A Generalized Evolutionary Classifier (EC) for Evolutionarily Guided Precision Medicine (EGPM)

Matthew McCoy[1], Chen-Hsiang Yeang[2], Jin Young Yang[1], Deepak Parashar[3,4], and Robert A. Beckman[1,5]

[1]Department of Oncology, Lombardi Comprehensive Cancer Center and Innovation Center for Biomedical Informatics, Georgetown University Medical Center, Washington, D.C. USA

[2]Institute for Statistical Science, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan

[3]Statistics and Epidemiology Unit & Cancer Research Centre, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry UK

[4]The Alan Turing Institute for Data Science and Artificial Intelligence, The British Library, London UK

[5]Department of Biostatistics, Bioinformatics, and Biomathematics, Lombardi Comprehensive Cancer Center, Georgetown University Medical Center, Washington, DC USA

Corresponding author: Matthew D. McCoy

Address: 2115 Wisconsin Ave NW, Suite G100

Phone: (202) 687-6781

Fax: (202) 687-5011

Email: matthew.mccoy@georgetown.edu

Running title: Classifier for Evolutionary Guided Precision Medicine

Keywords: Cancer, Tumor Evolution, Precision Medicine, Basket Trials, Classifiers

Financial support: Supported in part by The Royal Society International Exchanges Award to DP and RAB.

Disclosure: RAB consults for or has recently consulted for AstraZeneca, CSTone, EMD Serono, Vertex, and Zymeworks. He is the Chief Scientific Officer of Onco-Mind, LLC.

Word count: 3274

Figures: 3

Tables: 1

ABSTRACT

Precision medicine (PM) matches patients to therapies, utilizing traditional biomarker classifiers. Dynamic precision medicine (DPM) is an evolutionarily directed approach which adapts every six weeks, plans ahead for future resistance development, incorporates multiple therapeutic agents, and may improve survival (simulated hazard ratio DPM:PM, HR-DPM/PM, 0.52). We developed an evolutionary classifier (EC) to select patients who benefit from DPM. Subclonal prevalence and growth, mutation, and drug sensitivity parameters determine each DPM recommended adaptation (move). In simulations, if the first two moves are identical for DPM and PM, patients will not benefit (90% negative predictive value). The first two moves provide nearly the benefit of 40 moves. Patients benefiting equally between 2 and 40 moves have extraordinary predicted benefit (HR-DPM/PM 0.04). This EC development paradigm may apply to other dynamic cancer models despite different underlying assumptions. It may reduce the duration and frequency of required monitoring, and also enable “window” clinical trials.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Biomarker classifiers match patients to therapies. Dynamic precision medicine (DPM) directs therapeutic sequence and timing using evolutionary dynamics. We present an evolutionary classifier (EC) for predicting patient benefit from DPM, discovering that many require only briefly, thereby improving cost-effectiveness. This approach may generalize to other evolutionarily directed strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Evolutionary guided precision medicine (EGPM): Current precision cancer medicine matches therapies to static, consensus molecular patterns. Patients are treated with a matched therapy for as long as they are benefiting, and upon progression and relapse the process is repeated. This approach has resulted in substantial patient benefits and is a major current direction in oncology. However, despite the benefits of this approach, duration of response is variable, and long-term remissions and cures remain elusive.

Cancers are constantly evolving subclonal heterogeneity. Ultradeep sequencing (20,000X) of colorectal cancers at diagnosis and a novel approach to modeling the evolution of very rare subclones indicate that any cancer containing enough cells to be detectable will have at least one cell with a resistance mutation to any single therapy, and that as the cancer burden increases during a clinical course cells may evolve that are simultaneously resistant to multiple elements of a therapeutic cocktail, at a rate substantially faster than previously anticipated[1, 2]. Rare resistant cells may grow out relatively free of competition from other cancer cells in numerous micrometastases that are small enough to allow ready diffusion of oxygen and nutrients. Infiltration of major organs with micrometastases, rather than growth of large lesions, generally leads to cancer mortality[1, 3].

