

Statistical Prediction Based on Censored Life Data

Luis A. Escobar

Department of Experimental Statistics
Louisiana State University

and

William Q. Meeker

Department of Statistics
Iowa State University

October 19, 2002

1

Overview

- Problem background and motivation, general prediction problem.
- Probability prediction, naive statistical prediction, and coverage probability.
- Calibrating statistical prediction intervals and pivotal methods.
- Predicting the number of future field failures
 - ▶ Single cohort
 - ▶ Multiple cohorts
- Concluding remarks.

2

Introduction

Motivation: Prediction problems are of interest to consumers, managers, engineers, and scientists.

- A consumer would like to bound the failure time of a product to be purchased.
- Managers want to predict future warranty costs.
- Engineers want to predict the number of failures in a future life test.
- Engineers want to predict the number of failures during the following time period (week, month, etc.) of an on-going life test experiment.

3

Related Literature


- **Surveys and methods:** Hahn and Nelson (1973), Patel (1989), Hahn and Meeker (1991).
- **Analytical frequentist theory:** Cox (1975), Atwood (1984).
- **Simulation/bootstrap frequentist theory:** Beran (1990), Bai, Bickel, and Olshen (1990), Efron and Tibshirani (1993).
- **Log-location-scale distributions with failure (Type II) censored data—frequentist approach:** Faulkenberry (1973), Lawless (1973), Nelson and Schmee (1979), Engelhardt and Bain (1979), Mee and Kushary (1994).
- **Likelihood theory:** Kalbfleisch (1971).
- **Bayesian theory:** Geisser (1993).

4

New-Sample Prediction

Based on previous (possibly censored) life test data, one could be interested in:

- Time to failure of a new item.



- Time until k failures in a future sample of m units.
- Number of failures by time t_w in a future sample of m units.


5

Within-Sample Prediction

Predict future events in a process based on early data from the process. Followed n units until t_c and observed r failures. Data are first r of n failure times: $t_{(1)} < \dots < t_{(r)}$.

Want to predict:

- Number of additional failures in interval $[t_c, t_w)$.



- Time of next failure.
- Time until k additional failures.

6

Needed for Prediction

In general to predict one needs:

- A statistical model to describe the population or process of interest. This model usually depends on a set of parameters θ .
- Information on the values of the parameters θ . This information could come from
 - ▶ laboratory test.
 - ▶ field data.
- Nonparametric new-sample prediction also possible (e.g., Chapter 5 of Hahn and Meeker 1991).

7

Probability Prediction Interval (θ Known)


- An exact $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ probability prediction interval is (ignoring any data)

$$PI(\alpha) = [\underline{T}, \tilde{T}] = [t_{\alpha/2}, t_{1-\alpha/2}]$$

where $t_p = t_p(\theta)$ is the p th quantile of T .

- **Probability of coverage:**

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T \in PI(\alpha)] &= \Pr(\underline{T} \leq T \leq \tilde{T}) \\ &= \Pr(t_{\alpha/2} \leq T \leq t_{1-\alpha/2}) \\ &= 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned}$$



8

Example 1: Probability Prediction for Failure Time of a Single Future Unit Based on Known Parameters

- Assume cycles to failure follows a lognormal distribution with known parameters $\mu = 4.160, \sigma = .5451$
- A 90% probability prediction interval is

$$\begin{aligned} PI(\alpha) &= [\underline{T}, \tilde{T}] = [t_{\alpha/2}, t_{1-\alpha/2}] \\ &= [\exp(4.160 - 1.645 \times .5451), \exp(4.160 + 1.645 \times .5451)] \\ &= [26.1, 157.1]. \end{aligned}$$
- Then $\Pr(\underline{T} \leq T \leq \tilde{T}) = \Pr(26.1 \leq T \leq 157.1) = .90$.
- With misspecified parameters, coverage probability may not be .90.

9

Statistical Prediction Interval (θ Unknown)

Objective: Want to predict the random quantity T based on a learning sample information (DATA).

