

Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP)

Gut microbiome and individual treatment effects of diet on postprandial glucose: a series of N-of-1 trials

Version 1.0.0

BiomeHub
Department of Bioinformatics

21st December, 2023

Contents

1	Administrative information	2
1.1	Roles and responsibility	2
2	Study design	2
2.1	Design overview	2
2.2	Data generating process	2
3	Primary analysis plan	5
3.1	Determining the presence of heterogeneity of the ITEs of Diet B on iAUC — patient-by-treatment interaction	5
3.2	Determining the influence of the gut microbiome on the heterogeneity of the ITEs — microbiome-by-treatment interaction	5
3.3	Sample size and statistical power	6
3.4	Sensitivity analyses	6
4	Secondary analyses plan	7
4.1	Non-linear influence of the gut microbiome score on the heterogeneity of the ITEs	7
4.2	Exploratory microbiome data analysis	7
5	Software and reproducibility	7

1 Administrative information

The history for the current Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP) is shown in Table 1. The current SAP version (1.0.0) is aligned with protocol version 1.0.0. Trial registration: NCT06051318.

Table 1: SAP history.

Protocol version	Updated SAP version	Section	Description	Date
1.0.0	1.0.0	—	Initial version	21/Dec/2023

1.1 Roles and responsibility

This SAP was written by Giuliano Netto Flores Cruz, who is responsible for the statistical design and analysis of the trial. The SAP was reviewed and approved by all investigators.

2 Study design

2.1 Design overview

This is a series of N-of-1 trials comparing two diets (breakfast meals). The reference treatment is denoted Diet A, while the comparator is Diet B. The primary outcome is the positive incremental area-under-the-curve (iAUC) of the postprandial blood glucose, measured in $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ and calculated according to [Brouns et al. \(2005\)](#) [1]. The iAUC is based on continuous glucose monitoring with a blood glucose measurement right before and every 30 minutes for 2 hours after breakfast. Within each of five treatment cycles, each participant undergoes two periods of treatment. Within each of the ten total treatment periods, one diet is consumed and the outcome is measured. Participants will be randomized into one of two doubly counterbalanced sequences: ABBABAABBA or BAABABBAAB [2, 3]. Analysis of all outcomes will be carried out at the end of the study when all relevant data is available.

2.2 Data generating process

Here we state the full specification of the data generating process used for simulation-based power calculations. It also lays the basis for the primary analysis plan, described in upcoming sections.

Let Y_{ij} be the iAUC for participant $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ measured at the period $j = 1, 2, \dots, 10$. Let X_{ij} be the corresponding treatment indicator variable – i.e., it takes the value of 1 if the i^{th} participant ate diet B in the j^{th} period, and 0 otherwise. Denote M_i as a continuous score representing the gut microbiome profile for the i^{th} participant at the start of the trial (centred

and scaled to variance 1). Also, define S_i as the indicator variable for the treatment sequence randomized to each participant (equals 1 if the sequence is BAABABBAAB and 0 otherwise). We then assume

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha_i + \beta_i X_{ij} + g(j) + \kappa S_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

where $g(j) = \sum_{t=2}^5 \mu_t \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t = j\}$ is the effect of the j^{th} period, for $j = 2, \dots, 10$. Due to randomization, we know that the average sequence effect κ is exactly zero, but it is included to increase precision.

For the i^{th} participant, α_i is their average iAUC under Diet A and β_i is the average individual effect of Diet B. Note that β_i is an Individual Treatment Effect (ITE), identifiable thanks to the N-of-1 design where each individual participant, considered as the population of interest, is treated multiple times. The independent error term is $\epsilon_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ and represents the residual variability within participant and period. The participant-specific terms are modeled as

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_0 + \tau_1 M_i + u_{1i} \quad (2)$$

$$\beta_i = \beta_0 + \tau_2 M_i + u_{2i} \quad (3)$$

where u_{1i} and u_{2i} are random intercept and random slope terms, respectively, given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{1i} \\ u_{2i} \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma) \quad (4)$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{12} & \sigma_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Table 2 shows the interpretation for each parameter in the data-generating process specified by (1) — (5) along with values used in the simulation-based power calculations (see below). In addition to the ITE, β_i , we can also estimate the overall average treatment effect (ATE) through β_0 . The interaction term τ_2 allows estimating the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) of diet B, given the microbiome profile M_i .

Table 2: Parameters of the assumed data-generating process specified by (1)—(5).

