

Utility-based optimization of Fujikawa's basket trial design – Pre-specified protocol of a comparison study

Lukas D Sauer¹, Alexander Ritz², and Meinhard Kieser¹

¹*Institute of Medical Biometry, Heidelberg University, Germany*

²*Institute of Mathematics, Clausthal University of Technology, Germany*

May 17, 2024

Abstract

Basket trial designs are a type of master protocol in which the same therapy is tested in several strata of the patient cohort. Many basket trial designs implement borrowing mechanisms. These allow sharing information between similar strata with the goal of increasing power in responsive strata while at the same time constraining type-I error inflation to a bearable threshold. These borrowing mechanisms can be tuned using numerical tuning parameters. The optimal choice of these tuning parameters is subject to research. In a comparison study using simulations and numerical calculations, we are planning to investigate the use of utility functions for quantifying the compromise between power and type-I error inflation and the use of numerical optimization algorithms for optimizing these functions. The present document is the protocol of this comparison study, defining each step of the study in accordance with the ADEMP scheme for pre-specification of simulation studies.

1. Introduction

With the dawn of precision medicine and targeted antibody therapies, the wish for more flexible trial designs compared to randomized controlled trials has been emphasized in both clinical research and methodology. While randomized controlled trials are still the gold standard of clinical research owing to their high internal validity, in some contexts they may be costly, slow, unethical, or simply not feasible. The term *master protocols* summarizes more flexible trial designs that combine features such as the addition of promising new treatment arms, the removal of ineffective treatment arms, and the combination of arms with different endpoints. A commonly requested idea is testing the same treatment in several substrata of a patient cohort. Such a master protocol, i.e., a design that unifies several strata in a single clinical trial, is called

basket trial design. This unification streamlines the planning phase of the different strata and parallelizes their recruitment, resulting in an efficient use of resources. Basket trial designs are beginning to be picked up in practice. A systematic literature review conducted on February 20, 2023, in MEDLINE, Embase, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials found 146 oncology-related basket trials (Kasim et al. 2023). Especially in early stages of clinical research, these designs also offer statistical benefits: So-called *borrowing* techniques allow strata with similar responses to the treatment to share information with one another, thereby leveraging power despite small sample sizes while keeping type-I error rates only moderately inflated. The earliest publication known to us that suggests borrowing between strata was published in 2003 (Thall et al. 2003) and the last ten years showed a colorful bouquet of Bayesian and frequentist borrowing mechanisms being introduced to methodological research (see Pohl et al. 2021).

Borrowing usually depends on the choice of several tuning parameters. An optimal choice of tuning parameters has to offer a compromise between multiple components: achieving high power in responsive strata, keeping type-I error rates low in unresponsive strata and maintaining a good balance between these two measures across several response scenarios. This compromise can be quantified using utility functions. The optimal choice of tuning parameters can then be found by finding optimal utility function values with the help of numerical optimization algorithms. In the following document, we present the protocol of a comparison study planned to investigate utility-based optimization of basket trial designs using both simulations and numerical calculations. The basket trial design that we are considering as an example is a Bayesian design introduced by Fujikawa et al. 2020.

2. Methodology of utility functions in basket trial designs

In the statistical planning of clinical trials, the communication of type-I error rate (TOER) and power to stakeholders such as principal investigators, sponsors, ethical committees and regulatory authorities is essential. TOER is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis conditional on the assumption that the null hypothesis is true. Power is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis conditional on the assumption that some alternative hypothesis of interest holds. While these measures are purely frequentist in nature, they may also be requested during the planning of Bayesian trial designs.

In the planning of basket trial designs, this demand for TOER and power calculation is confronted with several challenges. Firstly, every stratum may have its own null and alternative hypothesis of interest so that a multitude of combinations of null and alternative hypotheses across baskets can be considered. Secondly, control of TOER in a scenario may not be possible if we want to employ borrowing in order to leverage power. Kopp-Schneider et al. 2020 proved that power increase always comes at the cost of TOER inflation in the context of borrowing from external data sources whenever a uniformly most powerful test exists. While we are not aware of a formal transfer of their argument to the context of basket trials, it is plausible that the argument holds in that setting as well.

In communication with stakeholders, the best practice may be to communicate both TOER and power for each stratum across a range of plausible scenarios combining null and alternative hypotheses in different strata.

However, when searching for the optimal choice of tuning parameters of a basket trial designs we need to combine TOER and power across strata and scenarios. A natural way of combining these values is by defining an appropriate utility function. Then, optimization algorithms can be employed in order to find the optimal tuning parameter vector. Constraints, e.g. the maximally tolerated TOER values, may either be incorporated into the utility function allowing for unconstrained optimization methods or may be set up as separate inequalities, asking for constrained optimization approaches. This utility-based optimization approach has already been employed in the context of adaptive designs (Pilz et al. 2021) and in the context of planning several stages of drug development (Kirchner et al. 2016) even though formal control of TOER is possible in these contexts. In the methodology of basket trial designs, we are aware of a first utility-based approach presented in Jiang et al. 2021. Their approach will also be considered in the presented comparison study protocol and will be supplemented by several other optimization algorithms and utility functions.

3. Goals of this comparison study

This comparison study's goal is to find optimal tuning parameter combinations for Fujikawa's basket trial design in a general framework that could subsequently be generalized to other basket trial designs as well. In particular, the study is divided into three parts addressing three questions related to finding optimal parameter combinations:

- I. Which type of optimization algorithm for finding the optimal tuning parameter vector Φ^* should be preferred in terms of runtime and reliability?
- II. What is a good definition of *optimal* tuning parameter vector Φ^* that takes the desire for maximizing the detection probability of active strata as well constraints on TOER into account while delivering favorable results across a range of outcome scenarios? This question amounts to finding an appropriate utility function. We will use the best algorithm found in Part I, and apply it to a variety of different utility functions.
- III. How does the optimal tuning parameter vector Φ^* found as a result of parts I and II perform in comparison to the tuning parameter combinations suggested in Fujikawa et al. 2020?

The document will begin with a brief introduction into basket trial designs in general and into Fujikawa's design in particular. Afterwards, we will explain the true scenarios of interest in our study as well as the considered utility function and optimization algorithms. Then we will present the pre-specified plan of the three parts of the study structured using the ADEMP scheme by Morris et al. 2019. Part I is a simulation study for comparing different algorithms, parts II and III are comparison studies where all measures of interest can be calculated exactly.

4. Basket trial designs

A basket trial design is a clinical trial design used primarily in oncological single-arm phase II studies. It tests the same null hypothesis in several strata. In the literature, either the ensemble of all strata together is called “basket” or the strata themselves are called “baskets”. In the following, the endpoint will always be binary. While this could be any binary endpoint, we will without loss of generality refer to response to a treatment vs. no response throughout the text. Strata that have a sufficiently high true response rate to the treatment are called *active*, otherwise they are called *inactive*.

Consider the design from Fujikawa et al. 2020, which is based on an alteration of the beta-binomial model. Using the notation from Pohl et al. 2021, it can be defined as follows: Let n_i resp. r_i be the number of patients resp. responders in stratum $i \in 1, \dots, I$ for some number of strata I . The sampling distribution is simply the binomial distribution

$$r_i \sim \text{Bin}(n_i, p_i),$$

where the true rate p_i follows a prior beta distribution with shape parameters $a_i, b_i > 0$,

$$p_i \sim \text{Beta}(a_i, b_i).$$

For analysis of data, Fujikawa et al. recommend an uninformative choice of prior distribution. We choose $a_i = b_i = 1$. By conjugacy, the usual posterior distribution would be

$$p_i \sim \text{Beta}(a_i + r_i, b_i + n_i - r_i) = \text{Beta}_i^{\text{post}}. \quad (1)$$

Now this posterior is altered by introducing a borrowing mechanism,

$$p_i \sim \text{Beta}(\sum_j \omega_{ij} \cdot (a_j + r_j), \sum_j \omega_{ij} \cdot (b_j + n_j - r_j)) = \text{Beta}_i^{\text{bor}}. \quad (2)$$

