

Some Features of Joint Confidence Regions for the Parameters of the Inverse Weibull Distribution

Azhari A. Elhag¹, Omar I. O. Ibrahim² and, Mohamed A. El-Sayed^{3,4}

¹Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Taif University, Taif, Saudi Arabia

²Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Taif University, Ranyah, Saudi Arabia

³Department of CS, Computers and IT College, Taif University, Taif, Saudi Arabia

⁴Mathematics Department, Faculty of Science, South Valley University, Egypt

azhri_elhag@hotmail.com, drmasayed@yahoo.com

Abstract

In this paper, we will study the joint confidence regions for the parameters of inverse Weibull distribution in the point of view of record values. One of the applications of the joint confidence regions of the parameters is to find confidence bounds for the functions of the parameters. Joint confidence regions for the parameters of extreme value distribution are also discussed. In this way we will discuss some numerical examples with real data set and simulated data, to illustrate the proposed method. A simulation study is performed to compare the proposed joint confidence regions.

Keywords: The joint confidence regions, confidence bounds; inverse Weibull distribution, extreme value distribution.

1. Introduction

Recently, there are many scenarios in life-testing and reliability experiments whose units are lost or removed from experimentation before failure. The loss may occur intentionally, or it may have been designed so in the study. The removal of units prior to failure is preplanned in order to provide saving in terms of time and cost associated with testing. There are different types of censored test. Type I and Type II have been investigated extensively in many papers (see, e.g., [1-4]). A generalization of Type II censoring is progressive Type II censoring. The statistical inference on the parameters of lifetime distribution under progressive censoring has been studied by [5-7]. In [8] Johnson described a life test in which the experimenter might decide to group the test units into several sets, each as an assembly of test units, and then run all the test units simultaneously until occurrence the first failure in each group. Such a censoring scheme is called first-failure censoring. Jun et al. [9] discussed a sampling plan for a bearing manufacturer. The bearing test engineer decided to save test time by testing 50 bearings in sets of 10 each. The first-failure times from each group were observed. Wu et al. [10] and Wu and Yu [11] obtained maximum likelihood estimates (MLEs), exact confidence intervals and exact confidence regions for the parameters of the Gompertz and Burr type XII distributions based on first-failure-censored sampling, respectively. Also see Lee et al. [12]. Note that a first-failure-censoring scheme is terminated when the first failure in each set is observed. If an experimenter desires to remove some sets of test units before observing the first failures in these sets this life test plan is called a progressive first-failure-censoring scheme which recently introduced by Wu and Kuş. [13]. In this scheme, first-failure censoring scheme is combined with progressive censoring scheme.

Suppose that n independent groups with k items within each group are put in a life test. R_1 groups and the group in which the first failure is observed are randomly removed from the test as soon as the first failure $X_{1;m,n,k}^R$ has occurred, R_2 groups and the group in which the second failure is observed are randomly removed from the test when the second failure $X_{2;m,n,k}^R$ has occurred, and finally R_m groups and the group in which the m -th failure is observed are randomly removed from the test as soon as the m -th failure $X_{m;m,n,k}^R$ has occurred. Then $X_{1;m,n,k}^R < X_{2;m,n,k}^R < \dots < X_{m;m,n,k}^R$ are called progressively first-failure censored order statistics with the progressive censored scheme $\mathbf{R} = \{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_m\}$. It is clear that m is number of the first failures ($1 < m \leq n$) and $n = m + \sum_{i=1}^m R_i$. If the failure times of the $(n \times k)$ items originally in the test are from a continuous population with distribution function $F(x)$ and probability density

function $f(x)$, the joint probability density function for $X_{1;m,n,k}^R, X_{2;m,n,k}^R, \dots, X_{m;m,n,k}^R$ is given by

$$f_{1,2,\dots,m}(x_{1;m,n,k}^R, x_{2;m,n,k}^R, \dots, x_{m;m,n,k}^R) = Ak^m \prod_{i=1}^m f(x_{i;m,n,k}^R) \times [1 - F(x_{i;m,n,k}^R)]^{k(R_i+1)-1}, \quad (1)$$

$$0 < x_{1;m,n,k}^R < x_{2;m,n,k}^R < \dots < x_{m;m,n,k}^R < \infty,$$

where

$$A = n(n - R_1 - 1)(n - R_1 - R_2 - 2) \dots (n - R_1 - R_2 - \dots - R_{m-1} - m + 1). \quad (2)$$

Special cases

It is clear from (1) that the progressive first-failure censored scheme containing the following censoring schemes as special cases: (i) The first-failure censored scheme when $R = \{0, 0, \dots, 0\}$. (ii) The progressive Type II censored order statistics if $k = 1$. (iii) Usually Type II censored order statistics when $k = 1$ and $R = \{0, 0, \dots, n - m\}$. (iv) The complete sample case when $k = 1$ and $R = \{0, 0, \dots, 0\}$.

