

1 **RaBlT: An Effective Visualization-Driven Tool for Power and Sample Size**

2 **Estimation in Two-Stage General Randomized Basket Trial Designs**

3 Desmond Zeya Chen^{1,2,3}, Sahil S. Patel^{1,4,5}, Aoqi Xie^{1,2}, Jiayin Chen⁶, David Castle^{7,8},

4 Clement Ma^{1,2,*}

5 **Affiliations**

6 1. Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

7 2. Division of Biostatistics, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto,
8 Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

9 3. Genetics and Genome Biology Program, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto,
10 ON, Canada.

11 4. Department of Statistical Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Science, University of
12 Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

13 5. Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina,
14 United States.

15 6. Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill
16 University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

17 7. Department of Psychiatry, University of Tasmania, Tasmania, Australia.

18 8. Centre for Mental Health Service Innovation, Statewide Mental Health Service,
19 Tasmania, Australia.

20 *Correspondence: clement.ma@camh.ca

21 **Abstract:** Basket trial designs with interim analysis have gained significant attention due
22 to their adaptability, flexibility, and scalability. In response to the need for user-friendly
23 tools that enhance the real-world applicability of these designs, we developed a web-
24 based interface aimed at facilitating two-stage basket trial designs. Built using R Shiny,
25 the tool was rigorously validated for output consistency by comparing it to an established
26 R pipeline. Additionally, user testing was conducted to ensure the interface is intuitive and
27 easy to use. The result is a freely accessible tool that provides effective and convenient
28 visualizations for general basket trial designs with interim analysis, available at
29 <https://desmondzeyachen.shinyapps.io/AdaptiveTwoStageBasketTrialFeb14/>. Future
30 improvements may further expand the tool's capabilities to accommodate the increasing
31 complexity of trial designs needed by the research community.

32 **Keywords:** Shiny App, Basket Trial, Interim Analysis, visualization, novel trial designs,
33 Adaptive designs.

34 **1. Introduction**

35 A master protocol trial is a state-of-the-art clinical trial design that innovatively aggregates
36 the evaluation of multiple treatments or disease subtypes¹. Its flexibility, adaptability, and
37 effectiveness aided it gaining popularity since the onset of the millennium². After the first
38 master protocol managed the Imatinib Target Exploration Consortium Study B2225
39 basket trial design^{3,4}, there has been a growing number of such trials being
40 implemented^{5,6}. Basket trials with biomarker enrichment have pioneered new frontiers in
41 personalized medicine and thoroughly revolutionized the randomized trial design⁷.

42 Prior work from Chen et al⁸ has laid the statistical foundation for an adaptive basket trial
43 design, it exquisitely addresses removal of given baskets based on interim results, while
44 still accurately quantifies a trial-wide type 1 error rate, and a guidance for power. However,
45 the impracticality of equal basket size assumption diminished its applicability. Such
46 assumption is rarely fulfilled in real-world settings, considering the disproportionately
47 distributed nature of disease subtypes prevalences among the population⁹. Following trial
48 design guidance with such assumption may leads to a conservative, under-powered
49 sample size estimate. After extensive investigation, we found an analytical solution to
50 overcome this pitfall and developed a complementary software pipeline for efficient
51 implementation and analysis¹⁰.

