

Bayesian Analysis of Modified Weibull distribution under progressively censored competing risk model

Arabin Kumar Dey

Department of Mathematics, IIT Guwahati

Abhilash Jha

Department of Mathematics, IIT Guwahati

Sanku Dey

St. Anthony's College

August 26, 2021

Abstract

In this paper we study bayesian analysis of Modified Weibull distribution under progressively censored competing risk model. This study is made for progressively censored data. We use deterministic scan Gibbs sampling combined with slice sampling to generate from the posterior distribution. Posterior distribution is formed by taking prior distribution as reference prior. A real life data analysis is shown for illustrative purpose.

Keywords: Modified Weibull, Competing risk, likelihood function, Slice sampling.

1 Introduction

In survival and medical studies it is quite common that more than one cause of failure may be directed to a system at the same time. It is often interesting that an investigator needs to estimate a specific risk in presence of other risk factors. In statistical literature analysis of such risk is known as competing risk model. Parametric inference of competing risk models are studied by many authors assuming that competing risks follow different lifetime distributions such as gamma, exponential and Weibull distribution; see for example Berkson and Elveback (1960), Cox (1959), David Moeschberger (1978). However determination of the cause of the failure is more difficult many times to observe than to follow up the time to failure. Under the assumption that risks follow exponential distribution, inference of the model studied by Miyakawa (1984). Kundu and Basu (2000) considered the same model, studied by Miyakawa under the assumption that every member of a certain target population either dies of a particular cause, say cancer or by other causes. Model can be more flexible by considering the fact that some individual may be alive at the end of experiment i.e. data are censored. Such models are available in literature even under bayesian set up; see for example Kundu and Pradhan (2011), Pareek, Kundu and Kumar (2009).

Here we consider competing risk under progressive type-II censoring. The censoring scheme is defined as follows. Consider n individuals in a study and assume that there are k causes of failure which are known. At time of each failure, one of more surviving units may be removed from the study at random. The data from a progressively type-II censored sample is as follows : $(X_{1:m:n}, \delta_1, R_1), \dots, (X_{m:m:n}, \delta_m, R_m)$. $X_{1:m:n} < \dots < X_{m:m:n}$. Note that the complete and type-II right censored samples are special cases of the above scheme when $R_1 = \dots = R_m = 0$ and $R_1 = R_2 = \dots = R_{m-1} = 0$ and $R_m = n - m$ respectively. For an exhaustive list of references and further details on progressive censoring, the reader may refer to the book by Balakrishnan and Aggarwala (2000).

The main focus of this paper is the analysis of parametric competing risk model when the data is progressively censored. No work has been done taking modified Weibull as parametric distribution of cause of the failures. Modified Weibull has different forms. We consider a specific form mentioned in section 2 which is not well-studied. In bayesian anal-

ysis we choose reference prior. Use of reference prior is rare as it makes the computational problem harder, though the best motivation for prior selection can be obtained through reference prior. Also many times expression of the prior may not be tractable. However using gibbs combined with slice can provide a solution to this problem. Bayes estimators and credible intervals are also obtained.

The organization of the chapter is as follows. In section 2 we describe the model and present the definitions and notation used throughout the paper. The bayesian estimation of the different parameters are considered in Section 3. Numerical results are provided in section 4. We illustrate the performance of those techniques in section 5 using real data set. Finally some conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

2 Section 2

We assume $(X_{1i}, X_{2i}), i = 1, \dots, n$ are n independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) modified Weibull random variable. Further X_{1i} and X_{2i} are independent for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $X_i = \min\{X_{1i}, X_{2i}\}$. We observe the sample $(X_{1:m:n}, \delta_1, R_1), \dots, (X_{m:m:n}, \delta_m, R_m)$ assuming all the causes of failure are known. We assume that the X_{ji} 's are modified Weibull distribution with parameters λ_j for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and for $j = 1, 2$. The distribution function $F_j(\cdot)$ of X_{ji} has the following form : $F_j(t) = 1 - e^{\lambda_j \alpha (1 - e^{(\frac{t}{\alpha})^\beta})}$, $j = 1$ and 2 . Therefore for each cause j , the pdf of failure time can be given by, $f_j(t) = \lambda_j \beta (\frac{t}{\alpha})^{(\beta-1)} e^{(\frac{t}{\alpha})^\beta} e^{\lambda_j \alpha (1 - e^{(\frac{t}{\alpha})^\beta})}$

