

A Bayesian Basket Trial Design Using Local Power Prior

Haiming Zhou^{*a}, Rex Shen^b, Sutan Wu^a and Philip He^a

^a*Daiichi Sankyo, Inc., USA*; ^b*Stanford University, USA*

Date: December 21, 2023

*Corresponding author; Email: haiming.zhou@daiichisankyo.com

ABSTRACT

In recent years, basket trials, which enable the evaluation of an experimental therapy across multiple tumor types within a single protocol, have gained prominence in early-phase oncology development. Unlike traditional trials, where each tumor type is evaluated separately with limited sample size, basket trials offer the advantage of borrowing information across various tumor types. However, a key challenge in designing basket trials lies in dynamically determining the extent of information borrowing across tumor types to enhance statistical power while maintaining an acceptable type I error rate. In this paper, we propose a local power prior framework that includes a 3-component borrowing mechanism with explicit model interpretation. Unlike many existing Bayesian methods that require Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling, the proposed framework offers a closed-form solution, eliminating the time-consuming nature of MCMC in large-scale simulations for evaluating operating characteristics. Extensive simulations have been conducted and demonstrated a good performance of the proposal method comparable to the other complex methods. The significantly shortened computation time further underscores the practical utility in the context of basket trials.

Keywords: Bayesian dynamic basket design, local power prior, dynamic borrowing, early-phase oncology trials

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, basket trials have emerged for assessing the effectiveness of novel targeted therapies across diverse tumor types, referred to as “baskets,” that share a common molecular alteration or biomarker. This innovative basket trial design represents a fundamental paradigm shift from traditional approach of oncology drug development, which typically focuses on the tumor’s tissue of origin, to molecular characteristics-based development, which prioritizes the molecular characteristics. Since FDA’s accelerated approval of pembrolizumab in unresectable/metastatic MSI-H or dMMR solid tumors in 2017, six additional indications have been approved by FDA (Appendix Table 8.1).

The majority of basket trial trials are in exploratory settings where the primary objective is to identify the cancer types that the experimental drug has promising activity for next phase of development. For example, one clinical study of BRAF V600 mutated tumors (Hyman et al., 2015) was conducted as an exploratory basket trial aiming to assess the preliminary efficacy of Vemurafenib for treating six pre-specified cancer types including non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), colorectal cancer treated with vemurafenib (CRC vemu), CRC treated with vemurafenib and cetuximab (CRC vemu+cetu), cholangiocarcinoma (bile duct), Erdheim-Chester disease or Langerhans' cell histiocytosis (ECD or LCH), anaplastic thyroid cancer (ATC), and colorectal cancer (CRC). In contrast to traditional trials, which typically investigate each cancer type through separate phase 2 studies, basket trials have the potential to expedite drug development and allow opportunities for information borrowing across various cancer types. This borrowing may considerably improve the trial efficiency and decision making. However, the key practical challenge is around the amount of borrowing and choice of multiple existing borrowing frameworks. Bayesian hierarchical model (BHM) (Berry et al., 2013) pioneered the Bayesian dynamic borrowing methods, which assumes that patients across different baskets respond to the therapy homogeneously. Since then, a variety of more flexible methods have been proposed to account for possible heterogeneity of treatment effects across baskets such as exchangeability–nonexchangeability (EXNEX) (Neuenschwander et al., 2016), Bayesian cluster hierarchical model (BCHM) (Chen & Lee, 2020), multisource exchangeability modeling (MEM) (Hobbs & Landin, 2018), Robust Bayesian Hypothesis Testing (RoBoT) (Zhou & Ji, 2021) and multiple cohort expansion (MUCE) (Lyu et al., 2023); see Pohl et al. (2021) for a comprehensive review of Bayesian basket trial design methods. Nonetheless, a shared computational challenge exists among most of these methods when they depend on Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) for posterior inference, which can be prohibitively time-consuming in large-scale simulations for exploring the operating characteristics of a design option. To our knowledge, only a few MCMC-free methods exist in the literature including Simon’s two-stage basket trial (Simon et al., 2016), information borrowing based on Jensen-Shannon divergence (Fujikawa et al., 2020), Bayesian model averaging (BMA) (Psioda et al.,

2021) and local MEM (Liu et al., 2022). Simon’s basket trial design considers either borrowing among all baskets or no borrowing among them. The BMA and local MEM methods require extensive computations as the number of baskets increases. Fujikawa’s method has computational advantage but it has large type I error inflation as shown in (Fujikawa et al., 2020) and our simulation studies (Section 3.4).

In this work, we propose a novel dynamic borrowing framework based on the power prior (Ibrahim et al., 2015) approach. In the setting of borrowing historical data, the power prior approach constructs an informative prior by incorporating historical data through a weight parameter, also called power parameter. This power parameter is often pre-specified, e.g., 0.5, based on subjective judgement to discount some amount of borrowing from historical data. A greater weight is assigned when the historical data are deemed more relevant. In the setting of exploratory basket trials, we apply the power prior concept in handling the borrowing among various tumor types (baskets). For each pair of baskets, the weight is determined according to their similarity in objective response rate (ORR), a commonly used endpoint in early-phase oncology studies. The advantages of the proposed power prior framework are significantly shortened computation time due to its closed form in posterior distribution and explicit interpretation of the borrowing mechanisms.

In Section 2, we review several existing methods related to power prior and present the details of the proposed local power prior method. In Section 3, we assess the performance of the local power prior method, comparing it against multiple existing methods through extensive simulations. In Section 4, we apply the proposed method to a case study for BRAF V600 mutated rare cancers and demonstrate its practical utility in a real-world context. Finally, we conclude with a discussion in Section 5 for some practical considerations.

2. METHODS

Consider a basket trial with B tumor types (i.e., baskets). Let p_i denote the ORR for basket i . Suppose n_i patients enrolled in basket i and Y_i of them achieved tumor response. Then

$$Y_i | p_i \sim \text{Binomial}(n_i, p_i), i = 1 \dots B.$$

The mechanism of information borrowing across baskets is facilitated by incorporating informative priors on p_i or $\text{logit}(p_i)$, e.g., BHM (Berry et al., 2013), EXNEX (Neuenschwander et al., 2016), and MEM (Hobbs & Landin, 2018). In contrast to many methods that necessitate Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling for posterior inference, we introduce a local power prior method that eliminates the need for MCMC. This is particularly advantageous for practical use in exploring trial design operating characteristics by simulations.

