

Semiparametric Multivariate Accelerated Failure Time Model with Generalized Estimating Equations

Sy Han Chiou, Junghi Kim, and Jun Yan

*University of Connecticut, University of Minnesota
and University of Connecticut Health Center*

Abstract: The semiparametric accelerated failure time model is not as widely used as the Cox relative risk model mainly due to computational difficulties. Recent developments in least squares estimation and induced smoothing estimating equations provide promising tools to make the accelerated failure time models more attractive in practice. For semiparametric multivariate accelerated failure time models, we propose a generalized estimating equation approach to account for the multivariate dependence through working correlation structures. The marginal error distributions can be either identical as in sequential event settings or different as in parallel event settings. Some regression coefficients can be shared across margins as needed. The initial estimator is a rank-based estimator with Gehan's weight, but obtained from an induced smoothing approach with computation ease. The resulting estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal, with a variance estimated through a multiplier resampling method. In a simulation study, our estimator was up to three times as efficient as the initial estimator, especially with stronger multivariate dependence and heavier censoring percentage. Two real examples demonstrate the utility of the proposed method.

Key words and phrases: efficiency; induced smoothing; least squares; multivariate survival.

1 Introduction

Multivariate failure times are frequently encountered in biomedical research where failure times are clustered. For example, a diabetic retinopathy study assessed the efficacy of a laser treatment on decelerating vision loss, measured by time to blindness in the left eye and in the right eye from the same patient with diabetes (Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group, 1976); a colon cancer study evaluated the treatment effects on prolonging the time to tumor recurrence and time to death (Lin, 1994). The failure times within the same cluster are associated. Even though the primary interest most often lies in the marginal effects of covariates on the failure times, accounting for the within-cluster dependence may lead to more efficient regression coefficient estimators. For non-censored multivariate data, the generalized estimating equations (GEE) approach (Liang and Zeger, 1986) has become an important piece in statisticians' toolbox for marginal regression. For censored multivariate failure times, the marginal accelerated failure time (AFT) model is a counterpart of the marginal model. This paper aims to develop a GEE approach to make inferences for multivariate AFT models, taking advantage of recent developments on AFT models with least squares and induced smoothing.

A semiparametric AFT model is a linear model for the logarithm of the failure times with error distribution unspecified. A nice interpretation is that the effect of a covariate is to multiply the predicted failure time by some constant. It provides an attractive alternative to the popular relative risk model (Cox, 1972). Three main classes of estimator exist for univariate AFT models. The Buckley–James (BJ) estimator extends the least squares principle to accommodate censoring through an expectation–maximization (EM) algorithm which iterates between imputing the

1 censored failure times and least squares estimation (Buckley and James, 1979). Despite the nice
2 asymptotic properties (Lai and Ying, 1991; Ritov, 1990), the BJ estimator may be hard to get
3 as the EM algorithm may not converge. Further, the limiting covariance matrix is difficult to
4 estimate because it involves the unknown hazard function of the error term. The second class is
5 the rank-based estimator motivated by inverting the weighted log-rank test (Prentice, 1978). Its
6 asymptotic properties has been rigorously studied by Tsiatis (1990) and Ying (1993). Due to lack
7 of efficient and reliable computing algorithm, the rank-based estimator has not been widely used in
8 practice until recently, with numerical strategies for drawing inference developed by Huang (2002)
9 and Strawderman (2005). The third class is obtained by minimizing an inverse probability of cen-
10 soring weighed (IPCW) loss function (Robins and Rotnitzky, 1992). The IPCW estimator is easy
11 to compute, consistent and asymptotically normal (Stute, 1993, 1996; Zhou, 1992), but it requires
12 correct specification of the conditional censoring distribution and overlapping of the supports of
13 the censoring time and the failure time.

14 More recent works have led to a promising perspective on bringing AFT models into routine
15 data analysis practice. For rank-based inference, Jin et al. (2003) proposed a linear programming
16 approach, exploiting the fact that the weighted rank estimating equation is the gradient of an ob-
17 jective function which can be readily solved by linear programming. Variances of the estimators are
18 obtained from a resampling method. A computationally more efficient approach for rank-based in-
19 ference with Gehan's weight (Gehan, 1965) is the induced smoothing procedure of Brown and Wang
20 (2007). This approach is an application of the general induced smoothing method of Brown and
21 Wang (2005), where the discontinuous estimating equations are replaced with a smoothed version,
22 whose solutions are asymptotically equivalent to those of the former. The smoothed estimating
23 equations are differentiable, which facilitates rapid numerical solution and sandwich variance esti-
24 mator. Jin et al. (2006a) suggested an iterative least-squared procedure that starts from a consistent
25 and asymptotically normal initial estimator such as the one obtained from the rank-based method
26 of Jin et al. (2003). The resulting estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal, with variance
27 estimated from a multiplier resampling approach.

28 For multivariate AFT models, Jin et al. (2006b) developed rank-based estimating equations that
29 are solved via linear programming for marginal regression parameters. Johnson and Strawderman
30 (2009) extended the induced smoothing approach for a rank-based estimator with Gehan's weight
31 to the case of clustered failure times and showed that the smoothed estimates perform as well as
32 those from the best competing methods at a fraction of the computational cost. Jin et al. (2006a)
33 considered their least squares method with marginal models for multivariate failure times. All
34 these approaches used independent working model and left the within-cluster dependence structure
35 unspecified. Li and Yin (2009) developed a generalized method of moments approach for rank-based
36 estimator using the quadratic inference function approach (Qu et al., 2000) to incorporate within-
37 cluster dependence. Wang and Fu (2011) incorporated within-cluster ranks for the Gehan type
38 estimator with the aid of induced smoothing. To the best of our knowledge, little work has been done
39 to extend the GEE approach to the setting of multivariate AFT models except a technical report
40 (Hornsteiner and Hamerle, 1996), where the BJ estimator was combined with GEE. Nevertheless,
41 having no access to recent advances on AFT models, they did not solve the convergence problems,
42 and their asymptotic variance estimator formula could not be easily computed because it depends
43 on the derivatives of imputed failure times with respect to regression parameters, which might
44 explain their overestimation of the variance.

45 We propose an iterative GEE procedure to account for multivariate dependence through a work-
46 ing covariance or weight matrix. This method has the same spirit as GEE in that misspecification
47 of the working covariance matrix does not affect the consistency of the parameter estimator in the

1 marginal AFT models; when the working covariance is close to the unknown truth, the estimator
 2 has higher efficiency than that from working independence as used in Jin et al. (2006a). Our initial
 3 estimator is the computationally efficient, rank-based estimator from Johnson and Strawderman
 4 (2009), whose consistency and asymptotic normality is inherited by the resulting GEE estimator.
 5 We develop methods for cases where all marginal distributions are identical and for cases where at
 6 least two margins are different. Regression coefficients can be the same or partially the same across
 7 margins as needed.

