

Clustering and Meta-Analysis Using a Mixture of Dependent Linear Tail-Free Priors

Bernardo Flores Peter Müller

Abstract

We propose a novel nonparametric Bayesian approach for meta-analysis with event time outcomes. The model is an extension of linear dependent tail-free processes. The extension includes a modification to facilitate (conditionally) conjugate posterior updating and a hierarchical extension with a random partition of studies. The partition is formalized as a Dirichlet process mixture. The model development is motivated by a meta-analysis of cancer immunotherapy studies. The aim is to validate the use of relevant biomarkers in the design of immunotherapy studies. The hypothesis is about immunotherapy in general, rather than about a specific tumor type, therapy and marker. This broad hypothesis leads to a very diverse set of studies being included in the analysis and gives rise to substantial heterogeneity across studies.

Keywords— Bayesian nonparametrics , Dirichlet process mixture, Polya tree, Meta analysis

1 Introduction

Meta-analysis is a widely used approach to synthesize data from multiple clinical studies that are targeting the same hypothesis of interest, allowing the pooling of information to produce more robust inference (Kelley and Kelley (2012)). This can be done using either aggregate or individual participant data. The latter permits to obtain summary results directly from patient level data using established statistical techniques; however, obtaining full sample results from every clinical trial is rarely feasible, so an aggregate approach is often taken (Kelley and Kelley (2012)). This approach combines summary statistics reported for the individual studies to estimate a global result. Classically, there are two ways this is done; using either a random or a fixed effects model (Kelley and Kelley (2012)). In a fixed effects meta-analysis, all studies are assumed to be measuring the same (noisy) overall effect θ , so a regression problem is set up by $\hat{\theta}_i = \theta + \varepsilon_i$, where ε_i is a residual with assumed known variance. In contrast, the random effects models sets up a hierarchical model $\hat{\theta}_i = \theta + \gamma_i + \varepsilon_i$ which takes into account that the change in study-level conditions can introduce more heterogeneity than what can be represented with a a homoskedastic fixed effect model.

When the reported statistic is the median, many methods rely on first using the median to estimate the mean and variance, which introduces additional sources of errors and assumes the outcome variable to be symmetric; whereas the techniques that directly analyse the difference of medians use strong parametric assumptions that limit their flexibility (McGrath et al., 2020b).

Bayesian nonparametric priors (BNP) offer a natural way to relax restrictive parametric assumptions by considering priors on random distributions. More formally nonparametric Bayesian models can be defined as prior probability models for infinite-dimensional parameter spaces (Ghosal and Vaart, 2017). The Dirichlet process (DP) introduced in (Ferguson, 1973) is arguably the most popular such prior with support over discrete probability measures. When used as a mixing measure for a mixture of Gaussian kernels, the resulting mixture, known as DP mixture (DPM) of normals, has full support over continuous densities (Ghosal and Vaart, 2017). The DPM prior, however is not the simplest model on densities with full support. One can instead think of constructing a random histogram by partitioning the sample space and assigning random masses on each partitioning subset. If these do not vary too wildly, continuity of the resulting probability density can be achieved. This reasoning resulted in the development of tail-free processes, with the seminal Pólya tree studied by Lavine in (Lavine, 1992) being the prime example (Ghosal and Vaart, 2017). Multivariate extensions of it that allow the inclusion of covariates have been proposed (Trippa et al. (2011), Jara and Hanson (2011)), but making the computation scalable to large data sets remains problematic.

Building on these models, we developed an extension of the linear dependent tail-free process (LDTP) from Jara and Hanson (2011) to explicitly deal with large heterogeneity while also permitting us to directly use the reported medians and confidence intervals to do inference. We refer to the proposed model as a Bayesian Nonparametric Meta-Analysis (BNPMA). An alternative construction building on a more general dependent tailfree process using Gaussian process priors on the conditional splitting probabilities is developed in Poli et al. (2023).

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce the motivating study together with a frequentist analysis of it. In Section 3, we review the Pólya tree and introduce a BNP mixture of LDTP priors, including an algorithm for posterior sampling. In Section 4, we show a simulation study using data generated from a mixture of Weibull regressions. Finally, in Section 5, we implement the model with the data presented in Section 2.

2 A meta-analysis of cancer immunotherapy studies

We analyze data collected in Fountzilias et al. (2023a), which reports summary statistics from phase I and II trials for a type of immunotherapy agents known as immune checkpoint inhibitors. These therapies have shown great promise as new-generation cancer treatments by incrementing the overall treatment

	Estimate	SE	P-Value
Means	2.0525	0.5172	<0.0001
Medians	1.6358	0.4319	0.0002

Table 1: Results from the frequentist meta-analysis.

outcomes in trials against standard treatments or placebo (Fountzilias et al., 2023a). The goal was to evaluate the potential of biomarkers for the design of immunotherapy studies and, more generally, to optimally match patients with available treatments. For this the authors performed a frequentist meta analysis using a random effects meta-regression. The data is available in Fountzilias et al. (2023b).

