

ESTIMATION FOR A SIMPLE EXPONENTIAL MODEL

Richard G. Cornell
Department of Statistics
Florida State University

Janace A. Speckman
Statistical Engineering Laboratory
National Bureau of Standards

GPO PRICE \$ _____

CFSTI PRICE(S) \$ _____

February 24, 1966

Hard copy (HC) 3.00

Microfiche (MF) .65

ff 653 July 65

Technical Report Number 3

NASA Grant No. NGR-10-004-029

FACILITY FORM 602

N67-17765

(ACCESSION NUMBER)

28
(PAGES)

CR 70495
(NASA CR OR TMX OR AD NUMBER)

(THRU)

(CODE)

(CATEGORY)

~~RECEIVED~~
~~NASA~~

ESTIMATION FOR A SIMPLE EXPONENTIAL MODEL

Richard G. Cornell, Ph.D.

and

Janace A. Speckman, M.S.


There are many situations of interest in public health where an estimate is required for the parameter ρ in the model

$$Y = 1 - e^{-\rho t} . \quad (1)$$

In this situation Y represents the expected value of a proportion y calculated from a count of the number of "reactions" among n independent observations and t is a variable such as time or dosage.

This model has been applied to histoplasma sensitivity conversion rates by Manos¹⁷ where in his paper Y is the theoretical proportion of positive reactors to histoplasma at time t in years after the initial conversions take place. It is assumed that n_y , the number of positive reactors out of n people tested at time t , has a binomial distribution with mean nY . Then ρ is interpreted as the instantaneous annual conversion rate. Manos developed a weighted least squares method of estimating ρ by calculating a straight line relationship between $(-\log_e y)$ and t . This estimation procedure was also studied earlier by Fisher¹² and has been discussed by several other authors.

Peto¹⁹ has discussed another situation where the model is applicable. Here Y is the proportional of test animals which would not be expected to survive after administration of a dose of t micro-organisms. The actual number who fail to survive, n_y , is assumed to have a binomial distribution. Peto developed an iterative maximum likelihood estimation procedure for this



model and presented tables to facilitate calculations. Finney^{8,9} considered the same bioassay model as Peto and developed slightly different iterative calculation schemes for maximum likelihood estimation. Johnson and Brown¹⁵ and Fisher¹¹ considered a similar situation except that they specified the dosages to be those which would be used in a serial dilution biological assay. Both/^{the}Johnson and Brown and the Fisher papers present estimation procedures for such assays.

Another example is an experiment in genetics performed by Edington, Epler and Regan⁷ to study the frequency-dose relation of X-ray induced Y-suppressed lethals in drosophila. The model was fitted to data on orthodox lethals where y is the proportion of orthodox lethals found at a dose of t roentgens of X-rays. For a given dosage it is again reasonable to assume that ny has a binomial distribution, where n is the number of chromosomes tested. In radiation genetics and virology the model (1) is called the one-particle or one-hit curve. The derivation of the model in these contexts was discussed more fully by Cochran.⁴

These examples illustrate a variety of situations in which the simple exponential model is encountered. The importance of this model in epidemiology was discussed more fully by Muench¹⁸, who also gave a nomogram which can be used in estimating ρ . Muench called the model (1) the simple catalytic curve. He points out that this model will arise whenever the change in Y for a small change in t is proportional to Y . The proportionality constant or rate of change is ρ .

The references discussed above also indicate that a variety of methods

are being used to estimate the parameter ρ in (1). In this paper several of these methods will be presented, illustrated and compared in order to guide the public health or medical investigator who encounters this model in his research. In the examples cited it is reasonable to assume that n_y , the observed count, has a binomial distribution for each value of t . All of the methods discussed in this paper may be applied under this assumption although some of them do not require this assumption and one involves a different assumption.

METHODS OF ESTIMATION

Graphical. Values of $u = [-\log_e(1-y)]$ are plotted against the corresponding t values in the graphical method of estimating ρ . A straight line is drawn through the origin by eye to describe the graphical relationship. The slope of this line is an estimate r_g of ρ .

Maximum Likelihood. As mentioned earlier, Peto¹⁹ has derived the maximum likelihood estimator of ρ for the situation where n_y has a binomial distribution for each value of t . Consider k samples of size n_i taken at various values of t_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. The binomial probability at t_i is $Y = 1 - \exp(-\rho t_i)$. Let y_i be the proportion of the n_i at time t_i exhibiting the characteristic of interest. Using this notation, the equation for the maximum likelihood estimator r_{ml} of ρ becomes

$$f(r_{ml}) = - \sum_i n_i t_i + \frac{1}{r_{ml}} \sum_i \frac{n_i y_i x_i}{1 - e^{-x_i}} = 0 \quad (2)$$

where $x_i = t_i r_{ml}$. Tables A and B of Peto's article aid in an iterative solution of equation (2) utilizing Newton's method, where in his notation $n_i(1-y_i) = r_i$.

