

1 **Comparison of Bayesian methods for incorporating adult clinical trial data to improve**
2 **certainty of treatment effect estimates in children.**

3

4 Walker R¹, Phillips B^{1,2}, Dias S¹.

5 ¹Centre for Reviews and dissemination, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD

6 ²Department of Paediatric Haematology and Oncology, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Great
7 George Street, Leeds, LS1 3EX

8 **Abstract**

9 There are challenges associated with recruiting children to take part in randomised clinical trials and
10 as a result, compared to adults, in many disease areas we are less certain about which treatments are
11 most safe and effective. This can lead to weaker recommendations about which treatments to
12 prescribe in practice. However, it may be possible to ‘borrow strength’ from adult evidence to
13 improve our understanding of which treatments work best in children, and many different statistical
14 methods are available to conduct these analyses. In this paper we discuss Bayesian methods for
15 extrapolating adult clinical trial evidence to children. Using an exemplar dataset, we compare the
16 effect of modelling assumptions on the estimated treatment effect and associated heterogeneity. We
17 finally discuss the appropriateness of different modelling assumptions in the context of estimating
18 treatment effect in children.

19

20 **Introduction**

21 There are various challenges associated with conducting randomised control trials (RCTs) to compare
22 the efficacy and safety of medical interventions in children. A lower disease incidence in children
23 means fewer patients are eligible to take part in clinical trials and research groups and pharmaceutical
24 companies are wary of the increased effort which is required to conduct research with this population.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 Further to this, young people and/or their parents/carers may not wish to take on the additional burden
26 and time commitment associated with being in a clinical trial (1) (2).

27 Despite many diseases affecting both adults and children, these challenges mean that when compared
28 to adults, there are usually fewer RCTs in children and therefore, a greater uncertainty about which
29 medicines work ‘best’ to treat a particular disease or condition. This can lead to medicines being
30 licenced (authorised for marketing on the basis of quality, safety and efficacy) in adults some years
31 before they become available for children (2). Prescribers may also have little alternative but to use
32 medicines off-label without having direct information to inform their decision. This in turn, can create
33 inconsistency in which medicines are prescribed to children to treat a particular condition and may
34 mean that not all children are receiving the most effective treatment available.

35 To inform decision making within healthcare (including which medicines to prescribe for a
36 condition), RCT evidence is often combined using evidence synthesis techniques, such as meta-
37 analysis (MA), that take a weighted average of efficacy or safety results from multiple clinical trials
38 (or studies) to produce a summary estimate of the comparative or relative efficacy (the effect of one
39 treatment compared to another) of two interventions (3). An extension of this technique is a network-
40 meta-analysis (NMA), sometimes referred to as a mixed-treatment comparison, that allows for
41 synthesis of three or more treatments and the simultaneous comparison of each treatment with every
42 other. NMA can also provide ‘indirect comparisons’ through which estimates of the relative efficacy
43 or safety of treatments that have not been compared in head-to-head clinical trials are produced,
44 provided they are present in a ‘connected network’ of treatments i.e., a network where there is a path
45 between any two interventions with paths formed of randomised comparisons (4).

46 In paediatric research, however, these analyses may still not provide sufficient evidence for healthcare
47 decision making as the required RCT evidence may be from a small number of patients and form only
48 a sparse or disconnected network of comparisons, meaning the pooled treatment effect remains
49 uncertain. To overcome these issues, it may be possible to ‘extrapolate’ or ‘borrow strength’ from
50 clinical trial evidence in a separate but related population. For the paediatric population, this could be
51 an adult population. Information from the adult population would be extended to make inference

52 about the efficacy of treatments in children and may reduce the uncertainty of treatment effect
53 estimates in children. To justify this type of extrapolation, the disease manifestation and progression
54 of the disease of interest, along with the exposure response relationship (that is the observed effects of
55 a treatment at different doses) should already be established in children and the similarities and/or
56 differences with the adult population understood (5).