Also, It should be noted that $X_{1;m,n,k}^R, X_{2;m,n,k}^R, \dots, X_{m;m,n,k}^R$ can be viewed as a progressive Type II censored sample from a population with distribution function $1 - (1 - F(x))^k$. For this reason, results for progressive type II censored order statistics can be extend to progressive first-failure censored order statistics easily. Also, the progressive first-failure-censored plan has advantages in terms of reducing the test time, in which more items are used, but only m of $n \times k$ items are failures.

In many practical situations, it is often known a priori that the hazard rate can not be monotone. It may happen that the course of a disease is such that the mortality reaches a peak after some finite period, and then declines slowly. For example, in a study of curability of breast cancer, Langlands et al. [14] found that the peak mortality occurred after about three years. It is important to analyze such data sets with appropriate models. If the empirical studies indicate that the hazard function might be unimodal, then the IWD may be an appropriate model.

The probability density function (*pdf*) and the cumulative distribution (*cdf*) of the IWD as follows:

$$f(x) = \alpha \beta x^{-\beta-1} \exp(-\alpha x^{-\beta}), \quad x > 0, \alpha, \beta > 0, \quad (3)$$

and

$$F(x) = \exp(-\alpha x^{-\beta}). \quad (4)$$

As in the Weibull distribution, the shape parameter β governs the shape of the *pdf*, the hazard function and the general properties of the IWD. *pdf* and HF can be unimodal or decreasing depending on the choice of the shape parameter. In this respect the behavior of IWD and the log-normal distribution is quite similar.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) is presented in section 2. In section 3, we provide The ML point and interval estimates of the parameters as well as approximate joint confidence region for the parameters of IWD. To study the performance of our approach, we simulated 1000 progressively first-failure censored samples from a IWD with the values of specific parameters as simulation study is presented in section 5. Illustrative examples and simulation results with data analysis are presented in section 5. and finally we conclude the paper in section 6.

2. Maximum Likelihood Estimation

To determine the point estimation, Let $\underline{X} = (X_{1;m,n,k}^R, X_{2;m,n,k}^R, \dots, X_{m;m,n,k}^R)$ be the progressive first-failure censored order statistics from inverse Weibull distribution with censored scheme R . From (1), (2) and (3), the likelihood function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\alpha, \beta | \underline{X}) = & m \log \alpha + m \log \beta - (\beta + 1) \sum_{i=1}^m \log x_i - \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \log(1 - \exp(-\alpha x_i^{-\beta})) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Calculating the first partial derivatives of (5) with respect to α and β and equating to zero, we obtain the likelihood equations

$$\frac{\partial \ell(\alpha, \beta | \underline{X})}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{m}{\alpha} - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} + \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \frac{x_i^{-\beta} \exp(-\alpha x_i^{-\beta})}{1 - \exp(-\alpha x_i^{-\beta})} = 0, \quad (6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell(\alpha, \beta | \underline{X})}{\partial \beta} = & \frac{m}{\beta} - \sum_{i=1}^m \log x_i + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} \log x_i \\ & - \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \frac{x_i^{-\beta} \log x_i \exp(-\alpha x_i^{-\beta})}{1 - \exp(-\alpha x_i^{-\beta})} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Hence

$$\frac{m}{\alpha} - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} + \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \frac{x_i^{-\beta}}{\exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) - 1} = 0, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\frac{m}{\beta} - \sum_{i=1}^m \log x_i + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} \log x_i - \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \frac{x_i^{-\beta} \log x_i}{\exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) - 1} = 0. \quad (9)$$

The maximum likelihood (ML) estimates $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ of the parameters can be obtained by solving the two nonlinear Eqs. (8) and (9), some numerical methods such as Newton's method can be employed.

