İSTATİSTİK: JOURNAL OF THE TURKISH STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION
Vol. 6, No. 2, July 2013, pp. 56–65
ISSN 1300-4077 | 13 | 2 | 56 | 65

İSTATİSTİK

A NONPARAMETRIC TEST FOR THE GROUPED AND RIGHT CENSORED DATA

Hyo-Il Park*
Department of Statistics, Chong-ju University
Chong-ju, Choong-book 360-764, Korea

Abstract : In this research, we propose a nonparametric test procedure for the right censored and grouped data under the additive hazards model. For deriving the test statistics, we use the likelihood principle. Then we illustrate proposed test with an example and compare the performance with other procedure by obtaining empirical powers. Finally we discuss some interesting features concerning the proposed test.

Key words: Additive hazards model, Grouped data, Log-rank test, Score function.
History: Submitted: 10 September 2012; Revised: 29 November 2012; Accepted: 9 January 2013

1. Introduction

The proportional hazards model (PHM) has been one of the most frequently applied ones for the analysis of the life-time data. Since Cox (1972) has proposed the PHM for the right censored data, the PHM has been developed and modified successfully in many various situations such as the multivariate and interval censoring cases. However when the proportionality among hazard functions may be suspicious, one may as well consider an alternative model rather than clinging to the PHM. Then the additive hazards model (AHM) may be a candidate for any possible alternatives. Let λ_0 be the baseline hazard function and z, the $p \times 1$ regression vector, which is independent of the time t. Then the hazard function $\lambda(t, z)$ for the AHM can be presented with the $p \times 1$ regression coefficient vector β as follows:

$$\lambda(t, z) = \lambda_0(t) + \beta' z, \tag{1.1}$$

where the prime represents the transpose of a vector or matrix. Then the corresponding cumulative hazard function, $\Lambda(t, z)$ and survival function, $S(t, z)$ under the AHM (1.1) can be written as follows with the facts that $\Lambda_0(t) = \int_0^t \lambda_0(x)dx$, $\int_0^t \beta' z dx = t\beta' z$ and $S(t, z) = \exp[-\Lambda(t, z)]$:

$$\Lambda(t, z) = \int_0^t (\lambda_0(x) + \beta' z)\, dx = \Lambda_0(t) + t\beta' z$$

and

$$S(t, z) = \exp[-\Lambda_0(t)] \exp[-t\beta' z]. \tag{1.2}$$

As an alternative model to the PHM, the AHM has not been widely used. The main reason for this may come from the fact that the conditional likelihood proposed by Cox (1972) can not be applied to the AHM because of the structure of the hazard function. The AHM (1.1) was initiated by Aalen (1980, 1989), who considered an inference procedure for λ_0 and β applying the least squares method. McKeague (1988) and Huffer and McKeague (1991) considered the weighted least squares estimates under some optimality consideration. Also Lin and Ying (1994) proposed an estimate procedure for β using the counting process as an ad hoc approach. McKeague and Sasieni

* E-mail:hipark@cju.ac.kr

(1994) developed partly parametric AHM. Also Scheike (2002) worked the AHM in this direction. For the multivariate data, Yin and Cai (2004) considered inferences based on the marginal AHM approach. However there has not been proposed a test procedure for β explicitly under the AHM (1.1).

Sometimes one cannot help observing the objects whether they fail or not periodically with time-schedule for some reasons. For example, after being exposed to the HIV virus, the observation must be carried out periodically since it usually takes several months for blood test results from HIV negative to HIV positive. In this case, the data set contains lots of tied value observations even though the underlying life-time distribution is continuous. This type of data set is called the grouped data and can be analyzed by the data-specific method. Heitjan (1989) reviewed extensively the methodology and suggested several research directions for the grouped data. For the right censored data, Prentice and Gloeckler (1978) considered the inferences about β under the PHM. Park (1993) proposed a class of nonparametric tests for the linear model while Neuhaus (1993) considered weighted log-rank tests for the two-sample problem.

