

## Bayesian Variable Selection in the Proportional Hazard Model

Kyeong Eun Lee<sup>1)</sup>

### Abstract

In this paper we consider the proportional hazard models for survival analysis in the microarray data. For a given vector of response values and gene expressions (covariates), we address the issue of how to reduce the dimension by selecting the significant genes. In our approach, rather than fixing the number of selected genes, we will assign a prior distribution to this number. To implement our methodology, we use a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method.

**Keywords** : Bayesian Model, Cox Proportional Hazards Model, Microarray Data, Survival analysis, Variable Selection.

### 1. Introduction

The advent of DNA microarrays makes possible to provide thousands of gene expressions at once (Duggan et al., 1999; Schena et al., 1995) but the main difficulty with microarray data analysis is that the sample size is so small compared to the dimension of the problem (the number of genes). The number of genes for a single individual is usually in the thousands and there are few individuals in the data set. Models for such data can be complicated, and computational methods are generally intensive. In this paper we are considering a situation when survival times of (for example) cancer patients are of interest. In this setting, it is of interest to identify the significant genes which are controlling the survival time of the patients. Also we want to estimate the patient survival probabilities after controlling for other covariates such as levels of clinical risk.

In this paper, we suggest a gene selection technique using a Bayesian model based variable selection approach for survival data. Typical Bayesian variable selection methods are based on the assumptions of Gaussian distributions for the

---

1) 1969 N. Hicks #102, Palatine, IL 60074  
E-mail : artlee1971@yahoo.com

likelihood and use of mixture priors to obtain marginal distributions (George and McCulloch, 1993). We extend these models to the data context where the responses are time to event. We address the issue of how to select the significant genes as well as assess the survival curves using the Cox proportional hazards model where the sample size  $n$  is much more smaller than the number of variables (genes)  $p$ .

We generalize the Gaussian mixture prior approach in this non-Gaussian framework. For non-Gaussian data it is well known that conjugate priors do not exist for the regression coefficients. The computations are then potentially much harder particularly when sampling the dimension of the model. This is due to possibly strong posterior correlation between the elements of regression parameters such that adding or removing a variable can result in a large drop in the model likelihood unless careful update proposals are made to the coefficients to accommodate the change. Hence, without tailored updates to regression parameter mixing in the MCMC sampler can be poor as moves are rarely accepted. The construction of good proposals is not trivial and depends on both the form of the model as well as on the data.

In this paper we exploit the use of a random residual component within the model. The use of a residual component is consistent with the belief that there may be unexplained sources of variation in the data perhaps due to explanatory variables that were not recorded in the original study. By adopting a Gaussian residual effect many of the conditional distributions for the model parameters will be of standard form which greatly aids in the computations.

We consider one cDNA data set, B-cell lymphoma data set (Alizadeh et al., 2000) and identify a set of responsible genes which explain the survival time.

## 2. Variable Selection Model

Let  $T_i$  be the survival time (observed or censored) for the  $i$ th patient and  $X_{ij}$ 's are the  $p+1$  covariates associated with it. Usually  $X_{i0}$  indicates the binary or multi-category phenotype covariate and other  $X_{ij}$ 's are  $p$  gene expressions from DNA microarray data, which are continuous in nature.

The Cox proportional hazards model (Cox, 1972) assumes that the hazard function consists of two parts: baseline hazard function and non-negative function of covariates  $\mathbf{x}$ . It is given by

$$h(t|\mathbf{x}) = h_0(t)\exp(W),$$

where  $h_0(t)$  is the baseline hazard function and  $W = \mathbf{x}'\beta$  where  $\beta$  is a

$(p + 1) \times 1$  vector of regression coefficients. Due to indetermination of baseline hazard function, the proportional hazards (PH) model has adequately adaptable for many applications (Kalbfleisch and Prentice, 2002).

Kalbfleisch (1978) suggested a nonparametric Bayesian method for the PH model. We apply Bayesian variable selection approach to this model. We overcame the computation difficulties by including a random residual component as

$$W_i = \mathbf{X}_i' \beta + \epsilon_i \text{ where } \epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$$

where  $\mathbf{X}$  is the design matrix with  $i$ th column  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . This introduction of  $\epsilon$  enables to generate samples from full conditionals of all other parameters which is consistent with the belief that there may be unexplained source of variation in the data perhaps departure from the assumption of linearity.