3. Approximate interval estimation

The asymptotic variances and covariances of the MLE for parameters $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are given by elements of the inverse of the Fisher information matrix

$$\mathbf{I}_{ij} = E \left[- \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha} \right]; \quad i, j = 1, 2. \quad (10)$$

Unfortunately, the exact mathematical expressions for the above expectations are very difficult to obtain. Therefore, we give the approximate (observed) asymptotic variance-covariance matrix for the MLE, which is obtained by dropping the expectation operator E

$$I_0^{-1}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = \begin{bmatrix} - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha^2} & - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta} \\ - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha} & - \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta^2} \end{bmatrix}_{(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{var}(\hat{\alpha}) & \text{Cov}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\alpha}) & \text{var}(\hat{\beta}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)$$

with

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta^2} = -\frac{m}{\beta^2} + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} (\log x_i)^2 - \alpha \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \frac{x_i^{-\beta} (\log x_i)^2 [\alpha x_i^{-\beta} \exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) - \exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) + 1]}{(\exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) - 1)^2}, \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha^2} = -\frac{m}{\alpha^2} - \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) \left(\frac{x_i^{-\beta}}{\exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) - 1} \right)^2 \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \alpha} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \alpha \partial \beta} = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{-\beta} \log x_i + \sum_{i=1}^m (k(R_i + 1) - 1) \frac{x_i^{-\beta} \log x_i [\exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) (\alpha x_i^{-\beta} - 1) + 1]}{(\exp(\alpha x_i^{-\beta}) - 1)^2}. \quad (14)$$

Approximate confidence intervals for β and α can be found by taking $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\alpha})$ to be bivariately normally distributed with mean (β, α) and covariance matrix $I_0^{-1}(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\alpha})$ i.e. $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\alpha}) \sim N((\beta, \alpha), I_0^{-1}(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\alpha}))$.

Thus, the $(1-\gamma)100\%$ confidence intervals for parameters $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ become

$$\hat{\alpha} \pm Z_{\gamma/2} \sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\alpha})} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta} \pm Z_{\gamma/2} \sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\beta})} \quad (15)$$

where $Z_{\gamma/2}$ is the percentile of the standard normal distribution with right-tail probability.

The approximate confidence region for (α, β) the normal approximation for $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$ implies that

$$[\hat{\alpha} - \alpha \hat{\beta} - \beta] I_0^{-1}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) [\hat{\alpha} - \alpha \hat{\beta} - \beta]^t \quad (16)$$

is asymptotically of chi-squared form with two degrees of freedom. Let

$$Q = \{(\alpha, \beta) : [\hat{\alpha} - \alpha \hat{\beta} - \beta] I_0^{-1}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) [\hat{\alpha} - \alpha \hat{\beta} - \beta]^t \leq \chi_{2(\gamma)}^2\}, \quad (17)$$

where $\chi_{2(\gamma)}^2$ is the percentile of the chi-squared distribution with right-tail probability and two degrees of freedom. This can be used to obtain the $100(1-\gamma)\%$ approximate confidence region for (α, β) .

4. Simulation Study

To study the performance of our approach, we simulated 1000 progressively first-failure censored samples from a IWD with the values of parameters $(\alpha, \beta) = (1.5, 0.5)$ and different combinations of n, m, k and censoring schemes \mathbf{R} . The samples were simulated by using the algorithm described in Balakrishnan and Sandhu [7]. First, we study the properties of the MLEs for different choices of n, m, k , and progressive censoring schemes \mathbf{R} . Table 1 provide the Average values and mean squared errors (MSEs) of the ML estimates.

In our study we have used three different censoring schemes (C.S), namely:

Scheme I: for $R_1 = n - m$, $R_i = 0$ for $i \neq m$.

Scheme II: for $R_m = n - m$, $R_i = 0$ for $i \neq 1$.

Scheme III: for $R_{(m+1)/2} = n - m$, $R_i = 0$ for $i \neq (m+1)/2$; if m odd, and $R_{m/2} = n - m$, $R_i = 0$ for $i \neq m/2$; if m even.

It is important to examine how well our proposed method works for constructing confidence intervals and regions. We will compare the approximate confidence intervals or regions on the basis of asymptotic properties

of the MLEs confidence interval discussed in Section 3 in terms of coverage probabilities. The coverage probability average length is the probability that the interval or region contains the true parameters. The simulation results of the coverage probabilities and average length are summarized in Table 2.