In this study, we propose a nonparametric test procedure for β under the AHM (1.1) using the score function based on the likelihood principle for the grouped and right censored data. The scores will be derived using the discrete model approach (cf. Kalbfleisch and Prentice, 1980) and estimated consistently. First of all, we consider a simple score test statistic for the scalar case and then extend this procedure to the vector covariate. Then we illustrate our test with an example and compare our test with that of Prentice and Gloeckler (1978) by obtaining empirical powers through simulation study. Finally we discuss some peculiar aspects about our test as concluding remarks.

2. A simple nonparametric score test

Suppose that we observe life time T_i for the ith individual with some specific scalar covariate, z_i, $i=1,\cdots,n$. We assume that each subject is prone to be censored. In this way, the data set can be represented as $\{(T_i,\delta_i,z_i)\,,i=1,\cdots,n\}$, where δ_i stands for the censoring status with values 0 or 1 if censored or not. Since we are concerned with the grouped data, we assume that the positive half real line, $[0,\infty)$ is partitioned into k sub-intervals such as $[0,\infty)=\bigcup_{l=1}^{k}[a_{l-1},a_l)$, with $a_0=0$ and $a_k=\infty$. Then one can only have the information that T_i is contained in one of the k sub-intervals for all i. We denote D_l and C_l as the indicate sets for the uncensored and censored observations in the lth sub-interval $[a_{l-1},a_l)$, respectively. Thus $i\in D_l$ or $i\in C_l$ means that T_i is uncensored($\delta_i=1$) or censored($\delta_i=0$) observation in the lth sub-interval. Also let $R_l=\bigcup_{m=l}^{k}\{D_m\cup C_m\}$ for each l, $l=1,\cdots,k$. Then we note that R_l is the risk set of the lth sub-interval. Finally we denote d_l and r_l as the sizes of D_l and R_l, respectively, $l=1,\ldots,k$. In this grouped continuous data, we assume that all the censorings occur at the end of a sub-interval and all the deaths proceed any censoring in the same sub-interval. Also we will assume that all the observations in the last sub-interval $[a_{k-1},\infty)$ are censored at a_{k-1} for some technical reason, which we will see later. Finally we assume that the survival and censoring distributions are independent to avoid the so-called identifiability problem. Then based on the discrete model for the grouped data used for PHM in Kalbfleisch and Prentice (1980), with all the assumptions and notation introduced up to now, we have under AHM (1.1) with (1.2) that for each l, $l=1,\cdots,k-1$

$$\Pr\{T_i\in[a_{l-1},a_l),\delta_i=1,z_i\}\propto\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})\right]\exp\left[-a_{l-1}\beta z_i\right]-\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(-a_l)\right]\exp\left[-a_l\beta z_i\right]$$

and

$$\Pr\{T_i\in[a_{l-1},a_l),\delta_i=0,z_i\}\propto\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_l)\right]\exp\left[-a_l\beta z_i\right].$$

For $l=k$, we have that

$$\Pr\{T_i\in[a_{k-1},\infty),\delta_i=0,z_i\}\propto\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_{k-1})\right]\exp\left[-a_{k-1}\beta z_i\right].$$

Also we note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})\right]\exp\left[-a_{l-1}\beta z_i\right]-\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_l)\right]\exp\left[-a_l\beta z_i\right]\\&=\left(\exp\left[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})\right]\exp\left[(a_l-a_{l-1})\beta z_i\right]-1\right)\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_l)\right]\exp\left[-a_l\beta z_i\right].\end{aligned}$$

Then under the AHM (1.1), the likelihood function $L(\beta)$ for the data $\{(T_i,\delta_i,z_i), i=1,\cdots,n\}$ based on the discrete model becomes as

$$\begin{aligned}L(\beta)=\prod_{l=1}^{k-1}\Bigg\{&\prod_{i\in D_l}\left(\exp\left[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})\right]\exp\left[(a_l-a_{l-1})\beta z_i\right]-1\right)\\&\times\prod_{i\in D_l\cup C_l}\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_l)\right]\exp\left[-a_l\beta z_i\right]\Bigg\}\prod_{i\in C_k}\exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_{k-1})\right]\exp\left[-a_{k-1}\beta z_i\right]\times C(I),\end{aligned}$$