Explicit consideration of subclonal heterogeneity and evolutionary dynamics may improve clinical results by preventing the evolution of resistance. Several strategies have been proposed for incorporating evolutionary dynamics in a personalized manner[4-7]. We will term these ***evolutionary-guided precision medicine (EGPM)*** strategies. A strategy is defined not as a particular therapy or regimen, but rather as an algorithm for determining optimal therapy sequences on an individual basis.

Our work has been focused on ***dynamic precision medicine (DPM)*****,** an approach to precision medicine that explicitly considers subclonal heterogeneity and dynamics, adapts very frequently, and proactively plans ahead based on estimated risks of future events[6]. DPM, unlike earlier EGPMs, considers optimal sequencing of multiple non-cross resistant therapies, rather than focusing on optimal scheduling of a single therapy. Extensive simulation has shown that significant improvements in relapse prevention and a doubling of median survival are possible. Primary resistance may be due to non-genetic plasticity or pre-existing mutations, whereas later relapses will increasingly be due to epigenetic and genetic sub-clonal evolution, the latter including not only mutations but also copy number changes and other rearrangements.

DPM explicitly considers minority subclones and heritable genetic and epigenetic evolutionary dynamics, with the goal of maximizing survival by balancing treating current disease and preventing refractory disease relapse, the latter accomplished by eliminating small singly-resistant subclones before they can evolve sub-subclonal variants simultaneously resistant to multiple non-cross resistant agents. DPM predicts

that “hypermutator subclones” will arise that mutate more rapidly due to random mutations in proteins responsible for genome integrity, such as replication and repair proteins[6, 8]. These hypermutator subclones can rapidly evolve cells that are simultaneously resistant to all the agents in a therapeutic cocktail, and are a particular priority for early elimination. The DPM prediction that hypermutator subclones will be enriched in resistant samples has been verified using a fluorescent reporter assay for hypermutators as well as ultradeep DNA sequencing[9]. As a result, DPM will often recommend brief periods of prioritizing elimination of rare hypermutator subclones vs. debulking the tumor.

DPM changes therapy very frequently and plans ahead for potential future evolution of rare hypermutator subclones and others using an adaptive evolutionary model to predict the optimal treatment regimen within a short time window - e.g. two 3-week therapy cycles, although the length of this window can be adjusted. We term each therapy adaptation a ”move” in analogy to chess. Frequent changes in therapy are a hallmark of DPM because this minimizes the constant, predictable selection pressure that facilitates multi-agent resistance in approaches that treat with a constant single or combination therapy until progression or relapse. Instead, frequent adaptation complicates evolutionary pathways to multiple resistance[10]. DPM considers the probabilities of distant outcomes up to 5 years in the future when determining each move, and may be superior at prioritizing these longer timescales of interest vs. other algorithms that focus on short term outcomes such as tumor shrinkage[11].

In an extensive simulation of 3 million virtual patients, where each patient represented a unique starting state of prevalence of sensitive and resistant subclones, and a unique set of parameters including net growth rates, phenotypic transition rates of each subclones between sensitivity and resistance to two non-cross resistant therapies, DPM doubled median survival compared to ***current precision medicine (CPM)***, over a wide range of scenarios encompassing literature and clinical experience across oncology[6]. This average benefit was driven by 31% of the virtual patients who experienced significant benefit while the other 69% of patients had equivalent outcomes on CPM and DPM.

This manuscript concerns the development of an ***evolutionary classifier (EC)*** to select the subset of patients that will benefit from DPM. The approach we have discovered may be readily generalizable to other EGPM approaches. This would greatly facilitate clinical testing of EGPM approaches.

Evolutionary basket design (EBD): Clinical testing of EGPM faces several hurdles[12]. Assays to detect rare subclones and predict their drug sensitivity and resistance properties may involve emerging single cell genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic techniques in both solid and liquid biopsies, as well as growing bioinformatic databases mapping molecular properties to phenotypes. We are also developing an assay to isolate and quantify hypermutators. However, these concerns are out of the scope of this manuscript, which instead focuses on selecting patients assuming the relevant input

parameters are (to some degree) available, and thus enhancing the efficiency of clinical studies to evaluate the merit of EGPM.

