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SUMMARY. This article is concerned with the analysis of recurrent events in the presence of a terminal event such as death. We consider the mean frequency function, defined as the marginal mean of the cumulative number of recurrent events over time. A simple nonparametric estimator for this quantity is presented. It is shown that the estimator, properly normalized, converges weakly to a zero-mean Gaussian process with an easily estimable covariance function. Nonparametric statistics for comparing two mean frequency functions and for combining data on recurrent events and death are also developed. The asymptotic null distributions of these statistics, together with consistent variance estimators, are derived. The small-sample properties of the proposed estimators and test statistics are examined through simulation studies. An application to a cancer clinical trial is provided.
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1. Introduction

In many clinical and epidemiological studies, subjects can potentially experience recurrent events. Examples include transient ischemic attacks in patients with cerebrovascular disease (Hobson et al., 1993), repeated seizures in epileptic patients (Albert, 1991), tumor recurrences in cancer patients (Byar, 1980), and recurrent opportunistic infections in HIV patients (Li and Lagakos, 1997). Often, the recurrence of serious events, such as tumors and opportunistic infections, is associated with an elevated risk of death so that the subject dies during the course of the study.

As an example, let us consider the well-known bladder tumor clinical trial conducted by the Veterans Administration Co-operative Urological Research Group (Byar, 1980). A total of 117 patients with superficial bladder tumors were randomly assigned to placebo, pyridoxine (vitamin B6), or thiotepa. The goal of the study was to determine the effectiveness of pyridoxine and thiotepa in reducing the rate of tumor recurrence. By the end of follow-up, there were 87, 57, and 45 recurrences among the 48, 31, and 38 patients in the placebo, pyridoxine, and thiotepa groups, respectively. Some patients died before any tumor recurrence, while others died after recurrences. There were 11, 7, and 12 observed deaths in the placebo, pyridoxine, and thiotepa groups, respectively.

Many authors (e.g., Andersen and Gill, 1982; Wei, Lin, and Weissfeld, 1989; Pepe and Cai, 1993; Lawless and Nadeau, 1995) have developed methods for analyzing recurrent events. All these methods, however, assume that recurrent events are not terminated by death during the study. Some efforts have been made in recent years to account for death in the analysis of recurrent events. In particular, Cook and Lawless (1997) studied the rate function of recurrence conditional on survival.

Li and Lagakos (1997) modeled the cause-specific hazard function (Kalbfleisch and Prentice, 1980, p. 167) for each recurrence by treating death as the competing risk. One could also model the intensity function of the recurrence process within the framework of multivariate counting processes (Andersen et al., 1993, Section II.4.1). Neither the cause-specific hazard function nor the intensity function characterizes the subject's ultimate recurrence experience.

In this article, we develop one- and two-sample nonparametric methods based on the marginal mean of the cumulative number of recurrent events over time. This quantity, to be referred to as the mean frequency function, incorporates the fact that subjects who die cannot experience any further recurrent events. Cook and Lawless (1997) suggested an estimator for this function but did not study its properties. As will be shown later, there is an intimate connection between the mean frequency function and the cumulative incidence function for the classical competing risks data (Kalbfleisch and Prentice, 1980, p. 168).

The course of this article is as follows. In Section 2, we study the nonparametric estimation of the mean frequency function. In Section 3, we develop nonparametric statistics for comparing two mean frequency functions. The issue of combining information about recurrent events and death is also addressed. In Section 4, we report the results of some simulation studies. In Section 5, the proposed methods are applied to the aforementioned bladder tumor clinical trial. Some concluding remarks are given in Section 6.

2. One-Sample Estimation

Let \( D \) denote the survival time and \( N^*(t) \) denote the number of recurrent events that occur in the time interval \([0, t]\). Naturally, subjects who die cannot experience any further recurrences.
current events so that \( N^*() \) does not jump after \( D \). Let \( C \) be the follow-up or censoring time, which is assumed to be independent of both \( D \) and \( N^*() \). Note, however, that we make no assumptions regarding the dependence among the recurrent events or the dependence between \( N^*() \) and \( D \). Because of censoring, \( D \) and \( N^*() \) may not be fully observed. Instead, one observes \( \{N(.), X, \delta\} \), where \( N(t) = N^*(t \wedge C) \), \( X = D \wedge C \), and \( \delta = I(\{D \leq C\}) \). Here and in the sequel, \( a \wedge b = \min(a, b) \) and \( I(.) \) is the indicator function. The observations \( \{N_i(.), X_i, \delta_i\} \ (i = 1, \ldots, n) \) are assumed to be independent replicates of \( \{N(.), X, \delta\} \). For technical reasons, we assume that there exists a constant \( \tau \) such that \( \Pr(X \geq \tau) > 0 \).