52 *1.1 Study Objectives and Existing Work*

53 We aim to provide trial researchers with support in proposal writing, trial monitoring, and

54 trial execution. Majority of trial design software facilitating multiplicity through multi-arm
55 multi-stage (MAMS) designs, only a few explicitly address basket trial designs. Berry
56 Consultants developed a commercial software called FACTS¹¹ (the “Fixed and Adaptive
57 Clinical Trial Simulator”) , which offers simulation-based analysis with highly flexible
58 options across different trial classes. FACTS can simulate basket trial designs with early
59 futility and interim analysis. However, sample size estimation was not supported, as
60 researchers must search through the range of sample sizes manually. Among open-
61 source packages and pipelines, the Integrated Platform for Designing Clinical Trials
62 (<https://trialsdesign.org>) currently features two basket design trial R pipelines based on
63 Bayesian framework. One of these proposes a calibration to the existing Bayesian
64 hierarchical approach¹², significantly reducing type I error rate inflation compared to the
65 uncalibrated version. The other, a Bayesian latent subgroup design¹³, clusters cancer
66 types in basket trials into responsive and non-responsive subgroups, resulting in higher
67 power and controlled type I error rates compared to standard approaches. Additionally, a
68 frequentist pipeline that analytically solves for early futility of baskets is available in the
69 supplemental section of Chen et al⁸. Although this overview highlights several essential
70 tools and pipelines, it is important to recognize that there may be additional software
71 options for basket trial design that are not included. Hence, to further enhance the
72 software applicability and user experience, and to present a holistic elucidation of
73 proposed trial design, we developed a web-based interactive R Shiny App^{14,15}, to fill the
74 methodological gap in two-stage general basket trial design¹⁶.

75 *1.2 Target Audiences and Application Scope*

76 Our tool is designed to support two-stage general randomized basket trials. Unlike
77 conventional trials that focus on a single disease at a time, basket trials assess the
78 efficacy of a single treatment across multiple homogenous diseases, significantly
79 reducing the required sample size. The two-stage setup adds flexibility by allowing
80 unresponsive disease baskets to be pruned at the interim stage, reallocating the
81 remaining recruitment quota to responsive baskets. This early futility check ensures that
82 resources are not wasted, improving the overall efficiency of the trial.

83 Initially developed for oncology studies, where it has been particularly effective in drug
84 development for cancers and tumors, this design has become a widely adopted tool in
85 various clinical research areas. Beyond oncology, the basket trial design is increasingly
86 used in other therapeutic areas, including rare diseases and precision medicine.

87 The tool is particularly valuable for clinical trial researchers and biostatistical support
88 teams due to its accessibility, intuitive usage, and convenience. Its user-friendly interface
89 simplifies the complex process of designing and analyzing basket trials, making it easier
90 for researchers to implement this advanced trial design without needing extensive
91 statistical training.

92 **2. Implementation**

93 *2.1 Statistical Methods*

94 The null hypothesis for the design is that none of the baskets are active, while the
95 alternative hypothesis is that only pre-specified baskets are active. As described by Chen
96 et al⁸ and Patel et al¹⁰ , the trial's overall Type I error rate is calculated as the sum of
97 rejection probabilities under the null hypothesis for different sets of baskets passing the
98 interim analysis. The rejection probability is assessed based on whether all baskets pass
99 through both the interim and final stages. Similarly, the power is estimated using the same
100 sum of rejection probability function but under the alternative hypothesis, where the
101 rejection region for pre-specified active baskets is adjusted according to the non-centrality
102 parameter given by Chen et al⁸.

103 Analytically solving the sample size formula can be algebraically tedious, so we propose
104 estimating it using a root-finding approach based on the power function. Unequal basket
105 size ratios can be directly estimated from disease prevalence ratios, meaning that only
106 the trial-wide sample size needs to be determined. Given the monotonic relationship
107 between power and sample size, a recursive binary search¹⁷ algorithm is more efficient
108 than computationally expensive iterative loops. This algorithm significantly improves the
109 responsiveness of the app, making it faster and more efficient.

110 *2.2 Variable Definitions and Input Parameters*

111 Both calculations require the user to provide crucial trial characteristics (Figure 1) such
112 as the standardized effect size (Δ) for each basket. Investigators can estimate this ratio
113 based on subtype prevalence from published results. Additionally, the proportion of

114 participants accrued at interim analysis (t) is needed. This is the cutoff point for interim
115 analysis, expressed as a percentage of the total participants recruited, and should be
116 consistent across all baskets. The interim significance level (α_t) is also required, which is
117 the designated α level for the interim analysis at proportion t . Any basket with a p-value
118 exceeding this threshold will be dropped. The trial-wide significance level (α) must also
119 be provided; this is the designated α level for the entire trial, representing the overall false
120 positive rate.