where $C(I)$ denotes the portion of $L(\beta)$ contributed by censoring. We assume that $C(I)$ contains no information about β (i.e., non-informative censoring). Then by taking logarithm to $L(\beta)$ and differentiating the log-likelihood function $l(\beta)$ with respect to β, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial l(\beta)}{\partial\beta}=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\Bigg\{\sum_{i\in D_l}\frac{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]\exp[(a_l-a_{l-1})\beta z_i](a_l-a_{l-1})z_i}{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]\exp[(a_l-a_{l-1})\beta z_i]-1}-\sum_{i\in D_l\cup C_l}a_l z_i\Bigg\}\\-\sum_{i\in C_k}a_{k-1}z_i.\end{aligned}$$

By substituting 0 for β in $\partial l(\beta)/\partial\beta$, we have that

$$W_n^0=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\left\{\sum_{i\in D_l}\frac{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]}{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]-1}(a_l-a_{l-1})z_i-\sum_{i\in D_l\cup C_l}a_l z_i\right\}-\sum_{i\in C_k}a_{k-1}z_i.$$

One may use W_n^0 for testing $H_0:\beta=0$ against $H_1:\beta\neq 0$ if the baseline hazard function λ_0 were fully known. Then the resulting test would be optimal in the local sense since W_n^0 has been derived by the likelihood principle with the specification of λ_0. However since we have assumed that λ_0 is unknown, we consider to use a suitable estimate for λ_0 or Λ_0. For this matter, first of all, we note that since under $H_0:\beta=0$,

$$S(t)=\exp[-\Lambda_0(t)],$$

we have that under $H_0:\beta=0$,

$$\frac{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]}{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]-1}=\frac{\exp[-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]}{\exp[-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]-\exp[-\Lambda_0(a_l)]}=\frac{S(a_{l-1})}{S(a_{l-1})-S(a_l)}.$$

Also we note that from the assumption of the precedence of death observations over censored ones in the same sub-interval, the Kaplan-Meier estimate $\hat{S}(a_l)$ of $S(a_l)$ under $H_0:\beta=0$ is of the form

$$\hat{S}(a_l)=\prod_{j=1}^{l}\left(1-\frac{d_j}{r_j}\right),$$

for each l, $l=1,\cdots,k-1$. Then under $H_0:\beta=0$,

$$\frac{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]}{\exp[\Lambda_0(a_l)-\Lambda_0(a_{l-1})]-1}$$

can be consistently estimated by

$$\frac{\hat{S}(a_{l-1})}{\hat{S}(a_{l-1})-\hat{S}(a_l)}=\frac{r_l}{d_l}. \tag{2.1}$$

Also we note that for each l, $l=1,\ldots,k-1$

$$a_l=(a_l-a_{l-1})+(a_{l-1}-a_{l-2})+\cdots+(a_1-a_0)=\sum_{j=1}^{l}(a_j-a_{j-1}).$$

Therefore we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\sum_{i\in D_l\cup C_l}a_l z_i+\sum_{i\in C_k}a_{k-1}z_i &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1}a_l\sum_{i\in D_l\cup C_l}z_i+a_{k-1}\sum_{i\in C_k}z_i\\ &=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\sum_{j=1}^{l}(a_j-a_{j-1})\sum_{i\in D_l\cup C_l}z_i+\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}(a_j-a_{j-1})\sum_{i\in C_k}z_i\\ &=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}(a_l-a_{l-1})\sum_{i\in R_l}z_i. \end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

Then from (2.1) and (2.2), we may have the following estimated score W_n for W_n^0 as

$$W_n=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}(a_l-a_{l-1})\frac{r_l}{d_l}\left\{\sum_{i\in D_l}z_i-\frac{d_l}{r_l}\sum_{i\in R_l}z_i\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

We note that under $H_0:\beta=0$, W_n is a martingale with discrete compensators (cf. Flemming and Harrington, 1991). One may confirm this by re-expressing W_n in (2.3) as a stochastic integral with identifying $w=(a_l-a_{l-1})r_l/d_l$ in the equation (4) of Jones and Crowley (1990). Therefore we see that

$$E\left(W_n\right)=0.$$

under $H_0:\beta=0$.

