# Estimands in the presence of treatment switching

Viktoriya Stalbovskaya, Juliane Manitz, Marie-Laure Casadebaig, Emily Martin, Rui (Sammi) Tang, Godwin Yung, Vincent Haddad, Fei Jie, Christelle Lorenzato, Jiangxiu Zhou, Evgeny Degtyarev

DAGStat

Munich, March 19, 2019



#### Outline

Introduction to the working group

- Treatment switching subteam
- Overall survival and intercurrent events
- Example study with treatment switch
- Several estimands and analyses approaches in a setting with treatment switching

Discussion



#### Estimands in Oncology WG

- initiated and led by Evgeny Degtyarev (Novartis) and Kaspar Rufibach (Roche), first TC Feb 2018
- main purpose: ensure common understanding and consistent definitions for key estimands in Oncology across industry
- ⊙ 31 members (14 from Europe and 17 from US) representing 19 companies
- established as EFSPI SIG for Estimands in Oncology in Nov 2018
- close collaboration with regulators from EMA, FDA, China, Taiwan and Canada





• whitepaper(s) and presentations at statistical and clinical conferences • plans to further engage with Clinical community beyond ASCO



#### Treatment switching subteam

• Viktoriya Stalbovskaya (Merus) • Juliane Manitz (EMD Serono) • Marie-Laure Casadebaig (Celgene) • Emily Martin (EMD Serono) • Rui (Sammi)Tang (Servier) • Godwin Yung (Takeda) • Vincent Haddad (AstraZeneca) • Fei Jie (Astellas) • Christelle Lorenzato (Sanofi) SANOFI Jiangxiu Zhou (GSK) • Evgeny Degtyarev (Novartis)





#### Overall survival – time from randomization to death from any cause





#### Disease progression often precedes death





#### Disease progression may allow initiation of experimental therapy





#### ... or a start of new anti-cancer therapy





#### How about events that are not observed?





#### How about events that are not observed?



#### ... or observed after a sequence of therapies?



• Phase III study of everolimus in metastatic renal cell carcinoma Motzer et al (2008, 2010)

- Double-blind, multicenter study with patients randomized to receive either everolimus (n = 277) or placebo (n = 139)
- Primary endpoint Progression-free survival defined as time from randomization until disease progression or death



Motzer et al (2010)



• Positive study with clinically meaningful improvement in PFS (HR=0.33, 95% CI: 0.25, 0.43, p-value < 0.001)



Motzer et al (2010)



• Positive study with clinically meaningful improvement in PFS (HR=0.33, 95% CI: 0.25, 0.43, p-value < 0.001)

- Protocol allowed crossover from placebo to everolimus upon progression (106 out of 139 patients, 76%)
- ITT analysis of OS showed trend in OS benefit (HR=0.87, 95% CI: 0.65-1.15, p-value=0.162)



Merus closing in on cancer

• Positive study with clinically meaningful improvement in PFS (HR=0.33, 95% CI: 0.25, 0.43, p-value < 0.001)

- Protocol allowed crossover from placebo to everolimus upon progression (106 out of 139 patients, 76%)
- ITT analysis of OS showed trend in OS benefit (HR=0.87, 95% CI: 0.65-1.15, p-value=0.162)





• Treatment switching methodology embedded in estimand framework

- Endpoints of interest: overall survival and PFS2
- Intercurrent events of interest: cross-over from control to experimental therapy, start of new anticancer therapy
- Scientific questions of interest and description of 4 attributes of corresponding estimands
- Impact on data collection
- Sensitivity and supportive analyses



	Estimand 1
Scientific question: does experimental therapy prolongs survival	regardless of crossover or new therapies
Population	All randomized patients
Variable	OS
Intercur. event: cross-over to experimental therapy	Treatment Policy
Intercur. event: switch to new anticancer therapy excl. cross-over	Treatment Policy
Population-level summary	Hazard ratio
Analysis	Estimate HR using Cox model and reported survival times
Additional data collection	



	Estimand 1	Estimand 2	
Scientific question: does experimental therapy prolongs survival	regardless of crossover or new therapies	in patients who did not cross- over	
Population	All randomized patients	All randomized patients excluding patients who cross-over	
Variable	OS	OS	
Intercur. event: cross-over to experimental therapy	Treatment Policy	Exclude switchers	
Intercur. event: switch to new anticancer therapy excl. cross-over	Treatment Policy	Treatment policy	
Population-level summary	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio	
Analysis	Estimate HR using Cox model and reported survival times	Estimate HR using Cox model excluding patients who switched	
Additional data collection		Indicator for treatment switch	



	Estimand 1 Estimand 2		Estimand 3	
Scientific question: does experimental therapy prolongs survival	regardless of crossover or new therapies	ardless of crossover or new in patients who did not cross- pies over		
Population	All randomized patients All randomized patients exclu patients who cross-over		All randomized patients	
Variable	OS	OS	OS	
Intercur. event: cross-over to experimental therapy	Treatment Policy	Exclude switchers	While on treatment	
Intercur. event: switch to new anticancer therapy excl. cross-over	Treatment Policy	Treatment policy	Treatment policy	
Population-level summary	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio	
Analysis	Estimate HR using Cox model and reported survival times	Estimate HR using Cox model excluding patients who switched	Estimate HR using Cox model censoring survival time at the time of switch	
Additional data collection		Indicator for treatment switch	Indicator for treatment switch, verification that no additional treatment had started	