8 The rest of the article is organized as follows. The semiparametric multivariate accelerated
 9 failure time model and the notation are introduced in Section 2. In Section 3, we propose an
 10 iterative GEE procedure to update a consistent and asymptotically normal initial estimator and
 11 present asymptotic properties of our estimator. A large scale simulation study is reported in
 12 Section 4 to assess the properties of the proposed estimator. The proposed methods are illustrated
 13 with the two aforementioned real applications in Section 5. In particular, some new findings are
 14 reported in analyzing the diabetic retinopathy study. A discussion concludes in Section 6. The
 15 sketch of proofs are relegated to the appendix.

16 2 Multivariate Accelerated Failure Time Model

17 There are two types of multivariate failure times depending on whether the multiple events are
 18 parallel or sequential. The difference between the two types is that the dimension is fixed for
 19 parallel data while random for sequential data. In a regression model, we generally have different
 20 covariates and different coefficients at each margin for parallel data. For sequential data, however,
 21 some or all covariates and covariate coefficients may be the same across margins. In general, it is
 22 desirable to allow some of the regression coefficients to be shared across margins as needed. We
 23 develop the methodology for parallel data for notational simplicity but comment when appropriate
 24 on how to adapt to sequential data.

25 Consider a random sample formed by n clusters. For parallel data, all clusters are of size K
 26 while for sequential data, cluster i may have size K_i . For ease of notation, assume at the moment
 27 that the cluster sizes are all equal to K . For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$, let T_{ik} and C_{ik} be,
 28 respectively, the log-transformed failure time and censoring time for margin k in cluster i . Let
 29 $Y_{ik} = \min(T_{ik}, C_{ik})$ and $\Delta_{ik} = I(T_{ik} < C_{ik})$. We stack Y_{ik} , T_{ik} , C_{ik} , and Δ_{ik} , $k = 1, \dots, K$, to form
 30 $K \times 1$ vector Y_i , T_i , C_i , and Δ_i , respectively. Let $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iK})^\top$ be a $K \times p$ covariate matrix,
 31 with the k th row denoted by X_{ik} . The observed data are independent and identically distributed
 32 copies of $\{Y, \Delta, X\}$: $\{(Y_i, \Delta_i, X_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. We assume that T_i and C_i are conditionally
 33 independent given X_i .

34 Our multivariate accelerated failure time model is

$$T_i = X_i \beta + \epsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

35 where β is a $p \times 1$ vector of regression coefficients, and $\epsilon_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \dots, \epsilon_{iK})^\top$ is a random error vec-
 36 tor with an unspecified multivariate distribution. This formulation accommodates margin-specific
 37 regression coefficients, in which case, β is a stack of all marginal coefficients, and X_i is a block
 38 diagonal matrix. The error vectors ϵ_i 's, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are independent and identically distributed.
 39 For parallel data, the K marginal distributions can be all different, while for sequential data, the
 40 number of unique marginal distributions may be smaller or even one as in a recurrent event setting.

1 With right censoring, Buckley and James (1979) replaced each response T_{ik} with its condi-
 2 tional expectation $\hat{Y}_{ik}(\beta) = E_{\beta}(T_{ik}|Y_{ik}, \Delta_{ik}, X_{ik})$, where the expectation is evaluated at regression
 3 coefficients β . Let $\hat{Y}_i(\beta) = (\hat{Y}_{i1}(\beta), \dots, \hat{Y}_{iK}(\beta))^{\top}$. Jin et al. (2006a) defined

$$U_n(\beta, b) = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^{\top} (\hat{Y}_i(b) - X_i\beta) = 0, \quad (2)$$

4 where $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i/n$, and b is an initial estimator of β . The solution for $U_n(\beta, \beta)$ is the Buckley-
 5 James estimator. The advantage for fixing the initial value b is to avoid solving for $U_n(\beta, \beta)$ which
 6 is neither continuous nor monotone in β . Let the $L_n(b)$ be the solution for $U_n(\beta, b) = 0$ given b .
 7 Then $L_n(b)$ has a closed-form,

$$L_n(b) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^{\top} (X_i - \bar{X}) \right]^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^{\top} (\hat{Y}_i(b) - \bar{Y}(b)) \right], \quad (3)$$

8 where $\bar{Y}(b) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Y}_i(b)/n$. Equation (3) leads to an iterative algorithm: $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)} = L_n(\hat{\beta}_n^{(m-1)})$,
 9 $m \geq 1$. If the initial estimator b is consistent and asymptotically normal, $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)}$ is consistent and
 10 asymptotically normal for every m .

11 Although this estimator is consistent, its efficiency might be low because it completely ignores
 12 the within-cluster dependence. We next propose to accommodate dependence using the GEE ap-
 13 proach, which covers the estimator of Jin et al. (2006a) as a special case with working independence.

14 3 Inference with GEE

15 For a given initial estimator b of β , we propose an updated estimator by solving the GEE

$$U_n(\beta, b, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^{\top} \Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha(b)) (\hat{Y}_i(b) - X_i\beta) = 0, \quad (4)$$

16 where $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i/n$, and $\Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha(b))$ is a $K \times K$ nonsingular working weight matrix which may
 17 involve additional working parameters α , which may depend on b . For given α and b , the solution
 18 of the GEEs (4) has a closed-form

$$L_n(b, \alpha) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^{\top} \Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha(b)) (X_i - \bar{X}) \right]^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^{\top} \Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha(b)) (\hat{Y}_i(b) - \bar{Y}(b)) \right]. \quad (5)$$

19 This process can be carried out iteratively, summarized as follows.

- 20 1. Obtain an initial estimate $\hat{\beta}_n^{(0)} = b_n$ of β and initialize with $m = 1$.
- 21 2. Obtain an estimate $\hat{\alpha}_n$ of α given $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m-1)}$, $\hat{\alpha}_n(\hat{\beta}_n^{(m-1)})$.
- 22 3. Update with $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)} = L_n(\hat{\beta}_n^{(m-1)}, \hat{\alpha}_n)$.
- 23 4. Increase m by one and repeat 2 and 3 until convergence.

1 As in Jin et al. (2006a), a consistent and asymptotically normal estimator is important for
 2 avoiding convergence problems. We propose to use the rank-based estimator with Gehan's weight
 3 from the induced smoothing approach of Johnson and Strawderman (2009). This estimator has the
 4 same asymptotic property as the non-smoothed version in Jin et al. (2003), but can be obtained
 5 with computation ease; its finite sample performance was also reported to be as well as the best
 6 competing methods (Johnson and Strawderman, 2009).

7 The GEEs are most efficient when Ω_i is chosen to be the covariance matrix of $\hat{Y}_i(b)$. When Ω_i 's
 8 are the identity matrix (working independence with all marginal variances the same), our estimator
 9 reduces to the least squares estimator of Jin et al. (2006a). The working covariance matrix Ω_i 's are
 10 the same when all clusters have the same size K ; they only vary with i when the cluster sizes are
 11 not equal.