Clinical studies of highly adaptive EGPM algorithms that consider multiple therapies face two challenges. First, the result of the studies could be confounded by the particular characteristics of the drugs in the setting where the EGPM is tested. To take DPM for example, it is apparent that the traditional distinction between lines of therapy will be blurred since DPM may recommend moves involving brief bursts of later line therapies early in the patient's course to eliminate minor subclones[12, 13]. But the efficacy of later line therapy when given earlier will in general not be known. Suppose a third line drug is highly effective in first line, unbeknownst to the community. DPM will recommend more of the drug in first line, and the DPM arm of a randomized study will appear superior. However, this result may not reflect the true merits of DPM, but rather the unexpected efficacy of the third line drug.

Secondly, highly adaptive EGPM presents a very large decision tree of therapy sequences which will be assigned to patients individually based on their initial state and evolutionary dynamic parameters, and will in real applications need periodic reassignment if future states diverge from predictions. In DPM, which takes into account possible need for dose reduction in simultaneous combination, if there are two non-cross resistant therapies A and B, there are three options at each move: full dose A, full dose B, and a simultaneous combination of A and B at reduced dose. (We note a "therapy" may itself be a combination of drugs. A "therapy" is defined as a drug or group of drugs targeted against a particular subclone). Due to frequent adaptation, both A and B can be delivered at high intensity early on, even if administered as monotherapy pulses. The number of possible paths if two therapies are considered over n moves. is thus 3^n. If we consider only 2 moves, or a 12-week window, there are 9 sequences to consider.

Cancer precision medicine has led to a surge in biomarker-guided clinical trial designs[14-19] such as the biomarker-stratified, biomarker-strategy, adaptive enrichment designs, and platform designs. For EGPM/DPM, cancers are constantly evolving subclonal tumor heterogeneity thereby presenting a challenge for designing clinical trials in a manner that accounts for these changes over time and considers the multiple possible pathways. It is tempting in such a scenario to randomize patients to either an interventional treatment arm (evolutionary guided precision medicine, EGPM) in this case targeting DPM or to a control arm offering standard precision medicine or other standard of care ('*biomarker-strategy*' designs)[20]. Such a design, however, is unlikely to be efficient as a significant number of patients will receive the same care in both treatment arms, thereby diluting the between-arms treatment effect, resulting in loss of statistical power and increased sample size. The strategy design, if applied to DPM, could be confounded by the underlying properties of the study drugs in an individual case, as discussed above, due to the blurring of "lines of therapy" compared to conventional approaches. Another possible approach is '*dynamic treatment regimens*'

(DTR) which allow treatment to vary with time and identify the treatment path for the patient subgroup that maximizes the outcome[21, 22]. DTRs do so by randomizing biomarker-defined patient subgroups at the first decision point and adaptively randomizing at the second decision point subgroups further split by response status, with responders being randomized to one of the maintenance therapies and non-responders to second line / salvage therapies. The DPM scenario is distinct in that each patient has several paths and one chooses the optimal one per individual. It is, therefore, pertinent to note that our novel approach differs from DTRs in two ways: firstly, we wish to define treatment sequences for each individual rather than two subgroups; secondly, we will a priori assign each patient to a treatment sequence predicted to be optimal using a novel classifier algorithm without having the need to randomize at each stage. A priori treatment assignments can be modified in DPM if interim measurements show that the patient's subclonal composition differs from what is predicted. This can result in a change in classifier status. Moreover, DTRs can also be confounded by early use of late line therapies, since they are designed to compare therapies at specific timepoints, not to evaluate a strategic approach towards sequencing therapies individually.

New cancer trial approaches called ***basket trial*** designs have been proposed to allow efficient study of a new therapy targeting a particular mutation that may be present in multiple tumor types[19]. Basket trials recruit patients with a common mutation from populations with different tumor types and can, based on borrowing of information between tumor types, or frank pooling, be more efficient than separate studies. The effect of experimental treatment can then be assessed both in the whole recruited group and in the individual tumor types.