The likelihood function of the observed data is

$$L(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \beta, \alpha) = \prod_{i=1}^m S_T^{R_i}(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \prod_{i=1}^{m_1} [f_1(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_1) S_2(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_2)] \\ \times \prod_{i=m_1}^m [f_2(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_1) S_1(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_2)]$$

where $S_T(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2) = (1 - F_T(t_i; \alpha, \beta, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2))$.

Evaluating the above likelihood we get

$$L(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \beta, \alpha) = n(n - R_1 - 1) \cdots (n - R_1 - \cdots - R_{m-1} - m + 1) \\ \times \lambda_1^{m_1} \lambda_2^{m-m_1} \beta^m e^{\sum_{i=1}^m (\frac{t_i}{\alpha})^\beta} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{t_i}{\alpha} \right)^{\beta-1} \right] e^{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m (R_i + 1) (1 - e^{(\frac{t_i}{\alpha})^\beta})}$$

2.1 Prior Assumption :

The key idea is to derive reference prior described by ? (1992) is to get prior $\pi(\theta)$ that maximizes the expected posterior information about the parameters. Let $I(\theta)$ is expected information about θ given the data $X = \underline{x}$. Then

$$I(\theta) = E_X(K(p(\theta|\underline{x})||\pi(\theta)))$$

where $K(p(\theta|\tilde{x})||\pi(\theta))$ is the Kullback-Leibler distance between posterior $p(\theta|\underline{x})$ and prior $p(\theta)$ can be given by

$$K(\pi(\theta|\underline{x})||\pi(\theta)) = \int_{\Omega_\theta} \ln \frac{\pi(\theta|\underline{x})}{\pi(\theta)} \pi(\theta|\underline{x}) d\theta$$

If the set up is as follows, $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, where θ_1 is $p_1 \times 1$ and θ_2 is $p_2 \times 1$. We define $p = p_1 + p_2$. where θ_1 is the parameter of interest and θ_2 is a nuisance parameter.

$$\text{Let } I(\theta) = I(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} I_{11}(\theta) & I_{12}(\theta) \\ I_{21}(\theta) & I_{22}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}$$

We can show $\pi(\theta_2|\theta_1) = |I_{22}(\theta)|^{\frac{1}{2}} c(\theta_1)$, where $c(\theta_1)$ is the constant that makes this distribution a proper density. We will be using this fact to get the expression for the prior in conditional distribution at each Gibbs sampler step.

Reference Prior for Gibbs sampling Set-up

In the Gibbs sampling set-up we try to reduce the posterior as the conditional distribution of one parameter given the other parameters and the data. For example, we are interested in finding the $p(\lambda_1|\lambda_2, \beta, \alpha, x) \propto p(x|\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \beta, \alpha) p_{\text{reference prior}}(\lambda_1|\lambda_2, \beta, \alpha)$. Complication of finding reference prior can be much simplified by using Gibbs sampler method.

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\lambda_1|\lambda_2, \beta, \alpha) &\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{J}(\lambda_1|\lambda_2, \beta, \alpha, x)} \\ &= \sqrt{-\left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda_1^2}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\beta|\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \alpha) &\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{J}(\beta|\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \alpha, x)} \\ &= \sqrt{-\left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \beta^2}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\alpha|\beta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) &\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{J}(\alpha|\beta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, x)} \\ &= \sqrt{-\left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \alpha^2}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\lambda_2|\beta, \lambda_1, \alpha) &\propto \sqrt{\mathcal{J}(\lambda_2|\beta, \lambda_1, \alpha, x)} \\ &= \sqrt{-\left(\frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \lambda_2^2}\right)}\end{aligned}$$

3 Posterior Analysis and Bayes Inference

However generation of random number from these conditional densities is not tractable through inverse transform method due to its highly complicated form. Therefore we use Slice sampler to generate sample from those conditional distribution. Steps of the algorithms and calculation of HPD region can be provided as follows :

