# THE EFFECT OF ESTIMATING PREVALENCES ON THE POPULATION-WISE ERROR RATE

Remi Luschei Competence Center for Clinical Trials Bremen University of Bremen rluschei@uni-bremen.de Werner Brannath Competence Center for Clinical Trials Bremen University of Bremen brannath@uni-bremen.de

## ABSTRACT

The population-wise error rate (PWER) is a type I error rate for clinical trials with multiple target populations. In such trials, one treatment is tested for its efficacy in each population. The PWER is defined as the probability that a randomly selected, future patient will be exposed to an inefficient treatment based on the study results. The PWER can be understood and computed as an average of strata-specific family-wise error rates and involves the prevalences of these strata. A major issue of this concept is that the prevalences are usually not known in practice, so that the PWER cannot be directly controlled. Instead, one could use an estimator based on the given sample, like their maximum-likelihood estimator under a multinomial distribution. In this paper we show in simulations that this does not substantially inflate the true PWER. We differentiate between the expected PWER, which is almost perfectly controlled, and study-specific values of the PWER which are conditioned on all subgroup sample sizes and vary within a narrow range. Thereby, we consider up to eight different overlapping patient populations and moderate to large sample sizes. In these settings, we also consider the maximum strata-wise family-wise error rate, which is found to be, on average, at least bounded by twice the significance level used for PWER control. Finally, we introduce an adjustment of the PWER that could be made when, by chance, no patients are recruited from a stratum, so that this stratum is not counted in PWER control. We would then reduce the PWER in order to control for multiplicity in this stratum as well.

*Keywords* Family-wise error rate, multiple testing, personalized medicine, population-wise error rate, prevalence estimation, umbrella trials

# 1 Introduction

Many clinical trials in personalized medicine examine multiple hypotheses, each about the efficacy of a medical treatment in a specific patient population. This is done, for example, in umbrella trials that enroll patients with the same cancer type, but define multiple study arms based on different mutations of this cancer. Current examples of umbrella trials and challenges associated with these trials have been discussed in Ouma *et al.* (2022). One difficulty arises from the fact that in case of overlapping populations, taking a false test decision may affect more than one population. In this case, type I error control should be adjusted for multiplicity. For this purpose, Brannath *et al.* (2023) introduced the population-wise error rate (PWER), a multiple type I error rate which is adapted to clinical trials with overlapping populations. It has been mentioned in Ouma *et al.* (2022) and has the advantage of being more liberal than the family-wise error rate (FWER), while still controlling an average type I error. This allows PWER-controlling tests to achieve a higher power, what is particularly useful when examining rare diseases, when only small sample sizes are available.

The PWER gives the probability that a randomly selected patient from the overall population will receive an inefficient treatment. For calculating it, the overall population is partitioned into disjoint strata, each containing individuals that are affected by the same test decisions. For each stratum, the respective multiple type I error probability is then weighted by its relative prevalence, i.e. the proportion of the stratum in the total population. In practice, however, the prevalences are often unknown and must be estimated from the study sample. One way to do this, if no further knowledge about the prevalences is available, is to take the maximum-likelihood-estimator from the multinomial distribution. This paper aims to examine whether the use of this estimator inflates the true PWER and to which extent. To this end, we will carry out simulations in which the relative prevalences will be estimated and used for the calculation of the rejection boundaries in order to control the estimated PWER at the pre-specified level. We will then compare the true PWER (using the true prevalences) to this significance level.

Another important question regarding PWER control is to what extent the FWER can then still be controlled. In this context, the FWER corresponds to the *maximal* risk for future patients to be assigned to an inefficient treatment policy. Brannath *et al.* (2023) have specified several theoretical bounds for the FWER, which are somewhat rough and can often be improved by the simulated values. Specifically, we will see that the FWER is often less than twice as large as the significance level of PWER control.

We will also cover a special situation that may arise at the calculation of the estimated PWER, when no patients are recruited from (at least) one stratum. In this case, the concerned strata are neglected by the PWER, such that a randomly selected person from one of these strata could have a greater chance of receiving an inefficient treatment than the FWER level. Our solution is to introduce a minimal prevalence to include all concerned strata-wise error rates into the PWER. In our simulations we will therefore also examine to what extent PWER-controlling tests with a minimal prevalence actually become more conservative in this situation.

We start this paper with the formal definition of the PWER in section 2. In section 3, we construct the test statistics used to handle the population-wise testing problems. The presentation of the simulations and their results is done in section 4, including a motivating example based on an umbrella trial data set from Kesselmeier *et al.* (2022) (section 4.1). The paper ends with a discussion in section 5. All simulations are done in R. The program files and outputs are available under https://github.com/rluschei/PWER-Estimate-Prevalences.

# 2 The population-wise error rate (PWER)

In this section we first recall the formal definition of the PWER from Brannath *et al.* (2023) and present a result on least favorable parameter configurations for the PWER which will be used in the calculation of the rejection boundaries for PWER control.