Parameter	Interpretation	Simulated value
α_i	Average iAUC for the i^{th} individual eating diet A with average microbiome profile (i.e., $M_i = 0$)	†
β_i	Average individual treatment effect (ITE) of diet B on iAUC for the i^{th} individual	†
$g(j)$	Average effect of j^{th} period (period $j = 1$ is the reference)	0
κ	Average effect of treatment sequence (sequence ABBABAABBA is the reference), known to be zero due to randomization	0
α_0	Overall average iAUC under Diet A	200
τ_1	Average effect on iAUC of increasing M_i by 1 standard deviation	5
β_0	Overall average treatment effect (ATE) of diet B on iAUC	0
τ_2	Conditional average treatment effect (CATE) of diet B on iAUC representing microbiome-by-treatment interaction	5
σ_1^2	Between-patient variance of u_{1i} (larger values represent greater variability of average iAUCs across individuals)	1575
σ_2^2	Between-patient variance of u_{2i} (larger values represent stronger patient-by-treatment interaction, i.e., greater variability of ITEs)	75
σ_{12}	Covariance between u_{1i} and u_{2i}	0
σ_ϵ^2	Residual within-patient variance (how much iAUC varies within a given patient, from period to period, under the same treatment)	225

† These values are computed from other parameters.

The rationale for the parameter values used in Table 2 was as follows. From past literature, it was assumed that 99% of potential iAUC values range approximately between 100 and 300 $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$, with an average of 200 $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ [4, 5, 6]. A relative difference in iAUC of 20% was used to compute the minimal clinically important difference (MCID) [7, 8, 9]. With a baseline average iAUC of 200 $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$, this corresponds to an absolute MCID of 40 $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$. In light of this value, the parameters σ_2^2 and τ_2 were set such that β_i would be within $\beta_0 \pm 20$ with approximately 95% probability (i.e., the standard deviation of β_i was set to 10). This means that the expected difference between the highest individual effect and the lowest individual effect should be close to 40 $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ around 95% of the time. The value of τ_2 was chosen so that around 25% of the total variance of the ITEs (β_i) was attributable to the microbiome score M_i . Similarly, the individual average iAUCs (α_i) were assumed to lie in the range 120—280 $\text{mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ about 95% of the time, with 25% of this variation attributable to variation in the microbiome, which defined the values of σ_1^2 and τ_1 shown in Table 2. Finally,

we assumed that the *observed* iAUC values for each patient, under a given treatment, vary from period to period within $\pm 30 \text{ mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ of their individual averages.

3 Primary analysis plan

The primary analysis plan will be based on random effects models and likelihood-ratio tests at a 5% significance level, described below for the two co-primary objectives of the study. We will employ Holm’s method to correct p-values due to the multiple comparisons. Missing covariate data will be handled using Multiple Imputation. The random effects models naturally deal with missing outcome values (e.g., if there is no iAUC available in some treatment period), assuming these are missing at random. Any estimates will be reported alongside 95% confidence intervals (two-sided) and will be considered in light of the MCID of $40 \text{ mmol} \cdot \text{min} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$.

3.1 Determining the presence of heterogeneity of the ITEs of Diet B on iAUC — patient-by-treatment interaction

In light of the data generating process defined by (1)—(5), here the specific question is: does β_i vary significantly across participants? This is equivalent to testing the (random) patient-by-treatment interaction. Notice that the influence of the microbiome profile M_i does not matter for this question.

The full model is:

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha_0 + u_{1i} + (\beta_0 + u_{2i})X_{ij} + g(j) + \kappa S_i + \epsilon_{ij} \tag{6}$$

The corresponding reduced model is:

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha_0 + u_{1i} + \beta_0 X_{ij} + g(j) + \kappa S_i + \epsilon_{ij} \tag{7}$$

In other words, we will test whether the use of a random slope term u_{2i} improves the model fit due to significant variation in the effect of Diet B from participant to participant – i.e., the patient-by-treatment interaction.

3.2 Determining the influence of the gut microbiome on the heterogeneity of the ITEs — microbiome-by-treatment interaction

Here the specific question is: does β_i vary significantly with M_i ? This is equivalent to testing the (fixed) microbiome-by-treatment interaction. If indeed β_i varies across participants, then we may be able to explain some of this variation by conditioning on the microbiome profile score M_i . This conditional average treatment effect (CATE) of Diet B given microbiome profile M_i can then be used to inform decision-making for future patients, outside the trial.