The mean frequency function is defined as \( \mu(t) = \mathbb{E}\{N^*(t)\} \). This is the marginal expected number of recurrent events up to \( t \) per subject, acknowledging the fact that no subject can experience any further recurrent event after death. This quantity has a clear clinical meaning and is interpretable regardless of what the distributions of \( D \) and \( N^*() \) are.

It is easy to see that

\[
\mu(t) = \int_0^t S(u)dR(u),
\]

where \( S(t) = \Pr(D \geq t) \) and \( dR(t) = \mathbb{E}\{dN^*(t) \mid D \geq t\} \). This representation suggests an obvious estimator. Specifically, let \( \hat{S}(t) \) be the Kaplan–Meier estimator of \( S(t) \) based on \( (X_i, \delta_i) \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, n) \) and let \( \hat{R}(t) \) be the Nelson–Aalen estimator for \( R(t) \) based on the recurrence data, i.e.,

\[
\hat{R}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{dN_i(u)}{\sum_{j=1}^n Y_j(u)},
\]

where \( Y_i(t) = I(X_i \geq t) \). Then \( \mu(t) \) is estimated by

\[
\hat{\mu}(t) = \int_0^t \hat{S}(u)d\hat{R}(u).
\]

This estimator was mentioned briefly by Cook and Lawless (1997). These authors did not study the asymptotic properties of \( \hat{\mu}(t) \), although they discussed the variance estimation for Nelson–Aalen-type estimators.

In the absence of death, \( \hat{\mu}(t) \) reduces to \( \hat{R}(t) \). In the presence of death, \( \hat{\mu}(t) < \hat{R}(t) \) for \( t \) greater than the first observed death. Thus, the Nelson–Aalen estimator (treating death as a censoring event for recurrences) generally overestimates the mean frequency function whether or not the death and recurrence processes are independent. If the event of interest can occur at most one time such that \( N^*(t) \) is a one-jump counting process, then \( \hat{\mu}(t) \) reduces to the estimator of the cumulative incidence function for the event of interest, with death acting as a competing risk (Gray, 1988; Pepe and Mori, 1993; Lin, 1997).

Let \( N^j_D(t) = I(X_i \leq t, \delta_i = 1) \) and \( \hat{Y}(t) = \Sigma_{i=1}^n Y_i(t) \). Also let \( \hat{M}(t) = \Sigma_{i=1}^n \hat{I}(t) \hat{Y}(t) - \hat{Y}(t)d\hat{R}(t), \) and \( \hat{M}^j_D(t) = N^j_D(t) - \hat{I}(t) \hat{Y}(t)d\hat{R}(t). \) Note that \( \hat{M}(t) \) is the Nelson–Aalen estimator for the cumulative hazard function of death \( \Lambda_D(t) \). We show in Appendix A.1 that \( n^{1/2}(\hat{\mu}(t) - \mu(t)) \) converges weakly to a mean-zero Gaussian process whose covariance function at \( (s, t) \) can be consistently estimated by

\[
\hat{\xi}(s, t) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\psi}_i(s)\hat{\psi}_i(t),
\]

where

\[
\hat{\psi}_i(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\hat{S}(u)d\hat{M}_i(u)}{\hat{Y}(u)n} - \hat{\mu}(t) \int_0^t \frac{d\hat{M}_i(u)}{\hat{Y}(u)n} + \int_0^t \frac{\hat{\mu}(u)d\hat{M}_i(u)}{\hat{Y}(u)n}.
\]

For any fixed time point \( t \), the asymptotic normality of \( \hat{\mu}(t) \), along with the consistent variance estimator \( \hat{\xi}(t, t) \), allows one to construct pointwise confidence intervals for \( \mu(t) \). Since \( \mu(t) \) is a nonnegative function, we consider the transformed variable \( n^{1/2}[\log(\hat{\mu}(t)) - \log(\mu(t))] \), which has a distribution asymptotically equal to that of \( n^{1/2}(\hat{\mu}(t) - \mu(t))/\mu(t) \) for \( \mu(t) > 0 \). With the logarithmic transformation, an approximate \((1 - \alpha)\) pointwise confidence interval for \( \mu(t) \) is given by

\[
\hat{\mu}(t)e^{\pm n^{-1/2}z_{\alpha/2}^2(1/2,t,t)/\hat{\mu}(t)},
\]

where \( z_{\alpha/2} \) is the upper \( 100\alpha/2 \) percentile of the standard normal distribution.