Finney^{9,10} also presented tables to aid in calculating $r_{m\ell}$ using a different iterative calculation scheme which is patterned after that usually used in probit analysis for a similar but different bioassay model. In his book Finney¹⁰ briefly reviewed several papers on maximum likelihood estimation for this "dilution series" model.

Least Squares. The least squares estimation procedure gives a method for calculating the slope of a straight line through the origin relating $u = [-\log_e(1-y)]$ and t in such a way that the sum of squares of deviations of the u 's about the line is minimized. The slope of this line is the least squares estimate r_{ls} of ρ . It involves the assumption of homogeneity of variance of the $[-\log_e(1-y)]$ values about the fitted line. This procedure is also a maximum likelihood procedure when the $\log_e(1-y)$ values have a normal distribution with homogeneous variance. The formula for the estimator is

$$r_{ls} = \frac{-\sum_i t_i \log_e(1-y_i)}{\sum_i t_i^2} \quad (3)$$

Weighted Least Squares. If the assumption of homogeneity of variance of the u values which is inherent in using least squares estimation is not tenable, then a possible alternative is the use of weighted least squares calculations as suggested by Manos¹⁷. If we define r_{wls} to be the weighted least squares estimator of ρ , then

$$r_{wls} = \frac{-\sum_i w_i t_i \log_e(1-y_i)}{\sum_i w_i t_i^2} \quad (4)$$

Each weight w_i is chosen to be inversely proportional to the estimated variance of the corresponding u_i variable. This estimated variance is obtained through approximating u_i by the first two terms of a Taylor series expansion and it involves the assumption that each y variable for a particular value of t has a binomial distribution. It also involves approximating $E(y)$ by y for each value of t used. The weights are given by $w_i = n_i(1-y_i)/y_i$. Substitution of these weights in (4) yields

$$r_{wls} = \frac{-\sum_i [n_i(1-y_i)t_i \log_e(1-y_i)]/y_i}{\sum_i n_i(1-y_i)t_i^2/y_i} \quad (5)$$

If a given $y_i = 0$ or 1 it is common practice (for example, see Berkson¹) to replace it by $1/2n$ or $(1-1/2n)$, respectively, in order not to become involved with an indeterminate result in (5). Another procedure has been proposed by Fisher¹² for avoiding this difficulty by using the data only to obtain an initial estimate in an iterative procedure. This is discussed by Cornfield⁶ who also suggested the possibility of applying weighted least squares calculations to the $(1-y)$ proportions instead of to their logarithms. In some instances it is possible to replace indeterminate terms in (4) by the appropriate limit as y_i approaches either 0 or 1 .

Partial Totals. The method of partial totals, which has been discussed by Speckman and Cornell²⁰, consists of equating $\Sigma(1-y_i)$ to its expected value $\Sigma(1-Y_i) = \Sigma e^{-pt_i}$. If the t values are equally spaced, that is, $t_{i+1} - t_i = d$,

then, letting $v = \exp(-r_{pt}d)$, the estimation equation is

$$f(v) = v^{k+t_1/d} - v^{t_1/d} + (1-v) \sum_{i=1}^k (1-y_i) = 0. \quad (6)$$

If $t_1 = 0$, this simplifies to

$$f(v) = v^k + (1-v) \sum_{i=1}^k (1-y_i) - 1 = 0. \quad (7)$$

Either equation (6) or (7) may be solved for v by Newton's iterative procedure and then $r_{pt} = (-\log_e v)/d$. Alternatively, when $t_1 = 0$, tables given by Speckman and Cornell²⁰ may be entered for values of $\bar{S} = \sum_{i=1}^k (1-y_i)/k$ and k to obtain the value of $r_{pt}d$ such that r_{pt} satisfies (7). If $t_1 = d$ estimates $r_{pt}d$ may also be obtained by entering the tables with $\bar{S} + 1$ and $k + 1$. Tables of estimates are presented for $k = 5, 6, 8, 10, 15, 20$ and 25 . Partial totals estimates for other values of k can sometimes be obtained by interpolation.