2.1. Power Prior and Dynamic Borrowing

The power prior approach models basket i data while using an informative prior constructed from the other baskets. Let $\pi(\cdot)$ be a generic notation for the density function of a random variable. The power prior (Ibrahim et al., 2015) for p_i is constructed below:

$$\pi(p_i | Y_j \text{ for } j \neq i) \propto \pi(p_i | a_{i0}, b_{i0}) \times \prod_{j \neq i} \{\pi(Y_j | n_j, p_i)\}^{w_{ij}}, \quad (1)$$

where $\pi(\cdot | a, b)$ is the density function of Beta(a, b), $\pi(\cdot | n, p)$ is probability mass function of Binomial(n, p), w_{ij} is the power parameter interpreted as the amount of borrowing from basket j , and (a_{i0}, b_{i0}) are pre-specified hyperparameters of the initial beta prior for p_i . When $w_{ij} = 0$, this prior reduces to the hyperprior without borrowing any information from other baskets. The power prior approach achieves significant computational advantage over BHM-based methods because the posterior distribution of p_i has a closed form of beta distribution:

$$p_i | \mathbf{Y}, a_{i0}, b_{i0} \sim \text{Beta} \left(a_{i0} + Y_i + \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} Y_j, b_{i0} + n_i - Y_i + \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} (n_j - Y_j) \right),$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_B)$. Let $\mathbf{\Omega}$ denote a $B \times B$ matrix with ij th element being w_{ij} and all diagonal elements being ones. The weight parameter w_{ij} has an explicit interpretation. For example, $w_{ij} = 0.4$ indicates that we borrow 40% of information from basket j when evaluating basket i . How do we determine or handle w_{ij} ? To our knowledge, there are three methods: MEM (Hobbs & Landin, 2018), Jensen-Shannon divergence (Fujikawa et al., 2020) and local MEM (Liu et al., 2022). We briefly review these three methods.

MEM. The MEM method assumes that $w_{ij} = w_{ji} \in \{0, 1\}$ with value 1 (0) indicating that baskets i and j are exchangeable (independent), leading to $J = \prod_{i=1}^{B-1} 2^i$ possible configurations of $\mathbf{\Omega}$. Each w_{ij} is assumed to follow a Bernoulli prior with $P(w_{ij} = 1) = 0.5$. The posterior distribution of p_i is derived by averaging over the posterior distribution of $\{w_{i1}, \dots, w_{iB}\}$. The R package *basket* (Kane et al., 2020) provides two methods to conduct the posterior inference: the exact method enumerating the entire sample domain for $\mathbf{\Omega}$ and the MCMC sampling method formulated from the Metropolis algorithm. The exact method is only computationally feasible for $B < 7$ and the MCMC method can be time-consuming in the large-scale simulations due to extensive posterior samplings.

Jensen-Shannon divergence (JSD). Denote $f_i(\cdot)$ as the posterior density function for p_i based on basket i data only, i.e., Beta($a_{i0} + Y_i, b_{i0} + n_i - Y_i$). Fujikawa et al. (2020) proposed an approach based on Jensen-Shannon divergence (Fuglede & Topsøe, 2004). For baskets i and j , denote

$$w_{ij}^* = 1 - JS(f_i | f_j) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left[KL \left(f_i \left| \frac{f_i + f_j}{2} \right. \right) + KL \left(f_j \left| \frac{f_i + f_j}{2} \right. \right) \right],$$

where $KL(f_i|f_{i'}) = \int_0^1 f_i(x) \log\left(\frac{f_i(x)}{f_{i'}(x)}\right) dx$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between densities $f_i(\cdot)$ and $f_{i'}(\cdot)$. The resulted w_{ij}^* ranges from 0.307 to 1. To allow for weaker or no borrowing among dissimilar baskets, Fujikawa et al. (2020) proposed to set $w_{ij} = (w_{ij}^*)^\epsilon I\{(w_{ij}^*)^\epsilon > \tau\}$, where $\epsilon \geq 1$ is a power tuning parameter and $\tau \in [0,1]$ is a threshold tuning parameter. They recommend setting $\epsilon = 2$ and try different τ values from $[0, 0.5]$.

Local MEM. This method considers all possible partitions of the B baskets into clusters of varying sizes with each partition corresponding to each configuration of Ω . For example, one can form $L = 5$ possible partitions of $B = 3$ baskets into clusters $\{1,2,3\}$, $\{(1,2), 3\}$, $\{(1,3), 2\}$, $\{(2,3), 1\}$ and $\{(1,2,3)\}$, where under each partition, set $w_{ij} = 1$ if baskets i and j are in the same cluster and 0 otherwise. Denote $\{\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_L\}$ as the collection of all possible configurations of Ω . Comparing to the original MEM method, the local MEM method does not allow information borrowing across different clusters. To determine which Ω configuration to use via posterior inference, Liu et al. (2022) assumed the following prior

$$\pi(\Omega_j) = \frac{|\Omega_j|^\delta}{\sum_{j=1}^L |\Omega_j|^\delta}, j = 1, \dots, L,$$

where $|\Omega_j|$ denote the number of clusters under the configuration Ω_j , and δ is a tuning parameter with larger positive δ values favoring partitions with more clusters. Liu et al. (2022) investigated the prior effect by considering $\delta = 0,1,2$. Let Ω^* denote the partition with the largest posterior probability and its posterior probability is denoted as $\pi(\Omega^*)$. The local MEM method sets $w_{ij} = \pi(\Omega^*)$ if baskets i and j are in the same cluster under configuration Ω^* and 0 otherwise. When the number of baskets is large (say $B > 7$), this method can become computationally intensive.

Dynamic Borrowing Mechanism We propose to decompose the weight parameter into three components $w_{ij} = a \cdot \omega_{ij} \cdot I\left\{\left|\frac{Y_i}{n_i} - \frac{Y_j}{n_j}\right| < \Delta_{ij}\right\}$, where $a \in [0,1]$ is a global parameter discounting the amount of borrowing at global scale for all baskets, ω_{ij} is a similarity parameter quantifying the degree of borrowing from basket j for basket i at local scale, $\Delta_{ij} \in [0,1]$ is a threshold parameter so that the borrowing from basket j is allowed only if the observed ORR rate difference is below the threshold. To promote borrowing, we don't recommend setting Δ_{ij} at a value smaller than 0.1 in general. On the other hand, Δ_{ij} should also be chosen in the consideration of the null and alternative hypotheses. Generally speaking, Δ_{ij} should be less than the difference of the response rates under null and alternative hypotheses. According to equation (1), smaller a means less borrowing a priori. When $a = 0$, equation (1) reduces to the independent model without any borrowing across baskets. When $a = 1$, there is no discount at all at global level for borrowing across tumor baskets before considering ω_{ij} and Δ_{ij} , which may lead to considerable type I error inflation. From (1), a can also be interpreted as the maximum allowed equivalent number of subjects borrowed from other tumors. For example, suppose there

are 5 tumor baskets and each one has 40 subjects. When $a = 0.25$, the maximum amount of borrowing for basket 1 from the other 4 baskets is capped to $0.25(40 \times 4) = 40$ equivalent subjects. This interpretation may provide a guidance for choosing a range of appropriate values for a . A particular value of $a = 1/(B - 1)$ means the maximum amount of borrowing is on average equivalent to the current tumor basket. This can be a good starting point for optimizing the choice of a . Further refinement should be investigated by simulations as conducted in Section 3.