3.1 Algorithm

1. Choose a starting value of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \alpha, \beta$.

2. Use slice sampling to generate λ_1 using above λ_2, α, β .
3. Use this new λ_1 and earlier λ_2, α, β to generate new λ_2 .
4. Use new λ_1, λ_2 and earlier α, β to generate new α .
5. Use new $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \alpha$ to generate new β .
6. repeat step 2-5 M times to generate new $(\lambda_{1i}, \lambda_{2i}, \alpha_i, \beta_i)$ $i = 1, \dots, m$.
7. Mean Bayesian estimate of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \alpha, \beta$ is given by:-

$$\hat{\lambda}_{1B} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \lambda_{1k}, \hat{\lambda}_{2B} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \lambda_{2k}$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_B = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \alpha_k, \hat{\beta}_B = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \beta_k$$

8. To obtain HPD(Highest Posterior Density) region of λ_1 , we order $\{\lambda_{1i}\}$, as $\lambda_{1(1)} < \lambda_{1(2)} < \dots < \lambda_{1(M)}$. Then $100(1 - \gamma)\%$ HPD region of λ_1 become

$$(\lambda_{1(j)}, \lambda_{1(j+M-M\gamma)}), \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, M\gamma$$

Therefore $100(1 - \gamma)\%$ HPD region of λ_1 becomes $(\lambda_{1(j^*)}, \lambda_{1(j^*+M-M\gamma)})$, where j^* is such that

$$\lambda_{1(j^*+M-M\gamma)} - \lambda_{1(j^*)} \leq \lambda_{1(j+M-M\gamma)} - \lambda_{1(j)}$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, M\gamma$. Similarly, we can obtain the HPD credible interval for λ_2, α and β .

4 Numerical Simulation:

In this section we conduct a simulation study to investigate the performance of the proposed Bayes estimators. We generate sample points from the actual distribution assuming the parameters provided along with different censoring schemes and then apply it to our model to predict the parameters and compare the results. To generate data sets currently we

assign the cause of failure as 1 or 2 with probability 0.5. We have generated 200 data points. Then we have divided it in 2 cases. In case 1 we consider all 200 data points (which is **Type 2 Censoring**) and in case 2 we will apply censoring on those data (which is **Progressive censoring**) and then predict the parameters. Below are the different schemes of data sets used for validation.

Scheme 1 $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 0.6, \alpha = 0.3, \beta = 0.1, n = 200$, Type 2 Censoring

Scheme 2 $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 0.6, \alpha = 0.3, \beta = 0.1, n = 200$, Progressive Type 2 Censoring

Scheme 3 $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 1, \alpha = 0.3, \beta = 0.1, n = 200$, Type 2 Censoring

Scheme 4 $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 1, \alpha = 0.3, \beta = 0.1, n = 200$, Progressive Type 2 Censoring

Scheme 1




Figure 1: Histogram and trace plot of parameter values for Scheme 1

Parameters	Actual	Result
λ_1	1	0.88139633304646
λ_2	0.6	0.87962618837108
α	0.3	0.226456918989323
β	0.1	0.087896231075444

Table 1: Results Comparison for Scheme 1

Scheme 2




Figure 2: Histogram and trace plot of parameter values for Scheme 2

Parameters	Actual	Result
λ_1	1	0.7918084
λ_2	0.6	0.6261012
α	0.3	0.2062639
β	0.1	0.08331048

Table 2: Results Comparison for Scheme 2

Scheme 3




Figure 3: Histogram and trace plot of parameter values for Scheme 3

Parameters	Actual	Result
λ_1	1	0.6300016260981249
λ_2	1	0.698699693413326
α	0.3	0.215528915817512
β	0.1	0.0977690735863656

Table 3: Results Comparison for Scheme 3

Scheme 4




Figure 4: Histogram and trace plot of parameter values for Scheme 4

Parameters	Actual	Result
λ_1	1	0.918084
λ_2	1	0.8261012
α	0.3	0.3062639
β	0.1	0.08331048