# 2.1 Definition

Let  $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m$  be the sets representing the given patient populations. They may, in particular, be overlapping. For every  $i \in I = \{1, \ldots, m\}$  we want to test a treatment  $T_i$  in the population  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . So we are interested in testing the null hypotheses  $H_i: \theta_i \leq 0$ , where  $\theta_i = \theta(\mathcal{P}_i, T_i) \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the effect of  $T_i$  in comparison to a control treatment Cin the population  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . To define the PWER, we partition the overall population  $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{P}_i$  into the disjoint strata  $\mathcal{P}_J \coloneqq (\bigcap_{j \in J} \mathcal{P}_j) \setminus (\bigcup_{k \in I \setminus J} \mathcal{P}_k), J \subseteq I$ . Each  $\mathcal{P}_J$  includes all individuals affected by the treatments indexed in J. Figure 1 illustrates the resulting partition for m = 3 overlapping populations. We denote the relative prevalence of  $\mathcal{P}_J$ among  $\mathcal{P}$  by  $\pi_J$ . Since the prevalences are usually unknown in practice, we will later propose how to estimate them. The *population-wise error rate* of the multiple testing problem is defined by

PWER = 
$$\sum_{J \subseteq I} \pi_J \mathbb{P}(\text{falsely reject any } H_j \text{ with } j \in J).$$

Hence, it gives the average probability of committing at least one type I error that would concern the individuals in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The PWER is more liberal than the family-wise-error-rate (FWER), i.e. it fulfils PWER  $\leq$  FWER (see Brannath *et al.* (2023)).



Figure 1: Partition of m = 3 overlapping populations

However, in order to control a type I error with estimated prevalences and assuming homogeneous residual variances within the strata, we will need to pass to stronger null hypotheses. For  $J \subseteq I$  and  $i \in J$ , let  $H_i^J : \theta_i^J \leq 0$  be the null hypothesis stating that treatment  $T_i$  is not better than the control in the stratum  $\mathcal{P}_J$ . We will test the intersection hypotheses  $H_i = \bigcap_{J \subseteq I: i \in J} H_i^J$ ,  $i \in I$ . Suppose that we use a right-tailed test, based on some test statistic  $Z_i$  and a common critical value c. Then the PWER equals to

$$PWER_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \sum_{J \subseteq I} \pi_J \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \left( \bigcup_{j \in J \cap I_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \{Z_j > c\} \right),$$

where the vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^J)_{J \subseteq I}$  with  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^J = (\theta_i^J)_{i \in J}$  equals the true effects, and the true null hypotheses are indexed by  $I_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \{i \in I : H_i \text{ is true}\}$ . We only consider equal critical values for the reasons given in Brannath *et al.* (2023), but we could in principle also use population-specific boundaries  $c_i$ .

#### 2.2 Least favorable parameter configurations

Under two additional assumptions it can be shown that the null vector  $\theta = 0$  is a worst case parameter for which the PWER attains its maximum. The first condition is the subset pivotality assumption (see Westfall and Young (1993), Dickhaus (2014)), which states that the multivariate distributions of the vectors  $(Z_j)_{j \in J \cap I_0(\theta)}$  do not depend on the truth or falsity of those hypotheses they are not relevant for. It is formally described by

$$\forall J \subseteq I, J \neq \emptyset : \forall \theta \in H_J \exists \theta^* \in H_I : \mathbb{P}_{\theta}^{\max_{j \in J} Z_j} = \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*}^{\max_{j \in J} Z_j},$$
(1)

where  $H_J := \bigcap_{j \in J} H_j, J \subseteq I$ , and  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}^{\max_{j \in J} Z_j}$  denotes the distribution of  $\max_{j \in J} Z_j$  in dependence of the parameter  $\theta$ . The second assumption is stochastic monotonicity of the subvectors  $(Z_j)_{j \in J}$ , stating that

$$\forall J \subseteq I, J \neq \emptyset : \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in H_I, \theta_1 \le \theta_2 : \mathbb{P}_{\theta_1} \left( \max_{j \in J} Z_j > c \right) \le \mathbb{P}_{\theta_2} \left( \max_{j \in J} Z_j > c \right).$$
(2)

Here the relation  $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$  is meant component-wise.

**Theorem 1** Under conditions (1) and (2) one obtains  $\sup_{\theta} PWER_{\theta} = PWER_{\theta^*}$  for  $\theta^* = 0$ .

The proof of this can be found in appendix A. We call every  $\theta^*$  fulfilling the equation from theorem 1 a least favorable parameter configuration (LFC) for the PWER. If an LFC exists, the PWER can be easily controlled at a given significance level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , by determining the smallest critical value c that satisfies PWER $_{\theta^*}(c) \leq \alpha$ . Note that this will also bound the FWER to a certain extent – some theoretical bounds are given in Brannath *et al.* (2023), and we will also investigate this numerically in section 4.5.

#### **3** Test statistics for a single-stage design

We now want to construct the vector of test statistics  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_i)_{i \in I}$  in order to conduct the multiple test. We follow the approach proposed by Hillner (2021), but replace the true prevalences used there by the given sample proportions. This allows for a concrete calculation in practice, e.g. under an umbrella trial framework with a common control as described in Ouma *et al.* (2022).

For every  $i \in I$ , let  $\mu_{T_i}^i \in \mathbb{R}$  be the expected response under treatment  $T_i$  in the population  $\mathcal{P}_i$  and let  $\mu_C^i \in \mathbb{R}$  be the expected response under the control C in  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Then the mean effect difference in population  $\mathcal{P}_i$  is  $\theta_i = \mu_{T_i}^i - \mu_C^i$ . Additionally, for every  $J \subseteq I$  and  $j \in J$  we define the expectations  $\mu_{T_j}^J \in \mathbb{R}$  under  $T_j$  and  $\mu_C^J \in \mathbb{R}$  under C in  $\mathcal{P}_J$ . The expectations in the population  $\mathcal{P}_i$  are then

$$\mu_{T_i}^i = \sum_{J \subseteq I: i \in J} \frac{\pi_J}{\pi_i} \mu_{T_i}^J \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_C^i = \sum_{J \subseteq I: i \in J} \frac{\pi_J}{\pi_i} \mu_C^J,$$

where  $\pi_i$  denotes the sum of all  $\pi_J$  with  $i \in J$  (and equals the prevalence of  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ). Suppose that a sample of N patients is given, in which  $n_J$  patients belong to the stratum  $\mathcal{P}_J$ , for every  $J \subseteq I$ . Let  $n_{J,T}$  be the number of patients assigned to treatment T in stratum  $\mathcal{P}_J$ , with  $T \in \mathcal{T}_J := \{T_j : j \in J\} \cup \{C\}$ , and let  $n_{i,T} := \sum_{J \subseteq I: i \in J} n_{J,T}$  be the number of patients assigned to T in population  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . In case of a stratified randomization, i.e. in every stratum  $\mathcal{P}_J$  the patients are assigned to the treatments evenly, we have  $n_{J,T} = n_J/(|J| + 1)$ , in average.