Empirical Bayes We propose to treat ω_{ij} s as parameters and to estimate them by empirical Bayes approach, i.e., by maximizing their marginal likelihoods. To isolate the effect of ω_{ij} s, when using the empirical Bayes estimation for ω_{ij} 's, we do not incorporate the other two weight components a and Δ_{ij} 's. We estimate ω_{ij} using only baskets i and j based on the following model:

$$Y_i | p_i \sim \text{Binomial}(n_i, p_i)$$

$$\pi(p_i | \omega_{ij}) \propto \pi(p_i | a_{i0}, b_{i0}) \pi(Y_j | n_j, p_i)^{\omega_{ij}}.$$

Then, the marginal likelihood of observing Y_i given Y_j and ω_{ij} is

$$L(Y_i | Y_j, \omega_{ij}) = \frac{\int_0^1 \pi(Y_i | n_i, p_i) \pi(p_i | a_{i0}, b_{i0}) \pi(Y_j | n_j, p_i)^{\omega_{ij}} dp_i}{\int_0^1 \pi(p_i | a_{i0}, b_{i0}) \pi(Y_j | n_j, p_i)^{\omega_{ij}} dp_i}$$

It can be shown that $L(Y_i | Y_j, \omega_{ij})$ is proportional to $m(\omega_{ij})$ given by

$$m(\omega_{ij}) = \frac{\text{Be}(a_{i0} + Y_i + \omega_{ij} Y_j, b_{i0} + (n_i - Y_i) + \omega_{ij}(n_j - Y_j))}{\text{Be}(a_{i0} + \omega_{ij} Y_j, b_{i0} + \omega_{ij}(n_j - Y_j))},$$

where $\text{Be}(a, b) = \int_0^1 t^{a-1} (1-t)^{b-1} dt$ is the beta function with parameters a and b . The parameters ω_{ij} s can be estimated by maximizing $m(\omega_{ij})$ independently for all $i \neq j$, denoted as $\hat{\omega}_{ij}$. For example, suppose the observed data are $(Y_1, \dots, Y_5) = (3, 10, 12, 18, 20)$ and $(n_1, \dots, n_5) = (40, 40, 40, 40, 40)$, and set the beta hyperprior with $a_{i0} = b_{i0} = 0.5$. Then the estimated weights $\hat{\omega}_{ij}$ are:

Basket	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	0.084	0.046	0.007	0.001
2	0.098	1	1	0.141	0.081
3	0.061	1	1	0.328	0.154
4	0.022	0.146	0.325	1	1
5	0.016	0.085	0.157	1	1

2.2. Type I Error and Calibration

Denote p_{i0} as the non-promising ORR and p_{i1} as the target promising ORR threshold for tumor type i , where $i = 1, \dots, B$. Suppose we would like to enroll up to n_i patients for tumor type i and

conduct K interim futility analyses when the sample size reaches $n_{i1} < n_{i2} \dots < n_{iK} < n_i$ and one final analysis when the sample size reaches the maximum n_i . Let Y_{ik} denote the number of responses at the k th interim analysis for basket i , we stop the accrual to basket i and claim futility if $Y_{ik} \leq r_{ik}$, where r_{ik} is a pre-specified futility boundary. When all baskets have either enrolled the maximum number of patients or stopped enrollment due to futility, we perform the final analysis. Let A denote the set of baskets that are included in the final analysis without determined futile at interim and D_i denote the cumulated data for basket i at the final analysis. Tumor type $i \in A$ is claimed promising if $P(p_i > p_{i0} | \{D_i, i \in A\}) > Q_i$, where Q_i is a pre-specified efficacy cutoff.

The futility stopping boundaries r_{ik} s if available, and the efficacy cutoffs Q_i s need to be calibrated via simulations to control the type I error rate for each basket at a desired level for a given sample size n_i . A smaller efficacy cutoff increases power but also inflates type I error. On the other hand, the sample size can be determined for given Q_i and power. In early-phase oncology trials, the incorporation of futility interim analyses is a common practice. Futility analyses are designed to evaluate if the treatment effect observed thus far is unlikely to reach a predefined level of clinical significance, warranting consideration of termination of the concerned cohort. The futility stopping boundaries can be determined according to multiple statistical approaches, such as Bayesian optimal phase 2 (BOP2) design (Zhou et al., 2017), considering the appropriate operating characteristics tailored for specific disease settings. The interim futility stopping boundaries are also incorporated in the calibration of Q_i .

In basket trials with multiple tumor types, there are multiple hypothesis tests. Multiple types of type I error appeared in literature including basket-wise type I error rate (BWER) (Liu et al., 2022), family-wise type I error rate (FWER) (Zhou & Ji, 2021), false positive rate (FPR) which is the average of BWERs (Jiang et al., 2021), and false discovery rate (FDR) (Zabor et al., 2022) which is the portion of false positive among claimed promising baskets. Since our setting of interest here is the exploratory early-phase study, we recommend that the calibration of Q_i is based on BWER at a desired level α (e.g., 0.1) under the global null scenario (i.e., $p_i = p_{i0}$ for all i) without consideration of multiplicity adjustment. In the following, we describe the calibration method based on BWER, which is also applicable to FPR, FWER or FDR if considered appropriate in a particular study.

- 1) Simulate a large number (M) of trials (e.g., $M = 100,000$) under the global null.
- 2) For each trial j , calculate q_{ij} , the posterior probability of $p_i > p_{i0}$ for basket i , $i = 1, \dots, B$.
 - If basket i has early futility stop at the k th interim, $q_{ij} = P(p_i > p_{i0} | D_{ijk})$, where D_{ijk} is the accumulated data for basket i at the k th interim; note that no information borrowing is applied in this calculation.
 - If basket i has no early futility stop, $q_{ij} = P(p_i > p_{i0} | \{D_{ij}, i \in A_j\})$ where A_j denote the set of baskets at the final look and D_{ij} is the accumulated data for basket $i \in A_j$; note that information borrowing across baskets in A_j is applied in this calculation.

3) Calculate Q_i as the $(1 - \alpha)$ th quantile of $\{q_{ij} | j = 1, \dots, M\}$.

In addition, when some baskets have the same null hypothesis p_{i0} and sample size n_i , the same Q_i should be used for these baskets, so Q_i is calculated as the $(1 - \alpha)$ th quantile of $\{q_{ij} | j = 1, \dots, M, i \in S\}$, where S is the set of baskets who have the same p_{i0} and n_i .

After Q_i is determined, the basket wise power is calculated by simulations as well. Suppose \tilde{M} trials are simulated under alternative hypotheses. Then the power for basket i is estimated by the proportion of trials that have the posterior probability $P(p_i > p_{i0} | \{D_i, i \in A_j\}) > Q_i$.

2.3. Tuning and Performance Evaluation

Section 2.1 provides some general considerations in choosing the global borrowing parameter a and the threshold borrowing parameter Δ_{ij} in the context of the proposed local power prior method. As in other basket design models, it is unlikely to provide the universal choices for both parameters. We advocate an optimization approach for both parameters based on enumerated trial scenarios of interest, spanning from a global null scenario (where no baskets show promise) to a global alternative scenario (where all baskets show promise). To evaluate performance among the specified scenarios, metrics such as average basket-wise type I error, basket-wise power, true positive rate (TPR) which is an average of basket-wise power, and correct classification rate (CCR) can be considered. Broglio et al. (2022) utilized the average CCR across specified scenarios to compare several BHM-based methods. In the following section, we adopt these evaluation measures to provide a nuanced understanding of the performance of the proposed local power prior method in comparison to other relevant methods.