Basket trials have been previously governed by short term endpoints such as tumor response[23], whereas DPM may sacrifice immediate results of tumor debulking to balance this with resistance prevention, and thus be evaluated best based on time to event endpoints. We have developed a randomized confirmatory basket design which can evaluate long term benefit[23, 24], as well as approaches to statistical issues arising from testing multiple hypotheses[25], and simulation techniques for evaluating performance[26], including efficiency (the number of true positives that can be identified per patient enrolled) and control of the false positive rate.

We are now evaluating an EBD in which patients are randomized to DPM or standard of care (SOC) for a 2-move window. They can receive drug A, drug B, or a reduced dose combination for each of the 2 moves. There are a total of 9 possible sequences as discussed above, one of which is SOC. The patients will be grouped into baskets, each corresponding to a particular 2-move sequence that is recommended for them. Because the initial states and dynamic parameters interact with each other in a complex way, patients with seemingly different starting states may be grouped into the same basket based on DPM recommendations. A small number of the control patients will not receive SOC but will receive an alternate DPM sequence from a different basket.

Analyses across baskets will define the global effectiveness of DPM and the specificity of the assignment of patients to baskets by DPM, thus controlling for confounding by early use of late line therapy. More details of the EBD will be published elsewhere.

Evolutionary classifier (EC): In contrast to a conventional biomarker classifier, which informs a matching between patients and optimal therapies, we seek to develop an evolutionary classifier that will match patients to strategic algorithms for computing optimal treatment sequences. To support the EBD, we note that the EC must now perform two classifications. EC1 must identify patients most likely to benefit from DPM. EC2 must sort patients selected by EC1 into baskets representing optimal therapy sequences. Figure 1 shows how these two classifiers might function together in the context of a window study in the neoadjuvant setting in ER/HER2 double positive breast cancer. In the results section, we will describe the development and performance of the classifier, as well as surprising results concerning a 2-move DPM window. In the discussion, we will discuss the impact and innovative aspects of these findings and their possible generality. We will also discuss limitations of the work and future plans.



Figure 1. Vision of an evolutionary clinical trial using novel mathematical and computational tools of EC and EBD. Within the neoadjuvant setting, breast cancer patients are screened for double HER and ER positive status. A diagnostic biopsy collects the individual DPM input parameters required for EC1 predictions. Patients expected to benefit from DPM are enrolled in a 2-move window trial within the EBD framework. EC2 assigns patients to different baskets to match with the evolutionary treatment sequence over the 2 moves predicted to be optimal. Core biopsy is performed at the end of move 1. Patients continue on standard precision medicine after DPM's neoadjuvant intervention for the first 2 moves. Another biopsy is performed at surgery for tissue analysis feeding back into EC1 for enhanced accuracy. With primary endpoint of Relapse-free Survival, all statistical hypotheses within and between baskets are tested for significant results.

RESULTS

Construction of EC1 and its performance: We hypothesized that DPM would not be beneficial compared to CPM if the recommendations for both moves 1 and 2 were identical between DPM and CPM. Based on observation that move 2 was less influential, we based the EC1 classifier on move 1 alone. As shown in Table 1, this modified hypothesis was correct. In this figure EC1 classifies patients as potentially benefitting from DPM if DPM recommended a different move 1 from CPM. Table 1 is a 2X2 table of predicted patient benefit by EC1 vs benefit in the simulation in which a virtual patient is said to have benefitted from DPM in the simulation if it provides at least a 25% relative and 2-month absolute survival advantage compared to CPM. Compared to the overall virtual population, from which 31% of the patients benefit, only 11% benefit if move 1 is the same, whereas 43% benefit if move 1 is different, for an odds ratio (95% confidence interval) associated with EC1 of 5.77 (5.73-5.81). Figure 3 shows a Kaplan-Meier plot and associated hazard ratios DPM:CPM for a full course of DPM and DPM in a 2-move window only ("trial DPM") when both moves 1 and 2 are identical between DPM and CPM. No significant advantage is seen under these conditions. Note p values are not shown in this research brief since the sample size in the virtual trial is extremely large, conferring statistically significant p values even in the face of clinically insignificant differences.