12 For convenience, we assume from now on that $E(\epsilon_{ik}) = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $k = 1, \dots, K$. This
 13 can be achieved by incorporating appropriate columns of ones in X_i , and, hence, adding intercepts
 14 in β . Our construction of working covariance involves filling element Ω_{kl} , for $k, l \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, of
 15 the working covariance matrix Ω . To allow arbitrary number of unique marginal distributions, let
 16 $m_k \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$ be the index of the k th margin among the κ unique marginal distributions. The
 17 conditional expectation $\hat{Y}_{ik}(b)$ is computed as

$$\hat{Y}_{ik}(b) = \Delta_{ik} Y_{ik} + (1 - \Delta_{ik}) \left[\frac{\int_{e_{ik}(b)}^{\infty} u d\hat{F}_{k,b}(u)}{1 - \hat{F}_{k,b}\{e_{ik}(b)\}} + X_{ik}^{\top} b \right],$$

18 where $e_{ik}(b) = Y_{ik} - X_{ik}^{\top} b$ is the right-censored error evaluated at b , and $\hat{F}_{k,b}$ is the pooled Kaplan–
 19 Meier estimator of the distribution function $F_{k,b}$ from the transformed data $\{e_{ir}(b), \Delta_{ir} : m_r = m_k\}$,
 20 which share the same margin m_k . Specifically, $\hat{F}_{k,b}$ is

$$\hat{F}_{k,b}(t) = 1 - \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq r \leq K: m_r = m_k, e_{ir} < t} \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_{ir}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq l \leq K: m_l = m_k} I(e_{jl}(b) \geq e_{ir}(b))} \right).$$

21 To fill the diagonal elements Ω_{kk} , $1 \leq k \leq K$, evaluate the conditional second moment of $\epsilon_{ik}(b)$
 22 given the observed data:

$$\hat{V}_{ik}(b) = \Delta_{ik} e_{ik}^2(b) + (1 - \Delta_{ik}) \frac{\int_{e_{ik}(b)}^{\infty} u^2 d\hat{F}_{k,b}(u)}{1 - \hat{F}_{k,b}\{e_{ik}(b)\}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (6)$$

23 For a given b , we fill Ω_{kk} by an unbiased estimator of $\text{Var}(\epsilon_{ik}(b))$

$$\hat{\Omega}_{kk}(b) = \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq r \leq K: m_r = m_k} \hat{V}_{ik}(b)}{n \sum_{1 \leq r \leq K} I\{m_r = m_k\}}. \quad (7)$$

24 To fill the off-diagonal elements Ω_{kl} , $k \neq l$, define

$$\hat{e}_{ik}(b) = \hat{Y}_{ik}(b) - X_{ik}^{\top} b, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (8)$$

25 the conditional expectation of $\epsilon_{ik}(b)$ given the observed data. Only when $\Delta_{ik} = 1$ is $\hat{e}_{ik}(b)$ equal to
 26 $e_{ik}(b)$. For a given b , we fill Ω_{kl} , $k \neq l$, by

$$\hat{\Omega}_{kl}(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{e}_{ik}(b) \hat{e}_{il}(b). \quad (9)$$

1 Because the construction of $\hat{e}_{ik}(b)$ does not involve the dependence between pair (k, l) in cluster i ,
 2 $\hat{e}_{ik}(b)\hat{e}_{il}(b)$ does not have expectation $\text{Cov}(\epsilon_{ik}(b), \epsilon_{il}(b))$ unless $\Delta_{ik} = \Delta_{il} = 1$. Nevertheless, $\hat{\Omega}_{kl}(b)$
 3 is still usable for its simplicity in constructing working covariance.

4 Parsimonious working covariance structures such as exchangeable (EX) or autoregressive with
 5 order 1 (AR1) can be imposed. Parameters α in the working covariance can be estimated with
 6 method of moment estimator $\hat{\alpha}_n$ based on $\hat{\Omega}$ as in the non-censored case (Liang and Zeger, 1986).
 7 When there is no censoring, the working covariance matrix $\hat{\Omega}$ converges to the true covariance
 8 matrix. This is no longer true when censoring is present. Nevertheless, $\hat{\Omega}$, and consequently, $\hat{\alpha}_n$,
 9 still converges to some limit which helps to improve the efficiency of the GEE estimation.

10 Extension to unequal cluster sizes as in a recurrent event setting is straightforward. In this
 11 case, it is reasonable to assume identical marginal error distributions, hence, identical marginal
 12 variances. The working covariance matrix Ω_i with dimension $K_i \times K_i$ can be constructed with an
 13 given estimator $\hat{\alpha}_n$ for α for a specified working covariance structure.

14 Under certain regularity conditions, the proposed estimator is consistent to the true regression
 15 coefficients β_0 and asymptotically normal. The asymptotic results are summarized in the following
 16 theorems, whose proofs are sketched in the Appendix.

17 **Theorem 1.** *Under conditions A1–A9 in the Appendix, $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)}$ is a consistent estimator of the true*
 18 *parameter β_0 for each $m \geq 1$.*

19 **Theorem 2.** *Under conditions A1–A9 in the Appendix, $n^{1/2}(\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)} - \beta_0)$ converges in distribution*
 20 *to multivariate normal with mean zero for each $m \geq 1$.*

21 The resampling approach developed by Jin et al. (2006a) is adapted to estimate the covariance
 22 matrix of $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)}$. Let $Z_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, be independent and identically distributed positive random
 23 variables, independent of the observed data, with $E(Z_i) = \text{Var}(Z_i) = 1$. Define

$$\hat{Y}_{ik}^*(b) = \Delta_{ik}Y_{ik} + (1 - \Delta_{ik}) \left[\frac{\int_{e_{ik}(b)}^{\infty} u d\hat{F}_{k,b}^*(u)}{1 - \hat{F}_{k,b}^*\{e_{ik}(b)\}} + X_{ik}^\top b \right],$$

24 where

$$\hat{F}_{k,b}^*(t) = 1 - \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq r \leq K: m_r = m_k, e_{ir} < t} \left(1 - \frac{Z_i \Delta_{ir}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq l \leq K: m_l = m_k} Z_l I(e_{jl}(b) \geq e_{ir}(b))} \right).$$

25 Then the multiplier resampling version of equation (5) has the following form,

$$L_n^*(b, \alpha) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (X_i - \bar{X}) \Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha(b)) (X_i - \bar{X}) \right]^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i (X_i - \bar{X}) \Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha(b)) \{ \hat{Y}_i^*(b) - \bar{Y}^*(b) \} \right],$$

26 where $\alpha(b)$ is an estimator of working correlation parameter given regression coefficients evaluated
 27 at b and $\bar{Y}^*(b) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Y}_i^*(b)/n$.

28 For a realization of (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) and an initial estimator $\hat{\beta}_n^{(0)}$, a bootstrap estimator of β is
 29 obtained from iteration $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)*} = L_n^*(\hat{\beta}_n^{(m-1)*})$. The covariance matrix of $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)}$ can be estimated
 30 from the sample covariance matrix of a bootstrap sample of $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)*}$. The consistency of this variance
 31 estimator can be proved following arguments similar to those in Jin et al. (2006a).