3. SIMULATION STUDY

3.1. Scenario Settings

Consider a design with $B = 5$ tumor types. Suppose the non-promising ORR in null hypothesis is $p_{i0} = 0.15$ and the target ORR is $p_{i1} = 0.3$ for all $i = 1, \dots, B$. The maximum sample size for each basket is $n_i = 40$ with one interim futility analysis conducted for the first 20 subjects: stop basket i if the number of responses is less than or equal to 2. Here the stopping boundary of 2 is determined using BOP2 design and it has around 4% early stopping rate when ORR = 0.3 and about 40% early stopping rate when ORR = 0.15. A total of six scenarios are considered for comparing various methods and described in Table 3.1. Scenario S1 is the global null and Q_i s are calibrated in this scenario so that the BWER is controlled at $\alpha = 0.1$. Scenario S6 is a global alternative. Scenarios S2-S5 contain scenarios that baskets have heterogeneous ORRs.

Table 3.1 Simulation scenarios

Scenario	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5
S1	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
S2	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.30	0.30

S3	0.15	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
S4	0.15	0.30	0.30	0.45	0.45
S5	0.15	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45
S6	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30

For each scenario, simulate $M = 5,000$ trials. Each simulated trial will first go through the interim futility assessment for each basket and only the baskets with more than 2 responses will continue to the final analysis.

3.2. Models Specifications

The following 8 methods with tuning parameters recommended by original authors are specified below:

1. IM (independent model): A Beta(0.15, 0.85) prior on p_i independently for baskets $i = 1, \dots, 5$. The prior has the mean as the null hypothesis.
2. Local PP (our proposed method): Set $\Delta_{ij} = 0.1$ and select the a from $[0, 1]$ that has the best overall operating characteristics in terms of type I error inflation and power as described in Section 2.3. Here $a = 0.2$. See the details below.
3. JSD (Fujikawa et al., 2020): Set $\epsilon = 2$ and select the τ from $[0, 1]$ that has the best overall operating characteristics in terms of type I error inflation and power. Here $\tau = 0.5$. See the details below.
4. EXNEX (Neuenschwander et al., 2016): A hierarchical prior $\theta_i = \log\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right)$: $\theta_i \sim w_{i1}N(\mu_{ex,1}, \sigma_{ex,1}^2) + w_{i2}N(\mu_{ex,2}, \sigma_{ex,2}^2) + w_{i0}N(\mu_{nex,i}, \sigma_{nex,i}^2)$, where $(w_{i1}, w_{i2}, w_{i0}) = (0.25, 0.25, 0.5)$, $\mu_{ex,1} \sim N(-1.73, 6.8)$, $\mu_{ex,2} \sim N(-0.85, 3.8)$, $\sigma_{ex,1}^2, \sigma_{ex,2}^2 \sim \text{Halfnormal}(0,1)$, $\mu_{nex,i} = -1.24$ and $\sigma_{nex,i}^2 = 5.73$.
5. BHM: A hierarchical prior on $\theta_i = \log\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right)$: $\theta_i | \mu, \sigma^2 \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, $\mu \sim N(0, 100)$, $\sigma^2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 100)$. The uniform prior was used for σ^2 following the recommendation by Cunanan et al. (2019).
6. BCHM (Chen & Lee, 2020): A hierarchical prior $\theta_i = \log\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right)$: $\theta_i | \mu, \sigma^2 \sim N\left(\mu, \frac{1}{\tau^2 C_{ij}}\right)$, $\mu \sim N(-1.73, 100)$, $\tau^2 \sim \text{Gamma}(50, 10)$, where C_{ij} is the probability of baskets i and j being classified into the same cluster, estimated using Dirichlet process mixture (Neal, 2000). The hyperparameters involved estimating C_{ij} are set to $\sigma_0^2 = 10$, $\alpha = 10^{-40}$, $d_0 = 0$, $\sigma^2 = 0.001$; see Chen & Lee (2020) for these notation definitions.
7. Local MEM (Liu et al., 2022): The original paper considered $\delta = 0, 1, 2$ and showed that the method with $\delta = 2$ keeps both family-wise and basket-wise type I error rates under control. Therefore, we set $\delta = 2$ for local MEM.
8. MEM (Kane et al., 2020): This method can be fit using the R package *basket* via the exact method.

All R codes were run in R version 4.2.2 under the platform x86_64-w64-mingw32/x64 (64-bit). The computation time for each method was calculated using the actual running time determined by R function Sys.time().

The grid search was performed to determine the global borrowing parameter a of the local PP method and the hyperparameter τ of JSD method. The results are summarized in Appendix Table 8.2 and Table 8.3 with evaluation metrics considered including FPR (false positive rate as average of BWER across all baskets under scenario S1), BWER-avg (average of BWER among all non-promising baskets across scenarios S1-S5), BWER-max (maximum BWER among all non-promising baskets across scenarios S1-S5), TPR-avg (average of true positive rates across scenarios S2-S6), and CCR-avg (average of correct classification rates across scenarios S2-S5). For the local PP method, as a increases from 0 to 1, BWER-avg, BWER-max and TPR-avg are all getting larger. In contrast, CCR increases first and then decreases. The highest CCR-avg is obtained when $a \in [0.2, 0.3]$, and among them $a = 0.2$ gives the smallest BWER-avg, i.e., lowest type I error inflation. Therefore, we will set $a = 0.2$ for the local PP method. For the JSD method, as τ increases from 0 to 1, BWER-avg, BWER-max and TPR-avg are all getting smaller. Although the highest CCR-avg is obtained when $\tau \in [0.4, 0.6]$, the corresponding BWER-max can inflate up to a level from 0.230 to 0.316. Since the original authors of JSD do not recommend τ larger than 0.5, we will set $\tau = 0.5$ for JSD.

3.3. Calibration of Q_i

Error! Reference source not found. presents the basket-wise efficacy cutoff Q_i for all considered methods. Note that the same non-promising ORR boundary $p_{i0} = 0.15$ and maximum sample size are assumed for all baskets, indicating that theoretically, the efficacy cutoff Q_i should also be the same. However, due to the limited number of MC replicates ($M = 5000$), the Q_i values are not exactly the same for most methods except the independent model (IM) although they are very close to each other. Since theoretically the same cutoff should be used for all baskets, a common cutoff Q is also calculated following the procedure introduced in Section **Error! Reference source not found.**. The operating characteristics reported in the following sections are all based on the common cutoffs in **Error! Reference source not found.**

Table 3.2 Summary of calibrated Q_i to ensure $BWER \leq 0.1$.

Method	Basket 1 (Q_1)	Basket 2 (Q_2)	Basket 3 (Q_3)	Basket 4 (Q_4)	Basket 5 (Q_5)	Common (Q)
1. IM	0.878	0.878	0.878	0.878	0.878	0.878
2. Local PP	0.878	0.878	0.886	0.884	0.878	0.884
3. JSD	0.932	0.933	0.933	0.932	0.933	0.933
4. EXNEX	0.878	0.876	0.882	0.874	0.877	0.878
5. BHM	0.878	0.878	0.881	0.876	0.878	0.878
6. BCHM	0.879	0.877	0.888	0.881	0.877	0.880
7. Local MEM	0.881	0.881	0.890	0.884	0.882	0.883
8. MEM	0.925	0.926	0.926	0.925	0.925	0.925

3.4. Results

Overall performance

The overall performance of the 8 methods is summarized in Table 3.3. First, all methods with information borrowing (Methods 2-8) have the FPR (i.e. average type I error) under global null controlled at the target level 0.1, which demonstrates the successful calibration of Q_i . Method 1 (IM) has notably lower type I error than the target level due to the discrete BWER values that BWER less than 0.1 is equivalent to 0.062 in the given settings. Second, all methods with information borrowing have inflated BWER (i.e. BWER-max > 0.1) with EXNEX having the least inflation and MEM having the highest inflation, while IM has no BWER inflation. Third, all methods with information borrowing have much higher TPR-avg (i.e. average power) than IM with MEM having the highest power. Forth, there is tradeoff between BWER-avg and TPR-avg, so CCR-avg can be viewed as the overall performance metric that balances BWER-avg and TPR-avg. We can see that all borrowing methods have much higher CCR-avg than IM with the local PP having the best overall performance in CCR-avg. Lastly, the local PP method is the fastest (<25 seconds) among all methods with information borrowing. The EXNEX takes 4.2 hours to run the whole simulation.

