

On Estimating the Selected Treatment Mean under a Two-Stage Adaptive Design

Masihuddin^{1*} and Neeraj Misra^{2†}

^{1,2} *Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur-208016, Uttar Pradesh, India*

Abstract: Adaptive designs are commonly used in clinical and drug development studies for optimum utilization of available resources. In this article, we consider the problem of estimating the effect of the selected (better) treatment using a two-stage adaptive design. Consider two treatments with their effectiveness characterized by two normal distributions having different unknown means and a common unknown variance. The treatment associated with the larger mean effect is labeled as the better treatment. In the first stage of the design, each of the two treatments is independently administered to different sets of n_1 subjects, and the treatment with the larger sample mean is chosen as the better treatment. In the second stage, the selected treatment is further administered to n_2 additional subjects. In this article, we deal with the problem of estimating the mean of the selected treatment using the above adaptive design. We extend the result of Cohen and Sackrowitz (1989) by obtaining the uniformly minimum variance conditionally unbiased estimator (UMVCUE) of the mean effect of the selected treatment when multiple observations are available in the second stage. We show that the maximum likelihood estimator (a weighted sample average based on the first and the second stage data) is minimax and admissible for estimating the mean effect of the selected treatment. We also propose some plug-in estimators obtained by plugging in the pooled sample variance in place of the common variance σ^2 , in some of the estimators proposed by Masihuddin and Misra (2022) for the situations where σ^2 is known. The performances of various estimators of the mean effect of the selected treatment are compared via a simulation study. For the illustration purpose, we also provide a real-data application.

AMS 2010 SUBJECT CLASSIFICATIONS: 62F07 · 62F10 · 62C20

Keywords and Phrases: Two-stage adaptive design; selected treatment; scaled mean squared error; scaled bias; minimax; UMVCUE; MLE; inadmissible estimator.

*Email : masih.iitk@gmail.com, masihst@iitk.ac.in

†Email : neeraj@iitk.ac.in

1 Introduction

Adaptive designs have a growing importance in clinical drug discovery and development. In clinical studies, multiple new treatments are often of interest for evaluation but, due to limited resources (time, available patients, budget, etc.), only one or two with the best-observed response(s) can be selected for further assessment in a large-scale clinical trial. Two-stage adaptive designs mainly deal with finding a safe and effective treatment among multiple candidate treatments in stage 1 and then validating its properties using an independent sample in stage 2.

For a thorough insightful overview on adaptive designs in clinical trials, the reader is referred to Pallmann et al. (2018). For an extensive discussion on inference procedures in two-stage adaptive designs, one may refer to Bauer and Kieser (1999), Sampson and Sill (2005), Stallard and Friede (2008), Bowden and Glimm (2008), Carreras and Brannath (2013), Kimani et al. (2013), Chiu et al. (2018), Kimani et al. (2020) and Robertson et al. (2022).

In this paper, we consider a two-stage adaptive design comprising two stages with selection of a candidate for the better treatment in the first stage and estimation of the mean treatment effect of the selected treatment in the second stage. It is well known that, using a single-stage data alone, there does not exist any unbiased estimator of the selected mean in many cases. For example, the selected means of normal and binomial populations are not unbiasedly estimable (see Putter and Rubinstein (1968) and Tappin (1992)). However, the naive estimates that incorporate data from both the stages can induce selection bias. To overcome this issue, the technique of Rao-Blackwellization can be utilized. Using this technique, the unbiased second stage sample mean is conditioned on a complete-sufficient statistic. As a result, a uniformly minimum variance conditionally unbiased estimator (UMVCUE) is obtained. An appealing property of the UMVCUE is that it has the smallest variance (or, in other words, the smallest mean squared error (MSE)) among all the conditionally unbiased estimators of the selected mean.

Initially, Cohen and Sackrowitz (1989) dealt with the two-stage estimation of the selected treatment mean under the ranking and selection framework in the Gaussian setting. They separately considered the cases of known and unknown variance. The authors obtained the UMVCUE for the selected normal mean which uses data from both the stages. A limitation of Cohen and Sackrowitz (1989) work is that it assumes single observation in the second stage of the adaptive design. Since then, their work has been extended by many researchers including Tappin (1992) and Sampson and Sill (2005). For the case of common known variance, Bowden and Glimm (2008) extended the UMVCUE to account for unequal stage one and stage two sample sizes, where the parameter of interest is the j^{th} best among the k candidates. Kimani et al. (2013) considered point estimation of the selected most effective treatment compared with a control, after a two-stage adaptive seamless trial in which treatment selection and the possibility of early stopping for futility are available at stage 1. Using a multistage analog of the two-stage drop-the-losers design, Bowden and Glimm (2014) provided unbiased and near unbiased estimates for the selected mean.