The figure shows two identical input forms side-by-side. The left form is titled 'Inputs:' and has 'Power' selected under 'What would you like to compute?'. The right form is also titled 'Inputs:' but has 'Sample Size' selected. Both forms have the following fields:

- Total sample size of each basket (N): 40,60,60,40
- Standardized effect size (Δ) of each basket: 0.3,0.3,0.5,0.2
- Proportion of participants accrued at interim analysis (t): 0.3
- Interim significance level (α_t): 0.5
- Trial-wide significance level (α): 0.05
- Accrual rate (individuals/month) of each basket: 2,3,2,2

Each form has a 'Calculate Now!' button at the bottom.

121

122 *Figure 1: Input Parameters Required for Power or Sample Size Calculation*

123 For sample size calculation, the sample size per basket is required. Conversely, for
124 calculating the sample size per basket, the nominal power (designated $1-\beta$ level for the
125 entire trial, or one minus the expected type II error rate) and the relative ratio of sample

126 size in each basket must be provided. These are the primary parameters that directly
127 influence the calculation, while the number of individuals recruited per month in each
128 basket only affects the trial duration estimation.

129 *2.3 System Architecture and User Interface Design*

130 Having cloud computing power freely provided by the R Shiny¹⁵ server, the local machine
131 is only responsible for capturing inputs and rendering outputs on the user interface,
132 requiring minimal hardware resources. The remote server handles heavy-duty statistical
133 computing tasks. The main tab of the tool consists of two sections: the input panel and
134 the output panel. Power and sample size calculations are unified through an initial
135 question that asks users which type of calculation they intend the tool to perform. The
136 corresponding trial characteristics are then required for the calculation of their choice. On
137 the output panel, an interactive trial design plot is displayed above the text summary. If
138 incorrect inputs are provided, error messages will appear, masking all outputs.
139 Additionally, a 'Readme' tab is available, offering an example, detailed explanations of the
140 interface, and the statistical methods used, helping users gain hands-on experience.

141 *2.4 Operational Workflow and Error Detection*

142 Users can input trial characteristics with just a few clicks and text entries. The app is
143 initiated by clicking the 'Calculate Now!' button. All input parameters are sent to the
144 backend, where they are checked for missing data or syntax errors before being passed
145 into the function. The function then verifies that the sample sizes are whole numbers

146 within baskets at each stage. If any errors are found, they are promptly flagged for
147 correction. Once all error checks are passed, the power or sample size is computed. Both
148 summary statistics and trial characteristics inputs are compiled into a plot to visually
149 represent the proposed trial. A text summary of the plot is displayed below for additional
150 clarity. Users could then download the plot and text summary for their intended use.\

151 *2.5 Validation, Reproducibility, and User Testing*

152 To enhance reproducibility, we conducted extensive validation analysis and user testing.
153 App's outputs were systematically compared with results generated by the original R
154 scripts used in the underlying statistical calculations from Patel et al¹⁰. This cross-
155 verification ensured that the app replicates the established methods accurately. A variety
156 of edge cases were tested, including extreme values of parameters and atypical trial
157 configurations, to confirm the app handles all inputs robustly and responsively. This is
158 crucial for identifying any scenarios where the app will fail and imposing corresponding
159 error checkers as countermeasures. Additionally, we carefully examined the app's error
160 reporting mechanisms to ensure they provide clear and actionable feedback to users.
161 This included verifying that the app correctly identifies and flags incorrect or missing
162 inputs before proceeding with calculations. Finally, we conducted user acceptance testing
163 with potential end-users like clinicians and biostatisticians to validate the app's
164 functionality in real-world scenarios. Participants were asked to replicate an example
165 provided in the questionnaire, specifically for testing reproducibility. Feedback from these

166 tests was incorporated to refine the app's interface and usability.

167 3. Results

168 Our two-stage general basket design visualization tool is hosted at
169 (<https://desmondzeyachen.shinyapps.io/AdaptiveTwoStageBasketTrialFeb14/>).