Assume that  $T_i$  is an independent random variable with conditional survival function

$$P(T_i \geq t_i | W_i, \Lambda) = \exp\{-\Lambda(t_i) \exp(W_i)\} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n).$$

Kalbfleisch (1978) suggested Gamma process (GP) prior for the baseline cumulative hazard function  $\Lambda(t)$ . The assumption is  $\Lambda \sim GP(a\Lambda^*, a)$  where  $\Lambda^*$  is the mean process and  $a$  is a weight parameter about the mean (Ibrahim et al., 2001). Kalbfleisch (1978) showed that if  $a \approx 0$ , the likelihood is approximately proportional to the partial likelihood and if  $a \rightarrow \infty$ , the limit of likelihood is same to the likelihood when the gamma process is replaced by  $\Lambda^*$ .

Since  $\Lambda(t) \sim G(a\Lambda^*(t), a)$  for given  $t$ , the unconditional marginal survival function is obtained by direct integration:

$$\begin{aligned} P(T_i \geq t | W) &= \int \exp(-r \exp(W)) \frac{r^{a\Lambda^*(t)-1}}{\Gamma(a\Lambda^*(t)) a^{-a\Lambda^*(t)}} \exp(-ar) dr \\ &= \left( \frac{a}{a + \exp(W)} \right)^{a\Lambda^*}. \end{aligned}$$

The joint survival function conditional on  $\Lambda$  is

$$P(T_1 \geq t_1, \dots, T_n \geq t_n | \mathbf{W}, \Lambda) = \exp\left\{-\sum \Lambda(t_i) \exp(W_i)\right\}.$$

For the  $i$ th data point  $t_i$ , the censoring indicator variable is  $\nu_i$ . For  $n$  observations  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)'$ , the corresponding censoring variables are  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)'$ , where

$$\nu_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t_i \text{ is censored} \\ 1 & \text{if } t_i \text{ is a death time} \end{cases}$$

Using a property of Gamma process, Kalbfleisch (1978) showed that the likelihood with some right censoring is

$$L(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{D}) = \exp \left\{ - \sum a B_i A^*(t_i) \right\} \prod_{i=1}^n \{ a \lambda^*(t_i) B_i \}^{\nu_i}$$

where  $A_i = \sum_{l \in R(t_i)} \exp(b W_l)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ),  $R(t_i)$  is the set of individuals at risk at time  $t_i - 0$ ,  $B_i = -\log\{1 - \exp(W_i)/(a + A_i)\}$  and  $\mathbf{D} = (n, \mathbf{t}, \nu)$  denotes the observed data.

Now we can construct the Gaussian mixture prior for  $\beta$  to perform the variable selection procedure. Define  $\gamma$  to be an arbitrary  $p \times 1$  vector of indicator variables with  $i$ th element  $\gamma_i$  such that  $\gamma_i = 0$  if  $\beta_i = 0$  (the gene is not selected) and  $\gamma_i = 1$  if  $\beta_i \neq 0$  (the gene is selected). Given  $\gamma$ , let  $\beta_\gamma$  consists of all non zero elements of  $\beta$  and let  $\mathbf{X}_\gamma$  be the columns of  $\mathbf{X}$  corresponding to those elements of  $\gamma$  that are equal to one. To complete the hierarchical model we need to make the prior assumptions:

1. Given  $\gamma$ , the prior for  $\beta_\gamma$  will be  $\beta_\gamma \sim N(0, c(\mathbf{X}_\gamma' \mathbf{X}_\gamma)^{-1})$ , where  $c$  is a positive scale factor specified by the user. Smith and Kohn (1996) suggested to choose  $c$  between 10 to 100 for linear model problems. We will fix  $c = 100$ , so that the prior of  $\beta_\gamma$ , given  $\gamma$ , contains little information about  $\beta_\gamma$ .
2. The  $\gamma_i$  will be assumed to be a priori independent with  $P(\gamma_i = 1) = \pi_i$ . The values of  $\pi_i$  will be chosen to be small which will restrict the number of genes in the model. For example if we have 3000 total number of genes and want to allow only 15 genes due to small sample size then will fix  $\pi_i \equiv 0.005$  to achieve the purpose. In addition, if we have prior knowledge that some genes are more important than others, we can incorporate this easily by assigning larger values of  $\pi$ .