57 If these conditions are satisfied, ‘borrowing of strength’ from the adult efficacy data can be facilitated
58 by an extension of Bayesian MA or NMA, referred to as a Bayesian information sharing model
59 (ISM). Working within a Bayesian framework allows you to combine prior information (e.g., data
60 from adult clinical trials or clinician's perspective) about a parameter (e.g., the relative treatment
61 effect), with that from a new study, to produce a ‘posterior probability distribution’ i.e. the revised or
62 updated probability of an event occurring after taking into consideration new information (6). If no
63 specific prior information is available, then a vague prior distribution can be specified in the ISM.

64 In order to ‘borrow strength’ from the adult population, ISMs need to make certain assumptions about
65 the relationship between adult and paediatric populations, in terms of the clinical efficacy of the
66 treatment (7). This can range from clinical trial information of the adult population being completely
67 generalisable to the paediatric population, where full information sharing would be appropriate, to the
68 clinical trial information of the two populations being completely independent of one another and no
69 information sharing can take place. The extent to which strength is borrowed from one population to
70 another is then determined by the modelling assumptions, the precision of the data available for the
71 different populations, and the extent of agreement across data sources (7).

72 In this paper, we use an exemplar dataset of 16 RCTs comparing two anti-sickness regimens for the
73 prevention chemotherapy induced nausea and vomiting, to investigate how the modelling assumptions
74 of four different ISMs impact the treatment effect estimates and associated heterogeneity in children.
75 The ISMs compared in this paper, extend the traditional MA and we discuss the appropriateness of
76 their assumptions in the context of estimating treatment effect in children.

77

78 **Exemplar data set**

79 Information sharing methods were motivated by an exemplar dataset containing outcomes from 16
80 RCTs (four from paediatric populations and 12 from adult populations) comparing aprepitant (a newer
81 antiemetic) or fosaprepitant (the intravenous version of aprepitant) with a control regimen of a 5HT3
82 antagonist + dexamethasone, for the treatment of chemotherapy induced nausea and vomiting.

83 To create this dataset, we identified RCTs from a recent clinical antiemetic guideline from the
84 Paediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (POGO) (8) and the Multinational Association for Supportive
85 Care in Cancer (MASCC) (9). Data were commonly reported as the proportion of patients
86 experiencing a ‘complete response’ i.e., no vomiting, from the point of chemotherapy administration,
87 up to five days afterwards. These data were extracted and converted into the number of participants
88 *experiencing* a vomiting event in the treatment and in the control arm. A table of study characteristics
89 and extracted outcome data is provided in the supporting information S1.

90 As the incidence of cancer in children is much rarer than in adults, but the therapeutic chemotherapies
91 used are often the same, and the effects of antiemetic medications are clinically believed to be similar,
92 it was considered appropriate to explore information sharing methods for this example.

93 **Methods**

94 **The MA model**

95 In the standard MA model for each study i and each arm k , the binary data in the form of events r_{ik}
96 and total number of patients n_{ik} , are described as coming from a binomial likelihood:

97

$$98 \quad r_{ik} \sim \text{Binomial}(p_{ik}, n_{ik})$$

99

100 where p_{ik} is the probability of an event in arm k of study i , modelled on the log-scale and defining the
101 linear predictor θ_{ik} i.e., the log risk of an event in arm k of trial i :

102

$$103 \quad \log(p_{i,k}) = \theta_{i,k} = \mu_i + \min(\delta_{i,k} - \log(p_{i,1})) \quad (1)$$

104

105 where μ_i is the study specific baseline treatment effects (i.e., the baseline risk of an outcome, which
106 must be positive) in arm 1 of trial i , defined as $\mu_i = \log(p_{i,1})$ where $p_{i,1}$ is given a vague prior
107 distribution (Uniform(0,1)), $\delta_{i,k}$ is the study specific relative treatment effect (i.e. the log risk ratio) of
108 the treatment in arm k compared to the treatment in arm 1 *in that trial* where the relative effect of a
109 treatment compared to itself, is set to zero: $\delta_{i,1} = 0$.

110 Models can be specified as having a common/fixed effect, where it is assumed that all studies estimate
111 the same relative effect i.e. the relative effect is not expected to differ between study populations
112 included in the analysis; or models may have random effects, where relative effects of studies are
113 assumed exchangeable or similar, i.e. the relative effect is expected to differ between study
114 populations included in the analysis, but is expected to fall within a certain range or distribution (3).

