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Abstract

A randomised controlled trial (RCT) is accepted as a very reliable way of assessing the efficacy of a treatment. However randomization is sometimes impractical or unethical, especially when assessing the ability of new diagnostic tests to predict the outcome of a treatment if the latter has shown to be superior to placebo already in a previous RCT. Such ‘tests’ may be based on single measurements or multivariable scores. The method described here is based on allocating subjects to a control limb in a predetermined and objective way if the results of the test used to select subjects for the trial are in one range (e.g. on one side of some threshold) and allocating subjects to a treatment limb if the results are in a different range (e.g. on the other side of a threshold). The results are interpreted by assuming that the distribution of baseline test results in those with a subsequent outcome are the same irrespective of whether the subjects with that outcome were in the treatment or placebo limbs. This is described as intervention independent likelihood distributions. The resulting likelihood ratios are then used in conjunction with the odds of an outcome in each limited range to estimate the probability of that outcome in the entire range of test results by using a rearrangement of Bayes rule. The approach is illustrated with data from a RCT where the diagnostic test was the albumin excretion rate, the treatment was an angiotensin receptor blocker and the outcome was biochemical nephropathy. When curves are constructed to show the probabilities of an outcome (nephropathy) on placebo and treatment for each diagnostic test result by using all the data from the RCT and from only the part of the data that would have been available from a ‘separate range’ trial, the results were very similar, the small differences being readily explicable by stochastic variation. Provided that suitable controls are in place, (e.g. ‘blinding’) it appears that a ‘separate range’ controlled trial (S-RCT) can predict the result of an RCT. The approach described here may have many advantages compared to a regression discontinuity design and assessing the predictive power of tests using linear regression.
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1. Introduction

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are accepted as a reliable way of assessing the efficacy of a treatment [1]. It would also be helpful to use RCTs to choose the best tests to identify who could benefit from that treatment and to establish thresholds that reduce the risk of over diagnosis, overtreatment and also under diagnosis and under-treatment [2]. It would be important to do so for new tests that were not available during the RCT that originally provided evidence of the treatment’s efficacy. However, it may not be possible or practical the repeat RCTs in such situations [3, 4] especially if a previous study had showed clear evidence of benefit from treatment compared to placebo.

There are concerns that too little attention is paid to the external validity of RCTs [5]. There is currently much interest in doing so by using ‘real world evidence’ in the form of assessments that do not use randomization [6]. The technique of ‘regression discontinuity’ [7, 8] has been proposed as a method of evaluating such external validity and as an alternative to randomization. However, ‘regression discontinuity’ is based on a non-parametric method that does not involve likelihood ratios which are the conventional way of representing test result performance for use with Bayes rule. Therefore, regression discontinuity has limitations when no single threshold can be used as a reason to begin treatment so that the rule for doing so is ill-defined or ‘fuzzy’ [7, 8].

This study explored a parametric method of allocating patients to a treatment or control that does not involve randomization. It involves allocating subjects to a control limb in a predetermined and objective way if the baseline results of the test used to select subjects for the trial are in one range (e.g. on one side of some threshold) and allocating subjects to a treatment limb if the results are in a different range (e.g. on the other side of a threshold). The interpretation of the results is based on an ‘assumption of intervention independent distributions’ in that the distribution of baseline test results in those with each outcome are the same irrespective of whether the subjects with that outcome were in the intervention or control limb.

The ‘assumption of intervention independent distributions’ is already the tacit assumption currently used to estimate an individual’s absolute risk reduction from a relative risk or odds ratio and individual baseline risk [2]. The resulting likelihood ratio is then used in conjunction with the proportion with an outcome in a specified range to estimate the proportion with that outcome throughout the entire range of tests results by using a rearrangement of Bayes rule. This approach might be used to assess tests for selecting patients for the treatment and also to reassess treatment efficacy. This result of this proposed method will be compared the result of a conventional RCT to see if the result of the former can predict the result of latter.
Methods

The data used to compare the result of randomizing patients to treatment and control with allocation based on baseline ranges were from the IRMA II trial [9, 10]. The aim of that trial was to assess the reno-protective efficacy of irbesartan. It was a randomised, placebo-controlled trial. It was conducted in 96 centres and 18 countries in 590 hypertensive patients of either sex, aged 30 to 70 years, and with Type 2 diabetes and persistent micro-albuminuria. A total of 1,469 patients were eligible after the enrolment visit. This visit was followed by a three-week run-in (screening) period, during which all antihypertensive treatment was discontinued. The BP was measured every week, and overnight urine specimens were obtained for the measurement of albumin concentrations on three consecutive days at the end of the three-week run-in period. Patients were selected if they had persistent hypertension and persistent albuminuria, defined as an albumin excretion rate of 20 to 200 mcg/minute in two out of three consecutive overnight urine samples. Persistent hypertension was defined as a mean systolic BP >135 mmHg or a mean diastolic BP >85 mmHg, or both, in at least two out of three consecutive readings obtained one week apart during the run-in period. Diabetic nephropathy was regarded as persistent macro-albuminuria, defined as an albumin excretion rate of over 200 mcg/minute in at least two successive samples, and an increase of at least 30% from baseline. A total of 590 of the 1,469 screened patients were randomised to groups of placebo, irbesartan 150 mg daily and irbesartan 300 mg daily, then followed-up at 3, 6, 12, 18 and 22 to 24 months. If the BP of any of the patients in the trial rose out of control after starting treatment, further antihypertensive treatment was added in the form of a diuretic, beta-blocker or non-dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker.

