

A Proper Concordance Index for Time-Varying Risk

A. Gandy

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, SW7 2AZ, U.K.
a.gandy@imperial.ac.uk

and

T. J. Matcham

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, SW7 2AZ, U.K.
NIHR ARC Northwest London, SW10 9NH, U.K.
thomas.matcham14@imperial.ac.uk

June 27, 2023

Abstract

Harrel's concordance index is a commonly used discrimination metric for survival models, particularly for models where the relative ordering of the risk of individuals is time-independent, such as the proportional hazards model. There are several suggestions, but no consensus, on how it could be extended to models where relative risk can vary over time, e.g. in case of crossing hazard rates. We show that these concordance indices are not proper, in the sense that they are maximised in the limit by the true data generating model. Furthermore, we show that a concordance index is proper if and only if the risk score used is concordant with the hazard rate at the first event time for each comparable pair of events. Thus, we suggest using the hazard rate as the time-varying risk score when calculating concordance. Through simulations, we demonstrate situations in which other concordance indices can lead to incorrect models being selected over a true model, justifying the use of our suggested risk prediction in both model selection and in loss functions in, e.g., deep learning models.

Keywords: Survival Discrimination metric; Crossing Hazards, Survival Loss Function

1 Introduction

Accurate patient prognosis estimation is an important clinical tool with applications including advising patients of their likely disease outcomes, informed selection of patient treatment as well as the design and evaluation of clinical trials. There exist several approaches to quantifying the predictive accuracy of survival models (Harrell Jr et al., 1996), which can in turn be optimized for, in order to improve a given aspect of the predictions. Discrimination metrics focus on a model’s ability to correctly order the predictions of the patient outcomes. This could be important, for example, in deciding the order in which a set of patients should be treated.

The most significant metric of survival model discrimination is Harrel’s concordance index (Harrell et al., 1984), hereafter the C-index, which was first developed as an adaptation of the Kendall-Goodman-Kruskal-Somers type rank correlation index (Goodman and Kruskal, 1954) to right-censored survival data, similar to an adaptation of Kendall’s τ by Brown Jr et al. (1973) and Schemper (1984).

We use the following setup. Let $(X_i, U_i, Z_i), i \in \mathbb{N}$, be independent and identically distributed with the lifetime X_i and the right censoring time U_i being non-negative random variables. Let the covariate Z_i be an element of some space \mathcal{Z} . We observe $(T_i, D_i, Z_i), i = 1, \dots, n$, where $T_i = \min(X_i, U_i)$ is the time at risk and $D_i = \mathbb{I}(X_i \leq U_i)$ is the event indicator.

The C-index estimates the probability that the predicted risk scores of a pair of individuals is concordant with that of their observed survival times. Only for pairs of individuals (i, j) , with $i \neq j$, for whom the first event is not a censoring event is an ordering of the outcome possible, i.e., the pair is comparable. The probability that individual i has such

an event occurring before event j is $P(D_i = 1, T_i < T_j)$. In this work we instead use

$$\pi_{comp} = P(D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j).$$

This has no effect on the continuous time case as $P(T_i = T_j) = 0$, however it is critical for the discrete case in Section 3, where ties will be possible.

Survival predictions are differentiated with functions of the covariate called risk scores. In situations where the relative risk of individual is not changing over time, e.g., in a proportional hazards model with only time-constant covariates, this is sufficient to discriminate between individuals. However, the risk score should arguably be time-dependent in situations where the relative risk of individuals changes over time, e.g., in cases where hazards of risk groups cross (Mantel and Stablein, 1988), where a proportional hazards model has time-dependent covariates, or where the risk prediction is individual over time as in machine learning approaches to survival models (Lee et al., 2018). Two situations in which we see crossing occur include when surgery or more aggressive medication incur a high initial hazard before eventually reducing the overall risk relative to the control group (James et al., 2017; Rothwell and Warlow, 1999).

Thus, the risk score we use is allowed to depend on the covariate and on time. Specifically, in a paired comparison, we compare the risk scores at the time when the first event occurs. Intuitively, this comparison gives a prediction of who was most at imminent risk of the event, given that they have survived until the first event time. This framework covers previous specific suggestions for dealing with time-varying risks (Antolini et al., 2005; Blanche et al., 2019; Haider et al., 2020). Formally, the risk score is specified through a function $q : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and for a given pair (i, j) , with $T_i \leq T_j$, we say that i has a higher risk score than j if $q(T_i|Z_i) > q(T_i|Z_j)$. Higher values of the risk score indicate a propensity towards earlier events.