In many practical situations, it may not be appropriate to assume the variances of the treatment effects to be known. For the case of common unknown variance, building upon the work of

Cohen and Sackrowitz (1989), we derive the UMVCUE for the selected treatment mean when there are more than one observations in the second stage of the adaptive design. Although, Robertson and Glimm (2019) had claimed that their UMVCUE works for multiple observations in the second stage, their approach is not optimal as they have conditioned the second stage data on a statistic which is not a complete-sufficient statistic. Our extended UMVCUE takes care of this deficiency. We have also obtained a minimax estimator for the selected treatment mean under the scaled mean squared error criterion. This minimax estimator is also shown to be admissible.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce some notations and preliminaries that will be used all across the paper. In Subsection 2.1, we derive the UMVCUE of the selected treatment mean. In Section 3, we prove that the naive estimator, which is the weighted average of the first and the second stage sample means, is minimax and admissible for estimating the selected treatment mean in case of common unknown variance. In Subsection 3.1, we provide some additional estimators for the selected treatment mean. In order to have numerical assessment of the performances of various competing estimators under the criterion of the scaled mean squared error and the scaled bias, we provide a simulation study in Section 4. For illustration, a real data set has also been considered in Section 5 of the paper.

2 Estimation of the selected treatment mean

The notations listed below will be used throughout the article:

- \mathbb{R} : the real line $(-\infty, \infty)$;
- \mathbb{R}^k : the k dimensional Euclidean space, $k \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$;
- $N(\theta, \sigma^2)$: normal distribution with mean $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and standard deviation $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$;
- $\phi(\cdot)$: probability density function (p.d.f.) of $N(0, 1)$;
- $\Phi(\cdot)$: cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) of $N(0, 1)$;
- $Beta(a, b)$: beta distribution with shape parameters $a > 0$ and $b > 0$;
- $B(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}$, $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$, will denote the usual beta function and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ will denote the usual gamma function;
- For real numbers x and y

$$I(x \geq y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \geq y \\ 0, & \text{if } x < y. \end{cases}$$

$I(x > y)$ is defined similarly.

Consider two treatments say, τ_1 and τ_2 , such that effectiveness of the treatment τ_i is described by $N(\mu_i, \sigma^2)$, $i = 1, 2$; where $\mu_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ are unknown mean treatment effects and σ^2 ($\sigma > 0$) is the common unknown treatment effect variance. We define the treatment associated with $\max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ as the better or the promising treatment. We consider an adaptive design which consists of two stages, with a single data-driven selection made in the interim. In the first stage of the design, say stage 1, the treatment τ_1 is administered to n_1 respondents and the treatment τ_2 is independently administered to another set of n_1 respondents. Let \bar{X}_i , $i = 1, 2$, be the sample averages (mean treatment effect estimates) corresponding to the two treatments. For the purpose of selecting the better treatment, we consider the natural selection rule that selects the treatment with the larger sample mean as the better treatment (for optimality properties of this natural selection rule, see Bahadur and Goodman (1952), Eaton (1967) and Misra and Dhariyal (1994)). Let $Q \in \{1, 2\}$ be the index of the selected treatment τ_Q (i.e. $Q = 1$, if $\bar{X}_1 > \bar{X}_2$, $Q = 2$, if $\bar{X}_2 \geq \bar{X}_1$). Treatment τ_Q is then carried forward to the second stage, referred to as the stage 2 of the two stage design, for further analysis. In stage 2, the selected treatment τ_Q is independently administered to n_2 additional respondents. Let \bar{Y} be the stage 2 sample mean for the selected treatment τ_Q . The goal is to estimate μ_Q , the mean effect of the selected treatment. Note that $\mu_Q \equiv \mu_Q(\mu_1, \mu_2, \bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2)$ is a random parameter which depends on μ_1, μ_2, \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2 , equals μ_1 , if $\bar{X}_1 > \bar{X}_2$, and equals μ_2 , if $\bar{X}_2 \geq \bar{X}_1$. Clearly, $\bar{X}_i \sim N\left(\mu_i, \frac{\sigma^2}{n_i}\right)$, $i = 1, 2$, are independently distributed and, conditioned on Q , $\bar{Y} \sim N\left(\mu_Q, \frac{\sigma^2}{n_2}\right)$.

The following notations will also be utilized throughout the paper:

$\underline{\mathcal{T}} = (\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}, S^2)$; $S^2 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{ij}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} Y_j^2$; $\underline{\theta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma)$; $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty)$; $\bar{X}_Q = \max(\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2)$ (maximum of \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2); $\bar{X}_{3-Q} = \min(\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2)$ (minimum of \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2). Also, for any $\underline{\theta} \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{\theta}}(\cdot)$ will denote the probability measure induced by $\underline{\mathcal{T}} = (\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}, S^2)$, when $\underline{\theta} \in \Theta$ is the true parameter value, and $\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}}(\cdot)$ will denote the expectation operator under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{\underline{\theta}}(\cdot)$, $\underline{\theta} \in \Theta$.