#### 3.1 Normal distribution model with homogeneous, known variances

In every stratum  $\mathcal{P}_J$ , let us represent the measured responses under treatment  $T \in \mathcal{T}_J$  by the normally distributed random variables  $X_{T,k}^J \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_T^J, \sigma^2)$ , for  $k = 1, \ldots, n_{J,T}$ . The variance  $\sigma^2 > 0$  is here assumed to be known, and the observations are assumed to be independent. For every J and for every treatment  $T \in \mathcal{T}_J$  we define the strata-wise arithmetic mean  $\bar{X}_T^J \coloneqq \frac{1}{n_{LT}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{J,T}} X_{T,k}^J$ . Then we can estimate the expected responses  $\mu_{T_i}^i$  and  $\mu_C^i$  through

$$\hat{\mu}^i_{T_i} \coloneqq \sum_{J \subseteq I: \, i \in J} \frac{n_{J,T_i}}{n_{i,T_i}} \bar{X}^J_{T_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}^i_C \coloneqq \sum_{J \subseteq I: \, i \in J} \frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}} \bar{X}^J_C.$$

This provides the test statistics

$$Z_i \coloneqq \frac{\hat{\mu}_{T_i}^i - \hat{\mu}_C^i}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Var}\left(\hat{\mu}_{T_i}^i - \hat{\mu}_C^i\right)}}, i \in I$$

One finds that

$$\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\mu}_{T_{i}}^{i} - \hat{\mu}_{C}^{i}) = \sigma^{2} V_{i} \quad \text{for} \quad V_{i} = \sum_{J \subseteq I: i \in J} \left( \frac{n_{J,T_{i}}}{n_{i,T_{i}}^{2}} + \frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}^{2}} \right)$$

Conditional on the sample sizes, the vector  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_i)_{i \in I}$  follows a multivariate normal distribution with the location  $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_i)_{i \in I}$  given by

$$\nu_i = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{V_i}} \left( \sum_{J \subseteq I: i \in J} \frac{n_{J,T_i}}{n_{i,T_i}} \mu_{T_i}^J - \frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}} \mu_C^J \right), i \in I.$$

The correlation matrix  $\Sigma = (\Sigma_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$  takes a different form depending on whether and which treatments are the same. When all treatments are different  $(T_i \neq T_j \text{ for } i \neq j)$ , we have

$$\Sigma_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{J \subseteq I: \, i, j \in J} n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C} n_{j,C} \sqrt{V_i V_j}}, i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{ii} = 1.$$
(3)

Note that  $\Sigma$  is always independent from  $\sigma^2$  by design. The derivation of the above results can be found in appendix B.

The vector Z fulfills the conditions (1) and (2), so that  $\theta = 0$  is an LFC for the PWER. Since  $\nu$  converges to zero under  $\theta = 0$ , the maximal PWER of the asymptotic test can be calculated by

$$PWER = \sum_{J \subseteq I} \pi_J \left( 1 - \Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J}(c, \dots, c) \right), \tag{4}$$

where  $\Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_J}$  denotes the cdf of the normal distribution with parameters  $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$  and  $\Sigma_J \coloneqq (\Sigma_{ij})_{i \ i \in J}$ .

#### 3.2 Normal distribution model with homogeneous, unknown variances

We now assume the variance  $\sigma^2$  to be unknown. For every  $J \subseteq I$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_J$  an unbiased estimator of  $\sigma^2$  is given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{J,T}^2 = \frac{1}{n_{J,T} - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{J,T}} \left( X_{T,k}^J - \bar{X}_T^J \right)^2.$$

Let  $s := \#\{J : J \subseteq I, \mathcal{P}_J \neq \emptyset\}$  be the number of strata. We use the (also unbiased) pooled variance estimator

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sum_{J \subseteq I, T \in \mathcal{T}_J} (n_{J,T} - 1) \hat{\sigma}_{J,T}^2}{N - s}$$

to construct the test statistics

$$T_i \coloneqq \frac{\hat{\mu}_{T_i}^i - \hat{\mu}_C^i}{\hat{\sigma}\sqrt{V_i}}, i \in I.$$

The vector  $(T_i)_{i \in I}$  then follows a multivariate *t*-distribution with N - s degrees of freedom. Hence, under an unknown and common residual variance the PWER is obtained by replacing  $\Phi_{0,\Sigma_J}$  with the cumulative distribution function of the (central) *t*-distribution with scale matrix  $\Sigma_J$  in formula (4) (see Kotz and Nadarajah (2004)).