170 To ensure broad accessibility, the app is designed to be fully responsive, allowing
171 seamless operation on desktops, tablets, or even smartphones. The intuitive user
172 interface (Figure 2) is built to cater to users with varying levels of statistical knowledge,
173 ensuring that even those unfamiliar with advanced statistical methods can easily navigate
174 the tool. The interactive trial design figure can be easily downloaded as a JPEG file, and
175 the design summary provides a clear, technical explanation of each characteristic and the
176 summary statistics of the proposed trial design.

Power Calculator for a 2-Stage Randomized Basket Design Calculator README References

Inputs:

What would you like to compute?

Power
 Sample Size

Total sample size of each basket (N)

40,60,60,40

Standardized effect size (Δ) of each basket

0.3,0.3,0.5,0.2

Proportion of participants accrued at interim analysis (t)

0.3

Interim significance level (α_i)

0.5

Trial-wide significance level (α)

0.05

Accrual rate (individuals/month) of each basket

2,3,2,2

Calculate Now!

Current Design

2-Stage Randomized Basket Design

Stage 1: Interim Analysis Per Basket
Proportion of participants accrued at 0.3 interim analysis

Continue enrolling to remaining baskets. The interim analysis will be terminated for that basket.

Stage 2: Final Pooled Analysis
Final significance level at 0.022
Power for pooled analysis at 0.824

Design Summary: Estimating power for proposed trial with selected sample sizes

This trial uses a 2-stage, randomized basket design. A total of $N=200$ participants from 4 baskets are randomized 1:1 to the treatment and control arms, stratified by basket. The 4 baskets have $N=(40,60,60,40)$ participants with standardized effect sizes $\Delta=(0.3,0.3,0.5,0.2)$, respectively.

The null hypothesis is that the standardized effect size (Δ) of the primary endpoint is zero ($H_0: \Delta=0$). The one-sided alternative hypothesis is that the standardized effect size of the primary endpoint is greater than zero ($H_A: \Delta>0$). Power calculations assume a basket to be truly active (under H_A) or truly non-active (under H_0).

Stage 1: Interim analysis within each basket

One pre-planned interim analysis will occur after a total of $0.3 \times 200 = 60$ participants have been enrolled. For each basket, a two-sample Z-test will compare the primary endpoint between arms. If the Z-test p-value is greater than the interim $\alpha_i=0.5$ threshold, accrual will be terminated for that basket. Accrual will continue for the remaining baskets. The planned number of participants from baskets removed during the interim analysis will be re-allocated to the remaining baskets so that the final analysis will maintain the original planned sample size of $N=200$ participants.

Stage 2: Final pooled analysis

After $N=200$ participants have been enrolled, a two-sample Z-test will compare the primary endpoint between arms pooling participants from the remaining baskets.

Power

The final pooled analysis has 80% power. To account for interim analyses, the final significance threshold $\alpha^*=0.022$ to maintain the trial-wide one-sided $\alpha=0.05$.

177

178 *Figure 2: App Interface*

179 *3.1 User Interaction Feedback and Usability*

180 Three users participated in the testing of the Shiny app, their feedback focused on ease
181 of use, functionality, layout, and performance. All users found the app easy to navigate,
182 especially with the help of default examples and detailed guidance provided in the
183 Readme tab. Our original goal was to make the tool accessible to users with limited
184 statistical training, aiming to simplify clinical trial design. However, one user noted that the
185 use of highly specialized statistical language in the input variable names and explanations
186 could create barriers for our target audience, potentially undermining our objective. We
187 addressed this issue by incorporating additional explanations for each input from a trial
188 design perspective, clarifying 'What does this mean in clinical trial terminology?' and 'How
189 could you decide on a value for it?'

190 The app was also presented at an internal meeting, where feedback related to sample
191 size estimation functionality was raised. In response, we enhanced the app by adding
192 features that support sample size estimation directly within the tool, further improving its
193 utility for users designing clinical trials.