Moments. Muench¹⁸ has presented the method of moments for computing an estimate r_m of the parameter ρ in (1). He computed the area under a histogram drawn from the data as $\sum_{i=1}^k y_k d_i$ where each d_i is the width of the interval on the t scale for which the corresponding y_i proportion is calculated. Muench assumed that the range of t values, for which the histogram with area $\sum A$ is drawn, is from 0 to τ . He approximated $\sum A$ by the integral

$$\int_0^{\tau} Y dt = \int_0^{\tau} (1 - e^{-\rho t}) dt = \tau + (e^{-\rho \tau} - 1)/\rho .$$

He equated ΣA to this integral in order to solve for his estimate r_m of ρ .

The estimation equation, after dividing both ΣA and the integral by τ , is

$$\Sigma A / \tau = 1 + (e^{-r_m \tau} - 1) / r_m \tau . \quad (8)$$

Muench's book¹⁸ contains a nomogram which gives values of

$$r_m' = r_m \tau / 100 \quad (9)$$

for various values of

$$\Sigma' A = (100) \Sigma A / \tau . \quad (10)$$

Finite Differences. The model (1) can be generated by the difference equation

$$y_{i+1} - (1 - e^{-\rho d}) - e^{-\rho d} y_i = 0 \quad (11)$$

where it is assumed as for the partial totals method that the t_i values are equally spaced at intervals of width d . Lipton and McGilchrist¹⁶ have given two methods of estimating ρ in (11). One is to choose $\exp(-\rho d)$ to minimize

$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} D_i^2$ where D_i is obtained from the left side of (11) by replacing the Y

expectations by the corresponding y proportions calculated from the data.

This leads to an estimator r_{fd1} of ρ which can be calculated from the formula

$$r_{fd1} = - \frac{1}{d} \log_e \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (1-y_i)(1-y_{i+1})}{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (1-y_i)^2} \right] . \quad (12)$$

The other finite differences method consists of minimizing

$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^j D_i \right)^2$ which yields the estimate r_{fd2} of ρ given by

$$r_{fd2} = -\frac{1}{d} \log_e \left[1 - \frac{\sum_{j=2}^k s_j (y_j - y_1)}{\sum_{j=2}^k s_j^2} \right] \quad (13)$$

where

$$s_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (1 - y_i) . \quad (14)$$

The estimator given by equation (13) is similar to that given by Hartley¹⁴ under the heading of internal least squares.

Fisher. Fisher¹¹ presented another procedure for the model

$E(y_i) = 1 - \exp(-\rho a^{-(i-1)})$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, for constant a . Letting $a = e^c$, we can regard his procedure as an estimation procedure for (1) with the t values spaced exponentially, that is, with $t = e^x$ for equally spaced x 's, $-\infty < x < \infty$. It is assumed that $E(y)$ nearly ranges from 0 to 1.

Fisher set

$$\sum_{i=1}^k y_i = \sum_{i=1}^k [1 - \exp(-\rho a^{-(i-1)})] \quad (15)$$

and solved for an estimate r_f of ρ by a numerical procedure. Fisher and Yates¹³ book gives tables for $a = 2, 4$, and 10 which list values of a quantity K for various pairs of values of $\sum_{i=1}^k y_i$ and k . In their notation $\sum_{i=1}^k y_i = x$ and $k = s$.

Then the equation

$$\log_{10}(r_f) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k y_i \right) \log_{10} a - K \quad (16)$$

may be solved to obtain r_f .

Fisher and Yates' tables may be used even if the t values used are not equal to $a^{-(i-1)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $a = 2, 4, \text{ or } 10$ / provided that $t_i/t_{i+1} = a$. The procedure is exactly the same as that given above except that equation (16) yields $\log_{10}(r_f t_1)$.

Spearman. Like the Fisher procedure, the Spearman method presented by Johnson and Brown¹⁵ may be used for the model (1) when the t values used are such that $t = e^x$ for equally spaced values of x with intervals of width c . Cornell⁵ has shown that the Spearman estimator may be derived by replacing the right side of equation (15) by a integral approximation under the assumption that k is large and c is correspondingly small. The resultant Spearman estimator r_s of ρ is given by

$$r_s = \exp\left(c \sum_{i=1}^k y_i - x_k - c/2 - \gamma\right) \quad (17)$$

where the range from x_1 to x_k is assumed to be great enough so that $y_1 = 0$ and $y_k = 1$. In this equation, $\gamma = 0.57722$ is Euler's constant.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Two sets of data are used to illustrate the various methods discussed above. The first set of data has equally spaced t 's, the second has

exponentially spaced t 's. Since the graphical, maximum likelihood, least squares, weighted least squares and moment estimation procedures do not require any specific spacing of the t 's, they will be illustrated in both examples. Partial totals and finite differences, which require equal spacing, will be illustrated only in Example 1. The Fisher and Spearman estimators, requiring exponential spacing, will be illustrated only in Example 2.

