Paper 179-2013

Assessing Drug Safety with Bayesian Hierarchical Modeling Using PROC MCMC and JMP^{\circledast}

Richard C. Zink, Ph.D., JMP Life Sciences, SAS Institute, Inc.

ABSTRACT

Bayesian hierarchical models are advantageous for the analysis of adverse events in clinical trials. First, the models can borrow strength across related events within the MedDRA hierarchy. Second, the models can naturally temper findings likely due to chance. We describe the implementation of two Bayesian hierarchical models (Berry & Berry, 2004; Xia et al., 2010) used for the analysis of adverse events using PROC MCMC. Once models are fit, it is necessary to review convergence diagnostics to ensure that the posterior samples of parameters sufficiently approximate the target distribution. Numerous diagnostics are available within PROC MCMC, and we also present a freely available JMP[®] add-in for MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) dynamically interactive diagnostics, summary statistics and graphics.

INTRODUCTION

The analysis of adverse events is an important part of the safety assessment of any experimental drug or vaccine. Disease severity, trial duration and the number of patients under investigation contribute to the sheer number and variety of events that occur, all of which complicate the statistical analysis of comparing the safety profile of the new treatment to a suitable control. In a Frequentist paradigm, when confronted with numerous tests for adverse events, it is natural and appropriate to apply some form of multiplicity adjustment to reduce the likelihood of committing type I errors. In a superiority trial, type I errors would have us conclude that there is a non-zero difference in adverse event rates between the two treatments when in actuality, there is no difference. However, when it comes to the analysis of safety endpoints, committing type II errors due to low power is as important a consideration as committing type I errors (Berry & Berry, 2004; Crowe et al., 2009). Here, type II errors would have us conclude there is no difference in adverse event rates between the two treatments when a difference truly exists. When faced with a large number of comparisons, the False Discovery Rate (FDR) multiplicity adjustment of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) and the Double FDR method (Mehrotra & Heyse, 2004; Mehrotra & Adewale, 2012) provide a more balanced approach between type I error and power, making them appropriate choices for the analysis of adverse events, and safety endpoints in general.

As an alternative to Frequentist approaches, Berry & Berry (2004) suggest a Bayesian three-level hierarchical mixture model for the analysis of adverse events as a way of coping with multiplicity. To determine whether treatment affects the incidence of a given event compared to control, their logistic model considers and incorporates how treatment affects all events being analyzed, particularly those from the same body system. Fitting such a model using ordinary logistic regression may not be possible since, as DuMouchel (2012) points out, the sparsity of many reported adverse events will likely cause estimation to fail. As a further benefit, the model naturally tempers extreme results that may occur due to the rarity of many events. Xia, Ma & Carlin (2010) study alternate specifications of this model, including a log-linear version that adjusts for the total subject-time at risk.

As Xia et al. (2010) point out, one reason the Berry & Berry model has not been more widely adopted is due to a lack of available software. To remedy this issue, they include code to fit these models using WinBugs software in the appendix of their manuscript. Gemperli (2010) shows how these models can be fit using PROC MCMC of SAS, although his code was written using an experimental version of the software included in SAS 9.2.

In this manuscript, we provide updated code for PROC MCMC to fit the Berry & Berry (2004) logistic regression model and the Xia et al. (2010) log-linear model using SAS 9.3 and SAS/STAT 12.1. Further, we introduce a freely available JMP[®] 10 add-in to assess MCMC diagnostics, generate forest plots of equal-tailed and highest posterior density (HPD) credible intervals, and calculate univariate and multivariate posterior probabilities (Zink, 2012).

We illustrate the use of these models using data from a vaccine trial described in Mehrotra & Heyse (2004). This clinical trial had 148 and 132 subjects in the treatment and control groups, respectively. There were 40 different adverse events reported across eight different body systems. Data are reproduced in the code in the Appendix.

BAYESIAN HIERARCHICAL MIXTURE MODELS

Suppose there are s = 1, 2, ..., S classifications of adverse events, which are often grouped by MedDRA system organ class (SOC). Within each SOC, there are numerous events $e = 1, 2, ..., E_s$ often coded by MedDRA preferred terms. Let Y_{se} and X_{se} be the number of subjects with event e in system organ class s for the Treatment group of N_t subjects and the Control group of N_c subjects, respectively.

For the Berry & Berry (2004) hierarchical logistic regression model, assume $Y_{se} \sim Bin(N_t, t_{se})$ and $X_{se} \sim Bin(N_c, c_{se})$ and define logit(c_{se}) = γ_{se} and logit(t_{se}) = γ_{se} + θ_{se} . The parameter θ_{se} is the log-odds ratio for the treatment effect of event *e* in system organ class *s*.

