EVERSANA™

Application of Propensity Score Matching and Bayesian Hierarchical Design Methods to Integrate Single-Arm Studies into Network Meta-Analyses (NMAs):

Opportunities and Pitfalls Illustrated in a Case Study Assessing Ablation/Radiation Therapies in Lung Cancer

Conflicts of Interest

- This work was supported by Ethicon, Inc., manufacturer of the NeuWave microwave ablation system.
- Rana A. Qadeer is an employee of EVERSANA, who were sponsored to perform this study by Ethicon, Inc.

P13:
COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES & METHODS

Application of Propensity Score Matching and Bayesian Hierarchical Design Methods to Integrate Single-Arm Studies into Network Meta-Analyses (NMAs):

Opportunities and Pitfalls Illustrated in a Case Study Assessing Ablation/Radiation Therapies in Lung Cancer

Rana A. Qadeer[1], Sudip Ghosh[2], Jeffrey W. Clymer[2], George Wright[1], Nicole Ferko[1], Chris Cameron[3]

[1] EVERSANA, Burlington, ON, Canada
[2] Ethicon Inc., Cincinnati, OH, USA
[3] EVERSANA, Sydney, NS, Canada

Outline

1. Introduction

Burden of lung cancer

Treatment options

Problems and objectives

2. Methods

Systematic literature review

Data synthesis and statistical methods

3. Results

Systematic literature review

Primary and exploratory analyses

4. Discussion

Summary

Opportunities and pitfalls

Outline

1. Introduction

Burden of lung cancer

Treatment options

Problems and objectives

2. Methods

Systematic literature review

Data synthesis and statistical methods

3. Results

Systematic literature review

Primary and exploratory analyses

4. Discussion

Summary

Opportunities and pitfalls

Burden of Lung Cancer

Among all cancer types, lung cancer is the ***leading cause of death*** worldwide[1]

In 2020, ***>228,000 new cases*** and ***>135,000 deaths*** in the United States[2]

In 2010, prevalence costs estimated to be ***$12.1 billion*** in the United States[3]

Treatment Options

- Key treatment option is surgical resection; however, only 20% to 25% eligible[4,5]
- Radiation and minimally-invasive ablation therapies are commonly used:[6-19]
  - Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy (SBRT)
  - Radiofrequency Ablation (RFA)
  - Microwave Ablation (MWA)

Problems and Objectives

TWO KEY PROBLEMS

1. Lack of analyses (e.g., network meta-analyses [NMAs]) that compare all three treatment modalities (SBRT, RFA, and MWA)
2. NMAs generally include direct comparative evidence (RCTs, observational studies); however, availability of direct comparative evidence was low

OBJECTIVES

- Compare the efficacy of SBRT, RFA, and MWA using a NMA incorporating **direct comparative and single-arm studies**
- Discuss opportunities/pitfalls of incorporating single-arm studies into NMAs

Outline

1. Introduction

Burden of lung cancer

Treatment options

Problems and objectives

2. Methods

Systematic literature review

Data synthesis and statistical methods

3. Results

Systematic literature review

Primary and exploratory analyses

4. Discussion

Summary

Opportunities and pitfalls

Systematic Literature Review



EVERSANA™

Data Synthesis and Statistical Methods

- Bayesian hierarchical NMAs were conducted:[20]

PRIMARY ANALYSES	EXPLORATORY ANALYSES
• Included RCTs and comparative observational studies	• Included RCTs, comparative observational studies, and **simulated comparative studies**
• Down-weighted lower quality evidence to provide adjusted treatment effects across treatments	• Down-weighted lower quality evidence to provide adjusted treatment effects across treatments

• RCTs received a weight of 100%, while comparative observational studies received a weight of 50%
  • Other weights were tested in sensitivity analyses
	• Weights: RCTs 100%, comparative observational studies 50%, simulated comparative studies 10%
	  • Other weights were tested in sensitivity analyses

• Fixed effect model due to limited number of studies
  • Other models were tested in sensitivity analyses
	• Random effects model with vague priors
	  • Other models were tested in sensitivity analyses

