

# *Analysis of multivariate competing risks data*

*Klaus Holst & Thomas Scheike*

*November 20, 2018*

---

## *Overview*

- marginal modelling with standard errors cif,
- cause specific hazards
- cumulative incidence modelling
  - random effects simple cif
  - Luise model

When looking at multivariate survival data with the aim of learning about the dependence that is present, possibly after correcting for some covariates different approaches are available in the `mets` package

- Binary models and adjust for censoring with inverse probability of censoring weighting
- Bivariate survival models of Clayton-Oakes type
  - With regression structure on dependence parameter
  - With additive gamma distributed random effects
  - Special functionality for polygenic random effects modelling such as ACE, ADE, AE and so forth.
- Plackett OR model model
  - With regression structure on OR dependence parameter
- Cluster stratified Cox

Typically it can be hard or impossible to specify random effects models with special structure among the parameters of the random effects. This is possible for our specification of the random effects models.

To be concrete about the model structure assume that we have paired binomial data  $T_1, \delta_1, T_2, \delta_2, X_1, X_2$  where the censored survival responses are  $T_1, \delta_1, T_2, \delta_2$  and we have covariates  $X_1, X_2$ .

The focus of this vignette is describe how to work on bivariate survival data using the additive gamma-random effects models. We present two different ways of specifying different dependence structures.

The basic models assumes that each subject has a marginal on Cox-form

$$\lambda_0(t) \exp(X_{ki}^T \beta)$$

then two types of models can be considered.

- Univariate models with a single random effect for each cluster and with a regression design on the variance.
- Multivariate models with multiple random effects for each cluster.

The univariate models are then given a given cluster random effects  $Z_k$  with parameter  $\theta$  the joint survival function is given by the Clayton copula and on the form

$$\psi(\theta, \psi^{-1}(\theta, S_1(t, X_{k1})) + \psi^{-1}(\theta, S_1(t, X_{k1})))$$

where  $\psi$  is the Laplace transform of a gamma distributed random variable with mean 1 and variance  $\theta$ .

We then model the variance within clusters by a cluster specific regression design such that

$$\theta = z_j^T \alpha$$

where  $z$  is the regression design (specified by theta.des in the software).

This model can be fitted using a pairwise likelihood or the pseudo-likelihood using either

- twostage
- twostageMLE

For the Multivariate models we are given a multivariate random effect each subject  $(Z_1, \dots, Z_d)$  with  $d$  random effects. The total random effect for each subject is then specified using a regression design on these random effects, with a regression vector  $v_j$  such that the total random effect is  $\{v_j^T (Z_1, \dots, Z_d)\}$ . Each random effect has an associated parameter  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$  and  $Z_j$  is Gamma distributed with

- mean  $\lambda_j / v_j^T \lambda$
- variance  $\{(\lambda_j / (v_j^T \lambda))^2\}$ .

The key assumption to make the two-stage fitting possible is that

$$\text{lamtot} = v_j^T \lambda$$

with clusters.

The DEFAULT parametrization (var.par=1) uses the variances of the random effects

$$\theta_j = \lambda_j / (v_j^T \lambda)^2$$

For alternative parametrizations one can specify how the parameters relate to  $\lambda_j$  with the argument var.par=0.

For both types of models the basic model assumptions are that given the random effects of the clusters the survival distributions within a cluster are independent and on the form

$$P(T > t|x, z) = \exp(-Z \cdot \text{Laplace}^{-1}(\text{lamtot}^{-1}, S(t|x)))$$

with the inverse laplace of the gamma distribution with mean  $\mathbf{1}$  and variance  $\mathbf{1}/\text{lamtot}$ .