Example 1. Equally spaced t 's.

The data for this example come from a genetics experiment discussed by Edington, Epler and Regan⁷. The purpose of the experiment was to establish a dose response relation of X-ray induced Y-suppressed lethals in drosophila. Five doses of X-rays, shown in column (1) of Table 1, were administered to n chromosomes as shown in column (2) and the numbers of orthodox and Y-suppressed lethals were counted. The number of orthodox lethals observed are shown in column (3) with the corresponding proportions, y , given in column (4). With model (1) and the assumption that ny is binomially distributed, we would expect that $y = 0$ when $t = 0$. Since this is not the case, due to the natural occurrence of lethals of about 0.02 percent, the data are corrected for this discrepancy. Thus the y values in column (4) are computed by taking the ratios of the corresponding entries in column (3) to those in column (2) and subtracting 0.0002.

The eight estimates calculated for this example are listed in Table 4. Graphical Method. Columns (5) and (1) of Table 2 enable $u = -\log_e(1-y)$ to be plotted against t as in Figure 1. The slope of this line, which was fitted by eye to relate u and t , is $r_g = 0.0000305$.

Maximum Likelihood. Peto's iterative calculations involve the computing of nyA and nyB for each t value during each iteration. He gave tables of A and B corresponding to various trial values of $x_i = t_i r_{m\ell}$. By following his instructions and using columns (3) and (4) of Table 2 as well as r_g as an initial estimate, one cycle of calculations yields $r_{m\ell} = 0.00003048$.

Table 1 - Data for Example 1

Dose	Chromosomes	Orthodox	
t	Tested, n	Lethals	y
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
0	4358	1	0.0000
1082	3352	111	0.0286
2164	3605	232	0.0642
3246	2313	259	0.0919
4328	2206	292	0.1322

Figure 1 - Graph of $u = -\log_e(1-y)$ against t with the line fitted by eye for Example 1




Table 2 - Calculations for Example 1 Leading to r_g, r_{ls}, r_{wls} , and r_{ml}

t	1-y	nt	ny	$u = -\log_e(1-y)$	t^2	tu	$w = n(1-y)/y$	$wt^2 \times 10^{-6}$	wtu
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
0	1.0000	0	0	0	0	0		0*	0*
1082	0.9714	4,167,864	110	0.0290	1,170,724	31.3780	130,839	153,177	4,105,472
2164	0.9358	7,801,220	231	0.0663	4,682,896	143.4732	52,555	246,110	7,540,233
3246	0.9081	9,130,998	259	0.0964	10,536,516	312.9144	27,791	292,822	8,696,244
4328	0.8678	9,547,568	292	0.1418	18,731,584	613.7104	14,478	271,197	8,885,330
TOTAL	4.6831	30,647,650			35,121,584	1101.4760		963,306	29,227,279

*L'Hospital's rule shows that the correct value for these terms is zero in the limit as y approaches zero.

Least Squares. The totals for columns (6) and (7) in Table 2, when substituted in equation (3), give $r_{ls} = 0.00003136$.

Weighted Least Squares. Column (8) in Table 2 gives the weights needed for these calculations. Reference to formula (4) shows that r_{wls} is the ratio of the totals of columns (10) and (9), that is, $r_{wls} = 0.00003034$.

Partial Totals. The range of i from 1 to 5 in Table 3 shows that $k = 5$ and the total for column (4) gives $\sum_{i=1}^5 (1-y_i) = 4.6831$ so that $\bar{S} = (4.6831)/5 = 0.9366$.

Speckman and Cornell's²⁰ tables of r_{pt}^d values have entries for $k = 5$ and $\bar{S} = 0.93$ and 0.94 . Linear interpolation yields $r_{pt}^d = 0.0333$ and $r_{pt} = 0.00003078$ since $d = 1082$. Alternatively, r_{pt} could have been determined by solving equation (7) iteratively.

Method of Moments. To calculate r_m , we first observe that the difference between two consecutive dosages is constant and equal to 1082. Taking each t value as the midpoint of an interval for the histogram, we have $d_i = 1082$ for all i , and $\tau = t_k + d/2 = 4328 + 1082/2 = 4869$. Thus,

$$\Sigma A = \sum_{i=1}^5 y_i d_i = (1082) \sum_{i=1}^5 y_i = 342.8858,$$

using the total for column (3) of Table 3. From equation (10),

$$\Sigma'A = (100)\Sigma A/\tau = (100)(342.8858)/(4869) = 7.0422.$$

Entering Chart I in Appendix A of Muench's book¹⁸ with this value of $\Sigma'A$, we obtain $r'_m = 0.0015$. This leads to

$$r_m = (100) r'_m/\tau = (100)(0.0015)/(4869) = 0.0000308$$

from equation (9).