Assume the following priors:

Stage 1 Priors:	γ _{se} ~ N(μ _{γs} , σ ² _{γs})	$\theta_{se} \sim \pi_s \delta(0) + (1 - \pi_s) N(\mu_{\theta s}, \sigma^2_{\theta s})$
Stage 2 Priors:	$\mu_{\gamma s} \sim N(\mu_{\gamma 0}, \tau^2_{\gamma 0})$	$\sigma^2_{\gamma s} \sim IG(\propto_{\gamma}, \beta_{\gamma})$
	$\mu_{\theta s} \sim N(\mu_{\theta 0}, \tau^2_{\theta 0})$	$\sigma^2_{\theta s} \sim IG(\propto_{\theta}, \beta_{\theta})$
Stage 3 Priors:	μ _{γ0} ~ Ν(μ _{γ00} , τ ² _{γ00})	$\tau^2_{\gamma 0} \sim IG(\propto_{\gamma 00}, \beta_{\gamma 00})$
	μ _{θ0} ~ Ν(μ _{θ00} , τ ² _{θ00})	τ ² _{θ0} ~ IG(∝ _{θ00} , β _{θ00})

Further assume that $\pi_s \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{\pi}, \beta_{\pi}), \alpha_{\pi} \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda_{\alpha}) \ I[\alpha_{\pi} > 1] \ \text{and} \ \beta_{\pi} \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda_{\beta}) \ I[\beta_{\pi} > 1], \ \text{and} \ \text{set} \ \mu_{\gamma 00} = \mu_{\theta 00} = 0, \ \tau^2_{\gamma 00} = \tau^2_{\theta 00} = 10, \ \alpha_{\gamma} = \alpha_{\theta} = \alpha_{\gamma 00} = \alpha_{\theta 00} = 3, \ \beta_{\gamma} = \beta_{\theta} = \beta_{\gamma 00} = \beta_{\theta 00} = 1 \ \text{and} \ \lambda_{\alpha} = \lambda_{\beta} = 0.1.$ The value $\delta(0)$ is a distribution having unit point mass at 0, and I[.] is an indicator function with value 1 if the condition inside the brackets is true, 0 otherwise.

For the Xia et al. (2010) model, let T_{se} and C_{se} be the total time at risk for event *e* in system organ class *s* for the treatment and control arms, respectively. For N_t treated subjects, define T_{se} as the summation of ξ_{sei} for $i = 1, 2... N_t$. Similarly, for N_c control subjects, define C_{se} as the summation of ζ_{sei} for $i = 1, 2... N_c$. The values ξ_{sei} and ζ_{sei} represent the time from first drug exposure until a subject experiences event *e* in system organ class *s* for the first time, or the total time on study if they did not experience the event. In lieu of the binomial assumptions above, assume $Y_{se} \sim \text{Pois}(t_{se}T_{se})$ and $X_{se} \sim \text{Pois}(c_{se}C_{se})$ and define $\log(c_{se}) = \gamma_{se}$ and $\log(t_{se}) = \gamma_{se} + \theta_{se}$. Here, the parameter θ_{se} is the log relative risk for the treatment effect of event *e* in system organ class *s*.

Rationale for assumed priors and constants are provided in Berry & Berry (2004) and Xia et al. (2010), though sensitivity analyses should examine the robustness of findings to alternate assumptions. Model fit can be assessed using the deviance information criterion (obtained through the DIC option in the PROC MCMC statement).

SPECIFICATION OF PROC MCMC

The PROC MCMC specification for the Berry & Berry (2004) hierarchical logistic regression model is contained in the Appendix. The code requests 20,000 samples from the posterior distribution after discarding a burn-in of 2,000 samples. Three separate Markov chains are requested to evaluate the convergence of the chains to the target distributions of the parameters. Unlike the data structures assumed in Gemperli (2010) and Xia et al. (2010), the PROC MCMC specification here assumes each treatment-event combination is a separate row, which is more in line with the vertical structure of many CDISC data standards (CDISC Submission Data Standards Team, 2012). When summarizing data from the AE domain, it is important that rows exist for treatment-event combinations that do not occur so that 0 events are explicitly specified in these cases.

Of particular note when comparing our specification to that of Gemperli (2010) is the use of RANDOM statements that simplify the specification of random-effects. While the RANDOM statement was available in earlier releases of PROC MCMC, this particular code requires SAS/STAT 12.1. Prior to SAS/STAT 12.1, random effects could not be specified as hyperparameters to other random effects. For example,

```
random mu_Ga ~ normal(mu_G0, prec = tau2_G0) subject = s monitor = (mu_Ga);
random G ~ normal(mu_Ga, prec = tau_Ga) subject = e monitor = (G);
```

would not have been previously permitted.

Time at risk was not available for the data described in Mehrotra & Heyse (2004). However, assuming time at risk is available in order to fit the Xia et al (2010) model, make the following modifications to incorporate T_{se} and C_{se} . We assume that the times at risk for each event, similar to the number of subjects experiencing the event, were previously summarized.

```
data ae;
    format term $28.;
    input e s term $ Y X T C;
    datalines;
    ...
run;
data ae(drop = Y X T C);
    set ae;
    count = Y; trt = 1; ntc = 148; risktime = T; output;
    count = X; trt = 0; ntc = 132; risktime = C; output;
run;
```

Further, in the PROC MCMC call change

```
ptc = logistic(lp);
model count ~ binomial(n = ntc, p = ptc);
```

to

```
ptc = log(lp);
model count ~ poisson(mean = ptc*risktime);
```

For either model, several instances of the following WARNING may appear in the log file after the PROC MCMC code compiles:

WARNING: There is still significant autocorrelation after 500 lags, and the effective sample size for the parameter XXXX might not be estimated accurately.