2. Analysis of results

The object of the analysis was to show that the partial data from a so-called ‘separate range’ controlled trial (SCT) that was not based on randomisation can provide enough information to come to the same conclusion as the greater amount of data provided by a RCT when assessing the ability of diagnostic tests to predict probable treatment outcome. However, in order to maximise the amount of data analysed the two ranges chosen for this particular analysis were adjacent. The first range was an AER up to the threshold of 80mcg/min and the second range was over the threshold of 80mcg/min. In order to perform the calculations we have to establish the following:

i. The proportions of patients with an AER up to 80mcg/min at the beginning of the trial who later develop nephropathy after 2 years of taking placebo

ii. The proportion of those with AERs over 80mcg/min at the beginning of the trial who later develop nephropathy after 2 years of taking irbesartan

iii. In those with an AER up to 80mcg/min at the beginning of the trial and taking placebo, the AER values in those who do and do not develop nephropathy within 2 years

iv. In those with an AER over 80mcg/min at the beginning of the trial and taking irbesartan, the AER values in those who do and do not develop nephropathy within 2 years

From the above and by applying a Bayes rule re-arrangement and the ‘assumption of intervention independent distributions’ we estimate the following:

A. The proportion with nephropathy after 2 years in all those in the placebo limb of the original RCT (i.e. with an AER from 20 to200mcg/min)

B. The proportion with nephropathy after 2 years in all those in the irbesartan limbs of the original RCT (i.e. with an AER from 20 to200mcg/min)
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C. The distribution of AER results at the beginning of the trial in those with and without the outcome of nephropathy by combining the data from (iii) and (iv) above.

3. **The assumption of intervention independent distributions**

The assumption of intervention independent distributions is that the frequency or distribution of test results observed at the beginning of a RCT in those with or without a target outcome is the same irrespective of whether they are on different interventions (e.g. treatment or on placebo). This is the underlying assumption that is made to calculate absolute risk reductions based on a particular baseline risk or probability from an observed average risk reduction or the odds ratio in a RCT [2]. A well known example is applying the average risk reduction in patients participating in a RCT on statins to patients with different baseline risks of cardio-vascular disease. This is based on an assumption that the relative risk is constant for all baseline probabilities. However, this is not true. Provided that the assumption of intervention independent likelihoods is valid, then it is the odds ratio that will be constant for all baseline odds not the relative risk. The relative risk provides a good approximation to the odds ratio only when it is based on very low proportions from a RCT and also when it only applied to baseline probabilities that are also low [2, 11].

A possible explanation for the assumption of intervention independent distributions is that a treatment reduces the number of patients with the target outcome equally along its distribution range so that the distribution of test results in those subjects being removed by treatment from a disease group are similar to those in the group originally (and also those left behind). Because of this, the shape of the distribution, its mean and standard deviation are assumed to remain the same. Those subjects that leave the target population with treatment move into the non-target population (e.g. those without nephropathy). The latter population is typically large and will be little changed by the ‘influx’ of subjects that have left the disease outcome because of treatment. Consequently, mean and standard deviation of results in the ‘non-disease’ outcome stays roughly the same.

The assumption of intervention independent distributions could be tested in an original RCT to assess efficacy of a treatment and if it appears to hold true, be applied to subsequent non-randomised studies used to explore the external validity of the original RCT or the effect of using different baseline measurements on estimating the probabilities of the outcome for different baseline results. If the assumption of intervention independent distributions did not apply strongly then it might be possible to use a correction factor for subsequent non-randomised studies of effectiveness of a treatment.

A corollary of this assumption of intervention independent distributions is that if we dichotomise the data into ‘low’ (e.g. from patients with an AER up to 80mcg/min and ‘high’ (e.g. from those with an AER above 80mcg/min), then the likelihood of a ‘high’ and ‘low’ AER should also be the same in those on treatment or placebo (or some other ‘control’ treatment). This in turn implies that the difference in response rate will be due to the effect of different treatments creating different ‘prior’ probabilities of the outcome (e.g. the prior probability of nephropathy on placebo before taking an initial AER level into account).
4. Results
The numbers developing persistent macro-albuminuria or ‘nephropathy’ up to 24 months on placebo and irbesartan 150mg and 300mg daily in the randomised IRMA2 RCT are shown in table 1.