Finite Differences Method 1. Substituting the totals of columns (5) and (6) of Table 3 along with $d = 1082$ into equation (12) yields

$$r_{fd1} = - \frac{1}{(1082)} \log_e \left(\frac{3.5182}{3.6439} \right) = 0.00003245 .$$

Finite Differences Method 2. Substitution of the totals of columns (8) and (10) into equation (13) yields

$$r_{fd2} = - \frac{1}{(1082)} \log_e \left(1 - \frac{0.9268}{27.8947} \right) = 0.00003123 .$$

Table 3 - Calculations for Example 1 Leading to r_{pt} , r_m , r_{fd1} , and r_{fd2}

i	t_i	y_i	$1-y_i$	$(1-y_i)^2$	$(1-y_i)(1-y_{i+1})$	$S_i = \sum_{h=1}^{i-1} (1-y_h)$	S_i^2	$y_i - y_1$	$S_i(y_i - y_1)$
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1	0	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.9714				
2	1082	0.0286	0.9714	0.9436	0.9090	1.0000	1.0000	0.0286	0.0286
3	2164	0.0642	0.9358	0.8757	0.8498	1.9714	3.8864	0.0642	0.1266
4	3246	0.0919	0.9081	0.8246	0.7880	2.9072	8.4518	0.0919	0.2672
5	4328	0.1322	0.8678			3.8153	14.5565	0.1322	0.5044
TOTAL		0.3169	4.6831	3.6439	3.5182		27.8947		0.9268

Table 4 - Estimates of ρ Computed by Several Different Methods for Example 1

Method	Graphical	Maximum Likelihood	Least Squares	Weighted Least Squares	Partial Totals	Moments	Finite Differences Method 1	Finite Differences Meth. 2
Estimate $\times 10^7$	305	304.8	313.6	303.4	307.8	308	324.5	312.3

Example 2. Exponentially spaced t 's.

For this example we use data obtained by Cirstea and Suhaciu³ in studies concerned with the passive sensitization of guinea-pigs. Table 5 gives their data on the mortality rates of guinea-pigs sensitized passively with intraperitoneal rabbit anti-ovalbumin serum and challenged 24 hours later with intracardial

antigen. Each rate is based on ten animals.

The values for the seven estimates calculated for this example are displayed in Table 6. The calculations for r_g , $r_{m\ell}$, $r_{\ell s}$ and $r_{w\ell s}$ are not shown since they were done in the same manner as for Example 1 except that $y_5 = 0$ was replaced by $1/2n = 0.05$ in computing the denominator of $r_{w\ell s}$ as given by equation (5) since this denominator approaches infinity as any y approaches zero. The term in the numerator for $i = 5$ was replaced by its limit as y approaches zero, which is $nt = 0.125$. This is essentially the same as the procedure followed in calculating $r_{w\ell s}$ for Example 1 except in that instance the smallest t value was zero.

Method of Moments. The calculation of this estimate is the same as in Example 1 except for the division of the range of t into intervals. In this calculation, equal intervals on the $\log t$ scale were used. That is,

$$d_i = \text{antilog} [\log t_i + (\log 2)/2] - \text{antilog} [\log t_i - (\log 2)/2] \text{ and} \\ \tau = \text{antilog} [\log 0.2 + (\log 2)/2] = 0.283 .$$

Fisher. To apply this procedure, we note that $t_i/t_{i+1} = 2$, $i=1,2,3,4$. However, $t_1 = 0.2$ instead of 1. Therefore, this method with $a = 2$ gives a solution for $t_1 r_f = (0.2)r_f$. In Fisher's notation $s = k = 5$ and $x = \sum y = 2.5$. Entering Fisher and Yates'¹³ Table VIII 2 with $a = 2$ (Two-fold), we find $K = 0.358$.

Substitution in equation (16) yields 0.395 which for this example equals $\log_{10} (0.2)r_f$. Solving for r_f gives $r_f = 12.4$ as listed in Table 6.

Spearman. From Table 5 we see that the largest t value is 0.2 which is t_k .

The corresponding $x_k = \log_e t_k = -1.60944$. Also, $c = \log_e (t_i/t_{i+1}) = \log_e 2 = 0.69315$ and Euler's constant $= \gamma = 0.57722$. Substitution of these quantities in equation (17) yields the value of 11.2 which is given for r_s in Table 6.

