

Analysis of multivariate competing risks data

Klaus Holst & Thomas Scheike

March 3, 2020

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 θ 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 ψ is the Laplace transform of a gamma distributed random variable with mean 1 and variance θ .

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 λ_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 λ parameters with the k underlying α 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 ¹ ; 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 ν^{-1} and mean $\mathbf{1}$. We get back to specific models where this is the case, but this assumption is often reasonable and needed ² ; 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 η 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 ³. We return to this in the next section. ³; 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 η 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
108 dataid <- dsort(data[ids,],"cluster")
109 outid <- ace.family.design(dataid,member="type",id="cluster"
      )
110 outid$parides
111 head(outid$des.rv)
112
113 tsdid <- twostage(aa,data=dataid,clusters=dataid$cluster,
114     theta=c(2,1)/10,var.link=0,step=1.0,
115     random.design=outid$des.rv,iid=1,
116     theta.des=outid$parides,pairs=pair.new)
117 summary(tsdid)
118 coef(tsdid)
119 coef(tsd)
120 # same as tsd
121
122
123 # now direct specification of random.design and
      theta.design
124 # rather than taking the rows of the des.rv for the
      relevant pairs
125 # can make a pair specific specification of random effects
126
127 pair.types <- matrix(dataid[c(t(pair.new)),"type"],byrow=T,
      ncol=2)
128 head(pair.new)
129 head(pair.types)
130
131 # here makes pairwise design , simpler random.design og
      parides, parameters
132 # stil varg, varc
133 # mother, child, share half rum=c(1,1,0) rvc=c(1,0,1),
134 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0,1))
135 #
136 # father, child, share half rvf=c(1,1,0) rvc=c(1,0,1),
137 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0,1))
138 #
139 # child, child, share half rvc=c(1,1,0) rvc=c(1,0,1),
140 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0,1))
141 #
142 # mother, father, share 0 rum=c(1,0) rvf=c(0,1),
143 # thetadesmf=rbind(c(1,0),c(1,0),c(0,1))
144
145 theta.des <- array(0,c(4,2,nrow(pair.new)))
146 random.des <- array(0,c(2,4,nrow(pair.new)))
147 # random variables in each pair
148 rvs <- c()
149 for (i in 1:nrow(pair.new))
150 {
151     if (pair.types[i,1]=="mother" & pair.types[i,2]=="father"
152         ")
153     {
154         theta.des[,i] <- rbind(c(1,0),c(1,0),c(0,1),c(0,0))
155         random.des[,i] <- rbind(c(1,0,1,0),c(0,1,1,0))
156         rvs <- c(rvs,3)
157     } else {
158         theta.des[,i] <- rbind(c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c(0.5,0),c
159             (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
181   pair
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
194   variance 0 !
195 out$random.des[, ,9]
196 out$theta.des[, ,9]
197
198 tsdid3 <- twostage(aa,data=dataid,clusters=dataid$cluster,
199                   theta=c(2,1)/10,var.link=0,step=1.0,
200                   random.design=out$random.design,
201                   theta.des=out$theta.des,pairs=pair.new,pairs.rvs=out$
202   ant.rvs)
203 summary(tsdid3)
204 coef(tsdid3)
205
206 # same as above tsdid2
207
208 # simple models, test for pairs structure
209
210 library(mets)
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)
```
