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## Censored and Truncated Data

- An observation is right censored at $y$ :

Unit is in our data, we know $T>y$.
Contribution to $L: P(T>y)=R(y)$.

- An observation is left censored at $y$ : Unit is in our data, we know $T<y$.
Contribution to $L: P(T<y)=F(y)$.
- An observation is right truncated at $y$ :

Unit is in our data only if $T \leq y$. We do not know about the units with $T>y$.
Contribution to $L$ of observed failure at $t$ :
$\Delta^{-1} P(t \leq T \leq t+\Delta \mid T \leq y) \approx f(t) / F(y)$.

- An observation is left truncated at $y$ :

Unit is in our data only if $T \geq y$. We do not know about the units with $T<y$.
Contribution to $L$ of observed failure at $t$ :
$\Delta^{-1} P(t \leq T \leq t+\Delta \mid T \geq y) \approx f(t) / R(y)$.

## Examples of left truncation:

- Ultrasonic inspection of material. Signal amplitude only trusted when above limit $\tau$. Condition for being in the data set is $T>\tau$.
- Life data with pretest screening. Electronic component is burn-in tested for 1000 hours. Only the ones that passed this test are observed later. The number of components failing at burn-in is unknown. Condition for being in the data set is $T>1000$.


## Example of right truncation:

- Casting for automobile engine mounts. Pore size distribution below 10 microns only are recorded (other units are immediately discarded). Condition for being in the data set is $T<10$ microns.
- Study group of individuals with AIDS diagnosis before July 1, 1986, and known date of HIV-infection (due to blood-transfusion). Let $T_{i}=$ time from HIV-infection to AIDS diagnosis for $i$ th individual. Then condition for being in the data set is that $T_{i} \leq v_{i}$ where $v_{i}$ is time from HIV-infection of the $i$ th individual to July 1, 1986. (Kalbfleisch and Lawless, 1989)


## COMPUTER PROGRAM EXECUTION TIME vs SYSTEM LOAD

Data: 17 observations of ( $\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{x}$ )

- Time to complete a computationally intensive task.
- Information from the Unix uptime command
- Predictions needed for scheduling subsequent steps in a multistep computational process.

| Seconds (T) | Load (x) | Seconds (T) | Load (x) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 123 | 2,74 | 110 | , 60 |
| 704 | 5,47 | 213 | 2,10 |
| 184 | 2,13 | 284 | 3,10 |
| 113 | 1,00 | 317 | 5,86 |
| 94 | , 32 | 142 | 1,18 |
| 76 | , 31 | 127 | , 57 |
| 78 | , 51 | 96 | 1,10 |
| 98 | , 29 | 111 | 1,89 |
| 240 | , 96 |  |  |

## Covariates (explanatory variables) for failure times

Useful covariates explain/predict why some units fail quickly and some units survive a long time:

- Continuous variables like stress, temperature, voltage, and pressure.
- Discrete variables like number of hardening treatments or number of simultaneous users of a system.
- Categorical variables like manufacturer, design, and location.

Regression model relates failure time distribution to covariates $x=$ $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right)$ :

$$
P(T \leq t)=F(t)=F(t ; x)
$$

## Why regression models?

- Want to find factors which explain the reliability of an item
- Want to exclude factors which do not influence the reliability
- Obtain new knowledge about failure mechanisms
- Make better predictions for reliability of an item

