Early reporting of efficacy endpoints and its potential impact
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Interim analysis

• For **futility**: decide that continuing enrollment is of no further use, because a positive finding is unlikely
  • (Wisely) giving up

• For **superiority**: decide that the statistical comparison process can end here, because we consider the result significant at this time
  • Stop accrual, possibly change treatment for some
  • Submit data for registration and/or publication
  • This one is the **topic of today**
Three major concerns

- Maturity
- Information volume
- Correct estimation
Maturity

- Early stopping for superiority will mean some results will never be available:
  - OS full comparison (if decision on PFS)
  - Full accrual may not be reached
  - HTA assessment will suffer
- The interim database is typically ‘in flux’, so despite best efforts data will still evolve
  - Build in a buffer (not part of the statistical approach!)
Information volume

• The full trial is designed to have a well-powered dataset for the question
• Stopping early means there is a trade-off between the effect size observed (so far) and the volume of data available
• Typically the bulk of the comparative data at interim is during the early experience (since randomization) of patients
  • Risk of overlooking late effects
  • This flows into the next topic
Estimation

• Hazard ratio (logrank, Cox) is the *average* ratio in risk of experiencing the event:
  • Over time since randomization
  • Weighed by the available data
  • -> at interim, weighed towards early experience
• Hazard ratio at each point in time is *conditioning* on not having reached the event up to that time
  • Important to understand
Some math

• Assuming **constant hazard ratio over time**

• On an individual trial basis, there is no mathematical trick to stop at an unbiased point: all estimates are unbiased

• However, if we consider the x% trials that are stopped at interim: those estimates are (collectively) biased and will regress to (a) mean if such trials are allowed to continue

???  ->>  Let’s give you a way to think about this.
Some math – a parallel

- We play 10 rounds of toss-a-coin, one Euro per game (trial)
  - Final outcome is -10 Euro to +10 Euro, and everything in between
  - There is no strategy to “win” this game (on average)
- I stop after 5 rounds if winning (interim analysis)
  - Win +1 to +5 Euro
  - If I only look at the games I am stopping halfway, those estimates are too optimistic (it is a zero-sum game)
Following slides

• Estimates at interim will be
  • Unbiased for constant hazard ratios
  • Optimistically biased for converging hazard ratios
  • Pessimistically biased for diverging hazard ratios
• Immunotherapy -> diverging hazard ratios?
Constant hazard ratios
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Constant hazard ratios
Converging hazard ratios
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Converging hazard ratios
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Diverging hazard ratios

The future of cancer therapy
Diverging hazard ratios
Diverging hazard ratios
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Overall concern for any IDMC member

• Will these data sway everyone who will look at this in the future?
  • Impossible to answer
  • It is very dangerous to be led by a p-value (alone)
• Is the argument “this is how it was designed at the time the protocol was written” enough?
  • Should build in extra conditions on data volume and maturity
Future patients’ interests / risks

On trial, may get

• Inefficient treatment which is current standard
• Are “few”: those still to be enrolled on the control arm, or those not offered opportunity to switch

After application of findings

• May never get the treatment if data not compelling enough
• Are many more
• May get wrong treatment (if error at interim)
Three major concerns: again

- Maturity
- Information volume
- Correct estimation

Should the IDMC have a hotline to regulators, decision makers, the whole community to know if “this is going to be enough”?

It is a very high responsibility
Conclusions

• In most cases, early stopping for superiority should be avoided, unless:
  • This is the second randomized Phase III trial
  • There is truly overwhelming evidence (…)
  • Full accrual is reached and large majority of patients are off treatment
• Any balancing of interests between patients on the trial and future patients should likely be very one-sided