These warnings can typically be eliminated using the THIN=*k* option in the PROC MCMC statement to keep every *k*th posterior sample. However, this is particularly wasteful. High autocorrelation is an indicator of poor sampling efficiency, so unless storage of posterior samples is of concern, the recommendation is to keep all posterior samples.

As a note, parameters whose priors are defined using a PRIOR statement need to be included in one or more PARMS statements. From the PROC MCMC documentation: "Each PARMS statement defines a block of parameters, and the blocked Metropolis algorithm updates the parameters in each block simultaneously." The code in the Appendix assumes one PARMS statement for each parameter, though these statements could have easily been specified differently. The user can examine the section "Blocking of Parameters" in the PROC MCMC documentation for details and recommendations.

As specified, the MCMC macro passes seeds 500, 203 and 140 to PROC MCMC to generate multiple chains. Users are encouraged to choose specific seeds in order to reproduce results. Alternatively, users can initialize parameters within the PARMS statement to evaluate whether parameters converge to the target distribution from extreme starting values. The example "Gelman-Rubin Diagnostics" in the PROC MCMC documentation provides further explanation.

To generate odds ratios or risk ratios within the PROC MCMC call, add the following lines:

array OR_[40] OR_1 - OR_40;

and

OR [e] = exp(T [e]);.

Similarly, indicators variables used to count whether treatment effects meet certain thresholds can be generated:

array IND_[40] IND_1 - IND_40;

and

IND [e] = (OR [e] > 1);.

Here, we have generated indicators based on whether there is an increase in risk for the treatment based on the odds or risk ratio. Remember to add these terms to the MONITOR option in the PROC MCMC statement.

Though PROC MCMC can calculate numerous summary statistics and diagnostics for the posterior samples, we did not include these specifications in our code in order to demonstrate the JMP10 MCMC Diagnostics add-in (Zink, 2012). Only posterior samples from the log odds ratios of the treatment effect $(T_1 - T_40)$ are kept in the output data set for illustrative purposes, though in general, diagnostics for all parameters should be evaluated.

REVIEWING SUMMARY STATISTICS AND DIAGNOSTICS FOR POSTERIOR SAMPLES USING $\mathsf{JMP}^{\texttt{B}}$

Here we describe a freely available JMP 10 add-in for reviewing summary statistics and diagnostics for posterior samples from one or more Markov chains (Zink, 2012). The user must have a free SAS profile in order to download the MCMC Diagnostics add-in. The input data can be from any source (e.g., SAS, WinBugs, BRugs), but it is assumed that the data set of posterior samples is sorted by Markov chain number and iteration (whether provided in the dialog or not), and that each chain has the same number of posterior samples. An example data set is shown in Figure 1, which summarizes the treatment parameters from the MCMC model using data from Mehrotra & Heyse (2004). All credible intervals and diagnostic calculations are performed on samples from the Markov chain that appears first in the data set (here, number 1). Samples from any additional Markov chains are used only to compute Gelman-Rubin diagnostics. Most variables within the data set will represent parameters from the specified model. The dialog can accommodate many parameters at once for analysis, though sets of similar parameters should be submitted so that forest plots of credible intervals are most meaningful.

