| Background | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|            |         |         |             |
|            |         |         |             |
|            |         |         |             |
|            |         |         |             |
|            |         |         |             |

## Dose-finding for Multi-drug Combinations

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

September 16, 2011

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

Dose-finding for Multi-drug Combinations

University of Virginia

| Background | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|            |         |         |             |
| Outline    |         |         |             |

- Background
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusions

◆□ > ◆□ > ◆三 > ◆三 > ・三 ・ のへぐ

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

| Background        | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|-------------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|                   |         |         |             |
| Multiple-agent Tr | ials    |         |             |

- In trials combining more than one drug, monotonicity assumption may not hold for every dose
- The ordering between toxicity probabilities of some combinations is unknown
- Toxicity probabilities now follow a "partial order"

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

• **Example:** Phase I study of Samarium Lexidronam / Bortezomib combination therapy (Berenson et al., 2009)

|                                 | Drug Combination |       |       |       |       |       |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Agent                           | $d_1$            | $d_2$ | $d_3$ | $d_4$ | $d_5$ | $d_6$ |
| Sm (mCi/kg)                     | 0.25             | 0.5   | 1.0   | 0.25  | 0.5   | 1.0   |
| Bortezomib (mg/m <sup>2</sup> ) | 1.0              | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.3   | 1.3   | 1.3   |

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

Dose-finding for Multi-drug Combinations

University of Virginia

| Background     | Methods     | Results | Conclusions |
|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|
|                |             |         |             |
| Partial Orderi | ng of Doses |         |             |

- The following order relationships between treatments are known

Strategy: specify all possible orderings of doses consistent

known with toxicity relationships.

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

. . . . . . .

| Background | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|            |         |         |             |
|            |         |         |             |

# Partial Ordering of Doses

This trial requires the investigation of the following *five* simple orders

• A random variable *M* indexes the set of possible simple orders

Image: A matrix

| Background    | Methods        | Results | Conclusions |
|---------------|----------------|---------|-------------|
|               |                |         |             |
| Toxicity Prol | bability Model |         |             |

• For a particular ordering, *m*, (*m* = 1, ..., *M*), the true probability of toxicity is modeled via a class of working models

$$R(x_j) = \Pr(Y_j = 1 | X_j = x_j) \approx \psi_m(x_j, a)$$

for  $x_j \in \{d_1 ..., d_k\}$ 

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

| Background        | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|-------------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|                   |         |         |             |
| Prior Information |         |         |             |

- Let p (m) = {p (1),..., p (M)} denote a discrete prior over the set of contending models
- Let g(a) represent the prior on the parameter a

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

<ロ> (四) (四) (日) (日) (日)

### Likelihood Function

• Under ordering *m*, the likelihood of *a* is given by

$$L_m(\boldsymbol{a}|\Omega_j) = \sum_{\ell=1}^j \boldsymbol{y}_\ell \log \psi_m(\boldsymbol{x}_\ell, \boldsymbol{a}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^j (1 - \boldsymbol{y}_\ell) \log(1 - \psi_m(\boldsymbol{x}_\ell, \boldsymbol{a}))$$

given the data  $\Omega_j = \{x_1, y_1, \dots, x_j, y_j\}$  for the first *j* patients.

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

| Background    | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|---------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|               |         |         |             |
| Model Selecti | ion     |         |             |

• The posterior probability of model *m* is given by

$$\pi(m|\Omega_j) = \frac{p(m) \int_{\mathcal{A}} L_m(a|\Omega_j) g(a) da}{\sum_{m=1}^{M} p(m) \int_{\mathcal{A}} L_m(a|\Omega_j) g(a) da}$$

University of Virginia

• Choose a single ordering, *h*, with the largest posterior model probability  $\pi(m|\Omega_j)$ 

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

| Background    | Methods          | Results | Conclusions |
|---------------|------------------|---------|-------------|
|               |                  |         |             |
| Toxicity Prob | bability Estimat | es      |             |

• Given h, toxicity probabilities estimates are given by

$$\hat{R}(d_i) = \psi_h(d_i, \hat{a}_h); \quad i = 1, \dots, k$$

• The next patient is then allocated to the dose combination with the estimated toxicity probability closest to the target.