Table 3.3 Overall performance for different methods

Method	FPR (S1)	BWER-avg (S1-S5)	BWER-max (S1-S5)	TPR-avg (S2-S6)	CCR-avg (S2-S6)	Time (hours)
1. IM	0.062	0.065	0.073	0.856	0.877	0.001
2. Local PP	0.097	0.117	0.176	0.912	0.905	0.007
3. JSD	0.098	0.152	0.264	0.929	0.904	0.012
4. EXNEX	0.098	0.116	0.138	0.910	0.903	4.179
5. BHM	0.099	0.177	0.318	0.941	0.902	0.826
6. BCHM	0.100	0.118	0.155	0.907	0.901	3.935
7. Local MEM	0.099	0.111	0.146	0.900	0.898	0.262
8. MEM	0.099	0.242	0.490	0.949	0.881	41.341

Note: FPR is the average basket-wise type I error under the global null. BWER-avg is the average basket-wise type I error rate for non-promising baskets across scenarios S1-S5 BWER-max is the maximum basket-wise type I error rate for non-promising baskets across scenarios S1-S5. TPR-avg is the average of true positive rate across scenarios S2-S6. CCR-avg is the average of true correct classification rate across scenarios S2-S6.

In summary, local PP, EXNEX and BCHM methods all have similar overall performance in terms of CCR-avg and BWER-avg. However, the local PP has the significant computational advantage (0.007 hour) over EXNEX and BCHM (around 4 hours) due to its closed form of posterior distribution. This is important for practical implementation when evaluating operation characteristics by simulations.

Performance by each scenario

The main results by scenarios are displayed in Table 3.4, including the basket-wise rejection rates (i.e., basket-wise type I errors for non-promising baskets and basket-wise powers for promising baskets), trial-wise FPR, FDR, TPR and CCR. Scenario S1 is the global null and all

methods have type I error rate controlled at 0.1 level. Scenario S2 has only two promising baskets. The local PP, EXNEX, BCHM and local MEM methods all perform similarly and have better overall performance than JSD, BHM and MEM in terms of type I error inflation and CCR.

Table 3.4 Summary of Basket-wise rejection rates, false positive rates (FPR), false discovery rates (FDR), true positive rates (TRP) and correct classification rates (CCR)

Method	Type I Error / Power					FPR	FDR	TPR	CCR
	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5				
Scenario S1 (0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.15)									
1. IM	0.065	0.059	0.065	0.062	0.059	0.062	0.276	NA	NA
2. Local PP	0.093	0.095	0.103	0.097	0.095	0.097	0.343	NA	NA
3. JSD	0.097	0.098	0.099	0.097	0.098	0.098	0.240	NA	NA
4. EXNEX	0.099	0.095	0.106	0.094	0.095	0.098	0.362	NA	NA
5. BHM	0.100	0.099	0.103	0.095	0.098	0.099	0.327	NA	NA
6. BCHM	0.099	0.095	0.109	0.101	0.095	0.100	0.355	NA	NA
7. Local MEM	0.095	0.095	0.105	0.101	0.098	0.099	0.343	NA	NA
8. MEM	0.099	0.101	0.101	0.098	0.097	0.099	0.177	NA	NA
Scenario S2 (0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.30, 0.30)									
Method	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5	FPR	FDR	TPR	CCR
1. IM	0.066	0.063	0.069	0.788	0.791	0.066	0.078	0.789	0.876
2. Local PP	0.139	0.129	0.139	0.852	0.858	0.136	0.133	0.855	0.861
3. JSD	0.208	0.196	0.199	0.866	0.868	0.201	0.177	0.867	0.826
4. EXNEX	0.129	0.122	0.130	0.862	0.868	0.127	0.132	0.865	0.870
5. BHM	0.208	0.199	0.200	0.876	0.882	0.203	0.184	0.879	0.830
6. BCHM	0.132	0.119	0.129	0.855	0.857	0.127	0.127	0.856	0.866
7. Local MEM	0.126	0.118	0.124	0.849	0.855	0.123	0.125	0.852	0.867
8. MEM	0.389	0.385	0.385	0.874	0.877	0.386	0.300	0.875	0.718
Scenario S3 (0.15, 0.30, 0.30, 0.30, 0.30)									
Method	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5	FPR	FDR	TPR	CCR
1. IM	0.069	0.805	0.800	0.798	0.793	0.069	0.017	0.799	0.825
2. Local PP	0.176	0.889	0.890	0.884	0.877	0.176	0.038	0.885	0.873
3. JSD	0.264	0.919	0.920	0.918	0.910	0.264	0.056	0.917	0.881
4. EXNEX	0.132	0.880	0.880	0.877	0.867	0.132	0.030	0.876	0.874
5. BHM	0.318	0.932	0.932	0.933	0.922	0.318	0.067	0.930	0.880
6. BCHM	0.155	0.876	0.873	0.873	0.862	0.155	0.034	0.871	0.866
7. Local MEM	0.125	0.870	0.864	0.862	0.855	0.125	0.028	0.863	0.865
8. MEM	0.490	0.961	0.954	0.957	0.949	0.490	0.102	0.955	0.866
Scenario S4 (0.15, 0.30, 0.30, 0.45, 0.45)									
Method	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5	FPR	FDR	TPR	CCR
1. IM	0.073	0.794	0.792	0.998	0.996	0.073	0.016	0.895	0.901
2. Local PP	0.144	0.846	0.846	0.999	0.997	0.144	0.030	0.922	0.909
3. JSD	0.211	0.873	0.868	0.999	0.998	0.211	0.044	0.934	0.905
4. EXNEX	0.138	0.871	0.868	0.999	0.998	0.138	0.030	0.934	0.920
5. BHM	0.264	0.910	0.900	0.999	0.999	0.264	0.055	0.952	0.909
6. BCHM	0.151	0.855	0.853	0.999	0.998	0.151	0.032	0.926	0.911
7. Local MEM	0.146	0.852	0.849	0.999	0.998	0.146	0.031	0.924	0.910