For a pair (i, j) , where we observe that i has occurred before j , i.e., $D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j$ we say that this pair is concordant if $q(T_i|Z_i) > q(T_i|Z_j)$. The probability of a pair having observed the event of i before the event of j and being concordant is

$$P(D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j, q(T_i|Z_i) > q(T_i|Z_j)). \quad (1)$$

Defining a concordance index as (1) divided by π_{comp} , would imply the following: a perfect model that could correctly order every pair would have a concordance of 1, a model that simply guesses for each pair would have a concordance of 0.5 on average, and a model that always orders incorrectly would have a concordance of 0. A model that gives the same prediction for each individual would also only get a concordance of 0, which seems undesirable.

To avoid the latter, tied risk scores are often rewarded with a score of 0.5, such that a model with the same risk score for everyone would still score 0.5 (Harrell Jr et al., 1996). Hence, in the C-index

$$C_q = \frac{\pi_{conc}}{\pi_{comp}}$$

we use

$$\pi_{conc} = P[D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j, q(T_i|Z_i) > q(T_i|Z_j)] + \frac{1}{2}P[D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j, q(T_i|Z_i) = q(T_i|Z_j)].$$

Given a random sample $(T_i, D_i, Z_i)_{i=1}^n$ we can estimate π_{conc} and π_{comp} with:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{conc} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n \{ \mathbb{I}[D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j, q(T_i|Z_i) > q(T_i|Z_j)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I}[D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j, q(T_i|Z_i) = q(T_i|Z_j)] \}, \\ \hat{\pi}_{comp} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n \mathbb{I}(D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j) \end{aligned}$$

and thus estimate the C-index C_q by

$$c_q^n = \hat{\pi}_{conc} / \hat{\pi}_{comp}.$$

Often, the risk score $q(t|z)$ being used is not dependent on the first argument t . For example, if a proportional hazards model with covariates z is used, then often the linear predictor $q(t|z) = z\hat{\beta}$ is used as risk score, where $\hat{\beta}$ is an estimate of the regression coefficient.

For more general survival models, where we have access to a survival function $S(t|z)$ as a function of the covariates z , a definition of a risk score is less obvious, as there may not be a clear definition of what constitutes higher risk, for example when the underlying hazard rates of individuals cross. Several methods of computing risk scores in this setting have been considered, for example $q(t|Z) = -S(t_0|Z)$, the negative of the survival function evaluated at some fixed time $t_0 > 0$ (Blanche et al., 2019), or $q(t|Z) = -\inf\{t \text{ s.t. } S(t|Z) \leq 0.5\}$, the negative of the median survival time (Haider et al., 2020). The negative is taken as predicted survival times have the opposite ordering to risk scores. Again, these suggestions do not depend on the first argument of q .

In the work of Antolini et al. (2005), a time-dependent concordance index, C^{td} , is introduced. This adaptation of the C-index is developed for models with either time-varying covariates or time-varying effects, while supposing the predicted survival function is the 'natural' relative risk predictor. This leads to an event-time dependent risk score

$$q(t|z) = -S(t|z).$$

This index is used widely in deep learning survival models, wherein the survival curves for distinct individuals are prone to crossing (Zhong et al., 2021). A similar concordance index has seen use in loss functions for deep survival models (Lee et al., 2018).

In Sections 4 and 5, we show through examples that these concordance indices do not always maximally reward correct models, and therefore could lead to selection of inferior predictive models. This is reinforced by the work of Rindt et al. (2022), wherein they show

that C^{td} and other metrics are not proper scoring rules.

The main contribution of this paper (Section 2 and 3) is that using the conditional hazard rate $\alpha(t|z)$ as a time-dependent risk score for an individual with covariates z does behave analogously to a proper scoring rule. Since the definition of a proper scoring rule cannot be directly applied to the concordance index, we define a proper concordance index as C_q defined above with a risk score q such that

$$\forall \tilde{q} : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : C_q \geq C_{\tilde{q}}.$$

Thus we suggest using $q(t|z) = \alpha(t|z)$ as risk score in concordance indices. Finally, we demonstrate in Section 6 the advantage of using this risk score when training deep learning models, both as an element of the loss function, as well as in model validation.

2 Continuous Event Time

The following theorem shows that, the estimated concordance index c_q^n converges in probability to the concordance C_q for any risk score $q : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and that the concordance is maximised iff the risk score is concordant with the hazard rate.

We assume that X_i and U_i are independent given Z_i , i.e., $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp U_i \mid Z_i$, that $X_i|Z_i$ has an absolutely continuous distribution, and that there exists $\alpha : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that the hazard rate of X_i given Z_i is $\alpha(t|Z_i)$. We also assume that $U_i \leq \mathcal{T}$ for some $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. that we have a finite observation window.