Here ω_{ij} is a similarity measure defined by $\omega_{ij} = \mathbf{1}(\tilde{\omega}_{ij}^\varepsilon > \tau) \cdot \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^\varepsilon$, where we have $\tau \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, and $\tilde{\omega}_{ij} = 1 - \text{JSD}(\text{Beta}_i^{\text{post}}, \text{Beta}_j^{\text{post}})$ with the Jensen-Shannon divergence JSD of the unaltered beta-binomial posterior distributions from Equation (1).¹ JSD is a measure of divergence of probability distribution which implies that ω_{ij} becomes a measure of similarity of probability distribution, which is set to 0 if the similarity is less or equal to τ . The Jensen-Shannon divergence is defined as

$$\text{JSD}(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2}(\text{KLD}(P, M) + \text{KLD}(Q, M)),$$

where $M = \frac{1}{2}(P + Q)$ is the mixture distribution of P and Q (see Fujikawa et al. 2020). Here, KLD is the Kullback-Leibler divergence defined as

$$\text{KLD}(P, Q) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} P(x) \log \left(\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right) \mu(dx),$$

¹Note that in the original publication (Fujikawa et al. 2020), the bound for ε is set to $\varepsilon \geq 1$. However, there is no mathematical or design-related reason to not allow values between 0 and 1.

where (\mathcal{X}, S, μ) is the probability space on which P , Q or M are defined (see Kullback and Leibler 1951) and $P(x)$ denotes the Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to μ , i.e. the probability density function in case μ is chosen to be the Lebesgue measure. Here, $\log(\cdot)$ denotes the natural logarithm. We use this logarithm for better comparability with Fujikawa's results where the natural logarithm is used as well. In Baumann et al. 2023, the logarithm with base 2 is used as it implies that the Jensen-Shannon divergence ranges from 0 to 1.

The test decision whether stratum i is *detected* as active is based on the posterior probability of lying above a desired target rate p_i^* , i.e.,

$$P(p_i > p_i^* | \mathbf{r}) \geq \lambda, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = (r_i)_i$ is the vector of responses and where the posterior probability $P(\cdot | \mathbf{r})$ is defined with respect to the borrowing posterior $\text{Beta}_i^{\text{bor}}$.

We denote by $\Phi = (\lambda, \varepsilon, \tau)$ the vector of tuning parameters. In the examples of Fujikawa et al. 2020, the shape parameter ε , the similarity cutoff τ and the detection threshold λ are chosen to be either $\Phi = (\lambda, \varepsilon, \tau) = (0.99, 2, 0)$ or $(0.99, 2, 0.5)$, but it is unclear whether this is the optimum for choosing the tuning parameters.

Concerning the relationship between ε and τ , one should note two things. Firstly, they are redundant when it comes to defining the minimal similarity for which borrowing is still allowed. Indeed, for a given minimal similarity $\tilde{\omega}^*$ and a given τ , we can choose $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\omega}^*}(\tau) = \log_{\tilde{\omega}^*}(\tau)$ (and analogously $\tau_{\tilde{\omega}^*}(\varepsilon) = (\tilde{\omega}^*)^\varepsilon$) such that the function $\omega_{ij} = \mathbf{1}(\tilde{\omega}_{ij}^\varepsilon > \tau) \cdot \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^\varepsilon \max_{r_k \neq r_l} \tilde{\omega}_{kl}$ is greater than 0 if and only if $\tilde{\omega}_{kl} > \tilde{\omega}^*$.

Secondly, this implies that when choosing $\tilde{\omega}^* = \max_{r_i \neq r_j} \tilde{\omega}_{i,j}$ or greater, then borrowing is only allowed for two substrata that have identical response rates. We call this the *extreme borrowing boundary* $\varepsilon_{\text{extreme}}(\tau)$. Increasing ε or τ above this boundary does not change the behavior as ω_{ij} is either equal to 1 in case $r_i = r_j$ or equal to 0 in case $r_i \neq r_j$.

The parameter space upon which we will perform optimization in this study will be $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon \in [0, \infty)$ and $\tau \in [0, 1]$. For the grid search algorithm (explained below), we will restrict ourselves to $\varepsilon \in [0, 25]$. This means that the parameter space will encompass the parameter suggestions by Fujikawa et al. and that we can study the behavior of the extreme borrowing boundary for higher τ values (approx. above $\tau = 0.6$) as can be seen in Figure 1.

5. Outcome scenarios

In order to study the performance of the tuning parameter combinations, each step of the comparison study will consider the scenarios following in the list below. Firstly, we are using scenarios from related methodological publications, namely Fujikawa et al. 2020 whose design we are studying, Baumann et al. 2023 whose underlying R package we are using for calculation of performance measures, and Krajewska and Rauch 2021 in anticipation of a future comparison of frequentist and Bayesian sharing techniques. The number of strata in these methodological




Figure 1: Extreme borrowing boundary $\varepsilon_{\text{extreme}}(\tau)$ for different stratum counts I and per-stratum patient counts n_i and the upper bound of the ε parameter space for the grid search algorithm

publications vary between $I = 3, 4$ and 8 and the per-stratum sample sizes range from $n_i = 15$ to $n_i = 24$. The scenarios with low stratum and patient counts ($I = 3, n_i = 24, p_0 = 0.2$) and ($I = 4, n_i = 0, p_0 = 0.15$) enable exact calculation of performance measures (up to numerical precision of integration methods) without the necessity for Monte Carlo methods.

In order to supplement these methodologically motivated scenarios by clinically realistic scenarios, we considered the publications and published supplementary material of four different systematic literature reviews of planned and ongoing basket trials. Park et al. 2019 and Meyer et al. 2020 investigated planned and ongoing master protocols including basket trials in July 2019 and January 2020, respectively. While their search scopes and the identified trials are partially overlapping, we considered both reviews: Park et al. found more basket trials than Meyer et al., but on the other hand, Meyer et al. presented individual trial characteristics in the main text which made information easy and safe to extract. Kasim et al. 2023 mirrored Park et al.'s search strategy in February 2023, focussing specifically on basket trials in oncology. Concerning search date, it is the most up-to-date of the considered reviews. The umbrella review by Haslam et al. 2023 again searched basket trials in oncology, albeit about a year earlier in March 2022. We still considered their review as they report summary data of response rates in the strata.

In table 1, we summarized trial characteristics as presented in the four systematic reviews. Median per-group sample size was higher in Meyer et al. 2020 compared to Park et al. 2019 and Kasim et al. 2023. As Meyer et al. reported the planned sample size, we deem the median per-group sample size in Park et al. 2019 and Kasim et al. 2023 more realistic. Considering these

summary data, it is apparent that the total sample size and per-stratum sample size are usually higher in actual clinical trials than in the scenarios taken from above-mentioned methodological publications. Hence, we included four more scenario sets that are similar to actual completed basket trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov. These four scenario sets represent trials with medium and large total sample sizes and medium and large per-stratum sample sizes.

Considering response rates, the active response rates in the methodological publications are slightly larger than the 75%-quantile reported in the systematic review by Park et al. The four realistic scenario sets complement these response rates by smaller response rates and smaller effect sizes.

1. Three-stratum scenarios from Fujikawa et al. 2020: The number of strata is $I = 3$, strata with true response rate $p_i = 0.2$ are truly inactive, strata with $p_i > 0.2$ are truly active. We will consider sample sizes of $n_i = 24$ per stratum and the following combinations of true response rates:
 - a) 0 of 3 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.2, 0.2, 0.2)$,
 - b) 1 of 3 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.2, 0.2, 0.5)$,
 - c) 2 of 3 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.2, 0.5, 0.5)$, and
 - d) 3 of 3 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$.
2. Four-stratum scenarios from Baumann et al. 2023: The number of strata is $I = 4$, strata with true response rate $p_i = 0.15$ are truly inactive, strata with $p_i > 0.15$ are truly active. We will consider sample sizes of $n_i = 20$ per stratum and the following combinations of true response rates:
 - a) 0 of 4 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.15)$,
 - b) 1 of 4 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.4)$,
 - c) 2 of 4 active strata $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, 0.15, 0.4, 0.4)$,
 - d) 3 of 4 active strata $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, 0.4, 0.4, 0.4)$,
 - e) 4 of 4 active strata $\mathbf{p} = (0.4, 0.4, 0.4, 0.4)$,²
 - f) one in the middle: $\mathbf{p} = (0.4, 0.4, 0.3, 0.5)$, and
 - g) linear: $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, 0.25, 0.35, 0.45)$.
3. Eight-basket scenarios analogous to Krajewska and Rauch 2021: The number of strata is $I = 8$, strata with true response rate $p_i = 0.15$ are truly inactive, strata with $p_i > 0.15$ are truly active. We will consider sample sizes of $n_i = 15$ per stratum. This is different from the exact sample size in Krajewska and Rauch 2021, where the sample size depends on a clustering decision made at interim. However, a sample size of $n_i = 15$ is the worst

²In Baumann et al. 2023, these first five scenarios are called global null, good nugget, half, bad nugget and global alternative.