8. MEM	0.341	0.913	0.907	0.999	0.999	0.341	0.069	0.955	0.896
Scenario S5 (0.15, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45)									
Method	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5	FPR	FDR	TPR	CCR
1. IM	0.068	0.995	0.996	0.996	0.997	0.068	0.014	0.996	0.983
2. Local PP	0.079	0.996	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.079	0.016	0.997	0.981
3. JSD	0.107	0.996	0.997	0.996	0.997	0.107	0.021	0.997	0.976
4. EXNEX	0.136	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.136	0.027	0.998	0.971
5. BHM	0.266	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.266	0.053	0.998	0.946
6. BCHM	0.112	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.112	0.022	0.997	0.975
7. Local MEM	0.087	0.996	0.997	0.997	0.997	0.087	0.017	0.997	0.980
8. MEM	0.175	0.997	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.175	0.035	0.998	0.963
Scenario S6 (0.30, 0.30, 0.30, 0.30, 0.30)									
Method	Basket 1	Basket 2	Basket 3	Basket 4	Basket 5	FPR	FDR	TPR	CCR
1. IM	0.799	0.801	0.802	0.796	0.800	NA	NA	0.799	0.799
2. Local PP	0.904	0.903	0.903	0.893	0.896	NA	NA	0.900	0.900
3. JSD	0.934	0.936	0.932	0.923	0.929	NA	NA	0.931	0.931
4. EXNEX	0.884	0.879	0.883	0.873	0.875	NA	NA	0.879	0.879
5. BHM	0.948	0.949	0.944	0.942	0.944	NA	NA	0.945	0.945
6. BCHM	0.890	0.888	0.888	0.880	0.884	NA	NA	0.886	0.886
7. Local MEM	0.870	0.867	0.871	0.860	0.864	NA	NA	0.866	0.866
8. MEM	0.964	0.965	0.961	0.957	0.960	NA	NA	0.961	0.961

NA: Not applicable.

In scenario S3 with only one non-promising basket, the methods of JSD, BHM and MEM have the highest basket-wise powers for baskets 2-5 but at the cost of largest type I error inflation (0.264 to 0.490). The methods of local PP, EXNEX, BCHM and local MEM appear having much a good balance between type I error inflation and power, and they all have better CCR than the IM method. In scenario S4, the models perform similarly as in scenario S3 except that EXNEX performs slightly better than local PP, BCHM and local MEM in terms of power.

In scenario S5, there is only one non-promising basket and the true ORRs in promising baskets are higher than the target ORR. The type I error for basket 1 is not inflated any more for methods local PP, JSD, BCHM and local MEM. The basket-wise powers for all methods are similar. In scenario S5, the methods with information borrowing do not add much value from the IM method. In scenario S6 when all baskets are promising and type I error inflation is not a concern, the methods JSD, BHM and MEM give the highest power followed by local PP.

In summary, the local PP method is comparable to EXNEX, BCHM and local MEM in scenarios S2-S5 and performs slightly better in scenario S6. Although JSD, BHM and MEM have much higher power than other information borrowing methods in scenario S6, they have severe type I error inflation in scenarios S2-S5 making them less desirable in practice. In addition, the local PP method has significant computation advantage comparing to EXNEX, BCHM and local MEM as shown in Table 3.3.

4. EXAMPLE

In this section, we apply the proposed local PP method to a basket trial designed to assess the effect of vemurafenib for treating nonmelanomas carrying the BRAF V600 variant, which has been previously analyzed in Chen & Hsiao (2023) using different information borrowing methods. Table 4.1 provides the number of responders, sample size and response rate for each basket.

Table 4.1 Summary of BRAF V600 study

Tumor Type	Sample size	Number of Responses	Response rate
NSCLC	19	8	0.421
CRC vemu	10	0	0
CRC vemu+cetu	26	1	0.038
Bile duct	8	1	0.125
ECD or LCH	14	6	0.429
ATC	7	2	0.286

Following Chen & Hsiao (2023), we set $p_{i0} = 0.15$ and $p_{i1} = 0.35$ for all baskets $i = 1, \dots, 6$, and the sample sizes are $(n_1, \dots, n_6) = (19, 10, 26, 8, 14, 7)$, and control the basket-wise type I error rate at $\alpha = 0.05$. Then we simulate $M = 100,000$ trials under the global null without interim analyses to calibrate the efficacy cutoff value Q_i for each basket. For the local PP method, we set $\Delta = 0.15$ which is less than $|p_{i1} - p_{i0}|$ and $a = \frac{1}{B-1} = 0.2$ based on the rule of thumb recommendation in Section 2.1. The resulted Q_i 's, type I errors and posterior probabilities $P(p_i > 0.15 | Data)$ are reported in Table 4.2. Comparing to the IM method, the local PP method gives much smaller posterior probability of $p_i > 0.15$ for bile duct and much higher posterior probability for ATC, which can be explained by the estimated similarity matrix shown in Table 8.4. The basket bile duct borrows 20% (i.e., corresponding $w_{ij} = 0.2$) of information from CRC vemu+cetu and 1% (i.e., corresponding $w_{ij} = 0.01$) from CRC vemu, and the basket ATC borrows 20% of information from NSCLC and 20% from ECD or LCH. Comparing the posterior probabilities with the corresponding efficacy cutoffs, baskets NSCLC and ECD or LCH both passes their efficacy boundaries using IM and local PP methods. In addition, the local PP method is also able to claim the efficacy for ATC, while the IM method and the methods proposed in Chen & Hsiao (2023) cannot.

Table 4.2 Efficacy cutoffs, type I errors and posterior probabilities for IM and local PP methods on BRAF V600 trial data when $\alpha = 0.05$.

Basket	Q_i		Type I error under global null		Posterior probability of $p_i > 0.15$	
	IM	Local PP	IM	Local PP	IM	Local PP
NSCLC	0.955	0.953	0.016	0.047	0.997	0.998

CRC vemu	0.849	0.959	0.050	0.050	0.014	0.015
CRC vemu+cetu	0.928	0.935	0.032	0.049	0.020	0.021
Bile duct	0.915	0.932	0.021	0.049	0.332	0.196
ECD or LCH	0.875	0.94	0.047	0.049	0.991	0.996
ATC	0.943	0.943	0.012	0.039	0.761	0.956

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUTIONS

We proposed a novel local power prior framework for information borrowing in exploratory basket trials. The framework has a particular advantage that there is a clear interpretation of amount of information borrowing through the resulted similarity matrix. In addition, the proposed approach has a significant advantage in computation due to its closed form of p_i 's posterior distribution and the estimation of power parameters w_{ij} 's based on empirical bayes method by maximizing the marginal distribution in pairwise fashion. The pairwise similarity assessment does not optimize the joint marginal likelihood, but the empirical similarity assessment is not influenced by other tumor baskets, which provides a clear model interpretation. We also explored the empirical bayes approach based on the joint marginal likelihood, however we observed parameter identifiability issue when multiple baskets have the same observed response rates, and the approach may allocate conflicting weights that are not straightforward to interpret. For example, in the case of $Y = (3, 10, 15)$ and $n = (40, 40, 40)$, the first basket has borrowing weight of $\omega_{12} = 0.084$ from 2nd basket, while the second basket has borrowing weight of $\omega_{21} = 0.792$ from the first basket. So, we do not recommend the empirical Bayes approach based on the joint marginal likelihood. Furthermore, we introduced two other important types of borrowing parameters (a, Δ_{ij}) to provide more customized control of information borrowing. The parameter a represents the global control of borrowing for all tumors. It is designed to reflect the confidence level of an experimental drug being able to produce a shared tumor response in various tumor baskets that have the same molecular characteristics. From statistical modeling perspective, a reflects the proportion of information borrowed from the other tumor baskets for each tumor basket. When the sample size is very limited in rare tumor types or there is a major concern of tumor heterogeneity, we can consider customizing a to control the maximum borrowing allowed from basket j for a particular tumor basket i , i.e., consider a_{ij} rather than a single parameter a . Despite the global control and the weight parameter empirically estimated, there still might be concern of borrowing if the observed response has significant difference. Therefore, the threshold parameter Δ_{ij} is proposed to address this concern. Extensive simulation results show that the simple formulation of the local PP method performs comparably to the existing much more complex methods.