Finally the parameters  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$  are related to the parameters of the model by a regression construction  $M$  ( $d \times k$ ), that links the  $d$   $\lambda$  parameters with the  $k$  underlying  $\alpha$  parameters

$$\lambda = M\alpha$$

here using `theta.des` to specify these low-dimension association. Default is a diagonal matrix. This can be used to make structural assumptions about the variances of the random-effects as is needed for the ACE model for example. In software  $M$  is called `theta.des`

We consider  $K$  independent clusters, with  $n_k$  subject within each cluster. For each cluster we are given a set of independent random effects  $V = (V_1, \dots, V_m)^T$ . We let  $(V_1, \dots, V_m)^T$  be independent Gamma distributed with  $V_l \sim \Gamma(\eta_l, \nu_l), l = 1, \dots, p$  independent gamma distributed random variables such that  $E(V_l) = \eta_l/\nu$  and  $\text{Var}(V_l) = \eta_l/\nu^2$ . Let  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_p)$ . The  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m)$  parameters are given such that  $\eta = D\theta$ . Letting the rows in the matrix be denoted as  $Q_i, \dots, Q_m$ . As is commonly done <sup>1</sup> ; and

To facilitate our two-stage construction we also assume that  $\nu = Q_i^T \eta$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n_k$  such that  $Q_i^T V$  is also Gamma distributed with  $\Gamma(1, \nu)$ , that is has variance  $\nu^{-1}$  and mean  $\mathbf{1}$ . We get back to specific models where this is the case, but this assumption is often reasonable and needed <sup>2</sup> ; and

Let  $\Psi(\eta_l, \nu, \cdot)$  denote the Laplace transform of the Gamma distribution  $\Gamma(\eta_l, \nu)$ , and let its inverse be  $\Psi^{-1}(\eta_l, \nu, \cdot)$ . For simplicity we also assume that  $\eta$  is the same across clusters.

Assume that the marginal survival distribution for subject  $i$  within cluster  $k$  is given by  $S_{X_{k,i}}(t)$  given covariates  $X_{k,i}$ .

Now given the random effects of the cluster  $V_k$  and the covariates  $X_{k,i}$   $i = 1, \dots, n_k$  we assume that subjects within the cluster are independent with survival distributions

$$\exp(-(Q_{k,i} V_k) \Psi^{-1}(\nu, \nu, S_{X_{k,i}}(t))).$$

A consequence of this is that the hazards given the covariates  $X_{k,i}$  and the random effects  $V_k$  are given by

$$\lambda_{k,i}(t; X_{k,i}, V_{k,i}) = (Q_{k,i} V_k) D_3 \Psi^{-1}(\nu, \nu, S_{X_{k,i}}(t)) D_t S_{X_{k,i}}(t) \quad (1)$$

where  $D_t$  and  $D_3$  denotes the partial derivatives with respect to  $t$  and the third argument, respectively.

Further, we can express the multivariate survival distribution as

$$\begin{aligned} S(t_1, \dots, t_m) &= \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^m (Q_i V) \Psi^{-1}(\eta_l, \nu_l, S_{X_{k,i}}(t_i))\right) \\ &= \prod_{l=1}^p \Psi(\eta_l, \eta, \sum_{i=1}^m Q_{k,i} \Psi^{-1}(\eta, \eta, S_{X_{k,i}}(t_i))). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In the case of considering just pairs, we write this function as  $C(S_{k,i}(t), S_{k,j}(t))$ .

In addition to survival times from this model, we assume that we independent right censoring present  $U_{k,i}$  such that the given  $V_k$  and the covariates  $X_{k,i}$   $i = 1, \dots, n_k$  ( $U_{k,1}, \dots, U_{k,n_k}$ ) of  $(T_{k,1}, \dots, T_{k,n_k})$ , and the conditional censoring distribution do not depend on  $V_k$ .

We can also express this via counting processes  $N_{k,i}(t) = I(T_{k,i} < t, T_{k,i} < U_{k,i})$  and with at risk indicators  $Y_{k,i}(t) = I(T_{k,i} > t, U_{k,i} > t)$ , and the censoring indicators  $\delta_{k,i} = I(T_{k,i} < U_{k,i})$ .