Outline

1. Introduction

Burden of lung cancer

Treatment options

Problems and objectives

2. Methods

Systematic literature review

Data synthesis and statistical methods

3. Results

Systematic literature review

Primary and exploratory analyses

4. Discussion

Summary

Opportunities and pitfalls

Systematic Literature Review



*5 studies compared MWA with RFA and 4 studies compared RFA with SBRT

EVERSANA™

Primary Analyses (1 of 2)

- Number of comparative studies included in each analysis varied based on the outcome:
  - **LTR:** 4 comparative observational studies
  - **1-year OS:** 1 RCT and 7 comparative observational studies
  - **2-year OS:** 5 comparative observational studies
  - **3-year OS:** 4 comparative observational studies
  - **Complications:** 1 RCT and 5 comparative observational studies
- Network diagram for all outcomes was a variation of the diagram shown on right (varied by sample sizes and number of studies included)



EVERSANA™

Primary Analyses (2 of 2)

LTR

- MWA was ranked first and RFA was ranked last
- Statistically significant reduction with MWA vs. RFA

1-Year OS

- No differences between treatments

2-Year OS

- No differences between treatments

3-Year OS

- No differences between treatments

Complications

- SBRT was ranked first and RFA was ranked last
- Statistically significant reductions with SBRT and MWA vs. RFA

Exploratory Analyses

Results observed in **exploratory analyses were similar to those from the primary analyses:**

	Number of Studies	Treatment Rankings	Treatment Effect Sizes
LTR			
Primary analyses	4	**Same**	Varied by 6% - 44%
Exploratory analyses	11		
1-, 2-, and 3-Year OS			
Primary analyses	8, 5, 4	**Some Variation**	Varied by 0% - 16%
Exploratory analyses	23, 17, 16		
Complications			
Primary analyses	6	**Same**	Varied by 3% - 16%
Exploratory analyses	22		

Sensitivity Analyses

Results from sensitivity analyses for the primary and exploratory analyses were aligned with results presented on previous slides

Outline

1. Introduction

Burden of lung cancer

Treatment options

Problems and objectives

2. Methods

Systematic literature review

Data synthesis and statistical methods

3. Results

Systematic literature review

Primary and exploratory analyses

4. Discussion

Summary

Opportunities and pitfalls

Summary

Problems:

- Lack of analyses that compare all three treatment modalities (SBRT, RFA, and MWA) for patients with inoperable lung cancer
- Paucity of direct comparative evidence but many single-arm studies available

Methods:

- Conducted Bayesian hierarchical NMAs:
  - Primary analyses included direct comparative evidence
  - Exploratory analyses included direct comparative and simulated comparative (generated through PSM of single-arm studies) evidence

Findings:

- Results observed in exploratory analyses were similar to those from the primary analyses

Opportunities and Pitfalls

OPPORTUNITIES

- May offer opportunities to utilize all available evidence
- Useful in disease/treatment areas with many single-arm studies and limited direct comparative evidence and incomplete evidence networks
- Can **up/down-weight** based on study design

PITFALLS

- Sub-optimal matching between single-arm studies limiting the ability to sufficiently **adjust** for cross-study differences
- **Limited** guidance regarding similarity
- **Limited** guidance regarding weighting of **lower quality evidence**

Conclusions

- NMAs typically consider comparative RCT evidence
- In therapeutic areas where RCT evidence is limited, Bayesian hierarchical NMAs integrating non-RCT evidence may allow for a more **fulsome consideration of all evidence and allow down-weighting of low quality evidence**
- Important that studies leveraging this methodology present results in a **transparent manner, including the stratification of results by study design**