The work is based on the setting of each tumor basket having the same null hypothesis and the same sample size. This provides a homogenous setting for evaluating various methods. In practice, the tumor baskets may not have the same sample size at time of analysis due to disease

prevalence and/or operation constraints. However, the proposed framework is able to address these variations. Basket trials, if used properly, can improve trial efficiency, however extensive trial simulations are required in order to optimize the operating characteristics by setting appropriate tuning parameters. It is very important to effectively communicate the operating characteristics and pros/cons for each design option to the study team in navigating the optimization of a basket design that best fits the clinical development. The proposed method provides a relatively easy interpretation of the modeling to the study team.

The setting of this work is the exploratory basket trials which are more commonly seen, with their primary aim being the identification of promising tumor types for further development. Regulatory approvals from basket trials have been based on single arm studies of exceptional drugs in terminal disease settings. The French Health Technology Assessment Group (Lengliné et al., 2021) advises randomized basket trials. For basket trials in confirmatory setting, please refer to Chen et al. (2016), Li et al. (2017) and Beckman et al. (2016). The R code included in this work is available at <https://github.com/wonderzhm/localPP.git>.

6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have declared no conflict of interest.

7. REFERENCE

Beckman, R. A., Antonijevic, Z., Kalamegham, R., & Chen, C. (2016). Adaptive Design for a

Confirmatory Basket Trial in Multiple Tumor Types Based on a Putative Predictive

Biomarker. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, *100*(6), 617–625.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/cpt.446>

Berry, S. M., Broglio, K. R., Groshen, S., & Berry, D. A. (2013). Bayesian hierarchical modeling

of patient subpopulations: Efficient designs of Phase II oncology clinical trials. *Clinical*

Trials, *10*(5), 720–734. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774513497539>

Broglio, K. R., Zhang, F., Yu, B., Marshall, J., Wang, F., Bennett, M., & Viele, K. (2022). A

Comparison of Different Approaches to Bayesian Hierarchical Models in a Basket Trial

to Evaluate the Benefits of Increasing Complexity. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical*

Research, *14*(3), 324–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19466315.2021.2008484>

- Chen, C., & Hsiao, C. (2023). Bayesian hierarchical models for adaptive basket trial designs. *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 22(3), 531–546. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pst.2289>
- Chen, C., Li, X. (Nicole), Yuan, S., Antonijevic, Z., Kalamegham, R., & Beckman, R. A. (2016). Statistical Design and Considerations of a Phase 3 Basket Trial for Simultaneous Investigation of Multiple Tumor Types in One Study. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, 8(3), 248–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19466315.2016.1193044>
- Chen, N., & Lee, J. J. (2020). Bayesian cluster hierarchical model for subgroup borrowing in the design and analysis of basket trials with binary endpoints. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 29(9), 2717–2732. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280220910186>
- Cunanan, K. M., Iasonos, A., Shen, R., & Gönen, M. (2019). Variance prior specification for a basket trial design using Bayesian hierarchical modeling. *Clinical Trials*, 16(2), 142–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774518812779>
- Fuglede, B., & Topsoe, F. (2004). Jensen-Shannon divergence and Hilbert space embedding. *International Symposium on Information Theory, 2004. ISIT 2004. Proceedings.*, 31-. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2004.1365067>
- Fujikawa, K., Teramukai, S., Yokota, I., & Daimon, T. (2020). A Bayesian basket trial design that borrows information across strata based on the similarity between the posterior distributions of the response probability. *Biometrical Journal*, 62(2), 330–338. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.201800404>
- Hobbs, B. P., & Landin, R. (2018). Bayesian basket trial design with exchangeability monitoring. *Statistics in Medicine*, 37(25), 3557–3572. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.7893>
- Hyman, D. M., Puzanov, I., Subbiah, V., Faris, J. E., Chau, I., Blay, J.-Y., Wolf, J., Raje, N. S., Diamond, E. L., Hollebecque, A., Gervais, R., Elez-Fernandez, M. E., Italiano, A.,

- Hofheinz, R.-D., Hidalgo, M., Chan, E., Schuler, M., Lasserre, S. F., Makrutzki, M., ... Baselga, J. (2015). Vemurafenib in Multiple Nonmelanoma Cancers with BRAF V600 Mutations. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *373*(8), 726–736. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1502309>
- Ibrahim, J. G., Chen, M.-H., Gwon, Y., & Chen, F. (2015). The power prior: Theory and applications. *Statistics in Medicine*, *34*(28), 3724–3749. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.6728>
- Jiang, L., Nie, L., Yan, F., & Yuan, Y. (2021). Optimal Bayesian hierarchical model to accelerate the development of tissue-agnostic drugs and basket trials. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, *107*, 106460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cct.2021.106460>
- Kane, M., J., Chen, N., Kaizer, A., M., Jiang, X., Xia, H., Amy, & Hobbs, B., P. (2020). Analyzing Basket Trials under Multisource Exchangeability Assumptions. *The R Journal*, *12*(2), 342. <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2021-020>
- Lengliné, E., Peron, J., Vanier, A., Gueyffier, F., Kouzan, S., Dufour, P., Guillot, B., Blondon, H., Clanet, M., Cochat, P., Degos, F., Chevret, S., Grande, M., & Putzolu, J. (2021). Basket clinical trial design for targeted therapies for cancer: A French National Authority for Health statement for health technology assessment. *The Lancet Oncology*, *22*(10), e430–e434. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(21\)00337-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(21)00337-5)
- Li, W., Chen, C., Li, X., & Beckman, R. A. (2017). Estimation of treatment effect in two-stage confirmatory oncology trials of personalized medicines. *Statistics in Medicine*, *36*(12), 1843–1861. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.7272>
- Liu, Y., Kane, M., Esserman, D., Blaha, O., Zelterman, D., & Wei, W. (2022). Bayesian local exchangeability design for phase II basket trials. *Statistics in Medicine*, *41*(22), 4367–4384. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.9514>

- Lyu, J., Zhou, T., Yuan, S., Guo, W., & Ji, Y. (2023). MUCE: Bayesian hierarchical modelling for the design and analysis of phase 1b multiple expansion cohort trials. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*, 72(3), 649–669.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jrsssc/qlad025>
- Neal, R. M. (2000). Markov Chain Sampling Methods for Dirichlet Process Mixture Models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9(2), 249–265.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10618600.2000.10474879>
- Neuenschwander, B., Wandel, S., Roychoudhury, S., & Bailey, S. (2016). Robust exchangeability designs for early phase clinical trials with multiple strata. *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 15(2), 123–134.
- Pohl, M., Krisam, J., & Kieser, M. (2021). Categories, components, and techniques in a modular construction of basket trials for application and further research. *Biometrical Journal*, 63(6), 1159–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.202000314>
- Psioda, M. A., Xu, J., Jiang, Q., Ke, C., Yang, Z., & Ibrahim, J. G. (2021). Bayesian adaptive basket trial design using model averaging. *Biostatistics*, 22(1), 19–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxz014>
- Simon, R., Geyer, S., Subramanian, J., & Roychowdhury, S. (2016). The Bayesian basket design for genomic variant-driven phase II trials. *Seminars in Oncology*, 43(1), 13–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1053/j.seminoncol.2016.01.002>
- Zabor, E. C., Kane, M. J., Roychoudhury, S., Nie, L., & Hobbs, B. P. (2022). Bayesian basket trial design with false-discovery rate control. *Clinical Trials*, 19(3), 297–306.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17407745211073624>