In this paper, our focus is on point estimation of the selected treatment mean effect defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_Q \equiv \mu_Q(\mu_1, \mu_2, \bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2) &= \begin{cases} \mu_1, & \text{if } \bar{X}_1 \geq \bar{X}_2 \\ \mu_2, & \text{if } \bar{X}_1 < \bar{X}_2 \end{cases}, \\ &= \mu_1 I(\bar{X}_1 \geq \bar{X}_2) + \mu_2 I(\bar{X}_2 > \bar{X}_1), \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

under the scaled squared error loss function

$$L_{\underline{\mathcal{T}}}(\underline{\theta}, a) = \left(\frac{a - \mu_Q}{\sigma}\right)^2, \quad \underline{\theta} \in \Theta, \quad a \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.2)$$

It is worth mentioning here that the statistic $\left(\frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, S^2, Q\right)$ is minimal sufficient but not complete. However, given Q , the statistic $\left(\frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, S^2\right)$ is a complete-sufficient statistic. Consequently, $\underline{\mathcal{T}} = (\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}, S^2)$ is a sufficient statistic and μ_Q depends on obser-

variations only through \underline{T} . Therefore, we may restrict our attention to only those estimators that depend on observations only through \underline{T} (see Misra and Singh (1993)).

Under the scaled squared error loss function (2.2), the risk function (also referred to as the scaled mean squared error) of an estimator $d(\underline{T})$ is defined by

$$R(\underline{\theta}, d) = \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}} \left(\frac{d(\underline{T}) - \mu_Q}{\sigma} \right)^2, \quad \underline{\theta} \in \Theta.$$

Suppose, we have a prior distribution (density) Π on Θ . Then, the Bayes risk of an estimator d , with respect to the prior, Π is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} r(\Pi, d) &= \mathbb{E}_{\Pi} (R(\underline{\theta}, d)) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \int_{\zeta} L_T(\underline{\theta}, d(\underline{t})) f(\underline{t}|\underline{\theta}) \Pi(\underline{\theta}) d\underline{t} d\underline{\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where ζ denotes the support of \underline{T} .

An estimator d_{Π} that minimizes the Bayes risk $r(\Pi, d)$, among all estimators d of μ_Q , is called a Bayes estimator with respect to the prior Π .

An estimator $d(\underline{T})$ is said to be conditionally unbiased, if

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}}((d(\underline{T})|Q = q)) = \mu_q, \quad \forall \underline{\theta} \in \Theta.$$

A naive estimator for estimating the mean effect of the selected treatment μ_Q is the weighted average of the sample means at the two stages, i.e.

$$d_M(\underline{T}) = \frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}. \quad (2.3)$$

Clearly, $d_M(\underline{T})$ is the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of μ_Q .

In the following subsection, the UMVCUE of the selected treatment mean μ_Q is derived under the assumption that the common variance is unknown.

2.1 The extended UMVCUE

Theorem 2.1. *The two-stage UMVCUE of μ_Q , given Q , is*

$$d_U(\underline{T}) = \frac{Z}{n_1 + n_2} - \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{n_2(n_1 + n_2)}} \tilde{S} \frac{(1 - V^{*2})^c}{2^{2c} c B(c, c) I_{c,c} \left(\frac{V^{*+1}}{2} \right)}, \quad (2.4)$$

where, $Z = n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}$, $V = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{n_1(n_1+n_2)}{n_2}}}{\tilde{S}} \left(\frac{Z}{n_1+n_2} - \bar{X}_{3-Q} \right)$, $V^* = \min\{V, 1\}$,

$$\tilde{S}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} X_{ij}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} Y_j^2 - (n_1 + n_2) \left(\frac{Z}{n_1+n_2} \right)^2 - n_1 \bar{X}_{3-Q}^2, \quad c = \frac{2n_1+n_2-3}{2},$$

$I_{c,c}(u)$ is the cumulative distribution function of a Beta(c, c) distribution and $B(c, c) = \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(2c)}$, $c > 0$, is the usual beta function.

Proof. Let $\underline{S} = (\underline{X}_1, \underline{X}_2, \underline{Y})$ denote the vector of $n = 2n_1 + n_2$ sample observations of stage 1 and stage 2, combined. Then, the joint probability density function (p.d.f.) of \underline{S} , given $Q = q$, based on the first and second stage data can be written as

$$f_q(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \underline{y} | \underline{\theta}) \propto \exp \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} x_{qj} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} y_j \right] \mu_q + \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} x_{(3-q)j}}{\sigma^2} \mu_{3-q} - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} x_{qj}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} x_{(3-q)j}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} y_j^2 \right] \right).$$

From the expression of the joint density $f_q(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \underline{y} | \underline{\theta})$, we observe that, given Q , the statistic $(Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2)$ is a complete-sufficient statistic. Since, given Q , \bar{Y} is an unbiased estimator of μ_Q , the UMVCUE of μ_Q is the Rao-Blackwellization of \bar{Y} , conditional on the complete-sufficient statistic $(Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2)$. Therefore, the required UMVCUE of the selected mean μ_Q , is $\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}} \left(\bar{Y} \mid (Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2, Q) \right)$.

Define,

$$U = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{n_2(n_1+n_2)}{n_1}} \left(\bar{Y} - \frac{Z}{n_1+n_2} \right)}{\tilde{S}}.$$

In order to show that the UMVCUE is the same as (2.4), it requires to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}} \left(U \mid (Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2) \right) = -\frac{(1 - V^{*2})^c}{2^{2c} c B(c, c) I_{c,c} \left(\frac{V^{*+1}}{2} \right)}. \quad (2.5)$$

To establish (2.5), we need to obtain the conditional p.d.f. of U given $(Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2, Q)$.