4 Simulation Study

We conducted two simulation studies to assess the performance of proposed estimators and compared its efficiency with the initial estimators from Johnson and Strawderman (2009). The first study had a clustered failure time setting with identical regression coefficients across margins and identical marginal error distributions. The cluster sizes were fixed at three. For cluster i , the multivariate failure time $T_i = (T_{i1}, T_{i2}, T_{i3})$ was generated from

$$\log T_{ik} = 2 + X_{1ik} + X_{2ik} + \epsilon_{ik},$$

where X_{1ik} was Bernoulli with rate 0.5, X_{2ik} was $N(0, 0.5^2)$, and $\epsilon_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \epsilon_{i2}, \epsilon_{i3})$ was a trivariate random vector specified by identical marginal error distributions and a copula for the dependence structure. Three marginal error distributions were considered: standard normal, standard logistic, and standard Gumbel, abbreviated by N, L, and G, respectively; the tail of the three distributions gets heavier from N to L to G. The dependence structure was specified by a Clayton copula with three levels of dependence measured by Kendall's tau: 0, 0.3, and 0.6. Censoring times were independently generated from uniform distributions over $(0, c)$, where c was selected for each margin to achieve three levels of censoring percentage: 0%, 25%, and 50%. We considered random samples of size $n = 200$ clusters. Rank-based estimator with Gehan's weight from the induced smoothing approach of Johnson and Strawderman (2009), denoted by JS, was used as the initial estimator for GEE estimators. Two working covariance structures, EX and AR1, were used for the proposed iterative GEE procedure. The covariance matrix of the estimator was obtained from the resampling approach with 200 bootstrap size in Section 3. For each configuration, we did 1000 replicates.

The results are summarized in Table 1. To save space, only results for nonzero Kendall's tau were reported. All estimators appear to be virtually unbiased. The empirical variation of the estimates and the estimated variation based on the resampling procedure agree closely for all estimators. For a given censoring percentage, as the dependence level increases, the variance of the JS estimator changes little, but the variance of the GEE estimators with both working covariance structures decreases. Further, the variance from the EX structure is in general smaller than that from the AR1 structure, which is expected because the true covariance structure is exchangeable in this simulation setting. For a fixed dependence level, the effect of censoring percentage on the variances of the estimator depends on the marginal error distributions. The variance increases clearly as the censoring gets heavier when the errors are normally distributed, but this pattern is not observed with Gumbel or logistic marginal error distributions. The relative efficiency of the proposed GEE estimator in relative to the rank-based JS estimator is up to 3.5 in the table (with logistic margin and Kendall's tau 0.6 for β_2).

The second simulation setting had multiple event data with different regression coefficients and different marginal error distributions. The cluster sizes were still fixed at three. For cluster i , the multivariate failure times were generated from

$$\log T_{ik} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{1k}X_{1ik} + \beta_{2k}X_{2ik} + \epsilon_{ik},$$

where $(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{1k}, \beta_{2k})$, $k = 1, 2, 3$, was the regression coefficient vector for margin k , and $\epsilon_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \epsilon_{i2}, \epsilon_{i3})$ was a trivariate random vector specified by three marginal distributions and a copula for dependence. The marginal distributions of ϵ_i were standard normal, standard logistic, and standard Gumbel, respectively, for the first, second and third margin; their copula was Clayton with three dependence levels measured by Kendall's tau: 0, 0.3, and 0.6. The regression coefficients $(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{1k}, \beta_{2k})$ were set to be $(-1, 1, -1)$, $(1, -1, 1)$, and $(1, 1, 1)$, respectively for $k = 1, 2$, and 3.

Table 1: Summary of simulation results with identical regression coefficients and identical marginal error distributions based on 1000 replications. Empirical SE is the standard deviation of the parameter estimates; Estimated SE is the mean of the standard error of the estimator; RE is the empirical relative efficiencies in relative to the JS estimator.

Marg	τ	Cens	β	Bias			Empirical SE			Estimated SE			RE	
				JS	EX	AR1	JS	EX	AR1	JS	EX	AR1	EX	AR1
N	0.3	0%	β_1	-0.002	-0.003	-0.004	0.087	0.072	0.075	0.084	0.068	0.072	1.492	1.376
			β_2	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.083	0.072	0.074	0.084	0.068	0.071	1.349	1.264
		25%	β_1	-0.008	-0.012	-0.013	0.091	0.073	0.076	0.089	0.073	0.077	1.543	1.415
			β_2	-0.003	-0.005	-0.003	0.093	0.075	0.079	0.090	0.075	0.078	1.550	1.384
		50%	β_1	-0.006	-0.011	-0.011	0.101	0.084	0.088	0.099	0.086	0.090	1.467	1.316
			β_2	-0.004	-0.009	-0.010	0.102	0.084	0.090	0.102	0.089	0.093	1.484	1.281
	0.6	0%	β_1	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.082	0.047	0.050	0.083	0.046	0.050	3.130	2.691
			β_2	0.005	0.001	0.001	0.082	0.045	0.050	0.084	0.046	0.050	3.316	2.697
		25%	β_1	-0.007	-0.009	-0.009	0.092	0.050	0.055	0.088	0.052	0.057	3.322	2.826
			β_2	-0.003	-0.008	-0.007	0.090	0.053	0.058	0.090	0.054	0.058	2.931	2.432
		50%	β_1	-0.003	-0.008	-0.008	0.101	0.063	0.069	0.100	0.069	0.074	2.567	2.144
			β_2	0.000	-0.005	-0.004	0.103	0.070	0.077	0.102	0.071	0.077	2.142	1.815
L	0.3	0%	β_1	-0.001	0.002	0.004	0.138	0.123	0.130	0.142	0.124	0.130	1.258	1.128
			β_2	-0.006	-0.004	-0.004	0.145	0.125	0.130	0.142	0.123	0.128	1.352	1.250
		25%	β_1	-0.020	-0.022	-0.021	0.140	0.117	0.121	0.145	0.121	0.128	1.442	1.341
			β_2	-0.013	-0.017	-0.018	0.153	0.124	0.131	0.147	0.121	0.128	1.512	1.369
		50%	β_1	-0.011	-0.012	-0.012	0.164	0.133	0.140	0.162	0.135	0.143	1.524	1.363
			β_2	-0.008	-0.013	-0.014	0.164	0.137	0.148	0.166	0.137	0.145	1.428	1.231
	0.6	0%	β_1	0.006	0.001	0.000	0.145	0.084	0.093	0.141	0.085	0.093	2.966	2.419
			β_2	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.142	0.082	0.090	0.142	0.085	0.092	3.020	2.505
		25%	β_1	-0.011	-0.014	-0.015	0.145	0.080	0.088	0.145	0.080	0.087	3.245	2.679
			β_2	-0.014	-0.013	-0.013	0.149	0.080	0.088	0.146	0.081	0.088	3.494	2.868
		50%	β_1	-0.009	-0.011	-0.012	0.164	0.089	0.099	0.162	0.094	0.102	3.439	2.778
			β_2	-0.006	-0.011	-0.012	0.161	0.092	0.102	0.165	0.095	0.104	3.036	2.479
G	0.3	0%	β_1	-0.001	0.004	0.005	0.092	0.092	0.096	0.094	0.093	0.096	0.982	0.911
			β_2	0.000	-0.004	-0.005	0.093	0.094	0.096	0.094	0.093	0.096	0.973	0.942
		25%	β_1	-0.007	-0.015	-0.017	0.095	0.086	0.089	0.093	0.085	0.088	1.221	1.155
			β_2	-0.007	-0.012	-0.014	0.094	0.088	0.092	0.094	0.086	0.089	1.140	1.048
		50%	β_1	-0.008	-0.012	-0.012	0.099	0.089	0.091	0.095	0.090	0.093	1.255	1.187
			β_2	-0.009	-0.013	-0.014	0.100	0.090	0.094	0.097	0.092	0.095	1.235	1.128
	0.6	0%	β_1	0.000	-0.004	-0.005	0.095	0.075	0.081	0.094	0.072	0.077	1.614	1.374
			β_2	0.001	-0.002	-0.002	0.094	0.074	0.079	0.094	0.071	0.077	1.592	1.426
		25%	β_1	-0.013	-0.015	-0.016	0.090	0.065	0.070	0.093	0.065	0.070	1.911	1.644
			β_2	-0.013	-0.016	-0.015	0.099	0.066	0.071	0.093	0.066	0.071	2.231	1.918
		50%	β_1	-0.012	-0.011	-0.011	0.093	0.069	0.074	0.095	0.074	0.079	1.835	1.561
			β_2	-0.008	-0.013	-0.013	0.096	0.073	0.079	0.097	0.077	0.083	1.729	1.448