So the prior distributions for variable selection is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{W} | \hat{\beta}_\gamma] &\sim \text{MN}(\mathbf{X}_\gamma \hat{\beta}_\gamma, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}) \\
[\hat{\beta}_\gamma] &\sim \text{MN}(0, c\sigma^2 (\mathbf{X}_\gamma' \mathbf{X}_\gamma)^{-1}) \\
[\gamma_i] &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_i) \\
[\sigma^2] &\sim \text{IG}\left(a_0, \frac{b_0}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where MN is multivariate normal distribution and IG is Inverse Gamma distribution. The full conditional distributions are presented in the appendix.

### 2.1. Bayes Factor Computation

Bayes factor is the coherent way to compare models in a Bayesian frame work (Kass and Raftery, 1995). The Bayes factor for a model  $M_1$  against another model  $M_0$  given data  $\mathbf{D}$  is the ratio of posterior to prior odds, namely  $B = \frac{p(\mathbf{D} | M_1)}{p(\mathbf{D} | M_2)}$ . If  $2\log B$  lies between 5 to 10 there is strong evidence and for larger than 10 there is very strong evidence for  $M_1$ . In our non-conjugate complicated models, derivation of the marginal likelihoods in explicit form is not possible. Chib and Jeliazkov (2001) overcame the problem of calculation of the marginal likelihood by estimating it through Metropolis- Hastings (M-H) output. We basically follow their two parameter blocks and multiple latent variable blocks algorithm to get the Bayes Factors for Cox proportional hazards model. The details of the calculation is in the appendix.

## 3. Example

We applied this method for finding a set of responsible genes which explain the survival function to a Diffuse Large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) data set (Alizadeh et al., 2000). Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) is one of subtypes of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. But still patients with this disease had diverse responses to current therapy. So Alizadeh et al. (2000) proposed that there should be some different forms of DLBCL and discovered two distinct forms of DLBCL, activated B-like DLBCL and GC-B like, using DNA microarray experiment and hierarchical clustering. They showed that these two subgroups of DLBCL were differentiated from each other by distinct gene expressions of hundreds of different genes and had different survival time patterns.

There are 40 patients and expression level measurement for 4513 genes for each patient. We consider the fixed binary covariate  $X_0$  as  $X_{i0} = 1$  if  $i$ th sample is Activated B-like and  $X_{i0} = 0$  if other case for  $i = 1, \dots, 40$ . Also we have the

expression level measurement for a set of genes, so  $X_{ij}$  is the normalized log scale measurement of the expression level of  $j$ th gene for the  $i$ th sample, where  $i = 1, \dots, 40$  and  $j = 1, \dots, 4513$ .

To develop the semiparametric model, we choose the baseline function  $\Lambda^*$  as Weibull distribution for the Gamma process, that is,  $\Lambda^*(t) = \eta_0 t^{\kappa_0}$ . We choose moderate value of the hyperparameter as  $a = 10$ . The estimates of hyperparameters,  $\eta_0$  and  $\kappa_0$ , are obtained using estimates of intercept and scale in Survreg function (`survReg (formula=Surv (y, censor) ~ 1, dist="weibull")`) in S+. For our computational convenience, 1000 genes are preselected by a two-sample t-test. We consider several frequent subsets from the MCMC chain and the top two genes model comes out to be the best subset with respect to Bayes factor.

The survival function in the Cox proportional hazards model is

$$S(t|W) = P(T \geq t | W) = \left( \frac{a}{a + \exp(W)} \right)^{a\Lambda^*},$$

and we exploited the posterior samples for this model to get the Monte Carlo estimate of the function. The posterior estimates of survival curves (solid line) with 5th and 95th survival estimates (dotted line) based on the top two genes are superimposed on the Kaplan-Meier (1958) estimates (dash-dotted line) of survival functions (Figure 1). These plots show that this model is a good fit to both of the subgroup of patients.

Rather than a single, parsimonious model, the biologists may be interested in bigger families of genes to study relationships and functions. We presented some selected genes based on the marginal frequencies in Table 1. Some of the identified genes are already known to be biologically significant. Since MAPK10 (mitogen-activated protein kinase 10) is connected to TNF (tumor necrosis factor)-a signaling pathway (Decraene et al., 2002), its expression is directly related to tumor. Rimokh et al. (1993) showed that FVT1 (follicular variant-translocation gene) is highly expressed in some T-cell malignancies. WASIP (Wiskott-Aldrich syndrome protein-interacting protein) is known to play a role in cortical actin assembly related to lymphocyte function by Ramesh et al. (1997).