Due to the marginal specification we can estimate apply the two-stage approach as in <sup>3</sup>. We return to this in the next section. <sup>3</sup>; and

One consequence of the model structure is that the Kendall's can be computed for two-subjects  $(i, j)$  across two clusters "1" and "2" as

$$E\left(\frac{(Q_{1i}V_1 - Q_{1j}V_2)(Q_{2i}V_1 - Q_{2j}V_2)}{(Q_{1i}V_1 + Q_{2i}V_2)(Q_{1j}V_1 + Q_{2j}V_2)}\right) \quad (3)$$

under the assumption that that we compare pairs with equivalent marginals ( $S_{X_{1,i}}(t) = S_{X_{2,i}}(t)$  and  $S_{X_{1,j}}(t) = S_{X_{2,j}}(t)$ ) and that  $S_{X_{1,i}}(\infty) = S_{X_{1,j}}(\infty) = 0$ . We return to another characterization of the dependence via the cross hazards ratio. Here we also use that  $\eta$  is the same across clusters. The Kendall's tau would be the same for (??) due to the same additive structure for the frailty terms, and the random effects thus have the same interpretation in terms of Kendall's tau.

### Clusters stratified Cox models

Show how efficient the stratified Cox is with GOF and all

---

```
1 library(mets)
2 data(diabetes)
3 margph <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~treat+strata(id),data=
  diabetes)
```

---

```
1 library(mets)
2 gg <- gof (margph)
3
4 par(mfrow=c(2,2))
5 plot(gg)
```

---

### Univariate plackett model twostage models

---

```
1 library(mets)
2 data(diabetes)
3
4 # Marginal Cox model with treat as covariate
5 margph <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~treat+cluster(id),data=
  diabetes)
6 # Clayton-Oakes, MLE
7 fitcol<-twostageMLE(margph,data=diabetes,theta=1.0)
8 summary(fitcol)
9
```

```

10 # Plackett model
11 mph <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~treat+cluster(id),data=
    diabetes)
12 fitp <- survival.twostage(mph,data=diabetes,theta=3.0,Nit
    =40,
13     clusters=diabetes$id,var.link=1,model="plackett")
14 summary(fitp)
15
16 # Clayton-Oakes
17 fitco2 <- survival.twostage(mph,data=diabetes,theta=0.0,
    detail=0,
18     clusters=diabetes$id,var.link=1,model="clayton.oakes
    ")
19 summary(fitco2)
20 fitco3 <- survival.twostage(margph,data=diabetes,theta=1.0,
    detail=0,
21     clusters=diabetes$id,var.link=0,model="clayton.oakes
    ")
22 summary(fitco3)
23
24 # without covariates but with stratified
25 marg <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~+strata(treat)+cluster(id),
    data=diabetes)
26 fitpa <- survival.twostage(marg,data=diabetes,theta=1.0,
    clusters=diabetes$id,score.method="optimize")
27 summary(fitpa)
28
29
30 fitcoa <- survival.twostage(marg,data=diabetes,theta=1.0,
    clusters=diabetes$id,
31     model="clayton.oakes")
32 summary(fitcoa)
33
34
35 # Piecewise constant cross hazards ratio modelling
36 d <- subset(simClaytonOakes(2000,2,0.5,0,stoptime=2,left=0),
    !truncated)
37 udp <- piecewise.twostage(c(0,0.5,2),data=d,score.method="
    optimize",
38     id="cluster",timevar="time",
39     status="status",model="clayton.oakes",silent=0)
40 summary(udp)

```

---

### Univariate gamma (clayton-oakes) model twostage models

#### Looking at the data

---

```

1 library(mets)
2 data(diabetes)
3
4 # Marginal Cox model with treat as covariate
5 margph <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~treat+cluster(id),data=
    diabetes)
6 # Clayton-Oakes, MLE
7 fitco1<-twostageMLE(margph,data=diabetes,theta=1.0)
8 summary(fitco1)
9
10 # Plackett model