The random DATA leads parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}$ and prediction interval $PI(\alpha) = [\underline{T}, \tilde{T}]$. Thus $[\underline{T}, \tilde{T}]$ and T have a joint distribution that depends on a parameter θ .

Probability of coverage: $PI(\alpha)$ is an exact $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ prediction interval procedure if

$$\Pr[T \in PI(\alpha)] = \Pr(\underline{T} \leq T \leq \tilde{T}) = 1 - \alpha.$$

First we consider evaluation, then specification of $PI(\alpha)$.

10

Coverage Probabilities Concepts

- **Conditional coverage probability for the interval:** For fixed DATA (and thus fixed $\hat{\theta}$ and $[\underline{T}, \tilde{T}]$):

$$\begin{aligned} CP[PI(\alpha) | \hat{\theta}; \theta] &= \Pr(\underline{T} \leq T \leq \tilde{T} | \hat{\theta}; \theta) \\ &= F(\tilde{T}; \theta) - F(\underline{T}; \theta) \end{aligned}$$

Unknown given $[\underline{T}, \tilde{T}]$ because $F(t; \theta)$ depends on θ .

Random because $[\underline{T}, \tilde{T}]$ depends on $\hat{\theta}$.

- **Unconditional coverage probability for the procedure:**

$$\begin{aligned} CP[PI(\alpha); \theta] &= \Pr(\underline{T} \leq T \leq \tilde{T}; \theta) \\ &= E_{\hat{\theta}} \{ CP[PI(\alpha) | \hat{\theta}; \theta] \}. \end{aligned}$$

In general $CP[PI(\alpha); \theta] \neq 1 - \alpha$.

- When $CP[PI(\alpha); \theta]$ does not depend on θ , $PI(\alpha)$ is an exact procedure.

11

One-Sided and Two-Sided Prediction Intervals

- Combining lower and upper $100(1 - \alpha/2)\%$ prediction bounds gives an equal-probability two-sided $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ prediction interval.


- If

$$\Pr(\underline{T} \leq T < \infty) = 1 - \alpha/2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\Pr(0 < T \leq \tilde{T}) = 1 - \alpha/2,$$

then

$$\Pr(\underline{T} \leq T \leq \tilde{T}) = 1 - \alpha.$$



12

Naive Statistical Prediction Interval

- When θ is unknown, a naive prediction interval is

$$PI(\alpha) = [T, \hat{T}] = [\hat{t}_{\alpha/2}, \hat{t}_{1-\alpha/2}]$$

where $\hat{t}_p = t_p(\hat{\theta})$ is the ML estimate of the p quantile of T .

- Coverage probability may be far from nominal $1 - \alpha$, especially with small samples.

13

Asymptotic Approximation for $CP[PI(\alpha); \theta]$

As suggested by Cox (1975) and Atwood (1984):

- For the naive lower prediction bound:
 $PI(\alpha) = [T, \infty] = [\hat{t}_\alpha, \infty] = [t_\alpha(\hat{\theta}), \infty]$, we have

$$CP [PI(\alpha) | \hat{\theta}; \theta] = \Pr(T \leq T < \infty; \theta) = g(\alpha, \hat{\theta}; \theta)$$

$$CP [PI(\alpha); \theta] = E_{\hat{\theta}} [g(\alpha, \hat{\theta}; \theta)].$$

- Under regularity conditions, using a Taylor expansion of $g(\alpha, \hat{\theta}; \theta)$, it follows that

$$CP[PI(\alpha); \theta] = \alpha + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \frac{\partial g(\alpha, \hat{\theta}; \theta)}{\partial \hat{\theta}_i} \Big|_{\theta} + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i,j=1}^k b_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 g(\alpha, \hat{\theta}; \theta)}{\partial \hat{\theta}_i \partial \hat{\theta}_j} \Big|_{\theta} + o_p$$

where a_i, b_{ij} are elements of vector \mathbf{a} and matrix \mathbf{B} defined by


$$E_{\hat{\theta}} (\hat{\theta} - \theta) = \mathbf{a}(\theta) + o(1/n)$$

$$E_{\hat{\theta}} [(\hat{\theta} - \theta)(\hat{\theta} - \theta)'] = \mathbf{B}(\theta) + o(1/n).$$

These are, in general, difficult to compute.