Table 4: Results Comparison for Scheme 4

5 Data Analysis : Application on Follicular Cell Lymphoma Data

Now We will move on to apply our model on real life data. For that we have considered the follicular cell lymphoma data from Pintilie (2007) where additional details about data set

can be found. The data set can be downloaded from `follic.txt`, and consists of 541 patients with early disease stage follicular cell lymphoma (I or II) and treated with radiation only (`chemo = 0`) or a combined treatment with radiation and chemotherapy (`chemo = 1`). Parameters recorded were `path1`, `ldh`, `clinstg`, `blktxcat`, `rebsite`, `chrt`, `survtime`, `stat`, `dftime`, `dfcens`, `resp` and `stnum`. The two competing risks are **death without relapse** and **no treatment response**. The patient's ages (`age`: mean = 57 and sd = 14) and haemoglobin levels (`hgb`: mean = 138 and sd = 15) were also recorded. The median follow-up time was 5.5 years. There are more parameters which are not of our concern.

First we read the data, compute the cause of failure indicator. Below is the code to calculate the cause.

```
R> evcens <- as.numeric(fol$resp == "NR" | fol$rebsite != "")
R> crcens <- as.numeric(fol$resp == "CR" &
  fol$rebsite == "" & fol$stat == 1)
R> cause <- ifelse(evcens == 1, 1, ifelse(crcens == 1, 2, 0))
R> table(cause)
cause
0    1    2
193 272 76
```

There are 272 (no treatment response or relapse) events due to the disease, 76 competing risk events (death without relapse) and 193 censored individuals. The event times are denoted as `dftime`. Thus our data set is prepared.

Now we will consider this data set and apply it on our model. We will consider 3 cases of analysis as defined below :-

Case 1 We will only consider those data in which `cause = 1` and `cause = 2` are considered.

Case 2 Here we will consider the censor data too. Now to prepare data set we will first sort data according to time. Then we will remove data points between two non-zero causes.

For Case 1, the following are the bayes estimate corresponding to the parameters, $\lambda_1 = 0.12128$, $\lambda_2 = 0.01762$, $\alpha = 2.33876$, $\beta = 0.44871$. For Case 2, bayes estimates are, $\lambda_1 =$

0.034 , $\lambda_2 = 0.004$, $\alpha = 30.228$, $\beta = 0.536$.

We show the histogram and trace plot of the parameters of the Follicular Data Case 1 and Case 2 in 5, 5 respectively.




Figure 5: Histogram and trace plot of parameters for Follicular Data Case 1




Figure 6: Histogram and trace plot of parameters for Follicular Data Case 2

Parameters	posterior median	Lower HPD	Upper HPD
λ_1	0.034	0.0222	0.0432
λ_2	0.004	0.00289	0.0058
α	30.228	7.725	164.4087
β	0.536	0.448	0.6362

Table 5: Posterior median and lower and upper HPD for Follicular Data in Case 2

The results obtained for HPD region of α apparently seem to look awkward as its width is very high. However taking posterior median as true value of the parameters of modified Weibull, we can easily cross-check it provides a good fit for histograms of the distribution of cause-specific data. This verifies the distributional assumption of this parametric approach.

6 Conclusion

We consider the bayesian analysis of the competing risks data when they are Type-II progressively censored. Numerical simulation shows the posterior median calculated via slice sampling combined with gibbs sampler works quite well. In this article we consider with two causes of failure only, the work can be extended to more than two causes of failure. We select parameters to follow reference prior which is very flexible. The similar work can be done for type-I progressively censored data. The work is on progress. Slice sampling uses step out methods where selection of width plays an important role. An automated choice of such selection based on the data and distribution can enhance the quality of the algorithm.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

References

- Abdel-Hamid, Alaa H and Al-Hussaini, Essam K (2011). Inference for a progressive stress model from Weibull distribution under progressive type-II censoring. *Journal of Computational and applied mathematics* **235**, no. 17, 5259-5271.
- Atreya, S. F. and Rizk, M. M. (2015). Prediction under modified Weibull distribution with applications. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research* **6**, 1625–1632.
- Asgharzadeh, A., Valiollahi, R. and Kundu, D. (2015). Prediction for future failures in Weibull Distribution under hybrid censoring *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research* **6**, 1625–1632.
- Azzalini, A. (2005). The skew-normal distribution and related multivariate families. **32**, 159–188.
- Balakrishnan, N (2007) Progressive censoring methodology: an appraisal *Test* **Springer**, no. 16, 211–259

