



The Impact of Bias on Different Randomization Procedures

David Schindler, Nicole Heussen, Diane Uschner,
Ralf-Dieter Hilgers

Institute of Medical Statistics
RWTH Aachen University

March 15th, 2016



FP7 HEALTH 2013 - 602552





- Choice of a randomization procedure does not follow scientific arguments up to now.
- Treatment comparisons should involve consideration of the potential contribution of bias to the p -value (ICH E9, 1998).
- Unequal performance of randomization procedures in the presence of
 - ▶ Selection bias
 - ▶ Chronological bias





- Two-armed clinical trial with parallel group design and total sample size N , where N is an even number.
- Experimental treatment E and control treatment C .
- Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_N)' \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be a randomization sequence.
- Let $N_j(i)$ be the number of patients assigned to treatment group $j \in \{E, C\}$ after i allocations.





Assuming a (random) bias vector $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N)^T$ the i th patient's response with $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ can be expressed as:

$$y_i = \mu_E T_i + \mu_C (1 - T_i) + b_i + \sigma \epsilon_i. \quad (1)$$

- The i th allocation is done as follows:

$$T_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if patient } i \text{ is allocated to group } E \\ 0, & \text{if patient } i \text{ is allocated to group } C \end{cases}$$

- Expected response μ_j under treatment $j \in \{E, C\}$.
- Errors $\epsilon_i \underset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$.





We test the hypotheses

$$H_0 : \mu_E = \mu_C \text{ vs. } H_1 : \mu_E \neq \mu_C$$

with Student's t-test (under misspecification) and test statistic

$$W = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{N_E N_C}{N_E + N_C}} (\bar{y}_E - \bar{y}_C)}{\frac{1}{N_E + N_C - 2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N T_i (y_i - \bar{y}_E)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - T_i) (y_i - \bar{y}_C)^2 \right)}$$

$$\text{with } \bar{y}_E = \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i T_i, \bar{y}_C = \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i (1 - T_i), \text{ and } N = N_E + N_C.$$





Under $H_0 : \mu_E = \mu_C$ the type-I-error probability in Model (1) (under misspecification) conditioned on the randomization sequence is

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_* &:= P(|W| > t_{N-2, 1-\alpha/2} | \mathbf{T}) \\ &= F_{N-2, \delta, \lambda}(t_{N-2, \alpha/2}) + 1 - F_{N-2, \delta, \lambda}(t_{N-2, 1-\alpha/2}),\end{aligned}$$

where $F_{N-2, \delta, \lambda}(x)$ is the distribution function of the doubly noncentral t-distribution with $N - 2$ degrees of freedom and parameters

$$\delta = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{N_E N_C}{N_E + N_C}} (\bar{b}_E - \bar{b}_C) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N b_i^2 - n_E \bar{b}_E^2 - n_C \bar{b}_C^2 \right]$$

$$\text{with } \bar{b}_E = \frac{1}{N_E} \sum_{i=1}^N b_i T_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{b}_C = \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{i=1}^N b_i (1 - T_i).$$





Step 1: Generate 100.000 randomization sequences of a given randomization procedure.

Step 2: For each randomization sequence we compute the corresponding noncentrality parameters dependent on the bias.

Step 3: Compute α_* of each randomization sequence.
⇒ Average of the α_* values is an estimator for the type-I-error probability of a randomization procedure.





Step 1: Generate 100.000 randomization sequences of a given randomization procedure.

Step 2: For each randomization sequence we compute the corresponding noncentrality parameters dependent on the bias.

Step 3: Compute α_* of each randomization sequence.
⇒ Average of the α_* values is an estimator for the type-I-error probability of a randomization procedure.





- Step 1: Generate 100.000 randomization sequences of a given randomization procedure.
- Step 2: For each randomization sequence we compute the corresponding noncentrality parameters dependent on the bias.
- Step 3: Compute α_* of each randomization sequence.
⇒ Average of the α_* values is an estimator for the type-I-error probability of a randomization procedure.





- PBR(k)** (Permuted Block Randomization with block length k)
Within each block half of the patients are assigned to E and C .
- RAR** Random Allocation Rule, PBR with only one block.
- CR** Complete Randomization is accomplished by tossing a fair coin for each included patient.
- TBD** (Truncated Binomial Design) CR is used until $N/2$ patients are assigned to E or C , afterwards the randomization list is filled with the opposite treatment.
- BSD(a)** (Big Stick Design) CR with a reflecting boundary a .





Type-I-error probability of Student's t-test dependent on the randomization procedure when the i th response is affected by a linear time trend (Tamm and Hilgers (2014)) for $N = 8$ (exact):

$$b_i = \frac{(i-1)\vartheta}{N} \quad \text{with } \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

ϑ	CR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	BSD(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$	TBD $\bar{\alpha}_*$	RAR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	PBR(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$
0	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050
1/2	0.050	0.050	0.052	0.050	0.048
1	0.050	0.048	0.057	0.050	0.043
2	0.050	0.043	0.075	0.051	0.026

Calculations done with `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016).

- Nominal significance level α of the test is 5%.