Then for testing $H_0:\beta=0$ against $H_1:\beta\neq 0$, one may reject $H_0:\beta=0$ for large values of $|W_n|$. For any given significance level, in order to decide the critical value, we need the distribution of W_n under $H_0:\beta=0$. However the derivation of the exact distribution of W_n would be difficult because of the involvement of censoring distribution into the distribution of W_n even under $H_0:\beta=0$. Therefore it is natural to consider the null distribution of W_n in an asymptotic manner. In the following theorem, we state the asymptotic normality for W_n. One may find the proof in Jones and Crowley (1990) and Flemming and Harrington (1991), whose proofs use the martingale central limit theorem based on the counting process theory. Before stating the theorem, we provide a consistent estimate of the variance of W_n (cf. Jones and Crowley, 1990) under $H_0:\beta=0$ in the following:

$$\hat{\sigma_n^2}=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}(a_l-a_{l-1})^2\frac{r_l(r_l-d_l)}{(r_l-1)d_l^2}\sum_{i\in R_l}\left(z_i-\bar{z}_l\right)^2,$$

where $\bar{z}_l=(1/r_l)\sum_{i\in R_l}z_i$. Also we note that $\hat{\sigma_n^2}$ is known to be unbiased (cf. Jones and Crowley, 1990).

Theorem 1. Under all the assumptions used up to now and with the following condition that

$$\max\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\{z_1,\ldots,z_n\}\to 0, \tag{2.4}$$

we have that under $H_0 : \beta = 0$

$$\frac{W_n}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_n^2}}$$

converges in distribution to a standard normal random variable as $n \to \infty$.

We note that the condition (2.4) is called Lindeberg-type condition (cf. Andersen and Gill, 1982) and is equivalent to the Noether's condition (cf. Randles and Wolfe, 1979). When there is at most one uncensored observation in each sub-interval, we note that W_n becomes

$$W_n = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (a_l - a_{l-1}) r_l \left\{ z_l - \frac{1}{r_l} \sum_{i \in R_l} z_i \right\}.$$

Also we note that when the lengths of sub-intervals $[a_{l-1}, a_l)$ are all equal for all l, $l = 1, \ldots, k-1$, then the quantity $a_l - a_{l-1}$ becomes a constant and so can be removed from the expression in W_n such as

$$W_n = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{r_l}{d_l} \left\{ \sum_{i \in D_l} z_i - \frac{d_l}{r_l} \sum_{i \in R_l} z_i \right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Especially, when each covariate z_i takes values only 0 or 1 as the indices of the populations for the two-sample problem, W_n has been called a generalized (or weighted) log-rank statistic.

3. Vector covariate case

We now consider the extension to the $p \times 1$ covariate vector case, $p \geq 2$. Then for the ith individual, the $p \times 1$ covariate vector may be denoted as $z_i = (z_{i1}, \ldots, z_{ip})'$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Also $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p)'$ denotes the corresponding regression coefficient vector. Then for the model (1.1), using the relation (1.2) with the same arguments for the scalar case, the likelihood function can be expressed as

$$L(\beta) = \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \left\{ \prod_{i \in D_l} \left(\exp\left[\Lambda_0(a_l) - \Lambda_0(a_{l-1})\right] \exp\left[(a_l - a_{l-1})\beta' z_i\right] - 1 \right) \right.$$
$$\left. \times \prod_{i \in D_l \cup C_l} \exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_l)\right] \exp\left[-a_l \beta' z_i\right] \right\} \prod_{i \in C_k} \exp\left[-\Lambda_0(a_{k-1})\right] \exp\left[-a_{k-1}\beta' z_i\right] \times C(I),$$

where $C(I)$ is the portion of $L(\beta)$ contributed by censoring. Also we assume the non-informative censoring scheme. Then for each j, $j = 1, \ldots, p$, by differentiating partially the log-likelihood function, $l(\beta)$, with respect to β_j and manipulating $\partial l(\beta)/\partial \beta_j$ with the same arguments for the scalar case, one may obtain the following score statistic W_{jn}:

$$W_{jn} = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (a_l - a_{l-1}) \frac{r_l}{d_l} \left\{ \sum_{i \in D_l} z_{ij} - \frac{d_l}{r_l} \sum_{i \in R_l} z_{ij} \right\}.$$

