Demographic Differences Between Unselected Patients and Participants of Multiple Myeloma Clinical Trials in the US: A Threat to External Validity

Luciano J Costa, MD, PhD¹, Parameswaran Hari, MD, MRCP, MS² and Shaji Kumar, MD³

- 1- Division of Hematology and Oncology, University of Alabama at Birmingham.
- 2- Division of Hematology and Oncology, Medical College of Wisconsin
- 3- Division of Hematology, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine



Knowledge that will change your world





Background

> Multiple myeloma affects predominantly older individuals.

➤Treatment tolerance and prognosis affected by age.

>Incidence of MM in blacks is nearly twice the incidence in white Americans.

Disease biology and possible interaction with therapy are different between blacks and whites.

Improvements in outcomes seen primarily among young individuals and more pronounced in whites.

Pulte et al. Leuk Lymphoma 55:1083, 2014 Baker et al. Blood 121:3147, 2013



Clinical trial results are primary source of information to guide patient management

Affected population



Clinical Trial Subjects



External validity = Findings are applicable to affected population

Internal validity = Study conducted without bias

Rothwell . Lancet 365:82, 2005



Objective

To compare composition of MM trials in US with MM population at large

≻Age

➢Disease stage

≻Gender

➢Race/ethnicity



Methods

PubMed search of MM trials performed in US

•Keyword "myeloma" and "clinical trial" followed by manual screening

•Trials published 2007-2014

•MM-directed intervention

•Trials performed entirely in US

► Reference population from SEER-18.



Information extracted from each trial

- Median age
- Gender composition
- Proportion of racial/ethnic minorities (Hispanic and/or non-white)
- Study phase (I/II vs. III)
- Sponsor (investigator vs. NCI vs. Industry)
- Population (untreated vs. R/R vs. other)
- International Staging System (ISS) for trials of untreated patients



Information extracted from SEER-18

- Age composition of unselected population
- Expected gender composition
- Expected proportion of minorities according to median age





Results

> 128 clinical trials (8,869 subjects)

•26% untreated, 54% R/R, 20 % other

•94% Phases I/II, 6% phase III

•54% Investigator, 13% NCI, 33% Industry-sponsored

> Age of subjects was reported in 127 (99.2%) trials.

➤Gender composition reported in 120 (93.8%) trials.

▶ Racial-ethnic composition reported in only 51 (39.8%) trials (4,853 subjects).



Median of median age of subjects 61 years vs. 69 years in unselected patients.



> 58.4% subjects were men vs. expected 56.9% (O:E ratio 1.03, 95% C.I. 0.99-1.05)



Stage distribution – preferential accrual of lower risk patients



Greipp et al. J Clin Oncol 23:3412, 2005 Kumar et al. Leukemia 28:1122, 2014



Minority participation – reported in 39.8% of trials only





Trials reporting were larger than trials not reporting minority accrual Accrual of minorities more often reported in industry-sponsored than investigator-sponsored trials



Minority participation – per sponsor



Number of Subjects



Minority participation- per sponsor





Conclusions

> Accrual of minorities is not reported for the majority of MM trials in US

•Industry > NCI > Investigator-sponsored trials

>Accrual of subjects to US MM is highly biased towards preferential accrual of:

•Younger patients

•Patients with lower-risk MM

•Non-Hispanic whites

Minority accrual Industry > NCI > Investigator-sponsored trials

>No evidence of gender bias



Conclusions – Possible interventions

Consistent reporting of minority accrual

•Ethnicity/race as variable for stratification and/or subset analysis

Engagement of clinical trial navigators

Development of age-specific, comorbidity-specific clinical trials

•Age ≥ 70

•Renal dysfunction

Use of less restrictive eligibility criteria