The full model is:

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \tau_1 M_i + u_{1i} + (\beta_0 + \tau_2 M_i + u_{2i}) X_{ij} + g(j) + \kappa S_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (8)$$

The corresponding reduced model is:

$$Y_{ij} = \alpha_0 + \tau_1 M_i + u_{1i} + (\beta_0 + u_{2i}) X_{ij} + g(j) + \kappa S_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (9)$$

So here we are testing whether $\tau_2 = 0$ — i.e, the microbiome-by-treatment interaction. Notice that Eq. (8) is exactly Eq. (1). The underlying linearity assumption between M_i and β_i will be relaxed in secondary analyses when estimating the effect of Diet B given an observed microbiome profile score M_i (e.g., using restricted cubic splines). The full model given by Eq. (8) will be used to estimate ITEs, regardless of statistical significance. ITEs will be reported as point estimates and bootstrap-based 95% confidence intervals.

3.3 Sample size and statistical power

The sample size was determined by simulation-based power calculation, under the assumptions described in section 2.2. The simulation setting followed the full data generating process described by Eq. (1)—(5) with parameters defined in Table 2. Using likelihood ratio tests at a 5% significance level and assuming a dropout rate of 20%, the present study required the recruitment of 80 participants followed through five treatment cycles. The numbers of participants and of treatment cycles were selected to provide a statistical power of at least 90% and 85% for the detection of patient-by-treatment interaction and microbiome-by-treatment interaction, respectively. The power calculation considered p-values adjusted for multiple comparisons using Holm’s method. Given these assumptions and the primary analysis plan described above, the present study required 80 participants with 5 treatment cycles per participant.

3.4 Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses will be implemented to check the robustness of the inferences made during the primary analysis, including period-by-treatment interactions and smooth time trends using restricted cubic splines. If some covariate data is missing (e.g., missing M_i), we will also perform a complete case analysis as well as a Bayesian version of the primary analysis treating each missing data point as a parameter. A Bayesian version of the primary analysis will also be performed, using weakly- or non-informative priors. The Bayesian interpretation of the results will be reported as a supplement.

4 Secondary analyses plan

4.1 Non-linear influence of the gut microbiome score on the heterogeneity of the ITEs

Secondary analyses will further explore the influence of the gut microbiome profile on the individual treatment effects of Diet B on the iAUC. In particular, the relationship between the treatment-by-microbiome interaction will allow for non-linearities using restricted cubic splines. The conditional effect of diet B given the microbiome score will be assessed visually.

4.2 Exploratory microbiome data analysis

Exploratory microbiome data analyses will be implemented [10]. Associations between new biomarkers and the individual treatment effects of diet B will be analyzed similarly to the primary analysis described in section 3.2, replacing the gut microbiome score M_i with the i^{th} patient's corresponding biomarker value. These biomarkers will include the relative abundance of the observed taxa (at the oligotype, species, genus, family, and phylum levels), alpha-diversity metrics (Shannon and Inverse Simpson indexes), functional microbiome profiles, and biochemical and inflammatory markers. Using proportion-normalized oligotype abundances, we will also perform beta-diversity analysis (e.g., based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarity). Differential abundance (DA) analyses will be performed as appropriate, considering the consensus of at least two DA tools available [11].

Given its exploratory nature, this analysis will control the false discovery rate (FDR) at 10% using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure [12]. Potential predictive models for both individual treatment effects and individual response will be explored using machine learning methods and internally validated through cross-validation. The predictive models will be ℓ_2 - and/or ℓ_1 -penalized for complexity to mitigate overfitting.

5 Software and reproducibility

All analyses will be conducted using the R software package (version 4.3.0 or higher) with code versioning and software dependency tracking [13]. A fixed Docker image will be used for all analyses to ensure full reproducibility [14]. Random effects models will be estimated using the lme4 R package (v. 1.1.33 or higher) and general data analysis will employ the tidyverse R meta-package [15, 16]. The simulation-based power calculation performed for this document is available at <https://github.com/biomehub/bhub-n-of-1-sap> and is equally fully-reproducible.