Table 1. Statistical performance of a heuristic EC1 based on differences between DPM's and CPM's recommended sequence of two drugs or a combination for the first two moves. Benefit is defined by an overall increase in survival by at least 25%, and at least 60 days when using the DPM approach.

		Evolutionary Classifier	
		No Benefit	Benefit
Simulation	No Benefit	910344	963087
	Benefit	116769	713241

Accuracy	0.60
Precision (PPV)	0.43
NPV	0.89
Sensitivity (pos recall)	0.86
Specificity (neg recall)	0.49
F1	0.57



Figure 2. (A) Kaplan-Meier plot of simulated survival, which is increased over the standard therapeutic sequence (red) when following the strategy defined by DPM for the entire clinical course (full DPM, green) or the first two moves only (DPM trial simulation, blue). Benefits from trial DPM and full DPM are similar, as shown by the hazard ratios. (B) Kaplan-Meier plot of those virtual patients predicted to have similar survival (within 25% relative and 2 months absolute) between trial DPM and full DPM. This group of patients, about 20% of those from the original population, experience substantial benefit from either trial DPM or full DPM. (Note p values in figures B and C are highly significant, but with such large sample sizes p values would be significant even with small differences).



Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier Plot for a simulated trial of DPM, where three treatment strategies were compared. CPM (Standard Therapy) (red) recommendations are based on the therapy that provides the greatest response to the largest population of tumor cells, and the Full DPM (green) recommendations minimize the emergence of multiple drug resistance at the expense of overall tumor shrinkage. The DPM Trial (blue) treatment strategy used the DPM recommendations for the first two therapeutic interventions before reverting to the standard therapeutic strategy. The resulting populations can be grouped based on comparing the recommendations of DPM and CPM. Here we show that if DPM and COM give identical recommendations for moves 1

and 2, there is little to no benefit of DPM. If only move 2 differs, DPM gives a clinically significant benefit (hazard ratio 0.74), but trial DPM does not (hazard ratio 0.86) (data not shown).

Nearly equal benefit from Full DPM and 2-Move Trial DPM: In order to consider a window-study design in which DPM is given only within a 2-move window, we must determine the benefit conferred by only 2-moves of DPM. Figure 2A shows the surprising finding that the first 2 moves of DPM confer most of the benefit of DPM. In the entire simulation, 40 moves of DPM confers a hazard ratio HR DPM/CPM of 0.52 and 2 moves of DPM confers a hazard ratio of HR DPM/CPM of 0.55.

Extraordinary benefit for virtual patients whose benefit from full DPM and 2-move trial DPM are closely equal. Figure 2B shows the benefit predicted for those virtual patients whose survival on trial DPM and full DPM differs by less than 25% relative and less than 2 months absolute. These patients, representing nearly 20% of the original population, experience an HR DPM/CPM of 0.04.

DISCUSSION

Previously, biomarker classifiers have been used to categorize patients and match them to therapy according to conventional precision medicine. These classifiers have consisted of a single biomarker such as a mutation, or a panel of biomarkers such as a gene expression profile, involving categorical or continuous variables, the latter converted to categorical by cutoffs[14-16, 18]. Here the classifier is being applied to determine if patients will benefit from DPM and to match patients to individualized therapy sequences of the same drugs according to an algorithm based on initial subclonal state variables and evolutionary dynamics parameters[6]. The EC input values are thus unique, related in a complex way by a system of differential equations[6], and deployed for unique purposes compared to previous biomarker classifiers.

The classification, however, can be dramatically simplified by a high-level principle. Populations can be enriched for DPM benefit based on comparison of therapy recommendations by DPM and SOC in the first move. It is striking that this is true for DPM that has the ability to plan each move against a future horizon longer than the proposed window.