1 Other settings such as the covariates, censoring time, sample size, initial estimator, bootstrap
 2 sample size for variance estimation, replication size were all the same as in the first simulation
 3 setting. In addition to the JS estimator, GEE estimators with two working covariance structures
 4 were considered: EX and unstructured (UN).

5 The results are summarized in Tables 2. Similar to the first simulation study, all estimators
 6 are virtually unbiased, and their variance estimators are generally close to the empirical variances
 7 of the replicates. The variance of the GEE estimators decreases as the dependence gets stronger
 8 at any level of censoring percentage. Holding the dependence level, as the censoring percentage
 9 increases, the variance increases at the normal margin, but the pattern is different for the other
 10 two margins. The variance has little changes at the logistic margin. At the Gumbel margin, it
 11 remains its level as the censoring percentage increases from 0 to 25%, but increases notably as the
 12 censoring percentage increases from 25% to 50%. There is almost no difference between the two
 13 working covariance structures, both leading to about the same relative efficiency compared to the
 14 rank-based JS estimator. The relative efficiency of both GEE estimators almost double as Kendall's
 15 tau is increased from 0.3 to 0.6.

16 5 Application

17 The diabetic retinopathy study (DRS) was started in 1971 (Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research
 18 Group, 1976) with the aim to investigate the efficacy of laser photocoagulation in delaying the
 19 onset of severe vision loss. Diabetic retinopathy is the most common and serious eye complication
 20 of diabetes, which may lead to poor vision or even blindness. A subset of the DRS data for patients
 21 with “high-risk” diabetic retinopathy, categorized by risk group 6 or higher, has been analyzed by
 22 many authors (e.g., Huster et al., 1989; Lee and Wei, 1993; Liang et al., 1993; Spiekerman and Lin,
 23 1996). Each of the 197 patients in this subset had one eye randomized to laser treatment and the
 24 other eye received no treatment. The outcomes of interest were the actual times from initiation of
 25 treatment to the time when visual acuity dropped below 5/200 at two visits in a row (defined as
 26 “blindness”). The scientific interest was the effectiveness of the laser treatment and the influence
 27 of other risk factors. In addition to the treatment indicator, three covariates are available: age at
 28 diagnosis of diabetes, type of diabetes (1 = adult, 0 = juvenile), and risk group (6 to 12, rescaled to
 29 0.5 to 1.0). Since the interaction between treatment and diabetes type was found to be significant
 30 in Spiekerman and Lin (1996), we also include this interaction in the model.

31 We first fit a bivariate AFT model with identical error margins and identical regression coeffi-
 32 cients for both left and right eyes. The second AFT model we fit was the opposite, with different
 33 error margins and different regression coefficients for left and right eyes. For each model, we report
 34 GEE estimators with working independence and working exchangeable covariance structures, in
 35 addition to the rank-based JS estimator in Table 3. The GEE estimator with exchangeable work-
 36 ing structure from the first model suggests that the treatment was significant in delaying the onset
 37 of vision loss; it had a significant higher effect for adult than for juvenile, and patients in higher risk
 38 groups tended to lose vision sooner. Note that the treatment effect was not significant if working
 39 independence were used in the GEE estimator. The second model offered a possibility to check
 40 whether the marginal error distributions and regression coefficients should indeed be identical as
 41 assumed in the first model. Figure 1 shows the the Kaplan–Meier survival curves of the censored
 42 residuals for the left margin and right margin respectively, overlaid with the pooled estimate from
 43 the first model. All three curves appear to be mingled together tightly. A naive log-rank test to
 44 compare the two margins, ignoring that the regression coefficients were not known but estimated,

Table 2: Summary of simulation results with different regression coefficients and different marginal error distributions based on 1000 replications. Empirical SE is the standard deviation of the parameter estimates; Estimated SE is the mean of the standard error of the estimator; RE is the empirical relative efficiencies in relative to the JS estimator.