References

- [1] F. Brouns, I. Bjorck, K. N. Frayn, A. L. Gibbs, V. Lang, G. Slama, and T. M. S. Wolever. Glycaemic index methodology. *Nutrition Research Reviews*, 18(1):145–171, 2005. ISSN 1475-2700. doi: 10.1079/nrr2005100. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1079/NRR2005100>.
- [2] Schmid CH, Duan N, and the DEcIDE Methods Center N-of 1 Guidance Panel. *Design and Implementation of N-of-1 Trials: A User’s Guide*, chapter Statistical Design and Analytic Considerations for N-of-1 Trials. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2014.
- [3] Jonathan A Shaffer, Ian M Kronish, Louise Falzon, Ying Kuen Cheung, and Karina W Davidson. N-of-1 randomized intervention trials in health psychology: A systematic review and methodology critique. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 52(9):731–742, 2018. ISSN 1532-4796. doi: 10.1093/abm/kax026. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/abm/kax026>.
- [4] P Burton and H J Lightowler. The impact of freezing and toasting on the glycaemic response of white bread. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 62(5):594–599, April 2007. ISSN 1476-5640. doi: 10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602746. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602746>.
- [5] Sheila M. Williams, Bernard J. Venn, Tracy Perry, Rachel Brown, Alison Wallace, Jim I. Mann, and Tim J. Green. Another approach to estimating the reliability of glycaemic index. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 100(2):364–372, August 2008. ISSN 1475-2662. doi: 10.1017/S0007114507894311. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0007114507894311>.
- [6] Amy J. Tucker, Jeffrey S. Vandermeij, Lindsay E. Robinson, Terry E. Graham, Marica Bakovic, and Alison M. Duncan. Effects of breads of varying carbohydrate quality on post-prandial glycaemic, incretin and lipidaemic response after first and second meals in adults with diet-controlled type 2 diabetes. *Journal of Functional Foods*, 6:116–125, January 2014. ISSN 1756-4646. doi: 10.1016/j.jff.2013.09.025. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jff.2013.09.025>.
- [7] Health Canada. Draft guidance document on food health claims related to the reduction in post-prandial glycaemic response. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-nutrition/public-involvement-partnerships/technical-consultation-draft-guidance-document-food-health-claims-related-post-prandial.html>, 2013. Accessed: 16-Nov-2023.
- [8] Courtney R Chang, Monique E Francois, and Jonathan P Little. Restricting carbohydrates at breakfast is sufficient to reduce 24-hour exposure to postprandial hyperglycemia and improve glycemic variability. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 109(5):1302–1309, May 2019. ISSN 0002-9165. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqy261. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqy261>.

- [9] Priyali Shah, Thomas MS. Wolever, Alexandra L. Jenkins, Adish Ezatagha, Janice Campbell, Andreea Zurbau, Manish Jain, Manoj Gote, Anirban Bhaduri, and Ashim Mullick. Acute glycemic and insulin response of fossence™ alone, or when substituted or added to a carbohydrate challenge: A three-phase, acute, randomized, cross-over, double blind clinical trial. *Heliyon*, 7(4):e06805, April 2021. ISSN 2405-8440. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06805. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06805>.
- [10] Rob Knight, Alison Vrbanc, Bryn C. Taylor, Alexander Aksenov, Chris Callewaert, Justine Debelius, Antonio Gonzalez, Tomasz Kosciolk, Laura-Isobel McCall, Daniel McDonald, Alexey V. Melnik, James T. Morton, Jose Navas, Robert A. Quinn, Jon G. Sanders, Austin D. Swafford, Luke R. Thompson, Anupriya Tripathi, Zhenjiang Z. Xu, Jesse R. Zaneveld, Qiyun Zhu, J. Gregory Caporaso, and Pieter C. Dorrestein. Best practices for analysing microbiomes. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 16(7):410–422, May 2018. ISSN 1740-1534. doi: 10.1038/s41579-018-0029-9. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41579-018-0029-9>.
- [11] Jacob T. Nearing, Gavin M. Douglas, Molly G. Hayes, Jocelyn MacDonald, Dhvani K. Desai, Nicole Allward, Casey M. A. Jones, Robyn J. Wright, Akhilesh S. Dhanani, André M. Comeau, and Morgan G. I. Langille. Microbiome differential abundance methods produce different results across 38 datasets. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), January 2022. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-022-28034-z. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28034-z>.
- [12] Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300, January 1995. ISSN 2517-6161. doi: 10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>.
- [13] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2023. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- [14] Dirk Merkel. Docker: lightweight linux containers for consistent development and deployment. *Linux journal*, 2014(239):2, 2014.
- [15] Douglas Bates, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker, and Steve Walker. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 2015. ISSN 1548-7660. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.
- [16] Hadley Wickham, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Grolemond, Alex Hayes, Lionel Henry, Jim Hester, Max Kuhn, Thomas Pedersen, Evan Miller, Stephan Bache, Kirill Müller, Jeroen Ooms, David Robinson, Dana Seidel, Vitalie Spinu, Kokske Takahashi, Davis Vaughan, Claus Wilke, Kara Woo, and Hiroaki

Yutani. Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43):1686, November 2019. ISSN 2475-9066. doi: 10.21105/joss.01686. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>.