Table 1 Proportion of patients developing nephropathy at 24 months on different treatments after starting from different baseline urinary albumin excretion rates (AERs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline AER</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>Irbesartan 150mg daily</th>
<th>Irbesartan 300mg daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161 to 200 μg/minute</td>
<td>2/7 = 28.57%</td>
<td>4/13 = 30.77%</td>
<td>1/2 = 50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 to 160 μg/minute</td>
<td>9/23 = 39.13%</td>
<td>3/16 = 18.75%</td>
<td>0/11 = 0.00%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 to 120 μg/minute</td>
<td>9/32 = 28.13%</td>
<td>7/33 = 21.12%</td>
<td>4/37 = 10.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 80 μg/minute</td>
<td>9/57 = 15.79%</td>
<td>5/66 = 7.58%</td>
<td>4/74 = 5.41%†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 μg/minute</td>
<td>1/77 = 1.30%</td>
<td>0/59 = 0%</td>
<td>1/68 = 1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All: 20 to 200 μg/minute</td>
<td>30/196 = 15.30%</td>
<td>19/187 = 10.16%</td>
<td>10/192 = 5.21%#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Likelihood distributions
It is well recognised that the AER distribution is skewed with a long tail for higher values. However, the logs of the AER values appear symmetrical and can be modelled with the normal distribution. The means and standard deviations of the natural log of the AER in patients with and without nephropathy who were taking placebo and irbesartan and various combinations of these groups are shown in table 2.

Table2: The means and standard deviations of the natural log of the AER (mean of three collection results) in those with and without nephropathy on placebo, irbesartan and combinations of these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placebo in AER in range of 20 to 200mcg/min</th>
<th>Irbesartan in AER range of 20 to 200mcg/min</th>
<th>Placebo and Irbesartan in AER range 20 to 200mcg/min</th>
<th>Placebo with AER≤80mcg/min &amp; Irbesartan with AER &gt; 80mcg/min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ln(AER)</td>
<td>Ln(AER)</td>
<td>Ln(AER)</td>
<td>Ln(AER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPHROPATHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO NEPHROPATHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the mean and standard deviations of the AER in those with nephropathy and no nephropathy are similar for all four subgroups. This is in keeping with the assumption that the distribution in these groups is not affected by the fact that the group was on active treatment or control. The distribution of the AER in those with no nephropathy was identical in each column at 3.65 and 0.91 respectively. This was because the distribution in each case was based on entire
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population of 1,469 patients with diabetes who were considered for the trial and little affected by the ‘addition’ of patients who were prevented from developing nephropathy.

6. Dichotomous observations

The principle of a treatment-independent likelihood distributions of results in those with and without an outcome irrespective of whether the patient was on a placebo or treatment can be applied to a dichotomous observation (e.g. that the AER was greater than 80mcg/min. Table 3 shows that the likelihood is much the same for the four different categories. Thus the likelihood of an AER >80mcg/min at the beginning of the study conditional on the presence of nephropathy at 24 months is 0.655 to 0.667 in all four categories in table 3. Similarly the likelihood of an AER ≤80mcg/min at the beginning of the study conditional on the presence of absence of nephropathy at 24 months is 0.253 to 0.275 in all four categories.

Table 3: The likelihood of observing a patient with an AER over 80mcg/min in various populations taking placebo or irbesartan 150mg or 300mg daily

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In those taking Placebo in entire AER range</th>
<th>In those taking Irbesartan in entire AER range</th>
<th>In those taking Placebo or Irbesartan in entire AER range</th>
<th>In those taking Placebo with AER≤80mcg/min &amp; Irbesartan with AER &gt; 80mcg/min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>If NEPHROPATHY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of AER&gt; 80mcg/min</td>
<td>20/19=0.655</td>
<td>20/30=0.667</td>
<td>39/59=0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No with outcome</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If NO NEPHROPATHY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of AER&gt; 80mcg/min</td>
<td>42/166=0.253</td>
<td>92/346=0.266</td>
<td>134/512=0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No with outcome</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Constructing curves to display the probability of nephropathy conditional on each AER

In order to construct curves to display the estimated probability of nephropathy conditional on each AER we need to know the estimated distribution of the AER in those patients with nephropathy and those without nephropathy. We can estimate these using the means and standard deviations shown in the fifth column of table 2. The distributions are shown in figure 1.

Figure 1: Likelihood distributions of the log AER in patients with and without biochemical nephropathy within 2 years
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We also need to estimate the overall ‘prior’ proportions of patients with nephropathy in those on placebo and irbesartan as shown in the bottom row of table 1. (These overall proportions will be those ‘prior’ to taking into account each AER likelihood ratio in order to create the posterior probability curves showing the estimated probability of nephropathy conditional on each AER). The overall ‘prior’ proportions in the bottom row of table 1 were obtained from all the data in the IRMA2 RCT. The task is to estimate these proportions from the ‘ranges’ of this data as shown in the 5th column of table 3.