mehrotra - JMP	Rouin	Cale DOI	Anabas	Greek C	Inical To	olt Addah	ter View	Window	Help														15	0 0
	24		E.s	Fo DA ma	1 1 1	HH	HE III IS	WINDOW .	nep															
mehrotra D	4		chain	Beration	T.1	1.2	1.3	T.4	T.5	т.6	1.7	T.B	т.9	T_10	T.11	T.12	T 13	T.14	T. 15	T_16	T. 17	T 18	T. 19	T_20
	1	1	1	2001	0	0	0	0	0	0.65426	0.554505	0.439765	0.96363	0.740485	0.541719	0.094768	-0.06631	-2.00342	-0.7615	0.843778	0.720198	0	0	1
A	1	2	1	2002	0	.0	0	0	0	0.65426	0.554505	0.439765	0.95363	0.740485	0.541719	0.094768	0	-2.58529	-0.7615	0.843776	0.615917	0	0	
columns (4200)		3	1	2003	0	0	0	0	0	0.65426	0.554505	0.439765	0.96363	0.332625	0.541719	0.094768	0	0.124519	-0.7615	0.843776	0.615917	0	0	0
Heration *		4	1	2004	0	0	0	0	0	0.65426	0.554505	0.439765	1.013573	0.332625	0.541719	0.094768	-0.06631	-1.30784	-0.7615	0.843776	0.615917	0	0	4
T_1		5	1	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0.65426	0.554505	0.296133	1.013673	0.332625	0.541719	0.094768	-0.06631	-1.30784	-0.7615	0.843776	0.615917	0	0	6
T_2		6	1	2005	0	0	0	0	0	0.789719	0.554505	0.296133	1.013573	0.332625	-0.00041	0.094768	-0.06631	-1.30784	-0.0408	0.843775	0.575663	0	0	6
T_3	-	7	1	2007	0	0	0	0	0	0.855442	0.554505	0.296133	1.013573	0.673983	-0.00041	0.094768	-0.06631	-0.95125	1.595271	0.843776	0.575663	0	0	6
T_4	-	8	1	2008	0	0	0	0	0	0.855442	0.554505	0.296133	1.013673	0.673983	-0.00041	0.094768	-0.06631	-0.53485	1.665842	0.151954	0.575663	0	0	6
1_0 T A	-	9	1	2009	0	0	0	0	0	0.692177	0.554505	-0.09467	1.013573	0.673983	-0.00041	0.094768	0	-0.53485	1.000842	0.151954	0.575663	0	0	1
T_7	-	10	1	2010	0	0	0	0	0	0.692177	0.554505	-0.09467	1.013573	0.673983	-0.00041	0.094768	0	-0.53485	1.000842	0.775622	0.575663	0	0	
T_8 .	-	12		2011	0	0	0	0	0	0.692177	0.554505	-0.09407	0.012529	0.073903	-0.46262	0.094769	-0.06621	-0.53485	1.0002.52	0.942266	0.575662	0	0	
	1	13		2013	0	0	0	0	0	0.692177	0.654505	-0.09467	0.912529	0.673983	-0.46263	0.094768	-0.06631	-0 63485	0.997005	0.243256	0.575663	0	0	-
10WS 60.000 -		14	1	2014	0	0	0	0	0	0.692177	0.554505	-0.09467	0.912529	0.673983	-0.45253	0.094768	0	-0 53485	0.676818	0.243255	0.575663	0	0	5
ected 0		15	1	2015	0	0	0	0	0	0.692177	0.462861	-0.09467	0.912529	0.476355	-0.92258	0.094768	0	0	0.676818	0.243256	0.575663	0	0	(
uded 0		16	1	2016	0	0	0	0	0	1.254219	0.462861	-0.09467	0.912529	0.476355	-0.86213	0.094768	0	0	0.675818	0.243255	0.575663	0	0	
den 0 .	110												1											

Figure 1. Posterior Samples from PROC MCMC Using Data from Mehrotra & Heyse (2004)