Then we note that for each for j, $j = 1, \ldots, p$, W_{jn} is a martingale with discrete compensator under $H_0 : \beta = 0$. Therefore W_{jn} can be used as a test statistic for testing $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$. This fact in turn, suggests that we may consider a quadratic form based on $(W_{1n}, \ldots, W_{pn})'$ for a test statistic for testing $H_0 : \beta = 0$. To this end, we need a null consistent estimate, $\hat{V}_n = (\hat{\sigma}_{jj'n})_{j,j'=1,\ldots,p}$, of the covariance matrix of $(W_{1n}, \ldots, W_{pn})'$. In the sequel, let $\bar{z}_{lj} = (1/r_l) \sum_{i \in R_l} z_{ij}$, $l = 1, \ldots, k$ and $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Then from the previous section, it is obvious that for each j, $j = 1, \ldots, p$, a consistent and unbiased null variance estimate $\hat{\sigma}_{jn}^2 = \hat{\sigma}_{jjn}$ for W_{jn} is

$$\hat{\sigma}_{jn}^2 = \hat{\sigma}_{jjn} = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (a_l - a_{l-1})^2 \frac{r_l (r_l - d_l)}{(r_l - 1) d_l^2} \sum_{i \in R_l} \left(z_{ij} - \bar{z}_{lj} \right)^2.$$

Also a null covariance estimate $\hat{\sigma}_{jj'n}$ of the covariance between W_{jn} and $W_{j'n}$ for $j \neq j'$ can be obtained by the same arguments used for the null variance estimate by noticing that the covariance between observations with z_{ij} and $z_{i'j'}$ is 0 whenever $i \neq i'$. Thus $\hat{\sigma}_{jj'n}$ becomes of the form

$$\hat{\sigma}_{jj'n} = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (a_l - a_{l-1})^2 \frac{r_l(r_l - d_l)}{(r_l - 1)d_l^2} \sum_{i \in R_l} (z_{ij} - \bar{z}_{lj})(z_{ij'} - \bar{z}_{lj'}).$$

We note that $\hat{\sigma}_{jj'n}$ is also a consistent estimate. Then with the assumption that $\hat{V}_n$ is nonsingular, one may propose the following quadratic form for a test statistic for testing $H_0 : \beta = 0$

$$Q_n = \begin{pmatrix} W_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ W_{pn} \end{pmatrix}' \hat{V}_n^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} W_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ W_{pn} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\hat{V}_n^{-1}$ is the inverse of $\hat{V}_n$. Then one may reject $H_0 : \beta = 0$ in favor of $H_1 : \beta \neq 0$ for large values of Q_n. Also in order to have the critical value for any given significance level, we need the null distribution of Q_n. Since the null distribution of Q_n contains the unknown censoring distribution, also we consider to obtain the limiting distribution of Q_n as for the scalar covariate case. Then with all the notation introduced up to now, we state the following main result.

Theorem 2. With the assumption that $\hat{V}_n$ is nonsingular and the condition that

$$\max \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \{z_{1j}, \ldots, z_{nj}\} \to 0, \text{ for each } \; j, j = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{3.1}$$

under $H_0 : \beta = 0$, distribution of Q_n converges to a central chi-square distribution with p degrees of freedom.

Proof. From Theorem 1 with condition (3.1), we see under $H_0 : \beta = 0$ that for each j $j = 1, \cdots, p$

$$W_{jn} / \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{jn}^2}$$

converges in distribution to a standard normal random variable as $n \to \infty$. Also from the Cramèr-Wold device (cf. Billingsley, 1986) and the Slutsky's theorem with the assumption that $\hat{V}_n$ is a nonsingular consistent estimate, we note that under $H_0 : \beta = 0$

$$(W_{1n}, \cdots, W_{pn}) \hat{V}_n^{-1/2}$$

converges in distribution to a p-variare normal random vector with 0 mean vector and covariance matrix I_p, where I_p is the $p \times p$ identity matrix. Thus the result follows easily.