3. Two-Sample Testing

In this section, we consider the comparison of the mean frequency functions for recurrent events between two treatment groups. In many situations, one is primarily interested in the recurrent events, and death is treated as a nuisance. In other situations, especially when the death rates are high, it may be desirable to examine evidence from both endpoints. These two types of situations are dealt with in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively.

3.1 Comparing Mean Frequency Functions

The null hypothesis to be tested is that the mean frequency functions are the same between the two treatment groups. For the classical competing risks problem, nonparametric statistics for testing the equality of two cumulative incidence functions have been proposed by Gray (1988), Pepe and Mori (1993), and Lin (1997). Perhaps the most appealing of these statistics is that of Gray because, in the case when there is no competing risk, the Gray test reduces to the familiar log-rank test for survival data. On the other hand, the Pepe–Mori test may be more powerful against alternatives in which the cumulative incidence for one group is consistently higher than that of the other. In this section, analogs of the Gray and Pepe–Mori tests are developed for the mean frequency function.

Let \( \mu_1(t) \) and \( \mu_2(t) \) denote the mean frequency functions for groups 1 and 2. The hypothesis to be tested is \( H_0: \mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t) \) for all \( t \). Let \( n_j \) be the number of subjects in the \( j \)th group \( (j = 1, 2) \) and let \( n = n_1 + n_2 \). Also, let \( \hat{\mu}_j(t) \) be the estimator of the mean frequency function for the \( j \)th group. As in the one-sample case, a constant \( \tau_j \) is assumed for the \( j \)th group. Denote \( \tau = \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \). According to the results of Section 2, \( n_j^{1/2}(\hat{\mu}_j(t) - \mu_j(t)) \) converges weakly to a mean-zero Gaussian process with a covariance function
that can be consistently estimated by

\[ \hat{\xi}_j(s, t) = n_j^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \hat{\Psi}_{ji}(s) \hat{\Psi}_{ji}(t), \quad j = 1, 2, \]

where \( \hat{\Psi}_{ji} \) is an obvious modification of \( \hat{\Psi}_i \) given in (2.2) for the \( j \)th group. These results provide the theoretical basis for constructing the desired two-sample statistics.

The analog of the Gray statistic for the mean frequency function is given by

\[ Q_{LR} = \int_0^\tau \dot{K}_{LR}(t) d\{\hat{\mu}_1(t) - \hat{\mu}_2(t)\}, \]

where \( \dot{K}_{LR}(t) \) is a weight function based on the observed data. We will refer to \( Q_{LR} \) as the generalized weighted log-rank statistic. If there is no death, then \( Q_{LR} \) reduces to the statistic of Cook, Lawless, and Nadeau (1996). The weight function analogous to that of the familiar log-rank statistic is

\[ \dot{K}_{LR}(t) = \frac{\hat{Y}_1(t)\hat{Y}_2(t)}{\hat{Y}_1(t) + \hat{Y}_2(t)} \frac{n}{n_1n_2}, \]

(3.1)

where \( \hat{Y}_j(t) \) represents the number of subjects in the \( j \)th group who are at risk at time \( t \).

Our extension of the Pepe-Mori statistic is given by

\[ Q_{GT} = \int_0^\tau \dot{K}_{GT}(t) \{\hat{\mu}_1(t) - \hat{\mu}_2(t)\} dt, \]

where \( \dot{K}_{GT}(t) \) is a weight function generally different from \( \dot{K}_{LR}(t) \). Clearly, \( Q_{GT} \) with a positive \( \dot{K}_{GT} \) will be consistent against the alternatives \( H_1: \mu_1(t) \geq \mu_2(t) \) or \( \mu_1(t) \leq \mu_2(t) \) with strict inequality for some \( t \in [0, \tau] \). We will refer to \( Q_{GT} \) as the generalized t-statistic because it reduces to the conventional t-statistic if there is a single event and no censoring. The weight function \( \dot{K}_{GT} \) needs to satisfy certain technical characteristics (Pepe and Fleming, 1989).

One suitable choice is

\[ \dot{K}_{GT}(t) = \frac{n\hat{H}_1(t)\hat{H}_2(t)}{n_1\hat{H}_1(t) + n_2\hat{H}_2(t)}, \]

(3.2)

where \( \hat{H}_j(\cdot) \) is the Kaplan-Meier estimator for the survival function of the censoring time in the \( j \)th group (\( j = 1, 2 \)).

We show in Appendix A.2 that, under \( H_0^* \), the random vector \( \mathbf{T} = (n_1n_2/n)^{1/2}(Q_{LR}, Q_D)' \) converges in distribution to a mean-zero bivariate normal vector with a covariance matrix that can be consistently estimated by \( \Sigma \). Thus, the quadratic form \( Q_T = \mathbf{T}'\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{T} \) is asymptotically chi-squared with 2 d.f.