equal-tailed and HPO credible intervals for a data set containing posterior samples from one or more parallel Markov chains. More Select Columns Cast Selected Columns into Roles Keestion Tra Tra Tra Tra Tra Tra Tra Tra	The MCMC Diagnostics a	add-in calculates c	onvergence diagnost	cs and
samples from one or more parallel Markov chains.	equal-tailed and HPD cre	dible intervals for a	data set containing	posterior
More Sete: Columns into Roles Cast Selected Columns into Roles Renation T-1 T-2 T-4 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-7 T-8 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-2 T-4 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-7 T-8 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-2 T-4 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-5 T-7 T-8 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1 T-1	samples from one or mo	re parallel Markov	chains.	
More Cast Selected Columns into Roles Chain Number Iteration Incade Chain Number Incade Chain Number Incade Iteration Incade Chain Number Incade Iteration Incade Chain Number Incade Iteration Incade Incade Incad Incad				
Select Columns into Roles Chain Cast Selected Columns into Roles Chain Iteration T_2 Iteration T_2 Iteration T_3 Iteration T_4 Iteration T_5 Iteration T_6 Iteration T_7 Iteration T_6 Iteration T_7 Iteration T_7 Iteration Iteration Iteratiteratitera	More			
Columns into Roles Leading Le				
Color Residen Iteration T_1 T_2 T_3 T_4 T_5 T_7 T_5 T_5 T_7 T_5 T_5 T_7 T_10 T_5 T_7 T_6 T_7 T_6 T_7 T_7 T_10 T_7 T_7 T_7 T_12 T_8 T_9 T_7 T_12 T_8 T_9 T_10 T_12 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_12 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_12 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_13 T_10 T_10 T_10 Black/Black Black/Black Black/Black Black/Black	Select Columns	-Cast Select	ed Columns into Roles	
Chain Number d chain 1_1 1_2 1_2 1_3 1_5 1_6 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_7 1_8 1_9 1_10 1_11 1_10 1_12 1_8 1_9 1_10 1_11 1_10 1_12 1_10 1_12 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10 1_10	chain	Iteratio	n Alteration	
T_2 T_1 T_4 T_2 T_5 T_6 T_7 T_6 T_7 T_6 T_7 T_7 T_10 T_7 T_7 T_8 T_70 T_7 T_10 T_7 T_10 T_70 T_11 T_10 T_110 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 T_10 Back/Black Display Display 0	An t	Chain Nu	mber chain	
T_3 T_4 T_5 T_4 T_5 T_6 T_6 T_7 T_8 T_9 T_13 T_8 T_12 Remove Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Black/Black Black/Black Black/Black	AT 2	E		-
T 4 T 3 T 5 T 3 T 5 T 6 T 7 T 5 T 6 T 7 T 7 T 8 T 10 T 7 T 12 T 9 T 13 Remove Stac/Red Blac/Black Blac/Black Blac/Black	AT_3	Paramet	ers T_1	- in
T_5 T_6 T_6 T_6 T_7 T_6 T_7 T_7 T_10 T_7 T_11 T_8 T_12 T_8 T_12 T_10 T_10 T_10	AT_4		47.2	6
T_6 T_5 T_7 T_6 T_9 T_7 T_12 T_9 T_13 Remove Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Black/Red Black/Black	⊿ T_5		T 4	-13
T 7 T_0 7 T_10 7 T_11 T_0 T_12 T_0 Black/Black Remove Black/Black Black/Black	⊿ T_6		T 5	
Image: Second	T_7		AT_6	
T_10 T_0 T_12 T_0 T_12 T_0 T_12 T_0 T_11 T_0 T_12 T_0 T_11 T_0 T_11 T_0 Endot Remove Black/Red Black/Black	T_8		⊿ T_7	
Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Black/Red Black/Black Black Blac	T 10		⊿ T_8	
Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Blac/Red BlackBlack bha 0.05 ull Value 0	AT 11		▲ T_9	
dT_13 * Remove Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Black/Blow ® Black/Black Black/Black	AT 12		T_10	
Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value BituryRed Red/Blue Black/Black Ipha 0.05 Util Value 0	T_13	+ Remov	re	
Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Blac/Red Red/Blue Black/Rack bla Ubla 0.05 Ull Value 0			Decamp.	
Color Preferences for Credible Intervals Above/Below Null Value Bible/Kel Bible/Kel Black/Black Dha 0.05 0				
Bille/NRed Black/Black pla uil Value 0	Color Preferences for Crea	dible Intervals Abov	e/Below Null Value	
Read/Blue Stack/Stack bha 0.05 uill Value 0	Blue/Red			
black/Black Ipha 0.05 uil Value 0	Red/Blue			
leha 0.05 Juli Value 0	O Black/Black			
lpha 0.05 iuli Value 0				
lull Value 0	lpha 0.05	1		
	Iuli Value 0	ก		
		-		

Figure 2. JMP10 MCMC Diagnostics Dialog

The MCMC Diagnostics dialog (Figure 2) displays all of the variables (COLUMNS) of the input data set. The only requirement to run the add-in is that at least one PARAMETER should be specified. In these instances, it is assumed that all samples are from a single Markov chain, and samples will be numbered in trace plots from 1 to the total number of rows in the data set. If ITERATION is provided, trace plots will reflect appropriate sample numbers (say, if burn-in samples were removed). CHAIN specifies a numeric value if multiple Markov chains are generated to assess parameter convergence to the target distribution. COLOR PREFERENCE specifies the color (default Blue/Red) of any credible intervals that exclude the NULL VALUE (default 0). Under the defaults, intervals entirely to the right or left of the null value will be blue or red, respectively. Color can be particularly useful for the Bayesian hierarchical models discussed in this paper. The mixture distribution including a point mass at zero could mean the endpoints of many credible intervals will be extremely close to 0 (meaning no treatment effect), making visual interpretation without color difficult. ALPHA (default 0.05) calculates (1- α)×100% credible intervals for the forest plots.

The add-in generates the MCMC Viewer Window in Figure 3. The Diagnostics Tab provides histograms, density function curves and summary statistics of the posterior samples from Chain 1 for all parameters. Trace plots summarize the behavior of the Chain 1 samples over the iterations and can be used to assess convergence of the chain to the target distribution. Histograms and summary statistics summarize the autocorrelation of Chain 1 posterior samples up to lag 25. If the analysis includes multiple Markov chains, trace plots summarize all chains simultaneously, and Gelman-Rubin Statistics are provided.

The interactivity of JMP is a key benefit of the add-in. The diagnostic output of all parameters except the first is initially collapsed. This output can be opened or closed by selecting the outline boxes in the Tab. By default, a non-parametric kernel density curve is fit to the posterior samples in the histograms. However, the user can add multiple reference lines from the red triangle menu of the histogram (Figure 4). If needed, a partial autocorrelation or variogram summary figure can be generated from the red triangle menu of any trace plot.

The Forest Plots of Credible Intervals Tab provides two figures of 95% credible intervals for the parameters using samples from Chain 1. Figure 5 summarizes equal-tailed credible intervals of the posterior samples. Here, the lower and upper endpoints for these intervals correspond to the 2.5^{th} and 97.5^{th} percentiles of the samples, respectively. Figure 6 summarizes the 95% highest posterior density (HPD) credible intervals, which are the narrowest intervals covering 95% of all samples. For both figures, the mean and median sample values are summarized using circles and diamonds, respectively. Only the intervals for T_17, which corresponds to the adverse event of irritability, exclude the assumed null value of 0. As in Berry & Berry (2004), we can conclude that treatment has an important effect on this adverse event. If needed, the underlying statistics for these figures are a button-click away (Figure 7). Note that PROC MCMC documentation refers to forest plots as caterpillar plots.