Of the several considered response variables, we are interested in progress-free survival (PFS), the time from initiation of treatment to the occurrence of disease progression or death. The data report PFS for $S = 25$ studies, $s = 1, \dots, 25$. All selected studies report summaries stratified by marker status for some biomarker related to immunotherapy, defining a total of $I = 53$ cohorts, $i = 1, \dots, 53$ (some studies are divided into more than two cohorts). In the following discussion we shall use i^- and i^+ to index matching marker-negative and marker-positive cohorts of a study. We will use $s(i)$ to denote the study that includes cohort i . The data are triples (l, m, h) for each cohort where m is the median and (l, h) a 95% confidence interval for it. The reported covariates were tumor type, therapeutic agent, line of treatment, treatment type (monotherapy, combination, etc.) and presence of biomarker.

Using the R package `metamedian`, we first implemented a frequentist meta-analysis based on both the median and the (estimated) mean. For the latter, we used the methodology developed in McGrath et al. (2020b) to estimate the population mean and standard deviations from the reported inference summaries. We then estimated the difference of medians and means by fitting a random effects model. This resulted in the estimates shown in Table 1. Both median and mean were significant, though the variances were not stable due to the large heterogeneity in the reported effect sizes. This is clear in both forest plots, shown in Figure 1.

3 Multivariate Pólya Tree

3.1 Univariate Pólya Tree

The Pólya tree (PT) (Lavine, 1992) is a stochastic process that generates random probability measures by recursively partitioning the desired support and assigning random conditional splitting probabilities to each branch of the resulting tree. The implied random probability measure P is often used as a non-parametric Bayesian prior for unknown distributions such as sampling models of random effects distributions (Diana et al. (2019), Zhao et al. (2009), Boeken and Mooij (2021)).




Figure 1: Forest plots of the estimated for the differences in mean (left) and median (right). The last line of the forest plots reports inference on the overall effect θ .

The formal definition of a PT prior starts with partitioning the sample space B into $B = B_0 \cup B_1$ and then forming a tree of partitions Π by recursively splitting $B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m} = B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 0} \cup B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 1}$, where $\epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Let P denote the PT random probability measure. At each split we define a random branching probability

$$Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 0} \equiv P(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 0} | B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m}) \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 0}, \alpha_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 1}) \quad (1)$$

and the complement $Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 1} = 1 - Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m 0}$, implying for any $\epsilon = \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$

$$P(B_\epsilon) = \prod_{j=1}^m Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_j}. \quad (2)$$

The class of distributions generated by this construction is quite flexible, as proven in [Jara and Hanson \(2011\)](#), with different choices of the parameter sequence $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_\epsilon\}$ implying densities with different characteristics. Assume that $\alpha_\epsilon = a_m$ for all $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m$ at level m , that is, all subsets at the same level share the same α_ϵ . If the sequence of parameters $\{a_m\}$ grows sufficiently fast, specifically if $\sum a_m^{-1} < +\infty$, then it can be shown ([Lavine, 1992](#)) that the corresponding Pólya tree generates continuous densities almost surely. Further, if for some $M > 0$ and a distribution G we set $\alpha_\epsilon = M G(B_\epsilon)$, a DP with base measure G and scale parameter M is recovered.

Let $\Pi_m = \{B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m}\}$ denote the partitioning subsets at level m and $\Pi = \{\Pi_m, m = 1, 2, \dots\}$, and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_\epsilon\}$ denote the hyperprior parameters in (1). We write $P \sim \text{PT}(\Pi, \mathcal{A})$ to indicate a PT random measure.

To center a PT around a desired distribution F_0 two different approaches can be used ([Lavine, 1992](#)).

One option is to start with fixed Π , and then set \mathcal{A} by

$$\alpha_{\epsilon 0} \propto F_0(B_{\epsilon 0}|B_\epsilon) \quad (3)$$

with proportionality across $\alpha_{\epsilon 0}, \alpha_{\epsilon 1}$, to ensure the desired prior expectation, i.e., $E\{P(A)\} = F_0(A)$. Alternatively, one can start by fixing \mathcal{A} with $\alpha_{\epsilon 0} = \alpha_{\epsilon 1}$ for all ϵ and then set the partitioning subsets as the dyadic quantiles of F_0 , i.e. define the partition Π_m at level m as

$$\Pi_m = \{[F_0^{-1}(k/2^m), F_0^{-1}((k+1)/2^m)], \quad k = 0, \dots, 2^m - 1\}. \quad (4)$$

In the upcoming construction we use both to maintain a common centering measure F_0 across cohorts, while allowing for a different partition sequence for each of them. For levels $m = 1, 2$ we will use the first construction with fixed B_0, B_1, \dots, B_{11} , while for the remaining levels, $m > 2$, we will use a variation of the second construction, involving dyadic splits of the respective parent set. That is, $B_{\epsilon 0}, B_{\epsilon 1}$ are defined by splitting B_ϵ at the median of F_0 restricted to B_ϵ . Since Π_1 and Π_2 are constructed differently, this defines a variation of (4).

3.2 Multivariate Pólya Tree

The univariate PT model generates a random probability measure P with full weak support (Lavine, 1992), yet it does not naturally extend to dependent families of distributions. One construction to achieve such an extension is introduced in Jara and Hanson (2011) who proposed the linear dependent tail free process (LDTP) for a family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_x; x \in X\}$ of random probability measures indexed by covariates $x \in X$.

