### INTRODUCING BAYESIAN DOSE ESCALATION IN AN INDUSTRIAL ENVIRONMENT: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES BEYOND STATISTICS

Daniela Fischer, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG Oliver Schönborn-Kellerberger, Cogitars GmbH









#### **Outline**

- Available algorithmic designs
- Bayesian approaches for dose escalation
- Communicating Bayesian Designs
- Implementing Bayesian Designs in Practice A company perspective









### **Available Algorithmic Designs (3+3)**



#### Advantages:

- Easy to implement
- Used for over 50 years
- No need of a statistician

#### **Disadvantages:**

- Fixed cohort size
- Algorithm makes
  the decision
- Only in-cohort
  information
- Target rate 35%-40% <sup>[1]</sup>









#### **Bayesian Approaches for Dose Escalation**

## Logit { $\pi_{\theta}(d)$ }=log $\alpha + \beta \log (d/d^*)$ , $\alpha, \beta > 0$ where $\theta = (\log \alpha, \log \beta)$ and $d^*$ is the reference dose <sup>[2]</sup>



#### Advantages:

- Flexibility
- Cost-effectiveness
- Risk prevention
- Joint decision making
- Target rate 60%-70%<sup>[2]</sup>

#### **Disadvantages:**

- you need a statistician
- Longer protocol development
- Analysis tools









#### **Communication essentials**

- F2F with full team / take the time
- Limit use of statistical terminology
- Understand the perspective of the stakeholders (especially non-statisticians)
- Receive feedback









#### Flexibility

- Cohort size
- Dose selection
- Regimen / population
- Avoids amendments









#### **Cost-effectiveness**

- Accelerated escalation
- Optimal patient number at different doses
- Prior information: replace on-study cohorts









#### **Risk prevention**

- Avoid closing doses by pure chance findings
- Evaluate intermediate doses
- Incorporate additional information in decision making









#### Common misunderstandings of Bayesian Designs

"If the results are the same than a 3+3 why make it complicated? As we do not expect any tox anyway"

"Bayesian escalation requires more patients and time"

"The Bayesian approach is less safe than a 3+3"

"The model selects the dose"







Why transition from 3+3 design to a Bayesian dose finding design?

- Some past studies where characteristics of the 3+3 design were of disadvantage
  - Observation of early DLTs
  - Study where the 3<sup>rd</sup> patient of a cohort needs to be replaced close to end of observation period, therefore long study duration



Need for a more flexible design









Statistics involvement in the trial process at the moment:

- Centrally:
  - Trial statisticians contact "expert team"
  - Expert team supports:
    - understanding general design and protocol development
    - (Optional) escalation board meeting preparation, TSAP writing, trial implementation, etc.









Statistics involvement in the trial process in future:

- Locally:
  - Each trial statistician is familiar with the design
  - "Expert team" only involved in
    - Exceptional cases
    - Specific questions
    - Adaptations of the standard model / development of new models



To achieve this, a training for all statisticians is planned to be given in autumn









**Future planning with Bayesian statistics:** 

- More trials using Bayesian dose finding design
- Enhancement of the current design
- Using Bayes in Phase II regarding
  - Confirmation of dose
  - Bayesian decision criteria for Phase II (PoC), cmp Gsponer et al.

















[1] LIN, Y., AND SHIH, W. Statistical properties of the traditional algorithm-based designs for phase I cancer clinical trials. Biostatistics 2 (2001), 203–215.

[2] NEUENSCHWANDER, B., BRANSON, M., AND GSPONER, T. Critical aspects of the Bayesian approach to phase I cancer trials. Stat Med 27 (2008), 2420–2439.

[3] NEUENSCHWANDER, B., MATANO, A., TANG, S., ROYCHOUDHURY S. WANDEL, S. BAILEY, S.

A Bayesian Industry Approach to Phase I Combination Trials in Oncology Statistical Methods in Drug Combination Studies, CRC Press (2015). Chapter 6