14

Prediction interval calibration curve lognormal model



15

Calibrating One-Sided Prediction Bounds

- To calibrate the naive one-sided prediction bound, find α_c , such that

$$CP[PI(\alpha_c); \hat{\theta}] = \Pr(T \leq T \leq \infty; \hat{\theta})$$

$$= \Pr[\hat{t}_{\alpha_c} \leq T \leq \infty; \hat{\theta}] = 1 - \alpha.$$

where $T = \hat{t}_{\alpha_c}$ is the ML estimator of the t_{α_c} quantile of T .

- Can do this analytically or by simulation.
- When for arbitrary α , $CP[PI(\alpha); \theta]$ does not depend on θ , the calibrated $PI(\alpha_c)$ procedure is exact.
- For a two-sided interval, do separately for each tail.

16

Simulation of the Sampling/Prediction Process

To evaluate the coverage probability of $PI(\alpha_0)$ for some specified $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$, do the following:

- Use the assumed model and ML estimates $\hat{\theta}$ to simulate the sampling and prediction process by computing $DATA_j^*$ and T_j^* , $j = 1, \dots, B$ for a large number B (e.g., $B = 4000$ or $B = 10000$). For each simulated sample/prediction:
- Compute ML estimates $\hat{\theta}_j^*$ from simulated $DATA_j^*$.
- Use α_0 to compute $T_j^* = \hat{t}_{\alpha_0}$ from simulated $DATA_j^*$ and compare with the simulated T_j^* . The proportion of the B trials having $T_j^* > T_j^*$ gives the Monte Carlo evaluation of $CP [PI(\alpha_0); \theta]$ at $\hat{\theta}$.
- To obtain a PI with a coverage probability of $100(1-\alpha)\%$, find α_c such that $CP[PI(\alpha_c); \hat{\theta}] = 1 - \alpha$.

17

The Effect of Calibration


Result: Beran (1990) showed that, under regularity conditions, with $PI(\alpha_c)$ being a once-calibrated prediction,

$$CP[PI(\alpha_c); \theta] = 1 - \alpha + O(1/n^2)$$


and that the order of the approximation can be improved by iterating the calibration procedure.

18


Lognormal probability plot of bearing life test data censored after 80 million cycles with lognormal ML estimates and pointwise 95% confidence intervals



Simulation of the bearing life test censored after 80 million cycles ($n = 23$ and $r = 15$), lognormal model, histograms of pivotal-like $Z_{\log(T^*)} = (\log(T^*) - \hat{\mu}^*)/\hat{\sigma}^*$ and $\Phi[Z_{\log(T^*)}]$



Prediction interval calibration function for the bearing life test data censored after 80 million cycles, lognormal model



Example 2: Lower Prediction Bound for a Single Independent Future T Based on Time-Censored (Type I) Data

- Life test run for 80 million cycles; 15 of 23 ball bearings failed. ML estimates of the lognormal parameters are: $\hat{\mu} = 4.160$, $\hat{\sigma} = .5451$.
- The naive one-sided lower 95% lognormal prediction bound (assuming no sampling error) is: $\hat{t}_{.05} = \exp[4.160 + (-1.645)(.5451)] = 26.1$.
- Need to calibrate to account for sampling variability in the parameter estimates.
- From simulation $CP[PI(1 - .964); \hat{\theta}] = .95$
- Thus the calibrated lower 95% lognormal prediction bound is

$$\hat{T} = \hat{t}_{.036} = \exp[4.160 + (-1.802)(.5451)] = 24.0$$


where $z_{.036} = -1.802$.

Comparison of Approximate 90% Prediction Intervals for Bearing Life from a Life Test that was Type I Censored at 80 Million Cycles

Lognormal	
Naive	[26.1, 157.1]
Calibrated	[24.0, 174.4]

Within-Sample Prediction
Predict Number of Failures in Next Time Interval

- The sample DATA are singly time-censored (Type I) from $F(t)$. Observe n units until time t_c . Failure times are recorded for the $r > 0$ units that fail in $(0, t_c]$; $n - r$ unfailed at t_c .
- **Prediction problem:** Find an upper bound for the number of future failures, K , in the interval $(t_c, t_w]$, $t_c < t_w$.