We describe the construction for the application to the event time distributions P_i for cohorts $i = 1, \dots, I$. Let then $Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)}$ denote the splitting probabilities for P_i . The LDTP defines $P_i = F_x$ for a cohort with covariates $x_i = x$ by setting up F_x with random splitting probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} \text{logit}\left(Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)}\right) &= \beta'_{\epsilon 0} x_i \\ \beta_{\epsilon 0} &\sim N(0, \Psi_{\epsilon 0}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for some net of covariance matrices $(\Psi_{\epsilon 0})_{\epsilon 0}$. Similarly to (2), model (5) defines a random probability measure P_i by $P_i(B_\epsilon) = \prod_{j=1}^m Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_j}^{(i)}$, if $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_m$. It can be shown (Jara and Hanson, 2011) that the LDTP preserves some of the properties of the PT model, namely (weak) posterior consistency and conditions for obtaining (Lebesgue) absolutely continuous densities, assuming that the partition tree corresponds to the dyadic quantiles of some Borel measure supported on the real line.

If for each level $m = 1, \dots$ we assume a covariance matrix $\Psi_m = 2c\rho(m)^{-1}I$ for some constant c and function ρ such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \rho(j)^{-1} < \infty$, then the LDTP generates Lebesgue densities with probability one. The flexibility of this logistic-normal construction lies in the inclusion of covariates with an arbitrary design matrix, which allows for complex correlations between the resulting trees.

One feature of this model that limits the applicability for the desired meta analysis is the use of a common regression parameters β_ϵ across all studies, imposing a strong structure. This assumption limits the ability to accommodate heterogeneity across studies. We propose a solution for this problem by using a mixture of LDTPs, produced by mixing over the coefficients of the logistic regression in (5). This translates to splitting the studies into different groups and independently fitting a logistic regression in each of them, which produces multimodality in the posterior distributions. Another limitation is the use of a common partitioning sequence Π across all cohorts i . We will introduce a variation of the LDTP to address both limitations, to define an inference model suitable for the desired meta-analysis problem.

4 BNP meta analysis

4.1 A mixture of LDTPs

We introduce two extension of model (5). First, we allow for study-specific regression coefficients $\beta^{(s)}$ to fit the expected heterogeneity across studies. Second, we will pool strength across similar studies by introducing clusters of studies with shared common $\beta^{(s)} = \beta_k^*$ for all studies s in cluster k .

Our proposal is to introduce mixing over the regression coefficients β with a Dirichlet process, which produces an unbounded number of clusters of studies with shared coefficients $\beta^{(s)}$. Recall that $s(i) = s$ indicates the study cohort i belongs to; then the full hierarchical model for all ϵ is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{logit} \left(Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)} \mid \beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} \right) &= \beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)'} x_i + z_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)}, \quad s = s(i) \\ z_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} &\sim N(0, \psi_{\epsilon 0}), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with random effects $z_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)}$, and study-specific effects $\beta^{(s)}$ that arise from a discrete prior,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} \mid G_{\epsilon 0} &\sim G_{\epsilon 0} \\ G_{\epsilon 0} &\sim DP \left(N \left(0, c2^{|\epsilon 0|} I \right), \alpha \right) \\ \psi_{\epsilon 0} &\sim \text{InvGamma}(a, b); \quad E[\psi_{\epsilon 0}] = b/(a - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The normal random effects together with the DP prior on $G_{\epsilon 0}$ define a DP mixture of normals for the study-specific effects $\beta^{(s)}$. The model induces the desired clustering on the logistic regression. This is because $G_{\epsilon 0}$ is discrete, implying positive probabilities of ties. Let $\{\beta_{\epsilon 0, k}^*, k = 1, \dots, K_{\epsilon 0}\}$ denote the unique values of $\beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)}$. The ties create clusters of studies with shared values $\beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} = \beta_k^*$. This effect is best seen in the predictive distribution, which defines the following recursive sampling of regression coefficients, including the point

masses for previously sampled coefficients. The latter induces the ties. See, for example, (Ghosal and Vaart, 2017) for more discussion. We have

$$p\left(\beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(s+1)} \mid \beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(s)}, \dots, \beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(1)}\right) \propto \alpha N\left(0, c2^{|\epsilon_0|} I\right) + \sum_{r=1}^s \delta_{\beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(r)}},$$

where $\delta_{\beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(s(i))}}$ is a Dirac measure centered at $\beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(s(i))}$. Essentially, at each step the Dirichlet process samples with positive probability from one of the previous sampled values or it chooses a new one from the base measure. This causes different studies to share the same parameters, inducing clustering. Finally, in (7) we use a DP mixture with the additional random effect, rather than only a DP prior. This particular structure of the DP mixture is chosen to induce additional correlation for cohorts under the same study.

4.2 Study-specific partitioning trees and centering

A particularly attractive property of tail-free process priors is that they easily allow to work with interval data. Recall that the data reports for each cohort the quadruples $q_i = (\ell_i, m_i, h_i, n_i)_{i=1}^N$, where m_i is a point estimate and (ℓ_i, h_i) is some $(1 - \alpha)$ -confidence interval for median PFS, and n_i is the sample size. Considering a single cohort, for the moment we drop the index i in the following discussion. We then define Π_1 and Π_2 using subsets defined by the quadruple q_i ,

$$B_0 = F_0^{-1}((0, m)) \quad \text{and} \quad B_1 = (m, \infty) \quad (8)$$

$$B_{00} = (0, l), \quad B_{01} = (l, m), \quad B_{10} = (m, h), \quad B_{11} = (h, \infty) \quad (9)$$