```

```

11 mph <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~treat+cluster(id),data=
    diabetes)
12 fitp <- survival.twostage(mph,data=diabetes,theta=3.0,Nit
    =40,
13     clusters=diabetes$id,var.link=1,model="plackett")
14 summary(fitp)
15
16 # Clayton-Oakes
17 fitco2 <- survival.twostage(mph,data=diabetes,theta=0.0,
    detail=0,
18     clusters=diabetes$id,var.link=1,model="clayton.oakes
    ")
19 summary(fitco2)
20 fitco3 <- survival.twostage(margph,data=diabetes,theta=1.0,
    detail=0,
21     clusters=diabetes$id,var.link=0,model="clayton.oakes
    ")
22 summary(fitco3)
23
24 # without covariates but with stratified
25 marg <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~+strata(treat)+cluster(id),
    data=diabetes)
26 fitpa <- survival.twostage(marg,data=diabetes,theta=1.0,
    clusters=diabetes$id,score.method="optimize")
27 summary(fitpa)
28
29
30 fitcoa <- survival.twostage(marg,data=diabetes,theta=1.0,
    clusters=diabetes$id,
31     model="clayton.oakes")
32 summary(fitcoa)
33
34
35 # Piecewise constant cross hazards ratio modelling
36 d <- subset(simClaytonOakes(2000,2,0.5,0,stoptime=2,left=0),
    !truncated)
37 udp <- piecewise.twostage(c(0,0.5,2),data=d,score.method="
    optimize",
38     id="cluster",timevar="time",
39     status="status",model="clayton.oakes",silent=0)
40 summary(udp)

```

---

### *Multivariate gamma twostage models*

```

1 library(mets)
2
3 # structured random effects model additive gamma ACE
4 # simulate structured two-stage additive gamma ACE model
5 data <- simClaytonOakes.twin.ace(2000,2,1,0,3)
6 out <- twin.polygen.design(data,id="cluster")
7 pardes <- out$pardes
8 pardes
9 des.rv <- out$des.rv
10 head(des.rv)
11 aa <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~x+cluster(cluster),data=data,
    robust=0)

```

```

12 ts <- survival.twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
13   detail=0,
14   theta=c(2,1),var.link=0,step=0.5,
15   random.design=des.rv,theta.des=pardes)
summary(ts)

```

---

```

1 library(mets)
2
3 set.seed(1000)
4 source("mets/R/sim.clayton.oakes.R")
5 data <- simClaytonOakes.family.ace(8000,2,1,0,3)
6 head(data)
7 data$number <- c(1,2,3,4)
8 data$child <- 1*(data$number==3)
9 out <- ace.family.design(data,member="type",id="cluster")
10 out$pardes
11 head(out$des.rv)
12
13 aa <- aalen(Surv(time,status)~+1,data=data,robust=0)
14 pa <- phreg(Surv(time,status)~+1+cluster(cluster),data=data)
15
16 # additive gamma models with and without pair call
17 # make ace random effects design
18
19 # simple random effects call
20 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
21   detail=1,var.par=1,var.link=0,
22   theta=c(2,1),
23   random.design=out$des.rv,theta.des=out$pardes)
24 summary(ts0)
25
26 ts00 <- twostage(pa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
27   detail=1,var.par=1,var.link=0,
28   theta=c(2,1),
29   random.design=out$des.rv,theta.des=out$pardes)
30 summary(ts00)
31
32
33 checkderiv=0
34 if (checkderiv==1) {
35   ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
36     detail=1,numDeriv=1,Nit=0,var.par=1,
37     theta=log(c(2,1)/9),var.link=1,step=1.0,
38     random.design=out$des.rv,theta.des=out$pardes)
39   ts0$score
40   ts0$score1
41
42   ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
43     detail=1,numDeriv=1,Nit=0,var.par=1,
44     theta=c(2,1)/9,var.link=0,step=1.0,
45     random.design=out$des.rv,theta.des=out$pardes)
46   ts0$score
47   ts0$score1
48
49
50   ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
51     detail=1,numDeriv=1,Nit=0,var.par=0,