Computer data
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```
Regression with Life Data: T versus x
|
Response Variable: T
Censoring Information Count
Uncensored value 17
Estimation Method: Maximum Likelihood
Distribution: Lognormal base e
Regression Table
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrr} 
& & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Standard } & Z & P \\
Predictor & Coef & Error & Lower & Upper \\
Intercept & 4,4936 & 0,1112 & 40,39 & 0,000 & 4,2756 & 4,7116 \\
x & 0,29075 & 0,04595 & 6,33 & 0,000 & 0,20069 & 0,38080 \\
Scale & 0,31247 & 0,05359 & & & 0,22327 & 0,43730
\end{tabular}
Log-Likelihood = -89,498
Anderson-Darling (adjusted) Goodness-of-Fit
Standardized Residuals = 0,8356; Cox-Snell Residuals = 0,8170
```

Regression with Life Data: C1 versus C2

Response Variable: C1
Censoring Information Count

Uncensored value
17

Estimation Method: Maximum Likelihood Distribution: Weibull

Regression Table

|  | Standard |  |  |  | 95,08 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lormal CI |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Predictor | Coef | Error | Z | P | Lower | Upper |
| Intercept | 4,6182 | 0,1219 | 37,88 | 0,000 | 4,3792 | 4,8572 |
| C2 | 0,31118 | 0,04939 | 6,30 | 0,000 | 0,21437 | 0,40799 |
| Shape | 3,0604 | 0,5245 |  |  | 2,1873 | 4,2820 |

Log-Likelihood $=-91,504$
Anderson-Darling (adjusted) Goodness-of-Fit

## Likelihood for Lognormal Distribution Simple Regression Model with Right Censored Data

The likelihood for $n$ independent observations has the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
L\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right) & =\prod_{i=1}^{n} L_{i}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma ; \text { data }_{i}\right) \\
& =\prod_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{1}{\sigma t_{i}} \phi_{\text {nor }}\left[\frac{\log \left(t_{i}\right)-\mu_{i}}{\sigma}\right]\right\}^{\delta_{i}}\left\{1-\Phi_{\text {nor }}\left[\frac{\log \left(t_{i}\right)-\mu_{i}}{\sigma}\right]\right\}^{1-\delta_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where data ${ }_{i}=\left(x_{i}, t_{i}, \delta_{i}\right), \mu_{i}=\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} x_{i}$,

$$
\delta_{i}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { exact observation } \\ 0 & \text { right censored observation }\end{cases}
$$

$\phi_{\text {nor }}(z)$ is the standardized normal pdf and $\Phi_{\text {nor }}(z)$ is the corresponding normal cdf.

The parameters are $\theta=\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)$.

## Estimated Parameter Variance-Covariance Matrix

Local (observed information) estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Sigma}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} & =\left[\begin{array}{lll}
\widehat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\hat{\beta}_{0}\right) & \widehat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{\beta}_{0}, \widehat{\beta}_{1}\right) & \widehat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{0}, \widehat{\sigma}\right) \\
\widehat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{1}, \widehat{\beta}_{0}\right) & \widehat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{1}\right) & \widehat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{1}, \widehat{\sigma}\right) \\
\widehat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{\sigma}, \widehat{\beta}_{0}\right) & \widehat{\operatorname{Cov}}\left(\hat{\sigma}, \widehat{\beta}_{1}\right) & \widehat{\operatorname{Var}}(\hat{\sigma})
\end{array}\right] \\
& =\left[\begin{array}{lll}