8. The Bayes rule rearrangement

According to the assumption of treatment independent likelihoods, the estimated odds of nephropathy conditional on an AER ≤ 80mcg/min when taking placebo (i.e. 10/124 from Table 1) will be equal to the prior odds of nephropathy on placebo multiplied by the likelihood ratio of an AER ≤ 80mcg/min with respect to nephropathy over ‘no nephropathy’ is:

\[(1-0.655)/(1-0.275) = 0.345/0.725 = 0.476 \text{ from table 3).}\]

This means that from the odds version of Bayes rule:

\[10/124 = \text{(Prior odds (Neph|Placebo))}*0.476}\]

If we rearrange the odds version of Bayes rule:

\[
\text{Prior odds of Nephropathy in those on Placebo} = \frac{10/124}{0.476} = 0.169.\]

The estimated prior probability of Nephropathy in those on Placebo is therefore \((1+0.169) = 0.145.\) This estimate is based on only the data that would have been obtained by a non-randomised ‘separate range’ study. It is close to the observed proportion in the complete data set of 30/196 = 0.153 as shown in Table 1. These and the other estimates are shown in Table 4. The estimates from the non-randomised study for irbesartan 150mg daily was 10.4% (observed 10.2% in table 1). The estimate for irbesartan 300mg daily was 4.2% (the observed proportion was 5.2% in table 1) and on 150mg or 300mg daily of irbesartan the estimate was 7.9% (observed 7.7% in table 1). There will be wider confidence intervals for these estimates compared to those observed in table 1 and the resulting curves as they were based on less than all the data that available from the RCT.

Table 4: Estimation of the ‘prior’ probability of nephropathy on placebo and irbesartan based on data from tables 1 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed proportion with Nephropathy in those with:</th>
<th>Conditional odds</th>
<th>Likelihood ratio (from column 5 Table 1)</th>
<th>Estim. odds of Nephropathy conditional on medication</th>
<th>Estim. Prob Neph from separate range data</th>
<th>Observed prob Neph from all data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AER≤80&amp;Placebo = 10/134 10/124</td>
<td>(10/124)/(1-0.275) = 0.476</td>
<td>0.169/(1+0.169) = 0.145</td>
<td>30/196 = 0.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER&gt;80&amp;Irb 150 or 300 = 19/112 19/93</td>
<td>0.655/0.275 = 0.655/0.275</td>
<td>0.0857/(1+0.0857) = 0.079</td>
<td>29/379 = 0.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER≤80&amp;Irb 150 = 14/62 14/48</td>
<td>0.655/0.275 = 0.655/0.275</td>
<td>0.116/(1+0.116) = 0.109</td>
<td>19/187 = 0.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER≤80&amp;Irb 300 = 5/50 5/45</td>
<td>0.655/0.275 = 0.655/0.275</td>
<td>0.044/(1+0.044) = 0.045</td>
<td>10/192 = 0.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The likelihood ratios in the third column of table 4 can also be estimated from the distributions of the AER values in figure 1. The threshold of 80mcg/min corresponds to a ln(AER) of 4.38. The proportion of the area under the no nephropathy distribution below ln(AER) 4.38 is 0.787 when the mean is 3.65 and the standard deviation is 0.913. The proportion of the area under the nephropathy distribution below ln(AER) 4.38 is 0.360 when the mean is 4.45 and the standard deviation is 0.450. These proportions are shown in bold in the third column of figure 5.

Table 5: Estimation of the ‘prior’ probability of nephropathy on placebo and irbesartan based on data from tables 1 and Figure 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed proportion with Nephropathy in those with:</th>
<th>Conditional odds</th>
<th>Likelihood ratio (from tails in Figure 1)</th>
<th>Estim. odds of Nephropathy conditional on medication</th>
<th>Estim. Prob Neph from separate range data</th>
<th>Observed prob Neph from all data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AER≤80&amp;Placebo =10/134</td>
<td>10/124</td>
<td>(1-0.640)/(1-0.213) = 0.360/0.787 = 0.458</td>
<td>(10)/124/(0.360/0.787) = 0.176</td>
<td>0.176/(1+0.176) = 0.150</td>
<td>30/196=0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER&gt;80&amp;Irb 150 or 300 =19/112</td>
<td>19/93</td>
<td>0.640/0.213 = 3.00</td>
<td>(19)/93/(0.640/0.213) = 0.068</td>
<td>0.068/(1+0.068) = 0.064</td>
<td>29/379=0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER≤80&amp;Irb 150 =14/48</td>
<td>14/48</td>
<td>0.640/0.213 = 3.00</td>
<td>(14)/48/(0.640/0.213) = 0.097</td>
<td>0.097/(1+0.097) = 0.089</td>
<td>19/187 = 0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER≤80&amp;Irb 300 = 5/50</td>
<td>5/45</td>
<td>0.640/0.213 = 3.00</td>
<td>(5)/45/(0.640/0.213) = 0.037</td>
<td>0.037/(1+0.037) = 0.036</td>
<td>10/192 = 0.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding overall proportions are shown in the last column and are slightly different from those in Figure 4. This reflects the result of the slightly different assumptions made in the calculations and the small numbers involved when the data for the two different doses of irbesartan are analysed separately.