Note that, on rearrangement of the terms in the expression of \tilde{S}^2 , we can write the expression of U^2 as

$$U^2 = \frac{\frac{n_2(n_1+n_2)}{n_1} \left(\bar{Y} - \frac{Z}{n_1+n_2} \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (Y_j - \bar{Y})^2 + \frac{n_2(n_1+n_2)}{n_1} \left(\bar{Y} - \frac{Z}{n_1+n_2} \right)^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

As in Cohen and Sackrowitz (1989) and Robertson and Glimm (2019), it can be verified that the conditional density of U , given $(Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2, Q) = (z, x_{3-q}, \tilde{s}, q)$, is given by

$$f_{U|(Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2, Q)}(u | (z, x_{3-q}, \tilde{s}, q)) = \frac{(1 - u^2)^{c-1}}{\int_{-1}^{v^*} (1 - u^2)^{c-1} du}, \quad -1 < u < v^*,$$

where, for $v = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{n_1(n_1+n_2)}{n_2}}}{\tilde{s}} \left(\frac{z}{n_1+n_2} - x_{3-q} \right)$, $v^* = \min\{v, 1\}$.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}} \left(U \mid \left(Z, \bar{X}_{3-Q}, \tilde{S}^2, Q \right) \right) &= \frac{\int_{-1}^{V^*} u(1-u^2)^{c-1} du}{\int_{-1}^{V^*} (1-u^2)^{c-1} du} \\ &= -\frac{(1-V^{*2})^c}{2^{2c} c B(c, c) I_{c,c} \left(\frac{V^*+1}{2} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the result follows. ■

Now, we will show that the naive estimator $d_M(\underline{T})$, defined by (2.3), is minimax and admissible for estimating μ_Q under the scaled mean squared error criterion.

3 The minimax and admissible estimator

Let $S^{*2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_i)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (Y_j - \bar{Y})^2}{2n_1 + n_2 - 3}$ be the pooled sample variance of the stage 1 and the stage 2 data, and let $W = (2n_1 + n_2 - 3)S^{*2}$, so that $\frac{W}{\sigma^2} \sim \chi_{2n_1+n_2-3}^2$. Suppose that the unknown parameter vector $\underline{\theta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma^2) \in \Theta$ is a realization of a random vector $\underline{P} = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$, having a specified probability distribution function. Consider a sequence of prior distributions (densities) $\{\xi_m\}_{m \geq 1}$, for $\underline{P} = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$, such that :

- (i) for any fixed $p_3 > 0$, given $P_3 = p_3$, conditionally, P_1 and P_2 are independent and identically distributed as $N(0, mp_3)$;
- (ii) the random variable P_3 follows the inverse exponential distribution having the p.d.f.

$$\Pi_{1,P_3}(p_3) = \frac{1}{p_3^2} e^{-\frac{1}{p_3}}, \quad p_3 > 0.$$

Recall that, \bar{X}_i ($i = 1, 2$) is the sample mean of the first stage sample from the i^{th} population and \bar{Y} is the second stage sample mean of the sample drawn from the population selected at the first stage. Then, under the prior distribution ξ_m , the joint posterior distribution of (P_1, P_2, P_3) given $(\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}, W) = (x_1, x_2, y, w)$, is such that:

- (i) for any $p_3 > 0$, conditionally, the random variables P_1 and P_2 are independently distributed as $N(\theta_{1,m}, \tau_{1,m}^2)$ and $N(\theta_{2,m}, \tau_{2,m}^2)$, respectively, where

$$(\theta_{1,m}, \theta_{2,m}, \tau_{1,m}^2, \tau_{2,m}^2) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{n_1 x_1 + n_2 y}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, \frac{n_1 x_2}{n_1 + \frac{1}{m}}, \frac{1}{\frac{n_1 + n_2}{p_3} + \frac{1}{mp_3}}, \frac{1}{\frac{n_1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{mp_3}} \right), & \text{if } x_1 \geq x_2 \\ \left(\frac{n_1 x_1}{n_1 + \frac{1}{m}}, \frac{n_1 x_2 + n_2 y}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, \frac{1}{\frac{n_1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{mp_3}}, \frac{1}{\frac{n_1 + n_2}{p_3} + \frac{1}{mp_3}} \right), & \text{if } x_1 < x_2 \end{cases}.$$

(ii) the random variable P_3 follows the inverse gamma distribution having the p.d.f.