Table 1: Characteristics of basket trials as found in the literature. Per-group no. of patients was calculated as the total number of patients divided by the number of subgroups. Data were taken from the publications of Meyer et al. 2020, Table 1, and Haslam et al. 2023, Table 1, and from the supplementary online material of Park et al. 2019, Additional file 1, Tables S9 and S10, and of Kasim et al. 2023, Data Sheet 2.

Characteristic	Systematic review			
	Park 2019	Meyer 2020 ¹	Haslam 2023 ²	Kasim 2023 ³
No. of trials, N	49	16	25	146
Total no. of patients				
Median (25–75%)	205 (90–500)	101 (95–481)	48 (30–122)	70 (35–145)
Range	12–6,452	71–11,000		0–1,609
Unknown	1	1		0
No. of strata				
Median (25–75%)	5.0 (3.5–6.5)	3.5 (1.8–4.0)		3.0 (1.0–5.0)
Range	2.0–27.0	1.0–7.0		1.0–24.0
Unknown	14	0		115
Per-stratum no. of patients				
Median (25–75%)	43 (30–71)	93 (23–145)		38 (18–61)
Range	17–514	14–2,750		6–172
Unknown	14	1		115
Response rate [%]				
Median (25–75%)			23.1 (8–30)	
Unknown	49	16		146

¹Meyer et al. 2020 reported the planned sample size and planned number of subgroups.

²Only summarized data were available for Haslam et al. 2023.

³Kasim et al. 2023 reported the number of subgroups only for completed basket trials.

case achieved when the clustering algorithm separates all strata. We will consider the following combinations of true response rates:

a) – i) a of 8 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, \dots, 0.15, \underbrace{0.45, \dots, 0.45}_a)$ with $0 \leq a \leq 8$.

4. Scenario with medium total sample size and small effect sizes, similar to NCT02454972: In Table S5 of the supplementary Data Sheet 1 to Kasim et al., the basket trial with above-mentioned ClinicalTrials.gov ID is summarized. It had $I = 9$ strata with per-stratum sample sizes ranging from 13 to 105 (median: 23) and observed per-stratum response rates of (0.056, 0.000, 0.113, 0.143, 0.043, 0.000, 0.286, 0.065, 0.362). Most strata had assumed null response rates of 0.01 (corresponding to standard of care) and targeted response rates of 0.1. In our comparison study, we will consider a simplified version of this trial: We will consider a trial with $I = 9$ strata with $n_i = 23$ patients each. Strata with $p_i = 0.01$ will be considered inactive, strata with $p_i > 0.01$ will be considered truly active. For optimization, we will then consider the following data scenarios:

a) – j) a of 9 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.01, \dots, 0.01, \underbrace{0.10, \dots, 0.10}_a)$ with $0 \leq a \leq 9$.

When calculating the performance measures of the optimized parameter combination in part II of the comparison study, we will also consider performance measures assuming that the observed response rates from the clinical trial are the true response rates.

5. Scenario with large total sample size and large number of baskets, similar to NCT02054806: In Kasim et al.'s supplementary material, another basket trial is summarized. It has $I = 20$ strata with per-stratum sample sizes ranging from 16 to 27 (median: 24) and assumed null and target response rates of 0.10 and 0.35, respectively. We will consider a simplified version with $I = 20$ strata with $n_i = 24$ patients each in which strata with $p_i = 0.10$ and $p_i > 0.10$ will be considered inactive and active, respectively. For optimization, we will then consider the following data scenarios:

a) – k) a of 20 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.10, \dots, 0.10, \underbrace{0.35, \dots, 0.35}_a)$ with $a = 0, 2, 4, \dots, 20$.

We will only consider even numbers in order to halve computation time. Again, we will also investigate the observed response rates

$$(0.160, 0.174, 0.120, 0.120, 0.167, 0.043, 0.130, 0.304, 0.080, 0.042, \\ 0.200, 0.259, 0.063, 0.115, 0.000, 0.174, 0.115, 0.333, 0.091, 0.056)$$

reported for the actual clinical trial when calculating the performance measures.

6. Scenario with medium per-stratum sample size similar to NCT01848834: In Kasim et al.'s supplementary material, yet another clinical trial is summarized. It has $I = 4$ strata with per-stratum sample sizes ranging from 32 to 60 (median: 36) and assumed null and target response rates of 0.10 and 0.35 in half of the baskets. We will consider a simplified version with $I = 4$ strata with $n_i = 36$ patients each in which strata with $p_i = 0.10$ and

$p_i > 0.10$ will be considered inactive and active, respectively. For optimization, we will then consider the following data scenarios:

a) – e) a of 4 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.10, \dots, 0.10, \underbrace{0.35, \dots, 0.35}_a)$ with $0 \leq a \leq 4$.

As before, when calculating the performance measures we will also investigate the observed response rates (0.156, 0.167, 0.212, 0.205) reported for the actual clinical trial assuming that they were identical to the true response rates .

7. Scenario with large per-stratum sample size similar to NCT01631552: Kasim et al. also included the study with above-mentioned ID, whose details can be found on the website ClinicalTrials.gov, see Gilead Sciences 2024 in the references. The response to treatment was observed separately in $I = 3$ strata in 45, 54 and 108 patients, respectively (median: 54). Assumed response rates used in the planning phase were neither available at ClinicalTrials.gov nor in the material provided by Kasim et al. Hence, we assumed a null response rate of 0.15 and a target response rate of 0.30. In particular, we will consider a simplified version with $I = 3$ strata with $n_i = 54$ per stratum in which strata with $p_i = 0.15$ and $p_i > 0.15$ will be considered inactive and active, respectively. For optimization, we will then consider the following data scenarios:

a) – d) a of 3 active strata: $\mathbf{p} = (0.15, \dots, 0.15, \underbrace{0.30, \dots, 0.30}_a)$ with $0 \leq a \leq 3$.

We will again investigate the observed response rates (0.289, 0.315, 0.333) as a further data scenario when calculating the performance measures.

6. Utility functions

Under a given true scenario \mathbf{p} and a tuning parameter vector Φ , we define the power in a truly active stratum i as the probability

$$\text{pow}_i(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = P(i \text{ detected} | \Phi, \mathbf{p}, i \text{ active})$$

and the type-I error rate (TOER) in a truly inactive stratum i as the probability

$$\text{toer}_i(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = P(i \text{ detected} | \Phi, \mathbf{p}, i \text{ inactive}).$$

In this context, all probabilities are “frequentist”, meaning that they are defined with respect to true binomial sampling distributions $r_i \sim \text{Bin}(n_i, p_i)$ for all i without being modeled on a prior distribution. However, the test decision whether a stratum is detected to be active is made according to the “Bayesian” borrowing posterior probability as defined in Equation (3). This approach is sometimes called “pragmatic Bayesianism”.

Let $R \subseteq \{1, \dots, I\}$ be the set of active strata with respect to \mathbf{p} , $R^c \subseteq \{1, \dots, I\}$ the set of inactive strata. Then, we define the experiment-wise power (EWP) as the probability

$$\text{ewp}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = P(\exists i \in R : i \text{ detected} | \Phi, \mathbf{p}).$$

Analogously, we define the family-wise error rate (FWER) as the probability

$$\text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = P(\exists i \in R^c : i \text{ detected} | \Phi, \mathbf{p}).$$

Finally, we define the expected number of correct decisions (ECD) as

$$\text{ecd}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{i \in R} P(i \text{ detected} | \Phi, \mathbf{p}) + \sum_{i \in R^c} P(i \text{ not detected} | \Phi, \mathbf{p}).$$

Based on these functions, we define the following utility functions. Across all definitions, $\xi_1, \xi_2 > 0$ are penalty parameters set to 1 by default.

1. Discontinuous family-wise power-error function

$$u_{\text{ewp}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) = \begin{cases} \text{ewp}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_1) & \text{if } \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) < \eta_1, \text{ and} \\ -\xi_1 \cdot \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) & \text{if } \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) \geq \eta_1, \end{cases}$$

usually with \mathbf{p}_2 being the global null scenario and $\eta_1 = 0.05$.

2. Expected number of correct decisions

$$u_{\text{ecd}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2) = \begin{cases} \text{ecd}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_1), & \text{if } \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) < \eta_1, \text{ and} \\ -\xi_1 \cdot \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) & \text{if } \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) \geq \eta_1, \end{cases}$$

usually with \mathbf{p}_2 being the global null scenario.