We can construct a 1 d.f. test by taking a linear combination of \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_D \). Specifically, define the combined statistic \( Q_{WCT} = pQ_{LR} + (1-p)Q_D \) (\( 0 \leq p \leq 1 \)). We show in Appendix A.2 that, under \( H_0^* \), \( (n_1n_2/n)^{1/2}Q_{WCT} \) converges in distribution to a mean-zero normal random variable with a variance consistently estimated by \( \sigma_{WCT}^2 \). Thus, the test statistic \( Q'_{WCT} = (n_1n_2/n)^{1/2}Q_{WCT}/\sigma_{WCT} \) is asymptotically standard normal under \( H_0^* \). The choice of \( p \) depends on the relative importance of the two endpoints as well as on the anticipated treatment effects on the two endpoints. It can be any value and may even be data dependent; however, the decision on how to choose \( p \) must be made before examining the data. In the sequel, we set \( p = 0.5 \) and denote the resulting test statistic by \( Q_{CT} \). The choice of \( p \) is further discussed in Section 5.

We can also test the umbrella hypothesis \( H_0^* \) sequentially against the one-sided alternatives that the treatment is beneficial, along the lines of Wei et al. (1989). To be specific, let \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_D \) denote the standardized values of \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_D \). Without loss of generality, assume that positive \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_D \) correspond to beneficial treatment effects. Suppose that \( Q_{LR} \geq Q_D \). Let \( (V_1, V_2) \) be a bivariate normal vector with zero mean, unit variances, and with a correlation that is equal to the estimated covariance between \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_D \) based on \( \Sigma \). Define the subhypotheses \( H_{0j}: \mu_j(t) = \mu_2(t) \) and \( H_{20}: \Lambda_j^D(t) = \Lambda_2^D(t) \). One rejects \( H_0 \) if \( \text{Pr}\{\max(V_1, V_2) \geq \alpha\} \leq \alpha; \) if \( H_{10} \) is rejected, then one rejects \( H_{20} \) if \( \text{Pr}(V_2 \geq Q_D) \leq \alpha \). The tests will be performed in the reverse order if \( Q_{LR} < Q_D \). It can be shown that the overall type I error rate for this multiple testing procedure is \( \alpha \). The procedure for testing two-sided alternatives can be developed in a similar fashion.
Each of the three proposed tests maintains a proper overall type I error rate and enables one to make a single probability statement regarding the effects of treatment on both the recurrent events and survival. The combined test tends to be more powerful than the quadratic-form test, the sequential test, and the separate tests (without adjusting for the effects of multiple comparisons) if the treatment effects on the two endpoints are similar but is not powerful if the two treatment effects are in the opposite directions. Neither the quadratic form or the combined test indicates with respect to which endpoint the treatment effect is significant when the umbrella hypothesis $H_0^+$ is rejected. By contrast, the sequential testing procedure enables one to determine on which endpoint the treatment has a beneficial effect.

4. Simulation Studies

Numerical studies were conducted to assess the finite-sample properties of the statistics proposed in the previous sections. We first examined the one-sample estimator $\hat{\mu}(t)$. The survival time and the gap times for recurrent events were all exponential random variables. To create the dependence among these variables, we used Gumbel (1960)'s bivariate exponential distribution with correlation $\rho$. To be specific, $\rho$ is the correlation between the first recurrent time and survival time as well as the common correlation between any two successive gap times. We set $\rho = 0, 0.0625, 0.125,$ and 0.25. Marginally, the survival time was exponential with rate $\lambda^S = 0.25$, while each gap time was exponential with rate $\lambda = 1$. The censoring time was a uniform $[0, 10]$ random variable, which resulted in approximately two observed events per subject. We set $n = 50$ and 100. For each simulation setting, 10,000 samples were generated. The summary statistics from these studies are presented in Table 1. The estimator $\hat{\mu}(t)$ is practically unbiased for every $t$. The standard error estimator has little bias and the confidence intervals have reasonable coverage probabilities, at least for $n = 100$.

We also assessed the behavior of the generalized $t$-statistic $Q_{CT}$, the generalized weighted log-rank statistic $Q_{LR}$, and the combined statistic $Q_{CT}$. The weight functions given in (3.1) and (3.2) were used. The survival time and recurrent event times were generated in a manner similar to the one-sample case. For the $j$th group, the survival time was exponential with rate $\lambda^D_j$, while the gap times were exponential with rate $\lambda_j$. The censoring distribution was the same as in the one-sample case. We considered $n_1 = n_2 = 50$ and 100. For each setting, 2000 simulation samples were generated. The value of $\tau$ was the last observed event time. The results are displayed in Table 2.

