Modeling survival to fully capture value

Scott Ramsey, MD, PhD Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center Seattle, Washington, USA

HICOR

Disclosures

Funding:

AstraZeneca, BMS, Genentech, Kite Pharma, National Cancer Institute, National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute



Heterogeneity of patient populations: a problem for survival modeling



Issues with the standard approach to survival modeling

- Mean OS for cured patients is much greater than mean OS for uncured patients
 - Mean OS for cured patients may exceed the observation period of the study
- Grouping cured and uncured patients together and reporting one mean value for OS does not account for heterogeneity in the population and results in
 - Incomplete assessment of a therapy that cures a proportion of patients
 - Biased assessments of OS

OS, overall survival



H FRED HUTCH

Estimating mean overall survival with survival plateau

Survival curves plateau

Standard approach and previous work

- Mean OS cannot be estimated from an • empirical curve
- Use parametric models to generate tail curve



Mixture cure models: basic approach

- General idea: explicitly model the mixture of "cured" and uncured • patients
- Use regression models to ٠
 - Estimate the probability that a patient is cured
 - Predict the survival of patients who are not cured

Population survival = p_{cured} × survival_{cured} + (1-p_{cured}) × survival_{uncured}

1. Berkson J, Gage RP. Proc Staff Meet Mayo Clin. 1950;25:270-288;

Kuk AYC, Chen CH. *Biometrika*. 1992;79:531–541;
 Peng Y, Dear KB. *Biometrics*. 2000;56:237–243;
 Sy JP, Taylor JM. *Biometrics*. 2000;56:227–236





Example: applying the mixture cure model to the ZUMA-1 trial of CAR T-cell therapy for patients with relapsed or refractory large B-cell lymphoma

- ZUMA-1 trial
 - Phase 2, single-arm, registration study (N = 111) of axi-cel in patients with relapsed or refractory large B-cell lymphoma
 - 54% of the patients achieved a complete response to therapy
 - At 18 months, the Kaplan-Meier estimated rate of OS was 52%
 - Median follow-up was15.4 months
 - Responses were ongoing in 42% of the patients, including 40% with a complete response



axi-cel, axicabtagene ciloleucel; CAR, chimeric antigen receptor; OS, overall survival Neelapu SS, et al. N Engl J Med. 2017;28;377:2531–2544

Methods for fitting Kaplan-Meier curves

- Weibull and lognormal distributions without a cure proportion
- · Mixture cure: weighted average of cured and noncured

 $S(t, x) = S_B(t, x)[p(x) + (1 - p(x))S_E(t, x)]$

- Estimation of $\int_0^\infty S_B(t)dt$ and $\int_0^\infty S_B(t)S_E(t)dt$, respectively
- Percentile-based bootstrap 95% CIs calculated using 1000 bootstrap replicates





Lognormal, Weibull, and mixture cure models applied to the ZUMA-1 trial data vs a Kaplan-Meier curve



FRED HUTCH

OS modeling in the SCHOLAR-1¹ cohort

 We assumed age-matched US general population mortality rates for patients alive at the conclusion of SCHOLAR-1 follow-up (10 years)



OS, overall survival 1. Crump M, et al. *Blood*. 2017;130:1800–1808

Mean OS estimates for ZUMA-1

Summary statistic	Result
Lognormal analysis (without cure modeling)	
Mean (95% CI) OS, years	4.6 (2.3–10.3)
Weibull analysis (without cure modeling)	
Mean (95% CI) OS, years	2.0 (1.5–3.0)
Mixture cure model analysis	
Cure fraction (95% CI), %	50.2% (36.3–64.1)
Mean (95% CI) OS among cured patients, years	28.1 (26.0–30.1)
Mean (95% CI) OS among noncured patients, months	8.2 (7.1–9.9)
Cl, confidence interval; OS, overall survival	HICOR
FRED HUTCH	

When to consider using mixture cure models vs standard models

- · All survival curves have some degree of a tail
- · Based on simulations, there needs to be
 - The possibility of cure: compared with standard models, mixture cure modeling is less efficient and can overestimate survival when there is no cure
 - Sufficient follow-up: Mixture cure modeling is likely to underestimate survival when the true-cure fraction is > 5% and follow-up is < 50% of the time at which 95% of events would have been observed
 - o The smaller the true-cure fraction, the longer the necessary follow-up





🧌 FRED HUTCH

When to consider using mixture cure models in general

- Biological rationale
 - Is long-term remission (ie, "cure") plausible?
- Shape of the Kaplan-Meier curve
 What is the proportion of survivors at the end of the follow-up period?
- Duration of follow-up
 - Shorter follow-up = more uncertainty
 - Rules of thumb?
- · Number of patients in each cohort





Conclusions

- Mixture modeling offers advantages over traditional survival modeling for extrapolation, when treatments produce a clear fraction of patients with long-term remission (ie, "cure")
 - Typically, mean survival estimates with mixture cure modeling are substantially greater than those achieved using standard parametric approaches
- The benefits of mixture cure modeling lessen and errors increase as the "cure fraction" decreases
- To avoid errors in estimation, it is critical to consider the biological rationale, shape of the Kaplan-Meier curve, and duration of follow-up before using mixture cure modeling





THANK YOU



fredhutch.org