9. Plotting the probabilities of nephropathy for each AER value for each medication

The estimated prior probabilities allow us to plot the curve showing the probabilities of nephropathy for each AER value for placebo, irbesartan 150 mg daily, irbesartan 300 mg daily and for the combined group of irbesartan 150 mg or 300mg daily. Thus the probability of nephropathy at a value AERi will be 1/(1 + [1/odds Nephropathy] * [1/ Likelihood ratio of AERi for Nephropathy]). The odds of nephropathy used are those from Table 4. The likelihood ratio of AERi for Nephropathy is the ratio of the heights of the curves in Figure 1. In the interest of simplicity, only curves are shown for irbesartan for the combined data for the two doses of 150 or 300mg daily.
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Figure 2: Estimated probabilities of nephropathy after 2 years on placebo and treatment from randomised (RCT) and simulated 'separate range' (S-RCT) controlled trials

There are 4 curves in figure 2. The unbroken curves were calculated using the prior probabilities from table 1 based on all the data from the IRMA2 RCT. The prior probability of nephropathy for those on placebo from the 6th column of table 4 based on all the data from the RCT was 30/196 = 0.153 and for treatment with both doses of irbesartan was 29/379 = 0.077. The unbroken curves are based on all the RCT data and show the probabilities of nephropathy after 2 years of placebo (the upper unbroken curve) and irbesartan (the lower double unbroken curve).

The broken curves are based on the estimated prior probabilities that would have been provided by a ‘separate range’ controlled trial. The upper broken curve was based on the estimated prior probability of 0.145 of nephropathy after taking placebo (see the 6th column of table 4). The lower broken curve was based on the estimated prior probability of 0.079 of nephropathy after taking irbesartan.

The unbroken curves based on the full data from the RCT and the broken curves based on partial data that would have been obtained from a ‘separate range’ trial in figure 2 are very similar. The small differences between the curves depend on the small differences between these ‘prior’ probabilities (of 0.153 compared to 0.145 for placebo and 0.077 compared to 0.079 for treatment) used to calculate them. This is a demonstration of how applying the Bayes rule rearrangement can be used to estimate the result of an RCT from a ‘separate range’ controlled trial. The curves for irbesartan 150mg alone and 300mg alone have been omitted from figure 2. The Irbesartan 150mg daily curve would have been above the irbesartan curve and the 300mg daily curve would have been below it. The small difference between the ‘separate range’ and RCT curves were due to the small differences between the estimated overall proportions of nephropathy on placebo and treatments. These differences can be explained by stochastic variation.

The steepness of the curves in figure 2 depends on the discriminating power of the AER. This is reflected by differences in the means and variances of the two distributions in figure 1. The means of
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the distributions of a diagnostic test in those with and without an outcome will be superimposed if there is no discriminating power. In this situation the curves in figure 2 would have been flat. However, in a more powerful test that the AER, the separation of the means of the distributions will be greater and the curves will be steeper and rise nearer to one.

10. **The difference between the probability estimates of nephropathy on placebo and treatment**

A clinical decision maker would be interested in the difference between the probable outcome of nephropathy on placebo and treatment. This can be found by subtracting the probability of nephropathy on placebo from that on treatment at each AER. A curve displaying the difference is shown in figure 3.

**Figure 3: Difference between estimated probabilities of nephropathy on Placebo and Irbesartan for each AER for an RCT and a Separe Range controlled trial (SRCT)**

![Graph showing the difference between estimated probabilities of nephropathy on Placebo and Irbesartan for each AER for an RCT and a SRCT](image)

The current ‘upper limit of normal’ for an AER is 20mcg/min but figure 3 shows that there is no difference at all between the effect of treatment and placebo at this value. The difference begins to appear at about 30mcg/min and at an AER of 40mcg/min there is a 2.5% absolute risk reduction from treatment compared to placebo on the ‘separate range’ curve and 3% absolute risk reduction on the RCT curve. The maximum risk reduction is about 15% at an AER of 140mcg/min. There is a current view is that patients should be informed of these risk reductions and asked to participate in shared decision making by balancing these risk reductions with the risk of harm and inconvenience of being on long term treatment [12] perhaps with the help of decision analysis. Figure 4 is a calibration curve that allows the differences in proportions responding to treatment over control in a SRCT to predict the result of a RCT.
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Figure 4: Calibration curve that allows the differences in proportions responding to treatment over control in a SRCT to predict the result of a RCT.

The overall proportion developing nephropathy on irbesartan during the RCT was $19/379 = 0.077$ so that the relative risk compared to placebo from the RCT was $0.077/0.135 = 0.57$, the odds ratio being 0.462. The overall proportion developing nephropathy on irbesartan during the ‘separate range’ analysis was 0.079 so that the relative risk was $0.079/0.145 = 0.54$, the odds ratio being 0.506.

11. Internal validity and assessing the assumption of treatment independent likelihoods

The internal validity of the probabilities estimated by the above methods depends on the controls (e.g. blinding of subjects and / or assessors) and also on the assumptions made. The data were analysed ‘as if’ a ‘separate range’ trial had been conducted were part of those used in a RCT and so this aspect of interval validity was the same as for the RCT. The other aspect of internal validity and source of bias is the ‘assumption of treatment independent likelihood distributions’ and that the distribution of the AER in those with and without nephropathy could be modelled with Gaussian or t-distributions using the mean and standard deviations in table 2.

