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I. MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

The **BIG** question: *Why do so many successful phase IIIs lead to disappointing phase IIIs?*

Many factors.
Three problems we can help solve:
1) *Misalignment* between sample size calculation and study objectives.
2) *Uncertainty* in the variance value used for planning.
3) *Bias* due to proceeding only after a significant result.

Focus here on power and power generalization for studies including Confidence Intervals (CIs).
Sample size goals include:

Width ($W$): CI is as narrow as desired

Validity ($V$): CI contains true unknown parameter

Rejection ($R$): of the null hypothesis

**Example:** Pisano, et al. (2002) *screening* study:

Radiologists read mammograms on film (hardcopy) and computer screen (softcopy). Is softcopy read faster or slower than hardcopy? Screening study results suggestive, would like to conduct *target* study.

Choose sample size for target study with CI endpoint.

Board certified radiologists are busy, expensive.
II. ALIGNING SAMPLE SIZE RULE WITH STUDY GOALS

For Pisano, et al. example:

Use screening data to plan target study.

Increase reading time of $< 25\%$ acceptable $\Leftrightarrow \log_{10}$ scale CI width of $\delta = 0.125$.

Test $H_0: \theta = 0$ vs. $H_a: \theta \neq 0$ of difference.

$\theta = \delta / 2 = 0.0625$; $\alpha = 0.05$.

$\hat{\sigma}_s^2 = 0.012$. For now, assume it's population value.
Figure 1. $\Pr\{W|V\}$ curve for target study.

$\geq 0.90$ target probability $\Rightarrow n = 20$
Figure 2. $\Pr\{ R \}$ curve for target study.

$\Pr\{ R \} \Leftrightarrow$ unconditional power

$\geq 0.90 \text{ power} \Rightarrow n = 35$
Figure 3. $\Pr\{(W \cap R)|V\}$ curve for target study.

$\geq 0.90$ target probability $\Rightarrow n = 33$
Figure 4. $\Pr\{(W \cap R)|V\}$: solid line, $\Pr\{R\}$: dashed line and $\Pr\{W|V\}$: dotted line curves for target study.

Relative size of CI width to test parameter most important.
Different examples than Pisano, et al. (2002); see Jiroutek (et al., 2003):

Figure 5. Event probabilities as a function of $n$ with log$_2$ spacing, $\nu_e = N - r$, $r = 2$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, $\theta_0 = 0$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. $\Pr\{W \cap R|V\}$: solid line; $\Pr\{R\}$: dashed line; $\Pr\{W|V\}$: dotted line.

Note: $\theta_d = \theta - \theta_0$: parameter of interest
$\delta$: CI width
Alignment Conclusions

• Jiroutek, et al. concluded \( \Pr\{(W \cap R)\mid V\} \) best aligned sample size with scientific goals.

• New exact small sample results apply to any scalar parameter in General Linear Multivariate Models (GLMM). Includes
  – one and two sample \( t \)-tests
  – paired-data \( t \)-test
  – planned scalar contrasts in univariate, multivariate or REPM ANOVA

• Unconditional power \( \leftrightarrow \Pr\{R\} \) and \( \Pr\{W\mid V\} \) are special cases of \( \Pr\{(W \cap R)\mid V\} \).
III. UNCERTAINTY IN CHANCE OF SUCCESS DUE TO ESTIMATING VARIANCE

Refer to $P_t$ as target probability, (e.g., power, $\Pr\{W|V\}$, $\Pr\{(W \cap R)|V\}$).

Ignored in previous results: Variance estimate from screening study used.

How to account for using $\hat{\sigma}^2$ in place of $\sigma^2$?

Type I & II error rates, scientifically important difference, and CI width all specified.

How is $\hat{\sigma}^2$ obtained?

- Guess
- Limited by financial, temporal or other constraints
- Best/most frequent case: Prior data
Use of $\hat{\sigma}^2$ (not $\sigma^2$) from pilot study, other study, literature $\Rightarrow$ random not fixed.

$P_t$ inherits randomness.

Suggests use of confidence bounds for $P_t$ curve.

$P_t$ a smooth, strictly monotone, 1-to-1 function of $\sigma^2$ $\Rightarrow$ exact CI follows from exact CI for $\sigma^2$.

Compute $(\hat{\sigma}_{sL}^2, \hat{\sigma}_{sU}^2)$.

Replace $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ in $P_t$ calculation.