$$\Pi_{2,m}(p_3) = \frac{(v_m)^{\frac{n+7}{2}} e^{-\frac{vm}{p_3}}}{\Gamma(n+7) p_3^{\frac{n+9}{2}}}$$

where, $n = 2n_1 + n_2 - 3$ and

$$v_m = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{w}{2} + \frac{n_1 x_1^2}{2} + \frac{n_1 x_2^2}{2} + \frac{n_2 y^2}{2} - \frac{(n_1 x_1 + n_2 y)^2}{2(n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m})} - \frac{(n_1 x_2)^2}{2(n_1 + \frac{1}{m})}, & \text{if } x_1 \geq x_2 \\ 1 + \frac{w}{2} + \frac{n_1 x_1^2}{2} + \frac{n_1 x_2^2}{2} + \frac{n_2 y^2}{2} - \frac{(n_1 x_2 + n_2 y)^2}{2(n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m})} - \frac{(n_1 x_1)^2}{2(n_1 + \frac{1}{m})}, & \text{if } x_1 < x_2 \end{cases},$$

$m = 1, 2, \dots$

Therefore, under the scaled squared error loss function (2.2), the Bayes estimator of the selected treatment mean μ_Q , w.r.t. the prior distribution ξ_m , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\xi_m}(T) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\frac{P|T}{\sim}(\frac{P_1}{P_3})}}{\mathbb{E}^{\frac{P|T}{\sim}(\frac{1}{P_3})}}, & \text{if } \bar{X}_1 \geq \bar{X}_2 \\ \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\frac{P|T}{\sim}(\frac{P_2}{P_3})}}{\mathbb{E}^{\frac{P|T}{\sim}(\frac{1}{P_3})}}, & \text{if } \bar{X}_1 < \bar{X}_2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{n_1 \bar{X}_1 + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, & \text{if } \bar{X}_1 \geq \bar{X}_2 \\ \frac{n_1 \bar{X}_2 + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, & \text{if } \bar{X}_1 < \bar{X}_2 \end{cases} \\ &= \frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

The posterior risk of the Bayes rule $d_{\xi_m}(T)$ is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} r_{d_{\xi_m}}(T) &= \mathbb{E}^{\frac{P|T}{\sim}} \left[\frac{\left(\frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}} - \mu_Q \right)^2}{P_3} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is independent of $\underline{T} = (\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \bar{Y}, W)$. Hence, the Bayes risk of the estimator d_{ξ_m} is

$$r_{d_{\xi_m}}^*(\xi_m) = \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.2)$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 (ii) of Masihuddin and Misra (2022), we obtain the risk of the estimator $d_M(\underline{T}) = \frac{n_1\bar{X}_Q + n_2\bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} R(\underline{\theta}, d_M) &= \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\theta}} \left(\frac{\frac{n_1\bar{X}_Q + n_2\bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2} - \mu_Q}{\sigma} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, the Bayes risk of the naive estimator $d_M(\underline{T})$, under the prior ξ_m , is

$$r_{d_M}^*(\xi_m) = \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.4)$$

Now, we provide the following theorem which proves the minimaxity of the natural estimator d_M .

Theorem 3.1. *Under the scaled squared error loss function (2.2), the natural estimator $d_M(\underline{T}) = \frac{n_1\bar{X}_Q + n_2\bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}$ is minimax for estimating the selected treatment mean μ_Q .*

Proof. Let d be any other estimator. Since, d_{ξ_m} , given by (3.1), is the Bayes estimator of μ_Q under the prior ξ_m , $m = 1, 2, \dots$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\underline{\theta} \in \Theta} R(\underline{\theta}, d) &\geq \int_{\Theta} R(\underline{\theta}, d) \xi_m(\underline{\theta}) d\underline{\theta} \\ &\geq \int_{\Theta} R(\underline{\theta}, d_{\xi_m}) \xi_m(\underline{\theta}) d\underline{\theta} \\ &= r_{d_{\xi_m}}^*(\xi_m) = \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2 + \frac{1}{m}}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots \quad (\text{using (3.2)}) \\ \Rightarrow \sup_{\underline{\mu} \in \Theta} R(\underline{\mu}, d) &\geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} r_{d_{\xi_m}}^*(\xi_m) = \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2} = \sup_{\underline{\theta} \in \Theta} R(\underline{\theta}, d_M), \quad (\text{using (3.4)}) \end{aligned}$$

implying that $d_M(\underline{T}) = \frac{n_1\bar{X}_Q + n_2\bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}$ is minimax for estimating μ_Q . ■

We will now invoke the principle of invariance. The problem of estimating the selected treatment mean μ_Q , under the scaled squared error loss function (2.2), is invariant under the affine group of transformations and also under the group of permutations.

It is easy to verify that any affine and permutation equivariant estimator of μ_Q will be of the form

$$d_{\psi}(\underline{T}) = \frac{n_1\bar{X}_Q + n_2\bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2} - \tilde{S}\psi\left(\frac{D}{\tilde{S}}\right), \quad (3.5)$$

for some function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $D = \frac{n_1\bar{X}_Q + n_2\bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2} - \bar{X}_{3-Q}$. Let the class of all affine and permutation equivariant estimators of the type (3.5) be denoted by \mathcal{E}_1 . Clearly, the MLE $d_M(\underline{T})$ and the UMVCUE d_U , defined by (2.3) and (2.4) respectively, belong to the class \mathcal{E}_1 .