It can be argued that reporting q_i implies counts of observed PFS times in these intervals. For this argument, consider the first n order statistics $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$ of the (unobserved) event times, and let M be the true median. Consider $Z \sim \text{Bin}(n, 0.5)$ that counts the number of data points that fall to the left of M . Next find the values k, j such that $P(Z \geq j) = \alpha/2$ and $P(Z < k) = \alpha/2$, that is, the $\alpha/2$ and $1 - \alpha/2$ quantiles of Z , respectively. Now, by definition $P(Z \geq j) = P(X_{(j)} < M)$ and $P(Z < k) = P(X_{(k)} \geq M)$, implying that $P(X_{(k)} < M < X_{(j)}) = 1 - \alpha$, i.e., $(X_{(k)}, X_{(j)})$ can be argued to be a $(1 - \alpha)$ confidence interval for the unknown median M . We proceed assuming that this is how the reported (ℓ_i, h_i) were determined (of course, in reality most were probably based on a Kaplan-Meier curve).

Let n_ϵ denote the counts for the intervals in Π_1 and Π_2 . The argument implies

$$n_0 = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor, n_{00} = k \quad \text{and} \quad n_{10} = j, \quad (10)$$

with the remaining counts at levels $m = 1, 2$ implied by the complements to n_i .

Finally, with (6) replacing the beta prior (1) we lose the earlier mentioned easy prior centering of the PT construction. Instead we add for each cohort a cohort-specific intercept $c_{\epsilon_0}^{(i)}$ in (6) to ensure $E(Y_{\epsilon_0}^{(i)}) = F_0(B_{\epsilon_0}^{(i)} \mid B_\epsilon^{(i)})$, for

cohort-specific partitioning subsets $B_\epsilon^{(i)}$. A minor complication arises from the fact that the nonlinear logit transformation does not preserve expectations. Instead we numerically solve an optimization problem:

$$c_{\epsilon 0}^i = \arg \min_c \left| F_0^{-1}(B_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)} | B_\epsilon^{(i)}) - E \left[\text{logit}^{-1} \left(c + \beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s(i))'} x_i + z_{\epsilon 0}^{(s(i))} \right) \right] \right|.$$

Using the intercept changes (6) to

$$\text{logit} \left(Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)} | \beta_{\epsilon 0} \right) = c_{\epsilon 0}^i + z_{\epsilon 0}^{s(i)} + \beta_{\epsilon 0}' x_i \quad (11)$$

with fixed intercept $c_{\epsilon 0}^i$.

4.3 A partially linear dependent tail-free process

We define the prior (6) only for levels $m = 1, 2$ using the cohort-specific partitions (9), for which the counts (10) allow informed posterior updating. For the remaining levels the data does not provide any additional information. We therefore continue the model beyond $m = 2$ with independent beta priors for $Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)}$ using $\alpha_\epsilon = a_m$ for all $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 \cdots \epsilon_m$ at level m . We use $a_m = 2^m$ to obtain continuous densities. Recall that the partitioning subsets $B_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)}$ beyond level 2 are defined by splitting the parent set $B_\epsilon^{(i)}$ at the median of the desired centering measure F_0 restricted to $B_\epsilon^{(i)}$.

Adding this construction the full model takes the following form. Let $m = |\epsilon|$ denote the level in the tree, and let $s = s(i)$ denote the study that includes cohort i .

$$\begin{aligned} m = 1, 2 : \quad & \text{logit} \left(Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)} \right) = c_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)} + z_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} + x_i' \beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} \\ & \beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)} \sim G_{\epsilon 0}, \quad m = 1, 2 \\ m > 2 : \quad & Y_{\epsilon 0}^{(i)} \sim \text{Be}(c \cdot 2^m, c \cdot 2^m), \quad m > 2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with the DP prior on $G_{\epsilon 0}$ and the hyperprior as before. This completes the construction of the proposed inference model for meta-analysis. We refer to (12) as nonparametric Bayesian meta analysis (BNPMA).

Theorem 4.1. *The marginal prior expectation of the random distribution $P^{(i)}$ under the BNPMA equals F_0 .*

Proof. In the following argument we drop the i sub and suuper indices and let $s = s(i)$ denote the study cohort i .

Start by noting that the splitting probabilities under the Dirichlet process with a Gaussian base-measure are marginally independent logit-normal random variables. Then

$$c_{\epsilon 0} + x' \beta_{\epsilon 0}^s | z_{\epsilon 0}^s \sim N \left(c_{\epsilon 0} + z_{\epsilon 0}^s, 2^{|\epsilon 0|} x' x \right).$$

Independence across ϵ implies that the process is (marginally) tail-free. Then to achieve the desired centering all we need (Ghosal and Vaart, 2017) is for all ϵ and i

$$E \left[P_i^{(i)}(B_\epsilon) \right] = F_0(B_\epsilon)$$

The moments of the inverse-logit distribution are not available in closed form (Holmes and Schofield, 2022), but can be calculated through numerical integration. But recall that c_{ϵ_0} was fixed such that the expected value of each $\text{logit}^{-1}(c_{\epsilon_0} + z_{\epsilon_0}^s + x'\beta_{\epsilon_0}^s)$ matches $F_0(B_{\epsilon_0})$, which centers the process in the desired distribution. \square

5 Posterior inference

We implement posterior MCMC simulation for P_i for all cohorts $i = 1, \dots, I$. Posterior inference on P_i then implies posterior inference on the median $M_i = \text{Mdn}(P_i)$, and the difference of log medians $\log(M_{i^+}) - \log(M_{i^-})$ for any pair of cohorts i^+, i^- which define matching marker-positive and marker-negative cohorts in the same study $s = s(i)$. Since the splitting probabilities $Y_{\epsilon_0}^{(i)}$ are all independent across ϵ , we can treat each ϵ as a separate inference problem, and implement separate instances of posterior MCMC simulation.