Distribution of K and Naive Prediction Bound

- Conditional on DATA, the number of failures K in $(t_c, t_w]$ is distributed as

$$K \sim \text{BIN}(n - r, \rho)$$

where

$$\rho = \frac{\Pr(t_c < T \leq t_w)}{\Pr(T > t_c)} = \frac{F(t_w; \theta) - F(t_c; \theta)}{1 - F(t_c; \theta)}$$

- Obtain $\hat{\rho}$ by evaluating at $\hat{\theta}$.
- The naive $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ upper prediction bound for K is $\tilde{K}(1 - \alpha) = \tilde{K}_{1-\alpha}$, the estimate of the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of the distribution of K . This is computed as the smallest integer such that

$$\text{BINCDF}(K, n - r, \hat{\rho}) > 1 - \alpha.$$

25

Example 3: Prediction of the Number of Future Failures

- $n = 10,000$ units put into service; 80 failures in 48 months. Want an upper prediction bound on the number of the remaining

$$n - r = 10000 - 80 = 9920 \text{ units}$$

that will fail between 48 and 60 months.

- Weibull time to failure distribution assumed; ML estimates: $\hat{\alpha} = 1152$, $\hat{\beta} = 1.518$ giving

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{\hat{F}(60) - \hat{F}(48)}{1 - \hat{F}(48)} = .003233.$$

- Point prediction for the number failing between 48 and 60 months is

$$(n - r) \times \hat{\rho} = 9920 \times .003233 = 32.07.$$

26

Calibration of the Naive Upper-Prediction Bound for the Number of Field Failures

- Find α_c such that

$$\text{CP}[PI(\alpha_c); \hat{\theta}] = \Pr[K \leq \tilde{K}(1 - \alpha_c)] = 1 - \alpha$$

- A Monte Carlo evaluation of the unconditional coverage probability is

$$\text{CP}[PI(\alpha_c); \hat{\theta}] = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B P_j$$

where


$$P_j = \text{BINCDF}[\tilde{K}_j(1 - \alpha_c)^*; n - r_j^*, \hat{\rho}]$$

is the conditional coverage probability for the j th simulated interval evaluated at $\hat{\rho}$.

- Similar for the lower prediction bound.


27

Example 3. Calibration functions for upper and lower prediction bounds on the number of future field failures



28

Example 3. Calibration functions for upper and lower prediction bounds on the number of future field failures



29


Example 3-Computations

- The naive 95% upper prediction bound on K is $\hat{K}_{.95} = 42$, the smallest integer K such that

$$\text{BINCDF}(K, 9920, .003233) > .95.$$


- From simulation $\text{CP}[PI(.9863); \hat{\theta}] \approx .95$.

- Thus the calibrated 95% upper prediction bound on K is $\tilde{K} = \tilde{K}_{.9863} = 45$, the smallest integer K such that $\text{BINCDF}(K, 9920, .003233) \geq .9863$.



30

Staggered Entry Prediction Problem



31

Bearing-Cage Field-Failure Data (from Abernethy et al. 1983)

- A total of 1703 units failed introduced into service over a period of eight years (about 1600 in the past three years).
- Time measured in hours of service.
- Six out of 1703 units failed.
- Unexpected failures early in life mandated a design change.
- How many failures in the next year (point prediction and upper prediction bound requested), assuming 300 hours of service.

32

Within-Sample Prediction With Staggered Entry

- The objective is to predict future events in a process based on several sets of early data from the process.
 - Units enter the field in groups over time. Need to predict the total number of new failures (in all groups) when unfailed units are observed for an additional period of length Δt .
 - For group i , n_i units are followed for a period of length t_{c_j} and r_i failures were observed, $i = 1, \dots, s$.
- DATA $_i$ for set i ($i = 1, \dots, s$) are the first r_i of n_i failure times, say $t_{(i1)} < \dots < t_{(ir_i)}$.