All three statistics maintain their type I errors around the nominal level. The generalized $t$-statistic and log-rank statistic have similar power characteristics. When there is a difference in recurrence but no difference in survival, the use of the combined statistic results in a loss in power as compared

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation summary statistics for $\hat{\mu}(t)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n = 50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $E\{\hat{\mu}(t)\}$, empirical mean of $\hat{\mu}(t)$; SE, empirical standard error of $\hat{\mu}(t)$; SEE, empirical mean of the standard error estimates; CP, coverage probability of the 95% confidence interval.
to the statistics for recurrent events alone. However, when there are differences in both endpoints, the combined statistic tends to be more powerful.

In response to a referee's suggestion, we evaluated the sizes of the proposed tests when \( \mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t) \) but the survival experiences are different between the two groups. The survival functions for the two groups, \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \), and the corresponding recurrence rates (conditional on survival), \( dR_1 \) and \( dR_2 \), were chosen to satisfy the random-effects models,

\[
S_2(t \mid \psi) = S_1(t \mid \psi)\theta,
\]

\[
dR_2(t \mid \psi) = S_1(t \mid \psi)^1 - \theta dR_1(t \mid \psi),
\]

where \( \psi \) is a gamma random variable with mean one and variance \( \sigma^2 \). For nonzero \( \sigma^2 \), the recurrence times and survival time are positively correlated. We set \( S_1(t \mid \psi) = e^{-0.2\theta t} \) and \( R_1(t \mid \psi) = \psi t \). The censoring time was a uniform \([0, \tau]\) random variable, which yielded an average of about two observed recurrences per subject. For each simulation setting, 2000 samples were generated. The results are given in Table 3. Again, the proposed tests maintain their sizes around the nominal level, at least for moderately large samples.

### 5. A Real Example

We now apply the methods developed in Sections 2 and 3 to the bladder tumor study described in Section 1. We will focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \rho )</th>
<th>( \lambda_2^D )</th>
<th>( \lambda_2 )</th>
<th>( n_1 = n_2 = 50 )</th>
<th>( n_1 = n_2 = 100 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survival time and the gap times for recurrent events were drawn from the bivariate exponential distribution (Gumbel, 1960) with rates \( \lambda_2^D \) and \( \lambda_2 \) for the jth group; \( \lambda_1^D = 0.25 \) and \( \lambda_1 = 1 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>( \sigma^2 )</th>
<th>( n_1 = n_2 = 50 )</th>
<th>( n_1 = n_2 = 100 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The survival time and recurrence event times were generated from the random-effects models \( S_2(t \mid \psi) = S_1(t \mid \psi)^\theta \), \( dR_2(t \mid \psi) = S_1(t \mid \psi)^1 - \theta dR_1(t \mid \psi) \), where \( \psi \) is a gamma random variable with mean one and variance \( \sigma^2 \).
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Figure 1. Estimated mean number of recurrences by treatment group: solid line, placebo; dashed line, thiotepa.

on the comparison between thiotepa and placebo. Thiotepa is a member of the class of alkylating agents, which were among the first anticancer drugs used. Alkylating agents are highly reactive and bind to certain chemical groups found in nucleic acids. These compounds inhibit proper synthesis of DNA and RNA, which leads to apoptosis or cell death. However, since alkylating agents cannot discriminate between cancerous and normal cells, both types of cells will be affected by this therapy. For example, normal cells can become cancerous due to alkylating agents. Thus, thiotepa is a highly cytotoxic compound and can potentially have adverse effects. Consequently, the effects of thiotepa on cancer recurrence and death are not obvious.

Figure 1 displays the estimated mean frequency functions of tumor recurrence for the placebo and thiotepa groups, while Figure 2 shows the estimates and the pointwise 95% confidence limits for the placebo group. There appears to be no early difference between the two treatment groups, but over time, patients on thiotepa have a lower frequency of recurrences than the placebo patients.

For the two-sample testing, we set \( \tau \) to be the last observed event time and use weight functions (3.1) and (3.2). The observed value of \( Q_{LR} \) is 2.140, corresponding to a two-sided \( p \)-value of 0.030; the observed value of \( Q_{GT} \) is 1.958, yielding a two-sided \( p \)-value of 0.050. The observed value of \( Q_{CT} \) is 1.904, which yields a two-sided \( p \)-value of 0.056. The reason that the combined statistic is less significant than \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_{CT} \) is because the survival distributions in the two groups are very similar, as shown in Figure 3. The observed value of \( Q_D \) is 0.894. The observed value of the quadratic form \( Q_T \) is 4.65, yielding a two-sided \( p \)-value of 0.098, which is less significant than the \( Q_{CT} \) test.