Consider thus the task of estimating the branching probability for a given ϵ . We focus on the first two levels, $m = 1, 2$ only. Given $Y_{\epsilon_0}^{(i)}$ for the first two levels the remaining splitting probabilities are easily imputed from the prior – there is no information in the data and therefore no posterior updating beyond level $m = 2$.

Updating G_{ϵ_0} . The random probability measures G_{ϵ_0} are *a posteriori* independent and can be updated in parallel. For the upcoming discussion we therefore drop the ϵ_0 index. We use a finite DP approximation (Ishwaran and James, 2001). Let then $G = \sum_{h=1}^H w_h \delta_{b_h}$ denote a finite truncation of G after H terms. The unique values β_k^* that were introduced in the comments following (7) are tied with some of the b_h , but not necessarily in the same order. For the upcoming discussion it is convenient to instead index the unique values with h for the corresponding b_h , noting that there can be some values b_h with $\beta^{(s)} \neq b_h$ for all s . Letting $C_h^s = \{s : \beta^{(s)} = b_h\}$ defines a partition of $\{1, \dots, S\} = \bigcup_{h=1}^H C_h^s$, allowing for empty clusters $C_h^s = \emptyset$ when $b_h \neq \beta^{(s)}$ for all s . Similarly we define $C_h = \{i : \beta^{(s(i))} = b_h\}$ as the corresponding partition of cohorts. For an alternative characterization of the partition we use cluster membership indicators $h_i = h$ if $i \in C_h$.

The DP prior $G \sim \text{DP}(G^*, \alpha)$ can be constructively defined as $w_h = v_h \prod_{\ell < h} (1 - v_\ell)$ with $v_h \sim \text{Be}(1, \alpha)$ and $b_h \sim G^*$, i.i.d., a priori. This is known as the stick-breaking construction (Sethuraman, 1994). Posterior updating for the weights is carried out by updating the stick-breaking components (v_h) using the complete conditional posterior $v_h \mid \dots \sim \text{Be}(m_h, \alpha + \sum_{j=h+1}^H m_j)$, where m_h is the number of cohorts with $\beta^{(i)} = b_h$.

Logistic regression parameters For empty clusters b_h is resampled using the base measure G^* . For non-empty clusters C_h we proceed as follows. For each cohort i let n_i denote the number of observed event times in $B^{(i)}$ (recall

that we are dropping the $\epsilon 0$ indices) given in (10), and let N_i denote the count in the corresponding parent set. Then the conditional posterior for b_h given the observed counts n_i, N_i is

$$p(b_h | \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{n}) \propto G^*(b_h) \cdot \prod_{i \in C_h} \frac{\exp(x'_i b_h)^{n_i}}{(1 + \exp(x'_i b_h))^{N_i}} \quad (13)$$

We include the random effects $z^{(s)}$ in b_h , replacing b_h by $\tilde{b}_h = b_h \cup \{z^{(s)} : s \in C_h^s\}$ and x_i by $\tilde{x}_i = [x_i \quad \mathcal{Z}_i]$, where \mathcal{Z}_i is the design vector for the random effects. Hence in the following discussion we will group together $z^{(s)}$ with b_h and update them simultaneously.

We use the data augmentation method of Polson et al. (2013) to implement sampling of (13). The scheme involves a latent Pólya-gamma distributed random variables ω_i , with complete conditionals for ω_i being a scaled Polygamma and for \tilde{b}_h being normal linear regression posterior distribution. See Polson et al. (2013) for details.

Gibbs sampler We define a Gibbs sampler using the algorithm in Ishwaran and James (2001) by iterating over the following steps. Here ... in the conditioning sets stands for all other parameters and the data, $h = h_i$ when the relevant cohort i is understood from the context, $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$, $m_h = |C_h|$ is the number of cohorts in cluster h , $\mathbf{n} = (\mathbf{n}_i, i = 1, \dots, I)$, $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_i, i = 1, \dots, I)$ and $\text{PG}(a, b)$ indicates a Pólya-Gamma distribution with parameters (a, b) .

We denote the design matrix (including the random effects) for a non-empty cluster C_h as X_h , and the diagonal matrix constructed from the PG latent variables belonging to C_h as Ω_h . Let $\tilde{b}_h = (b_h, z^{(s)}; s \in C_h^s)$ and \tilde{x}_i the i -th row of the extended design matrix with the random effects included and let then the prior variance of \tilde{b}_h be

$$\Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} c 2^{-m} I & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \psi I \end{pmatrix},$$

for $\psi > 0$.

In step 1, let $\kappa_i = n_i - N_i/2$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}_h = (\kappa_i, i \in C_h)$.

