Population state-space modelling of patient responses in antidepressant studies

lack of "first principles" from which response models can be derived. The state-space framework, which is based on a set of differential (or difference) equations that describes the evolution of one or more variables characterizing the patient's health

Dose change

 $\overline{x}_{2}(t)$

Typical score

 $\widetilde{x}_{2}^{\prime}(t)$

Individual shift

Dose change

A discrete-time stochastic model (integrated random walk, IRW) can be easily obtained by replacing the integrals of the

According to an empirical Bayes paradigm, hyperparameters were estimated through Maximum Likelihood. Estimation

A double-blind, randomized, placebo controlled, flexible dose depression trial was used as a benchmark for alternative

x'(t)

True score of *i*-th subject

. Marostica¹, A. Russu¹, G. De Nicolao¹, R. Gomeni²

comprehensive state-space approach, we address two main questions:

How should flexible dosing schedules be handled within a state-space framework? Stochastic state-space model of HAMD score

random processes whose statistics were specified through hyperparameters.

 $\overline{x}_1(t)$

1st derivative

of typical score

 $\tilde{x}_{1}^{i}(t)$

1st derivative

Figure 1: Block-diagram of the st

 $\overline{x}_1(0), \overline{x}_2(0), \overline{w}(t), \widetilde{x}_1^i(0), \widetilde{x}_2^i(t), \widetilde{w}^i(t), \overline{\Delta}, \overline{\Delta}^i, v_k^i$ are independent of each other.

continuous-time one (population smoothing splines, PSS) with discrete sums.

 $\widetilde{\Delta}^i \sim N(0, \sigma_A^2)$

Δ

t flex

 $\overline{x}_{2}(0)$

 $\widetilde{x}_2^i(0) \sim N(0, \sigma_2^2)$

noise with finite variance, a classical device to enforce a smoothness prior on the continuous-time score signal.

Initial stat

How to give an adequate description of the clinical response?

 $\overline{x}_1(0)$

 $\widetilde{x}_{1}^{i}(0) \sim N(0, \sigma_{1}^{2})$

Initial state

University of Pavia

Results (2)

The continuous-time model (PSS) provided good individual fittings (*Figure 4*) and satisfactory Visual Predictive Checks (Figure 5) for both treatment arms.

GlaxoSmithKline





- The results demonstrate that state-space approaches not only provide adequate description of population responses but are also easily adapted to account for possible dose changes during the trial.
- Among the advantages, there is the possibility to model the presence of random perturbations that affect the patient's health state.
- Alternative state-space models whose output converges to a stationary process, e.g. autoregressive moving average (ARMA) models5, may be considered.
- A further step will be the development of an integrated response and dropout model within the state-space framework.

References

- Russu A, Marostica E, De Nicolao G, Hooker AC, Poggesi I, Gomeni R, Zamuner S, Integrated model for clinical response and dropout in depression trials: a state-space approach, PAGE 19th Meeting, Abstract 1852, 2010 Magni P, Bellazzi R, De Nicolao G, Poggesi I, Rocchetti M, Norparametric AUC estimation in population studies with incomplete sampling: a Bayesian approach, *Journal of Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics* 29, 445–471, 2002
- Pharmacodynamics 29, 445–471, 2002 Neve M, De Nicolao G, Marchesi L, Nonparametric identification of population models via Gaussian processes, Automatica 43, 1134–1144, 2007
- 1134–1144, 2007 R Development Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria 2010. http://www.R-project.orgs. Ljung L, System Identification: Theory for the User, Prentice-Hall,Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1987

Introduction A major challenge posed by the analysis of the clinical scores used to assess the disease status in depression trials is the

White noise

 $\overline{W} \sim WGN(\overline{\lambda}^2)$

2nd derivative

of typical score

White noise $\widetilde{w}^i \sim WGN(\widetilde{\lambda}^2)$

2nd derivative

of individual shif

Results (1)

state-space approaches



and post-processing were carried out with R 2.10.04

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)			
	IRW	PSS	
Non-escalating subjects	4.880	5.396	
Escalating subjects	4.469	4.948	
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)			
	IRW	PSS	
Non-escalating subjects	11.009	10.678	
Escalating subjects	11.224	10.851	
Table 1: RMSE and BIC of the placebo arm			



DRUG ARM

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)			
	IRW	PSS	
Non-escalating subjects	4.766	6.106	
Escalating subjects	4.253	4.832	
Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)			
	IRW	PSS	
Non-escalating subjects	11.422	10.921	
Escalating subjects	11.085	10.799	
Table 2: PMSE and PIC of the drug arm			

Contacts: Eleonora Marostica, Department of Computer Engineering and Systems Science, University of Pavia, via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy, E-mail: ele126@hotmail.it

Web Broadcasting Service

Conclusions