115 For random effects model the study specific relative treatment effects are assumed to be drawn from a
116 normal distribution with a common mean and between trial variability (i.e., the heterogeneity
117 parameter) τ^2 . As we are only comparing two treatments in our application the common mean $d_{1,2}$,
118 represents the pooled relative effect of the treatment regimen 2 (aprepitant/fosaprepitant + a 5HT₃
119 antagonist + dexamethasone) compared to the comparator treatment regimen 1 (a 5HT₃ antagonist +
120 dexamethasone) :

121
$$\delta_{i,k} = \text{Normal}(d_{1,2}, \tau^2) \quad (2)$$

122

123 The parameter $d_{1,2}$ is to be estimated and given a non-informative prior: $d_{1,2} \sim \text{Normal}(0, 100^2)$.

124 For the fixed effects model equation 2 is replaced by:

125
$$\delta_{i,k} = d_{1,2} \quad (3)$$

126

127

128 **Bayesian information sharing models**

129 We now describe the four ISMs compared in this paper. These ISMs differ in parameters in which
130 they share information: either relative treatment effects, or between study heterogeneity (for random
131 effects models). As a result, different assumptions are made about the relationship between the two
132 populations and different amounts of information are shared between them.

133 N.B ISMs that relate the parameters of the evidence sets using an exchangeability-based relationship
134 (where a common distribution is imposed on the parameters e.g., in the multilevel models and the
135 random walk model) are most useful when there are multiple sources of evidence (7). As we are only
136 considering two populations, these models are not discussed in this paper.

137 **The splitting model**

138 The first model we implement is the splitting model, which simply extends the standard MA model to
139 accommodate the inclusion of two evidence sets but estimates model parameters separately for each
140 population j (7).

141 For the random effect model, equation 2 is edited to include population specific parameters:

$$142 \quad \delta_{i,k} = \text{Normal}(d_{j,1,2}, \tau^2)$$

143 where j defines the population. $j = 1$ when study index $i = 1, \dots, \text{nsA}$ (indicating the adult studies),
144 and $j = 2$ when $i = \text{nsA} + 1, \dots, \text{nsA} + \text{nsC}$ (indicating the children studies), where nsA is the number
145 of adult studies and nsC is the number of children studies.

146 For the fixed effects model, equation 3 is edited to include population specific parameters:

$$147 \quad \delta_{i,k} = d_{j,1,2} \quad (4)$$

148 The treatment effects for population j are given vague priors: $d_{j,1,2} \sim \text{Normal}(0, 100^2)$.

149 As such, one MA is performed on the adult data, and another on data from the children, although both
150 analyses are conducted simultaneously. In the random effects model, information on between-study
151 heterogeneity is shared between populations and is assumed the same for adults and children i.e., the

152 variation in treatment effect between clinical trials is assumed the same in the adult and paediatric
153 populations (although other assumptions could also be imposed e.g., that heterogeneity in children is
154 proportional to adults). This produces a marginal benefit, in terms of supporting the estimation of
155 treatment effect in children, as when there are few children studies there is little information about the
156 variation in treatment effect between studies.

157 The fixed effect version of this model does not share any information between the populations, rather
158 it estimates the treatment effects separately in adults and children, assuming they are completely
159 independent of each other (see equation 4).

160

161 **Functional relationship models**

162 This ISM assumes parameters are related using a deterministic function i.e. assuming that the relative
163 effect in one population can be written as a function of the relative effect in the other (7):

$$164 \quad d_{Child} = f(d_{Adult}) \quad (5)$$

165 Where d_{Child} is the parameter that relates to the children's evidence and d_{Adult} the parameter that
166 relates to the adult evidence. The function $f()$ can take different forms. Here we explore two
167 relationships.

168 **The 'lumping' model**, 'lumps' the data together from the evidence sets and therefore assumes the
169 adult data is completely generalisable to the children i.e., the function in equation 5 is the identity
170 function and there is no difference in the relative effect between the two populations. This is
171 equivalent to not distinguishing between adult and paediatric data and carrying out a simple meta-
172 analysis using all the data.