The Univariate Posterior Probability Calculator enables the user to define probability statements for the parameters, the results of which are summarized in a table (Figure 8). Ranges can be added manually, or the sliders can be used to select limits which are restricted to the minimum and maximum values of the samples for all parameters from Chain 1. The Multivariate Posterior Probability Calculator lets the user define probability statements that consider two or more parameters simultaneously. Figure 9 illustrates this calculator using only the treatment parameters from the first five adverse events. We calculate the posterior probability that treatment has an undesirable effect (essentially each parameter greater than 0) on astenia/fatigue, fever, infection-fungal, infection-viral and malaise simultaneously as 0.1756. However, since this particular model does not account for the association between different adverse events, this probability may be misleading. The multivariate calculator makes use of the JMP Data Filter to select data table rows meeting the criteria defined in the filter. Alternatively, the user can open the data table and select rows manually, or apply a function to the columns of interest. Once rows are selected, the user can push the Calculate Posterior Probability button.



Figure 3. MCMC Diagnostics Including Histogram and Density Function of Posterior Samples, Trace Plots, Autocorrelation Assessment and Gelman-Rubin Statistics



Figure 4. Adding Reference Curves Interactively



Figure 5. 95% Equal-Tailed Credible Intervals of Posterior Samples



Figure 6. 95% Highest Posterior Density (HPD) Credible Intervals of Posterior Samples

	A 160 0 0.	24 D	På #8	te 7. T	HHE	AD 183 R				
Parameter Means a P	4 .	Anatysis		House	Hadaa	OwnerHar 2.6	OwnerHead 7.6	HDDie	HODEL	
Source		T. d	00000	0.436674	Anequan	Quantity SY.5	0.737003	HPUID	0.603070734700330	
	,	7.0	20000	0.130071	0	0.0520.5	0.757905	0.000000000000000000000000	0.00000101041000000	
		7.0	00000	0.097022	0	-0.05201	0.03102	0.0307032751440456	0.032130014790075	
		7.4	20000	0.137565	0	-0.20773	1.134007	0.210030420300937	1.15600024012085	
		1.4	20000	0.133034	0	0.00404	1.004342	-0.291039219039672	1.01420412420070	
	0	7.4	20000	0.030300	0.075000	0.09404	0.0/1328	-0.0307017940077039	0.002401406/90/00	
	0	1_0	20000	0.4481//	0.375885	-0.17320	1,660610	-0.180799188030081	1.43119111405407	
	/	1_/	20000	0.234540	0.049902	-0.05747	1,335217	-0.641957492200583	1.34570853473564	
	8	1_8	20000	0.254358	0.108893	-0.5761	1.316563	-0.574691639597418	1.3165630239439	
		1_9	20000	0.538148	0.563526	0	1.333074	-0.00273054680905195	1,23508951745542	
	10	T_10	20000	0.258085	0.102074	-0.57219	1,294413	-0.51816068563349	1.31924607447437	
Columns (B/0)	11	1_11	20000	-0.20209	0	-1.31557	0.583889	-1.17075077688419	0.686735646758111	
Analysis Columns A *	12	T_12	20000	0.0675	0	-0.45066	0.623215	-0.407259592668764	0.658666339756232	
N	13	T_13	20000	0.067402	0	-0.72517	1.045698	-0.723500205546046	1.04569847095843	
Mean	14	T_14	20000	-0.92104	-0.34135	-4.47155	0,41779	-4.00693497725861	0.559606732023381	
Median	15	T_15	20000	0.628018	0.610619	-0.53054	1.849169	-0.561945466271832	1.7897370725166	
Quantiles2.5	16	T_16	20000	0.352442	0.364794	-0.88057	1.485965	-0.720619223222244	1.56225049273973	
Quantiles97.5	17	T_17	20000	0.737514	0.74419	0.141497	1.201507	0.267398368806429	1.26572313183737	
HPDIo	18	T_18	20000	0.03511	0	0	0.649052	-0.0124475700054847	0.514473509452799	
HPDhi	19	T_19	20000	0.026778	0	0	0.510644	0	0.480116515059389	
	20	T_20	20000	0.007739	0	-0.16234	0.381522	-0.257714300938831	0.240745749849465	
	- 21	T_21	20000	0.037254	0	0	0.580887	-0.0450615065919513	0.41300352940509	
	22	T_22	20000	0.032759	0	0	0.526673	-0.00335761630149445	0.376586573524143	
	23	T_23	20000	0.018374	0	-0.10458	0.536428	-0.15646312778027	0.398847939369827	
	24	T_24	20000	0.029437	0	0	0.487173	-0.00287656849010254	0.330074756507303	
	25	T_25	20000	0.01954	0	0	0.377265	-0.0242144829180627	0.293929122366365	
	26	T_26	20000	0.029457	0	0	0.574616	-0.0759852754184344	0.422036964325229	
	27	T_27	20000	0.021908	0	-0.05049	0.505356	-0.103068185471586	0.447242438802888	
Rows	28	T_28	20000	0.027185	0	0	0.507827	-0.0959039884406869	0.330376580176116	
i rows 40	29	T_29	20000	0.807838	0.819553	-0.12177	1.848174	-0.103926849806045	1.85407416764919	
elected 0	30	T_30	20000	0.567205	0.571394	-0.46366	1.604186	-0.403684844929346	1.63562158702412	
kouded 0	31	T_31	20000	0.485103	0.500649	-0.62463	1.524142	-0.59329476604338	1.52733968133498	
Labelled 0	32	T_32	20000	1.27065	1.31815	0	2.337149	0	2.15892155865355	
	33	T_33	20000	0.881454	0.909921	0	1.901183	-0.0183899735431964	1.8576416009047	
	34	T 34	20000	1.090932	1.139222	0	2,110923	0	1.9892227831458	
	35	T 35	20000	0.669457	0.688364	-0.25166	1.709991	-0.210929277211261	1.7205752701421	
	36	T 35	20000	0.127159	0.135409	-1.2477	1,188244	-1.12356157075831	1,27327275836833	
	37	T 37	20000	0.300374	0.296635	-0.91808	1.324771	-0.787015232014812	1.43126171842898	
	34	T 38	20000	-0.15136	0	+1.51862	0.324995	-1.35022100226399	0.429154706576014	
	10	T 39	20000	0.066928	0	-0.20822	0.761092	-0 303849557409088	0.632854951041647	
	40	T 40	20000	-0.02831	0	-0.9363	0.652496	-0.920688384073669	0.653014054773487	
		1000								