194 The app's layout and functionality were deemed logical and well-organized, with users
195 appreciating the clear instructions and intuitive design. Suggestions for enhanced result
196 explanations and improved result visibility were carefully incorporated. In terms of
197 performance, while the app generally worked well, users did experience occasional
198 freezing or slower performance when working with larger sample sizes. These issues are

199 common with the free version of the Shiny App server, and we plan to address them by
200 either hosting the app on an internal server or upgrading to a premium account. All users
201 expressed their willingness to use and recommend the app, citing its user-friendly
202 interface and practical features. The user testing process, along with the feedback from
203 the internal meeting, significantly improved the app's usability and provided
204 valuable, unbiased feedback from potential users.

205 *3.2 Comparative Analysis*

206 Primary trial characteristics like the total sample size, interim sample size, and number of
207 baskets are influenced by the interrelated inputs: the number of baskets, sample size per
208 basket, and interim proportions. Selecting an interim alpha of 0.3 allows for effective
209 interim analysis without being overly conservative during partial recruitment. The trial-
210 wide alpha is set at the conventional two-sided significance level of 0.025. We validate
211 the Shiny App by comparing it against an R pipeline, using selected combinations of these
212 inputs while controlling for effect sizes and alphas (Table 1).

Number of Baskets	Size Per Basket	Interim Proportion	R code alpha*	Shiny App alpha*	R code Power	Shiny App Power
2	(60,60)	0.3	0.018037	0.018	0.765977	77%
2	(60,60)	0.5	0.014339	0.0143	0.789333	79%
3	(60,60,30)	0.3	0.0137	0.0137	0.860155	86%
3	(60,60,30)	0.5	0.01057	0.0106	0.872503	87%

4	(60,60,20,60)	0.3	0.011321	0.0113	0.942003	94%
4	(60,60,20,60)	0.5	0.008469	0.0085	0.948105	95%
5	(60,60,20,60,40)	0.3	0.009582	0.0096	0.973314	97%
5	(60,60,20,60,40)	0.5	0.006907	0.0069	0.976438	98%
6	(60,60,20,60,40,60)	0.3	0.008301	0.0083	0.991963	99%
6	(60,60,20,60,40,60)	0.5	0.005759	0.0058	0.993236	99%
7	(60,60,20,30,40,60,30)	0.3	0.007563	0.0076	0.992084	99%
7	(60,60,20,30,40,60,30)	0.5	0.005134	0.0051	0.993035	99%
8	(60,60,20,30,40,40,30,20)	0.3	0.006894	0.0069	0.992196	99%
8	(60,60,20,30,40,40,30,20)	0.5	0.004558	0.0046	0.99303	99%
9	(60,30,20,30,40,40,30,20,30)	0.3	0.006115	0.0061	0.992624	99%
9	(60,30,20,30,40,40,30,20,30)	0.5	0.00388	0.0039	0.993487	99%
10	(20,30,20,30,40,40,30,20,30,40)	0.3	0.005407	0.0054	0.99337	99%
10	(20,30,20,30,40,40,30,20,30,40)	0.5	0.003276	0.0033	0.994405	99%

Table 1: Assuming standardized effect size are all 0.5, all baskets are active interim alpha set at 0.3, and trial-wide alpha set at 0.025, alpha* is the recommended significance threshold of final analysis based on user provided trial wide alpha.

213 The alternative hypothesis is defined by user-specified effect sizes, with a value of 0
 214 indicating that a basket will be pruned during interim analysis. To validate the tool under
 215 different alternative hypothesis scenarios, we varied the effect sizes per basket while
 216 keeping the sample size, number of baskets, interim proportion, and alphas constant
 217 (Table 2).

218 The results from the tool matched those generated by the R code after rounding,
 219 confirming that the tool correctly interprets the inputs and performs equivalently to the R
 220 code. This validation demonstrates the tool's robustness and reliability in replicating