. . . . . . .

| Background   | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|              |         |         |             |
| Illustration |         |         |             |

•  $R(d_1) = 0.04, R(d_2) = 0.07, R(d_3) = 0.20, R(d_4) =$ 

 $0.35, R(d_5) = 0.55$  and  $R(d_6) = 0.70$ .

- Target toxicity rate  $\theta = 0.20$ .
- The trial will treat n = 24 patients.
- For each ordering, we used the power model,

$$\psi_m(d_i, a) = \alpha^a_{mi}; \quad m = 1, \dots, 5; i = 1, \dots, 6$$

Image: A matrix

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

. . . . . . .

# Working Models

#### Table: Working model for five simple orders

|              |             |      | Combinations |      |      |      |      |
|--------------|-------------|------|--------------|------|------|------|------|
| М            | Ordering    | 1    | 2            | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| <i>m</i> = 1 | 1-2-3-4-5-6 | 0.01 | 0.07         | 0.20 | 0.38 | 0.56 | 0.71 |
| <i>m</i> = 2 | 1-2-4-3-5-6 | 0.01 | 0.07         | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.56 | 0.71 |
| <i>m</i> = 3 | 1-2-4-5-3-6 | 0.01 | 0.07         | 0.56 | 0.20 | 0.38 | 0.71 |
| <i>m</i> = 4 | 1-4-2-3-5-6 | 0.01 | 0.20         | 0.38 | 0.07 | 0.56 | 0.71 |
| <i>m</i> = 5 | 1-4-2-5-3-6 | 0.01 | 0.20         | 0.56 | 0.07 | 0.38 | 0.71 |

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

Dose-finding for Multi-drug Combinations

University of Virginia

ъ

| Background   | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|              |         |         |             |
| Illustration |         |         |             |



Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia

| Background      | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|-----------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|                 |         |         |             |
| Simulation Setu | JD      |         |             |

- 3 different toxicity scenarios.
- Target toxicity rate  $\theta = 0.20$ .
- The trial will treat n = 24 patients.
- Tables present
  - percentage of MTD recommendation over 2000 simulated trials
  - 2 percentage of patients that were treated at each combination

| Rac | ka | ind |
|-----|----|-----|
| Dau | ĸу |     |

## Results

| Dose     | <i>d</i> <sub>1</sub> | <i>d</i> <sub>2</sub> | d <sub>3</sub> | $d_4$ | $d_5$ | $d_6$ | %tox |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| $R(d_i)$ | 0.04                  | 0.07                  | 0.20           | 0.35  | 0.55  | 0.70  | -    |
| % Rec    | 0.02                  | 0.23                  | 0.47           | 0.26  | 0.01  | 0.00  | 0.23 |
| % Exp    | 0.07                  | 0.25                  | 0.34           | 0.26  | 0.07  | 0.01  |      |
|          |                       |                       |                |       |       |       |      |
| $R(d_i)$ | 0.01                  | 0.02                  | 0.09           | 0.20  | 0.40  | 0.58  | -    |
| % Rec    | 0.00                  | 0.02                  | 0.36           | 0.47  | 0.14  | 0.00  | 0.20 |
| % Exp    | 0.02                  | 0.10                  | 0.33           | 0.33  | 0.18  | 0.05  |      |
|          |                       |                       |                |       |       |       |      |
| $R(d_i)$ | 0.00                  | 0.00                  | 0.02           | 0.07  | 0.22  | 0.41  | -    |
| % Rec    | 0.00                  | 0.00                  | 0.14           | 0.16  | 0.58  | 0.12  | 0.17 |
| % Exp    | 0.00                  | 0.05                  | 0.17           | 0.22  | 0.36  | 0.19  |      |
|          |                       |                       |                |       |       |       |      |