The main treatment difference appears to be that the patients on thiotepa have fewer recurrences than those on placebo. This is borne out by using the sequential testing procedure. In this case, \( (Q_{LR}, Q_D) = (2.140, 0.894) \) and the estimated correlation between \( Q_{LR} \) and \( Q_D \) is 0.523. Since \( Q_{LR} > Q_D \), we test \( H_{10}: \mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t) \) first and \( H_{20}: \Lambda_1^P(t) = \Lambda_2^P(t) \) second. By numerical integration, \( \Pr(\max(V_1, V_2) > 2.140) = 0.030 \) and \( \Pr(V_2 \geq 0.894) = 0.190 \). Thus, at the one-sided significance level of 0.05 or two-sided significance level of 0.10, we reject \( H_{10} \) in favor of thiotepa and fail to reject \( H_{20} \), as expected.

6. Discussion

In this article, we develop nonparametric methods for making inferences about the mean function of the recurrent events in

Figure 2. Estimated mean frequency function and associated 95% pointwise confidence limits for the placebo group: solid line, estimated mean frequency function; dotted line, 95% pointwise confidence limits.

Figure 3. Estimated survival distributions by treatment group: solid line, placebo; dashed line, thiotepa.
the presence of death. If the event cannot recur, then the proposed methods reduce to those of Gray (1988), Pepe and Mori (1993), and Lin (1997) for the cumulative incidence function of competing risks. On the other hand, if there is no death, then the proposed methods reduce to those of Pepe and Cai (1993), Lawless and Nadeau (1995), Cook et al. (1996), and others for recurrent events. Thus, the proposed methodology merges the existing literature on recurrent events with that of competing risks.

A truncation time \( \tau \) has been assumed for the two-sample statistics. One can extend \( \tau \) to \( \infty \) by setting the weight function in the statistics to zero for \( t \) greater than \( \tau \). As shown by the simulation results, one can take \( \tau \) to be the last observed event time so that all the data are used in the analysis.

For censored survival data, the asymptotic efficiency of the weighted log-rank statistic has been well studied (Gill, 1980, Chapter 5). It does not seem possible to find an optimal weight for \( Q_{L.R} \). This was noted by Gray (1988) in the special case of the cumulative incidence function. Given the weight functions, however, one can choose an optimal value of \( p \) that maximizes the power of \( Q_{W.C.T} \), along the lines of Wei et al. (1989).

In this article, we have concentrated on the one- and two-sample problems. It would also be desirable to develop regression methods. One could extend the approach of Cheng, Fine, and Wei (1998) by modeling \( \lambda(t) \) and \( dR(t) \) with proportional hazards and proportional rates models, respectively. It might be more appealing to model \( \mu(t) \) directly. Both of these approaches are currently under investigation.
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RÉSUMÉ

L'analyse d'événements récurrents en présence d'un événement terminal tel que le décès fait l'objet de cet article. Nous considérons une fonction de fréquence moyenne, définie comme la moyenne marginale du nombre cumulé d'événements récurrents au cours du temps. Un estimateur non paramétrique simple de cette quantité est présenté. Il est montré que cet estimateur, correctement normé, converge vers un processus gaussien de moyenne zéro, et dont la fonction de covariance est facilement estimable. Des tests non paramétriques permettant de comparer deux fonctions de fréquence moyenne et de prendre en compte simultanément les événements récurrents et les décès sont aussi proposés. Les distributions asymptotiques de ces statistiques sous l'hypothèse nulle, ainsi que des estimateurs de variance conséquents sont calculés. Des études de simulation permettent d'examiner les propriétés des estimateurs proposés et des statistiques de tests en cas de petits échantillons. Une application aux données d'un essai clinique en cancérologie est présentée.

REFERENCES


Received November 1998. Revised July 1999. Accepted August 1999.

**APPENDIX**

Derivations of Asymptotic Results

A.1. One-Sample Estimator

By the definitions of $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$, we have

$$n^{1/2} \{ \hat{\mu}(t) - \mu(t) \} = n^{1/2} \int_0^t \hat{S}(u) d \{ \hat{R}(u) - R(u) \} + n^{1/2} \int_0^t \{ \hat{S}(u) - S(u) \} d R(u). \tag{A.1}$$

Due to the asymptotic equivalence of $\hat{S}(\cdot)$ and $e^{-\Delta^D(\cdot)}$, the second term on the right-hand side of (A.1) is

$$n^{1/2} \int_0^t \{ \hat{S}(u) - S(u) \} d R(u) = -n^{1/2} \int_0^t \{ \hat{\Lambda}^D(u) - \Lambda^D(u) \} d \mu(u) + o_P(1). \tag{A.2}$$