3. Two-level family-wise power-error function

$$u_{2\text{ewp}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = \text{ewp}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) - (\xi_1 \text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) + \xi_2 (\text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) - \eta_2) \mathbf{1}(\text{fwer}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) - \eta_2)),$$

where $\eta_2 \in [0, 1]$ is a threshold for imposing harder FWER penalty, set to 0.1 by default.

4. Two-level stratum-wise power-error function

$$u_{2\text{pow}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{i \in R} \text{pow}_i(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) - \sum_{j \in R^c} (\xi_1 \text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) + \xi_2 (\text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) - \eta_2) \mathbf{1}(\text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) - \eta_2)),$$

as suggested in Jiang et al. 2021.

5. Scenario-averaged versions of the above utility functions

$$\bar{u}_l(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \{\mathbf{p}, \dots\}} w_{\mathbf{p}} u_l(\Phi, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}_2) \quad \text{for } l = \text{ewp, ecd (i.e. from Item 1 and 2),}$$

and

$$\bar{u}_l(\Phi) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \{\mathbf{p}, \dots\}} w_{\mathbf{p}} u_l(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) \quad \text{for } l = 2\text{ewp, } 2\text{pow (i.e. from Item 3 and 4),}$$

where $\{\mathbf{p}, \dots\}$ is a set of scenarios of interest, e.g., the set of scenarios with number of strata l from Section 5, and $w_{\mathbf{p}}$ are weights with $\sum_{\mathbf{p}} w_{\mathbf{p}} = 1$, e.g., $w_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{\#\{\mathbf{p}, \dots\}}$ for all \mathbf{p} .

6. Scenario-averaged utility functions with penalty of maximal TOER inflation

$$\bar{u}_{l,\text{pen}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_l(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_2) & \text{if } \max_{\mathbf{p}, j} \text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) < \eta_3, \\ -\xi_3 \cdot \max_{\mathbf{p}, j} \text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) & \text{if } \max_{\mathbf{p}, j} \text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) \geq \eta_3, \end{cases}$$

for $l = \text{ewp}$ or ecd with the maximum defined across all $\mathbf{p} \in \{\mathbf{p}, \dots\}$ and $j \in R^c$, and

$$\bar{u}_{l,\text{pen}}(\Phi) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_l(\Phi) & \text{if } \max_{\mathbf{p}, j} \text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) < \eta_3, \\ -\xi_3 \cdot \max_{\mathbf{p}, j} \text{toer}_j(\Phi) & \text{if } \max_{\mathbf{p}, j} \text{toer}_j(\Phi, \mathbf{p}) \geq \eta_3, \end{cases}$$

for $l = 2\text{ewp}$ or 2pow , where we choose $\eta_3 = 0.2$ and $\xi_3 = 1000$. In order to make the penalty work, $\xi_3 \cdot \eta_3$ should be greater than the absolute value $|\min \bar{u}_l|$.

We call the first four functions single-scenario utility functions. The scenario-averaged two-level stratum-wise power-error utility function $\bar{u}_{2\text{pow}}$ was suggested in Jiang et al. 2021, except for the fact that the authors use all possible partitions with respect to response rates whereas we allow arbitrary scenario sets. The scenario-averaged expected number of correct decisions function $\bar{u}_{2\text{pow}}$ emulates the optimization algorithm from Baumann et al. 2023 which in turn took the algorithm from Broglio et al. 2022. There, the detection threshold λ is first optimized to keep FWER with respect to the global null scenario below a threshold and then the mean ECD across all scenarios is maximized subsequently.

The scenario-averaged utility functions with penalty of maximal TOER inflation are promising as they present a good compromise between research goals and regulatory requirements. In the context of borrowing from an external data source, it is an established fact that power gains using an external data source can only come at the price of type-I error inflation (see Kopp-Schneider et al. 2020). This shortcoming is usually accepted as a lesser evil in the context of platform trials. However, regulation may impose a constraint on maximal TOER inflation per basket, which can be taken into account by implementing the very harsh penalty ξ_3 .

7. Optimization algorithms

For finding the optimal value (minimum or maximum) of a utility function $u(\cdot) : \Phi \mapsto u(\Phi)$, we will consider the optimization algorithms named in the following list. A brief explanation of the functionality of each optimization algorithm is presented below the list.

1. Bounded simulated annealing algorithm using the reflection approach for bounding the parameter space as suggested in Section 6 of Haario and Saksman 1991 – implemented in an R package developed for the purpose of this comparison study, using a start temperature of
 - a) $T_{\text{start}} = 100$,
 - b) $T_{\text{start}} = 10$,
 - c) $T_{\text{start}} = 1$,and one function evaluation per temperature step.³
2. Unbounded simulated annealing algorithm using the “return NA” approach for bounding the parameter space – implemented in the R function `stats::optim()`, using the start temperature $T_{\text{start}} = 10$ and one function evaluation per temperature step.
3. Differential evolution (DE) as implemented in the R package `metaheuristicOpt`, using a population size of 40, a scaling vector of 0.8 and a cross-over rate of 0.5.
4. Grey wolf optimizer (GWO) as implemented in the R package `metaheuristicOpt`, using a population size of 40.
5. Constrained optimization by linear approximations (COBYLA) algorithm as implemented in the R package `nloptr`, using stopping tolerance of 10^{-6} in the parameter space of Φ and a stopping tolerance of 0 in the value space of $u(\cdot)$.
6. Grid search algorithm, searching the set of all combinations of

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &\in \{0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9\} \cup \{0.99\} \cup \{0.999\}, \\ \varepsilon &\in \{0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0\} \cup \{5.0, 10.0, 15.0, 20.0, 25.0\}, \text{ and} \\ \tau &\in \{0.0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\} \cup \{1.0\}.\end{aligned}$$

We will allow each algorithm to run for up to 1000 function evaluations. The grid of the grid search algorithm was chosen to use 1000 function evaluations as well. In order to put focus on parts of the grid that seemed most relevant in preliminary experiments while restricting to grid dimensions $10 \times 10 \times 10$, we omitted some seemingly less relevant parts: $\lambda < 0.2$ (i.e. test decision almost always positive), high resolution for $\varepsilon > 2$ (i.e. sharing only with high similarity)

³Simulated annealing is an optimization algorithm inspired by the thermodynamic process of “annealing” in metal industry, hence the physical term “temperature”. Temperature is a transformation of the probability of jumping to a parameter state with lower utility with the hope of escaping local critical points in order to find global critical points. At the beginning of the run, temperature is relatively high and will then be decreased.

and $\tau = 0.9$ (i.e. almost no sharing, similar to 0.8 and 1.0). If one of the simulated annealing algorithms, GWO, DE, or the COBYLA algorithm shows poor convergence after 1000 evaluations and runtime permits it, we will conduct one more run with 20 000 function evaluations. With this number of iterations, preliminary experiments with simulated annealing reached convergence, which were, however, based on an R package unfit for the analysis.

We will end this chapter with a brief explanation of the functionality of each optimization algorithm:

Simulated annealing, referred to as unbounded simulated annealing in this publication, is a physics-inspired metaheuristic optimization algorithm suggested by Kirkpatrick et al. 1983. It builds upon the Metropolis algorithm that is also used in Markov chain Monte Carlo procedures. It is named simulated annealing as it mimics the procedure of annealing in metallurgy: There, a metal product is heated and then slowly cooled down in order to achieve a more homogeneous and stable structure within the product. The algorithm starts at a user-suggested or randomly selected initial parameter vector. In each step, the simulated annealing algorithm randomly suggests a new parameter vector near the old parameter vector. If the new vector has better utility, The current parameter vector is updated to be the new parameter vector. If it has worse utility, it is still replaced with a probability proportional to current “temperature”. At the beginning, the temperature is high in order to allow the algorithm to escape local optima. Following a prespecified temperature schedule, it is then slowly cooled down in order to find the global optimum. This algorithm was first shown to converge on finite parameter spaces in S. Geman and D. Geman 1984. Due to the finite nature of computer memory, we can consider our parameter spaces as finite.

Bounded simulated annealing is a generalization of the simulated annealing algorithm to hypercubes of the form $\prod_{i=1}^d [l_i, u_i]$ with lower and upper bounds l_i and u_i considered as a subset of \mathbb{R}^d . It works identically to above-mentioned unbounded simulated annealing algorithm. Whenever a suggested parameter vector’s component ϕ_i surpasses one boundary l_i or u_i , it is reflected along these boundaries until it lies in the respective interval $[l_i, u_i]$. Haario and Saksman 1991 suggested this modification and proved its convergence. This reflection procedure’s result can be calculated by a simple affine transformation combined with division with remainder.