1. $p(\tilde{b}_h | \mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \dots) = N(\mu_\omega, V_\omega)$ where $V_\omega = (\tilde{X}'_h \Omega_h \tilde{X}_h + \Sigma_0^{-1})^{-1}$ and $\mu_{\omega_h} = V_{\omega_h} (\tilde{X}'_h \boldsymbol{\kappa}_h + \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu_o)$
2. $p(\omega_i | \dots, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \beta_{h_i}^*, \dots) = \text{PG}(1, \tilde{x}'_i \tilde{b}_{h_i})$
3. $p(h_i | \dots) = \sum_{h=1}^H p_h \delta_h$ with $p_h \propto \left(w_h \text{Binom}(n_i | N_i, \text{logit}^{-1}(\tilde{b}'_h \tilde{x}_i)) \right)_k$
4. $w_h = (1-V_1)(1-V_2) \dots (1-V_{h-1})V_h$, where $V_h \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \text{Be} \left(m_h, \alpha + \sum_{\ell=h+1}^H m_\ell \right)$
5. Recall the hyperprior $\psi \sim \text{InvGamma}(a, b)$, implying the familiar conjugate InvGamma conditional posterior distribution.

6 Simulation study

We set up a simulation generating data for $S = 30$ studies with $I = 60$ cohorts, including one marker-positive cohort i^+ and one marker-negative cohort i^- for each study. For each study, both, i^+ and i^- , share the same covariates, a normal variable $x_{i1} \sim N(5, 1)$ and a binary Bernoulli random variable $x_{i2} \sim \text{Bern}(0.7)$. Next we generated study-specific random effects $\gamma_s \sim \text{Unif}(-0.3, 0.3)$ for each study. With these variables we then simulated data from a mixture of two Weibull regressions (c.f. (Lemeshow et al., 2008)), choosing each of the two regression models with equal probability. Let $k_i \sim \text{Bern}(0.5)$ denote a group assignment for cohort i . In summary, assuming $n_i = 50$ patients for each study, the generative model for simulated event times $t_{ij}, j = 1, \dots, n_i = 50$ patients per cohort is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \log(t_{ij}) &= \beta'_{k_i} x_i + \gamma_i + \log w_{ij} \text{ with } w_{ij} \sim \text{Exp}(1). \\ \gamma_s &\sim \text{Unif}(-0.3, 0.3) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We use $\beta_1 = (0.4, 0.2)$ and $\beta_2 = (0.7, 0.5)$. Based on the simulated patient-level data we then consider Kaplan-Meier plots, and read off estimates m_i of the median and a corresponding 95% confidence interval (ℓ_i, h_i) . We record the quadruple $q_i = (\ell_i, m_i, h_i, n_i)$ as the hypothetical data in the simulation. Note that in this construction the simulation truth is different from the analysis model that is assumed under the proposed BNPMA approach. Figure ?? shows the simulation truth for each of the 60 simulated cohorts, separated by true cluster assignment.

Conditional on these data we then implement Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) posterior simulation as described before. We simulate 50,000 iterations to evaluate posterior summaries, including posterior expectations for the median M_i of the event time distributions P_i . We compare the posterior estimates with the simulation truth M_i^o under (14). The latter are calculated from the Weibull regression as $q_{\frac{1}{2}} = \log\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \exp \beta'_{k_i} x + \gamma_i$. The earlier, i.e., the posterior means, are obtained from the posterior Monte Carlo samples by evaluating for each iteration of the MCMC simulation the branching probabilities and then constructing a histogram as in (2) to determine the implied median M_i corresponding to each posterior sample. Finally, the Markov chain Monte Carlo average of M_i across iterations evaluates the posterior expectation $\bar{M}_i = E(M_i | \text{data})$. Figure 2(a) compares posterior estimates \bar{M}_i versus the simulation truth M_i^o . The accumulation of the scatter plot around the identity is evidence that posterior inference under BNPMA was indeed able to recover the true effects under these realistic sample sizes and effect.

Finally, the forest plot in Figure 2(b) shows the estimated log-ratio of medians for pairs (i^+, i^-) of marker-positive and marker-negative cohorts under each study. The figure shows estimates from a meta regression using both, the proposed BNPMA and an established frequentist inference method (McGrath et al., 2020a). For the latter first the mean and standard deviations are obtained from the medians and intervals using the estimators developed in Luo et al. (2018); after which a random effects model with moderators is fitted.




Figure 2: Posterior inference on the medians M_i in the simulation study. Panel (a) plots posterior expected medians $\bar{M}_i = E(M_i | data)$ vs true medians M_i for all cohorts (in log-log scale). Panel (b) shows a forest plot of the estimated log-ratio of medians and corresponding confidence and credible interval using classical meta-analysis using a random effects model (red, with bullets) and the BNPMA (green with triangles), respectively. For reference, the simulation truth is also shown (blue, with little boxes).

The frequentist model shows shrinkage towards an overall effect, with little variation across its estimates. We estimated a random effects model using the function `rma` from the package `metafor` with default parameters, which induced the strong shrinkage seen in the figure. However, note the horizontal scale of the figure, to accommodate the fit of the several outlier studies, which makes the shrinkage under the meta-regression appear more extreme. BNPMA instead induces more heterogeneity, still with shrinkage of the estimates towards the same overall effect, but allowing the fitting of the several outlier studies.

Finally, Figure 3 illustrates $p(P_i | data)$ by way of showing 50 posterior draws for the corresponding survival function for three randomly selected cohorts. The medians for the estimated curves are close to the true medians and uncertainty around the curve increases away from the reported interval boundaries (ℓ_i, m_i, h_i) (which are marked by vertical lines). Keep in mind that the data only informs about the counts in the intervals between the vertical lines. Consequently posterior inference can only recover the probability mass for each interval, but not possibly any finer details. This is most evident in the right most intervals. The data provides no information about the right tail.