# 4 Estimation of the population prevalences

The populations  $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m$  are usually defined by certain inclusion and exclusion criteria and are assumed to have infinite size, because they not only include the study patients, but also patients outside of the trial and potential future patients. Consequently, the exact values of the relative prevalences  $\pi_J$  are typically not known in practice and must be estimated in some way to compute the PWER. For this purpose, one could possibly use findings from previous studies. Another possibility is to utilize the sample sizes collected in the study. In the latter case, the vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_J)_{J\subseteq I}$ may be estimated by the maximum-likelihood-estimator (MLE) of the multinomial distribution with parameters Nand  $\pi$ , whose discrete density  $f: (n_J)_{J\subseteq I} \mapsto N! \prod_{J\subseteq I} \pi_J^{n_J}/n_J!$  gives the probability of selecting  $n_J$  patients from the population  $\mathcal{P}_J$  in a random sample of  $N = \sum_{J\subseteq I} n_J$  patients. The MLE  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} = (\hat{\pi}_J)_{J\subseteq I}$  has the form  $\hat{\pi}_J = n_J/N$ , and is a mean unbiased and asymptotically consistent estimator. This implies that for a given fixed critical value c the PWER can be estimated mean unbiasedly and consistently by plugging in  $\hat{\pi}_J$ . However, in practice we would rather determine the critical value such that the estimated PWER equals the significance level  $\alpha$ .

#### 4.1 Umbrella trial example

To illustrate how the test decisions change under control of the estimated PWER compared to FWER control and unadjusted testing, we regard a real data example introduced by Kesselmeier *et al.* (2022). It is used to investigate two treatment allocation strategies for patients that are eligible for multiple arms in umbrella trials: the pragmatic strategy assigning the patients to the eligible subtrial with currently fewest patients, and random allocation of these patients. The example is based on the MAXSEP study (Brunkhorst *et al.* (2012)) that compared the effect of meropenem to the effect of a combination therapy with moxifloxacin and meropenem in patients with severe sepsis. Kesselmeier *et al.* (2022) define two overlapping populations,

$$P_1$$
 = patients with baseline lactate value > 2 mmol/L  
 $P_2$  = patients with baseline C-reactive proteine value > 128 mg/L

and for these they build 1 000 bootstrap samples of sizes  $N \in \{100, 200, 500\}$  from the study data. For each they apply both allocation stategies, and also the gold-standard independent trial design (where the subtrials screen their patients independently for just one of the biomarkers). We use the resulting allocation numbers and prevalence estimates to compute the rejection boundaries one would get under PWER- and FWER-control, for both allocation strategies. We assume the significance level  $\alpha = 0.025$  and z-distributed test statistics. In the independent subtrials case, one would typically not adjust for multiplicity, such that one would use  $\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) = 1.96$  as critical value, where  $\Phi^{-1}$  denotes the quantile function of the standard normal distribution. The distribution of the critical values is plotted in figure 3. We see that they can be significantly reduced by replacing FWER control with PWER control and that PWER control leads to a good compromise between unadjusted testing and the more strict FWER control.



Figure 2: Critical boundaries for the real data example from Kesselmeier *et al.* (2022) under FWER-control and control of the estimated PWER. For each bootstrap sample, we utilize the allocation numbers and prevalence estimates that result from applying the pragmatic strategy and the random allocation strategy to calculate the FWER and the estimated PWER. We assume normally distributed test statistics and use  $\alpha = 0.025$  as significance level. The critical value for unadjusted testing is  $c_{\text{unadj}} = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) = 1.96$ .

We also want to assess how the estimated critical boundaries for PWER control deviate from the true critical boundaries that we would obtain from the true prevalences. To do this, let us assume that the true prevalences are equal to their mean estimates over all the 1 000 bootstrap samples. The distribution of the resulting true critical values is shown in table 1. It does not significantly differ from that of the estimated critical values. We also see this in figure 2 that shows the difference between the estimated and the true critical values.

		Pragma	atic allocation	Random allocation		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
total sample size	N = 100	2.1135	$4.9689 \cdot 10^{-4}$	2.1165	$4.9803 \cdot 10^{-4}$	
	N = 200	2.113	$3.4428 \cdot 10^{-4}$	2.1156	$3.485 \cdot 10^{-4}$	
	N = 500	2.1127	$2.2974 \cdot 10^{-4}$	2.1153	$2.3468 \cdot 10^{-4}$	

Table 1: Distribution of the true critical values for the real data example from Kesselmeier *et al.* (2022). We obtain them by calculating the PWER with the mean prevalence estimates. We assume normally distributed test statistics and  $\alpha = 0.025$ .



Figure 3: Distribution of the difference between the estimated and the true critical boundaries for the real data example from Kesselmeier *et al.* (2022).

#### 4.2 Setup of the simulations

We now want to investigate the accuracy of the PWER estimation more systematically in some simulations. Under the assumptions from section 3, we obtain the estimated critical value  $\hat{c}$  from the condition

$$\widehat{\text{PWER}}\left(\hat{c}\right) \coloneqq \sum_{J \subseteq I} \hat{\pi}_J \left(1 - \Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_J}(\hat{c}, \dots, \hat{c})\right) = \alpha.$$
(5)

Our goal is now to find out if the true PWER

$$PWER(\hat{c}) = \sum_{J \subseteq I} \pi_J \left( 1 - \Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_J}(\hat{c}, \dots, \hat{c}) \right)$$
(6)

is then still controlled at the significance level  $\alpha$ . Asymptotically, this is the case due to the almost sure convergence of  $\hat{\pi}_J$  to  $\pi_J$ . We can also show that the sequence of critical values  $(\hat{c}_N)$  converges in probability towards the true critical value *c* that would be obtained from the true prevalences and correspondingly proportioned sample sizes. This is not even necessary for the proof of asymptotic PWER control, but could be of interest for further considerations (see the discussion). Both results are shown in appendix C.