DPM and potentially other EGPM approaches require repeat observations over time at deep sub-clonal resolution. While single cell methods are improving, they are expensive and sensitivity and accuracy may be insufficient to distinguish rare cells from technical error. According to DPM simulations, one cell in 100,000 can alter the optimal strategy if it is an extreme hypermutator. These challenges are magnified for liquid biopsies which

are nonetheless essential to minimize patient risk and inconvenience if prolonged monitoring is required. The finding that a brief window of DPM provides similar benefits to prolonged DPM opens up the possibility of reduced patient risk and inconvenience, and reduced cost. The proposed 3-month window may allow DPM to be deployed in high risk neoadjuvant settings, where tissue availability at diagnosis and at surgery are routine and only one additional core biopsy between these timepoints would be required.

From the point of view of dynamic models of cancer treatment, especially EGPM approaches, it also raises the question of how general this high-level approach to classifying patients can be. Can patients who will benefit from other treatment approaches based on other dynamic models of cancer be selected based on whether the recommended treatment differs from SOC in an initial treatment window, and what in a given model determines the required length of this window?

One might imagine in patients who benefit equally from a finite number of moves directed by EGPM and more extended EGPM, that the initial moves convert the patient's cancer to a state similar to the initial state of a patient who cannot benefit. Once these states precluding further benefit are identified, periodic checks can in principle be instituted to govern stopping and restarting of an EGPM as needed, again optimizing cost-effectiveness. While details will differ for each EGPM, the high-level principle may be general.

Future work is necessary to more deeply understand these findings. We will determine whether this process can in fact be used to stop and restart DPM. We will create subsets of the very large simulation population based on recommended moves and on clustering based on initial state variables and input parameters, and visualize and analyze representatives of each cluster to elucidate underlying evolutionary mechanisms for DPM benefit. There may be multiple mechanisms behind significant DPM benefit in the nearly one million virtual patients who demonstrated it. We are also in the process of working with deep learning and decision-tree based-machine learning methods to improve the positive and negative predictive value of EC1 and its robustness in the face of missing data, assay sensitivity limitations, or noise.

METHODS

DPM simulations were performed and DPM and CPM recommendations for each move read out to support EC1 and EC2 as previously described[6] using strategy 2.2 to represent DPM and strategy 0 to represent CPM. Strategy 2.2 prioritizes prevention of the birth of multiply resistant cells unless the total cancer burden exceeds a predetermined threshold, whereupon reducing the total cell number is prioritized. In

actual practice, determining when it is critical to prioritize overall cytoreduction would be based on the clinical situation according to the judgement of the treating physician.

Kaplan-Meier analyses, calculation of statistical properties of EC1 including odds ratios and its confidence intervals, were performed by standard methods.