For $t \leq \max_i X_i$, we have

$$n^{1/2} \{ \Lambda^D(t) - \hat{\Lambda}^D(t) \} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d M_i^D(u)}{\pi(u)n}, \tag{A.3}$$

where $M_i^D(t) = N_i(t) - \int_0^t Y_i(u)d\Lambda^D(u)$. It then follows from the martingale central limit theorem (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Theorem 5.3.5) that

$$n^{1/2} \{ \hat{\Lambda}^D(t) - \Lambda^D(t) \} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d M_i^D(u)}{\pi(u)} + o_P(1), \tag{A.4}$$

where $\pi(t) = \Pr(X \geq t)$. Integrating the right-hand side of (A.2) by parts and using representation (A.4), we get that

$$n^{1/2} \int_0^t \{ \hat{S}(u) - S(u) \} d R(u) = -n^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mu(t) \int_0^t \frac{d M_i^D(u)}{\pi(u)} - \int_0^t \frac{\mu(u)d M_i^D(u)}{\pi(u)} \right\} + o_P(1). \tag{A.5}$$

By the consistency of the Kaplan–Meier estimator (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, p. 115), the first term on the right-hand side of (A.1) is

$$n^{1/2} \int_0^t \hat{S}(u) d \{ \hat{R}(u) - R(u) \} = n^{1/2} \int_0^t S(u) d \{ \hat{R}(u) - R(u) \} + o_P(1). \tag{A.6}$$

For $t \leq \max_i X_i$,

$$n^{1/2} \{ \hat{R}(t) - R(t) \} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d M_i(u)}{\hat{Y}(u)/n}, \tag{A.7}$$

where $M_i(t) = N_i(t) - \int_0^t Y_i(u)dR(u)$. Although the right-hand side of (A.7) takes a similar form to that of (A.3), its asymptotic properties are much more difficult to derive because, unlike the $M_i^D(\cdot)$’s, the $M_i(\cdot)$’s are not martingales, so the martingale central limit theorem is not applicable. Using some tools from the empirical process theory, however, we can show that

$$n^{1/2} \{ \hat{R}(t) - R(t) \} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{d M_i(u)}{\pi(u)} + o_P(1), \tag{A.8}$$

which implies that

$$n^{1/2} \int_0^t \hat{S}(u) d \{ \hat{R}(u) - R(u) \} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{S(u)}{\pi(u)} d M_i(u) + o_P(1). \tag{A.9}$$

The arguments leading from (A.7) to (A.8) are very delicate and are thus omitted here. The interested reader is referred to the Appendix of Lin, Wei, and Ying (1998) for a similar proof in a related context.

In view of (A.1), (A.5), and (A.9), we have

$$n^{1/2} \{ \hat{\mu}(t) - \mu(t) \} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_i(t) + o_P(1), \tag{A.10}$$

where

$$\Psi_i(t) = \int_0^t \frac{S(u)}{\pi(u)} d M_i(u) - \mu(t) \int_0^t \frac{d M_i^D(u)}{\pi(u)} + \int_0^t \frac{\mu(u)d M_i^D(u)}{\pi(u)}. \tag{A.11}$$

For any fixed $t$, $\Psi_i(t)$ ($i = 1, \ldots, n$) are i.i.d. mean-zero random variables. Thus, the finite-dimensional normality of (A.10) follows from the classical central limit theorem. By the arguments given in the proof of Theorem 1 of Lin et al. (1998), we can show that (A.10) is tight and thus converges weakly to a centered Gaussian process. The limiting covariance function at the pair of time points $(s, t)$ is given by

$$Q(s, t) = E[\Psi_s(s)\Psi_t(t)].$$

It is natural to estimate $Q(s, t)$ by $\hat{Q}(s, t)$, where

$$\hat{Q}(s, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\Psi}_i(s)\hat{\Psi}_i(t),$$

where $\hat{\Psi}_i(t)$ is obtained by replacing all the unknown parameters in $\Psi_i(t)$ with their respective sample estimators, as given in (2.2). The consistency of $\hat{Q}$ follows from the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3 of Lin et al. (1998).