For our simulations we define populations  $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m$  by m different binary biomarkers, that are expressed with the probabilities  $p_1, \ldots, p_m$ . For every  $i \in I$ , the population  $\mathcal{P}_i$  consists of all patients with the *i*-th biomarker being expressed. In particular, since the biomarkers are not assumed to be exclusive, these populations overlap. It should be noted that we do not consider the configuration where none of the biomarkers are present, since these patients would typically be excluded from the study for ethical reasons. Hence, we consider here the overall population of patients where at least one biomarker is expressed. In the first step of the simulation, we define the biomarker expression probabilities  $p_i$  (for example by randomly generating them from the uniform distribution). From the  $p_i$  we generate in turn a multinomial random vector containing the  $2^m - 1$  strata-wise sample sizes. We find  $\hat{\pi}$  by dividing this vector with the total sample size N. The critical value  $\hat{c}$  is then computed from formula (5) and plugged into the true PWER

(formula 6). We repeat this procedure 10 000 times, draw a boxplot of the resulting values of  $PWER(\hat{c})$ , and tabulate their mean. We will always assume the significance level  $\alpha = 0.025$ .

## 4.3 Results

We run the simulations described above for many different scenarios in which the following aspects are varied:

- We consider different numbers m of biomarkers, from m = 2 to m = 8 biomarkers.
- We consider different total sample sizes, from N = 25 to N = 500 patients.
- We consider independent and dependent biomarkers.
- We consider known and unknown residual variances (z- or t-distributed test statistics).
- We consider pairwise different treatments  $(T_i \neq T_j \text{ for } i \neq j)$ , and equal treatments  $(T_i = T_j)$  (this influences on the correlation matrix).
- We consider fixed biomarker expression probabilities (= fixed prevalences) and probabilities that vary with each simulation run (by randomly drawing them from the uniform distribution).
- We consider different treatment allocation numbers, for example equal allocation within the strata or random allocation.

For all these configurations, the distribution of true PWER (obtained from formula 6) turns out to be very similar. The detailed results can be found in the Github repository. Exemplary, we now describe the results for the following configuration: Let the total sample size be fixed at N = 500 patients, which corresponds to a medium to large size for a multi-population study. We use *t*-distributed test statistics with the correlation matrix from formula (3), and regard m = 2 to m = 8 independent biomarkers. The biomarker expression probabilities are randomly and independently generated from the uniform distribution on (0, 1) in each simulation run. With this we cover situations with up to  $2^8 - 1 = 255$  different strata. Additionally, we assume equal allocation of the patients to the eligible treatments within the strata. The observed values of the true PWER are plotted in figure 4. One can see that for all m, they are clustered quite tightly and symmetrically around 0.025. The mean values, which approximate the expected, overall PWER, can be found in table 2. They are very close to  $\alpha$ . The standard deviations are also quite small. For these reasons, the true PWER appears to be well under control. However, small variations may actually occur in individual situations: For example, in the case of m = 4 biomarkers, 8.81 percent of the observed values are outside the interval (0.02425, 0.02575) and thus deviate from  $\alpha$  by at least 3 percent. In summary, this implies that, conditional on the actually observed sample sizes, the PWER may (with a small probability) be moderately inflated or deflated, however, is well under control in the average.

$\overline{m}$	Mean	SD	Min	Q1	Med	Q3	Max
2	0.025	0.00039	0.02273	0.02476	0.025	0.02525	0.0268
3	0.02501	0.00042	0.02316	0.02474	0.02501	0.02528	0.02669
4	0.02501	0.00041	0.02341	0.02474	0.02501	0.02527	0.02665
5	0.02501	0.00039	0.02294	0.02476	0.025	0.02525	0.02683
6	0.025	0.00037	0.02333	0.02477	0.025	0.02523	0.02683
7	0.02501	0.00035	0.02341	0.02479	0.025	0.02523	0.02679
8	0.02501	0.00033	0.02346	0.0248	0.02501	0.02521	0.0268

Table 2: Summary statistics for the  $10^4$  simulated values of the true PWER illustrated in figure 4.

Figure 5 shows 10 000 more simulated values of PWER( $\hat{c}$ ), whereby the number of biomarkers is now fixed at m = 3 and the sample size varies from N = 25 to N = 500. While larger inaccuracies can occur at sample sizes N = 25 or N = 50, for N = 100 all values of the true PWER already deviate less than 15 percent from the significance level, and for N = 200 less than 10 percent. So the mentioned convergence of PWER( $\hat{c}$ ) with respect to N takes place very quickly and applies to practical situations.

In figure 4, we see that the boxplot ranges seem to decrease as the number m of populations increases. This is probably due to the fastly increasing number of strata and thus decreasing prevalences, so that single estimation inaccuracies in



Figure 4: Distribution of  $10^4$  simulated values of the true PWER for different numbers m of binary and independent biomarkers. This corresponds to m overlapping populations with  $2^m - 1$  strata. The critical value  $\hat{c}$  is computed from the estimated PWER, under the significance level  $\alpha = 0.025$ . We assume a total sample size of N = 500 screened patients and a stratified randomization to the treatments.

the strata-wise probabilities do not have a major impact on the PWER. In practice, of course, the sample size would have to be increased in order to have enough patients in all strata. We get similar results when we assume equal prevalences for all strata and leave them constant over all simulation runs. However, if individual prevalences remain constant with an increasing number of strata, this is not the case any more. This can be seen, for example, when one prevalence is set to 0.5 independently of the number of strata. The range of the simulated values then increases with increasing m, up to a standard deviation of  $7.7 \cdot 10^{-4}$  for m = 8. The detailed results from all these cases are included in the supplement.

The assumption of independent biomarkers is not necessarily guaranteed in practice. But the above simulations can easily be extended to correlated biomarkers by deriving the biomarker probabilities from a normally distributed random vector with an arbitrary covariance matrix. We have done this for various cases and found no particular differences to the presented results. The same applies to the other cases treated in section 3, i.e. under the model with known variances (where the test statistics are normally distributed), in the single treatment case (where we have  $T_i = T$  for all  $i \in I$ ) and also when considering uneven treatment allocation numbers. For the latter case, in each simulation run we draw random allocation probabilities within all strata and randomly determine the allocation numbers according to these probabilities. The detailed results can also be found in the supplement.