33

Bearing Cage Data and Future-Failure Risk Analysis

Group i	Hours in Service	n_i	Failed r_i	At Risk $n_i - r_i$	$\hat{\rho}_i$	$(n_i - r_i) \times \hat{\rho}_i$
1	50	288	0	288	.000763	.2196
2	150	148	0	148	.001158	.1714
3	250	125	1	124	.001558	.1932
4	350	112	1	111	.001962	.2178
5	450	107	1	106	.002369	.2511
6	550	99	0	99	.002778	.2750
.
.
.
17	1650	6	0	6	.007368	.0442
18	1750	0	0	0	.007791	0
19	1850	1	0	1	.008214	.0082
20	1950	0	0	0	.008638	0
21	2050	2	0	2	.009062	.0181
Total		1703	6			5.057

34

Distribution of the Number of Future Failures

- Conditional on DATA $_i$, the number of additional failures K_i in group i during interval $(t_{c_j}, t_{w_i}]$ (where $t_{w_i} = t_{c_j} + \Delta t$) is distributed as $K_i \sim \text{BIN}(n_i - r_i, \rho_i)$ with

$$\rho_i = \frac{\Pr(t_{c_j} < T \leq t_{w_i})}{\Pr(T > t_{c_j})} = \frac{F(t_{w_i}; \theta) - F(t_{c_j}; \theta)}{1 - F(t_{c_j}; \theta)}$$

- Obtain $\hat{\rho}_i$ by evaluating $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s)$ at $\hat{\theta}$.
- Let $K = \sum_{i=1}^s K_i$ be the total number of additional failures over Δt . Conditional on the DATA (and the fixed censoring times) $K \sim \text{SBINCDF}(k; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ a sum of s independent binomials; $\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{r} = (n_1 - r_1, \dots, n_s - r_s)$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s)$.
- A naive $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ upper prediction bound $\tilde{K}(1 - \alpha)$ is computed as the smallest integer k such that $\text{SBINCDF}(k, \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{r}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*) \geq 1 - \alpha$.

35

Calibration of the Naive Upper Prediction Bound for the Staggered Entry Number of Field Failures

- Find α_c such that

$$\text{CP}[PI(\alpha_c); \hat{\theta}] = \Pr[K \leq \tilde{K}(1 - \alpha_c)] = 1 - \alpha$$

- A Monte Carlo evaluation of the unconditional coverage probability is

$$\text{CP}[PI(\alpha_c); \hat{\theta}] = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B P_j$$

where


$$P_j = \text{SBINCDF}\left[\tilde{K}(1 - \alpha_c)_j^*; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{r}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\right]$$

is the conditional coverage probability for the j th simulated interval evaluated at $\hat{\rho}$.


- Similar for the lower prediction bound.

36

Example 4: Calibration functions for upper and lower prediction bounds on the number of future field failures with staggered entry



Example 4: Calibration functions for upper and lower prediction bounds on the number of future field failures with staggered entry




Example 4-Computations

- The naive 95% upper prediction bound on K is $\hat{K}_{.95} = 9$, the smallest integer K such that

$$SBINCDF(K, n - r, \hat{\rho}) > .95.$$

- From simulation $CP[PI(.9916); \hat{\theta}] \approx .95$.
- Thus the calibrated 95% upper prediction bound on K is $\hat{K} = \hat{K}_{.9916} = 11$, the smallest integer K such that $SBINCDF(K, n - r, \hat{\rho}) > .9916$.



Concluding Remarks and Future Work

- Methodology can be extended to:
 - ▶ Staggered entry with differences among cohort distributions.
 - ▶ Staggered entry with differences in remaining warranty period.
 - ▶ Modeling of spatial and temporal variability in environmental factors like UV radiation, acid rain, temperature, and humidity.
- Today, the computational price is small; general-purpose software needed.
- Asymptotic theory promises good approximation when not exact; use simulation to verify and compare with other approximate methods.