Table 5 - Data for Example 2

Dose of Antiserum (mℓ)	Mortality Rate	Survival Rate
t	y	1 - y
(1)	(2)	(3)
0.2	0.9	0.1
0.1	0.8	0.2
0.05	0.7	0.3
0.025	0.1	0.9
0.0125	0	1.0
	2.5	

Table 6 - Estimates of ρ Computed by Several Different Methods for Example 2

Method	Graphical	Maximum Likelihood	Least Squares	Weighted Least Squares	Moments	Fisher	Spearman
Estimate	13.5	12.9	12.8	9.2	7.1	12.4	11.2

DISCUSSIONS AND COMPARISONS

Ease of Computation. The examples investigated in this last section help compare some of the characteristics of the estimation procedures described in this paper. Also, a summary of the procedures considered in this paper with regard to the computation of estimates is given in Table 7. As is indicated in Table 7, the graphical procedure is simple and easy to carry out. It requires no assumption concerning the spacing of the t values provided at least two different t values are used or concerning the distribution of the deviations of the data about the model of expectations given by (1). However, the graphical method depends on the judgment of the person drawing the line to describe the data. It usually leads to a lack of reproducibility and the variability in the estimates determined by this method is impossible to assess. The graphical method ordinarily is used only to obtain a preliminary parameter estimate which is subsequently refined, perhaps using an iterative computational procedure. The unweighted and weighted least squares methods as well as the moment, Spearman and finite differences procedures are relatively simple computationally since they do not involve iterative calculations. The partial totals and Fisher methods require extensive calculation if the estimation formulas are evaluated entirely with computations, but, as mentioned earlier, tables are available which make such calculations unnecessary in many instances and make these estimation procedures the easiest to apply in these instances. For the maximum likelihood method, the tables given by Peto and Finney only assist in, but do not eliminate, iterative calculations and

therefore this method remains one of the more difficult computationally.

Distribution and Sampling Specifications, Large Sample Properties. As presented in this paper, only the maximum likelihood and weighted least squares methods take into account variability in the n_i values. The others would not be preferred if the n_i were very different from each other. However, some of them performed well on Example 1 where n_1 is nearly twice as large as n_5 . The maximum likelihood and weighted least squares procedures are also the only ones which make explicit use of the assumption of a binomial distribution of the y variable for each t value. The other estimation methods only use the functional form of the expected value of y as given by the model in equation (1). The maximum likelihood, least squares, weighted least squares and moment procedures share with the graphical method the advantage of being applicable regardless of the spacing of the t values while the partial totals, Fisher and Spearman methods require particular spacings of the t values. Like the partial totals method, the two finite differences methods require equally spaced t values. These two methods will not be discussed further because no attempt has been made to evaluate them for the model under consideration.

The evaluation of the least squares and weighted least squares procedures is difficult because of the necessity of replacing y by an arbitrary approximation when $y = 0$ or 1 , making the properties usually associated with least squares procedures in doubt. Moreover, in order for the unweighted least squares method to yield an estimator with minimum variance, the variables $u_i = [-\log_e(1-y_i)]$ would have to have the same variance for all i , an assumption that is not fulfilled, for instance, under the binomial model proposed

Table 7 - Summary of Ten Procedures with regard to the Computation of Estimates

Method	Restrictions on Spacing of t Values	Restrictions on Approximate Range of y	Distribution Assumptions for Derivation of Estimation Methods	Ease of Computation	Computational Aids
Graphical (g)				Very easy	
Maximum Likelihood (ml)			Binomial	Difficult, iterative	Tables used in iterations
Least Squares (ls)			Constant vari- ance of log y	Easy, direct	
Weighted Least Squares (wls)			Binomial	Easy, direct	
Partial Totals (pt)	Equal			Easy with tables	Estimates tabled, $t_1 = 0, d$
Moments (m)	Equal Preferred			Easy with nomogram	Nomogram for estimates
Finite Differences Method 1 (fd1)	Equal			Easy, direct	
Finite Differences Method 2 (fd2)	Equal			Easy, direct	
Fisher (f)	Exponential	0 to 1		Easy with tables	K tabled for $a = 2, 4, 10$
Spearman (s)	Exponential	0 to 1		Easy, direct	

earlier for maximum likelihood estimation. Even the weighted least squares method does not necessarily lead to a minimum variance estimator under this model because the appropriate weights are not necessarily known exactly but are estimated from the data and because of the problems when $y = 0$ or 1 . However, when the sample size n_i for each i is large enough so that no $y_i = 0$ or 1 , under our model the weighted least squares estimator is approximately normally distributed. In fact, the weighted least squares estimator is consistent and asymptotically efficient with a variance approximated by

$$1 / \sum_{i=1}^k w_i t_i^2 \text{ when each } n_i \text{ is sufficiently large.}$$