-\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \beta_{0}^{2}} & -\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \beta_{0} \partial \beta_{1}} & -\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \beta_{0} \partial \sigma} \\
-\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \beta_{1} \partial \beta_{0}} & -\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \beta_{1}^{2}} & -\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \beta_{1} \partial \sigma} \\
-\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \sigma \partial \beta_{0}} & -\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \sigma \partial \beta_{1}} & -\frac{\partial^{2} \mathcal{L}\left(\beta_{0}, \beta_{1}, \sigma\right)}{\partial \sigma^{2}}
\end{array}\right]^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Partial derivatives are evaluated at $\widehat{\beta}_{0}, \widehat{\beta}_{1}, \widehat{\sigma}$.

## Standard Errors and Confidence Intervals for Parameters

- Lognormal ML estimates for the computer time experiment were $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}=\left(\widehat{\beta}_{0}, \widehat{\beta}_{1}, \widehat{\sigma}\right)=(4.49, .290, .312)$ and an estimate of the variance-covariance matrix for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is

$$
\Sigma_{\widehat{\theta}}=\left[\begin{array}{rrr}
.012 & -.0037 & 0 \\
-.0037 & .0021 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & .0029
\end{array}\right]
$$

- Normal-approximation confidence interval for the computer execution time regression slope is
$\left[\beta_{\sim}, \quad \tilde{\beta}_{1}\right]=\widehat{\beta}_{1} \pm z(.975)^{\widehat{\mathrm{se}}_{\widehat{\beta}_{1}}=.290 \pm 1.96(.046)=[.20, ~}$
where $\widehat{\mathrm{se}}_{\widehat{\beta}_{1}}=\sqrt{.0021}=.046$.

Probability Plot for SResids Comp Data Weibull
Smallest Extreme Value - $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$
Complete Data - ML Estimates


| Tabe of Staustics |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lec | Q,0000000 |
| Scale | 1,00000 |
| Mean | 0,577216 |
| StDev | 1,28255 |
| Medan | 0,366513 |
| 1QR | 1,57263 |
| Faikre | 17 |
| Censar | 0 |
| AD* | Q,84 |



## Ordinary residuals

$y_{i}-x_{i}^{\prime} \hat{\beta}$
where
yi is the ith response value
$X_{i}^{\prime}$ is the vector of predictor values associated with the ith response value
$\beta$ represents the estimated regression coefficients

## Standardized residuals

$\frac{y_{i}-x_{i}^{\prime} \hat{\beta}}{\hat{\sigma}}$
where $\hat{\theta}$ is the estimated scale parameter.

## Cox-Snell residuals

$-\ln \left(\hat{R}\left(y_{i}\right)\right)$
where
$\hat{R}\left\langle y_{\dot{V}}\right\rangle$ is the estimated survival (reliability) probability for the response value yi $\ln (x)$ is the natural $\log$ of $x$


Probability Plot for CSResids Comp Data Lognormal
Exponential - 95\% CI
Complete Data - ML Estimates


| Row | Pseudo- <br> stress | k Cycles | Status | (1=failed, 0=censored) |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :--- |
| i | s | Y | C | DATA DESCRIPTION : |
| 1 | 80,3 | 211,629 | 1 | Low-Cycle Fatigue Life of Nickel-Base |
| 2 | 80,6 | 200,027 | 1 | Superalloy Specimens |
| 3 | 80,8 | 57,923 | 0 | (in units of thousands of cycles |
| 4 | 84,3 | 155,000 | 1 | to failure). |
| 5 | 85,2 | 13,949 | 1 |  |
| 6 | 85,6 | 112,968 | 0 | Data from Nelson (1990) : |
| 7 | 85,8 | 152,680 | 1 |  |
| 8 | 86,4 | 156,725 | 1 |  |
| 9 | 86,7 | 138,114 | 0 |  |
| 10 | 87,2 | 56,723 | 1 |  |
| 11 | 87,3 | 121,075 | 1 |  |
| 12 | 89,7 | 122,372 | 0 |  |
| 13 | 91,3 | 112,002 | 1 |  |
| 14 | 99,8 | 43,331 | 1 |  |