Constrained optimization by linear approximation (COBYLA) is an optimization algorithm suggested by Powell 1994. It employs a d -dimensional simplex in order supply linear approximations of the utility function without the need for calculating derivatives. New simplex vertices are suggested by using these linear approximations while dynamically adjusting search radius and punishment for constraint violations. The algorithm’s procedure is too complex to be described in detail but can be found in above-mentioned reference.

Differential evolution (DE) is a metaheuristic optimization algorithm that mimics genetic evolution (see Das and Suganthan 2011, for an overview). From a fixed number of candidate vectors (“the population”), donor vectors are generated by randomly adding the scaled differences of two vectors to a third vector (“mutation”). Then, new candidates (“offspring”) are generated by randomly replacing some vector components of the original candidates with components of the donor vectors (“crossover”). Finally, the new candidates replace the old candidates in the

next generation if they perform better or equal (“natural selection”). Many improvements of this idea have been suggested as discussed by Das et al.

The grey wolf optimizer (GWO) is a metaheuristic optimization algorithm inspired by the hunting behavior and social hierarchy of grey wolves suggested by Mirjalili et al. 2014. The parameter space is searched by a number of candidate vectors (“pack of wolves”) which are following the direction of the three best candidates (“alpha, beta and delta wolves”). Candidate vectors are allowed more random behavior in the beginning (“searching for prey”) and are more strictly following the best solutions in the end (“encircling the prey”). The algorithm has further been improved (see Nadimi-Shahraki et al. 2021), but this improved version is not implemented in R.

Grid search is the conceptually simplest of the mentioned algorithms. For each component of the parameter vector, the user specifies a set of values of interest. Then, the algorithm simply searches all possible combinations of values for the optimal value. Grid search can be parallelized and is completely deterministic, but on the other hand, its cost grows exponentially with the number of parameters. Its precision will never be finer than the size of the mesh.

This choice of optimization algorithms is obviously not exhaustive of the abundance of available optimization algorithms. We chose these algorithms as they represent different approaches to optimization: stochastic metaheuristics with inspirations from physics, genetics and swarm behavior (simulated annealing, DE, and GWO, respectively), non-linear programming (COBYLA), and naive deterministic approaches (grid search). Both COBYLA and grid search were already applied to the optimization of clinical trial designs, see Kunzmann et al. 2021, Jiang et al. 2021, and Baumann et al. 2023. Stochastic metaheuristics appear to be a good alternative as they have little requirements to the “niceness” of the targeted utility function and as they are often able to escape local minima. Availability of R implementations was also a relevant criterion in the selection of optimization algorithms.

8. Comparison protocol

The comparison study is divided into three parts with I. the goal of comparing optimization algorithms, II. the goal of comparing utility functions, and III. the goal of comparing the optimized parameter values to the parameter values suggested in Fujikawa et al. 2020 as described above. For each part of the study, we will apply the ADEMP scheme for describing simulation studies that was introduced in Morris et al. 2019. The ADEMP scheme was developed for describing simulation studies of statistical methods. In Part I, the methods of interest are optimization algorithms rather than statistical methods. However, the ADEMP scheme could still be adapted to match the best practices in benchmarking algorithms described in Beiranvand et al. 2017, namely “clarifying the reason for benchmarking” (*aim* in the ADEMP scheme), selecting an appropriate test set (*data-generating mechanism* in ADEMP) and reporting comparative measures of efficiency, reliability and quality of solution (*performance measures* in ADEMP). Some more sophisticated methods from Beiranvand et al. 2017 such as the choice of an exhaustive test problem set and the reporting of performance profile plots was omitted as

our algorithm comparison is a quite small case study rather than a complete benchmarking of possible algorithms choices.

8.1. Part I: Comparison of optimization algorithms

In this first part of our comparison study, we will explore what optimization algorithm is best suited for the utility-based optimization approach. To this end, we will test the optimization algorithms on a selection of utility functions and outcome scenarios. Judging from some preliminary simulation attempts, it is expected that testing the optimization algorithms on all utility functions will take too long to be numerically feasible, see Section 10 for a detailed explanation.

1. Aim: The goal of this part of the comparison study is to select the fastest among all reliable algorithms for optimizing the parameters of Fujikawa's basket trial.
2. Test problems: We will consider the utility functions *scenario-averaged two-level stratum-wise power-error function* $\bar{u}_{2\text{ewp}}$ and *scenario-averaged expected number of correct decisions function* \bar{u}_{ecd} and will optimize the functions on one scenario set, namely the scenario set from Section 5 with $(I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15)$, yielding a total of two optimization test problems (two functions with one scenario set each). The deterministic algorithms will only be run once on each test problem, whereas the stochastic algorithms will be run $n_{\text{runs}} = 50$ times on each test problem. The number of algorithm runs is justified in Section 10 below. The seed of the first run will be 1856. As a start value for simulated annealing and COBYLA, we will choose $\Phi_{\text{start}} = (\lambda_{\text{start}}, \varepsilon_{\text{start}}, \tau_{\text{start}}) = (0.2, 0.5, 0)$, i.e. a test decision that is mostly positive and borrowing that takes place most of the time – this will be suboptimal in most scenarios, as it very frequently commits a type-I error.
3. Estimand/target: The target of each optimization algorithm is to find the optimal parameter combination with respect to a utility function as quickly as possible.
4. Methods: We will compare the six optimization algorithms described in Section 7. Bounded simulated annealing will be tested with three different starting temperatures, resulting in a total of eight studied algorithms.
5. Performance measures: The following comparative measures are of interest for comparing the different algorithms. Performance measures will be presented separately per test problem. If the performance measure was measured for each run of a stochastic algorithm, the measures will be summarized using mean, standard deviation, minimal and maximal values as appropriate. For selecting the best optimization algorithm, we will use the following approach: Across all test problems, we will calculate the mean performance measures. We will begin with internal reliability. Only optimization algorithms with an internal reliability of over 99% will be considered for comparing external reliability. Only optimization algorithms with a success rate of over 99% will be considered for comparing speed. Finally, the fastest of all the remaining optimization algorithms will be considered the best algorithm.

- a) Efficiency: number of fundamental evaluations of the utility function, user CPU time, system CPU time, wall clock time, memory usage.
 - b) Internal consistency: mean resulting optimal utility function value, marginal means of the optimal parameter vector components, the component's marginal sample standard deviations, the 95%-confidence interval of the means assuming normality, minimal and maximal values of resulting function values and parameter vector components.
 - c) External reliability: The true optimal solution is unknown, but the grid search algorithm will be used as a reference benchmark, as it is a deterministic algorithm that exhausts the whole parameter space, up to the grid's precision. The following performance measures will then be considered: success rate of delivering an optimal utility value greater than or equal to the grid search results, 95%-confidence interval of the difference to the grid search result assuming normality, minimal and maximal difference to the grid search results.
6. Reporting: We will provide tabular presentation of the performance measures. For the stochastic algorithms, Monte Carlo standard errors (MCSE) of the performance measures will be reported wherever estimating formulae of MCSE are known. In addition, we will use box plots to visualize performance measures of interest as appropriate. Furthermore, we will generate line plots showing the convergence of the simulated annealing runs, each line representing one run, with function evaluations on the x-axis and the utility function value or one parameter on the y-axis. Finally, we will generate a four-dimensional plot of the grid search run in order to visualize the shape of each utility function: the x-axis will represent the parameter ε , the y-axis the parameter τ , plot facets will represent the parameter λ and color will represent the utility function value $u(\lambda, \varepsilon, \tau)$.

8.2. Part II: Comparison of utility functions

In the second part of the comparison study, we will explore which utility function is best-suited for the optimization of Fujikawa's basket trial.