One test of the internal validity of probabilities within a subset is that their average corresponds to the overall frequency of that outcome that they seek to predict in the whole set. For example, the estimate overall frequency of nephropathy after 2 years on placebo was 0.145. For the results of those patients in the original RCT, the average of the estimated probabilities of nephropathy on placebo was a slight overestimate of 0.156. This implies that the assumption of treatment independent likelihood and that the distributions could be modelled with a Gaussian distribution were reasonable but not precisely correct.

Discussion

12. Stochastic variation

The prior probability estimates will be subject to stochastic variation of course. For example, from all the RCT data shown in table 1 the estimated overall ‘prior’ probability of nephropathy in those on
placebo was 30/106 = 0.153, the 95% confidence limits being 0.107 and 0.213. The prior probability of 0.145 from the ‘separate range’ study was based only on part of the data generated by the RCT (i.e. 134 observations) so the confidence limits for the estimate of 0.145 were estimated in turn to be 0.077 and 0.245. This implies that the curves in figure 2 from the separate range study would have wider confidence intervals than those in the RCT. This would also be true for the differences between them as shown in figure 3.

There will also be stochastic variation in the difference between the means shown in figure 1. If the means were the same, then the curves in figure 2 would be flat. If the means were wider apart then both curves would be steeper. The stochastic variation would therefore be seen as a tendency for the probability curves in Figure 2 to ‘rotate’ from being steeper to being flatter. The standard error of the estimated probabilities of nephropathy in the outcome probability curve will be affected by the overall standard error of the prior proportion (e.g. 30/196) and the stand errors of the two mean AER values in those with nephropathy and no nephropathy. The effect on the entire curve in Figure 2 due to changes in the above means and overall proportion can be assessed by recalculating the curve when the means are one standard deviation above the expected mean or proportion.

Subtracting the probabilities along the expected curves in Figure 2 from the corresponding probabilities on the recalculated curve using plus and minus one standard deviation (e.g. of the expected mean for patients with nephropathy) provides the standard deviation of the curve at each point along the curve. If this is done for the two distributions in Figure 1 and the overall proportion allows us to find the variances, adding them and finding the square root of this sum along the entire length of the curve in Figure 2 then this provides the standard deviation for the combined variation. Figure 4 shows these combined standard deviations for the placebo curve.

The probabilities along the curve in Figure 4 can also be interpreted as the estimated proportions observed if a RCT had been conducted on patients at each point. From the estimated standard deviation, we can also estimate the virtual number of observations that would have been made to arrive at the probability at each point. For example at an AER of 110mcg/min, the probability of nephropathy (p) is 0.4 and the estimated standard deviation (SD) is 0.054 so that the virtual number of observations is \( p(1-p)/SD^2 = 81.4 \). By establishing the probability and virtual number of observations for the treatment curve, we can then estimate the confidence interval for the differences between the curves in Figure 3. For the treatment curve at an AER of 110mcg/min \( p=0.233, \text{ SD} = 0.035 \) so that the virtual number of observations is 143.8. This suggests that if an RCT had been done on patients with an AER of 110mcg/min, then the two sided P value would be 2 x 0.004 = 0.008 and the 95% confidence limits on the difference would be 0.040 and 0.294. These P values and confidence limits can be estimated along the length of the RCT curve in Figure 3.

The SRCT was based on fewer observations at the same AER of 110mcg/min. For the SRCT, the probability of nephropathy for the placebo limb was 0.391 and the virtual number of total observations was 71.8 so that the virtual number of the latter with nephropathy was 0.391x71.2 = 28.1. The probability of nephropathy for the treatment limb was 0.220 and the virtual number of observations for the treatment limb was 47.2 so that the virtual number of the latter with nephropathy was 0.220 x 47.2 = 10.4. At an AER of 110mcg/min the virtual one sided P value for the difference between the two virtual proportions of 10.4/47.1 and 28.1/71.8 was 0.0255 and the 95% confidence limits for the difference in proportions were -0.0076 and 0.3344.
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The virtual P values and confidence intervals apply to virtual studies conducted on imaginary patients all with an AER of 110mcg/min. However, if we had an individual patient with an AER of 110mvg/min, then we would have to take into account the precision of that single measurement in order to estimate the probability of nephropathy together with the SD of that probability. In order to do this, the laboratory would need to give us an estimate of the SD of their AER measurement result of 110mcg/min. With this information and the SD of all other AER results between 20 and 200mcg/min, we could calculate the SD of the probabilities of nephropathy for all single AER values between 20 and 200mcg/min.

13. Assessing the influence of a new test on the effectiveness of a treatment

The inclusion criteria for a RCT or SRCT may be a combination of qualitative findings (e.g. gender or a genetic marker) or the dichotomised result of a continuous variable (e.g. a cut-off point for blood pressure, weight, age fasting blood glucose or the albumin excretion rate as in the trial analysed here). These findings often represent diagnostic criteria, the diagnosis being a title to a theory that explains why the diagnostic criteria should be able to predict the outcome of the controlled trial. One or more of the continuous independent variables can also be used as a measure of severity of the underlying disease. It is also common experience that the severity and rate of change of a disease can dictates the effectiveness of the treatment.