| 15 | 100,1 | 12,076 | 1 |  |
| 16 | 100,5 | 13,181 | 1 |  |
| 17 | 113,0 | 18,067 | 1 |  |
| 18 | 114,8 | 21,300 | 1 |  |
| 19 | 116,4 | 15,616 | 1 |  |
| 20 | 118,0 | 13,030 | 1 |  |
| 21 | 118,4 | 8,489 | 1 |  |
| 22 | 118,6 | 12,434 | 1 |  |
| 23 | 120,4 | 9,750 | 1 |  |
| 24 | 142,5 | 11,865 | 1 |  |
| 25 | 144,5 | 6,705 | 1 |  |
| 26 | 145,9 | 5,733 | 1 |  |

## Plot of Y vs s




Regression with Life Data: $Y$ versus $x$

Response Variable: $Y$
Censoring Information
Count
Uncensored value
22
Right censored value
4
Censoring value: $C=0$

Estimation Method: Maximum Likelihood
Distribution: Weibull

Regression Table

|  | Standard |  |  |  | $95,0 \%$ Normal CI |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Predictor | Coef | Error | Z | P | Lower | Upper |
| Intercept | 31,432 | 2,008 | 15,65 | 0,000 | 27,496 | 35,368 |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | $-5,9600$ | 0,4329 | $-13,77$ | 0,000 | $-6,8085$ | $-5,1116$ |
| Shape | 2,2105 | 0,3894 |  |  | 1,5651 | 3,1221 |

Log-Likelihood $=-97,155$

Anderson-Darling (adjusted) Goodness-of-Fit

Standardized Residuals $=1,0768$; Cox-Snell Residuals $=1,0768$

Response Variable: Y

| Censoring Information | Count |
| :--- | ---: |
| Uncensored value | 22 |
| Right censored value | 4 |
| Censoring value: $C=0$ |  |
|  |  |
| Estimation Method: Maximum Likelihood |  |
| Distribution: Weibull |  |

Regression Table

|  | Standard |  |  |  |  | $95,0 \%$ Normal CI |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Predictor | Coef | Error | Z | P | Lower | Upper |  |
| Intercept | 217,61 | 62,13 | 3,50 | 0,000 | 95,83 | 339,39 |  |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | $-85,52$ | 26,55 | $-3,220,001$ | $-137,55$ | $-33,49$ |  |  |
| x*x | 8,483 | 2,831 | 3,00 | 0,003 | 2,934 | 14,032 |  |
| Shape | 2,6685 | 0,4777 |  |  | 1,8789 | 3,7900 |  |

Log-Likelihood $=-93,382$
Anderson-Darling (adjusted) Goodness-of-Fit
Standardized Residuals $=0,9283$; Cox-Snell Residuals $=0,9283$

## Log-Quadratic Weibull Regression Model with Constant ( $\beta=1 / \sigma$ ) Fit to the Fatigue Data $\log \left[\hat{t}_{p}(x)\right]=\widehat{\mu}(x)+\Phi_{\operatorname{sev}}^{-1}(p) \hat{\sigma}, x=\log$ (pseudo-stress)



Pseudo-stress (ksi)

Regression with Life Data: $Y$ versus $\mathbf{x}$

| Table of Percentiles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Standard | 95,0\% | Normal CI |
| Percent | $s$ | x | Percentile | Error | Lower | Upper |
| 10 | 80 | 4,3820 | 133,3747 | 34,0579 | 80,8565 | 220,0048 |
| 10 | 100 | 4,6052 | 16,7928 | 3,4263 | 11,2577 | 25,0494 |
| 10 | 120 | 4,7875 | 5,7830 | 1,2364 | 3,8034 | 8,7929 |
| 10 | 140 | 4,9416 | 3,6458 | 0,8760 | 2,2766 | 5,8386 |
| 50 | 80 | 4,3820 | 270,1879 | 56,0580 | 179,9121 | 405,7621 |
| 50 | 100 | 4,6052 | 34,0186 | 4,3027 | 26,5494 | 43,5891 |
| 50 | 120 | 4,7875 | 11,7151 | 1,5950 | 8,9713 | 15,2980 |
| 50 | 140 | 4,9416 | 7,3856 | 1,2828 | 5,2547 | 10,3807 |
| 90 | 80 | 4,3820 | 423,6933 | 90,4646 | 278,8097 | 643,8659 |
| 90 | 100 | 4,6052 | 53,3461 | 6,8162 | 41,5281 | 68,5272 |
| 90 | 120 | 4,7875 | 18,3709 | 2,4567 | 14,1351 | 23,8760 |
| 90 | 140 | 4,9416 | 11,5817 | 1,9813 | 8,2824 | 16,1952 |

ESTIMERT KOVARIANSMATRISE FOR ( $\widehat{\beta}_{0}, \widehat{\beta}_{1}, \widehat{\beta}_{2}, \widehat{\sigma}$ )

| 3860,37 | $-1649,17$ | 175,82 | $-0,80$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $-1649,17$ | 704,70 | $-75,15$ | 0,33 |
| 175,82 | $-75,15$ | 8,02 | $-0,03$ |
| $-0,80$ | 0,33 | $-0,03$ | 0,23 |



Probability Plot for CSResids of Y
Exponential - 95\% CI
Censoring Column in C - ML. Estimates