```

```

52     theta=log(c(2,1)),var.link=1,step=1.0,
53     random.design=out$des.rv,theta.des=out$pardes)
54 ts0$score
55 ts0$score1
56
57 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
58     detail=1,numDeriv=1,Nit=0,var.par=0,
59     theta=c(2,1),var.link=0,step=1.0,
60     random.design=out$des.rv,theta.des=out$pardes)
61 ts0$score
62 ts0$score1
63
64 }
65
66
67 # now specify fitting via specific pairs
68
69 # first all pairs
70 mm <- familycluster.index(data$cluster)
71 head(mm$familypairindex,n=10)
72 pairs <- matrix(mm$familypairindex,ncol=2,byrow=TRUE)
73 tail(pairs,n=12)
74 # make all pairs and pair specific design and pardes
75 # same as ts0 but pairs specified
76 ts <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
77     theta=c(2,1),var.link=0,step=1.0,
78     random.design=out$des.rv,
79     theta.des=out$pardes,pairs=pairs)
80 summary(ts)
81
82 ts <- twostage(pa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
83     theta=c(2,1),var.link=0,step=1.0,
84     random.design=out$des.rv,
85     theta.des=out$pardes,pairs=pairs)
86 summary(ts)
87
88
89 # random sample of pairs
90 ssid <- sort(sample(1:48000,20000))
91
92 # take some of all
93 tsd <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
94     theta=c(2,1)/10,var.link=0,step=1.0,
95     random.design=out$des.rv,iid=1,
96     theta.des=out$pardes,pairs=pairs[ssid,])
97 summary(tsd)
98
99 # same analyses but now gives only data that is used in the
100 # relevant pairs
101
102 ids <- sort(unique(c(pairs[ssid,])))
103
104 pairsids <- c(pairs[ssid,])
105
106 pair.new <- matrix(fast.approx(ids,c(pairs[ssid,])),ncol=2)
107 head(pair.new)
108
109 # this requires that pair.new refers to id's in dataid
110 # (survival, status and so forth)
111 # random.design and theta.des are constructed to be the

```



```

      array 3 dims via individual specification from
      ace.family.design
1108 dataid <- dsort(data[ids,],"cluster")
1109 outid <- ace.family.design(dataid,member="type",id="cluster"
      )
1110 outid$pardes
1111 head(outid$des.rv)
1112
1113 tsdid <- twostage(aa,data=dataid,clusters=dataid$cluster,
1114     theta=c(2,1)/10,var.link=0,step=1.0,
1115     random.design=outid$des.rv,iid=1,
1116     theta.des=outid$pardes,pairs=pair.new)
1117 summary(tsdid)
1118 coef(tsdid)
1119 coef(tsd)
1120 # same as tsd
1121
1122
1123 # now direct specification of random.design and
      theta.design
1124 # rather than taking the rows of the des.rv for the
      relevant pairs
1125 # can make a pair specific specification of random effects
1126
1127 pair.types <- matrix(dataid[c(t(pair.new)),"type"],byrow=T,
      ncol=2)
1128 head(pair.new)
1129 head(pair.types)
1130
1131 # here makes pairwise design , simpler random.design og
      pardes, parameters
1132 # stil varg, varc
1133 # mother, child, share half rum=c(1,1,0) rvc=c(1,0,1),
1134 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0,1))
1135 #
1136 # father, child, share half rvf=c(1,1,0) rvc=c(1,0,1),
1137 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0,1))
1138 #
1139 # child, child, share half rvc=c(1,1,0) rvc=c(1,0,1),
1140 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0,1))
1141 #
1142 # mother, father, share 0 rum=c(1,0) rvf=c(0,1),
1143 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(1,0),c(1,0),c(0,1))
1144
1145 theta.des <- array(0,c(4,2,nrow(pair.new)))
1146 random.des <- array(0,c(2,4,nrow(pair.new)))
1147 # random variables in each pair
1148 rvs <- c()
1149 for (i in 1:nrow(pair.new))
1150 {
1151     if (pair.types[i,1]=="mother" & pair.types[i,2]=="father"
1152         ")
1153     {
1154         theta.des[,i] <- rbind(c(1,0),c(1,0),c(0,1),c(0,0))
1155         random.des[,i] <- rbind(c(1,0,1,0),c(0,1,1,0))
1156         rvs <- c(rvs,3)
1157     } else {
1158         theta.des[,i] <- rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c
1159             (0,1))