221 established statistical processes. The consistency between the tool and the R code
222 suggests that users can confidently employ the tool for interim analysis and hypothesis
223 testing in clinical trials.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of the Tool vs R pipeline varying effect size per basket					
Effect Size Per Basket	Truly Active Vector	R code alpha*	Shiny App alpha*	R code Power	Shiny App Power
(0.2,0.2,0)	(1,1,0)	0.01370037	0.0137	0.19221983	19%
(0.2,0.2,0.2)	(1,1,1)	0.01369794	0.0137	0.23586268	24%
(0.5,0.2,0)	(1,1,0)	0.01370189	0.0137	0.55850379	56%
(0.5,0.2,0.2)	(1,1,1)	0.01369941	0.0137	0.58211621	58%
(0.5,0.5,0)	(1,1,0)	0.01370145	0.0137	0.78413515	78%
(0.5,0.5,0.2)	(1,1,1)	0.01370213	0.0137	0.79281031	79%
(0.5,0.5,0.5)	(1,1,1)	0.0137017	0.0137	0.8601982	86%

Table 2: Varying effect size & whether the basket is truly active of (60,60,30). Interim proportion set at 0.3, interim alpha set at 0.3, and trial-wide alpha set at 0.025. Truly active vector, the corresponding baskets that pass interim analysis, deduced via effect size per basket that user provided.

224

225 4. Discussion

226 Our open-source calculator is compiled to run on browser while computing were done
227 remotely at RShiny¹⁵ server. Both power and sample size calculation functions were
228 integrated into the same interface. Instead of manually constructing the pipeline,
229 calibrating inputs, rephrasing outputs so its human readable, and plotting the design; our
230 visualization tool automates all above tasks with just few simple steps. It provides users
231 with an integrated, statistics enriched trial design figure and detailed textual exposition of

232 the trial design alongside statistical results. These outputs can be conveniently
233 assimilated as presented.

234 This user-friendly approach not only saves time but also reduces the potential for human
235 error in trial design, ensuring a higher degree of accuracy and consistency. The tool's
236 ability to produce ready-to-assimilate outputs enhances its practical value, allowing for
237 immediate integration into trial planning and reporting.

238 As clinical research moves towards more complex trial designs, basket trials have
239 become increasingly popular due to their efficiency in exploring the effects of interventions
240 across multiple disease types. These designs allow clinicians to investigate multiple
241 patient populations simultaneously, improving resource allocation and potentially
242 accelerating the discovery of effective treatments. Our tool fits seamlessly into this
243 evolving landscape, providing an accessible means for researchers to engage with these
244 complex designs without the need for extensive statistical training. By supporting the
245 development and execution of basket trials, the tool also holds potential for educational
246 purposes, enabling clinicians and researchers to independently explore and visualize
247 these innovative trial structures. This flexibility, combined with the potential to expand into
248 multi-stage and multi-arm trial designs, underscores the importance of developing tools
249 that can keep pace with modern research needs.

250 Additionally, as the use of basket trials continues to expand, our tool is positioned to
251 evolve alongside these developments, with potential future enhancements to support

252 multi-stage designs, multi-arm trials, and other innovative trial methodologies. Gathering
253 user feedback will be critical in guiding these developments to ensure the tool continues
254 to meet the evolving needs of the research community.

255 **Author Contributions**

256 D.Z.C. and C.M. conceptualized the study. C.M. supervised the study. D.Z.C. and C.M.
257 drafted the manuscript. D.Z.C. performed the analyses, developed the visualization
258 software, and summarized the results. S.S.P. developed the base R code. S.S.P., A.X.,
259 J.C., and D.C. contributed to the investigation by conducting user testing of the application.
260 All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

261 **Declaration of interests**

262 The author(s) declare no conflicts of interest.

263 **Acknowledgements**

264 We would like to thank Marcos Sanches and the rest of the biostatistics core at CAMH for
265 their insightful questions during the internal meeting, which played a key role in shaping
266 the development of this application. We would like to acknowledge the support of the
267 University of Toronto Fellowship, provided by the University of Toronto for funding this
268 research.

269 **Software and Web Resources**

270 The visualization tool was developed using R¹⁴ version 4.3.2. The implementation

271 involved several R packages, including shiny¹⁵ (version 1.8.0), shinythemes¹⁸ (version
272 1.2.0), ggplot2¹⁹ (version 3.4.4), ggtext²⁰ (version 0.1.2), and ggforce²¹ (version 0.4.1).