Figure 3: Plot of 50 posterior simulated survival functions for three cohorts (thin grey lines) versus the simulation truth (black line). The vertical lines mark the observed median and confidence interval limits.

7 Results

We fit the proposed BNPMA model to the data presented in Section 2. In levels $m = 1, 2$ of the nested partition tree we specify the base measure of the DP prior (6) as a normal distribution, $N(0, \sigma_m^2 I)$. Recall that G_{ϵ_0} is the prior for the regression coefficients $\beta_{\epsilon_0}^{(s)}$, justifying the zero mean as a symmetric prior. Also, keeping in mind the nature of the covariates as categorical indicators, we use $\sigma_m^2 = 2^{m+1}$ to define a vague prior.

We implemented the BNPMA with the two (categorical) covariates of therapeutic agent and tumor type, both coded as multiple binary indicators.

Estimating P_i . We implemented posterior MCMC simulation as proposed before. After a burn-in of 49,000 iterations, over another 1000 iterations, $j = 1, \dots, 1000$, we evaluated the imputed event time distributions P_i for each iteration. Figure 4 illustrates estimation of P_i by showing the corresponding survival function for a randomly selected cohort. Note the multimodality (in the implied event time distribution), justifying the use of the nonparametric prior for P_i .




Figure 4: Posterior estimated P_i for a randomly chosen cohort, shown as a survival function. Note the apparent changepoint (around 6).

As in the simulation study we then evaluated the implied medians $M_i^{(j)}$.




Figure 5: Forest plots of the observed (left) and estimated (right) intervals for the median effect of the therapeutic agents. Note the difference in scales between both plots.

For a study s with marker-positive and marker-negative cohorts i^+ and i^- , let $D_s = \log\{M_{i^+}/M_{i^-}\}$ define the difference of log median event times, and let $D_s^{(j)}$ denote the same under the parameters imputed in iteration j . Summaries of $D_s^{(j)}$ report the effect of marker-status. Averaging over all studies we find $1/S \sum p(D_s > 0 \mid data) = .743$, This is the posterior probability of larger median event time for marker-positive than for marker-negative patients.

Further, we compare posterior inference on D_s with the reported confidence intervals in the original studies. We use 95% posterior credible intervals. The comparison is shown in Figure 5. Overall, the credible intervals report similar effects as the reported confidence intervals, but are shorter due to the sharing of strength in the BNPMA, and outliers are shrunk towards an overall mean.

Meta-regression and posterior predictive inference. For meta-regression we are interested in the effect of tumor types or treatments on D_s . Since the model does not include any parameters that are explicitly interpretable as covariate effects on D_s (the β_s are regression coefficients for the logit splitting probabilities), we need to improvise and proceed as follows. To report covariate effects for categorical covariates, such as agent and tumor type, we combine $D_s^{(j)}$ across all studies s with the corresponding value of the covariate. We then report the resulting distribution of $D_s^{(j)}$ as posterior distribution for the effect of a covariate value of interest. We show the summaries for some covariates of interest in Figure 6. For the frequentist analysis we implement a meta-regression using the R package `metamedian`. For the BNPMA results we reported 95% credible intervals for the difference of medians for studies with the covariate vs without

it. Note that the posterior intervals for the difference of log medians under the BNPMA are generally narrower than under the frequentist method, most likely due to the information sharing between different studies. Also, the clustering allows for multimodality. According to these results, we find the main effects of durvalumab, pembrolizumab, patients with melanoma and with the overflow category of tumors "other" to be non-significant; in contrast with the classical method, which reports only nivolumab and melanoma as non significant.




Figure 6: 95% credible (confidence) predictive intervals for the difference of log medians induced by different covariates, namely tumor types and treatments.

We also perform a two-way interaction analysis. For this we evaluate the predictive intervals for future studies with the observed tumor-treatment combinations, shown in Figure 7.

We again obtain a similar conclusion as under the frequentist method, with only four disparities. The main one concerning the joint effect of nivolumab and "other", as the signs of the effect in the difference of medians are opposite; however, note that the other interactions with "other" are skewed to the negative axis, suggesting that result is most likely due to the estimated dependence structure between effects.

For posterior predictive inference for specific tumor types or treatments we proceed similarly as for meta-regression. For example, to report a predictive distribution of event times, PFS in our case, for melanoma we average imputed P_i across all cohorts with melanoma patients. Figure 8 shows predictive densities for the most common tumor type and treatment: melanoma and avelumab. The smoothed densities imply a stronger effect of the said immunotherapy on biomarker-positive melanoma patients than for biomarker-negative patients.

Study heterogeneity – clustering. Finally we report results on the inference for study heterogeneity, i.e., on the random partition of studies induced by the DP mixture prior on $\beta_{\epsilon 0}^{(s)}$. See Section 2 in the supplement for details on how we determine a point estimate for a random partition.

Figures 10 and 9 show summaries of the estimated partition of studies. The three largest groups show a model split according to different characteristics




Figure 7: 95% credible (confidence) predictive intervals for the second order interaction for the indicated tumor and treatment levels. The left panel shows the results under the BNPMA; the right panel shows the same under classical meta-regression using a random effect model.




Figure 8: Estimated distributions of the PFS for biomarker-positive and negative patients treated with avelumab, regardless of the type of cancer; with melanoma, regardless of the treatment; and with melanoma treated with avelumab.

of the trials; for instance, clusters 1 and 2 mainly have trials with avelumab and pembrolizumab, but the first one excludes breast cancer for melanoma and NSCLC while the second one includes does the opposite.