References

1. Yang X, Ye X, Zheng A, Huang G, Ni X et al. (2014) Percutaneous microwave ablation of stage I medically inoperable non-small cell lung cancer: Clinical evaluation of 47 cases. Journal of surgical oncology 110 (6): 758-763.
2. American Cancer Society: Key statistics for lung cancer. Updated January 8th, 2020. Available online at: https://www.cancer.org/cancer/lung-cancer/about/key-statistics.html. Accessed: February 24th, 2020.
3. Yabroff, K. R., Lund, J., Kepka, D., & Mariotto, A. (2011). Economic burden of cancer in the United States: estimates, projections, and future research. Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Biomarkers, 20(10), 2006-2014.
4. Ou W, Li N, Wang SY, Li J, Liu QW et al. (2016) Phase 2 trial of neoadjuvant bevacizumab plus pemetrexed and carboplatin in patients with unresectable stage III lung adenocarcinoma (GASTO 1001). Cancer 122 (5): 740-747.
5. Liu H, Steinke K (2013) High-powered percutaneous microwave ablation of stage I medically inoperable non-small cell lung cancer: a preliminary study. Journal of medical imaging and radiation oncology 57 (4): 466-474.
6. Lewis J, Gillaspie EA, Osmundson EC, Horn L (2018) Before or after: evolving neoadjuvant approaches to locally advanced non-small cell lung Cancer. Frontiers in oncology 8 5.
7. Moya-Horno I, Viteri S, Karachaliou N, Rosell R (2018) Combination of immunotherapy with targeted therapies in advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Therapeutic advances in medical oncology 10 1758834017745012.
8. Kang KH, Okoye CC, Patel RB, Siva S, Biswas T et al. (2015) Complications from stereotactic body radiotherapy for lung cancer. Cancers 7 (2): 981-1004.
9. Wegner RE, Ahmed N, Hasan S, Schumacher LY, Van Deusen M et al. (2018) SBRT for early stage lung cancer: outcomes from biopsy-proven and empirically treated lesions. Lung cancer management 7 (1): LMT01.
10. Allibhai Z, Taremi M, Bezjak A, Brade A, Hope AJ et al. (2013) The impact of tumor size on outcomes after stereotactic body radiation therapy for medically inoperable early-stage non-small cell lung cancer. International Journal of Radiation Oncology* Biology* Physics 87 (5): 1064-1070.
11. Parker SM, Siochi RA, Wen S, Mattes MD (2019) Impact of tumor size on local control and pneumonitis after stereotactic body radiation therapy for lung tumors. Practical radiation oncology 9 (1): e90-e97.
12. Kim C (2018) Understanding the nuances of microwave ablation for more accurate post-treatment assessment. Future Oncol 14 (17): 1755-1764.
13. Poulou LS, Botsa E, Thanou I, Ziakas PD, Thanos L (2015) Percutaneous microwave ablation vs radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Hepatol 7 (8): 1054-1063.
14. Palussière J, Catena V, Buy X (2017) Percutaneous thermal ablation of lung tumors–Radiofrequency, microwave and cryotherapy: where are we going? Diagnostic and interventional imaging 98 (9): 619-625.
15. Wolf FJ, Grand DJ, Machan JT, DiPetrillo TA, Mayo-Smith WW et al. (2008) Microwave ablation of lung malignancies: effectiveness, CT findings, and safety in 50 patients. Radiology 247 (3): 871-879.
16. Vogl TJ, Naguib NN, Gruber-Rouh T, Koitka K, Lehnert T et al. (2011) Microwave ablation therapy: clinical utility in treatment of pulmonary metastases. Radiology 261 (2): 643-651.
17. Ahmed M, Solbiati L, Brace CL, Breen DJ, Callstrom MR et al. (2014) Image-guided tumor ablation: standardization of terminology and reporting criteria--a 10-year update. Radiology 273 (1): 241-260.
18. Kim C (2018) Understanding the nuances of microwave ablation for more accurate post-treatment assessment. Future Oncol 14 (17): 1755-1764.
19. Poulou LS, Botsa E, Thanou I, Ziakas PD, Thanos L (2015) Percutaneous microwave ablation vs radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. World J Hepatol 7 (8): 1054-1063.
20. Schmitz S, Adams R, Walsh C (2013) Incorporating data from various trial designs into a mixed treatment comparison model. Statistics in medicine 32 (17): 2935-2949.
21. Austin PC (2011) An introduction to propensity score methods for reducing the effects of confounding in observational studies. Multivariate behavioral research 46 (3): 399-424.

THANK YOU

Rana.Qadeer@Eversana.com