Test results that can predict the outcome more accurately will be able improve the effectiveness of the treatment. Thus in Figure 1, if the distributions of the AER in those with and without the outcome of nephropathy were wider apart, then the outcome probability curves in Figure 2 would be steeper and more patients will fall into the ranges that either show a very low probability of benefiting. Excluding these from treatment will allow the proportion benefiting to be greater. If the distributions in Figure 1 were superimposed, the curves would be flat and all patients would appear to have an equal chance of benefiting.

Once the efficacy of a treatment reflected by the odds ratio has been established by a RCT and its selection criteria in one setting it might be assumed that it would apply to any other criteria in any other setting and would thus be transportable. It might then be assumed that in order to assess a test reflecting severity of the condition, all that is necessary is to establish its distributions as in Figure 1. However, it can be seen from Table 1 that the outcome frequency of Nephropathy changes with the dose of Irbesartan. It is therefore not the case that the relative effect in the form of relative risk or odds ratio is constant. The following example shows this.

14. The effect of medication dose on heterogeneity of treatment effect (HTE)

When the dose of Irbesartan was 150mg daily, the proportion with nephropathy was 19/187 = 0.1016 so that the odds of doing so was 0.1016/1.1016 = 0.0922 and when the dose of Irbesartan was 300mg daily the proportion getting nephropathy was 0.0521 so that the odds of doing so was 0.0521/1.0521 = 0.0495. However, the proportion developing nephropathy on placebo was 30/196=0.153, the odds of doing so being 0.1530/1.1530 = 0.13274. The odds ratio for Irbesartan 150mg to placebo would therefore be 0.13274/0.04952 = 2.68. The odds ratio for Irbesartan 300mg to placebo would therefore be 0.13274/0.09223 = 1.44. Both these doses were used in the IRMA2 trial and in order to have a single odds ratio for the trial, the data from both were combined so that the overall probability of nephropathy was (19+10)/(187+192) = 29/397 = 0.07305, so that the odds would be 0.07305/1.07305 = 0.07096, the odds ratio with respect to placebo being 1.97. This was
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the odds ratio used in the above calculations in order to get an ‘average’ representative odds ratio for the IRMA 2 trial as a whole. However, it might be appropriate to create a family of outcome probability curves based on different odds ratios for various doses of a treatment.

This is an example of heterogeneity of treatment effect (HTE) on the relative scale [13, 14]. It would come into play for an individual patient when a prescriber chose one or other of the doses for a patient. The calculation of absolute risk reduction would have to be based on the appropriate odds ratio for the dose as well as the baseline value of the AER. A similar consideration might apply to other treatments. It would also be important to check the odds ratio of a SRCT was performed in a new setting, perhaps when assessing the predictive power of some new test. Although the odds ratio will be constant within each RCT and SRCT, there may well be considerable variation between trials. A meta-analysis will arrive at a mean odds ratio but the variation between the trials studied will give a important insight into their HTE.

15. Modelling the influence of covariates on the disease outcome

The dose of a drug affects the disease outcome partly because of its effect on the drug’s blood and tissue levels. The latter are also affected by the way the body metabolises a drug and this can be affected by the patient’s weight, height, body fat, age, renal and liver disease and other substances (e.g. alcohol). A model of its effect on outcome might therefore incorporate the effect of the latter on the odds ratio. An elevated blood pressure and poor diabetic control as evidence by a high HbA1c could also accelerate the onset of nephropathy. These were brought under control before entry into the IRMA2 trial and if this was not possible those patients were excluded. However, these variables could be combined with the AER to form a nephropathy risk score and regarded as a new test to be assessed as a potentially better predictor than the AER alone.

The potential influence of these variables could be assessed by estimating the mean and standard deviations of each one in those with and without nephropathy. The likelihood ratio can then be determined for each value as illustrated in Figure 1 (or after some other transformation perhaps based on spline functions). Their combined effect could then be estimated for an individual patient by assuming statistical independence and finding the product of all the likelihood ratios. This assumes that the two distributions of the predicting variable (or a transformation such as the natural log of the AER) are normally distributed. Failing this, a spline distribution could be fitted to the data. The estimated posterior probability would have to be calibrated against the observed frequencies of the outcome. Thus would be an alternative approach to a model based on linear regression and an additivity assumption [13, 14].

16. Subgroup inclusion and exclusion and the importance of disease severity

It is important to emphasise at this point that some of the exclusion criteria would have removed patients at risk of harm by treatment with irbesartan. Others may have improved the predictive performance of the AER by removing potentially confounding variables due to the presence of patients without diabetic albuminuria (e.g. proteinuria due to urinary tract infections). This may have increased the baseline AER in patients not destined to develop with nephropathy and increased the mean value of the distribution of AER in those without nephropathy thus reducing its discriminating performance. This exclusion would have been done at the design stage and would not be an example of subgroup analysis as a result of performing ‘one at a time’ analyses post hoc on the data. When applied to an individual patient this process of excluding disease processes that
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would not respond to treatment correspond to the process of diagnosis by elimination which can be modelled with a theorem derived from the extended version of Bayes rule [15].