When $\hat{V}_n$ is singular, i.e., $|\hat{V}_n| = 0$, Wei and Lachin (1984) recommended to add some number b_n such that $b_n = o(n^{-1})$ to each $\hat{\sigma}_{jn}^2$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$, where $b_n = o(n^{-1})$ means that $nb_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

4. An example and simulation results

In order to illustrate our test procedure, we consider the data reported by Embury et al. (1977) for the length of remission (in weeks) for the two groups (maintenance chemotherapy and control) with acute myelogenous leukemia patients. Since the length of remission for each patient was measured by week, the data set contains several tied observations. Therefore a sub-interval may be designated by each week. Then we note that the lengths of sub-intervals are all the same with unity. Thus we may use the statistic (2.5) rather than (2.3) for this problem with the corresponding variance estimate. The objective of the experiment was to see if the maintenance chemotherapy prolongs the length of remission. The data has been summarized as follows:

Control group: 5, 5, 8, 8, 12, 16+, 23, 27, 30, 33, 43, 45

Maintenance group: 9, 13, 13+, 18, 23, 28+, 31, 34, 45+, 48, 161+,
where + indicates censored observation. We note that this is a two-sample problem. Therefore by allocating 0 or 1 to covariate z_i for the ith individual according as from the control or maintenance chemotherapy group in (2.5), we obtain the following necessary quantities.

$$W_n = 27.5 \text{ and } \hat{\sigma}_n^2 = 253.5183.$$

Thus we have that

$$\frac{W_n}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_n^2}} = 1.73$$

The corresponding p-value is 0.042, which shows the strong evidence against $H_0 : \beta = 0$ in favor of $H_1 : \beta \neq 0$. In passing, we note that the procedure proposed by Prentice and Gloeckler (1978) gives 0.065 as its p-value.

The following tables are the simulation results under the two-sample problem setting. In this study, we considered two cases of models such that for any two random variables X and Y, we have that for some real number β,

$$Y = \beta + X \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$Y = (1 + \beta)X. \tag{4.2}$$

Tables 1-4 summarizes the results under the model (4.1) and Tables 5-8, those under the model (4.2). We note that β in (4.1) is the location translation parameter while β in (4.2) plays the role of a kind of scale parameter. We compare our proposed test (AHM) with that of Prentice and Gloeckler (1978) (PHM) through obtaining empirical powers by varying the values of β. For the underlying distributions, we considered the Weibull and gamma distributions. For the Weibull distribution, we considered three different values of the shape parameter α, $\alpha = 1, 2$ and $4/5$ with the scale parameter $\theta = 1$. For the gamma distribution, we only considered the case that $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\theta = 2$. For the Weibull distribution, we note that $\alpha = 1$ implies the exponential distribution. For the censored distribution, we considered the exponential distribution with mean 2 in order to avoid excessive censoring. The sample size is 20 for each sample and we varied the value of β from 0 to 0.5 by increment with 0.1 for the first sample while fixed as 0 for the second. Therefore we note that when $\beta = 0$ in the tables for the first sample, the two distributions F and G coincides. In other words, the null hypothesis holds when $\beta = 0$. Also we chose a partition of $[0, \infty)$ for grouping as $[0, 0.2), \cdots, [1.8, 2.0), [2.0, \infty)$, i.e., 11 sub-intervals. For each case, we obtained empirical power based on 1000 simulations. The simulations have been carried out by SAS/IML on PC version and the nominal significance level is 0.05.

First of all, we should note here that we cannot compare the empirical powers among distributions since the random numbers for each case have not been generated under a unified standard because the mean and variance of the Weibull distribution cannot be obtained explicitly. In general, we see that AHM achieves high performance under the location translation model (4.1) whereas PHM shows better performance for (4.2) as we might expect. Therefore our test may be a reliable alternative when the proportional hazards assumption fails, especially when the location shift holds. The reason for this will be more examined in the next section.