Type-I-error probability of Student's t-test dependent on the randomization procedure when the i th response is affected by a linear time trend (Tamm and Hilgers (2014)) for $N = 8$ (exact):

$$b_i = \frac{(i-1)\vartheta}{N} \quad \text{with } \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

ϑ	CR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	BSD(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$	TBD $\bar{\alpha}_*$	RAR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	PBR(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$
0	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050
1/2	0.050	0.050	0.052	0.050	0.048
1	0.050	0.048	0.057	0.050	0.043
2	0.050	0.043	0.075	0.051	0.026

Calculations done with `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016).

- Nominal significance level α of the test is 5%.





Type-I-error probability of Student's t-test dependent on the randomization procedure when the i th response is affected by a linear time trend (Tamm and Hilgers (2014)) for $N = 60$ (simulated):

$$b_i = \frac{(i - 1) \vartheta}{N} \quad \text{with } \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

ϑ	CR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	BSD(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$	TBD $\bar{\alpha}_*$	RAR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	PBR(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$
0	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050
1/2	0.050	0.048	0.055	0.051	0.048
1	0.050	0.042	0.069	0.050	0.041
2	0.049	0.026	0.115	0.051	0.024

Calculations done with `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016).

- Nominal significance level α of the test is 5%.





Type-I-error probability of Student's t-test dependent on the randomization procedure when the i th response is affected by selection bias (Proschan, 1994) for $N = 8$ (exact):

$$b_i = \begin{cases} \eta, & \text{if } N_E(i-1) < N_C(i-1) \\ 0, & \text{if } N_E(i-1) = N_C(i-1) \text{ with } \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+ . \\ -\eta, & \text{if } N_E(i-1) > N_C(i-1) \end{cases}$$

ϑ	CR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	BSD(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$	TBD $\bar{\alpha}_*$	RAR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	PBR(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$
0.30	0.050	0.051	0.053	0.055	0.063
0.60	0.052	0.055	0.061	0.068	0.098
1.19	0.056	0.065	0.083	0.103	0.207

Calculations done with `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016).

- Nominal significance level α of the test is 5%.





Type-I-error probability of Student's t-test dependent on the randomization procedure when the i th response is affected by selection bias (Proschan, 1994) for $N = 60$ (simulated):

$$b_i = \begin{cases} \eta, & \text{if } N_E(i-1) < N_C(i-1) \\ 0, & \text{if } N_E(i-1) = N_C(i-1) \text{ with } \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+ . \\ -\eta, & \text{if } N_E(i-1) > N_C(i-1) \end{cases}$$

ϑ	CR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	BSD(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$	TBD $\bar{\alpha}_*$	RAR $\bar{\alpha}_*$	PBR(2) $\bar{\alpha}_*$
0.09	0.050	0.053	0.051	0.051	0.064
0.18	0.051	0.061	0.052	0.054	0.106
0.37	0.052	0.091	0.057	0.064	0.278

Calculations done with `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016).

- Nominal significance level α of the test is 5%.





- Power loss due to unequally sized groups at the end of the clinical study depend on the randomization procedure and sample size N .
- For a study, which is planned with 80% power, we get:

N	CR $1 - \beta_*$	BSD(2) $1 - \beta_*$	TBD $1 - \beta_*$	RAR $1 - \beta_*$	PBR(2) $1 - \beta_*$
8	0.736	0.787	0.800	0.800	0.800
60	0.793	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800

Calculations done with `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016).





- Randomization procedures differ in terms of their susceptibility to selection and chronological bias.
- The choice of an appropriate randomization procedure is the crucial point to prevent bias.
- Evaluation of randomization procedures should be part of the trial and analysis plan.
- We developed `randomizeR` (Schindler and Uschner, 2016) for making fair comparisons of randomization procedures concerning different types of bias and their balancing behavior.

The IDEAL project has received funding from the European Union's 7th Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under Grant Agreement no 602552.





- Blackwell, D. and J. L. Hodges Jr. (1957). Design for the control of selection bias. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 25, 449–460.
- ICH E9 (1998). Statistical principles for clinical trials. *Current Step 4 version dated 5 February 1998*. Available from: <http://www.ich.org>.
- Kennes, L. N., E. Cramer, R.-D. Hilgers, and N. Heussen (2011). The impact of selection bias on test decision in randomized clinical trials. *Statistics in Medicine* 30, 2573–2581.
- Langer, S. (2014). *The modified distribution of the t-test statistic under the influence of selection bias based on random allocation rule*. master thesis, RWTH Aachen University.
- Proschan, M. (1994). Influence of selection bias on type 1 error rate under random permuted block designs. *Statistica Sinica* 4, 219–231.
- Rosenkranz, G. K. (2011). The impact of randomization on the analysis of clinical trials. *Statistics in Medicine* 30, 3475–3487.



Schindler, D. and D. Uschner (2016). *randomizeR: Randomization for clinical trials*. R package version 1.1.

Tamm, M. and R.-D. Hilgers (2014). Chronological bias in randomized clinical trials under different types of unobserved time trends. *Methods of Information in Medicine* 53, 501–510.