1. Aim: The aim of this part of the comparison study is to find the utility function which achieves the best compromise between single-stratum power and EWP on the one hand and single-stratum TOER and FWER on the other hand.
2. Data: We use the fastest reliable algorithm found in Part I of the study to optimize the tuning parameters Φ with respect to the utility functions of interest. If the algorithm is stochastic, a seed will be fixed to 899. The functions will be optimized for the seven scenario sets introduced in Section 5. The scenario-averaged utility functions will be averaged across all scenarios in the respective scenario set. The single-scenario utility functions, i.e., $u_l(\Phi, \mathbf{p})$ with $l = 2\text{ewp}$ or 2pow , will be optimized for the scenarios $\mathbf{p} =$ "2 of 3 active", "2 of 4 active" and "4 of 8 active", respectively. In the scenario sets with $(I = 3, n_i = 24, p_0 = 0.2)$ (from Fujikawa et al. 2020) and $(I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15)$ (from

Baumann et al. 2023), all utility functions can be calculated exactly up to the precision of numerical integration using the `baskexact` R package (Baumann 2023). Hence, this part is not actually a simulation study. The number of runs to calculate the optimal results will be 1. However, for all other scenario sets, we rely on simulation for calculating the performance measures.

3. Estimands: The estimand of each utility function is the optimal parameter vector. By applying the optimization algorithm to the respective utility function, we will receive an optimal parameter vector. The optimal parameter vector should of course be optimal with respect to the respective utility function, but should also show satisfactory performance with respect to the performance measures mentioned below.
4. Methods: The methods of interest are the eight different utility functions mentioned in Section 6.
5. Performance measures: For $(I = 3, n_i = 24, p_0 = 0.2)$ and $(I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15)$, all of the performance measures mentioned below can be calculated exactly up to the precision of numerical integration using the `baskexact` R package, without the necessity of Monte Carlo simulation. For all other scenarios, performance measures will be calculated using Monte Carlo simulation as implemented in the `basksim` package. A parameter combination is always optimal *with respect* to the scenario set, e.g. with respect to $(I = 3, n_i = 24, p_0 = 0.2)$. For each scenario from Section 5 the respective scenario set, the following performance measures will be reported:⁴
 - a) Marginal rejection rate of the local null hypothesis in each stratum, equivalent to TOER if the stratum is inactive and power if the stratum is active,
 - b) FWER,
 - c) EWP⁵,
 - d) expected number of correct decisions,
 - e) utility function value of all utility functions. Depending on the results, it may be difficult to select a clear “best choice” among the utility functions. Based on the results per scenario as well as pooled results across all scenarios, we will attempt to discuss advantages and disadvantages among the utility functions in order to suggest a “best practice”.
6. Reporting: Tabular reports of all performance measures will be provided. In addition, dot plots of the performance measures will be provided for each stratum count $I = 3, 4$ and 8 . On the x-axis, the scenarios will be sorted by the number of active strata followed by the

⁴Performance measures will even be reported if the optimal parameter combination was optimized for another scenario. For example, if $u_{\text{ewp}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2)$ was optimized for \mathbf{p}_1 being the 2 of 4 strata active scenario and \mathbf{p}_2 being the global null scenario with four strata, then we will still report the performance measures for all scenarios from the set $(I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15)$ mentioned in Section 5.

⁵The EWP is equal to the expected sensitivity in the terminology of Krajewska and Rauch 2021. The FWER is equal to one minus the expected specificity in their terminology.

scenarios with mixed true rates. On the y-axis, the respective performance measure will be plotted.

8.3. Part III: Comparison of optimal parameter combinations to Fujikawa's suggested parameter combination

Part III is an addition to the methods studied in Part II. In addition to the optimal parameter vectors obtained by utility optimization in Part II, we will also calculate the same performance measures for the parameter choice suggested in Fujikawa et al. 2020. There, the shape parameter ε , the similarity cutoff τ and the detection threshold λ are suggested to be either $\Phi_{\text{Fuj (i)}} = (\lambda, \varepsilon, \tau) = (0.99, 2, 0)$ or $\Phi_{\text{Fuj (ii)}} = (0.99, 2, 0.5)$.

9. Further analyses

In an exploratory fashion, we will consider two further aspects in our comparison study. Firstly, Fujikawa's basket trial design could be altered by replacing the Jensen-Shannon divergence JSD by the Hellinger distance (see e.g. Le Cam and Lo Yang 2000),

$$\text{HLD}(P, Q) = 1 - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{P(x)Q(x)} \mu(dx),$$

which has the advantage that for two beta distributions, it can be calculated from basic functions without the need for numerical integration (see Sasha 2012):

$$\text{HLD}(\text{Beta}(a_1, b_1), \text{Beta}(a_2, b_2)) = 1 - \frac{B\left(\frac{a_1+a_2}{2}, \frac{b_1+b_2}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{B(a_1, b_1)B(a_2, b_2)}}.$$

We will explore whether this replacement results in a speedup of the design while at the same time maintaining a similar behavior compared to Fujikawa's design.

Secondly, we will graphically investigate the effect of borrowing on the maximal TOER in $I = 2$ strata. One inactive basket will be kept at a stable response rate of $p_1 = 0.2$, while we increase the response rate of the other basket from $p_2 = 0.2$ to $p_2 = 1$. We will then plot the response rate of p_2 on the x-axis and the TOER of basket 1 on the y-axis for different combinations of ε and τ . The resulting curves may give an overview of how borrowing affects the TOER in inactive strata.

10. Justification of simulation size and runtime

For assessing the precision of the stochastic algorithms in Part I of our comparison study, we decided to run the algorithms for a total of $n_{\text{runs}} = 50$ times. In the following Section 10.1, we will justify the choice of this simulation size by estimating the study's run time. For the calculation of design operating characteristics, we will use the *baskexact* package, which calculates exactly up to numerical imprecision whenever it is feasible. However, we use the Monte Carlo-based R package *basksim* (Baumann 2024) for estimating design characteristics in the case of large sample sizes and large stratum counts, as the *baskexact* package would take too long (see Section 10.1 for a more detailed explanation). We use $n_{\text{MC}} = 1000$ for the number of Monte Carlo-generated data sets in *basksim*. The choice of this number is justified in Section 10.3.

For scenario sets ($I = 3, n_i = 24, p_0 = 0.2$) and ($I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15$), Part II and Part III of our comparison study are deterministic and precise up to the precision of numerical integration. Therefore, we do not conduct several runs in these parts. In other words, the simulation size for parts II and III equals 1. For the other scenario sets, the calculation of performance measures is based on Monte Carlo-generated data sets with $n_{\text{MC}} = 1000$.

10.1. Estimation of runtime

In order to estimate the duration of our simulation, we ran a small pilot simulation: We executed the bounded simulated annealing algorithm and the grid search with 1000 iterations each for optimizing the utility function $u_{\text{ewp}}(\Phi, \mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2)$ with respect to stratum counts I , per-stratum sample sizes n_i and the respective global null hypothesis \mathbf{p}_2 using the R packages *baskexact* and *basksim*. The resulting run times are specified in Table 3.

The *baskexact* package took 80.24 min to run for ($I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15$). This package calculates operating measures combinatorically and the runtime is hence influenced by the number of combinations, which is proportional to $(n_i)^I$. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that larger scenarios, e.g. with ($I = 8, n_i = 15, p_0 = 0.15$) would have a longer duration by several orders of magnitude more than 80.24 min ($\frac{15^8}{20^4} = c \cdot 10^5$), rendering any simulation infeasible. This is the reason why we will calculate the utility function for the other scenario sets with the R package *basksim*, which applies Monte Carlo simulation and can hence reduce run time. The execution of *basksim* used $n_{\text{sim}} = 1000$ Monte Carlo simulations in each call to the package.

The grid search algorithm was faster than the simulated annealing algorithm by more than a factor 15 even though both algorithms ran for 1000 iterations. This is due to the fact that we used parallelization on 20 workers on our institute's RStudio server for calculating the performance measures on the grid. Due to the sequential stochastic nature of metaheuristic optimization algorithms, parallelization of a single simulated annealing, GWO or DE run is not possible. However, we will be able to parallelize part of the $n_{\text{runs}} = 50$ simulated annealing runs; hence we will also estimate a speedup by a factor 15 for Part I. In Table 4, we show a detailed explanation of the run time of Part I. The estimated run time of 15.7 days is long. However, it

Table 3: Run time of 1000 iterations in a pilot study

Algorithm	I	n_i	Scenario p_1	Used package	Run time
Simulated annealing	3	24	(0.2, 0.2, 0.5)	<i>baskexact</i>	15.64 min
	4	20	(0.15, 0.15, 0.4, 0.4)	<i>baskexact</i>	80.24 min
	8	15	(0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45)	<i>basksim</i>	60.12 min
Grid search	3	24	(0.2, 0.2, 0.5)	<i>baskexact</i>	1.03 min
	4	20	(0.15, 0.15, 0.4, 0.4)	<i>baskexact</i>	4.52 min
	8	15	(0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.15, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45)	<i>basksim</i>	201.67 min