Next, we will show that the MLE d_M is admissible within the class \mathcal{E}_1 of affine and permutation equivariant estimators. Notice that, the risk function of any estimator $d \in \mathcal{E}_1$ depends on $\underline{\theta} \in \Theta$ through $\mu = \frac{\theta_2 - \theta_1}{\sigma}$, where $\theta_2 = \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ and $\theta_1 = \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$. Consequently, the Bayes risk of any estimator $d \in \mathcal{E}_1$ depends on the prior distribution of $\underline{P} = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$ through the distribution of $\frac{P_{[2]} - P_{[1]}}{P_3}$, where $P_{[1]} = \min\{P_1, P_2\}$, $P_{[2]} = \max\{P_1, P_2\}$.

The following theorem establishes the admissibility of the estimator d_M , within the class \mathcal{E}_1 of affine and permutation equivariant estimators. Since the proof of the theorem is on the lines of the proof of Theorem 5.2 of Masihuddin and Misra (2021), it is being omitted.

Theorem 3.2. *The natural estimator $d_M(\mathcal{T}) = \frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}$ is admissible for estimating the selected treatment mean μ_Q , within the class \mathcal{E}_1 , under the criterion of scaled mean squared error.*

4 Some additional naive estimators and a simulation study

For estimating the selected treatment mean, some additional naive estimators can be obtained by plugging in the estimate of unknown variance σ^2 in the expressions of estimators (δ_0^{RB} and δ_1) derived by Masihuddin and Misra (2022), for the case when σ^2 is known. For unknown variance case, two such naive estimators are obtained as:

$$d_{U_1}(\mathcal{T}) = d_0^{RB, \hat{\sigma}}(\mathcal{T}) = Z_1 + \frac{\sqrt{n_2} S^*}{\sqrt{n_1(n_1 + n_2)}} \frac{\phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{n_1(n_1 + n_2)}}{\sqrt{n_2} S^*} (Z_1 - Z_2)\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{n_1(n_1 + n_2)}}{\sqrt{n_2} S^*} (Z_1 - Z_2)\right)} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$d_{U_2}(\mathcal{T}) = d_1^{\hat{\sigma}}(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{cases} \frac{(n_1 + n_2)Z_1 + n_1 Z_2}{2n_1 + n_2} \left\{ \frac{\Phi\left(\frac{Z_1 - Z_2}{\hat{\sigma}_1}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{n_1(Z_1 - Z_2)}{(2n_1 + n_2)\hat{\sigma}_1}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{Z_1 - Z_2}{\hat{\sigma}_1}\right)} \right\} \\ + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_1 \phi\left(\frac{n_1(Z_1 - Z_2)}{(2n_1 + n_2)\hat{\sigma}_1}\right) + Z_1 \Phi\left(\frac{n_1(Z_1 - Z_2)}{(2n_1 + n_2)\hat{\sigma}_1}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{Z_1 - Z_2}{\hat{\sigma}_1}\right)}, & \text{if } Z_1 > Z_2, \\ \frac{(n_1 + n_2)Z_1 + n_1 Z_2}{2n_1 + n_2}, & \text{if } Z_1 \leq Z_2 \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where, $\hat{\sigma}_1 = S^* \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1(n_1 + n_2)}}$, $Z_1 = \frac{n_1 \bar{X}_Q + n_2 \bar{Y}}{n_1 + n_2}$, $Z_2 = \bar{X}_{3-Q}$ and S^{*2} is the pooled sample variance based on the stage 1 and the stage 2 data.

Now we report a simulation study on performance comparison of estimators d_{U_1} , d_{U_2} , the MLE d_M and the UMVCUE d_U under the scaled mean squared error and the bias criterion.

We compare the risk (scaled MSE) and the bias performances of various estimators of the selected treatment mean (μ_Q) using the Monte-Carlo simulations. Following estimators are considered for our numerical study: d_M , d_U , d_{U_1} and d_{U_2} (see (2.3), (2.4), (4.1) and (4.2)). Since the scaled MSEs and biases of these estimators of μ_Q depend on parameters $\underline{\theta} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma) \in \Theta$

through $\mu (\geq 0)$, we have plotted the simulated risks and the scaled biases of various estimators against $\mu \geq 0$ for different configurations of sample sizes n_1 and n_2 . The simulated values of the scaled MSE and the bias based on 100,000 simulations are plotted in Figures 4.1-4.7. In Figures 4.1-4.2, we have plotted the simulated scaled MSEs of the proposed estimators against μ . In Figures 4.3-4.5, we have plotted the simulated values of the scaled MSE against the information fraction ($= \frac{n_1}{n_1+n_2}$) for fixed total sample size $n = n_1 + n_2$ and μ . The scaled biases of various estimators have been plotted in Figures 4.6-4.7.

Following conclusions are drawn based on the simulation study :

- (i) In conformity with (3.3), the scaled MSEs of the natural estimator d_M is constant($=\frac{1}{n_1+n_2}$) for all values of the normalized treatment effect difference μ .
- (ii) The scaled MSEs of all other estimators (d_U , d_{U1} and d_{U2}), except d_M , decrease as the the value of μ increases. For larger values of μ , the estimator d_{U2} has better scaled MSE performance as compared to other estimators.
- (iii) For $n_1 = n_2$, the UMVCUE d_U has the similar scaled MSE performance as the estimator d_{U1} . For $n_1 \geq n_2$, the estimator d_{U2} outperforms estimators d_U and d_{U1} .