173 **The proportional effects model**, assumes that the relative risk estimated in children is proportional to
174 the relative risk estimated in the adult population, so that there is an additive relationship on the log
175 relative risk scale:

$$176 \quad d_{2,1,2} = d_{1,1,2} + \lambda$$

177 A vague prior distribution is specified for the relative treatment effect in adults on the log relative risk
178 scale $d_{1,1,2} \sim (\text{Normal}(0,100^2))$ and the change (in the log-RR scale in children) is measured by a
179 parameter lambda (λ), which is also given a vague prior distribution $\lambda \sim (\text{Normal}(0,100^2))$ (although an
180 informative prior could be used for λ if appropriate). In this model, information sharing takes place
181 from adult to children but also vice-versa. An alternative way of implementing this model is through
182 modifying the BUGS code to include of a ‘cut’ function (4)(see supporting information S2).

183

184 **Meta-regression**

185 An alternative model is where the two populations are indicated by a binary study-level covariate and
186 a regression parameter i.e., the difference in treatment effect between the two populations, is
187 estimated. Here the linear predictor (equation 1) is modified as follows (10):

$$188 \quad \theta_{i,k} = \mu_i + \delta_{i,k} + \beta_{Ik} * X_i$$

189 Where β_{Ik} is the covariate effect of the indirect or (or adult) population X_i on the treatment effect.
190 This model allows for a test of interaction between the relative treatment effect and the binary study
191 level covariate that identifies the adult population. This will assess whether the relative treatment
192 effect is dependent on data arising from the adult or children’s population. In this model, information
193 sharing only occurs in random effects models where the heterogeneity is assumed equal across
194 populations. In a fixed effect model this is equivalent to a subgroup analysis.

195

196 **Implementation**

197 All analyses were carried out in OpenBUGS version 3.2.2 (11) and code to implement all models can
198 be found in the supporting information S2. Whilst we include only one treatment comparison in our
199 analyses (equivalent to a pairwise meta-analysis) and only two arm trials, the code provided in the
200 supporting information S2 will accommodate multiple treatment comparisons and studies with three
201 or more arms whilst adequately accounting for multiple random effects that are correlated (see (4)).

202 Separate MA models were conducted for adults and for children, followed by the four ISMs. For all
203 models, vague prior distributions were used for all trial baselines and for relative treatment effects
204 (Normal(0,100²)). For random effects models, a minimally informative prior distribution
205 (Uniform(0,2)) was used for the between-study heterogeneity parameter. Results are based on 50,000
206 interactions on three chains after a burn-in of 10,000. Convergence was assessed visually by checking
207 the mixing of chains. Model fit statistics including the deviance information criteria, and total residual
208 deviance from each ISM model, along with treatment effect estimates and associated heterogeneity
209 (and 95% credible intervals) were compared to those from the separately applied NMAs for adults and
210 for children.

211

212 **Results**

213 Table 1 presents treatment effect estimates and model fit statistics from both fixed and random effects
214 models analysing data from adults and children's populations separately, and together, using the four
215 proposed models. The 'lumping' model, which assume relative effects in both populations are the
216 same, produced treatment effect estimates closer to those of the MA using adult only data and had a
217 larger between study heterogeneity compared to the other models, suggesting heterogeneity might be
218 explained by assuming a less restrictive relationship for the relative effects across the populations.
219 The splitting model (with shared heterogeneity when random effects are considered), proportional
220 effects and meta-regression model, produced estimates for adults and children comparable to the MAs
221 conducted separately for the populations and the precision of the treatment effect estimate for children
222 produced by the random effects model was improved in all models. Although there was little change
223 in precision in fixed effect models, model fit was slightly improved (residual deviances were closer to
224 the number of data points) compared to the lumping model. Across all information sharing models,
225 fixed effects and random effects models produced comparable DICs. The total residual deviance was
226 marginally lower for the random effects models (table 1), although differences were small meaning
227 that in general the simplest of the two models (i.e., the fixed effect model with no additional
228 parameters – 'lumping model') would be selected.