THEOREM 1. *Under the continuous time set-up, if $\pi_{comp} > 0$ then*

$$c_q^n \xrightarrow{p} C_q \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Furthermore, the following equivalence holds:

C_q is a proper concordance index, i.e.,

$$\forall \tilde{q} : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : C_q \geq C_{\tilde{q}}$$

if and only if for $i \neq j$:

$$\begin{aligned} E \int_0^{\tau_{ij}} \{ & \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) \geq q(s|Z_j), \alpha(s|Z_i) < \alpha(s|Z_j)] \\ & + \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) \leq q(s|Z_j), \alpha(s|Z_i) > \alpha(s|Z_j)] \} ds = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\tau_{ij} = T_i \wedge T_j$.

Equation (2) is trivially satisfied if $q = \alpha$, which is why we suggest using the hazard rate as the risk score. More generally, (2) is satisfied if the risk score q and the hazard rate α are concordant in the sense that $\forall s \in [0, \infty), z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z} : q(s|z_1) > q(s|z_2) \iff \alpha(s|z_1) > \alpha(s|z_2)$.

To show Theorem 1, we need to introduce some counting process notation.

$$N_{ij}^{comp}(t) = \mathbb{I}(T_i \leq t, D_i = 1, T_i \leq T_j)$$

indicates if the event for i is known to have occurred before the event for j by time t .

The counting process $N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t)$ indicates if additionally the risk scores are in line with i occurring before j , i.e.,

$$N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) = N_{ij}^{comp}(t) \cdot \mathbb{I}[q(T_i|Z_i) > q(T_i|Z_j)]$$

and $N_{ij}^{conc,2}(t)$ indicates if additionally the risk scores for i and j are tied, i.e.,

$$N_{ij}^{conc,2}(t) = N_{ij}^{comp}(t) \cdot \mathbb{I}[q(T_i|Z_i) = q(T_i|Z_j)].$$

$N_{ij}^{conc}(t)$ adds these two together, with tied predictions instead contributing 1/2, i.e.,

$$N_{ij}^{conc}(t) = N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) + \frac{1}{2}N_{ij}^{conc,2}(t).$$

Based on the above, we now define the concordance of n individuals using information up to time t as

$$c_q^n(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n N_{ij}^{conc}(t)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n N_{ij}^{comp}(t)}. \quad (3)$$

We have $c_q^n = c_q^n(\mathcal{T})$.

The following lemma derives the compensator of N_{ij}^{conc} with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$, where $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Z_i, \mathbb{I}(T_i \leq s), \mathbb{I}(T_i \leq s, D_i = 1), i \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq s \leq t)$ is the information observed up to time t .

LEMMA 1. $N_{ij}^{conc}(t)$ has a unique decomposition into a martingale $M_{ij}^{conc}(t)$ and compensator

$$\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t) = \int_0^t Y_{ij}(s) [Q_{ij}^1(s) + \frac{1}{2} Q_{ij}^2(s)] \alpha(s|Z_i) ds,$$

where $Y_{ij}(t) = \mathbb{I}(\tau_{ij} \geq t)$, $\tau_{ij} = T_i \wedge T_j$, $Q_{ij}^1(t) = \mathbb{I}[q^{\tau_{ij}}(t|Z_i) > q^{\tau_{ij}}(t|Z_j)]$, $Q_{ij}^2(t) = \mathbb{I}[q^{\tau_{ij}}(t|Z_i) = q^{\tau_{ij}}(t|Z_j)]$, and $q^{\tau_{ij}}(t|\cdot) = q(t \wedge \tau_{ij}|\cdot)$.

The proof of this lemma can be found in the Appendix.

Proof of Theorem 1. $\hat{\pi}_{conc}$ can be written as a U-statistic

$$\hat{\pi}_{conc} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n h[(T_i, D_i, Z_i), (T_j, D_j, Z_j)]$$

with the kernel

$$h[(T_i, D_i, Z_i), (T_j, D_j, Z_j)] = N_{ij}^{conc}(\mathcal{T}) + N_{ji}^{conc}(\mathcal{T}).$$