Figure 7. Data Table of Parameter Means and Credible Intervals of Chain 1

Define probability statement to apply to all parameters individually using posterior samples from Chain 1. e Parameter 0 0 < ◎ < --ft Calculate Posterior Probability Posterior Probabilities Posterior Parameter Probability 0.98605 T_1 T_2 0.96235 T_3 T_4 T_5 T_6 T_7 T_8 0.93925 0.9395 0 94525 0.94675 0.81615 0.8285 T_9 0.9951 T_10 0.8376 T_11 0.50795 T_12 T_13 T_14 0.7304 0.86185 0.4478 T_15 0.8611 T_16 0.74695 T_17 0.99945 T_18 0.98395 T_19 0.9786 T_20 0.9611 * p(0<Parameter<=3.63764658079003)

Figure 8. Univariate Probability Calculator

Define probability statement using posterior samples from Chain 1. In lieu of using data filter to select records, open the data table to select rows using Row Selection submenu under Rows menu.



Figure 9. Multivariate Probability Calculator

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we summarized two Bayesian three-level hierarchical mixture models for the analysis of adverse events and provided PROC MCMC code using SAS 9.3 and SAS/STAT 12.1 software (Berry & Berry, 2004; Xia et al., 2010). Further, we demonstrated the flexibility of JMP for reviewing posterior samples from models fit using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (Zink, 2012). Though the models described here only consider a single study comprising two treatment arms, the PROC MCMC specification provided can be extended to include additional treatment arms or effects to account for multiple studies. These hierarchical models will be included in a future release of JMP Clinical.

The models as defined utilize summary statistics at the event level and do not explicitly model the association among adverse events. If interested, the reader can review the multivariate Bayesian logistic regression model of DuMouchel (2012) for an example of hierarchical models that take advantage of subject-level data. However, one benefit of relying on data summarized at the event level is that it is straightforward to model a mixture of ongoing trials and data from trials taken from the literature.

REFERENCES

Benjamini, Y & Hochberg, Y. (1995). "Controlling the False Discovery Rate: a Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B: Statistical Methodology* 57: 289–300.

Berry, SM & Berry, DA. (2004). "Accounting for Multiplicities in Assessing Drug Safety: A Three-Level Hierarchical Mixture Model." *Biometrics* 60: 418-426.

CDISC Submission Data Standards Team. (2012). "Study Data Tabulation Model, Version 3.1.3" Round Rock, TX: Clinical Data Interchange Standards Consortium. Available for download: <u>http://www.cdisc.org/sdtm</u>

Crowe, BJ, Xia, HA, Berlin, JA, Watson, DJ, Shi, H, Lin, SL, Kuebler, J, Schriver, RC, Santanello, NC, Rochester, G, Porter, JB, Oster, M, Mehrotra, DV, Li, Z, King, EC, Harpur, ES & Hall, DB. (2009). "Recommendations for Safety Planning, Data Collection, Evaluation and Reporting During Drug, Biologic and Vaccine Development: a Report of the Safety Planning, Evaluation, and Reporting Team." *Clinical Trials* 6: 430-440.