It is also observed that the estimator d_{U2} uniformly dominates d_{U1} in terms of the scaled MSE.

- (iv) For small n_2 and relatively large n_1 , the scaled MSEs of the estimators d_{U1} and d_{U2} are very much close to that of d_M .

When n_1 is small and n_2 is large, the scaled MSE of the UMVCUE d_U is closer to the scaled MSEs of d_M .

- (v) For fixed smaller values of μ and the total sample size $n = n_1 + n_2$, the scaled MSEs of the UMVCUE d_U increases as the information fraction $\frac{n_1}{n}$ increase whereas the scaled MSEs of d_{U1} and d_{U2} decreases as the information fraction increases. For larger values of μ , the estimators d_U and d_M have similar scaled MSE performance.
- (vi) The scaled biases of all the competing estimators (d_M , d_{U1} and d_{U2}), except the UMVCUE d_U , decreases as the value of μ increases.

For larger values of μ these estimators have scaled bias performance comparable to d_U .


It is also interesting to note that all the competing estimators of μ_Q have the maximum bias when μ is zero and it decreases as the value of μ increases.

- (vii) The scaled MSEs and scaled biases of all the competing estimators decrease towards zero for large value of the sample sizes n_1 and n_2 .


When scaled MSE is the key criterion for choosing suitable estimators, we recommend estimators d_M and d_{U2} . For some specific configurations of n_1 and n_2 (small n_1 and large n_2), the UMVCUE d_U is also a good competitor.

When both scaled bias and scaled MSE are to be controlled, we recommend using estimators d_U and d_M .


Estimation of the Selected Treatment Mean




(a) $n_1 = 3, n_2 = 5$



(b) $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 5$




(c) $n_1 = 8, n_2 = 5$




(d) $n_1 = 10, n_2 = 10$

Figure 4.1: Scaled MSE plots of various competing estimators for different configurations of n_1 and n_2


Estimation of the Selected Treatment Mean




(a) $n_1 = 15, n_2 = 5$



(b) $n_1 = 15, n_2 = 20$



(c) $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 15$



(d) $n_1 = 10, n_2 = 30$

Figure 4.2: Scaled MSE plots of various competing estimators for different configurations of n_1 and n_2

Estimation of the Selected Treatment Mean




Figure 4.3: Scaled MSE plots of different competing estimators for fixed $n = n_1 + n_2 = 20$ and $\mu = 0.1$.




Figure 4.4: Scaled MSE plots of different competing estimators for fixed $n = n_1 + n_2 = 20$ and $\mu = 0.6$.




Figure 4.5: Scaled MSE plots of different competing estimators for for fixed $n = n_1 + n_2 = 20$ and $\mu = 1.2$.






Figure 4.6: Scaled Bias plots of different competing estimators for $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 3$.


Estimation of the Selected Treatment Mean




(a) $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 5$



(b) $n_1 = 5, n_2 = 8$



(c) $n_1 = 10, n_2 = 30$



(d) $n_1 = 30, n_2 = 10$

Figure 4.7: Scaled Bias plots of various competing estimators for different configurations of n_1 and n_2

5 Real data example

In this section, we provide an illustration of the theoretical findings of our paper to a data set. The details of the data set can be accessed using the link: <https://vincentarelbundock.github.io/Rdatas>. The data is presented in Table 1 below. Data from this experiment compared weight gain for 60 baby rats that were fed different diets. Half of the rats were given low-protein diets and the rest were supplied high-protein diet. The source of protein was either beef, cereal, or pork.

Using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test with a p -value of 0.834 for high protein diet and 0.771 for low protein diet, we conclude that the underlying populations of weight gains of the baby rats receiving high protein diet and low protein diet are approximately Gaussian. The assumption of equality of variance of the two populations is also accepted with a p -value of 0.631 by using the F test. So, the data can be considered to have come from two normal populations $N(\mu_1, \sigma^2)$ and $N(\mu_2, \sigma^2)$, with $(\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2) = (92.5, 81.6)$.

To select the effective protein diet (which provides the largest weight gain), we extract a sample of size $n_1 = 20$ from the each population group and calculate \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2 . If $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_2$, we select the population corresponding to the high protein diet and, if $\bar{x}_2 \geq \bar{x}_1$, we select the population corresponding to the low protein diet. In stage 2, we draw an additional sample of size $n_2 = 10$ from the selected population in stage 1, and calculate the stage 2 sample mean \bar{Y} . Finally, we compute the estimates d_M, d_U, d_{U1} and d_{U2} based on the calculated values of $\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, S^2$ and \bar{Y} .

Table 1
Weight gain in rats after being fed with high-protein diets.

	73	102	118	104	81	107	100
Stage I data	87	117	111	98	74	56	111
	95	88	82	77	86	92	

Weight gain in rats after being fed with low-protein diets.