A.2. Two-Sample Statistics

Let $\rho_j = \lim_{n \to \infty} n_j/n$ ($j = 1, 2$). Assume that $\hat{K}_{LR}(t)$ converges to a bounded function $K_{LR}(t)$ uniformly on $[0, \tau]$. Then under $H_0$: $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t)$ for all $t$,

$$\left( \frac{n_1n_2}{n} \right)^{1/2} Q_{LR} = \left( \frac{n_1n_2}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$
According to (A.10),
\[ n_1^{1/2} \{ \bar{\mu}_j(t) - \mu_j(t) \} = n_j^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \Psi_{ji}(t) + o_P(1), \quad j = 1, 2, \]
where \( \Psi_{ji}(t) \) is the expression of \( \Psi_i(t) \) for the \( j \)th group \( (j = 1, 2) \). Thus, the right-hand side of (A.11) is equal to
\[ \left( \frac{n_1}{n} \right)^{1/2} n_1^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) d\Psi_{11}(t) \]
\[ - \left( \frac{n_1}{n} \right)^{1/2} n_2^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) d\Psi_{21}(t) + o_P(1), \]
(A.12)
which is essentially the difference of two independent sums of i.i.d. mean-zero random variables. It then follows from the classical central limit theorem that \((n_1 n_2/n)^{1/2} Q_{LR}\) converges to a mean-zero normal random variable with variance
\[ \sigma_{LR}^2 = \rho_2 E \left\{ \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) d\Psi_{11}(t) \right\}^2 + \rho_1 E \left\{ \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) d\Psi_{21}(t) \right\}^2. \]
The estimator \( \hat{\sigma}_{LR}^2 \) given in (3.3) is obtained from \( \sigma_{LR}^2 \) by replacing all the unknown quantities with their empirical counterparts. The consistency of \( \hat{\sigma}_{LR}^2 \) follows from the kind of arguments given in the proof of Theorem 3 of Lin et al. (1998).

In a similar manner, we can show that, under \( H_0 \), the generalized t-statistic \((n_1 n_2/n)^{1/2} Q_{GT}\) converges to mean-zero normal random variable with variance
\[ \sigma_{GT}^2 = \rho_2 E \left\{ \int_0^T K_{GT}(t) d\Psi_{11}(t) dt \right\}^2 + \rho_1 E \left\{ \int_0^T K_{GT}(t) d\Psi_{21}(t) dt \right\}^2, \]
where \( K_{GT} \) is the limit of \( \hat{K}_{GT} \). A consistent estimator for \( \sigma_{GT}^2 \) is given in (3.4).

We now derive the asymptotic distributions of \( T \) and \( Q_{WCT} \) under \( H_0^* \): \( \mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t) \) and \( \Lambda_{D_j}(t) = \Lambda_D^*(t) \) for all \( t \). By the martingale central limit theorem (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Theorem 5.3.5),
\[ \left( \frac{n_1 n_2}{n} \right)^{1/2} Q_D \]
\[ = \left( \frac{n_1}{n} \right)^{1/2} n_1^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) dM_{D_i}(t) \]
\[ - \left( \frac{n_1}{n} \right)^{1/2} n_2^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) dM_{D_i}(t) + o_P(1), \]
(A.13)
where \( M_{D_i}(t) \) and \( \pi_j(t) \) are the expressions of \( M_j^D(t) \) and \( \pi(t) \) for the \( j \)th group \( (j = 1, 2) \). Because both (A.12) and the right-hand side of (A.13) are sums of i.i.d. mean-zero random variables, the classical multivariate central limit theorem implies that, under \( H_0^* \), \( T \) converges in distribution to a bivariate normal vector with mean zero and covariance matrix \( \Sigma = \rho_2 E(V_{11} V'_{11}) + \rho_1 E(V_{12} V'_{21}) \), where \( V_{ji} = \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) d\Psi_{ji}(t), \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) d\Psi_{ji}(t)/\pi_j(t) \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, n_j; j = 1, 2) \). It also follows from (A.12) and (A.13) that
\[ \left( \frac{n_1 n_2}{n} \right)^{1/2} Q_{WCT} = \left( \frac{n_2}{n} \right)^{1/2} n_1^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} U_{1i} \]
\[ - \left( \frac{n_1}{n} \right)^{1/2} n_2^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} U_{2i} + o_P(1), \]
where \( U_{ji} = \int_0^T K_{LR}(t) \{ p d\Psi_{ji}(t) + (1 - p) dM_{D_i}(t)/\pi_j(t) \} \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, n_j; j = 1, 2) \). Because the \( U_{ji} \)'s are i.i.d. mean-zero random variables, the classical central limit theorem implies that \( Q_{WCT} \) converges to a mean-zero normal random variable with variance \( \sigma_{WCT}^2 = \rho_2 E(U_{11}^2) + \rho_1 E(U_{21}^2) \). Replacing all the unknown quantities in \( \Sigma \) and \( \sigma_{WCT}^2 \) with their respective empirical counterparts yields consistent estimators \( \hat{\Sigma} \) and \( \hat{\sigma}_{WCT}^2 \).