- Balakrishnan and Aggarwala (2000) Progressive censoring : Theory, Methods, and Applications *Statistics For Industry and Technology*, **Birkhauser**, Boston
- Berkson, J. and Elveback, L. (1960). Competing exponential risks with particular inference to the study of smoking lung cancer *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **87**, 84-89.
- Bernardo, José M (1979). Reference posterior distributions for Bayesian Inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **B 41**, 113 - 147.
- Bernardo, José M (1992). On development of reference priors. *Bayesian Statistics* **4**, 61 - 77.
- Berger, James O and Bernardo, José M and Sun, Dongchu (2009). Competing exponential risks with particular inference to the study of smoking lung cancer *The Annals of Statistics* **37**, no. 2, 905–938.
- Cox, D. R. (1959). The analysis of exponentially distributed lifetimes of with two types of failure times *Journal of Royal Statistics* **B 21**, 411 - 421.
- David, H. A. and Moeschberger (1978). The Theory of Competing Risks *Griffin* London.
- Kaplan, E. L. and Meier, P. (1958). Non-parametric estimation from incomplete observation *Journal of American Statistical Association*, vol. 53, 457 - 481.
- Peterson, Jr., A. P. (1977). Expressing the Kaplan-Meier estimator as a function of empirical survival functions *Journal of American Statistical Association*, vol. 72, 854 - 858.
- Hall, P. (1988). Theoretical comparison of bootstrap confidence intervals. *Annals of Statistics*, vol. 16, 927 - 953.
- Chen, Ming-Hui and Shao, Qi-Man (2005). Monte Carlo Estimation of Bayesian Credible and HPD Intervals. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **32**, 159–188.

- Damien, Paul and Wakefield, Jon and Walker, Stephen (1999). Gibbs sampling for Bayesian non-conjugate and hierarchical models by using auxiliary variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical Methodology* **5**, 331–344.
- Gasmi, S. and Berzig, M. (2011). Parameters Estimation of the Modified Weibull Distribution Based on Type I Censored Samples. *Applied Mathematical Sciences* **5**, 2899–2917.
- Hemmati, F. and Khorram, E. (2016). On Adaptive Progressively Type-II Censored Competing Risks Data. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* **just-accepted**.
- Pareek, Bhuvanesh and Kundu, Debasis and Kumar, Sumit (2009) Bayesian analysis of progressively censored competing risks data *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **53**, no. 12, 4083–4094.
- Kundu, Debasis and Pradhan, Biswabrata (2011) On progressively censored competing risks data for Weibull distributions. *Sankhya B* **73**, no. 2, 276–296.
- Kundu, Debasis and Basu, S. (2000) Analysis of incomplete data in presence of competing risk *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **73**, no. 2, 276–296.
- Preda, V., Panaitescu, E. and Constantinescu, A. (2010). Bayes estimators of Modified-Weibull distribution parameters using Lindley’s approximation *Wseas Transactions on Mathematics* **9**, 539–549.
- Miyakawa, M. (1984). Analysis of incomplete data in competing risks model *IEEE Transactions on Reliability Analysis* **33**, no. 4, 293-296.
- Neal, Radford M (2003). Slice sampling *Annals of statistics* **9**, 705–741.
- Sarhan, Ammar M. and Apaloo, J. (2013). Exponentiated modified Weibull extension distribution *Reliability Engineering and System Safety* **112**, 137–144.
- Satagopan, JM and Ben-Porat, L and Berwick, M and Robson, M and Kutler, D and Auerbach, AD (2004), A note on competing risks in survival data analysis *British journal of cancer* vol. 91, no. 7, 1229–1235.

Upadhyaya, S. K., and Gupta, A. (2010). A Bayes analysis of modified Weibull distribution via Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation, *J. Statist. Comput. Simul.* **80**, 241-254.

Xie, M., Tang, Y. and Goh, TN. (2002). A modified Weibull extension with bathtub-shaped failure rate function. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety* **76**, 279–285.