Table 4: Estimation of the total run time for Part I of the comparison study

Algorithms	Bounded simulated annealing with 3 starting temperatures, unbounded simulated annealing, DE, GWO (each of these six with $n_{\text{runs}} = 50$ runs in order to investigate stochastic behavior), COBYLA, grid search
Utility functions	Scenario-averaged utility functions $\bar{u}_{2\text{ewp}}$ and \bar{u}_{ecd}
Scenarios	Seven scenarios with ($I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15$)
Run time	80.24 min on a scenario with ($I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15$) using the <i>baskexact</i> package
Computation clusters	20 computation kernels on the institute's RStudio server resulting in a speedup by a factor of 15
Estimated total run time	$(6 \cdot n_{\text{runs}} + 2) \cdot 2 \cdot 7 \cdot 80.24 \text{ min} \cdot \frac{1}{15} = 15.7 \text{ d}$

Table 5: Estimation of the total run time for Part II of the comparison study

Algorithms	Fastest reliable algorithm selected in Part I
Utility functions	Four single-scenario utility functions, four scenario-averaged utility functions, four scenario-averaged utility functions with maximal TOER penalty
Scenarios	One scenario per scenario set for the single-scenario utility functions; 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 5, 4 scenarios per scenario set for the scenario-averaged utility functions
Run time	15.64 min on a scenario with ($I = 3, n_i = 24, p_0 = 0.2$), 80.24 min on a scenario with ($I = 4, n_i = 20, p_0 = 0.15$) using the <i>baskexact</i> package, 60.12 min on a scenario with ($I = 8, n_i = 15, p_i = 0.15$) with the <i>basksim</i> package, similar for large scenario sets
Computation clusters	1 computation kernel on the institute's RStudio server resulting in no speedup
Estimated total run time	$1 \cdot (4 \cdot (15.64 \text{ min} + 80.24 \text{ min} + 60.12 \text{ min})) + (4 + 4) \cdot (4 \cdot 15.64 \text{ min} + 7 \cdot 80.24 \text{ min} + (9 + 10 + 11 + 5 + 4) \cdot 60.12 \text{ min}) \cdot 1 = 16.9 \text{ d}$

is still feasible while underlining the necessity to keep the example set of utility functions as small as it is.

The run time of Part II of our study is shown in the following Table 5. The estimation of the benefit of parallelization appears more complicated in this case: Should we parallelize across the set of 12 utility functions or across the set of up to 11 data scenarios? However, even without any parallelization, the estimated run time is 16.9 days, which would be feasible.

Finally note that the grid search algorithm on $I = 8$ strata is slower by a factor of 3 compared to simulated annealing. Grid search using the *basksim* package cannot use parallelization, as the *basksim* package already uses parallelization internally. However, it should optimally have about the duration as the simulated annealing algorithm, as both take the same number of iterations if executed sequentially. The unwanted slowdown may be due to a suboptimal R implementation and will be further investigated before execution of the comparison study.

10.2. Monte Carlo standard error of the algorithms' precision in Part I

In Part I of the comparison study, we are interested in the precision of partly stochastic optimization algorithms. We use $n_{\text{runs}} = 50$ to estimate this precision. How precise will our estimates be? The marginal sample standard deviation of the components of the resulting optimal parameter vectors is one of the most relevant performance measures of Part I of the comparison study. Assuming a normal distribution of the marginal optimal algorithm result components around the true optimal vector components, we want to keep the standard deviation of the marginal standard deviation of the vector components below a reasonable level. An unbiased estimator of the standard error of the sample standard deviation is given by

$$\widehat{\text{SD}}(s) = s \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})}{\Gamma(n/2)} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{2} - \left(\frac{\Gamma(n/2)}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})}\right)^2},$$

where $s = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$ is the sample standard deviation and $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt$ is the gamma function for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with positive real part $\Re(z) > 0$, see Appendix, Section A, for details. For a total of 50 algorithm runs, this means that we will achieve a standard error of $\widehat{\text{SD}}(s)_{50} = 0.10127 \cdot s$, i.e., the sample standard deviation will be precise up to a standard error of little more than 10%. Regarding the already long run time, this appears acceptable.

10.3. Monte Carlo standard error of the design characteristics in parts I and II

In parts I and II, we will estimate the design characteristics of basket trial designs with $I = 8$ using the Monte Carlo-based package *basksim*. We want to estimate the stratum-wise power and TOER by applying the design to $n_{\text{MC}} = 1000$ simulated data sets. According to Morris et al. 2019,

Table 6, the Monte Carlo standard error of a rejection rate estimate $\widehat{\text{rate}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{MC}}} \sum_{l=1}^{n_{\text{MC}}} \mathbf{1}(p_l \leq \alpha)$ such as power and TOER is given by

$$\widehat{\text{SD}}(\widehat{\text{rate}}) = \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{\text{rate}} \cdot (1 - \widehat{\text{rate}})}{n_{\text{MC}}}}.$$

The value is maximal for $\widehat{\text{rate}} = 0.5$, resulting in a Monte Carlo standard error of $\widehat{\text{SD}}(\widehat{\text{rate}}) \leq 0.016$ for $n_{\text{MC}} = 1000$, i.e., a standard error of less than 2%. This seems acceptable regarding the long run time in Part I of our comparison study.

11. Discussion

Utility functions are a feasible and objective way of combining operating characteristics in clinical trials, which has proved useful in different contexts. So far in the context of basket trials, optimization is usually restricted to heuristic manual tuning of parameters as in Fujikawa et al. 2020 or to optimizing one characteristic of interest (e.g. expected number of correct decisions) while keeping type-I error rate in one scenario controlled as in Broglio et al. 2022 and Baumann et al. 2023. The challenge of optimizing across multiple scenarios and the choice of optimization algorithm is usually not discussed. Jiang et al. 2021 suggested two types of utility functions but their choice was also not compared to other functions. Hence, our comparison study will fill a research gap in investigating both the choice of utility functions and of optimization algorithms.

If it proves effective and feasible, the studied optimization framework may lay the foundation for further research on optimizing basket trials, be it extensions to unbalanced sample size in the strata, multi-stage basket trials, and different Bayesian or frequentist basket trial designs.

12. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Lukas Baumann, Marietta Kirchner and Paul Thalmann from the Institute of Medical Biometry at the Heidelberg University Hospital, Germany, Norbert Benda from the German Federal Institute for Drugs and Medical Devices (BfArM), and Carolin Herrmann from Novo Nordisk, Denmark, for useful comments concerning this protocol. Furthermore, we thank two anonymous reviewers for their suggestions on how to improve the study protocol. This project is funded by the German Research Organization (DFG) as part of the project *STOP OR GO*, grant KI 708/9-1.