	Estimand 1	Estimand 2	Estimand 3	Estimand 4
Scientific question: does experimental therapy prolongs survival	regardless of crossover or new therapies	in patients who did not cross- over	in patients while they remained on randomized treatment or no treatment	had cross-over not occurred and regardless of new therapies
Population	All randomized patients	All randomized patients excluding patients who cross-over	All randomized patients	All randomized patients
Variable	OS	OS	OS	OS
Intercur. event: cross-over to experimental therapy	Treatment Policy	Exclude switchers	While on treatment	Hypothetical
Intercur. event: switch to new anticancer therapy excl. cross-over	Treatment Policy	Treatment policy	Treatment policy	Treatment Policy
Population-level summary	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio	Hazard ratio
Analysis	Estimate HR using Cox model and reported survival times	Estimate HR using Cox model excluding patients who switched	Estimate HR using Cox model censoring survival time at the time of switch	Estimate HR using RPSFT and re- calculate survival times based on time spent on experimental treatment
Additional data collection		Indicator for treatment switch	Indicator for treatment switch, verification that no additional treatment had started	Start and stop dates on experimental therapy for patients who switched



# A hypothetical estimand

A. Population

All randomized patients: patients defined through inclusion/exclusion criteria to reflect the target patient population for drug approval

B. Endpoint

Overall survival: time from randomization until death from any cause

C. Handling of intercurrent events

Crossover to experimental therapy in control arm patients: survival time will be re-calculated based on time spent on experimental therapy and

New antineoplastic therapy with the same class of drugs as experimental arm: follow treatment policy approach and not account for it

D. Summary measure for the variable

Estimate hazard ratio using reconstructed data through Cox model.

Estimand: hazard ratio of overall survival between experimental and control therapy in the targeted patient population had the crossover not occurred



## Observed and counterfactual survival times



Counterfactual survival time

- Model-based method that reconstructs survival times of patients who switched as if they had not received experimental treatment.
- Treatment effect is expressed on the time scale as acceleration factor. It can also be estimated on HR scale (Cox model with counterfactual survival times for crossover patients)
- Assumption: the treatment effect is multiplicative and only the time spent on experimental treatment affects the difference in survival expectation.



#### Summary for RPSFT

#### Pros

- Provides a randomization-based treatment effect estimator
- May use HR and KM curves
- Crossover may happen any time independent of disease-related events
- Doesn't require information on covariates unlike IPCW
- Can handle larger proportion of patient switching

#### Cons

- Requires "common treatment effect" assumption (assumes that treatment effect is the same regardless of when the experimental treatment is initiated)
- The structural failure time assumption(treatment is acting by multiplying survival time by a given factor once patient starts receiving active treatment) is not testable
- HR CIs requires extra computation



# Selected sensitivity and supplementary analyses

#### Addressing robustness towards model assumptions

• Technical implementation:

- Use different step size for the G-estimation
- Use of different test statistic for G-estimation

Model assumptions:

Common treatment effect – the treatment effect in the control arm after switchover is w times the treatment effect in the experimental arm (apply weight on multiplication factor after switchover).

#### Addressing alternative estimands

 Calculation of counterfactual survival time after discontinuation of experimental treatment based on "treatment group" approach – once experimental therapy started the treatment effect applies to the entire follow up time (e.g. surgery, curative treatment)



 Preparation of the position paper with the estimands, strategies for handling intercurrent events, recommendations to data collection

• Active engagement within the industry, with regulators and payers

• Influence and feedback to the agency guideline to fit for oncology estimand framework

• Raise awareness of the estimands framework with the wider audience



- ICH E9 working group. ICH E9 (R1): Addendum on estimands and sensitivity analyses in clinical trials to the guideline on statistical principles for clinical trials. 2017.
- Motzer RJ1, Escudier B, Oudard S et al (2008). Efficacy of everolimus in advanced renal cell carcinoma: a doubleblind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase III trial. Lancet. 2008 Aug 9;372(9637):449-56.
- Motzer RJ1, Escudier B, Oudard S et al (2010). Phase 3 trial of everolimus for metastatic renal cell carcinoma : final results and analysis of prognostic factors. Cancer. 2010 Sep 15;116(18):4256-65.
- Robins, J.M. and Tsiatis, A.A. (1991). Correcting for non-compliance in randomized trials using rank preserving structural failure time models. *Communications in Statistics Theory and Methods* 20:2609-2631.
- Korhonen PA, Laird NM, Palmgren J. (1999). Correcting for non-compliance in randomized trials: an application to the ATBC Study. Stat Med. 1999 Nov 15;18(21):2879-97.
- Korhonen P, Zuber E, Branson M, Hollaender N, Yateman N, Katiskalahti T, Lebwohl D, Haas T. Correcting overall survival for the impact of crossover via a rank-preserving structural failure time (RPSFT) model in the RECORD-1 trial of everolimus in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma. J Biopharm Stat. 2012;22(6):1258-71