#### 4.4 Marginal sum estimator

When defining the populations for our simulation, we assumed that all patients without any biomaker being expressed would not be included in the study. However, these patients usually also go through the screening process, so their number is usually known. We can use this to define another estimate. Let  $\hat{\tau}_J$ ,  $J \subseteq I$  denote the prevalence estimators that we get when including this stratum into the total population (so that we have  $\hat{\tau}_{\emptyset} > 0$ ). In the independent biomarkers case, another possibility of estimating  $\pi_J$  is then using the marginal prevalence estimator

$$\tilde{\pi}_J = \left(\prod_{j \in J} \hat{p}_j\right) \left(\prod_{k \in I \setminus J} (1 - \hat{p}_k)\right) / (1 - \hat{\tau}_{\emptyset}), \tag{7}$$



Figure 5: Distribution of  $10^4$  simulated values of the true PWER for different overall sample sizes N. The number of independent biomarkers is fixed at m = 3.

which is based on the marginal frequencies  $\hat{p}_j = \sum_{J \subseteq I: j \in J} \hat{\tau}_J$  of the strata. Under the independence assumption, this also gives consistent estimates. We adopted the marginal prevalence estimator into our simulations and got similar results to section 4.3: The deviation of the true PWER from  $\alpha$  is slightly lower than before, with standard deviations lying between  $2.7 \cdot 10^{-4}$  (m = 2) and  $3.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$  (m = 4, 5).

### 4.5 Behavior of the maximal strata-wise FWER

In PWER-controlling test procedures, we may also be interested in the behavior of the single strata-wise family-wise error rates, which are defined by  $FWER_J(c) := \mathbb{P}(\max_{j \in J} Z_j > c)$  for every  $J \subseteq I$ , to verify whether excessive type I error probabilities occur in individual strata. Brannath *et al.* (2023) give some upper bounds for  $FWER_J(c)$ , whose quality depend on different factors like the prevalence  $\pi_J$  or the number of biomarkers the stratum  $\mathcal{P}_J$  belongs to. Under the setup of the previous simulations, we also examine the values of the maximum  $\max_{J \subseteq I} FWER_J(\hat{c})$ . They are plotted in figure 6, for the first case presented (with randomly generated true prevalences, independent biomarkers, using the MLE and with unknown residual variances). We see that on average, the maximal FWER is limited by  $0.05 = 2\alpha$ . We get very similar results in the other cases (see the supplement).

#### 4.6 Introduction of a minimal prevalence for neglected strata

In the case of very small, but non-empty strata  $\mathcal{P}_J$ , it may happen that no patients are sampled from them, meaning that they are neglected by the estimated PWER. Then we would not directly account for the multiplicity in these strata and might therefore expose future patients to an increased risk of receiving inefficacious treatments. This is especially a problem when the strata are intersections of many different populations. If the biomarkers are independent, a solution could be to replace the MLE of  $\pi_J$  with the marginal estimator  $\tilde{\pi}_J$  from section 4.4. Since these estimates are based on the empirical marginal prevalences of the larger subpopulations  $\mathcal{P}_j$ , the problem of missed prevalences is avoided or at least much reduced. In the general case, one could introduce a minimal prevalence  $\pi_{\min}$  to include all FWER<sub>J</sub> with  $n_J = 0$  in the estimated PWER, and reduce the other prevalences proportionally. However, those estimated prevalences that are smaller than  $\pi_{\min}$  should not be penalized, so we suggest to increase them to  $\pi_{\min}$  as well. The minimal prevalence should not be chosen too large, as this could result in greater inaccuracy of the estimations. One



Figure 6: Distribution of  $10^4$  simulated values of the maximal strata-wise FWER for different numbers of biomarkers m under PWER control at level  $\alpha = 0.025$ . The overall sample size is fixed at N = 500.

possible choice is  $\pi_{\min} = 1/(2^{m+1}-2)$ , i.e. half of the prevalence that each stratum would have if all strata were of same size. Given the very small value of  $\pi_{\min}$ , especially for high numbers of biomarkers, we are then unlikely to overestimate the true prevalences of the strata with no observations (and underestimate the others).

This approach actually leads to more conservative tests: In additional simulations we restrict the biomarker probabilities  $p_1, ..., p_m$  to the interval (0, 0.1), in order to achieve that large intersections preferably get small prevalences. We then compute the critical boundary  $\hat{c}$  and the adjusted  $\hat{c}_{\min}$  resulting from weighting up all neglected strata by  $\pi_{\min}$ . Figure 7 compares the distributions of the true PWER and of the maximum FWER for these two boundaries, in a setting with m = 3 populations. We see that in the unadjusted case, the maximal FWER is increased in comparison to the previous simulation results, and is reduced to an acceptable level by the suggested adjustment of the prevalences. The true PWER is also becoming more conservative. For larger numbers of biomarkers m, this reduction becomes larger in absolute terms. For example, for m = 6 the mean PWER decreases from 0.025 to 0.01403 and the mean maximal FWER decreases from 0.12579 to 0.0723 by replacing  $\hat{c}$  with  $\hat{c}_{\min}$ . Note that in general  $\hat{c}_{\min}$  is not necessarily larger than  $\hat{c}$ , especially when strata belonging to only few populations have small prevalences. Therefore we suggest comparing  $\hat{c}$  and  $\hat{c}_{\min}$  and choosing the greater one for PWER control.