References

- Baumann, Lukas (2023). *baskexact: Exact Calculation of Basket Trial Operating Characteristics*. R package version 0.2.0. URL: <https://github.com/lbau7/baskexact>.
- (2024). *basksim: Compare basket trial designs based on simulation*. R package version 0.1.0. URL: <https://github.com/lbau7/basksim>.
- Baumann, Lukas, Lukas Sauer, and Meinhard Kieser (2023). “Basket trial designs based on power priors”. arXiv:2309.06988 [stat].
- Beiranvand, Vahid, Warren Hare, and Yves Lucet (2017). “Best practices for comparing optimization algorithms”. In: *Optimization and Engineering* 18.4, pp. 815–848. DOI: 10.1007/s11081-017-9366-1.
- Broglio, Kristine R., Fanni Zhang, Binbing Yu, Jayne Marshall, Fujun Wang, Maxine Bennett, and Kert Viele (2022). “A Comparison of Different Approaches to Bayesian Hierarchical Models in a Basket Trial to Evaluate the Benefits of Increasing Complexity”. In: *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research* 14.3, pp. 324–333. DOI: 10.1080/19466315.2021.2008484.
- Das, Swagatam and Ponnuthurai Nagaratnam Suganthan (2011). “Differential Evolution: A Survey of the State-of-the-Art”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 15.1, pp. 4–31. DOI: 10.1109/TEVC.2010.2059031.
- Fujikawa, Kei, Satoshi Teramukai, Isao Yokota, and Takashi Daimon (2020). “A Bayesian basket trial design that borrows information across strata based on the similarity between the posterior distributions of the response probability”. In: *Biometrical Journal* 62.2, pp. 330–338. DOI: 10.1002/bimj.201800404.
- Geman, Stuart and Donald Geman (1984). “Stochastic Relaxation, Gibbs Distributions, and the Bayesian Restoration of Images”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* PAMI-6.6, pp. 721–741. DOI: 10.1109/TPAMI.1984.4767596.
- Gilead Sciences (2024). *Study of Sacituzumab Govitecan-hziy (IMMU-132) in Adults With Epithelial Cancer*. Clinical trials registry. URL: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT01631552>.
- Haario, Heikki and Eero Saksman (1991). “Simulated annealing process in general state space”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 23.4, pp. 866–893. DOI: 10.2307/1427681.
- Haslam, Alyson, Timothée Olivier, Jordan Tuia, and Vinay Prasad (2023). “Umbrella review of basket trials testing a drug in tumors with actionable genetic biomarkers”. In: *BMC Cancer* 23.1, p. 46. DOI: 10.1186/s12885-022-10421-w.
- Holtzman, Wayne H. (1950). “The Unbiased Estimate of the Population Variance and Standard Deviation”. In: *The American Journal of Psychology* 63.4, pp. 615–617. DOI: 10.2307/1418879.
- Jiang, Liyun, Lei Nie, Fangrong Yan, and Ying Yuan (2021). “Optimal Bayesian hierarchical model to accelerate the development of tissue-agnostic drugs and basket trials”. In: *Contemporary Clinical Trials* 107, p. 106460. DOI: 10.1016/j.cct.2021.106460.
- Kasim, Adetayo, Nathan Bean, Sarah Jo Hendriksen, Tai-Tsang Chen, Helen Zhou, and Matthew A. Psioda (2023). “Basket trials in oncology: a systematic review of practices and methods, comparative analysis of innovative methods, and an appraisal of a missed opportunity”. In: *Frontiers in Oncology* 13, p. 1266286. DOI: 10.3389/fonc.2023.1266286.
- Kirchner, Marietta, Meinhard Kieser, Heiko Götte, and Armin Schüler (2016). “Utility-based optimization of phase II/III programs”. In: *Statistics in Medicine* 35.2, pp. 305–316. DOI: 10.1002/sim.6624.

- Kirkpatrick, S., C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi (1983). "Optimization by Simulated Annealing". In: *Science* 220.4598, pp. 671–680. DOI: 10.1126/science.220.4598.671.
- Kopp-Schneider, Annette, Silvia Calderazzo, and Manuel Wiesenfarth (2020). "Power gains by using external information in clinical trials are typically not possible when requiring strict type I error control". In: *Biometrical Journal* 62.2, pp. 361–374. DOI: 10.1002/bimj.201800395.
- Krajewska, Maja and Geraldine Rauch (2021). "A new basket trial design based on clustering of homogeneous subpopulations". In: *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* 31.4, pp. 425–447. DOI: 10.1080/10543406.2021.1897993.
- Kullback, S. and R. A. Leibler (1951). "On Information and Sufficiency". In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 22.1, pp. 79–86.
- Kunzmann, Kevin, Maximilian Pilz, Carolin Herrmann, Geraldine Rauch, and Meinhard Kieser (2021). "The **adoptr** Package: Adaptive Optimal Designs for Clinical Trials in R". In: *Journal of Statistical Software* 98.9. DOI: 10.18637/jss.v098.i09.
- Laforgia, Andrea (1984). "Further inequalities for the gamma function". In: *Mathematics of Computation* 42.166, pp. 597–600. DOI: 10.1090/S0025-5718-1984-0736455-1.
- Le Cam, Lucien and Grace Lo Yang (2000). *Asymptotics in Statistics*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1166-2. (Visited on 02/23/2024).
- Macro (2012). *Answer to "Standard deviation of standard deviation"*. URL: <https://stats.stackexchange.com/a/28567> (visited on 11/13/2023).
- Meyer, Elias Laurin, Peter Mesenbrink, Cornelia Dunger-Baldauf, Hans-Jürgen Fülle, Ekkehard Glimm, Yuhuan Li, Martin Posch, and Franz König (2020). "The Evolution of Master Protocol Clinical Trial Designs: A Systematic Literature Review". In: *Clinical Therapeutics* 42.7, pp. 1330–1360. DOI: 10.1016/j.clinthera.2020.05.010.
- Mirjalili, Seyedali, Seyed Mohammad Mirjalili, and Andrew Lewis (2014). "Grey Wolf Optimizer". In: *Advances in Engineering Software* 69, pp. 46–61. DOI: 10.1016/j.advengsoft.2013.12.007.
- Morris, Tim P., Ian R. White, and Michael J. Crowther (2019). "Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical methods". In: *Statistics in Medicine* 38.11, pp. 2074–2102. DOI: 10.1002/sim.8086.
- Nadimi-Shahraki, Mohammad H., Shokooh Taghian, and Seyedali Mirjalili (2021). "An improved grey wolf optimizer for solving engineering problems". In: *Expert Systems with Applications* 166, p. 113917. DOI: 10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113917.
- Park, Jay J. H., Ellie Siden, Michael J. Zoratti, Louis Dron, Ofir Harari, Joel Singer, Richard T. Lester, Kristian Thorlund, and Edward J. Mills (2019). "Systematic review of basket trials, umbrella trials, and platform trials: a landscape analysis of master protocols". In: *Trials* 20.1, p. 572. DOI: 10.1186/s13063-019-3664-1.
- Pilz, Maximilian, Kevin Kunzmann, Carolin Herrmann, Geraldine Rauch, and Meinhard Kieser (2021). "Optimal planning of adaptive two-stage designs". In: *Statistics in Medicine* 40.13, pp. 3196–3213. DOI: 10.1002/sim.8953.
- Pohl, Moritz, Johannes Krisam, and Meinhard Kieser (2021). "Categories, components, and techniques in a modular construction of basket trials for application and further research". In: *Biometrical Journal* 63.6, pp. 1159–1184. DOI: 10.1002/bimj.202000314.
- Powell, M. J. D. (1994). "A Direct Search Optimization Method That Models the Objective and Constraint Functions by Linear Interpolation". In: *Advances in Optimization and Numerical*

- Analysis*. Ed. by Susana Gomez and Jean-Pierre Hennart. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, pp. 51–67. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-015-8330-5_4. (Visited on 05/06/2024).
- Sasha (2012). *Answer to "Hellinger distance between Beta distributions"*. URL: <https://math.stackexchange.com/a/165399/332808> (visited on 02/23/2024).
- Thall, Peter F., J. Kyle Wathen, B. Nebiyu Bekele, Richard E. Champlin, Laurence H. Baker, and Robert S. Benjamin (2003). "Hierarchical Bayesian approaches to phase II trials in diseases with multiple subtypes". In: *Statistics in Medicine* 22.5, pp. 763–780. DOI: 10.1002/sim.1399.

A. Appendix: Estimation of the standard error of the sample standard deviation

In the following, we present a calculation of the standard error of the sample standard deviation, following the explanation on StackExchange, see Macro 2012.

Proposition A.1. Consider n random variables $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ which are independent identically normally distributed $X_i \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Furthermore, consider the usual consistent estimator of the sample standard deviation $s = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$ and let $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt$ be the gamma function for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with positive real part $\Re(z) > 0$. Then the following holds:

1. The expectation of the sample standard deviation is given by $E(s) = \frac{\sigma}{c_n}$ with the correction factor $c_n = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{2}}$.
2. $s_{\text{un}} = c_n \cdot s$ is a consistent and unbiased estimator of σ .
3. $\widehat{SD}(s) = s \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(c_n)^2}}$ is a consistent estimator of $SD(s)$.
4. $\widehat{SD}_{\text{un}}(s) = c_n \cdot s \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(c_n)^2}} = s \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{2} - \left(\frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})}\right)^2}$.

Proof. The proof of 1. can be found in Holtzman 1950. The proof of 2. is a straightforward corollary of 1. using the linearity of expectation for proving unbiasedness and the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 1$ (see Laforgia 1984) together with Slutsky's theorem for proving consistency.

Straightforward calculation using 1. shows that

$$SD(s) = \sqrt{\text{Var}(s)} = \sigma \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(c_n)^2}}.$$

Using the fact that s is a consistent estimator of σ and the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(c_n)^2}} = 0$, this calculation implies 3. Finally, 4. follows from 2. and 3 using linearity of expectation for proving unbiasedness and once again the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(c_n)^2}} = 0$ for proving consistency. \square

Correspondence Lukas D Sauer, Institute of Medical Biometry, Heidelberg University, Im Neuenheimer Feld 130.3, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany. E-mail: sauer@imbi.uni-heidelberg.de