```

```

158     random.des[, ,i] <- rbind(c(1,1,0,1),c(1,0,1,1))
159     rvs <- c(rvs,4)
160   }
161 }
162 # 3 rvs here
163 random.des[, ,7]
164 theta.des[, ,7]
165 # 4 rvs here
166 random.des[, ,1]
167 theta.des[, ,1]
168 head(rvs)
169
170 tsdid2 <- twostage(aa,data=dataid,clusters=dataid$cluster,
171                   theta=c(2,1)/10,var.link=0,step=1.0,
172                   random.design=random.des,
173                   theta.des=theta.des,pairs=pair.new,pairs.rvs=rvs)
174 summary(tsdid2)
175 tsd$theta
176 tsdid2$theta
177 tsdid$theta
178
179
180 # simpler specification via kinship coefficient for each
    pair
181
182 kinship <- c()
183 for (i in 1:nrow(pair.new))
184 {
185   if (pair.types[i,1]=="mother" & pair.types[i,2]=="father")
186     pk1 <- 0 else pk1 <- 0.5
187   kinship <- c(kinship,pk1)
188 }
189 head(kinship,n=10)
190
191 out <- make.pairwise.design(pair.new,kinship,type="ace")
192 names(out)
193 # 4 rvs here , here independence since shared component has
    variance 0 !
194 out$random.des[, ,9]
195 out$theta.des[, ,9]
196
197 tsdid3 <- twostage(aa,data=dataid,clusters=dataid$cluster,
198                   theta=c(2,1)/10,var.link=0,step=1.0,
199                   random.design=out$random.design,
200                   theta.des=out$theta.des,pairs=pair.new,pairs.rvs=out$
    ant.rvs)
201 summary(tsdid3)
202 coef(tsdid3)
203
204 # same as above tsdid2
205
206
207 # simple models, test for pairs structure
208
209 library(mets)
210
211 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,

```

```

212     detail=0,numDeriv=1,Nit=10,
213     theta=c(0.17),var.link=0,step=1.0)
214 summary(ts0)
215 ts0$score; ts0$score1
216 ts0$Dscore; ts0$hess
217
218 mm <- familycluster.index(data$cluster)
219 head(mm$familypairindex,n=10)
220 pairs <- matrix(mm$familypairindex,ncol=2,byrow=TRUE)
221 head(pairs,n=12)
222 tail(pairs,n=12)
223 dim(pairs)
224
225 cc <- cluster.index(data$cluster)
226
227 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
228               detail=1,Nit=0,
229               theta=ts0$theta,var.link=0,pairs=pairs)
230 summary(ts0)
231
232
233
234 library(mets)
235
236 set.seed(100)
237 data <- simClaytonOakes.family.ace(8000,2,1,0,3)
238 head(data)
239 data$number <- c(1,2,3,4)
240 data$child <- 1*(data$number==3)
241
242 # make ace random effects design
243 out <- ace.family.design(data,member="type",id="cluster")
244 out$parides
245 head(out$des.rv)
246
247 # makes marginal model (same for all)
248 aa <- aalen(Surv(time,status)~+1,data=data,robust=0)
249
250
251 mm <- familycluster.index(data$cluster)
252 head(mm$familypairindex,n=10)
253 pairs <- matrix(mm$familypairindex,ncol=2,byrow=TRUE)
254 head(pairs,n=12)
255 tail(pairs,n=12)
256 dim(pairs)
257 #
258
259 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
260               detail=1,Nit=10,
261               theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0)
262 summary(ts0)
263
264 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
265               detail=1,Nit=10,numDeriv=1,
266               theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0,pairs=pairs)
267 summary(ts0)
268 ts0$score

```

```
269 ts0$score1
270
271 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
272 detail=1,Nit=10,
273 theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0,model="plackett")
274 summary(ts0)
275
276 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
277 detail=1,Nit=10,
278 theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0,model="plackett",pairs=
279 pairs)
280 summary(ts0)
281
282
283 theta.des <- model.matrix(~x1,data=data)
284
285 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
286 detail=1,Nit=10,theta.des=theta.des,
287 theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0)
288 summary(ts0)
289
290 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
291 detail=1,Nit=10,theta.des=theta.des,
292 theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0,pairs=pairs)
293 summary(ts0)
294
295 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
296 detail=1,Nit=10,theta.des=theta.des,
297 theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0,model="plackett")
298 summary(ts0)
299
300 ts0 <- twostage(aa,data=data,clusters=data$cluster,
301 detail=1,Nit=10,theta.des=theta.des,
302 theta=c(0.2),var.link=0,step=1.0,model="plackett",pairs=
303 pairs)
304 summary(ts0)
```

---