5. Some concluding remarks

In this section, we discuss some interesting aspects for the test under the model (1.1). For this, we consider the case of equal length of sub-intervals. Then under the two-sample problem setting, we note that W_n in (2.5) can be re-written as

$$W_n = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} r_{2l} d_{1l} - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} r_{1l} d_{2l}, \tag{5.1}$$

where r_{jl} and d_{jl} denote the size of risk set and the number of deaths in the lth sub-interval of the jth sample, respectively, $j = 1, 2$. We note that W_n in (5.1) is just the Gehan statistic for the grouped data. Therefore one may consider that (2.5) is a modification of the Gehan statistic for the grouped case. Since the Gehan test is an extension of the Wilcoxon test for the censored data, the Gehan test must be locally most powerful against the location translation alternatives (cf. Gill, 1980). Therefore it is no wonder that AHM has more empirical power than PHM under the model (4.1) and PHM does more power under (4.2) in the previous section.

In section 2, we assumed that all the observations in the last sub-interval $[a_{k-1}, \infty)$ are censored at a_{k-1}, which is the beginning point of the last sub-interval. The reason for this is as follows. First of all, we note that the length of the last sub-interval is infinity. If there is any uncensored observation in the last sub-interval, then the length of the last sub-interval should be included in W_n, which is an absurd expression. Also if we maintain the assumption that the censoring occurs at the end of each sub-interval, then the derivation of (2.2) becomes impossible for the censored observations in the last sub-interval. However in the real experiment, since always a researcher observes the objects during a finite time period, such assumption becomes insignificant and cannot be applied for the real world.

For the null distribution, we derived the asymptotic normality using the large sample approximation. Also one may consider a re-sampling approach such as the permutation principle (cf. Good, 2000) to obtain a null distribution. Park (1993) and Neuhaus (1993) considered to apply the permutation principle for obtaining the null distribution of the test statistics for the right censored and grouped data. However if one applies the permutation principle for the censored data, then one must include the equality of unknown censoring distributions, which are of nuisance, in the null hypothesis. The resulting permutation test is known as exact but conditional. Also as another re-sampling method, one may use the bootstrap method (cf. Efron and Tibshirani, 1993). For the censored data, you may refer to Efron (1981) and Reid (1981). Unlike the permutation principle, the bootstrap method does not require the equality among censoring distributions for the null hypothesis. However because of the computational amount of work, the application of the re-sampling methods always take the Monte-Carlo approach.

We note that when there is at most one uncensored observation in each sub-interval, then this corresponds to the no tied-value case and the assumption for the allowance of discontinuity of hazard function disappears. Also in this research, only we considered the case that the covariate is independent of time. For the time-dependent case, the likelihood function would not be tractable because of the involvement of time into the cumulative covariate function such as $Z(t) = \int_0^t z(x)d(x)$, which in turn requires some specific functional form of $z(t)$. However in the light of applicability, this research should be done in the near future.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to express his sincere appreciation to the anonymous referee for reading carefully the first version of this paper. This work was supported by by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MEST)(no.2007-0052725).

References

Aalen, O. O. (1980). *A model for non-parametric regression analysis of counting processes.* Springer Lecture Notes Statistics 2, 1-25. Mathematical Statistics and Probability Theory, W. Klonecki, A. Kozek and J. Rosinski, editors.

Aalen, O. O. (1989). A linear regression model for the analysis of life times. *Statistics in Medicine* 8, 907-925.

Andersen, P. K. and Gill, R. D. (1982). Cox's regression model for counting processes: A large sample study. *Annals of Statistics* 10, 1100-1120.

Billingsley, P. (1986). *Probability and Measure*, Second Edition. Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York.

Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society* B 34, 189-220.

Efron, B. (1981). Censored data and the bootstrap. Journal of American Statistical Association 76, 312-319.

Efron, B. and Tibshirani, R. J. (1993). *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman and Hall, New York.

Embury, S. H., Elias, L., Heller, P. H., Hood, C. E., Greenberg, P. L. and Schrier, S. L. (1977). Remission maintenance therapy in acute myelogenous leukemia. *Western Journal of Medicine* 126, 267-272.

Flemming, T. R. and Harrington, D. P. (1991). *Counting Processes and Survival Analysis*. Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York.