DuMouchel, W. (2012). "Multivariate Bayesian Logistic Regression for Analysis of Clinical Study Safety Issues." *Statistical Science* 27: 319–339.

Gemperli, A. (2010). "Safety Analysis Using Bayesian Simulation Methods in SAS[®] 9.2." *Pharmaceutical Programming* 3: 29-36.

Mehrotra, DV & Heyse, JF. (2004). "Use of the False Discovery Rate for Evaluating Clinical Safety Data." *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 13: 227-238.

Mehrotra, DV & Adewale, AJ. (2012). "Flagging Clinical Adverse Experiences: Reducing False Discoveries Without Materially Compromising Power for Detecting True Signals." *Statistics in Medicine* 31: 1918–1930.

Xia, HA, Ma, H & Carlin, BP. (2011). "Bayesian Hierarchical Modeling for Detecting Safety Signals in Clinical Trials." *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* 21: 1006-1029.

Zink, RC. (2012). MCMC Diagnostics Add-in for JMP 10. Available for download (must have free SAS profile): <u>http://support.sas.com/demosdownloads/downarea_t4.jsp?productID=111697&jmpflag=N</u>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the following individuals for their valuable feedback and suggestions: Fang K. Chen, Haijun Ma, Arati Mejdal, Kelci Miclaus and Amy Xia.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Your comments and questions are valued and encouraged. Contact the author at:

Name: Richard C. Zink, Ph.D. Enterprise: JMP Life Sciences, SAS Institute Inc. Address: SAS Campus Drive City, State ZIP: Cary, North Carolina 27513 E-mail: <u>richard.zink@jmp.com</u> Web: <u>http://www.jmp.com/lifesciences-resources/</u> Blog: <u>http://blogs.sas.com/content/jmp/author/rizink/</u> Twitter: <u>@rczink</u>

SAS and all other SAS Institute Inc. product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of SAS Institute Inc. in the USA and other countries. ® indicates USA registration.

Other brand and product names are trademarks of their respective companies.

APPENDIX: PROC MCMC CODE

run;

```
macro MCMC(suffix = , seed = );
  %let mu GOO = 0; %let mu TOO = 0;
 %let tau2 G00 = 10; %let tau2 T00 = 10;
 %let A G = 3;
                   \$let A T = 3;
 %let A G00 = 3;
                    %let A T00 = 3;
                   %let B T = 1;
 %let B G = 1;
 %let B_G00 = 1;
                    %let B T00 = 1;
 %let L A = 0.1;
                    %let L B = 0.1;
 proc mcmc data = ae seed = &seed nmc = 20000 dic maxtune = 500
             monitor = ( parms T 1-T 40) outpost = outpost&suffix nbi = 2000;
   *** Treatment Effects for the 40 Adverse Events ***;
  array T [40] T 1 - T 40;
  parms mu G0;
  parms tau2 G0;
  parms mu T0;
  parms tau2 T0;
  parms A P;
  parms B P;
   *** Hyperpriors for Gammas ***;
   prior mu_G0 ~ normal(&mu_G00, prec = %sysevalf(1/&tau2_G00));
   prior tau2 G0 ~ gamma(&A G00, iscale = &B G00);
   *** Hyperpriors for Thetas ***;
   prior mu_T0 ~ normal(&mu_T00, prec = %sysevalf(1/&tau2_T00));
   prior tau2 T0 ~ gamma(&A T00, iscale = &B T00);
   *** Hyperpriors for Pis \overline{*}**;
   prior A_P ~ expon(iscale = &L_A, lower = 1);
  prior B_P ~ expon(iscale = &L_B, lower = 1);
  random mu Ga ~ normal(mu G0, prec = tau2 G0) subject = s monitor = (mu Ga);
   random tau Ga ~ gamma(&A G, iscale = &B G) subject = s monitor = (tau Ga);
  random G ~ normal(mu Ga, prec = tau Ga) subject = e monitor = (G);
  random mu_Ta ~ normal(mu_T0, prec = tau2_T0) subject = s monitor = (mu_Ta);
   random tau_Ta ~ gamma(&A_T, iscale = &B_T) subject = s monitor = (tau_Ta);
   random T1 ~ normal(mu Ta, prec = tau Ta) subject = e monitor = (T1);
   random P ~ beta(A P, B P) subject = s monitor = (P);
   random Bi ~ binary(P) subject = s monitor =(Bi);
  T [e] = (1 - Bi) * T1;
  lp = G + T [e] * trt;
  ptc = logistic(lp);
  model count ~ binomial(n = ntc, p = ptc);
 run;
%mend MCMC;
*** Generate 3 Independent Chains ***;
%MCMC(suffix = 1, seed = 500);
%MCMC(suffix = 2, seed = 203);
%MCMC(suffix = 3, seed = 140);
data out.events(keep = chain iteration T 1-T 40);
 set outpost1(in = ina) outpost2(in = inb) outpost3(in = inc);
 if ina then chain = 1;
 else if inb then chain = 2;
 else if inc then chain = 3;
run;
```