273 **References:**

- 274 1. Redman MW, Allegra CJ. The Master Protocol Concept. *Semin Oncol*. Oct 2015;42(5):724-30.
275 doi:10.1053/j.seminoncol.2015.07.009
- 276 2. Cunanan KM, Iasonos A, Shen R, Begg CB, Gonen M. An efficient basket trial design. *Stat Med*. May 10
277 2017;36(10):1568-1579. doi:10.1002/sim.7227
- 278 3. McArthur GA, Demetri GD, van Oosterom A, et al. Molecular and clinical analysis of locally advanced
279 dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans treated with imatinib: Imatinib Target Exploration Consortium Study B2225.
280 *J Clin Oncol*. Feb 1 2005;23(4):866-73. doi:10.1200/JCO.2005.07.088
- 281 4. Heinrich MC, Joensuu H, Demetri GD, et al. Phase II, open-label study evaluating the activity of imatinib
282 in treating life-threatening malignancies known to be associated with imatinib-sensitive tyrosine kinases. *Clin*
283 *Cancer Res*. May 1 2008;14(9):2717-25. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-07-4575
- 284 5. Park JJH, Siden E, Zoratti MJ, et al. Systematic review of basket trials, umbrella trials, and platform trials: a
285 landscape analysis of master protocols. *Trials*. Sep 18 2019;20(1):572. doi:10.1186/s13063-019-3664-1
- 286 6. Cummings J, Montes A, Kamboj S, Cacho JF. The role of basket trials in drug development for
287 neurodegenerative disorders. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. May 25 2022;14(1):73. doi:10.1186/s13195-022-01015-6
- 288 7. Fountzilas E, Tsimberidou AM, Vo HH, Kurzrock R. Clinical trial design in the era of precision medicine.
289 *Genome Med*. Aug 31 2022;14(1):101. doi:10.1186/s13073-022-01102-1
- 290 8. Chen C ea. Statistical Design and Considerations of a Phase 3 Basket Trial for Simultaneous Investigation
291 of Multiple Tumor Types in One Study. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*. 2016;8(3):248-257.
292 doi:10.1080/19466315.2016.1193044
- 293 9. Wang M, Spiegelman D, Kuchiba A, et al. Statistical methods for studying disease subtype heterogeneity.
294 *Stat Med*. Feb 28 2016;35(5):782-800. doi:10.1002/sim.6793
- 295 10. Patel SS. Randomized Basket Trial with an Interim Analysis (RaBlT) and Applications in Mental Health. 2024
- 296 11. Berry Consultants. Fixed and adaptive clinical trial simulator. Accessed 08-13, 2024.
297 <https://www.berryconsultants.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/FACTS-Overview.pdf>
- 298 12. Chu Y, Yuan Y. A Bayesian basket trial design using a calibrated Bayesian hierarchical model. *Clin Trials*.
299 Apr 2018;15(2):149-158. doi:10.1177/1740774518755122
- 300 13. Yiyi Chu YY. BLAST: Bayesian Latent Subgroup Design for Basket Trials Accounting for Patient
301 Heterogeneity. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*. 2018;67(3):723-740.
- 302 14. RCoreTeam. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 303 15. *Shiny App: Easy web applications in R*. Version 1.8.0. 2013. <http://www.rstudio.com/shiny/>
- 304 16. Kasim A, Bean N, Hendriksen SJ, Chen TT, Zhou H, Psioda MA. Basket trials in oncology: a systematic
305 review of practices and methods, comparative analysis of innovative methods, and an appraisal of a missed
306 opportunity. *Front Oncol*. 2023;13:1266286. doi:10.3389/fonc.2023.1266286
- 307 17. D.H.Lehmer. *Proc Symp Appl Math*. 1960;10:180-181.
- 308 18. Chang W. shinythemes: Themes for Shiny. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=shinythemes>

- 309 19. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York; 2016.
310 <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- 311 20. Wiernik COWaBM. ggtext: Improved Text Rendering Support for 'ggplot2'. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggtext)
312 [project.org/package=ggtext](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggtext)
- 313 21. Pedersen TL. ggforce: Accelerating 'ggplot2'. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggforce>