ≤ 1 is the linkage parameter for non-responders such that response rate for treatment k in stage 2 is lower than the response rate for treatment k in stage 1
- β₁ ≥ 1 is the linkage parameter for responders such that response rate for treatment k in stage 2 is higher than the response rate for treatment k in stage 1

Choice of Prior Distributions

- π_k ~ Beta(0.4, 1.6)
 - ARAMIS investigators felt an ineffective treatment would have spontaneous response rate of 0.20
 - Prior sample size = 2
- $\beta_0 \sim \text{Beta}(1,1)$
 - Equivalent to Unif(0,1)
 - On average the stage 2 response rate for non-responders is ½ times as large as stage 1 response rate
- $\beta_1 \sim \text{Pareto}(3,1)$
 - On average the stage 2 response rate for responders is 1.5 times as large as the stage 1 response rate

BJSM Results vs. Log Poisson GEE model: Efficiency



Other snSMART Methods

- Bayesian Joint Stage Model
 - Unbiased and efficient estimation of treatment effects and **dynamic treatment regimens** (tailored sequences of treatments, start with A, continue if response, switch to B if not)

Sample Size Calculation and Applet

- Find n such that the credible interval of the difference in the 2 best treatment rules out 0 with desired power
- <u>https://umich-biostatistics.shinyapps.io/snsmart_sample_size_app/</u>
- Two Step Bayesian Dropping Rule
 - Include interim analyses to drop the worst performing arm
- Allowing for Continuous Intermediate and Overall Outcomes

Overall research goal

APPROVED TREATMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR >> 5% OF ALL RARE DISEASES

Follow up: kidwell@umich.edu

References

- Tamura et al. Small n sequential multiple assignment randomized trial design for use in rare disease research. (2016) Contemporary Clinical Trials. 46, 48-51.
- Wei B, Braun TM, Tamura RN, Kidwell KM. A Bayesian analysis of small n sequential multiple assignment randomized trials (snSMARTs). (2018) *Statistics in Medicine*. 37(26): 3723—3732.

Under Review

- Wei B, Braun TM, Tamura RN, Kidwell KM. Sample size considerations for a small n sequential multiple assignment randomized trial (snSMART) using Bayesian analysis.
- Chang YC, Braun TM, Tamura RN, Kidwell KM. A group sequential small n sequential multiple assignment randomized trial.
- Chao YC, Braun, TM, Trachtman H, Gipson DS, Spino C, Kidwell KM. Small n SMART design to efficiently develop personalized treatment regimens in rare disease: An application in Focal Segmental Glomerulosclerosis (FSGS).