229 Lambda and beta estimates, indicating the difference between the treatment effect estimates in children
230 and adults are comparable, with both models estimating a 14% and 13% increase in the relative risk
231 for children compared to adults, for the fixed and random effects models respectively, although the
232 95% CrI for the latter includes the possibility of no difference in effects across the populations for
233 both models (table 1).

234 Table 1. Results from MA and ISM models comparing aprepitant or fosaprepitant to control regimen for the treatment of chemotherapy induced nausea and vomiting.

Model	Number of data points	Fixed effect model			Random effect model			
		RR (95%CrI)	DIC	totresdev*	RR (95%CrI)	Between-study heterogeneity (SD)	DIC	totresdev*
Adults' data only	24	0.672 (0.626 to 0.720)	165.7	23.72	0.672 (0.614 to 0.731)	0.064 (0.005 to 0.189)	167.2	22.88
Children's data only	8	0.768 (0.689 to 0.849)	48.6	11.32	0.754 (0.468 to 1.1)	0.287 (0.01 to 1.140)	48.1	8.54
INFORMATION-SHARING MODELS								
Lumping model	32	0.698 (0.656 to 0.740)	215.7	37.55	0.695 (0.638 to 0.751)	0.079(0.008 to 0.198)	215.7	32.76
Splitting model**								
Adults	32	0.672 (0.626 to 0.720)	214.3	35.04	0.673 (0.616 to 0.733)	0.052(0.003 to 0.181)	215.3	33.02
Children		0.767 (0.687 to 0.849)			0.762 (0.656 to 0.862)			
Proportional effects model								
Adults	32	0.671 (0.626 to 0.720)	214.3	35.05	0.673 (0.614 to 0.733)	0.066 (0.005 to 0.184)	215.4	32.9
Children		0.766 (0.687 to 0.848)			0.758 (0.652 to 0.861)			
Lambda (relative risk scale)		1.143 (1.004 to 1.291)			1.129 (0.948 to 1.315)			
Meta-regression**								
Adults	32	0.672 (0.626 to 0.720)	214.2	35.02	0.671 (0.618 to 0.731)	0.066 (0.003 to 0.183)	215.3	32.82
Children		0.766 (0.685 to 0.847)			0.761 (0.655 to 0.862)			
Beta (relative risk scale)		1.139 (1.000- 1.290)			1.125 (0.950-1.028)			

235 * compare to the number of data points, **Fixed effect model does not share information.

236

237 **Discussion**

238 In situations where the disease manifestation and progression, along with the exposure response
239 relationship of a treatment is understood in children, ISMs could help to overcome the scarcity of
240 clinical effectiveness evidence in this population, by including adult data into analyses(5). As ISMs
241 may improve the precision or certainty of the relative treatment effect estimates in children, the
242 analyses could maximise the usefulness of an existing evidence base in children to inform decisions
243 about which treatment to prescribe for paediatric diseases and or illnesses. In this work we have
244 compared the relative treatment effects and associated heterogeneity produced by different ISMs that
245 incorporated adult data, to estimates from a MA using only data from children.

246 We found that when treatment effect estimates for children produced by the model that does not
247 distinguish between populations ('lumping model') were compared to those produced by the MAs
248 conducted separately for children, the estimates were closer to those from the adults MA. This is
249 because there are more studies in the adult population and therefore the results are dominated by the
250 adult information. In the random effect model the between study-heterogeneity was greater than that
251 of the other information sharing models (Table 1). This is due to the assumption that the relative
252 treatment effect and heterogeneity are equal for both populations and therefore the model needs to
253 account for the additional heterogeneity resulting from pooling adult and paediatric data. Thus, we
254 consider the 'lumping model' is likely not an appropriate choice, particularly when there is potential
255 for differences in relative treatment effect between adults and children, as pooled estimates produced
256 for children may not reflect the true effectiveness of the treatment in this population.