#### **5** Discussion

The PWER is a quite new concept for measuring multiple type I errors in clinical trials with overlapping patient populations. It gives the average probability of erroneous rejections in the disjoint population strata. This makes the PWER only consider type I errors that are really relevant to the patients. The aim of this work was to investigate the stability of the PWER under plug-in estimation of the (usually unknown) strata prevalences. We have seen that in situations with up to eight different biomarkers and up to 255 strata, estimating prevalences does not prevent from adequate control of the true PWER. When interpreting the results from section 4, one should distinguish between individual values of the true PWER, which are conditional on the vector of sample sizes  $(n_J)_{J\subseteq I}$ , and their mean over all simulation runs. An individual value of PWER( $\hat{c}$ ) is only meaningful for a specific study with a specific vector of sample sizes drawn from the multinomial distribution. We have seen a rather limited fluctation of these values. The unconditional PWER, where we average over all sample size configurations, approximates the expected PWER over



Figure 7: Comparison of the true PWER (left plot) and of the maximal strata-wise FWER (right plot) with and without the use of the minimal prevalence  $\pi_{\min} = 1/(2^{m+1}-2)$ , in a setting with m = 3 populations, N = 500 patients and significance level  $\alpha = 0.025$ . Only cases in which at least one stratum has no observations are included here.

many studies. For critical boundaries that are based on sample estimates of the prevalences, it is very well under control. In practice the situation may even be improved by also utilizing historical data in the estimation of the prevalences.

In section 3 we assumed that the residual variances are homogeneous over the different strata. In the inhomogeneous case, greater difficulties arise. The variances (or their estimates) then appear in the correlation matrix of the test statistics, which makes its computation much more difficult, and thereby also PWER control. Dealing with this situation could be a topic for future research.

Regarding the maximal strata-wise FWER, we have seen in the simulations that under PWER control it is often indirectly controlled at a higher level, here  $2\alpha$ . Note that there is no guarantee for this, so in practice the maximal FWER should always be investigated (e.g. by simulations) and be taken into account in order to adjust the PWER or the prevalences used, as indicated in section 4.6 (if deemed necessary). However, when using the same critical value for all test statistics, it can be expected that by PWER control the FWER is at least smaller than the FWER with no multiplicity control.

An important prerequisite for the practical applicability of the PWER is the development of a sample size estimation for PWER-controlling studies, this could also serve as a subject for future investigation. The convergence of the rejection boundaries presented in appendix C could be of interest for this.

# Appendix

## A Proof of theorem 1

For every  $\theta$  and  $J \subseteq I$  with  $J \cap I_0(\theta) \neq \emptyset$  we have  $\theta \in H_{J \cap I_0(\theta)}$ . So according to the subset pivotality condition (1) there is a  $\theta^* \in H_I$  with  $FWER_{\theta}^J \coloneqq \mathbb{P}_{\theta} \left( \max_{j \in J \cap I_0(\theta)} Z_j > c \right) = \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*} \left( \max_{j \in J \cap I_0(\theta)} Z_j > c \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^*} \left( \max_{j \in J} Z_j > c \right)$ . With the monotonicity (2) we get that  $FWER_{\theta}^J \leq \mathbb{P}_0 \left( \max_{j \in J} Z_j > c \right) = FWER_0^J$ . One concludes  $PWER_{\theta} = \sum_{J \subseteq I} \pi_J FWER_{\theta}^J \leq \sum_{J \subseteq I} \pi_J FWER_0^J = PWER_0$ .

#### **B** Correlation of the test statistics

We want to calculate the correlation matrix of the test statistics from section 3.1. The variance of the estimated effect of  $T_i$  in population  $\mathcal{P}_i$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{\mu}_{T_{i}}^{i}-\hat{\mu}_{C}^{i}\right) &= \operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\frac{n_{J,T_{i}}}{n_{i,T_{i}}}\bar{X}_{T_{i}}^{J}-\sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}}\bar{X}_{C}^{J}\right) \\ &= \operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\frac{n_{J,T_{i}}}{n_{i,T_{i}}}\bar{X}_{T_{i}}^{J}\right) + \operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}}\bar{X}_{C}^{J}\right) \\ &= \sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\left(\frac{n_{J,T_{i}}}{n_{i,T_{i}}}\right)^{2}\operatorname{Var}(\bar{X}_{T_{i}}^{J}) + \sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\left(\frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}}\right)^{2}\operatorname{Var}(\bar{X}_{C}^{J}) \\ &= \sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\left(\frac{n_{J,T_{i}}}{n_{i,T_{i}}^{2}}+\frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}^{2}}\right)\sigma^{2} = V_{i}\sigma^{2}, \end{aligned}$$

using the independence of the observations in the third equation.

For different treatments tested in all populations and  $i \neq j$  we have

$$\operatorname{Cov}(Z_i, Z_j) = \sigma^{-2} (V_i V_j)^{-1/2} \operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{\mu}_{T_i}^i - \hat{\mu}_C^i, \hat{\mu}_{T_j}^j - \hat{\mu}_C^j\right) = \sigma^{-2} (V_i V_j)^{-1/2} \operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{\mu}_C^i, \hat{\mu}_C^j\right),$$

because covariances with unequal treatments eliminate due to independent observations. And we get

$$\begin{split} \operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{\mu}_{C}^{i},\hat{\mu}_{C}^{j}\right) &= \operatorname{Cov}\left(\sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C}}\bar{X}_{C}^{J},\sum_{J'\subseteq I:\,j\in J'}\frac{n_{J',C}}{n_{j,C}}\bar{X}_{C}^{J'}\right) \\ &= \sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i\in J}\sum_{J'\subseteq I:\,j\in J'}\frac{n_{J,C}n_{J',C}}{n_{i,C}n_{j,C}}\operatorname{Cov}\left(\bar{X}_{C}^{J},\bar{X}_{C}^{J'}\right) \\ &= \sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i,j\in J}\frac{n_{J,C}^{2}}{n_{i,C}n_{j,C}}\operatorname{Var}\left(\bar{X}_{C}^{J}\right) = \sum_{J\subseteq I:\,i,j\in J}\frac{n_{J,C}\cdot\sigma^{2}}{n_{i,C}n_{j,C}}. \end{split}$$