	90	76	90	64	86	51	72
Stage I data	90	95	78	107	107	97	80
	98	74	74	67	89	58	

Weight gain in rats after being fed with high-protein diets.

Stage II data	94	79	96	98	102	102	108
	91	120	105				

The various two-stage estimates of the selected treatment mean μ_Q are tabulated in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Various estimates of the selected treatment mean μ_Q .

d_M	d_U	d_{U1}	d_{U2}
95.13	91.23	88.34	89.34

From various estimates of the selected treatment mean given in Table 2, we notice that the two-stage adaptive estimates d_M and d_U are near the true value of the mean of the selected treatment, i.e., $\mu_Q = 92.5$.

6 Concluding Remarks

In this article, we investigated the problem of estimating the mean of the selected treatment under a two-stage adaptive design. We have extended the work of Cohen and Sackrowitz (1989) by considering availability of multiple observations at the second stage.

In the unknown variance setting, we have derived the UMVCUE of the selected treatment mean and have shown that the MLE (a weighted average of the first and second stage sample means, with weights being proportional to the corresponding sample sizes) is minimax and admissible. We have also proposed two plug-in estimators (d_{U1} and d_{U2}) obtained by plugging in the pooled sample variance in place of the common variance σ^2 , in some of the estimators proposed by Masihuddin and Misra (2022). Using simulations we have tried to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of these four estimators under different trial designs.

References

- Bahadur, R. R. and Goodman, L. A. (1952). Impartial decision rules and sufficient statistics. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 553–562.
- Bauer, P. and Kieser, M. (1999). Combining different phases in the development of medical treatments within a single trial. *Statistics in medicine*, 18(14):1833–1848.
- Bowden, J. and Glimm, E. (2008). Unbiased estimation of selected treatment means in two-stage trials. *Biometrical Journal: Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences*, 50(4):515–527.
- Bowden, J. and Glimm, E. (2014). Conditionally unbiased and near unbiased estimation of the selected treatment mean for multistage drop-the-losers trials. *Biometrical Journal*, 56(2):332–349.
- Carreras, M. and Brannath, W. (2013). Shrinkage estimation in two-stage adaptive designs with midtrial treatment selection. *Statistics in Medicine*, 32(10):1677–1690.
- Chiu, Y.-D., Koenig, F., Posch, M., and Jaki, T. (2018). Design and estimation in clinical trials with subpopulation selection. *Statistics in medicine*, 37(29):4335–4352.
- Cohen, A. and Sackrowitz, H. B. (1989). Two stage conditionally unbiased estimators of the selected mean. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 8(3):273–278.
- Eaton, M. L. (1967). Some optimum properties of ranking procedures. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 38(1):124–137.

- Kimani, P. K., Todd, S., Renfro, L. A., Glimm, E., Khan, J. N., Kairalla, J. A., and Stallard, N. (2020). Point and interval estimation in two-stage adaptive designs with time to event data and biomarker-driven subpopulation selection. *Statistics in medicine*, 39(19):2568–2586.
- Kimani, P. K., Todd, S., and Stallard, N. (2013). Conditionally unbiased estimation in phase ii/iii clinical trials with early stopping for futility. *Statistics in Medicine*, 32(17):2893–2910.
- Masihuddin and Misra, N. (2021). Equivariant estimation following selection from two normal populations having common unknown variance. *Statistics*, 55(6):1407–1438.
- Masihuddin and Misra, N. (2022). Estimation of the selected treatment mean in two-stage drop-the-losers design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.08567*.
- Misra, N. and Dhariyal, I. D. (1994). Non-minimaxity of natural decision rules under heteroscedasticity. *Statistics and Decisions*, (12):79–98.
- Misra, N. and Singh, G. (1993). On the umvue for estimating the parameter of the selected exponential population. *Journal of Indian Statistical Association*, 31(1):61–9.
- Pallmann, P., Bedding, A. W., Choodari-Oskooei, B., Dimairo, M., Flight, L., Hampson, L. V., Holmes, J., Mander, A. P., Odoni, L., Sydes, M. R., et al. (2018). Adaptive designs in clinical trials: why use them, and how to run and report them. *BMC medicine*, 16(1):1–15.
- Putter, J. and Rubinstein, D. (1968). On estimating the mean of a selected population technical report no. 165. *Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin*.
- Robertson, D. S., Choodari-Oskooei, B., Dimairo, M., Flight, L., Pallmann, P., and Jaki, T. (2022). Point estimation for adaptive trial designs i: A methodological review. *Statistics in Medicine*.
- Robertson, D. S. and Glimm, E. (2019). Conditionally unbiased estimation in the normal setting with unknown variances. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 48(3):616–627.
- Sampson, A. R. and Sill, M. W. (2005). Drop-the-losers design: normal case. *Biometrical Journal: Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences*, 47(3):257–268.
- Stallard, N. and Friede, T. (2008). A group-sequential design for clinical trials with treatment selection. *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(29):6209–6227.
- Tappin, L. (1992). Unbiased estimation of the parameter of a selected binomial population. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 21(4):1067–1083.