Table 1. Average values and MSEs of the estimates of α and β with ($\alpha = 1.5, \beta = 0.5$).

k	n	m	$C.S$	$\hat{\alpha}_{ML}$	$\hat{\beta}_{ML}$
1	20	10	I	1.5493(0.4925)	0.5781(0.1711)
			II	1.6061(0.5073)	0.5827(0.1811)
			III	1.6145(0.4995)	0.5803(0.1804)
		15	I	1.5746(0.4448)	0.5626(0.1248)
			II	1.6331(0.4772)	0.5591(0.1303)
			III	1.5746(0.4594)	0.5569(0.1250)
	50	20	I	1.6542(0.2553)	0.5311(0.0963)
			II	1.5258(0.2586)	0.5390(0.1178)
			III	1.4761(0.2526)	0.5433(0.1049)
		30	I	1.5189(0.2288)	0.5115(0.0683)
			II	1.5401(0.2322)	0.5400(0.0915)
			III	1.5564(0.2669)	0.5264(0.0728)
3	20	10	I	1.4418(0.2868)	0.5585(0.1472)
			II	1.4552(0.3189)	0.5744(0.1803)
			III	1.4350(0.2960)	0.5776(0.1630)
		15	I	1.4850(0.2436)	0.5486(0.1204)
			II	1.4918(0.2564)	0.5559(0.1379)
			III	1.5019(0.2536)	0.5420(0.1429)
	50	20	I	1.5113(0.2471)	0.5273(0.0881)
			II	1.4388(0.2571)	0.5459(0.1103)
			III	1.4841(0.2325)	0.5370(0.0954)
		30	I	1.5074(0.1826)	0.5094(0.0723)
			II	1.4867(0.1658)	0.5223(0.0780)
			III	1.5014(0.2016)	0.5352(0.0840)
5	20	10	I	1.4689(0.2959)	0.5511(0.1267)
			II	1.4065(0.3474)	0.5850(0.1830)
			III	1.4371(0.3224)	0.5731(0.1607)
		15	I	1.4781(0.2513)	0.5383(0.1175)
			II	1.4461(0.2763)	0.5552(0.1260)
			III	1.4510(0.2736)	0.5566(0.1196)
	50	20	I	1.4274(0.2113)	0.5388(0.0939)
			II	1.4698(0.2173)	0.5313(0.0987)
			III	1.5042(0.2355)	0.5150(0.0919)
		30	I	1.5014(0.1666)	0.5293(0.0738)
			II	1.4651(0.1811)	0.5212(0.0748)
			III	1.4385(0.1855)	0.5333(0.0825)

Table 2: Coverage probability and average length for the approximate MLE ($\alpha = 1.5, \beta = 0.5$).

k	n	m	$C.S$	$\hat{\alpha}_{ML}$	$\hat{\beta}_{ML}$	$(\hat{\alpha}_{ML}, \hat{\beta}_{ML})$
1	20	10	I	0.95(1.7221)	0.92(0.5307)	0.91
			II	0.97(1.4927)	0.95(0.5486)	0.89
			III	0.92(1.5556)	0.92(0.5645)	0.90
		15	I	0.94(1.5416)	0.96(0.4400)	0.92
			II	0.94(1.4754)	0.97(0.4307)	0.90
			III	0.92(1.4250)	0.99(0.4406)	0.91
	50	20	I	0.95(1.2542)	0.93(0.3345)	0.93
			II	0.91(1.3258)	0.92(0.3587)	0.92
			III	0.92(1.2761)	0.94(0.3645)	0.92
		30	I	0.95(0.9189)	0.97(0.2739)	0.93
			II	0.95(1.0401)	0.90(0.2925)	0.91
			III	0.95(1.0004)	0.97(0.2907)	0.92
3	20	10	I	0.91(1.2418)	0.97(0.4650)	0.90
			II	0.93(1.2552)	0.96(0.5420)	0.89
			III	0.91(1.2350)	0.96(0.5129)	0.90
		15	I	0.92(0.9850)	0.96(0.3946)	0.91
			II	0.93(1.0008)	0.98(0.4161)	0.91
			III	0.90(1.0002)	0.89(0.4035)	0.91
	50	20	I	0.93(0.8113)	0.94(0.3027)	0.94
			II	0.95(0.8880)	0.95(0.3692)	0.92
			III	0.90(0.8541)	0.93(0.3350)	0.93
		30	I	0.94(0.7074)	0.93(0.2521)	0.96
			II	0.96(0.7670)	0.95(0.2803)	0.92
			III	0.91(0.7014)	0.94(0.2795)	0.93
5	20	10	I	0.94(1.0689)	0.96(0.4443)	0.90
			II	0.88(1.2206)	0.96(0.5587)	0.88
			III	0.91(1.1371)	0.96(0.4990)	0.90
		15	I	0.91(0.7781)	0.95(0.3783)	0.92
			II	0.95(0.8461)	0.95(0.4160)	0.90
			III	0.93(0.8310)	0.97(0.4067)	0.90
	50	20	I	0.94(0.7074)	0.94(0.3030)	0.93
			II	0.93(0.7269)	0.97(0.3626)	0.91
			III	0.94(0.7042)	0.95(0.3138)	0.92
		30	I	0.95(0.5014)	0.95(0.2571)	0.94
			II	0.94(0.5565)	0.93(0.2806)	0.92
			III	0.93(0.5339)	0.95(0.2724)	0.92