The kernel h is bounded, implying $Eh^2[(T_i, D_i, Z_i), (T_j, D_j, Z_j)] < \infty$, and thus Theorem 12.3 of van der Vaart (1998) shows that $\hat{\pi}_{conc}$ is asymptotically normal as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with mean $\frac{1}{2}E[N_{ij}^{conc}(t) + N_{ji}^{conc}(t)] = E[N_{ij}^{conc}(\mathcal{T})] = \pi_{conc}$. Thus, we have $\hat{\pi}_{conc} \xrightarrow{p} \pi_{conc}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, we can show $\hat{\pi}_{comp} \xrightarrow{p} \pi_{comp}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by the assumption $\pi_{comp} > 0$, we have $c_n^q = \hat{\pi}_{conc}/\hat{\pi}_{comp} \xrightarrow{p} \pi_{conc}/\pi_{comp} = C_q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Our choice of q has no influence on the denominator, so considering the numerator only we find that, using Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} 2E[N_{ij}^{conc}(t)] &= E[N_{ij}^{conc}(t) + N_{ji}^{conc}(t)] = E[\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t) + \Lambda_{ji}^{conc}(t)] + E[M_{ij}^{conc}(t) + M_{ji}^{conc}(t)] \\ &= E[\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t) + \Lambda_{ji}^{conc}(t)] + 0 = E \int_0^t f_q(s) Y_{ij}(s) ds = E \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{ij}} f_q(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_q(s) &= \alpha(s|Z_i) \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) > q(s|Z_j)] + \alpha(s|Z_j) \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) < q(s|Z_j)] \\ &\quad + 0.5[\alpha(s|Z_i) + \alpha(s|Z_j)] \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) = q(s|Z_j)]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $F_q = E \int_0^{\tau_{ij}} f_q(s) ds$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} A_q(s) &= \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) \geq q(s|Z_j), \alpha(s|Z_i) < \alpha(s|Z_j)] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) \leq q(s|Z_j), \alpha(s|Z_i) > \alpha(s|Z_j)]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any q ,

$$F_\alpha - F_q = E \int_0^{\tau_{ij}} [f_\alpha(s) - f_q(s)] ds = E \int_0^{\tau_{ij}} [f_\alpha(s) - f_q(s)] A_q(s) ds,$$

as $f_q(s) = f_\alpha(s)$ if $A_q(s) = 0$. The latter can be seen by going through the three cases $\alpha(s|Z_i) > \alpha(s|Z_j)$, $\alpha(s|Z_i) < \alpha(s|Z_j)$ and $\alpha(s|Z_i) = \alpha(s|Z_j)$. Furthermore, $A_q(s) = 1$ implies $f_\alpha(s) > f_q(s)$. Thus, $F_\alpha \geq F_q$ and $F_\alpha = F_q$ if and only if $E \int_0^{\tau_{ij}} A_q(s) ds = 0$. \square

3 Discrete Event Time

We show that an analogous result to Theorem 1 holds for discrete time data. To show the result we need to treat pairs of events with tied event times ($T_i = T_j, i \neq j$) as comparable.

Suppose that the possible event and censoring times X_i and U_i are discrete random variables over the positive integers \mathbb{N}^+ . We denote the discrete hazard rate by $\alpha(t|Z_i) =$

$P(X_i = t | X_i \geq t, Z_i)$. As before, we assume $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp U_i \mid Z_i$ and that there is a finite observation window ensured by $U_i \leq \mathcal{T}$ for some $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{N}^+$. The definitions of T_i , D_i , π_{comp} , c_q^n and C_q are as in the previous sections and risk scores are now defined as $q : \mathbb{N}^+ \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

THEOREM 2. *Under the discrete time set-up, if $\pi_{comp} > 0$ then*

$$c_q^n \xrightarrow{p} C_q \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

Furthermore, the following equivalence holds:

C_q is a proper concordance index, i.e.,

$$\forall \tilde{q} : \mathbb{N}^+ \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1] : \quad C_q \geq C_{\tilde{q}}$$

if and only if for $i \neq j$:

$$\begin{aligned} E \sum_{s=1}^{\tau_{ij}} \{ & \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) \geq q(s|Z_j), \alpha(s|Z_i) < \alpha(s|Z_j)] \\ & + \mathbb{I}[q(s|Z_i) \leq q(s|Z_j), \alpha(s|Z_i) > \alpha(s|Z_j)] \} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\tau_{ij} = T_i \wedge T_j$.

The proof of which is similar to that of Theorem 1 and can be found in the Appendix. The decision to treat pairs with tied event times as comparable pulls each concordance score towards 0.5. Also, the scores of different models are pulled closer together, while retaining the same ordering. This is because for such pairs we always have $N_{ij}^{\text{conc}}(\tau_{ij}) + N_{ji}^{\text{conc}}(\tau_{ij}) = 1$ and $N_{ij}^{\text{comp}}(\tau_{ij}) + N_{ji}^{\text{comp}}(\tau_{ij}) = 2$. We prove these statements fully in Appendix A.2.