Compute $(\hat{P}_{tL}, \hat{P}_{tU})$. 
Pisano, et al. (2002) study (variation, larger $\delta$):

![Graph showing confidence region](image)

**Figure 6.** 95% confidence region (dots) for $\Pr\{(W_t \cap R_t) \mid V_t\}$ (solid) based on $\hat{\sigma}_s^2 = 0.012; \theta = 0.0625; \delta_s = \delta_t = 1.5; n_s = 8$.

Wide bands due to small $n_s$.

Confidence region for power (GLUM): Taylor & Muller (1995). Extended to $\Pr\{ (W \cap R) \mid V \}$ in GLMM by Jiroutek & Muller (2004, in review).
Uncertainty Conclusions

- Screening study sample size more important than target study sample size!
- We believe this explains an important fraction of failures in replicating studies.
- New exact small sample results apply to any scalar parameter in GLMM.
IV. BIAS IN ESTIMATED CHANCE OF SUCCESS DUE TO TRUNCATION

Ignored in previous results: Target study conducted only if screening study successful.

Same in drug discovery process: Ph II (III) trial occurs only after *significant* Ph I (II) result.

Studies with small $\hat{\sigma}^2$ by chance more likely successful.

Only early studies with sufficiently small variability will lead to later phase studies.
Figure 7. Example distribution of $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ ($\chi^2_{\alpha}$, eight df).
Figure 8. Example distribution of $\sigma_s^2$ ($\chi^2_\alpha$, eight $df$) with truncation point, highlighting failure region.
**Figure 9.** Example distribution of $\hat{\sigma}^2_s$ ($\chi^2_\alpha$, eight df) with truncation point, highlighting success region.
Figure 10. Example of “success truncated” distribution of $\tilde{\sigma}_s^2$ ($\chi^2_{\alpha}$, eight df).

Distribution of sufficiently small $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ different than that of all $\tilde{\sigma}^2$. 
“Success truncation” describes this effect on PDF (CDF) of $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$.

Under normality, $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ a truncated, scaled $\chi^2$.

Truncation occurs as a result of observing only $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ that achieve pre-specified criteria.

Muller & Pasour (1997) derived exact expression for truncated CDF of $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ for power.

Jiroutek and Muller (2004, in review) extended to $\Pr\{(W \cap R)\mid V\}$, while considering better aligned truncation.
Impact on $P_t$?

For power, success truncation occurs when screening study hypothesis test significant.

For $\Pr\{(W \cap R) | V\}$, success truncation occurs when screening study hypothesis test significant and CI width achieved.

Estimated $P_t$ computed with $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ (truncated or not).

Exact CI for estimated probability criterion based on truncated $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$: replace untruncated $\hat{\sigma}_s^2$ bounds with appropriate truncated values.

Remaining inputs fixed constants, may or may not coincide with screening study values.
Recall, **Figure 6** for variation of Pisano, et al. (2002) study:
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**Figure 11.** 95% confidence region (dots) for \( \text{Pr}\{(W_t \cap R_t)|V_t\} \) (solid) based on \( \hat{\sigma}_s^2 = 0.012; \beta = 0.0625; \delta_s = \delta_t = 1.5; n_s = 8. \)
If Pisano, et al. screening study significant:

Figure 12. 95% success truncation (dashes) and no-truncation (dots) confidence regions for $\Pr\{W_t \cap R_t \mid V_t\}$ (solid) based on $\sigma_s^2 = 0.012$; $\beta = 0.0625$; $\delta_s = \delta_t = 1.5$; $n_s = 8$.

Bias occurs if success truncation ignored $\Rightarrow$ optimistic bias and sample size too small.

Wide bands due to small $n_s$. 
Bias Conclusions

• New exact small sample results account for success truncation in analysis of any scalar parameter in GLMM.

• Ignoring success truncation causes optimistic bias when computing sample size.

• Correcting sample size eliminates bias, should lead to more successes.

• We believe this explains another important fraction of failures in replicating studies.

• In non-GLMM, if using (asymptotically) Gaussian test, above results may apply.

• “failure truncation” creates pessimistic bias and sample size too big.
V. EXTENSIONS

Work in progress:
User-friendly freeware for $\Pr\left\{ (W \cap R) \mid V \right\}$ (Figure 5). Uncertainty, bias extensions to follow.
Internal Pilot Designs (interim power analysis).

Important unanswered questions:
Group sequential designs.
Binomial data. More complex due to dependence between mean and variance.
Exponential data.
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