Gill, R. D. (1980). *Censoring and Stochastic Integrals*. Mathematical Centre Tracts, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.

Good, P. (2000). *Permutation Tests-A Practical Guide to Resampling Methods for Testing Hypothesis*. second Edition. Springer, New York.

Heitjan, D. F. (1989). Grouped continuous data. *Statistical Sciences* 4, 164-183.

Huffer, F. W. and McKeague, I. W. (1991). Weighted test squares estimation for Aalen's additive risk model. *Journal of American Statistical Association* 86, 114-129.

Jones, M. P. and Crowley, J. (1990). Asymptotic properties of a generalized class of nonparametric tests for survival analysis. *Annals of Statistics* 18, 1203-1220.

Kalbfleisch, J. D. and Prentice, R. L. (1980). *The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data*. Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York.

Lin and Ying (1994). Semiparametric analysis of the additive risk model. *Biometrika* 81, 61-71.

McKeague, I. W. (1988). A counting process approach to the regression analysis of grouped survival data. *Stochastic Process with Applications* 28, 221-239.

McKeague, I. W. and Sasieni, P. D. (1994). A partly parametric additive risk model. *Biometrika* 81, 501-514.

Neuhaus, G. (1993). Conditional rank tests for the two-sample problem under random censorship. *Annals of Statistics* 21, 1760-1779.

Park, H. I. (1993). Nonparametric rank-order tests for the right censored and grouped data in linear model. *Communications in statistics-Theory and Methods* 22, 3143-3158.

Prentice, R. L. and Gloeckler, L. A. (1978). "Regression analysis of grouped data with applications to breast cancer data", *Biometrics* 34, 57-67.

Randles, R. H. and Wolfe, D. A. (1979). *Introduction to the Theory of Nonparametric Statistics*. Wiley, New York.

Reid, N. (1981). Estimating median survival time. *Biometrika* 68, 601-608.

Scheike, T. H. (2002). The additive nonparametric and semiparametric Aalen model as the rate function for a counting process. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 8, 247-262.

Wei, L. J. and Lachin, J. M. (1984). Two-sample asymptotically distribution-free tests for incomplete multivariate observations. *Journal of American Statistical Association* 79, 653-661.

Yin, G. and Cai, J. (2004). Additive hazards model with multivariate failure time data. *Biometrika* 91, 801-818.

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.045	0.046
0.1	0.071	0.071
0.2	0.189	0.116
0.3	0.279	0.198
0.4	0.533	0.319
0.5	0.607	0.543

TABLE 1. exponential

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.040	0.062
0.1	0.083	0.106
0.2	0.208	0.209
0.3	0.403	0.373
0.4	0.608	0.565
0.5	0.802	0.727

TABLE 2. Weibull(α=2)

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.059	0.056
0.1	0.074	0.085
0.2	0.183	0.145
0.3	0.243	0.201
0.4	0.498	0.306
0.5	0.546	0.392

TABLE 3. Weibull(α=4/5)

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.052	0.074
0.1	0.087	0.085
0.2	0.170	0.150
0.3	0.332	0.249
0.4	0.487	0.389
0.5	0.663	0.521

TABLE 4. gamma(λ=2 and α=1/2)

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.045	0.046
0.1	0.051	0.060
0.2	0.069	0.073
0.3	0.080	0.101
0.4	0.106	0.131
0.5	0.140	0.163

TABLE 5. exponential

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.040	0.062
0.1	0.057	0.093
0.2	0.098	0.154
0.3	0.149	0.261
0.4	0.218	0.391
0.5	0.287	0.490

TABLE 6. Weibull(α=2)

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.059	0.056
0.1	0.063	0.064
0.2	0.066	0.073
0.3	0.087	0.092
0.4	0.106	0.117
0.5	0.122	0.144

TABLE 7. Weibull(α=4/5)

β	AHM	PHM
0.0	0.052	0.074
0.1	0.061	0.080
0.2	0.085	0.103
0.3	0.131	0.170
0.4	0.182	0.245
0.5	0.233	0.324

TABLE 8. gamma(λ=2 and α=1/2)