- Zhou, H., Lee, J. J., & Yuan, Y. (2017). BOP2: Bayesian optimal design for phase II clinical trials with simple and complex endpoints. *Statistics in Medicine*, 36(21), 3302–3314. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.7338>
- Zhou, T., & Ji, Y. (2021). RoBoT: A robust Bayesian hypothesis testing method for basket trials. *Biostatistics*, 22(4), 897–912. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxaa005>
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2017) FDA grants accelerated approval to pembrolizumab for first tissue/site agnostic indication. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information-approved-drugs/fda-grants-accelerated-approval-pembrolizumab-first-tissuesite-agnostic-indication>. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2018) FDA approves larotrectinib for solid tumors with NTRK gene fusions. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/fda-approves-larotrectinib-solid-tumors-ntrk-gene-fusions>. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2019) FDA approves entrectinib for NTRK solid tumors and ROS-1 NSCLC. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information-approved-drugs/fda-approves-entrectinib-ntrk-solid-tumors-and-ros-1-nsclc>. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2020) FDA approves pembrolizumab for adults and children with TMB-H solid tumors. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/fda-approves-pembrolizumab-adults-and-children-tmb-h-solid-tumors>. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2021) FDA grants accelerated approval to dostarlimab-gxly for dMMR advanced solid tumors. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information-approved-drugs/fda-grants-accelerated-approval-dostarlimab-gxly-dmmr-advanced-solid-tumors>. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2022a) FDA grants accelerated approval to dabrafenib in combination with trametinib for unresectable or metastatic solid tumors with BRAF V600E mutation. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information-approved-drugs/fda-grants-accelerated-approval-dabrafenib-combination-trametinib-unresectable-or-metastatic-solid>. Accessed on December 10, 2023.
- FDA Approvals and Databases (2022b) FDA approves selpercatinib for locally advanced or metastatic RET fusion-positive solid tumors. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/resources-information->

[approved-drugs/fda-approves-selpercatinib-locally-advanced-or-metastatic-ret-fusion-positive-solid-tumors](#). Accessed on December 10, 2023.

8. APPENDIX

Table 8.1 FDA Agnostic Approvals 2017 – 2022.

FDA Approval	Drug	Setting	ORR (N)
May 2017 (source FDA 2017)	Pembrolizumab	Unresectable/metastatic MSI-H or dMMR solid tumors that progressed after previous treatment with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	40% (59)
November 2018 (source FDA 2018)	Larotrectinib	Unresectable/metastatic <i>NTRK</i> gene fusion–positive solid tumors without a known acquired resistance mutation that progressed after previous treatment or with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	75% (55)
August 2019 (source FDA 2019)	Entrectinib	Unresectable/metastatic <i>NTRK</i> gene fusion–positive solid tumors without a known acquired resistance mutation that progressed after previous treatment or with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	57% (54)
June 2020 (source FDA 2020)	Pembrolizumab	Unresectable/metastatic TMB-H (≥ 10 mut/Mb) solid tumors that progressed after previous treatment with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	29% (102)
August 2021 (source FDA 2020)	Dostarlimab	Recurrent/advanced dMMR solid tumors that progressed on or after previous treatment with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	42% (209)
June 2022 (source FDA 2022a)	Dabrafenib+trametinib	Unresectable/metastatic solid tumors with BRAF-V600 ^E mutation that progressed after previous treatment with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	41% (131)

September 2022 (source FDA 2022b)	Selpercatinib	Locally advanced/metastatic solid tumors with a RET gene fusion that progressed on or after previous treatment or with no satisfactory alternative treatment options	44% (41)
-----------------------------------	---------------	--	----------

Table 8.2 Overall performance across all scenarios for the local PP method with different scaling parameters. FPR is the average basket-wise type I error under the global null, BWER-avg and BWER-max are the average and maximum basket-wise type I error rate for non-promising baskets across scenarios S1-S5, TPR-avg is the average of true positive rate across scenarios S2-S6, and CCR-avg is the average of true correct classification rate across scenarios S2-S6.

Local PP	FPR (S1)	BWER-avg (S1-S5)	BWER-max (S1-S5)	TPR-avg (S2-S6)	CCR-avg (S2-S6)
a=0.0	0.062	0.065	0.073	0.856	0.877
a=0.1	0.097	0.108	0.137	0.904	0.902
a=0.2	0.097	0.117	0.176	0.912	0.905
a=0.3	0.096	0.123	0.189	0.915	0.905
a=0.4	0.098	0.127	0.198	0.916	0.904
a=0.5	0.099	0.133	0.209	0.919	0.904
a=0.6	0.097	0.132	0.210	0.918	0.904
a=0.7	0.096	0.136	0.224	0.919	0.903
a=0.8	0.096	0.136	0.224	0.919	0.903
a=0.9	0.097	0.137	0.228	0.918	0.902
a=1.0	0.099	0.14	0.236	0.918	0.902

Table 8.3 Overall performance across all scenarios for the JSD method with different tuning parameters. FPR is the average basket-wise type I error under the global null, BWER-avg and BWER-max are the average and the maximum basket-wise type I error rate for non-promising baskets across scenarios S1-S5, TPR-avg is the average of true positive rate across scenarios S2-S6, and CCR-avg is the average of true correct classification rate across scenarios S2-S6

JSD	FPR (S1)	BWER-avg (S1-S5)	BWER-max (S1-S5)	TPR-avg (S2-S6)	CCR-avg (S2-S6)
$\tau = 0.0$	0.100	0.267	0.520	0.957	0.875
$\tau = 0.1$	0.100	0.259	0.469	0.957	0.879
$\tau = 0.2$	0.099	0.217	0.424	0.951	0.892
$\tau = 0.3$	0.100	0.192	0.360	0.945	0.899
$\tau = 0.4$	0.099	0.171	0.316	0.938	0.903
$\tau = 0.5$	0.098	0.152	0.264	0.929	0.904
$\tau = 0.6$	0.094	0.137	0.230	0.921	0.904

$\tau = 0.7$	0.096	0.127	0.208	0.910	0.900
$\tau = 0.8$	0.091	0.105	0.152	0.890	0.894
$\tau = 0.9$	0.097	0.098	0.110	0.886	0.892
$\tau = 1.0$	0.062	0.065	0.073	0.856	0.877

Table 8.4 The estimated similarity matrix for local PP method on BRAF V600 trial data.

	NSCLC	CRC vemu	CRC vemu+cetu	Bile duct	ECD or LCH	ATC
NSCLC	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.20
CRC vemu	0.00	1.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
CRC vemu+cetu	0.00	0.07	1.00	0.20	0.00	0.00
Bile duct	0.00	0.01	0.20	1.00	0.00	0.00
ECD or LCH	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.20
ATC	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	1.00