4 Demonstration of incorrect model selection

We now present an experiment to compare concordance indices produced by different risk scores. The set up is chosen to show that it is possible to favour incorrect models over the

true data generating mechanism. Further studies would be needed to show how typical this situation is.

We generate a data set with crossing hazards inspired by the problem discussed by Mantel and Stablein (1988). Let a population of 2000 be divided into two groups, with covariate $Z_i = 0$ for those in group 0 and $Z_i = 1$ for those in group 1. The data generating model M_0 is specified by the hazard rates

$$\alpha_{M_0}(t|Z_i = 0) = 0.5, \quad \alpha_{M_0}(t|Z_i = 1) = t$$

There is independent right censoring by an exponential distribution with rate 0.05 as well as censoring for anyone who survives until $t = 1.1$.

Now let there be 3 incorrect models M_1, M_2, M_3 , for us to compare to, which are defined by their hazard rates $\alpha_{M_1}, \alpha_{M_2}, \alpha_{M_3}$ as follows:

$$\alpha_{M_1}(t|Z_i = 0) = 0.5, \quad \alpha_{M_1}(t|Z_i = 1) = \begin{cases} t, & (t \leq 0.5) \\ 10t, & (0.5 < t) \end{cases},$$

$\alpha_{M_2}(t|Z_i = 0) = 0.25, \alpha_{M_2}(t|Z_i = 1) = t, \alpha_{M_3}(t|Z_i = 0) = 0.5, \alpha_{M_3}(t|Z_i = 1) = 0.5t$. The hazard and cumulative hazard rates are shown in in Figure 1.

We use four different risk scores to calculate concordance indices. Our suggestions of the hazard at time of first event uses $q(s|Z) = \alpha(s|Z)$ and is denoted by C_α . Survival at time of first event, the suggestion of Antolini et al. (2005), is denoted by C^{td} and uses $q(t|z) = -S(t|z)$, where $S(t|z)$ is the survivor function at time t for an individual with covariate z . Survival at fixed times 0.5 and 1.05 are denoted by $C_{S(0.5)}$ and $C_{S(1.05)}$ and use $q(t|z) = -S(0.5|z)$ and $q(t|z) = -S(1.05|z)$, respectively. The quantile survival time is denoted by $C_{\mu(s)}$ and uses $q(t|z) = -\inf\{u \text{ s.t } S(u|z) \geq s\}$.

We generated 100 different data sets and computed the resulting concordance indices




Figure 1: Hazard rates (top row) and cumulative hazard rates (bottom row) of models M_0, \dots, M_3 (left to right). Group 0: solid lines; group 1: dotted lines.

as well as, for every concordance index, the frequency with which each model achieved the highest concordance index. Results are presented in Table 1.

As anticipated by Theorem 1, C_α almost always selects the correct model, but is unable to distinguish between M_0 and M_1 as both models have risk scores concordant with the hazard rate of the true model M_0 . The concordance C^{td} consistently selects an incorrect model in this situation. $C_{S(0.5)}$ fails to perform any model selection, giving every model an equal score in every experiment. $C_{S(1.05)}$ mostly selects an incorrect model. Finally, $C_{\mu(0.5)}$ similarly chooses an incorrect model in most iterations, while $C_{\mu(0.75)}$ mostly fails to distinguish between M_0 and M_3 , showing that choosing $\mu(s)$ as the risk score can perform as well as C_α , but is dependent on s (the best of which will be unknown). With each iteration there is a small chance that the randomly generated data will result in concordance calculation orderings that do not match the order of the expected concordances. This has resulted in a small number of deviations in model selection from the general trend.

Table 1: Simulation from M_0 as described in Section 4. Left: Average concordance scores for each model/risk score. Right: Frequency of model selection via the highest risk score 100 replications; tied highest scores counted for all tied models.