Large sample results are also known for several of the other methods. The maximum likelihood estimator is consistent and asymptotically efficient and normally distributed provided that for given t_i at least two of the n_i become large as the total sample size becomes large for given t_i . Peto¹⁹ gives a procedure for estimating the asymptotic variance of the maximum likelihood estimator. The situation where Muench's method of moments is most likely to be used, especially for large samples, is when t_i values are equally spaced and $E(y)$ comes close to ranging from 0 to 1 . In this instance, Cornell⁵ has shown that Muench's method of moments and the partial totals methods are equivalent when observations are taken for a large number of t values, that is, for k large. Moreover, Speckman and Cornell²⁰ showed that the partial totals estimator, r_{pt} , is approximately normally distributed for large sample sizes whether or not k is large. They give an expression for the asymptotic variance of r_{pt} and they show that r_{pt} is consistent but not asymptotically efficient.

It has also been shown by Cornell⁵ that Fisher and Spearman estimators are equivalent for k large. Fisher¹¹, and Johnson and Brown¹⁵, gave a formula for the asymptotic variance of these estimators which are consistent and asymptotically normally distributed. These procedures have an asymptotic relative efficiency of 88 per cent. In deriving these large sample properties independent sampling at different t values and finite variances of the y variables were assumed. The large sample results derived for the Spearman and Fisher procedures also require addition of the assumption that for any given t value, the corresponding y variable is binomially distributed.

Small Sample Properties. The large sample properties just reviewed are useful but can be very misleading for small samples. This is particularly true for the least squares and weighted least squares procedures since the large sample conclusions require a large sample for each t value for these methods./it is necessary to examine the results of Monte Carlo studies. In their study, Speckman and Cornell²⁰ compared the least squares, weighted least squares, maximum likelihood and partial totals methods for the model discussed in this paper with t values a constant interval of width d apart for the following parameter combinations:

$\rho d = 0.30; k = 5; n = 5, 10, 15, 25,$

$k = 10; n = 5, 10$

$k = 15; n = 5, 25,$

$\rho d = 0.15; k = 10; n = 10,$

$\rho d = 0.10; k = 15; n = 5, 25.$

They included the assumption that y has a binomial distribution for each value

of t in their model. They found that the partial totals estimator is slightly less biased than the maximum likelihood estimator, particularly for small n and k . The least squares and especially the weighted least squares estimators are considerably more biased. In their study for $y = 0$ and 1 in the two least squares procedures, an adjustment of $1/2n$ was made only when the indeterminate form of concern had no limit as y approached the appropriate end-point. If such a limit existed, it was used. In comparing the methods on relative efficiency, which equals the variance plus the square of the bias, for $p_d = 0.30$ the partial totals estimator was superior for $k = 5$ and either the least squares or partial totals method was superior for $k = 10$ and 15 . For $p_d = 0.15$ and 0.10 , for which only k values of 10 and 15 were studied, the maximum likelihood estimator was more efficient. The weighted least squares estimator had low efficiency relative to the other methods in most cases and never had the highest efficiency. In a comparison of the maximum likelihood and partial totals estimators, it was found that they performed very similarly, although the partial totals estimator had slightly higher efficiency for the small sample sizes while the opposite was true for the larger sample sizes studied empirically. A recommendation was also made that asymptotic variances be multiplied by 1.5 when used to estimate variances for small samples. Further work has shown that for some situations this factor may be too small.

Comparable evidence on the properties of the other estimators for small samples is not available. However, Johnson and Brown¹⁵ presented a bias approximation for the Spearman estimator which can be used to obtain a less biased estimator. Also, in studies summarized by Brown,² Spearman estimation has been

found to have high efficiency relative to maximum likelihood for small samples for models different but similar to the one considered here. However, since the Spearman method involves approximating a sum used by Fisher under the assumption that k is large, the Fisher method would seem preferable for small samples. Similarly, the method of partial totals for equally spaced t values would be preferred to Muench's method of moments since Cornell⁵ has shown that they are related in the same way as the Fisher and Spearman methods in this instance. When the t values are not equally spaced the integral used by Muench is the same as that when they are equally spaced, so his method of moments would appear inappropriate then. In particular, if the t values are exponentially spaced, the Spearman method, which is similar to the Muench method except that it is explicitly devised for exponential spacing instead of equal spacing, would be more appropriate.