5. Illustrative Example

For illustrative purpose, we consider a progressive first-failure censored sample were generated from IWD with parameters: $\alpha = 2, \beta = 1$, using the algorithm proposed by Balakrishnan and Sandhu [7]. The data consisting of 150 observations as a lifetime data, were randomly grouped into $n = 30$ sets, with 5 observations in each. The progressive first-failure censored sample with the corresponding censoring scheme are given in Table 3. Under the data given in Table 3 we compute MLEs estimates of α and β results are given in Table 4. Table 5

gives the 95%, approximate MLE confidence intervals .

Table 3. Results obtained by MLE

Parameter	True value	$(\cdot)_{ML}$
ζ	2.0	2.09252
ϵ	1.0	0.957363

Table 4. Two-sided 95% confidence intervals of α and β

Method of Estimate	95% C.I of α	Length	95% C.I of β	Length
MLE	(1.50641,2.67864)	1.18223	(0.53840,1.37633)	0.83793

6. Conclusion

Censoring is a common phenomenon in life-testing and reliability studies. The subject of progressive censoring has received considerable attention in the past few years, due in part to the availability of high speed computing resources, which makes it both a feasible topic for simulation studies for researchers and a feasible method of gathering lifetime data for practitioners.

In this article, we have considered the maximum likelihood for the parameters of the IWD using progressive first-failure censored scheme. Also, we develop an approximate confidence intervals and an approximate joint confidence region for the parameters of the IWD. A simulation study was conducted to examine and compare the performance of the proposed methods. From Tables 1, as the effective sample proportion m/n increases, the MSEs of the estimators, reduce significantly. For fixed n, m and k , we can determine the censoring scheme which is most efficient; for example, from tables, we observe that the censoring scheme II, corresponding to the case of withdrawal in the first stage of the test, seems to provide the smallest MSE for the estimate of the parameters.

References

- Mann, N. R. (1971), Best linear invariant estimation for Weibull parameters under progressive censoring, *Technometrics*, vol. 13, pp. 521-533.
- Lawless, J. F. (1982), *Statistical Models and Methods for Lifetime Data*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA.
- Meeker, W. Q. and Escobar, L. A. (1998), *Statistical Methods for Reliability Data*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA.
- Tse, S. K. and Yuen, H. K., (1998) Expected experiment times for the Wiebull distribution under progressive censoring with random removals, , *journal of Applied Statistics*, vol. 25, pp. 75-83.
- Cohen, A. C. (1963) Progressively censored samples in life testing, *Technometrics*, vol. 5, pp. 327-339.
- Viveros, R. and Balakrishnan, N. (1994), Interval estimation of parameters of life from progressively censored data, *Technometrics*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 84-91.
- Balakrishnan, N. and Sandhu, R. A.,(1996) Best linear unbiased and maximum likelihood estimation for exponential distributions under general progressive type-II censored samples, *Sankhya. Series B*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Johnson, N. L., Kotz, S., Balakrishnan, N., (1995). *Continuous Univariate Distributions*. Vol. 2. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jun, C.-H., Balamurali, S and Lee, S.-H., (2006). Variables sampling plans for Weibull distributed lifetimes under sudden death testing. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 55, 53-58.
- Wu, J. W., Yu, H. Y., (2005). Statistical inference about the shape parameter of the Burr type XII distribution under the failure-censored sampling plan. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 163, 443-482.
- Lee, W.-C., Wu, J.-W., Yu, H.-Y., (2007). Statistical inference about the shape parameter of the bathtub-shaped distribution under the failure-censored sampling plan. *International Journal of Information and Management Sciences* 18, 157-172.
- Wu, S. J., Kuş, C., (2009). On estimation based on progressive first-failure-censored sampling. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 53 3659 3670.
- Langlands, A.O., Pocock, S.J., Kerr, G.R. and Gore, S.M. (1979), Long term survival of patients with breast cancer: a study of curability of the disease", *British Medical Journal*, 247-125.
- Bennette,S. (1983), Log-logistic regression models for survival data", *Aplied Statistics*, vol. 32, 165-171.
- Prentice, R.L. (1973), Exponential survivals with censoring and explanatory variables", *Biometrika*, vol. 60, 279-288.