Figure 9: Contingency tables for treatment and tumor type for the three largest clusters.

8 Conclusion

We have introduced a novel non-parametric Bayesian approach for meta-analysis with event time endpoints. The model naturally accommodates heterogeneity




Figure 10: Posterior forest plot. Each color represents one different cluster. Cluster 3 was excluded since it included studies with small sample sizes the `metamedian` package could not use.

across included studies and allows inference without restrictive parametric assumptions. Using a non-parametric Bayesian mixture of LDTP models allows for flexibility in the regression on study-specific covariates, while still taking advantage of the parsimonious nature of the LDTP. Several alternative extensions of the LDTP are possible, including, for example, the use of more general dependent tailfree processes to link models across studies (or cohorts), as in [Poli et al. \(2023\)](#) or in [Jara and Hanson \(2011\)](#).

Limitations of the proposed approach include the dependence of inference on the unknown distributions on the chosen partition sequences, including a lack of smoothness in the estimated densities at the partition boundaries. Reporting survival functions, as is customary for event time data, this is less of a problem. Another limitation is the focus on event time outcomes. The model is not appropriate, for example, for binary outcomes like tumor response, but could be used without modification for any other continuous outcome. This is related to another limitation of the model by not specifically accommodating censoring. Instead inference hinges only on the reported point and interval estimates of median event times. The only practical constraint is that other continuous outcomes might not commonly be summarized by estimates of median outcomes.

References

- Boeken, P. A. and Mooij, J. M. (2021). A Bayesian nonparametric conditional two-sample test with an application to Local Causal Discovery. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1565–1575. PMLR.
- Diana, A., Griffin, J., and Matechou, E. (2019). A Polya Tree Based Model for Unmarked Individuals in an Open Wildlife Population. In Argiento, R., Durante, D., and Wade, S., editors, *Bayesian Statistics and New Generations*, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, pages 3–11, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian Analysis of Some Nonparametric Problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(2):209–230.
- Fountzilias, E., Vo, H. H., Mueller, P., Kurzrock, R., and Tsimberidou, A.-M. (2023a). Correlation between biomarkers and treatment outcomes in diverse cancers: a systematic review and meta-analysis of phase I and II immunotherapy clinical trials. *European Journal of Cancer (Oxford, England: 1990)*, 189:112927.
- Fountzilias, E., Vo, H. H., Mueller, P., Kurzrock, R., and Tsimberidou, A.-M. (2023b). Dataset of phase I and II immunotherapy clinical trials used for a meta-analysis to assess the role of biomarkers in treatment outcomes in diverse cancers. *Data in Brief*, 51:109698.
- Ghosal, S. and Vaart, A. v. d. (2017). *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge ; New York, 1st edition edition.
- Holmes, J. B. and Schofield, M. R. (2022). Moments of the logit-normal distribution. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 51(3):610–623.
- Ishwaran, H. and James, L. F. (2001). Gibbs Sampling Methods for Stick-Breaking Priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(453):161–173.
- Jara, A. and Hanson, T. E. (2011). A class of mixtures of dependent tail-free processes. *Biometrika*, 98(3):553–566.
- Kelley, G. A. and Kelley, K. S. (2012). Statistical models for meta-analysis: A brief tutorial. *World Journal of Methodology*, 2(4):27–32.
- Lavine, M. (1992). Some Aspects of Polya Tree Distributions for Statistical Modelling. *The Annals of Statistics*, 20(3):1222–1235.
- Lemeshow, S., May, S., and Jr, D. W. H. (2008). *Applied Survival Analysis: Regression Modeling of Time-to-Event Data*. Wiley-Interscience, Hoboken, N.J, 2nd edition edition.

- Luo, D., Wan, X., Liu, J., and Tong, T. (2018). Optimally estimating the sample mean from the sample size, median, mid-range, and/or mid-quartile range. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 27(6):1785–1805.
- McGrath, S., Sohn, H., Steele, R., and Benedetti, A. (2020a). Meta-analysis of the difference of medians. *Biometrical Journal. Biometrische Zeitschrift*, 62(1):69–98.
- McGrath, S., Zhao, X., Steele, R., Thombs, B. D., Benedetti, A., and DEPRESSION Screening Data (DEPRESSD) Collaboration (2020b). Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from commonly reported quantiles in meta-analysis. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 29(9):2520–2537.
- Poli, G., Fountzilas, E., Tsimeridou, A.-M., and Müller, P. (2023). A Multivariate Polya Tree Model for Meta-Analysis with Event Time Distributions. [eprint: 2312.06018](#).
- Polson, N. G., Scott, J. G., and Windle, J. (2013). Bayesian Inference for Logistic Models Using Pólya–Gamma Latent Variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(504):1339–1349.
- Sethuraman, J. (1994). A Constructive Definition of Dirichlet Priors. *Statistica Sinica*, 4(2):639–650.
- Trippa, L., Müller, P., and Johnson, W. (2011). The multivariate beta process and an extension of the Polya tree model. *Biometrika*, 98(1):17–34.
- Zhao, L., Hanson, T. E., and Carlin, B. P. (2009). Mixtures of Polya trees for flexible spatial frailty survival modelling. *Biometrika*, 96(2):263.