	M_0	M_1	M_2	M_3		M_0	M_1	M_2	M_3
C_α	0.57	0.57	0.55	0.53	C_α	98	98	2	0
C^{td}	0.53	0.57	0.57	0.52	C^{td}	0	50	50	0
$C_{S(0.5)}$	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	$C_{S(0.5)}$	100	100	100	100
$C_{S(1.05)}$	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.52	$C_{S(1.05)}$	4	4	4	96
$C_{\mu(0.5)}$	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.52	$C_{\mu(0.5)}$	4	4	4	96
$C_{\mu(0.75)}$	0.52,	0.48	0.48	0.52	$C_{\mu(0.75)}$	96	4	4	96

5 Comparing Kaplan-Meier Estimates

For a set of right censored survival data, the maximum likelihood estimator over all valid survival distributions is given by the Kaplan-Meier estimator. The Kaplan-Meier estimate is useful when simply examining recovery rates and probable event times for groups of individuals, as well as investigating the effectiveness of a treatment. In the latter case, individuals are grouped by treatment, and survival curve estimates for each group are compared using, for example, the log-rank test to establish treatment efficacy. The quality of the fit of such estimates are also commonly evaluated using the C-index. In the following experiment we investigate two further situations, (M_4, M_5) , with crossing hazard rates between groups, for which Kaplan-Meier estimates will be evaluated by the concordance index using a range of risk scores.

Let there be two groups of 2000 patients with hazards rates

$$\alpha_{M_4}(t|Z_i = 0) = \begin{cases} 6, & (t \leq 0.1) \\ 1, & (t > 0.1) \end{cases}, \quad \alpha_{M_4}(t|Z_i = 1) = 1.4$$

in the first experiment, and as

$$\alpha_{M_5}(t|Z_i = 0) = \begin{cases} 0.5, & (t \leq 0.9) \\ 10, & (t > 0.9) \end{cases}, \quad \alpha_{M_5}(t|Z_i = 1) = \begin{cases} 2, & (t \leq 0.9) \\ 1, & (t > 0.9) \end{cases},$$

in the second experiment. The Kaplan-Meier estimates of the survival functions will be calculated for each group, which will then be used to produce risk scores for all event times. The risk score used in C_α requires an estimate of the hazard rate at each event time. One formula for the hazard rate, given a survival function when the survival time has an absolutely continuous distribution function is $\alpha(t) = f(t)/S(t) = \frac{-dS(t)}{dt}/S(t)$ (Andersen et al., 2012, Example II.4.1). Therefore, by smoothing and differentiating the Kaplan-Meier estimate of the survival function, we will be able to produce an estimate of the hazard rate. In the following experiment we smooth the Kaplan-Meier survival estimate using a triangular smoothing kernel with bandwidth $b = 0.05$. Furthermore, in order to prevent a bias at the beginning and end of the survival curve, we firstly extend $\hat{S}(t)$ by b around $t = 0$, and secondly we report results right censored b earlier than the true right-censoring time, giving a final right-censor time of 1. For full implementation details refer to Appendix A.3.

The survival and hazard function estimates are show in Figures 2 and 3. The hazard rate estimates correctly only cross once in each experiment, near the true hazard crossing times. Concordance results for each risk score are reported in Table 2. For model M_4 we find that all concordance indices, except C_α , find that this model has almost no ability to discriminate, scoring only 0.51, whereas C_α scores 0.57, indicating good discrimination. For




Figure 2: Estimated survival and hazard functions for data from M_4 .

model M_5 , C_α finds the model to be even stronger, whereas every other risk score reports the model to be significantly discordant, with scores of 0.44, despite the predicted hazard and survival functions matching the truth well. The estimated survival plot is produced using the lifelines python package Davidson-Pilon (2019), which includes 95% confidence intervals.

This experiment shows a clear shortcoming of calculating the C-index with other risk scores that is not experienced with C_α , further justifying its use. Furthermore, M_4 may be of special interest as it reflects a treatment setting wherein the treatment group experiences an initial period of higher mortality, followed by a recovered period where they are healthier. We have shown that the other risk scores cannot be relied to recognise strong models in situations where hazard rates cross. These experiments also give a simple method of calculating C_α for the Kaplan-Meier survival function estimate. This method may be less feasible in situations with less data points, as this will result in poorer hazard function estimates.




Figure 3: Estimated survival and hazard functions for data generated by M_5 .

Table 2: Concordance index scores across range of risk indices for models Kaplan-Meier estimates of models M_4 and M_5 .

	C_α	C^{td}	$C_{S(0.5)}$	$C_{\mu(0.25)}$	$C_{\mu(0.5)}$	$C_{\mu(0.75)}$
M_4	0.57	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51
M_5	0.61	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.44