Heat maps have become popular in the microarray literature, Eisen et al. (1998), as graphical representations of the primary data where each point is associated with a color that reflects its value. Increasingly, positive values are represented with reds of increasing intensity and increasing negative values with greens of increasing intensity. A heatmap based on the top two genes in Figure 2 shows that these gene expression pattern is related to survival times and it is distinct between two groups.

### 4. Discussion

We have proposed a Bayesian model for variable selection in the proportional hazards model with a specific application to analyze Microarray data. We obtain a nice estimate of the survival curves with an extremely small number of genes. On the other hand, bigger families of genes can be useful to biologists to study the relationship and functions. Information on the size of models for prediction can be easily included in our Bayesian search of good models. The method has flexibility of allowing the location of larger sets of genes, via the inspection of the best visited models or the marginal probabilities of single genes, as we have illustrated.

### 5. Appendix

#### 5.1. Conditional Distributions in the Cox Proportional Model

The full conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$  is:

$$p(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma, \sigma^2) \propto \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n a_i B_i \Lambda^*(t_i)\right\} \prod_{i=1}^n \{a_i \lambda^*(t_i) B_i\}^{\nu_i} \\ \times \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}_\gamma \beta_\gamma)' (\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}_\gamma \beta_\gamma)\right\}$$

In order to get the  $p(\gamma | \mathbf{W}, \sigma^2)$ , we need to integrate out  $\beta_\gamma$  and the approach is similar to the Weibull regression situation.

The marginal distribution of  $\gamma$  given  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\sigma^2$  is

$$p(\gamma | \mathbf{W}, \sigma^2) \propto p(\mathbf{W} | \gamma, \sigma^2) p(\gamma) \\ \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} S(\gamma)\right\} \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_i^{\gamma_i} (1 - \pi_i)^{1 - \gamma_i}$$

where  $S(\gamma) = \mathbf{W}' \mathbf{W} \frac{c}{1+c} \mathbf{W}' \mathbf{X}_\gamma (\mathbf{X}_\gamma' \mathbf{X}_\gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_\gamma' \mathbf{W}$ .

Now rather than drawing  $\gamma$  as a vector better to draw component wise from  $p(\gamma_i | \lambda, \gamma_{j \neq i})$  which is

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\gamma_i | \mathbf{W}, \gamma_{j \neq i}, \sigma^2) &\propto p(\mathbf{W} | \gamma, \sigma^2) p(\gamma_i) \\
&\propto (1+c)^{-q_i/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} S(\gamma)\right\} \pi_i^{\gamma_i} (1-\pi_i)^{1-\gamma_i} \\
p(\gamma_i = 1 | \mathbf{W}, \gamma_{j \neq i}, \sigma^2) &\propto \pi_i (1+c)^{-q_i/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} S(\gamma_i^1)\right\} \\
p(\gamma_i = 0 | \mathbf{W}, \gamma_{j \neq i}, \sigma^2) &\propto (1-\pi_i) (1+c)^{-q_i/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} S(\gamma_i^0)\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_i^1 = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_i = 1, \dots, \gamma_p)$  and  $\gamma_i^0 = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_i = 0, \dots, \gamma_p)$ ,

$$p(\gamma_i = 1 | \mathbf{W}, \gamma_{j \neq i}, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1-\pi_i}{\pi_i} (1+c)^{1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} (S(\gamma^0) - S(\gamma^1))\right\}}.$$

The conditional distribution of  $\beta_\gamma$  is again

$$\beta_\gamma | \gamma, \mathbf{W}, \sigma^2 \sim \text{MN}(\mathbf{V}_\gamma \mathbf{X}_\gamma' \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{V}_\gamma)$$

and the conditional distribution of  $\sigma^2$  is Inverse-gamma.