257 The 'splitting' model produced very similar treatment effect estimates to the MAs conducted using
258 only children's data. For the fixed effect model, this is expected as the model does not share
259 information between the populations. While perhaps safest, in terms of not mistakenly assuming
260 similarity in clinical efficacy, this maintains the status-quo of evidence sparsity for children. The
261 random effect model shares information on the between study heterogeneity and therefore estimated
262 this parameter in children more precisely than when the MA is conducted separately for children
263 (Table 1), as it is able to borrow information from the adult data to better estimate the parameter. We

264 note that the plausibility of this assumption (in our example, that the spread of effects in antiemetic
265 trials in children would be the same as seen in adults), would need to be considered by paediatrics
266 oncology experts. If considered appropriate, this model may be useful for reducing the uncertainty
267 around treatment effect estimates when there are very few RCTs in children and a random effects
268 model is considered appropriate.

269 The proportional effects model, which estimates the difference (λ) between the treatment effects
270 across the two populations, produced comparable relative effects estimates to the MAs containing
271 only children's data (Table 1). This model is particularly advantageous, as it is able to include the
272 adult data to support the sample size in the paediatric population, without assuming that the relative
273 effectiveness is identical. This may be the 'safer' option when extrapolating from adult clinical trial
274 data, as the efficacy of medications may vary from that of children due to differences in the way that
275 medicines are absorbed, distributed, metabolised, and excreted in the body (2) (12).

276 However, in the proportional effects model, information sharing takes place from adult to children but
277 also vice-versa, which may not be desirable. When the model was modified to prevent the data from
278 the children affecting the estimate of the adult population, results were comparable to the MAs
279 containing only data from children (see Supporting information S3). This modification may be helpful
280 when adult data are particularly abundant and it is, therefore, not necessary, or desirable for the
281 children's data to influence adult relative effect estimates or decisions already made for adults.

282 Finally, the meta-regression model that estimates the effect of a binary covariate (adult/child) on the
283 treatment outcome, again produced comparable results to the MAs containing only children's data and
284 produced very similar estimates to the proportional effects model. This is expected as both models are
285 estimating conceptually similar parameters in different ways, the proportional effects model estimates
286 λ as an unknown parameter from the treatment effect estimates, whilst the meta-regression model
287 includes the adult/children as a binary study-level covariate in the linear predictor, then estimates the
288 difference in treatment effect between adults and children. The meta-regression model may be
289 particularly useful to explore further differences in treatment effect between adults and children. The
290 model can be extended to include baseline risk or other covariate in the model, to understand whether

291 differences are attributable to differences in underlying risk or other population differences. The code
292 to implement this model can be found in the supporting information S2.

293 Of the methods discussed, we would advocate the use of the proportional effects or meta-regression
294 models to incorporate adult data into analyses that estimate the relative effectiveness of treatments in
295 children, as these methods can account for the scenario where children's responses to medical
296 intervention differs from adults, and this difference can be quantified by parameters estimated from
297 the data. Although not explored in this paper, there are alternative ISMs available that can impose
298 constraints on the relationship between the adult and child population e.g., assuming the relative
299 effectiveness of one population is assumed to be larger or smaller than another or is expected to
300 follow a particular mathematical function, however for these to be considered appropriate in the
301 context of 'borrowing strength' from adult data, a substantial amount of previous knowledge and
302 clinical advice would be required to make such assumptions with confidence.

303 We have shown ISM methods can improve the certainty of clinical effectiveness estimates in the
304 paediatric population. However, we note that that the performance of the methods can differ under
305 different conditions e.g., when used with datasets with different features and different network
306 structures (10). Ultimately, improving the certainty of estimates in children may help to reduce the
307 need for additional RCTs in children, and aid clinicians and patients in making treatment decisions,
308 from the existing evidence base. The models may also be used to facilitate prediction of the effect of
309 new treatments in children (through estimation of a prediction interval) for example, if models such as
310 the 'proportional effects model' or 'meta-regression model' showed treatment effect estimates of
311 current treatments options were consistent between adults and children, (either consistently similar or
312 had similar differences across comparisons). These predictions could then lead to smaller trials being
313 required to confirm the relative effects of new drugs in children, which could improve the evidence-
314 base in this population and lead to faster approval and uptake of effective treatments.