6 Deep Learning

In this section we produce an experiment to test how using C_α in the loss function of a deep learning survival model may improve predictions. In the work of Lee et al. (2018) they present DeepHit, a neural network that predicts discrete probability mass functions for each T_i , $\hat{f}(t|Z_i)$. The loss function used to train DeepHit is the sum of two terms, the regular log-likelihood function

$$L_0 = \sum_{i, D_i=1} \log(\hat{f}(t|Z_i)) + \sum_{i, D_i=0} \log(1 - \hat{F}(t|Z_i)), \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{F}(t|Z_i) = \sum_{s \leq t} \hat{f}(s|Z_i)$. As well as a second term that is designed to encourage the minimisation of C^{td}

$$L^{td} = \sum_{i \neq j} A_{i,j} \cdot \eta(\hat{F}(T_i|Z_i), \hat{F}(T_j|Z_j)), \quad (6)$$

where $A_{i,j} = \mathbf{1}(T_i < T_j, D_i = 1)$ indicates which ordering of each pair (i,j) has first experienced the event first (if at all) and $\eta(x, y) = \exp(\frac{-(x-y)}{\sigma})$ for some fixed hyperparameter $\sigma > 0$. It seems this function is chosen instead of the previous concordance equation as it is differentiable and can therefore be optimised for using gradient descent. However, we argue that a loss built to mimic the C-Index should return scores for a pair in as similar a way as possible and decided to use the sigmoid function $\sigma(x) = \frac{e^x}{e^x + 1}$ instead of the exponential, giving $\eta(x, y) = \sigma(\frac{-(x-y)}{\sigma})$, so that loss incurred by each pair is limited to $[0, 1]$ with risk score draws returning 0.5. Another change made was the calculation of C-indices in validation and testing was altered to match that given in Section 3, treating pairs with equal observation time as comparable.

In our experiment we will target C_α by adapting L^{td} to instead evaluate the ordering of the predicted hazard rate $\hat{\alpha}$ at the first event time for each pair.




Figure 4: DeepHit predicted discrete cumulative hazard using L^{td} (a) and L_{α} (b)

$$L_{\alpha} = \sum_{i \neq j} A_{i,j} \cdot \eta(\hat{\alpha}(T_i|Z_i), \hat{\alpha}(T_i|Z_j)) \quad (7)$$

To test this model we again produce some synthetic survival data, modelling discrete hazard rates as DeepHit produces prediction for discrete event times. We let there be two groups of 10,000 patients with discrete hazard rates

$$\alpha_{M_6}(t|Z_{i,1} = 0) = \begin{cases} 0.05, & (t = 1, \dots, 5) \\ 0.5, & (t = 6, \dots, 10) \end{cases}, \quad \alpha_{M_6}(t|Z_{i,1} = 1) = \begin{cases} 0.5, & (t = 1, \dots, 5) \\ 0.05, & (t = 6, \dots, 10) \end{cases},$$

Noise variables are included alongside the true covariates. For each patient, independent covariates $Z_{i,k} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ for $k = 2, \dots, 10$ are included.

We train on 80% of this data, validate during training on 4% and test with the remaining 16%. The validation is accomplished by calculating C^{td} for the model trained with the L^{td} loss term and C_{α} for the model trained with L_{α} (since these are the metric each model is targeting) and training stops if these scores do not improve for 5 training epochs.

The models perform admirably when evaluating them according to the concordance

index corresponding to the loss functions used. The model trained with L_{td} loss scores $C_{td} = 0.69$, while the model trained with L_α loss scores $C_\alpha = 0.69$ on the testing data. However, comparison of concordance scores in this setting is non-informative as each model is designed to perform well for their respective metrics. Since we know the form of the true hazard rates for each individual we can compare the predictions directly with the truth. In Figure 4 (a) and (b) all discrete cumulative hazard predictions are displayed.

DeepHit trained with L_α performs as expected, predicting the cumulative hazards correctly, with some noise due to the inclusion of the nine noise variables. Conversely, when training with L^{td} the cumulative hazards rates for the second group cross below those of the first group at $t = 7$, several steps earlier than it should.

This error can be explained by the following; suppose the network gave the true hazard rates as the predictions. The loss function based on C^{td} would then evaluate across all pairs of individuals. If we consider the pairs (i,j) such that $Z_{i,1} = 0, Z_{j,1} = 1, 6 \leq T_i \leq T_j$ and $D_i = 1$. Despite individual i actually having a higher hazard rate at T_i , the cumulative hazard for j would be higher, so L^{td} considers the pair non-concordant and would incur a loss. Such spurious losses would then in future training cycles encourage the neural network to re-weight in such a way that the cumulative hazard of j would be lower at T_i , while the cumulative hazard for i would be higher.

This experiment is designed to prominently display the consequences of choosing to target C_α instead of C^{td} in the loss function of deep learning survival models. Our result shows that if the underlying process generating the data does have crossing hazard rates between individuals, then this trend may not be effectively learned by using L_{td} instead of L_α . In a real data setting it may be expected that the hazard rate crossing may not be as dramatic, but without knowing the true hazard functions, using L_α may be preferred.