τ	Cen	β	EST			Empirical SE			Estimated SE			RE	
			JS	EX	UN	JS	EX	UN	JS	EX	UN	EX	UN
0.3	0%	β_{11}	0.008	0.003	0.003	0.143	0.122	0.123	0.146	0.120	0.119	1.370	1.351
		β_{21}	0.000	-0.003	-0.004	0.151	0.130	0.130	0.146	0.120	0.119	1.340	1.346
		β_{12}	-0.000	-0.003	-0.002	0.164	0.163	0.164	0.166	0.160	0.159	1.014	1.006
		β_{22}	-0.001	-0.005	-0.005	0.162	0.160	0.161	0.166	0.158	0.157	1.023	1.012
		β_{13}	0.002	-0.004	-0.003	0.242	0.219	0.219	0.247	0.217	0.217	1.221	1.220
		β_{23}	0.007	-0.001	-0.003	0.254	0.227	0.228	0.249	0.217	0.217	1.257	1.248
	25%	β_{11}	0.008	0.004	0.003	0.154	0.131	0.132	0.156	0.127	0.127	1.374	1.368
		β_{21}	-0.005	-0.007	-0.006	0.160	0.132	0.132	0.158	0.129	0.128	1.476	1.478
		β_{12}	-0.006	-0.001	-0.000	0.161	0.151	0.151	0.165	0.148	0.147	1.147	1.150
		β_{22}	-0.003	-0.010	-0.010	0.170	0.154	0.154	0.167	0.149	0.149	1.217	1.209
		β_{13}	0.002	-0.006	-0.006	0.262	0.228	0.230	0.260	0.220	0.219	1.315	1.295
		β_{23}	-0.000	-0.011	-0.012	0.262	0.229	0.228	0.264	0.221	0.221	1.310	1.321
	50%	β_{11}	0.010	0.001	-0.000	0.170	0.144	0.145	0.177	0.146	0.145	1.381	1.376
		β_{21}	-0.018	-0.008	-0.007	0.180	0.150	0.150	0.181	0.148	0.147	1.443	1.434
		β_{12}	-0.006	-0.005	-0.004	0.176	0.153	0.152	0.169	0.149	0.148	1.319	1.342
		β_{22}	0.014	0.004	0.002	0.185	0.165	0.166	0.172	0.153	0.152	1.261	1.241
		β_{13}	0.018	0.001	0.000	0.315	0.270	0.271	0.309	0.262	0.260	1.364	1.352
		β_{23}	0.029	0.006	0.007	0.327	0.283	0.283	0.314	0.264	0.262	1.339	1.339
0.6	0%	β_{11}	0.004	-0.000	-0.001	0.149	0.089	0.087	0.146	0.084	0.092	2.813	2.919
		β_{21}	-0.015	-0.003	-0.002	0.140	0.085	0.085	0.146	0.082	0.090	2.700	2.722
		β_{12}	-0.010	0.000	-0.001	0.167	0.126	0.126	0.165	0.120	0.142	1.754	1.744
		β_{22}	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	0.169	0.124	0.124	0.165	0.119	0.166	1.873	1.853
		β_{13}	0.003	-0.004	-0.005	0.245	0.159	0.156	0.248	0.156	0.192	2.370	2.451
		β_{23}	-0.003	-0.001	-0.000	0.238	0.158	0.156	0.248	0.154	0.189	2.279	2.326
	25%	β_{11}	0.009	0.003	0.002	0.155	0.093	0.092	0.157	0.091	0.113	2.783	2.858
		β_{21}	-0.007	-0.004	-0.005	0.155	0.093	0.092	0.159	0.093	0.112	2.763	2.798
		β_{12}	0.000	-0.003	-0.002	0.166	0.113	0.113	0.166	0.111	0.114	2.145	2.168
		β_{22}	-0.003	-0.006	-0.006	0.168	0.118	0.118	0.167	0.112	0.114	2.036	2.033
		β_{13}	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.266	0.160	0.160	0.260	0.155	0.175	2.769	2.771
		β_{23}	0.011	-0.000	0.000	0.264	0.153	0.152	0.262	0.155	0.174	2.991	3.028
	50%	β_{11}	0.007	0.004	0.004	0.174	0.112	0.111	0.176	0.112	0.112	2.404	2.471
		β_{21}	-0.015	-0.005	-0.005	0.192	0.120	0.119	0.179	0.118	0.117	2.567	2.587
		β_{12}	-0.009	0.002	0.003	0.180	0.120	0.120	0.169	0.119	0.120	2.235	2.229
		β_{22}	0.017	0.005	0.003	0.176	0.127	0.127	0.172	0.125	0.126	1.911	1.923
		β_{13}	-0.000	-0.006	-0.003	0.307	0.199	0.196	0.312	0.200	0.203	2.387	2.444
		β_{23}	0.036	0.004	0.004	0.322	0.207	0.205	0.315	0.204	0.203	2.423	2.471

Table 3: Results of analyzing Diabetic Retinopathy Study.

Margin	Effects	JS		IND		EX	
		EST	SE	EST	SE	EST	SE
Identical error margins and identical regression coefficients:							
pooled	risk group	-2.659	0.739	-2.408	0.859	-2.306	0.775
	age	-0.010	0.012	-0.010	0.013	-0.010	0.014
	diabetes	-0.140	0.349	-0.065	0.440	-0.065	0.369
	treatment	0.520	0.197	0.545	0.330	0.542	0.263
	interaction	1.116	0.301	0.961	0.466	0.964	0.410
Different error margins and different regression coefficients:							
left	risk group	-2.819	1.114	-2.832	1.195	-2.654	1.242
	age	-0.042	0.016	-0.037	0.019	-0.036	0.020
	diabetes	0.825	0.463	0.706	0.554	0.702	0.544
	treatment	0.925	0.422	0.645	0.549	0.652	0.489
	interaction	1.719	0.650	1.742	0.855	1.739	0.820
right	risk group	-2.087	1.013	-1.944	1.316	-1.805	1.283
	age	0.011	0.014	0.009	0.016	0.009	0.018
	diabetes	-0.770	0.432	-0.640	0.528	-0.639	0.656
	treatment	0.383	0.326	0.481	0.381	0.477	0.446
	interaction	0.752	0.476	0.600	0.639	0.603	0.646
Identical error margins with partial common regression coefficients:							
left	age	-0.039	0.015	-0.036	0.021	-0.036	0.022
	diabetes	0.892	0.406	0.848	0.607	0.846	0.621
right	age	0.011	0.015	0.009	0.019	0.009	0.017
	diabetes	-0.870	0.435	-0.837	0.499	-0.835	0.574
common	treatment	0.630	0.227	0.606	0.250	0.607	0.267
	risk group	-2.588	0.747	-2.409	1.034	-2.264	0.938
	interaction	1.067	0.318	1.014	0.344	1.014	0.409




Figure 1: Kaplan–Meier survival curves for censored residuals of the two applications. Left: the DRS Study. Right: the colon cancer study.

1 yielded a p-value of 0.907, confirming the visual observation. Our joint model also allows hypoth-
 2 esis testing of equal coefficients for each covariate across the two margins with Wald-type tests.
 3 The coefficients of treatment, risk group, and treatment-diabetes interaction were found to be not
 4 significantly different across the two margins, with p-values 0.400, 0.278, and 0.147, respectively.
 5 The coefficients of age and diabetes were found to be significantly different across the two margins,
 6 with p-values 0.036 and 0.042, respectively.

7 We then fit an bivariate AFT model with identical error margins, same coefficients for treatment,
 8 risk group and treatment-diabetes interaction, and different coefficients for age and diabetes. This
 9 is one of the many models with intermediate complexity between the first model and the second
 10 model. Results are summarized in the last section of Table 3. This time, the shared coefficients
 11 of treatment, risk group, and treatment-diabetes interaction remained significant as before. An
 12 interesting finding is that the difference between the coefficient of diabetes (0.846 versus -0.835)
 13 is significantly nonzero with a p-value 0.002, suggesting that the adult diabetes have sooner onset
 14 of vision loss in right eye than in left eye. This finding has not been reported in existing analyses.

15 The second application is a colon cancer study (Lin, 1994). Through randomization, 315,
 16 310 and 304 patients with stage C colon cancer received observation, levamisole alone (Lev), and
 17 levamisole combined with fluorouracil (Lev + 5FU), respectively. Lin (1994) considered bivariate
 18 models for the time to first recurrence and the time to death. The research interest was the
 19 effectiveness of the treatment in prolonging the time to recurrence and time to death. Gender and
 20 age are available as covariates besides treatment.

21 In this application, the error distributions and regression coefficients have no reason to be
 22 identical across margins. We report results with different error margin and different regression
 23 coefficients in Table 4. Since all covariates are at the cluster level, the exchangeable and independent
 24 working covariance structure give the same results (e.g., Hin et al., 2007). The Kaplan–Meier
 25 survival curves for the two error margins are shown in Figure 1, which clearly exhibits no similarity;
 26 a naive log-rank test gives p-value 0.0008. The treatment of levamisole combined with fluorouracil

Table 4: Result of analyzing Colon Cancer Study

Margin	Effects	JS		EX	
		EST	SE	EST	SE
recurrence	Lev	0.010	0.124	0.012	0.173
	Lev + 5FU	0.940	0.138	0.931	0.185
	gender	0.310	0.111	0.274	0.161
	age	0.011	0.004	0.012	0.006
death	Lev	-0.009	0.104	-0.038	0.131
	Lev + 5FU	0.458	0.108	0.307	0.136
	gender	0.064	0.090	0.066	0.111
	age	-0.003	0.004	-0.004	0.004

1 appears to have a significant positive effect on both event times. The gender and age are found not
 2 to be significant for either time. The estimated difference between the combined treatment effect
 3 on recurrence and on death (0.931 versus 0.307) has a standard error 0.103, suggesting that the
 4 combined treatment has a higher effect on recurrence than on death.

5 6 Discussion

6 The working covariance structure of the proposed GEE approach is different from that in a gen-
 7 eralized linear model setting, where the variance is assumed to be a function of the mean. The
 8 errors at each margin are assumed to be independent and identically distributed, and hence have
 9 the same variance. This assumption may be relaxed by imposing a structure on the variance of
 10 the errors. For instance, in model (1), we replace ϵ_{ik} with $\sigma_{ik}\nu_{ik}$, where ν_{ik} 's are independent and
 11 identically distributed for $i = 1, \dots, n$ with mean zero and variance one, and the scale σ_{ik} may be
 12 described by a regression model with covariates. Such specification leads to heteroskedasticity in
 13 errors and merits further investigation.

14 For applications like the DRS study, where there are reasons to impose identical distribution
 15 across margins, a rigorous test to compare the survival curves of the residuals would be desirable.
 16 We used naive tests ignoring the fact that the residuals were calculated based on estimated regres-
 17 sion coefficients. A rigorous test procedure should take into account of the variation caused by the
 18 estimation procedure.

19 A Sketch of the Proofs

20 We impose the following regularity conditions:

21 A1: $\|X_i\| \leq B$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and some nonrandom constant B , where $\|\cdot\|$ is matrix norm.

22 A2: The density function of $F_{k,\beta}$ exists such that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t^2 dF_{k,\beta}(t) < \infty$, for $k = 1, \dots, K$.

A3: The distribution function $F_{k,\beta}$ is twice differentiable with density $f_{k,\beta}$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{f'_{k,\beta}(t)}{f_{k,\beta}(t)} \right)^2 dF_{k,\beta}(t) < \infty$$

1 where $1 \leq k \leq K$, and both $f_{k,\beta}(t)$ and $f'_{k,\beta}(t)$ are bounded functions.

2 A4: $E[\exp(\theta \epsilon_{ik}^-)] + \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} E[\exp(\theta C_{ik}^-)] < \infty$ for some $\theta > 0$, where $a^- = |a|I_{\{a \leq 0\}}$.

3 A5: $\sup_{|b| < \infty; -\infty < t < \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \Pr(t \leq C_{ik} - X_{ik}^\top b \leq t + h) = O(nh)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$ and $nh \rightarrow \infty$.

4 A6: As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\alpha}_n$ is bounded and is $n^{1/2}$ consistent to α_0 given β .

5 A7: As $n \rightarrow \infty$, initial estimator b_n is $n^{1/2}$ consistent to β_0 and $\sqrt{n}(b_n - \beta_0)$ is asymptotically normal
6 with zero mean.

7 A8: The slope matrices $n^{-1} \partial U_n / \partial \beta$ and $n^{-1} \partial U_n / \partial b$ evaluated at $(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)$ converge to nonde-
8 generate, finite limit A and B , respectively.

9 A9: The derivative $\partial \Omega_i^{-1}(\alpha) / \partial \alpha$ is finite for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

10 Conditions A1–A5 are standard and ensure the existence of the solution of equation (2) (Lai
11 and Ying, 1991). It is natural to assume that the working covariance matrix Ω in equation (4)
12 is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Then there exist a $K \times K$ nonsingular matrix, Γ , such
13 that $\Omega(\alpha_0) = \Gamma^{1/2} \Gamma^{1/2}$. Let $\mathbb{X}_i = \Gamma^{-1/2} X_i$, $\mathbb{Y}_i = \Gamma^{-1/2} Y_i$, $\mathbb{C}_i = \Gamma^{-1/2} C_i$, and $\omega_i = \Gamma^{-1/2} \epsilon_i$. Then
14 equation (4) evaluated at $\alpha = \alpha_0$ can be viewed as equation (2) with the transformed data \mathbb{X}_i and
15 $\mathbb{Y}_i = \min(\mathbb{Y}_i, \mathbb{C}_i)$, with error ω_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. The existence of the solution to equation (4) can be
16 verified by the same arguments as in Lai and Ying (1991), with assumptions similar to A1 to A5
17 on the transformed data. The consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimator given $\alpha = \alpha_0$
18 follow from the same arguments as in Jin et al. (2006a).

19 The extra complexity here comes from the fact that equation (4) is solved at $\alpha = \hat{\alpha}_n$, an
20 estimator of α_0 . Under condition A9, the i th term in the summation of $\partial U_n / \partial \alpha$ evaluated at
21 $(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)$ is a linear function of $\hat{Y}_i(\beta_0) - X_i^\top \beta_0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, with expectation zero. By the law
22 of large number, $n^{-1} \partial U_n / \partial \alpha$ evaluated at $(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)$ converges to zero in probability.

23 A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

24 At the solution $\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)}$ given b_n and $\hat{\alpha}_n$, we have $n^{-1} U_n(\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)}, b_n, \hat{\alpha}_n) = 0$. Taylor expansion at
25 $(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{n} U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0) + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} [U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)] (\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)} - \beta_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial b} [U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)] (b_n - \beta_0) + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} [U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)] (\hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0) + A_n(\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)} - \beta_0) + B_n(b_n - \beta_0) + C_n(\hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

26 With regularity conditions A1–A5, the first term converges in probability to zero by the law of
27 large number. The convergence of b_n and α_n in A6 and A7, combined with the limit condition in
28 A8 and A9, then gives consistency of $\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)}$ to β_0 . By induction, $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)}$ is consistent for β_0 at every m .

1 A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

2 Under regularity conditions $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)} - \beta_0)$ can be expressed as

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)} - \beta_0) = [A_n]^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0) + B_n \sqrt{n}(b_n - \beta_0) + C_n \sqrt{n}(\hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0) \right] + o_p(1). \quad (11)$$

3 With condition A9, C_n converges to zero in probability, and, hence, with \sqrt{n} consistency of $\hat{\alpha}_n$,
4 $C_n \sqrt{n}(\hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_0) = o_p(1)$. Equation (11) is then asymptotically equivalent to

$$[A_n]^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0) + B_n \sqrt{n}(b_n - \beta_0) \right].$$

5 With the assumption that $b_n - \beta_0$ is asymptotically normal, there exist some nonrandom functions
6 η_i with zero mean such that,

$$\sqrt{n}(b_n - \beta_0) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i + o_p(\|b_n - \beta_0\|).$$

7 On the other hand, $U_n(\beta_0, \beta_0, \alpha_0)$ is a sum of independent and identically distributed quantities
8 with zero mean, denoted by ϕ_i 's, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Equation (11) reduces to

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)} - \beta_0) = [A_n]^{-1} \left[n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\phi_i + B_n \eta_i) \right] + o_p(\|b_n - \beta_0\|).$$

9 By multivariate central limit theorem for sums of independent random vectors, the asymptotic
10 distribution for $\hat{\beta}_n^{(1)}$ is zero mean multivariate normal as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The limit covariance matrix Σ
11 have the form $A^{-1} \Phi A^{-1}$, where $\Phi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i v_i^\top$ with $v_i = \phi_i + B_n \eta_i$. Induction then
12 implies that $\hat{\beta}_n^{(m)}$ is multivariate normal for every m .

13 References

14 Brown, B. M. and Wang, Y.-G. (2005). Standard errors and covariance matrices for smoothed rank
15 estimators. *Biometrika* **92**, 149–158.

16 Brown, B. M. and Wang, Y.-G. (2007). Induced smoothing for rank regression with censored
17 survival times. *Statistics in Medicine* **26**, 828–836.

18 Buckley, J. and James, I. (1979). Linear regression with censored data. *Biometrika* **66**, 429–436.

19 Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal*
20 *Statistical Society, Series B, Methodological* **34**, 187–220.

21 Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group (1976). Preliminary report on effects of photocoagu-
22 lation therapy. *American Journal of Ophthalmology* **81**, 383–396.

23 Gehan, E. A. (1965). A generalized Wilcoxon test for comparing arbitrarily singly-censored samples.
24 *Biometrika* **52**, 203–223.

- 1 Hin, L.-Y., Carey, V. J., and Wang, Y.-G. (2007). Criteria for working correlation structure selection
2 in GEE. *The American Statistician* **61**, 360–364. doi:10.1198/000313007X245122.
- 3 Hornsteiner, U. and Hamerle, A. (1996). A combined GEE/Buckley-James method for estimating
4 an accelerated failure time model of multivariate failure times. Discussion Paper 47, Ludwig-
5 Maximilians-Universität München, Collaborative Research Center 386.
- 6 Huang, Y. (2002). Calibration regression of censored lifetime medical cost. *Journal of the American*
7 *Statistical Association* **97**, 318–327.
- 8 Huster, W. J., Brookmeyer, R., and Self, S. G. (1989). Modelling paired survival data with covari-
9 ates. *Biometrics* **45**, 145–156.
- 10 Jin, Z., Lin, D. Y., Wei, L. J., and Ying, Z. (2003). Rank-based inference for the accelerated failure
11 time model. *Biometrika* **90**, 341–353.
- 12 Jin, Z., Lin, D. Y., and Ying, Z. (2006a). On least-squares regression with censored data. *Biometrika*
13 **93**, 147–161.
- 14 Jin, Z., Lin, D. Y., and Ying, Z. (2006b). Rank regression analysis of multivariate failure time data
15 based on marginal linear models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **33**, 1–23.
- 16 Johnson, L. M. and Strawderman, R. L. (2009). Induced smoothing for the semiparametric ac-
17 celerated failure time model: Asymptotics and extensions to clustered data. *Biometrika* **96**,
18 577–590.
- 19 Lai, T. L. and Ying, Z. (1991). Large sample theory of a modified Buckley-James estimator for
20 regression analysis with censored data. *The Annals of Statistics* **19**, 1370–1402.
- 21 Lee, E. W. and Wei, Z., L. J. and Ying (1993). Linear regression analysis for highly stratified
22 failure time data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **88**, 557–565.
- 23 Li, H. and Yin, G. (2009). Generalized method of moments estimation for linear regression with
24 clustered failure time data. *Biometrika* **96**, 293–306.
- 25 Liang, K.-Y., Self, S. G., and Chang, Y.-C. (1993). Modelling marginal hazards in multivariate
26 failure time data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B: Statistical Methodology* **55**,
27 441–453.
- 28 Liang, K.-Y. and Zeger, S. L. (1986). Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models.
29 *Biometrika* **73**, 13–22.
- 30 Lin, D. Y. (1994). Cox regression analysis of multivariate failure time data: The marginal approach.
31 *Statistics in Medicine* **13**, 2233–2247.
- 32 Prentice, R. L. (1978). Linear rank tests with right censored data (Corr: V70 p304). *Biometrika*
33 **65**, 167–180.
- 34 Qu, A., Lindsay, B. G., and Li, B. (2000). Improving generalised estimating equations using
35 quadratic inference functions. *Biometrika* **87**, 823–836.

- 1 Ritov, Y. (1990). Estimation in a linear regression model with censored data. *The Annals of*
2 *Statistics* **18**, 303–328.
- 3 Robins, J. M. and Rotnitzky, A. (1992). Recovery of information and adjustment for dependent
4 censoring using surrogate markers. In Jewell, N., Dietz, K., and Farewell, V. (editors), *AIDS*
5 *Epidemiology — Methodological Issues*, pages 297–331. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser.
- 6 Spiekerman, C. F. and Lin, D. Y. (1996). Checking the marginal Cox model for correlated failure
7 time data. *Biometrika* **83**, 143–156.
- 8 Strawderman, R. L. (2005). The accelerated gap times model. *Biometrika* **92**, 647–666.
- 9 Stute, W. (1993). Consistent estimation under random censorship when covariables are present.
10 *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **45**, 89–103.
- 11 Stute, W. (1996). Distributional convergence under random censorship when covariables are
12 present. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **23**, 461–471.
- 13 Tsiatis, A. A. (1990). Estimating regression parameters using linear rank tests for censored data.
14 *The Annals of Statistics* **18**, 354–372.
- 15 Wang, Y.-G. and Fu, L. (2011). Rank regression for accelerated failure time model with clustered
16 and censored data. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **55**, 2334–2343.
- 17 Ying, Z. (1993). A large sample study of rank estimation for censored regression data. *The Annals*
18 *of Statistics* **21**, 76–99.
- 19 Zhou, M. (1992). M -estimation in censored linear models. *Biometrika* **79**, 837–841.
- 20 Department of Statistics, University of Connecticut, 215 Glenbrook Rd. U-4120, Storrs, CT 06269,
21 U.S.A.
22 E-mail: (steven.chiou@uconn.edu and jun.yan@uconn.edu)
- 23 Division of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, A460 Mayo Building,
24 MMC 303, 420 Delaware St., S.E. Minneapolis, MN 55455
25 E-mail: (junghikim0@gmail.com)
- 26 Institute for Public Health Research, University of Connecticut Health Center, 99 Ash Street, 2nd
27 Floor, MC 7160, East Hartford, CT 06108
28 E-mail: (jun.yan@uconn.edu)