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

University of Virginia



- Sometimes, it may not be feasible to consider all possible orderings
- **Example:** Consider a trial investigating two agents, *A* and *B*. Suppose *A* has 4 dose levels and *B* has 4 dose levels.
- Therefore, a total of 16 drug combinations are under consideration

| Background    | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|---------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|               |         |         |             |
| Matrix Orders |         |         |             |

#### Table: Drug combinations for $4 \times 4$ matrix order

| Doses of | Doses of Drug B        |                        |                        |                        |
|----------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Drug A   | 1                      | 2                      | 3                      | 4                      |
| 4        | <i>d</i> <sub>13</sub> | <i>d</i> <sub>14</sub> | <i>d</i> <sub>15</sub> | <i>d</i> <sub>16</sub> |
| 3        | $d_9$                  | $d_{10}$               | d <sub>11</sub>        | $d_{12}$               |
| 2        | $d_5$                  | $d_6$                  | $d_7$                  | $d_8$                  |
| 1        | $d_1$                  | $d_2$                  | $d_3$                  | $d_4$                  |

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

Dose-finding for Multi-drug Combinations

< ≣ ► ≣ পি ৭ ৫ University of Virginia

(日)

| Background   | Methods         | Results | Conclusions |
|--------------|-----------------|---------|-------------|
|              |                 |         |             |
| Strategy for | r Matrix Orders |         |             |

- Assume that toxicity increases monotonically for each drug when the other drug is held fixed
- Use known ordering information to choose a "proper" subset of orderings
- Use "toxicity zones" as a guide for order selection

# Strategy for Matrix Orders

Figure: An illustration of zoning a drug combination matrix



| Background | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|            |         |         |             |
| 3 Possible | Orders  |         |             |

$$\begin{array}{l} m=1 \quad d_1 \rightarrow d_2 \rightarrow d_5 \rightarrow d_3 \rightarrow d_6 \rightarrow d_9 \rightarrow d_4 \rightarrow d_7 \rightarrow d_{10} \\ \rightarrow d_{13} \rightarrow d_8 \rightarrow d_{11} \rightarrow d_{14} \rightarrow d_{12} \rightarrow d_{15} \rightarrow d_{16} \end{array} \\ m=2 \quad d_1 \rightarrow d_5 \rightarrow d_2 \rightarrow d_3 \rightarrow d_6 \rightarrow d_9 \rightarrow d_{13} \rightarrow d_{10} \rightarrow d_7 \\ \rightarrow d_4 \rightarrow d_8 \rightarrow d_{11} \rightarrow d_{14} \rightarrow d_{15} \rightarrow d_{12} \rightarrow d_{16} \end{array} \\ m=3 \quad d_1 \rightarrow d_5 \rightarrow d_2 \rightarrow d_9 \rightarrow d_6 \rightarrow d_3 \rightarrow d_{13} \rightarrow d_{10} \rightarrow d_7 \\ \rightarrow d_4 \rightarrow d_{14} \rightarrow d_{11} \rightarrow d_8 \rightarrow d_{15} \rightarrow d_{12} \rightarrow d_{16} . \end{array}$$

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

ৰ≣ া ্ ি থ University of Virginia

(日)

| Background | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|            |         |         |             |
| Concluding | Remarks |         |             |

- Overall, the proposed design is competitive with existing methods for dose-finding in multi-agent trials
- When the true ordering is known, the design reduces to the CRM, making it compatible to single-agent trials. Therefore, it can be considered an extension of the CRM

| Background | Methods | Results | Conclusions |
|------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|            |         |         |             |
| Questions? |         |         |             |

### Thank You!

Nolan A. Wages, Ph.D.

Dose-finding for Multi-drug Combinations

< ≣ ► ≣ পি ৭ ৫ University of Virginia

<ロ> <四> <四> <三</p>