All in all, this gives

$$\operatorname{Cov}\left(Z_{i}, Z_{j}\right) = \frac{\sum_{J \subseteq I: \, i, j \in J} n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C} n_{j,C} \sqrt{V_{i} V_{j}}}$$

In case of only one single treatment T tested in all populations one obtains analogously

$$\operatorname{Cov} (Z_i, Z_j) = (V_i V_j)^{-1/2} \sum_{J \subseteq I: \, i, j \in J} \left( \frac{n_{J,T}}{n_{i,T} n_{j,T}} + \frac{n_{J,C}}{n_{i,C} n_{j,C}} \right)$$

#### C Convergence of the true PWER

Under the conditions of section 3.2 we assume that for every parameter  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  of the multinomial distribution, and for each of its realizations  $(n_J)_{J\subseteq I}$ ,  $\hat{c}_N$  is a critical value that satisfies  $\widehat{PWER}(\hat{c}_N) = \alpha$ . The sequence  $(PWER(\hat{c}_N))_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$  then almost surely converges to  $\alpha$ . This follows from  $PWER(\hat{c}_N) - \alpha = PWER(\hat{c}_N) - \widehat{PWER}(\hat{c}_N) = \sum_{J\subseteq I} (\pi_J - \hat{\pi}_J) (1 - \Phi_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_J}(\hat{c}_N, \dots, \hat{c}_N)) \xrightarrow[N \to \infty]{a.s.} 0$ , in consequence of the strong consistency of the MLE  $\hat{\pi}$  and the boundedness of  $\Phi$ .

The sequence  $(\hat{c}_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  of the estimated critical values is also convergent, in terms of convergence in probability, towards the critical limit  $c(\pi)$  that results from using the true prevalences and correspondingly proportioned sample sizes. To prove this, we first note that for any fixed  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  the estimated PWER  $F_N(c) := \widehat{PWER}_{\nu_N, \Sigma_N}(c)$  converges

in probability (and even almost surely) to  $F(c) \coloneqq PWER_{\nu(\pi),\Sigma(\pi)}(c)$ , where  $\nu(\pi)$  and  $\Sigma(\pi)$  are based on the true prevalences. This follows from the continuity of the multivariate t-distribution with respect to its location and scale matrix. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Using the strong monotonicity of the PWER with respect to c, we find

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\hat{c}_{N}-c(\pi)\right|\geq\varepsilon\right)\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{c}_{N}\geq\varepsilon+c(\pi)\right)+\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{c}_{N}\leq c(\pi)-\varepsilon\right)$$
  
$$\leq\mathbb{P}\left(F_{N}\left(\varepsilon+c(\pi)\right)\geq\alpha\right)+\mathbb{P}\left(F_{N}\left(c(\pi)-\varepsilon\right)\leq\alpha\right)$$
  
$$=\mathbb{P}\left(F_{N}\left(\varepsilon+c(\pi)\right)-F(\varepsilon+c(\pi))\geq\alpha-F(\varepsilon+c(\pi))\right)$$
  
$$+\mathbb{P}\left(F(c(\pi)-\varepsilon)-F_{N}\left(c(\pi)-\varepsilon\right)\geq F(c(\pi)-\varepsilon)-\alpha\right),$$

and also some  $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$  with  $F(\epsilon + c(\pi)) = \alpha - \delta_1$  und  $F(c(\pi) - \varepsilon) = \alpha + \delta_2$ . Hence with the pointwise convergence of  $F_N$  to F we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\hat{c}_{N}-c(\pi)\right|\geq\varepsilon\right)\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\left|F_{N}\left(\varepsilon+c(\pi)\right)-F(\varepsilon+c(\pi))\right|\geq\delta_{1}\right)\\+\mathbb{P}\left(\left|F(c(\pi)-\varepsilon)-F_{N}\left(c(\pi)-\varepsilon\right)\right|\geq\delta_{2}\right)\xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{}0+0=0.$$

# Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dr. Miriam Kesselmeier for kindly providing the data set of her real data example. We also thank Dr. Charlie Hillner for his comments on a previous version of the manuscript.

## References

Ouma, LO et al. Design and analysis of umbrella trials: Where do we stand? Front. Med. 2022; 9:1037439.

- Brannath, W, Hillner, C and Rohmeyer, K. The population-wise error rate for clinical trials with overlapping populations. Statistical Methods in Medical Research. 2023;32(2):334-352.
- Westfall, PH and Young, SS. Resampling-based multiple testing. Examples and methods for p-value adjustment. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics, Applied probability and statistics. Wiley, New York, 1993.
- Dickhaus, T. Simultaneous Statistical Inference. With Applications in the Life Sciences. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014.
- Hillner, C. Adaptive group sequential designs with control of the population-wise error rate. Universität Bremen, PhD thesis, 2021.

Kotz, S and Nadarajah, S. Multivariate T-Distributions and Their Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kesselmeier, M *et al.* Effect size estimates from umbrella designs: Handling patients with a positive test result for multiple biomarkers using random or pragmatic subtrial allocation. PLoS ONE 2020; 15(8):1-24.

Brunkhorst, FM *et al.* Effect of empirical treatment with moxifloxacin and meropenem vs meropenem on sepsis-related organ dysfunction in patients with severe sepsis: a randomized trial. JAMA 2012; 307(22):2390-9.