## 5.2. Bayes Factor Computation

For the Weibull model, let  $q(\lambda, \lambda' | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma, \theta)$  the proposal density for the transition from  $\lambda$  to  $\lambda'$ . And let

$$\alpha(\lambda, \lambda' | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma, \theta) = \min\left\{1, f(\mathbf{D} | \lambda', \theta, \gamma) \pi(\lambda', \theta) f(\mathbf{D} | \lambda, \theta, \gamma) \pi(\lambda, \theta) \times \frac{q(\lambda', \lambda | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)}{q(\lambda, \lambda' | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)}\right\}$$

denote the acceptance probability for the move from  $\lambda$  to  $\lambda'$ . Using a basic marginal likelihood identity

$$m(\mathbf{D}) = \frac{f(\mathbf{D} | \lambda^*, \theta^*) \pi(\lambda^*, \theta^*)}{\pi(\lambda^*, \theta^* | \mathbf{D})} \text{ for any } \lambda^* \text{ and } \theta^*$$

and the following decomposition

$$\pi(\lambda^*, \theta^* | \mathbf{D}) = \pi(\lambda^* | \mathbf{D}) \pi(\theta^* | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*),$$

the estimation of the marginal likelihood reduces to estimation of  $\pi(\lambda^* | \mathbf{D})$  and

$\pi(\theta^* | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)$ . Let  $p(\lambda, \lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma) = \alpha(\lambda, \lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)q(\lambda, \lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)$  be the subkernel of the M-H chain for  $\lambda$  conditioned on  $(\theta, \beta_\gamma)$ .

By a local reversibility condition

$$p(\lambda, \lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)\pi(\lambda | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma) = \pi(\lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)p(\lambda^*, \lambda | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)$$

and by integrating over  $\psi = (\lambda, \theta, \beta_\gamma)$  after multiplying both sides of the local reversibility condition by  $\pi(\theta, \beta_\gamma | \mathbf{D})$ , we obtain finally

$$\pi(\lambda^* | \mathbf{D}) = \frac{E_1\{\alpha(\lambda, \lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)q(\lambda, \lambda^* | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)\}}{E_2\{\alpha(\lambda^*, \lambda | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)\}}$$

where  $E_1$  is expectation with respect to the distribution  $\pi(\lambda, \theta, \beta_\gamma | \mathbf{D})$  and  $E_2$  is expectation with respect to the distribution  $\pi(\theta, \beta_\gamma | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*) \times q(\lambda^*, \lambda | \mathbf{D}, \theta, \beta_\gamma)$ . Numerator can be estimated by averaging the full run Monte Carlo samples and denominator can be estimated by averaging the additional MCMC samples. Since we can not get the normalizing constant of  $\pi(\theta | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)$ , we need a similar step to estimate it.

$$\hat{\pi}(\theta^* | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*) = \frac{M^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^M \alpha(\theta^{(g)}, \theta^* | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*) q(\theta^{(g)}, \theta^* | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)}{J^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha(\theta^*, \theta^{(j)} | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)}$$

where  $\theta^{(g)}$  from  $\pi(\theta | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)$  and  $\theta^{(j)}$  from  $q(\theta^*, \theta | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)$ .

After that, we can get the estimated logarithm of marginal likelihood given by

$$\log \hat{m}(\mathbf{D}) = \log f(\mathbf{D} | \lambda^*, \theta^*) + \log \pi(\lambda^*, \theta^*) - \{\log \hat{\pi}(\lambda^* | \mathbf{D}) + \log \hat{\pi}(\theta | \mathbf{D}, \lambda^*)\}.$$

For the Cox's Proportional model, the estimation of the marginal likelihood is very similar to the method for Weibull model. The basic marginal likelihood identity is

$$m(\mathbf{D}) = \frac{f(\mathbf{D} | \mathbf{W}^*)\pi(\mathbf{W}^*)}{\pi(\mathbf{W}^* | \mathbf{D})}.$$

An estimate of marginal ordinate is similarly

$$\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{W}^* | \mathbf{D}) = \frac{M^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^M \alpha(\mathbf{W}^{(g)}, \mathbf{W}^* | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma^{(g)}) q(\mathbf{W}^{(g)}, \mathbf{W}^* | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma^{(g)})}{J^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha(\mathbf{W}^*, \mathbf{W}^{(j)} | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma^{(j)})}$$

where  $\{\mathbf{W}^{(g)}, \beta_\gamma^{(g)}\}$  from the full run and  $\beta_\gamma^{(j)}$  from  $\pi(\beta_\gamma | \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{W}^*)$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(j)}$  from  $q(\mathbf{W}^*, \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{D}, \beta_\gamma^{(j)})$ . Therefore, the logarithm marginal likelihood estimate is  $\log \hat{m}(\mathbf{D}) = \log f(\mathbf{D} | \mathbf{W}^*) + \log \pi(\mathbf{W}^*) - \log \hat{\pi}(\mathbf{W}^* | \mathbf{D})$ . We can use these marginal likelihood calculations to obtain the Bayes factor to compare two models.