The examples given earlier illustrate several properties discussed. In Table 4, the estimates computed by several methods for Example 1 are given. The estimate computed by the first finite differences method is much larger/ than the others while those computed by least squares and the second finite / differences method are close together and relatively large. The other estimates are close together with the weighted least squares estimate being the smallest. This supports the evidence given above that least squares estimators for the model being studied, whether unweighted or weighted, are biased more than maximum likelihood and partial totals estimators. The partial totals and moment methods, which are similar for equally spaced t values as used in this example, give essentially the same answer. The estimates given for the second example, which has exponential

spacing of t values, in Table 6 are similar except the estimates computed by the weighted least squares and moments methods are small relative to the others. Unsatisfactory performance of weighted least squares for small samples is illustrated here as is the inappropriateness of Muench's method of moments when the t values are not equally spaced. These two examples, of course, give no indication of the sampling variability of the various estimators.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Several methods of estimating the parameter in a simple exponential model, which often arises in epidemiological studies and biological assay, are presented, illustrated and compared. The method of maximum likelihood, which can be used for any spacing of doses, is known to have very desirable large sample properties and behaved quite well in the limited Monte Carlo study. The simple method of partial totals is suggested as a possible alternative to maximum likelihood for small samples for equally spaced doses. The Fisher and Spearman methods, which are also computationally easy, are suggested as alternative methods regardless of the sample size for exponentially spaced dosages, that is, for dosages whose logarithms are equally spaced.

REFERENCES

1. Berkson, J. Application of the Logistic Function to Bio-assay.
J. of the Amer. Stat. Ass. 39:357-365, 1944.
2. Brown, B. W., Jr. Some Properties of the Spearman Estimator in Bioassay.
Biometrika 48: 293-302, 1961.
3. Cirstea, M. and Suhaciu, G. Studies on Passive Sensitization in Guinea-pigs.
Int. Archives of Allergy and Appl. Immunology 23: 216-218, 1963.

4. Cochran, W. G. Estimation of Bacterial Densities by Means of the "Most Probable Number". *Biometrics* 6: 105-116, 1950.
5. Cornell, R. G. Spearman Estimation for a Simple Exponential Model. *Biometrics* 21, 1965.
6. Cornfield, J. Measurement and Comparison of Toxicities: The Quantal Response. *Statistics and Mathematics in Biology* (ed. by Kempthorne, Bancroft, Gowen and Lush). Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1954, Chapter 25.
7. Edington, C. W., Epler, J. L. and Regan, J. D. The Frequency-dose Relation of X-ray Induced Y-suppressed Lethals in *Drosophila*. *Genetics* 47: 397-406, 1962.
8. Finney, D. J. The Principles of Biological Assay. *J. of the Roy. Stat. Soc.*, Supplement 9: 46-91, 1947.
9. Finney, D. J. The Estimation of Bacterial Densities from Dilution Series. *J. of Hygiene* 49: 26-35, 1951.
10. Finney, D. J. *Statistical Methods in Biological Assay* (2nd ed.) New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1964, Section 21.5.
11. Fisher, R. A. On the Mathematical Foundations of Theoretical Statistics. *Phil. Trans. of the Roy. Soc. A* 222: 309-368, 1921.
12. Fisher, R. A. The Case of Zero Survivors. Appendix in C. I. Bliss. *The Calculation of the Dosage-mortality Curve*. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 22: 134-167, 1935.
13. Fisher, R. A. and Yates, F. *Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research* (6th ed.), Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963.
14. Hartley, H. O. The Estimation of Non-linear Parameters by "Internal Least Squares." *Biometrika* 35: 32-45, 1948.
15. Johnson, E. A. and Brown, B. W., Jr. The Spearman Estimator for Serial Dilution Assays. *Biometrics* 17: 79-88, 1961.
16. Lipton, S. and McGilchrist, C. A. The Derivation of Methods for Fitting Exponential Regression Curves. *Biometrika* 51: 504-508, 1964.
17. Manos, N. E. Histoplasma Sensitivity Conversion Rates. *Am. J. of Hygiene* 58: 119-131, 1953.
18. Muench, H. *Catalytic Models in Epidemiology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

19. Peto, S. A Dose-response Equation for the Invasion of Micro-organisms. Biometrics 9: 320-335, 1953.
20. Speckman, J. A. and Cornell, R. G. Estimation for a One-parameter Exponential Model. J. of the Amer. Stat. Ass. 60: 560-572, 1965.

Dr. Cornell is Associate Professor of Statistics and Director of the Biometry Training Program at Florida State University. During a portion of the work on this paper he received support from training grant number 5TI GM-913 from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences and from NASA grant number NGR-10-004-029.

Miss Speckman is a statistician with the Statistical Engineering Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards.