

# Predictive Accuracy of Markers or Risk Scores for Interval Censored Survival Data

Yuan Wu, Xiaofei Wang, Jiaying Lin, Beilin Jia, and Kouros Owzar

Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University Medical Center

Durham, North Carolina, U.S.A.

## Abstract

Methods for the evaluation of the predictive accuracy of biomarkers with respect to survival outcomes subject to right censoring have been discussed extensively in the literature. In cancer and other diseases, survival outcomes are commonly subject to interval censoring by design or due to the follow up schema. In this paper, we present an estimator for the area under the time-dependent receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve for interval censored data based on a nonparametric sieve maximum likelihood approach. We establish the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimator, and illustrate its finite-sample properties using a simulation study. The application of our method is illustrated using data from a cancer clinical study. An open-source R package to implement the proposed method is available on CRAN.

**Keywords:** Area under ROC curve; Interval censoring; Joint distribution; Sieve estimation

# 1 Introduction

The receiver operator curve (ROC) (Zweig and Campbell, 1993) serves as an established and widely used tool for visual assessment of the sensitivity and specificity of diagnostic tests, and of risk and prediction scores derived from machine learning applications (Spackman, 1989). While originally developed for binary outcomes, the ROC concept has been extended to the evaluation of the predictive accuracy of tests and markers with respect to time-to-event outcomes (Heagerty *et al.*, 2000). In this context, a time-dependent analog of the ROC is constructed on the basis of corresponding time-dependent analogs of sensitivity and specificity.

There exists a rich body of literature for estimation of the time-dependent ROC when the time-to-event outcome is subject to a right-censoring mechanism (Heagerty *et al.*, 2000; Heagerty and Zheng, 2005; Saha-Chaudhuri and Heagerty, 2013). The application of these methods is limited in many cancer studies as the corresponding time-to-event outcomes of interest are invariably subject to interval-censoring mechanisms by virtue of clinical practice or study design. To be more specific, we consider CALGB 30801 which is a randomized double-blinded phase III study evaluating the role of selective COX-2 inhibition in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (Edelman *et al.*, 2017). The progression of the tumors in these patients is monitored on the basis of radiologic assessments once every two months in the first two years and then once every six months in the next three years. Per protocol, these continue until the first confirmed assessment of tumor progression. The actual time of this event is not observable as it is realized between two consecutive assessments dates. Similarly toxicity events for this and most cancer studies are not reported in real time but rather by dosing cycles. Neutropenia, defined as an abnormally low count of neutrophils, is a common toxicity associated with many chemotherapy agents, including

gemcitabine, pemetrexed or carboplatin, the agents used in CALGB 30801. A high-grade neutropenia event is defined when the absolute neutrophil count falls below 1000 cells per microliter of blood. As neutrophil counts are typically measured right before the chemotherapy dose is administered, the time of this event, when the neutrophil count crosses the critical threshold, is not observable. What are observed are the date of the first cycle at which the patient's count as observed to be below the threshold, along with the date of the previous cycle when the count was recorded to be above the threshold. Consequently the actual time of toxicity is not observable and effectively interval censored between the dates of two consecutive drug cycles.

A naïve approach for estimating the ROC in presence of an interval-censored mechanism is to impute the event time using for example the midpoint or the right end of the last observed time interval. While this approach is convenient, in the sense that it allows for re-purposing methods developed for right-censored data, it is biased. Li and Ma (2011) proposed a non-parametric approach for estimating the ROC and AUC in presence of interval censoring. To estimate the curve at time say  $t > 0$ , they exclude the data from any patients whose last observed time interval contains  $t$ . The authors formally quantify the loss of information using a fraction and point out that as this fraction increases, the accuracy of the estimator decreases and the variance is inflated. Jacqmin-Gadda *et al.* (2016) proposed two approaches to estimate the time-dependent ROC and AUC in the context of semi-competing time-to-event outcomes subject to interval censoring. Their first approach is fully model based method, which is based on the well known Cox regression type illness-death model for the mark effect on the two competing events. Their second approach also needs the result of illness-death model result to impute the probability of subjects become diseased before time  $t$  when  $t$  is interval censored. These two approaches could be potentially applied for interval censored single event case. But obviously the mis-specification of the illness-death

model is very likely to introduce estimation bias in the single event case.

In this paper, we propose a non-parametric approach for estimating the time-dependent ROC and AUC when the outcome is subject to an interval-censoring mechanism. Our approach is summarized as follows. Let  $T$  denote the time of the event of interest and  $M$  denote a quantitative marker whose predictive performance with respect to  $T$  is to be assessed on the basis of the time-dependent ROC.  $T$  is subject to interval censoring and  $M$  is assumed to be observable.

We first adopt a sieve spline approach to estimate the joint distribution of  $(T, M)$  and the corresponding marginal distribution of  $M$ . That is, the joint and marginal functions are restricted in spline function classes (sub-sets of nonparametric function classes) for their maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). The resulting estimates are then used to produce plug-in estimates of the time-dependent sensitivity and specificity functions which are in turn used to produce a plug-in estimator of the time-dependent ROC function.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we outline the technical considerations for our proposed method. Thereafter, we illustrate its finite-sample operating characteristics using a simulation study. Finally, we present an analysis assessing the performance of COX2 and pgem1 as predictive biomarkers for progression-free survival (PFS) in advanced non-small cell lung cancer based on data from CALGB 30801 and conclude the paper with a discussion. The theoretical results are developed in Web Appendix 1. Specifically, we show that for each  $t$  in the support of the censoring time, this plug-in ROC estimator is uniformly consistent on the support of the continuous marker, and for each  $t$  the corresponding AUC estimator is consistent. An open-source R (R Core Team, 2018) extension package, `intcensroc` (Lin *et al.*, 2018), to implement the proposed method is available through the Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN). The scripts to replicate the results from the simulation study using this package are included as online supplementary material.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Sieve Estimators for the ROC curve and the corresponding AUC

In this section, we outline a spline-based sieve MLE approach for estimation of the joint distribution of the event time  $T$  and marker  $M$ . Once this estimate is obtained, we construct plug-in estimators for the ROC curve and the AUC at time  $t > 0$  based on the following definitions as given in Heagerty *et al.* (2000):

$$\text{ROC}_t(p) = \text{TP}_t \{ \text{FP}_t^{-1}(p) \} \text{ and } \text{AUC}_t = \int_0^1 \text{ROC}_t(p) dp, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\text{TP}_t(m) = \frac{F(t, \tau_m) - F(t, m)}{F(t, \tau_m)} \text{ and } \text{FP}_t(m) = \frac{1 - F_2(m) - F(t, \tau_m) + F(t, m)}{1 - F(t, \tau_m)},$$

and where  $F(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $F_2(\cdot)$  denote the joint distribution function of  $(T, M)$  and the marginal distribution function of  $M$  respectively.

It is supposed that the event time  $T$  is interval censored by observation times  $U$  and  $V$  and that the marker  $M$  is observable.  $(U, V)$  is assumed to be independent of  $(T, M)$ . What is observed for patient  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the sextuple  $(u_i, v_i, m_i, \delta_i^{(1)}, \delta_i^{(2)}, \delta_i^{(3)})$  where  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  are the observation times,  $m_i$  is the observed marker value, and  $\delta_i^{(1)} = 1_{[t_i \leq u_i]}$ ,  $\delta_i^{(2)} = 1_{[u_i < t_i \leq v_i]}$  and  $\delta_i^{(3)} = 1_{[t_i > v_i]}$  are the event indicators for left, interval and right censoring respectively. In these event definitions,  $t_i$  denotes the latent event time for patient  $i$ . Note that  $U$  and  $V$  could be two random observation times or result from a group censoring mechanism. The reader is referred to Sun (2006) for a detailed account on interval censoring.

By virtue of the independence assumption between  $(U, V)$  and  $(T, M)$ , the likelihood is reduced to

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\partial F(u_i, m_i)}{\partial m} \right\}^{\delta_i^{(1)}} \left\{ \frac{\partial F(v_i, m_i)}{\partial m} - \frac{\partial F(u_i, m_i)}{\partial m} \right\}^{\delta_i^{(2)}} \left\{ \frac{dF_2(m_i)}{dm} - \frac{\partial F(v_i, m_i)}{\partial m} \right\}^{\delta_i^{(3)}}. \quad (2)$$

As discussed in Wu and Zhang (2012), a purely nonparametric MLE approach for optimizing (2) is both computationally and theoretically challenging. To optimize the likelihood, we propose to use spline-based sieve approach. Suppose  $T \in [0, \tau_t]$  and  $M \in [0, \tau_m]$  where  $\tau_t$  and  $\tau_m$  are two fixed constants. Construct two sets of B-splines of order  $l$  (Schumaker, 1981):  $\{B_j^{(1),l}(t)\}_{j=1}^{p_n}$  with knot sequence  $\tilde{\xi}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\xi} &= \{(\xi_j)_{j=1}^{p_n+l} : \\ &0 = \xi_1 = \dots = \xi_l < \xi_{l+1} < \dots < \xi_{p_n} < \xi_{p_n+1} = \xi_{p_n+l} = \tau_t\}, \end{aligned}$$

and  $\{B_k^{(2),l}(m)\}_{k=1}^{q_n}$  with the knot sequence  $\tilde{\eta}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta} &= \{(\eta_k)_{k=1}^{q_n+l} : \\ &0 = \eta_1 = \dots = \eta_l < \eta_{l+1} < \dots < \eta_{q_n} < \eta_{q_n+1} = \eta_{q_n+l} = \tau_m\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $p_n$  and  $q_n$  are both positive integers dependent on the sample size  $n$ . Let

$$F_n(t, m) = \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \alpha_{j,k} B_j^{(1),l}(t) B_k^{(2),l}(m) \quad (3)$$

and

$$F_{n,2}(m) = \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \beta_k B_k^{(2),l}(m), \quad (4)$$

be the joint and marginal distribution functions for  $(T, M)$  restricted to classes of spline functions. As discussed in Wu and Zhang (2012), by the fact that  $F_n(0, 0) = F_{n,2}(0) = 0$  as distribution functions, the constraints for spline coefficients are given as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_{j,1} = 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p_n, \\
& \alpha_{1,k} = 0 \text{ for } k = 2, \dots, q_n, \\
& (\alpha_{j+1,k+1} - \alpha_{j+1,k}) - (\alpha_{j,k+1} - \alpha_{j,k}) \geq 0 \\
& \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, p_n - 1, k = 1, \dots, q_n - 1, \\
& \beta_1 = 0, \\
& (\beta_{k+1} - \beta_k) - (\alpha_{p_n,k+1} - \alpha_{p_n,k}) \geq 0 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, q_n - 1, \\
& \beta_{q_n} \leq 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Substitute  $F_n(\cdot, \cdot) = F(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $F_{n,2}(\cdot) = F_2(\cdot)$  in (2), by (3) and (4) we obtain the following spline-based log likelihood function

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{l}_n(\alpha, \beta; ) = & \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \delta_i^{(1)} \log \frac{\partial \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \alpha_{j,k} B_j^{(1),l}(u_i) B_k^{(2),l}(m_i)}{\partial m} \right. \\
& + \delta_i^{(2)} \log \frac{\partial \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \alpha_{j,k} B_j^{(1),l}(v_i) B_k^{(2),l}(m_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \alpha_{j,k} B_j^{(1),l}(u_i) B_k^{(2),l}(m_i) \right\}}{\partial m} \\
& \left. + \delta_i^{(3)} \log \frac{\partial \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \beta_k B_k^{(2),l}(m_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{p_n} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} \alpha_{j,k} B_j^{(1),l}(v_i) B_k^{(2),l}(m_i) \right\}}{\partial m} \right], \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha = \{\alpha_{j,k}\}_{j=1, \dots, p_n, k=1, \dots, q_n}$  and  $\beta = \{\beta_k\}_{k=1, \dots, q_n}$ . In the proposed sieve MLE approach, nonparametric distribution functions are restricted to classes of spline functions for their estimation. This is equivalent to finding the maximizer  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$  for (6) subject to the constraints in (5). By plugging  $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$  into (3) and (4) we obtain the sieve MLE for  $(F_0(\cdot, \cdot), F_{0,2}(\cdot))$ , the true distribution functions for  $(T, M)$ .

## 2.2 Computing the Sieve MLE

Given that the B-spline based sieve MLE approach for (6) involves complicated constraints (5). Similar to the approach used by Wu and Zhang (2012), we propose to use I-splines and

its derivatives to simplify the computation.

Let  $I_j^l$  and  $M_j^l$  be I-spline and M-spline, respectively, as defined by Ramsay (1988) and Schumaker (1981), where  $M_j^l(t) = \frac{dI_j^l(t)}{dt}$ . Wu and Zhang (2012) showed that  $I_j^l(t) = \sum_{h=j+1}^{p_n+1} B_h^{l+1}(t)$ . Note that  $I_j^l$  is of degree  $l$ , both  $N_j^l$  and  $B_j^l$  are of degree  $l - 1$ . By some algebra we see that  $F_n(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $F_{n,2}(\cdot)$  given by (3) and (4) with constraints (5) are equivalent to

$$F_n(t, m) = \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} I_j^{(1),l}(t) I_k^{(2),l}(m), \quad (7)$$

and

$$F_{n,2}(m) = \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} + \omega_k \right\} I_k^{(2),l}(m). \quad (8)$$

subject to the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{j,k} &\geq 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p_n - 1, k = 1, \dots, q_n - 1, \\ \omega_k &\geq 0, k = 1, \dots, q_n - 1, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} + \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \omega_k &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

By (7) and (8) and  $M_j^l(t) = \frac{dI_j^l(t)}{dt}$ , we rewrite the B-spline-based log likelihood (6) as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{l}_n(\gamma, \omega) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \delta_i^{(1)} \log \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} I_j^{(1),l-1}(u_i) M_k^{(2),l-1}(m_i) \right\} \right. \\ &+ \delta_i^{(2)} \log \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} I_j^{(1),l-1}(v_i) M_k^{(2),l-1}(m_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} I_j^{(1),l-1}(u_i) M_k^{(2),l-1}(m_i) \right\} \\ &\left. + \delta_i^{(3)} \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} + \omega_k \right) M_k^{(2),l}(m_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{p_n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{q_n-1} \gamma_{j,k} I_j^{(1),l-1}(v_i) M_k^{(2),l-1}(m_i) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\gamma = \{\gamma_{j,k}\}_{j=1, \dots, p_n-1, k=1, \dots, q_n-1}$ ,  $\omega = \{\omega_k\}_{k=1, \dots, q_n-1}$ .

Now, the proposed sieve MLE problem is equivalent to finding the maximizer  $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\omega})$  for (10) subject to the simpler set of constraints (9). The optimization can be efficiently



implemented using the generalized gradient projection algorithm (Jamshidian, 2004; Zhang *et al.*, 2010; Wu and Zhang, 2012).

The spline knot sequence for the event time component is chosen based on the observed times  $\{(u_i, v_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ . Specifically, we first let  $\mathcal{O} = \left\{u_i\delta_i^{(1)} + \frac{u_i+v_i}{2}\delta_i^{(2)} + v_i\delta_i^{(3)}\right\}_{i=1}^n$ , that is, each member of  $\mathcal{O}$  equals  $u_i$  for left censoring,  $(u_i + v_i)/2$  for interval censoring and  $v_i$  for right censoring. Then we let the number of the interior knots be  $[n^{1/3}]$  (the closest integer to  $n^{1/3}$ ), and put interior knots at the quantiles of  $\mathcal{O}$ . In the marker direction, the knot sequence can be directly chosen based on the quantiles of  $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^n$ .

As we have pointed in Section 2.1, once we have the sieve MLE estimates, the plug-in spline estimators for ROC and AUC are readily obtained (see (1)). For statistical inference for the AUC, we propose to use the BCa method (Thomas and Bradley, 1996) for computing bootstrap confidence intervals.

### 3 Simulation Study

We evaluate the finite-sample operating characteristics of our method on the basis of the following simulation study. We assume that event time  $T$  follows an exponential distribution with hazard rate  $\lambda > 0$  and that the marker  $M$  follows a beta distribution with density  $f_2(m) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}m^{\alpha-1}(1-m)^{\beta-1}$ . The joint distribution of  $(T, M)$  is assumed to be generated by a Clayton copula (Nelsen (2006)), with parameter  $\mu > 1$

$$F(t, m) = \Pr(T < t, M < m) = \{F_1(t)^{\mu-1} + F_2(m)^{\mu-1} - 1\}^{1/(\mu-1)},$$

where  $F_1(\cdot)$  denotes the marginal distribution function of  $T$ , and as denoted in Section 2,  $F_2(\cdot)$  represents the marginal distribution function of  $M$ . We quantify the dependence between  $T$  and  $M$  using Kendall's  $\tau$  (Daniel, 1990). Note that for Clayton's copula larger values of the dependence parameter  $\mu$  imply stronger association. More specifically,  $\mu$  is

related to  $\tau$  through  $\tau = \frac{\mu-1}{\mu+1}$  (Nelsen, 2006).

The number of assessments,  $K_c$ , is assumed to follow a geometric distribution with parameter  $\nu > 0$ . The distance between two contiguous assessment times,  $L_c$ , is assumed to be fixed. For a given right censoring rate  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , the parameter  $\nu$  is calibrated so that  $\rho = \Pr(T > L_c K_c)$ . Uniform noise, distributed over the interval  $(-L_c/6, L_c/6)$ , is added to each assessment time to account for patient non-compliance. Based on the relationship between event time and the actual assessment times we can get the actual values for  $u_i, v_i, \delta_i^{(1)}, \delta_i^{(2)}$  and  $\delta_i^{(3)}$  in the likelihood function (10). Note that  $\delta_i^{(1)} = 1$  (left censoring) implies  $u_i = L_c$ ,  $\delta_i^{(2)} = 1$  (interval censoring) implies  $u_i$  and  $v_i$  are two consecutive observation times with  $v_i - u_i = L_c$  and  $\delta_i^{(3)} = 1$  (right censoring) implies  $v_i$  is the last assessment time.

For estimation, we consider spline basis functions of order  $l = 3$ , that is, we use quadratic and M-spline basis functions, cubic I-spline basis functions throughout the simulation as mentioned in Section 2.2. The knot sequence for the splines is chosen as described in Section 2.2.  $T$  is generated from an exponential distribution with hazard rate  $\lambda = \log(2)/30$ .  $M$  is generated from a beta distribution with  $\alpha = 2.35$  and  $\beta = 1.87$ , and then  $M$  is scaled from 0 to 10. We consider  $\tau = 0.2$  and  $\tau = 0.6$  to represent weak versus strong association, and right censoring rates of  $\rho = 0.3$  and  $\rho = 0.5$  to represent low versus high levels of censoring. We choose  $L_c = 6$  for assessment times. The ROC and the AUC are estimated at times  $t = 12$  and 28. We consider sample sizes of  $n = 100$  and 300. Coverage probabilities, at the nominal two-sided 95% level, are assessed by calculating confidence intervals using the BCa method on the basis of  $B = 1000$  bootstrap replicates. Each illustration is based on  $N = 1000$  simulation replicates. We note that the putative parameter values for the distributions are chosen to mimic those from CALGB 30801.

The relative bias (re-Bias), standard deviation and coverage probability, at the nominal

two-sided 95% level, for estimation of AUC are shown in Table 1. We observe that for the scenarios we have considered, the relative bias is less than 6% for  $n = 100$  and less than 2% for  $n = 300$ . Our approach provides consistent coverage, at the nominal two-sided confidence level of 95%, when  $n = 300$ . We note that strong association seemingly results in larger bias. We also note that the bias is larger at time point  $t = 12$  under a right censoring rate of 0.3 than under a right censoring rate of 0.5. We will comment on these two issues in the discussion.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 present the results for estimating the ROC curve, at time  $t = 12$  under a right censoring rate of 0.5 for  $\tau = 0.2$  and 0.6, and  $n = 100$  and 300. The estimation becomes more accurate when the size is increased from 100 to 300, as expected, and less accurate as the association becomes stronger, which is consistent with the results in Table 1.

## 4 Analysis of CALGB 30801

We applied our AUC estimator for analysis of CALGB 30801 data (randomized phase III double blind trial evaluating selective COX-2 inhibition in COX-2 expressing advanced non-small cell lung cancer). The CALGB 30801 data includes interval censored progression free survival and two markers (COX-2 and pgem1) for 312 patients. The median survival time is 10.9 weeks. We also produce the Kaplan-Meier plots (Figure 3) for both COX-2 and pgem1 markers, the markers are transferred into a binary factor “low” and “high” regarding to the median marker levels.

For the purpose of demonstration, we only include patients with observed markers, and we treated patients without progression events after the last follow-up visit as right censored in our AUC estimator.

The two AUC estimates for two markers are 0.50 and 0.55 with 95% confidence inter-

Table 1: The proposed sieve estimation for AUC

Time	True AUC	Right censoring rate	Size	re-Bias	Std	95% CP
$\tau = 0.2$						
12	0.6818	0.3	100	-0.0130	0.0629	0.845
			300	-0.0031	0.0365	0.961
		0.5	100	-0.0011	0.0628	0.878
			300	-0.0030	0.0384	0.935
28	0.6397	0.3	100	-0.0090	0.0552	0.846
			300	-0.0006	0.0323	0.932
		0.5	100	-0.0217	0.0518	0.840
			300	-0.0009	0.0355	0.932
$\tau = 0.6$						
12	0.9473	0.3	100	-0.0347	0.0270	0.960
			300	-0.0161	0.0137	0.961
		0.5	100	-0.0368	0.0243	0.954
			300	-0.0101	0.0160	0.968
28	0.8948	0.3	100	-0.0173	0.0314	0.954
			300	-0.0020	0.0194	0.930
		0.5	100	-0.0570	0.0380	0.816
			300	-0.0092	0.0210	0.953




Figure 1: The average sieve estimated ROC curves for two sample sizes,  $n = 100$  and  $300$ , with a right censoring rate of  $0.5$  and  $\tau = 0.2$  evaluated at time  $t = 12$




Figure 2: The average sieve estimated ROC curves for two sample sizes,  $n = 100$  and  $300$ , with a right censoring rate of  $0.5$  and  $\tau = 0.6$  evaluated at time  $t = 12$




Figure 3: Kaplan-Meier plots for CALGB 30801 data for COX-2 and pgem1 markers, marker levels are separated into two groups regarding to their median levels as “high” and “low” category.

val  $[0.4721, 0.5139]$  and  $[0.5000, 0.6498]$  for time at 12 weeks, respectively. The confidence intervals are obtained by bootstrap, the number of resample are 10000 for both markers. The bootstrap confidence intervals are computed using BCa method (Thomas and Bradley, 1996). Since both AUC values are not significantly greater than 0.5, neither marker is very helpful to predict the event time.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

We have proposed spline based plug-in estimators for time dependent ROC curve and its corresponding AUC measure based on interval censored time to event data and continuous marker. Our simulation studies show very good performance, with respect to bias, for our proposed method with practical finite sample sizes. The results also suggest the BCa bootstrapping confidence interval can be used for statistical inference on our proposed AUC estimator when the sample size is large.

Two observations from the simulation results shown in Table 1 bear discussion.

Comparing the results for  $\tau = 0.2$  and  $\tau = 0.6$ , we observe that stronger association between event time and marker seemingly increases relative bias. This is likely due to the fact that the two knot sequences, for estimating the marginal distributions of  $T$  and  $M$ , were chosen independently. The suboptimality of this approach is likely to become more pronounced as the association between  $T$  and  $M$  becomes stronger. This explanation also applies to the results for estimating the ROC curve shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 where the discrepancy between the actual ROC curve and its estimates is larger for stronger association.

When estimating AUC at time 12 (a relatively early time), the relative bias under a right censoring rate of 0.3 is larger than that under a right censoring rate of 0.5. In Figure 4,



we illustrate the distributions of current status times under light and heavy right censoring. We observe that under light right censoring, the distribution of the current status times is skewed to the left away from the early time points. As the knots are assigned based on quantiles of the censoring times, the performance of sieve estimation at relatively early times may be worse under light right censoring than that at later time points.




Figure 4: The distributions of the current status times under heavy and light right censoring

Besides simulation, we have established the consistency of our estimators theoretically (see Web Appendix 1). The proposed method can be extended to the competing risk or multi-marker frameworks. A user-friendly R (R Core Team, 2018) package to implement our proposed method has already been released on CRAN (<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=intcensROC>).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research was supported in part by award number P01CA142538 from the National Cancer Institute. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute of Health.

## References

- Daniel, W. W. (1990). *Applied nonparametric statistics. 2nd ed.* PWS-KENT, Boston.
- de Boor, C. (2001). *A Practical Guide to Splines, Revised Ed.* Springer, New York.
- Edelman, M. J., Wang, X., Hodgson, L., Cheney, R. T., Bagstrom, M. Q., and Thomas, S. P. (2017). Phase iii randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial of celecoxib in addition to standard chemotherapy for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer with cyclooxygenase-2 overexpression: Calgb 30801 (alliance). *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, **35**, 2184–2192.
- Heagerty, P. J. and Zheng, Y. (2005). Survival model predictive accuracy and roc curves. *Biometrics*, **61**, 92–105.
- Heagerty, P. J., Lumley, T., and Pepe, M. S. (2000). Time dependent roc curves for censored survival data and a diagnostic marker. *Biometrics*, **56**, 337–344.
- Jacqmin-Gadda, H., Blanche, P., Chary, E., Touraine, C., and Dartigues, J. (2016). Receiver operating characteristic curve estimation for time to event with semicompeting risks and interval censoring. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, **25**, 2750–2766.
- Jamshidian, M. (2004). On algorithms for restricted maximum likelihood estimation. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, **45**, 137–157.
- Li, J. and Ma, S. (2011). Time-dependent roc analysis under diverse censoring patterns. *Statistics in Medicine*, **30**, 1266–1277.
- Lin, J., Wu, Y., Wang, X., and Owzar, K. (2018). *intcensROC: Fast Spline Function Based Constrained Maximum Likelihood Estimator for AUC Estimation of Interval Censored Survival Data*. R package version 0.1.1.

- Nelsen, R. B. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas. 2nd edition.* Springer, New York.
- R Core Team (2018). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ramsay, J. O. (1988). Monotone regression splines in action. *Statist Science*, **3**, 425–441.
- Saha-Chaudhuri, P. and Heagerty, P. J. (2013). Non-parametric estimation of a time-dependent predictive accuracy curve. *Biostatistics*, **14**, 42–59.
- Schumaker, L. (1981). *Spline Function: Basic Theory.* John Wiley, New York.
- Spackman, K. A. (1989). Signal detection theory: Valuable tools for evaluating inductive learning. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Machine Learning*, pages 160–163, San Mateo, CA.
- Sun, J. (2006). *The Statistical Analysis of Interval-censored Failure Time Data.* Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Thomas, D. J. and Bradley, E. (1996). Bootstrap confidence intervals. *Statistical Science*, **11**, 189–212.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes.* Springer, New York.
- Wu, Y. and Zhang, Y. (2012). Partially monotone tensor spline estimation of the joint distribution function with bivariate current status data. *Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 1609–1636.

Zhang, Y., Hua, L., and Huang, J. (2010). A spline-based semiparametric maximum likelihood estimation for the cox model with interval-censored data. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **37**, 338–354.

Zweig, M. H. and Campbell, G. (1993). Receiver-operating characteristic (roc) plots: a fundamental evaluation tool in clinical medicine. *Clinical Chemistry*, **39**, 561–577.

## Asymptotic Properties

We establish asymptotic consistency of the plug-in sieve estimators for the target ROC curve and AUC. Study of the asymptotic properties needs empirical process theory and requires some regularity conditions on the joint and marginal distributions of the marker and event time. Let  $F_0(\cdot, \cdot)$  denote true joint distribution function for  $(T, M)$ , and  $F_{0,2}(\cdot)$  denote the true marginal distribution function for  $M$ , respectively. The following conditions sufficiently guarantee the results in the forthcoming Theorem 1.

### Regularity Conditions:

- C1.  $\frac{\partial^2 F_0(t,m)}{\partial t \partial m}$  has a positive lower bound in  $[0, \tau_t] \times [0, \tau_m]$ .
- C2. All  $p$ th mixed partial derivatives of  $\frac{\partial F_0(t,m)}{\partial m}$  are continuous in  $[0, \tau_t] \times [0, \tau_m]$ ; The  $p$ th derivative of  $\frac{dF_{0,2}(m)}{dm}$  is continuous on  $[0, \tau_m]$ .
- C3. The random observation times  $U$  and  $V$  are both in  $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ , with  $\tau_1 > 0$ , and  $\tau_2 < \tau_t$  with  $V - U \geq \tau_0$  for fixed  $\tau_0, \tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ .
- C4.  $(U, V)$  either has discrete distribution or a continuous probability density function (pdf). If  $(U, V)$  is discrete, its probability mass function has a positive lower bound. Otherwise, the pdf of  $(U, V)$  has a positive lower bound.

Let  $\|\cdot\|_{L_r(P_{U,M})}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{L_r(P_{V,M})}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{L_r(P_M)}$  denote the  $L_r$ -norms associated with the probability measures  $P_{U,M}$ ,  $P_{V,M}$  and  $P_M$  for  $(U, M)$ ,  $(V, M)$  and  $M$ , respectively. For  $\theta_1 = \{f_1(\cdot, \cdot), h_1(\cdot)\}$  and  $\theta_2 = \{f_2(\cdot, \cdot), h_2(\cdot)\}$ , we define

$$d(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \left\{ \|f_1 - f_2\|_{L_2(P_{U,M})}^2 + \|f_1 - f_2\|_{L_2(P_{V,M})}^2 + \|h_1 - h_2\|_{L_2(P_M)}^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (11)$$

Let  $X = (U, V, M, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3)$ . For a single observation  $x = (u, v, m, \delta^{(1)}, \delta^{(2)}, \delta^{(3)})$  from  $X$  and the variable of nonparametric functions  $\theta = \{(G(\cdot, \cdot), G_2(\cdot))\}$ , the log likelihood function is given by

$$l(\theta; x) = \delta^{(1)} \log G(u, m) + \delta^{(2)} \{G(v, m) - G(u, m)\} + \delta^{(3)} \{G_2(m) - G(v, m)\},$$

where  $G(t, m) = \frac{dF(t, m)}{dm}$  and  $G_2(m) = \frac{dF_2(m)}{dm}$ , with the joint and marginal distribution functions  $F(\cdot, \cdot)$  for  $(T, M)$  and  $F_2(\cdot)$  for  $M$ .

Denote  $\mathbb{M}(\theta) = Pl(\theta; x)$  with  $P$  being the true joint probability measure of  $X$ , and  $\mathbb{M}_n(\theta) = \mathbb{P}_n l(\theta; x)$  with  $\mathbb{P}_n f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)$  the empirical process indexed by  $f(X)$ .

Let  $\theta_0 = (G_0, G_{0,2}) \equiv \left( \frac{\partial F_0}{\partial m}, \frac{dF_{0,2}}{dm} \right)$  and  $\theta_n = (G_n, G_{n,2}) = \left( \frac{\partial F_n}{\partial m}, \frac{dF_{n,2}}{dm} \right)$  for  $F_n$  and  $F_{n,2}$  being spline functions as defined by (3) and (4) in the main manuscript.

In what follows, we prove the consistency for the sieve plug-in point estimators for ROC and AUC in Theorem 1. To this end, we first prove the consistency for the proposed sieve MLE for the joint distribution of  $(T, M)$  in the following lemma.

**Lemma 1** *Suppose that C1–C4 hold and denote  $\tilde{l}_n(\theta_n; \cdot)$  as  $\bar{l}_n(\alpha, \beta; \cdot)$  for  $\bar{l}_n(\alpha, \beta; \cdot)$  defined by (6) in the main manuscript. Then there exists a class  $\Theta_n$  with elements  $\theta_n$ 's, for the maximizer  $\hat{\theta}_n$  of  $\tilde{l}_n(\theta_n; \cdot)$  over  $\Theta_n$ , we have that*

$$d(\hat{\theta}_n, \theta_0) \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Denote  $\hat{F}_n(t, m) = \int_0^m \hat{G}_n(t, u) du$  and  $\hat{F}_{n,2}(m) = \int_0^m \hat{G}_{n,2}(u) du$  with  $\hat{\theta}_n = (\hat{G}_n, \hat{G}_{n,2})$ .

Then by their cumulative definitions in Heagerty *et al.* (2000), we write estimators for

$\text{TP}_{0,t}(m) \equiv \frac{F_0(t, \tau_m) - F_0(t, m)}{F_0(t, \tau_m)}$  and  $\text{FP}_{0,t}(m) \equiv \frac{1 - F_{0,2}(m) - F_0(t, \tau_m) + F_0(t, m)}{1 - F_0(t, \tau_m)}$  as

$$\widehat{\text{TP}}_{n,t}(m) = \frac{\hat{F}_n(t, \tau_m) - \hat{F}_n(t, m)}{\hat{F}_n(t, \tau_m)}$$

and

$$\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m) = \frac{1 - \hat{F}_{n,2}(m) - \hat{F}_n(t, \tau_m) + \hat{F}_n(t, m)}{1 - \hat{F}_n(t, \tau_m)},$$

respectively. Then the sieve estimators for  $\text{ROC}_{0,t}(p) \equiv \text{TP}_{0,t}\{\text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p)\}$  and  $\text{AUC}_{0,t} \equiv$

$\int_0^1 \text{ROC}_{0,t}(p) dp$  are given as

$$\widehat{\text{ROC}}_{n,t}(p) = \widehat{\text{TP}}_{n,t}\{\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p)\}$$

and

$$\widehat{\text{AUC}}_{n,t} = \int_0^1 \widehat{\text{ROC}}_{n,t}(p) dp,$$

respectively.

**Theorem 1** *Suppose that C1–C4 hold. Then for any  $t$  in the support of  $U$  or  $V$*

$$\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{ROC}}_{n,t}(p) - \text{ROC}_{0,t}(p) \right| \rightarrow_P 0.$$

*In addition,  $\widehat{\text{AUC}}_{n,t}$  is a consistent estimator for  $\text{AUC}_{0,t}$  for any  $t$  in the support of  $U$  or*

*$V$ .*

## Technical Proofs

### Proof of Theorem 1

By Lemma 1 and the definition of  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (11),  $\left\| \hat{G}_n - G_0 \right\|_{L_2(U, M)} \rightarrow_P 0$ ,  $\left\| \hat{G}_n - G_0 \right\|_{L_2(V, M)} \rightarrow_P 0$  and  $\left\| \hat{G}_{n,2} - G_{0,2} \right\|_{L_2(M)} \rightarrow_P 0$ . By the properties of  $\Theta_n$  and regularity conditions C1, C2

and C4, using the similar arguments as Lemma 0.7 in Wu and Zhang (2012) we can establish that for any  $t$  on the support of  $U$  or  $V$

$$\sup_{m \in [0, \tau_m]} \left| \hat{G}_n(t, m) - G_0(t, m) \right| \rightarrow_P 0$$

and

$$\sup_{m \in [0, \tau_m]} \left| \hat{G}_{n,2}(m) - G_{0,2}(m) \right| \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Then we can show that  $\widehat{\text{TP}}_{n,t}(m) \rightarrow_P \text{TP}_{0,t}(m)$  and  $\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m) \rightarrow_P \text{FP}_{0,t}(m)$  both uniformly for  $m \in [0, \tau_m]$ . It is clear that  $\text{FP}_{0,t}(m)$  has continuous inverse function  $\text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p)$  for any  $p \in [0, 1]$ . Now we show that for  $\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p)$  (the inverse function of  $\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m)$ )

$$\sup_{p \in [0, 1]} \left| \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) - \text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p) \right| \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Since  $\text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p)$  is continuous at any  $p \in [0, 1]$ , then it is uniformly continuous on  $[0, 1]$ . If we denote  $m_p = \text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p)$ , then for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|p' - p| < 2\delta$  implies  $|\text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p') - m_p| < \epsilon$  for any  $p \in [0, 1]$  and  $p' \in [0, 1]$ . Hence,

$$\text{FP}_{0,t}(m_p - \epsilon) - p > \delta$$

and

$$\text{FP}_{0,t}(m_p + \epsilon) - p < -\delta.$$

Next suppose

$$\sup_{m \in [0, \tau_m]} \left| \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m) - \text{FP}_{0,t}(m) \right| < \delta.$$

If we also denote  $m_n = \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p)$ , then we have  $m_n > m_p - \epsilon$ . Since if not, then

$$\text{FP}_{0,t}(m_p - \epsilon) - p < \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m_p - \epsilon) + \delta - p \leq \delta,$$

which contradicts the previous inequality. Similarly, we can use contradiction to show that  $m_n < m_p + \epsilon$ . Hence, for any  $p \in [0, 1]$

$$|m_n - m_p| < \epsilon.$$

The preceding arguments imply that

$$\Pr \left( \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) - \text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p) \right| \geq \epsilon \right) \leq \Pr \left( \sup_{m \in [0, \tau_m]} \left| \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m) - \text{FP}_{0,t}(m) \right| \geq \delta \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

by the uniform convergence for  $\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}(m)$ , as we discussed at the beginning of the proof.

Hence, we complete the verification for

$$\sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) - \text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p) \right| \rightarrow_P 0.$$

Next, it is easily seen that  $\text{TP}_{0,t}(m)$  is uniformly continuous function in variable  $m$  on  $[0, \tau_m]$ .

Therefore, by the uniform convergence for  $\widehat{\text{TP}}_{n,t}(m)$  (as briefly discussed at the beginning of this proof), and applying the continuous mapping theorem (with continuous mapping  $\text{TP}_{0,t}(m)$ ) on the preceding established uniform convergence for  $\widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{ROC}}_{n,t}(p) - \text{ROC}_{0,t}(p) \right| &= \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{TP}}_{n,t} \left\{ \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) \right\} - \text{TP}_{0,t} \left\{ \text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p) \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{TP}}_{n,t} \left\{ \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) \right\} - \text{TP}_{0,t} \left\{ \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) \right\} \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \text{TP}_{0,t} \left\{ \widehat{\text{FP}}_{n,t}^{-1}(p) \right\} - \text{TP}_{0,t} \left\{ \text{FP}_{0,t}^{-1}(p) \right\} \right| \\ &\rightarrow_P 0. \end{aligned}$$

The consistency for  $\widehat{\text{AUC}}_{n,t}$  is then trivial, that is

$$\left| \widehat{\text{AUC}}_{n,t} - \text{AUC}_{0,t} \right| \leq \int_0^1 \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left| \widehat{\text{ROC}}_{n,t}(p) - \text{ROC}_{0,t}(p) \right| \rightarrow_P 0. \quad \square$$

### Proof of Lemma 1

We apply Theorem 5.7 in van der Vaart (1998) to show the consistency. Following the proof of this theorem, we need to find a set containing both  $\theta_0$  and  $\hat{\theta}_n$  (as set “ $\Theta$ ” in Theorem 5.7 in van der Vaart (1998)).



To find the sub class  $\Theta_n$  as addressed in Lemma 1, we enforce the following conditions on  $(G_n, G_{n,2}) = \left(\frac{\partial F_n}{\partial m}, \frac{dF_{n,2}}{dm}\right)$ :

- T1.  $F_n$  and  $F_{n,2}$  satisfy the conditions for a joint distribution function and a corresponding marginal distribution function in  $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \times [0, \tau_m]$  and on  $[0, \tau_m]$ , respectively.
- T2.  $G_n$  and  $G_{n,2}$  are defined in  $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \times [0, \tau_m]$  and on  $[0, \tau_m]$ , respectively.
- T3.  $G_n$  and  $\left|\frac{\partial G_n}{\partial t}\right|$ ,  $\left|\frac{\partial G_n}{\partial m}\right|$ ,  $\left|\frac{\partial^2 G_n}{\partial t^2}\right|$ ,  $\left|\frac{\partial^2 G_n}{\partial m^2}\right|$  and  $\left|\frac{\partial^2 G_n}{\partial t \partial m}\right|$  all have a positive upper bound.
- T4.  $G_{n,2}$  and  $\left|\frac{dG_{n,2}}{dm}\right|$  both have a positive upper bound.
- T5. Let  $\Delta_i^\xi = \xi_{i+1} - \xi_i$  and  $\Delta_j^\eta = \eta_{j+1} - \eta_j$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, p_n - 1$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q_n - 1$ ,  $\frac{\min_{i:l \leq i \leq p_n} \Delta_i^\xi}{\max_{i:l \leq i \leq p_n} \Delta_i^\xi}$  and  $\frac{\min_{j:l \leq j \leq q_n} \Delta_j^\eta}{\max_{j:l \leq j \leq q_n} \Delta_j^\eta}$  both have positive lower bounds.
- T6.  $G_n(u, m)$ ,  $G_n(v, m) - G_n(u, m)$  and  $G_{n,2}(m) - G_n(v, m)$  all have positive lower bounds for  $(u, v) \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$  with  $v - u \geq \tau_0$  and  $m \in [0, \tau_m]$ .

And  $\Theta_n$  is defined by

$$\Theta_n = \{\theta_n = (G_n, G_{n,2}) : \text{T1-T6 hold}\}. \quad (12)$$

Now we create a more general class  $\Theta$  compared to  $\Theta_n$ . That is, for functions  $G(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $G_2(\cdot)$ , we enforce the following conditions:

- H1.  $G$  and  $G_2$  are defined on  $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \times [0, \tau_m]$  and  $[0, \tau_m]$ , respectively.
- H2.  $G$  and  $\left|\frac{\partial G}{\partial t}\right|$ ,  $\left|\frac{\partial G}{\partial m}\right|$ ,  $\left|\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial t^2}\right|$ ,  $\left|\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial m^2}\right|$  and  $\left|\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial t \partial m}\right|$  all have a positive upper bound.
- H3.  $G_2$  and  $\left|\frac{dG_2}{dm}\right|$  both have a positive upper bound.
- H4.  $G(u, m)$ ,  $G(v, m) - G(u, m)$  and  $G_2(m) - G(v, m)$  all have positive lower bounds for  $(u, v) \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$  with  $v - u \geq \tau_0$  and  $m \in [0, \tau_m]$ .

Now we define

$$\Theta = \{\theta = (G, G_2) : \text{H1-H4 hold}\} \quad (13)$$

It is obvious that  $\Theta_n \subset \Theta$ . On the other hand, by regularity conditions C1 and C2 it can be shown that  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ . Hence, both  $\theta_0$  and  $\hat{\theta}_n$  are contained in  $\Theta$ . In what follows we complete the proof by verifying the conditions of Theorem 5.7 in van der Vaart (1998). First, we verify  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\mathbb{M}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{M}(\theta)| \rightarrow_P 0$ . Denote  $\mathfrak{L} = \{l(\theta; x) : \theta \in \Omega\}$ . Since

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Omega} |\mathbb{M}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{M}(\theta)| = \sup_{l(\theta; X) \in \mathfrak{L}} |(\mathbb{P}_n - P)l(\theta; X)| \rightarrow_P 0,$$

it suffices to show that  $\mathfrak{L}$  is a  $P$ -Glivenko-Cantelli.

Let  $\Theta_G = \{G : \theta = (G, G_2), \theta \in \Theta\}$  and  $\Theta_{G_2} = \{G_2 : \theta = (G, G_2), \theta \in \Theta\}$ . By H2 and the bracket numbers for Sobolev spaces, we know that there exists  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$   $\epsilon$ -brackets

$$[G^{L,1}, G^{R,1}], \dots, [G^{L,[e^{c/\epsilon}]}, G^{R,[e^{c/\epsilon}]}]$$

to cover  $\Theta_G$ . Similarly, by H3 and the bracket numbers for Sobolev spaces, we know that there exists  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$   $\epsilon$ -brackets

$$[G_2^{L,1}, G_2^{R,1}], \dots, [G_2^{L,[e^{c/\epsilon}]}, G_2^{R,[e^{c/\epsilon}]}]$$

to cover  $\Theta_{G_2}$ .

Hence, it is easy to construct a set of brackets  $[l_{i,j}^L, l_{i,j}^R]$  with  $i = 1, \dots, [e^{c/\epsilon}]$  and  $j = 1, \dots, [e^{c/\epsilon}]$  that for any  $l(\theta; x) \in \mathfrak{L}$  with any observation  $x = (t, u, v, q, z, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$  we have  $l_{i,j}^L \leq l(\theta; x) \leq l_{i,j}^R$ , where

$$l_{i,j}^L = \delta_1 \log G^{L,i}(u, m) + \delta_2 \{G^{L,i}(v, m) - G^{R,i}(u, m)\} + \delta_3 \{G_2^{L,j}(m) - G^{R,i}(v, m)\}$$

and

$$l_{i,j}^R = \delta_1 \log G^{R,i}(u, m) + \delta_2 \{G^{R,i}(v, m) - G^{L,i}(u, m)\} + \delta_3 \{G_2^{R,j}(m) - G^{L,i}(v, m)\}.$$

It can be seen that  $\|l_{i,j}^R - l_{i,j}^L\|_\infty \leq c\epsilon$  by some algebra using property H4 for  $\Theta$ . This leads to the conclusion that  $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq e^{c/\epsilon}$ .

Then by  $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, L_1(P)) \leq N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ , we have  $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, L_1(P)) \leq e^{c/\epsilon}$ . Hence,  $\mathfrak{L}$  is a  $P$ -Glivenko-Cantelli by Theorem 2.4.1 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996).

Second, by lemma 2, we have that for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,

$$\mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) \geq cd(\theta, \theta_0)^2.$$

Finally, we verify  $\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) \geq \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_0) - o_P(1)$ .

By regularity conditions C1 and C2, and the construction of  $\Theta_n$ , Jackson's Theorem on page 149 in de Boor (2001) and Lemma 0.2 in the supplemental material of Wu and Zhang (2012) imply that there exists  $\theta_n = (G_n, G_{n,2})$  in  $\Theta_n$  such that  $\|G_n - G_0\|_\infty \leq c(n^{-p\kappa})$  and  $\|G_{n,2} - G_{0,2}\|_\infty \leq c(n^{-p\kappa})$ . Since  $\hat{\theta}_n$  maximizes  $\mathbb{M}_n(\theta)$  in  $\Theta_n$ ,  $\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) - \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_n) > 0$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) - \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_0) &= \mathbb{M}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) - \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_n) + \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_n) - \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_0) \\ &\geq \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_n) - \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_0) \\ &= (\mathbb{P}_n - P)\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\} + P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\} \end{aligned}$$

By regularity conditions C1, C2 and C3, and the construction of  $\Theta_n$ , using some algebra, we get

$$P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\}^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\} &= (P[\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\} - P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\}]^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq [P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\}^2]^{1/2} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By  $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, L_2(P)) \leq N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ , we have  $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, L_2(P)) \leq e^{c/\epsilon}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} J_{[\cdot]}(\delta, \mathfrak{L}, L_2(P)) &= \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathfrak{L}, L_2(P))} d\epsilon \leq \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log(e^{c/\epsilon})} d\epsilon \\ &\leq \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\left(\frac{c}{\epsilon}\right)} d\epsilon \leq c \int_0^\delta \epsilon^{-1/2} d\epsilon = c\delta^{1/2} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\mathfrak{L}$  is Donsker by Theorem 19.5 in van der Vaart (1998). Then by Corollary 2.3.12 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) we have

$$(\mathbb{P}_n - P)\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\} = o_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

Furthermore, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$|P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\}| \leq P|l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)| \leq c [P\{l(\theta_n; X) - l(\theta_0; X)\}^2]^{1/2} \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then  $Pl(\theta_n; X) > l(\theta_0; X) - o(1)$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{\theta}_n) - \mathbb{M}_n(\theta_0) \geq o_P(n^{-1/2}) - o(1) = -o_P(1).$$

This completes the proof of  $d(\hat{\theta}_n, \theta) \rightarrow_P 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2** *Given that C1-C4 hold. For any  $\theta \in \Theta$  for  $\Theta$  defined by (13).*

$$\mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) \geq cd(\theta, \theta_0)^2.$$

Proof of Lemma 2

For  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the likelihood function with one observation  $x$  is denoted as

$$L(\theta; x) = G(u, m)^{\delta_1} \{G(v, m) - G(u, m)\}^{\delta_2} \{G_2(m) - G(v, m)\}^{\delta_3}.$$

For the vector of true distribution functions  $\theta_0$ , the likelihood function  $L(\theta_0; x)$  is given similarly.

Let  $dP/d\mu = \varrho$  for Lebesgue measure (dominating measure)  $\mu$ . It is easy to see  $\varrho$  is closely related to  $L(\theta_0; X)$  since  $P$  is the joint probability measure of  $X$ . Then by regularity conditions C1, C2, C3 and C4, and the properties of  $\Theta$  and the proof of Lemma 5.35 in van der Vaart (1998)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) &= P \log L(\theta_0; X) - P \log L(\theta; X) = P \log \frac{L(\theta_0; X)}{L(\theta; X)} \\ &\geq c \int \left( \sqrt{L(\theta_0; x)} - \sqrt{L(\theta; x)} \right)^2 d\mu \geq c \int (L(\theta_0; x) - L(\theta; x))^2 \varrho d\mu \\ &= cP (L(\theta_0; X) - L(\theta; X))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} P (L(\theta_0; X) - L(\theta; X))^2 &= P [\Delta_1 \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2] \\ &\quad + P (\Delta_2 [\{G_0(V, M) - G_0(U, M)\} - \{G(V, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2) \\ &\quad + P (\Delta_2 [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_0(V, M)\} - \{G_2(M) - G(V, M)\}]^2), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P [\Delta_1 \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2] &= E [\Delta_1 \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2] \\ &= E (E [\Delta_1 \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2 | U, M]) \\ &= P_{U,M} ([F_{0,1}(U) \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2]) \\ &\geq cP_{U,M} \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &P (\Delta_2 [\{G_0(V, M) - G_0(U, M)\} - \{G(V, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2) \\ &= E (\Delta_2 [\{G_0(V, M) - G_0(U, M)\} - \{G(V, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2) \\ &= E \{E (\Delta_2 [\{G_0(V, M) - G_0(U, M)\} - \{G(V, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2 | U, V, M)\} \\ &= P_{U,V,M} ([\{F_{0,1}(V) - F_{0,1}(U)\} [\{G_0(V, M) - G_0(U, M)\} - \{G(V, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2]) \\ &\geq cP_{U,V,M} [\{G_0(V, M) - G_0(U, M)\} - \{G(V, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left( \Delta_3 [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_0(V, M)\} - \{G_2(M) - G(V, M)\}]^2 \right) \\
&= E \left( \Delta_3 [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_0(V, M)\} - \{G_2(M) - G(V, M)\}]^2 \right) \\
&= E \left\{ E \left( \Delta_3 [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_0(V, M)\} - \{G_2(M) - G(V, M)\}]^2 \mid V, M \right) \right\} \\
&= P_{V,M} \left( [\{1 - F_{0,1}(V)\} [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_0(V, M)\} - \{G_2(M) - G(V, M)\}]^2] \right) \\
&\geq cP_{V,M} [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_0(V, M)\} - \{G_2(M) - G(V, M)\}]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) &\geq cP \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2 \\
&\quad + cP [\{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\} - \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2 \\
&\quad + cP [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_2(M)\} - \{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\}]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $a^2 + b^2 \geq (a + b)^2/2$  and  $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 \geq (a + b + c)^2/3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) &\geq cP \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2 \\
&\quad + cP [\{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\} - \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2 \\
&\geq cP \{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) &\geq cP \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2 \\
&\quad + cP [\{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\} - \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}]^2 \\
&\quad + cP [\{G_{0,2}(M) - G_2(M)\} - \{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\}]^2 \\
&\geq cP \{G_{0,2}(M) - G_2(M)\}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{M}(\theta_0) - \mathbb{M}(\theta) &\geq cP \{G_0(U, M) - G(U, M)\}^2 + cP \{G_0(V, M) - G(V, M)\}^2 \\ &\quad + cP \{G_{0,2}(M) - G_2(M)\}^2 \\ &\geq cd^2(\theta_0, \theta). \quad \square\end{aligned}$$