## Reference

1. Alizadeh, A. *et al.* (2000). Distinct Types of Diffuse Large B-cell Lymphoma Identified by Gene Expression Profiling. *Nature*, 403, 503–511.
2. Chib., S. and Jeliazkov, I. (2001). Marginal Likelihood From the Metropolis–Hastings Output. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 453, 270–281.
3. Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression Models and Life Tables. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society. B*, 34, 187–220.
4. Decraene, C., Brugg, B., Ruberg, M., Eveno, Matingou, C., Tahiri, F., Mariani, J., Auffray, C. and Pietu, G. (2002). Identification of Genes Involved in Ceramide-dependent Neuronal Apoptosis Using cDNA Arrays, *Genome Biol.* 3(8): research0042.1–research0042.22
5. Duggan, D. J., Bittner, M., Chen, Y., Meltzer, P. and Trent, J. M. (1999). Expression Profiling Using cDNA Microarrays. *Nature Genetics*, 21(1 suppl), 10–14.
6. Eisen, M.B., Spellman, P.T., Brown, P.O. and Botstein, D. (1998). Cluster Analysis and Display of Genome-Wide Expression Patterns. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 95, 14863–14868.
7. George, E and McCulloch, R. (1993), Variable Selection via Gibbs Sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88, 881–889.
8. Ibrahim, J.G., Chen, M.H. and Sinha, D. (2001). Bayesian Survival Analysis. *Springer*.
9. Kalbfleisch, J. D. (1978). Non-parametric Bayesian Analysis of Survival Time Data. *Journal Royal Statistical Society B*, 40, 214–221.
10. Kalbfleisch, J. D. and Prentice, R. L. (2002). The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data. *Wiley-Interscience*, 2nd edition.
11. Kaplan, E.L. and Meier, P. (1958) Nonparametric Estimation from

- Incomplete Observations. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 53, 457–481.
12. Kass, R. E. and Raftery. (1995). Bayes Factor. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 90, 773–795
  13. Ramesh., N, Anton, I.M., Hartwig, J.H, Geha, R.S. (1997). WIP, a Protein Associated with Wiskott–aldrich Syndrome Protein, Induces Actin Polymerization and Redistribution in Lymphoid Cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 94(26), 14671–14676.
  14. Rimokh, R., Gadoux, M., Bertheas, M. F., Berger, F., Garoscio, M., Deleage, G., Germain, D., Magaud, J. P. (1993). FVT-1, a Novel Human Transcription Unit Affected by Variant Translocation t(2;18)(p11;q21) of Follicular Lymphoma. *Blood*, 81(1), 136–42.
  15. Schena, M. *et al.* (1995). Quantitative Monitoring of Gene Expression Patterns with a Complementary DNA Microarray. *Science*, 270, 467–470.
  16. Smith, M. and Kohn, R. (1997). Nonparametric Regression Using Bayesian Variable Selection. *Journal of Econometrics*, 75, 317–344.

Frequency	Clone ID	Gene Symbol	Gene Name
1014	1355868		
910	290230	ICSBP1	Interferon consensus sequence binding protein 1
405	814260	FVT1	Follicular lymphoma variant translocation 1
289	1353111	MDS019	Phorbolin-like protein MDS019
180	683069		EST
156	1340233	FGD3	FGD1 family, member 3
156	23173	MAPK10	Mitogen-activated protein kinase 10
154	814601		
132	1335070		ESTs
132	1303587		
124	1337701	WASPIP	Wiskott-Aldrich syndrome protein interacting protein
121	824198		Homo sapiens far upstream element (FUSE) binding protein 1 (FUBP1)

Table 1. Responsible Genes Found for Estimating the Survival Function DLBCL Data

Figure 1. Survival Function for DLBCL Data Using Semiparametric Hazards Model

Figure 2. Heat Map with Survival Time for DLBCL Data

[ received date : Jun. 2004, accepted date : Aug. 2004 ]