315 **Limitations**

316 Here we have focused on simple approaches to information sharing in pairwise meta-analysis,
317 however, other methods have been proposed, namely using the external data as prior information (13)
318 or model averaging approaches (14) to combine the different evidence sources, which we have not
319 evaluated in this paper.

320 Our work uses an example dataset containing only trials making the same treatment comparison.
321 Collecting data to form a full network of treatments where direct and indirect evidence is available
322 (within populations), could result in stronger evidence and the potential for more information sharing.
323 It would also allow for testing further assumptions e.g., whether relative treatment effects are similar
324 for adults/children across multiple treatments or within a class of treatments but not another.

325

326 **Authors roles**

327 RW was responsible for the conceptualization, methodology, data curation, formal analysis, software
328 programming, preparation and presentation of the published work and writing of the original draft for
329 publication.

330 SD was involved in the conceptualization, methodology, formal data analysis, supervision and
331 reviewing and editing the published work.

332 BP was involved in the conceptualization, methodology, supervision and reviewing and editing the
333 published work.

334

335 **Reference list**

336

337 1. Hein IM TP, de Vries MC, Knibbe CA, van Goudoever JB, Lindauer RJ. Why do children
338 decide not to participate in clinical research: a quantitative and qualitative study. *Pediatric Research*.
339 2015;78.

340

- 341 2. Gamalo-Siebers M SJ, Basu C, Zhao X, Gopalakrishnan M, Gao A, et al. Statistical modeling
342 for Bayesian extrapolation of adult clinical trial information in pediatric drug evaluation. .
343 *Pharmaceutical Statistics* 2017; . 2017;16:232-49.
344
- 345 3. Deeks JJ, Higgins, J.P., Altman, D.G. Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In
346 *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (J.P. Higgins JT, J. Chandler, M.
347 Cumpston, T. Li, M.J. Page and V.A. Welch, editor)2019.
348
- 349 4. Dias S WN, Jansen JP, Sutton A. *Network Meta-analysis for Decision Making*: Wiley & Sons
350 ltd; 2018.
351
- 352 5. Ollivier C, Thomson, A, Manolis, E, et al. Commentary on the EMA Reflection Paper on the
353 use of extrapolation in the development of medicines for paediatrics. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*.
354 2019;85:659– 68.
355
- 356 6. Spiegelhalter DJ MJ, Jones DR, Abrams KR. *Methods in health service research. An*
357 *introduction to bayesian methods in health technology assessment*. *BMJ*. 1999;21((7208)):508-12.
358
- 359 7. Nikolaidis GF wB, Palmer S, Soares M. Classifying information-sharing methods. *BMC*
360 *Medical Research Methodology* 2021(21).
361
- 362 8. Patel P, Robinson PD, Thackray J, Flank J, Holdsworth MT, Gibson P, et al. Guideline for the
363 prevention of acute chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: A
364 focused update. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*. 2017;64.
365
- 366 9. Roila F MA, Herrstedt J, Aapro M, Gralla RJ, Bruera E, et al. MASCC and ESMO guideline
367 update for the prevention of chemotherapy- and radiotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting and of
368 nausea and vomiting in advanced cancer patients. *Annals of Oncology* 2016. 2016;27:119-33.
369
- 370 10. Nikolaidis G. *Borrowing strength from 'indirect' evidence: methods and policy implications*
371 *for health technology assessment*. : University of York.; 2020.
372
- 373 11. Lunn D. S, D., Thomas, A. and Best, N. The BUGS project: Evolution, critique and future
374 directions. . *Statist Med*, . 2009;28: :3049-67.
375
- 376 12. O'Hara K. Paediatric pharmacokinetics and drug doses. *Aust Prescr*. 2016;39:208-10.
377
- 378 13. Best N PR, Pouliquen IJ, Keene ON. . Assessing efficacy in important subgroups in
379 confirmatory trials: An example using Bayesian dynamic borrowing. *Pharm Stat*. 2021 May;.
380 2021;20:551-62.
381
- 382 14. Röver C, Wandel, S, Friede, T. Model averaging for robust extrapolation in evidence
383 synthesis. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2019;38:674– 94.