References

1. Beckman RA, Loeb LA. Rare Mutations in Cancer Drug Resistance and Implications for Therapy. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. Jul 2020;doi:10.1002/cpt.1938
2. Loeb LA, Kohrn BF, Loubet-Senear KJ, et al. Extensive subclonal mutational diversity in human colorectal cancer and its significance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Dec 2019;doi:10.1073/pnas.1910301116
3. Beckman R, Kareva I, Adler F. How should cancer models be constructed? . *Cancer Control* , in press; 2020.
4. Gatenby RA, Silva AS, Gillies RJ, Frieden BR. Adaptive therapy. *Cancer Res*. Jun 2009;69(11):4894-903. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-3658
5. Chmielecki J, Foo J, Oxnard GR, et al. Optimization of dosing for EGFR-mutant non-small cell lung cancer with evolutionary cancer modeling. *Sci Transl Med*. Jul 2011;3(90):90ra59. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3002356
6. Beckman RA, Schemmann GS, Yeang CH. Impact of genetic dynamics and single-cell heterogeneity on development of nonstandard personalized medicine strategies for cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Sep 2012;109(36):14586-91. doi:10.1073/pnas.1203559109
7. Leder K, Pitter K, LaPlant Q, et al. Mathematical modeling of PDGF-driven glioblastoma reveals optimized radiation dosing schedules. *Cell*. Jan 2014;156(3):603-616. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.12.029
8. Beckman RA, Loeb LA. Evolutionary dynamics and significance of multiple subclonal mutations in cancer. *DNA Repair (Amst)*. 08 2017;56:7-15. doi:10.1016/j.dnarep.2017.06.002
9. Riggins RB, Stires H, Balachandran M, et al. Estrogen receptor heterogeneity and signaling in HER2+/ER+ breast cancer. Hormone-Dependent Cancers Gordon Research Conference, Newry, ME.; 2019.
10. Kauffman SA. *The Origins of Order*. Oxford University Press, New York; 1993.
11. Yeang CH, Beckman RA. Long range personalized cancer treatment strategies incorporating evolutionary dynamics. *Biol Direct*. 10 2016;11(1):56. doi:10.1186/s13062-016-0153-2
12. Beckman RA, Yeang CH. Nonstandard personalized medicine strategies for cancer may lead to improved patient outcomes. *Per Med*. Sep 2014;11(7):705-719. doi:10.2217/pme.14.57
13. Beckman RA, Kareva I, Adler FR. How should cancer models be constructed? . 2020;
14. Buyse M, Michiels S, Sargent DJ, Grothey A, Matheson A, de Gramont A. Integrating biomarkers in clinical trials. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn*. Mar 2011;11(2):171-82. doi:10.1586/erm.10.120
15. Beckman RA, Clark J, Chen C. Integrating predictive biomarkers and classifiers into oncology clinical development programmes. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. Sep 2011;10(10):735-48. doi:10.1038/nrd3550
16. Freidlin B, McShane LM, Polley MY, Korn EL. Randomized phase II trial designs with biomarkers. *J Clin Oncol*. Sep 2012;30(26):3304-9. doi:10.1200/JCO.2012.43.3946
17. Parashar D, Bowden J, Starr C, Wernisch L, Mander A. An optimal stratified Simon two-stage design. *Pharm Stat*. 07 2016;15(4):333-40. doi:10.1002/pst.1742
18. Simon N, Simon R. Adaptive enrichment designs for clinical trials. *Biostatistics*. Sep 2013;14(4):613-25. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxt010
19. Antonijevic Z, Beckman RA. *Platform Trials in Drug Development: Umbrella Trials and Basket Trials*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press 2018.
20. Freidlin B, McShane LM, Korn EL. Randomized clinical trials with biomarkers: design issues. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Feb 2010;102(3):152-60. doi:10.1093/jnci/djp477
21. Dawson R, Lavori PW. Efficient design and inference for multistage randomized trials of individualized treatment policies. *Biostatistics*. Jan 2012;13(1):142-52. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxr016
22. Kidwell KM. SMART designs in cancer research: Past, present, and future. *Clin Trials*. Aug 2014;11(4):445-456. doi:10.1177/1740774514525691

23. Beckman RA, Antonijevic Z, Kalamegham R, Chen C. Adaptive Design for a Confirmatory Basket Trial in Multiple Tumor Types Based on a Putative Predictive Biomarker. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 12 2016;100(6):617-625. doi:10.1002/cpt.446
24. Chen C, Li X, Yuan S, Antonijevic Z, Kalamegham R, Beckman RA. Statistical Design and Considerations of a Phase 3 Basket Trial for Simultaneous Investigation of Multiple Tumor Types in One Study. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*. 2016;8(3):248-257. doi:-10.1080/19466315.2016.1193044
25. Stallard N, Todd S, Parashar D, Kimani PK, Renfro LA. On the need to adjust for multiplicity in confirmatory clinical trials with master protocols. *Ann Oncol*. 04 2019;30(4):506-509. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdz038
26. He L, Ren Y, Chen H, et al. Efficiency of a randomized confirmatory basket trial design constrained to control the false positive rate by indication. *biorxiv preprint*. 2020;doi:10.1101/2020.07.22.216127