The choice of AER as the baseline predictor of outcome was made during the study design stage based on strong evidence of the predictive power of the AER in past studies and its adoption as a diagnostic criterion for diabetic albuminuria. It was the only variable tested here for the predicting ability of different values. In this case the AER value was a measure of the severity of the disease of ‘diabetic albuminuria’. Currently, the commonest test used to predict nephropathy is the albumin-creatinine ratio (ACR) but the different ACR values have not been analysed for their ability to predict nephropathy as described here for the AER. It would be interesting to do this using the SRCT design. If this were done during day to day care and using different treatments that prevent nephropathy then the SRCT design would allow the overall treatment efficacy in the form of an odds ratio to be assess for the combinations of treatment and their ranges of different doses.

It is of course a basic principle of medicine that disease severity is an important predictor of disease outcome. Mild disease will often resolve spontaneously due to the body’s homeostatic and reparative mechanisms. Such patients are asked to return if they get worse, given appointments to reviewed or kept in hospital to observe progress. It is when patients have moderate, severe or worsening conditions that this self correction is less likely to happen so that they may benefit from immediate intervention.

17. Survival from the fate of nephropathy and Hazard Ratios

The proportion of patients developing nephropathy would change with time. The overall proportion with nephropathy on placebo in the IRMA2 study at 24 months was 0.153 and without nephropathy it was 1-0.153 = 0.847. The virtual proportions in Figure 2 were also based on observations made at about 24 months. Assuming exponential decay in the proportion surviving with no nephropathy at 24 months then at 48 months survival the proportion without nephropathy would be estimated to be 0.847^2 = 0.717 so that the proportion with nephropathy would be 1-0.717 = 0.283. Similarly by assuming exponential decay the proportion without nephropathy at 48 months on treatment would be (1-0.077)^2 = 0.852 and the proportion with nephropathy would be 0.148. The Hazard ratio for a 24 month interval would therefore be 0.153/0.077 =1.99.

It would be possible to create a family of outcome probability curves at different time intervals. These time intervals could be at intervals of 24 months or fractions of 24 months together with their Hazard Ratios. The estimated proportion without nephropathy after 1 month on placebo would be 0.847^{1/23} = 0.8995 and after 1 month of treatment and subsequent monthly intervals it would be 0.923^{1/23} = 0.9965. The Hazard ratio at monthly intervals would thus be (1-0.8995)/(1-0.9965) = 28.7. The Hazard Ratio diminishes as the interval diminishes so that at 1/24000 of a month, the Hazard Ratio would be approaching a limit at about 30.4. It is therefore possible to provide estimated survival curves with survival proportions at very close intervals.

18. Varying the predicted outcome

The purpose of this analysis is not only to show the effect of a treatment (reflected by the odds ratio between the placebo ad treatment curves (or the relative risk for very low probabilities) but also the shape of the curves and the point at which a clinical difference appears (i.e. at about 40mcg/min in
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figures 2 and 3). This approach can also be used to examine the effect of using different test results, including those based on multivariable analyses and different inclusion and exclusion criteria.

This analysis based on a Bayes rule rearrangement could be repeated for different outcomes (i.e. instead of an AER over 200mcg/min at 2 years signifying ‘nephropathy’, the analysis could be repeated with an outcome of an AER of over 350, 300, 250, 200, 150, 100 and 50mcg/min for example). This would create a family of curves that would represent an overall picture and allow the probability to be estimated of the AER after 2 years falling within any range.


One of the assumptions made during analysis of a ‘separate range’ study design is that the distribution of diagnostic test result in some outcome is the same in those on a treatment or not on treatment. This means that if patients were started on treatments at different diagnostic test result thresholds (e.g. instead of all at an AER of 80mcg/min, some were started at 70, some at 80 some at 90mcg/min etc.) then this would not affect the estimated distributions of diagnostic test result in those with and without some outcome. This is termed a ‘fuzzy’ effect during ‘regression discontinuity’ analyses [7, 8] and impedes its application. This is not the case for the method described here based on an assumption of treatment independent likelihoods and a Bayes rearrangement which can cope with such ‘fuzzy’ data as it is based on the assumption that the distributions are the same irrespective of whether they are treatment or control. However the estimation on the overall or proportions ‘prior’ to knowing the AER result can be estimated from other ranges of data away from the ‘fuzzy’ areas.

The patients and assessors of response in a ‘real-world’ study may not be blinded so that subjectively reported outcomes might be affected by a placebo effect (less so for biochemical and other objective outcomes as in this study). However, the approach could be used to monitor and audit the effect of treatments and diagnostic tests in the community. It could also be used to assess the external validity of an RCT (which is a concern [5]) by observing what happens when a treatment is given or not during day to day care.

20. Conclusion

Provided that suitable controls are in place (e.g. use of placebo arms and ‘blinding’) it appears that a study of this kind might provide an acceptable estimate of the result of an RCT or be a substitute if an RCT is not possible. It might also used to assess the performance of various diagnostic tests in predicting outcomes on treatment and placebo. The approach might be applicable to so-called pragmatic ‘real-world’ assessments or an audit of the performance of tests and treatments during day to day care to assess the external validity of previous RCTs.
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