7 Discussion

In this paper we have explored the limitations of risk scores used in the C-index, specifically when it is used to assess survival models that are capable of producing crossing hazard rate predictions. Previous work has approached solving similar problems, for example Antolini’s C-index focused on models with crossing survival curves. In our work we show that even these efforts can still suffer from rewarding incorrect survival models more highly than the truth. The main contribution of this paper is the development of the proper concordance index C_α , which we prove has the desirable property of asymptotically not scoring a prediction more highly than the true survival distribution. We demonstrated the advantages of C_α in two settings, first as the metric of success for Kaplan-Meier models, and secondly its various uses for deep learning models. The deep learning models trained with loss functions incorporating C_α outperformed those targeting C^{td} in a situation with crossing hazard rates. This experiment also further demonstrated the advantages of C_α as success metric, as well as its use as a validation metric during training.

A Appendix

A.1 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the counting process $N_i(t) = D_i \mathbb{I}(T_i \leq t)$, with a unique decomposition $N_i(t) = \Lambda_i(t) + M_i(t)$ into a compensator $\Lambda_i(t) = \int_0^t \alpha(s|Z_i) Y_i(s) ds$ and a finite variation local martingale M_i with respect to (\mathcal{F}_t) .

With $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \neq i$, let $N_i^{\tau_{ij}}$ be N_i stopped at τ_{ij} , i.e., $N_i^{\tau_{ij}}(t) = N_i(t \wedge \tau_{ij})$. Since a finite variation local martingale stopped at a stopping time is also a finite variation local martingale $M_i^{\tau_{ij}}(t) := M_i(t \wedge \tau_{ij})$ is a finite variation local martingale. By uniqueness of decomposition (Protter, 2010, Theorem III.16), the compensator of $N_i^{\tau_{ij}}(t)$ is therefore

$$\Lambda_i^{\tau_{ij}}(t) = \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{ij}} \alpha(s|Z_i) Y_i(s) ds = \int_0^t \alpha(s|Z_i) Y_{ij}(s) ds,$$

where $Y_{ij}(t) = \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau_{ij})$. Letting $Q_{ij}^1(t) = \mathbb{I}[q(t \wedge \tau_{ij}|Z_i) > q(t \wedge \tau_{ij}|Z_j)]$, we can write $N_{ij}^{conc,1}$ as

$$N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) = \int_0^t Q_{ij}^1(s) dN_i^{\tau_{ij}}(s) = \Lambda_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) + M_{ij}^{conc,1}(t),$$

where $\Lambda_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) := \int_0^t Q_{ij}^1(s) d\Lambda_i^{\tau_{ij}}(s)$ and $M_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) := \int_0^t Q_{ij}^1(s) dM_i^{\tau_{ij}}(s)$.

$M_{ij}^{conc,1}(t)$ is a local martingale with respect to (\mathcal{F}_t) as Q_{ij}^1 is predictable and bounded (Andersen et al., 2012, Theorem II.3.1). Thus, again by uniqueness of decomposition, the compensator of $N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t)$ is given by $\Lambda_{ij}^{conc,1}(t)$, which can be rewritten as

$$\Lambda_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) = \int_0^t \alpha(s|Z_i) Q_{ij}^1(s) Y_{ij}(s) ds,$$

implying that the intensity of $N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t)$ is $\lambda_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) = \alpha(t|Z_i) Q_{ij}^1(t) Y_{ij}(t)$. By similar arguments we can show that the process $N_{ij}^{conc,2}(t)$ has a decomposition into local martingales and compensators with intensity process

$$\lambda_{ij}^{conc,2}(t) = \alpha(t|Z_i) Q_{ij}^2(t) Y_{ij}(t),$$

where $Q_{ij}^2(t) = \mathbb{I}[q(t \wedge \tau_{ij}|Z_i) = q(t \wedge \tau_{ij}|Z_j)]$. Now we can decompose N_{ij}^{conc} as

$$N_{ij}^{conc}(t) = N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) + N_{ij}^{conc,2}(t)/2 = \Lambda_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) + \Lambda_{ij}^{conc,2}(t)/2 + M_{ij}^{conc,1}(t) + M_{ij}^{conc,2}(t)/2.$$

Since the property of a process being a local martingale is closed under addition and scalar multiplication, the final two terms, which we call $M_{ij}(t)$, form a local martingale. Therefore, the first two terms are the compensator of $N_{ij}^{conc}(t)$, which simplify to

$$\Lambda_{ij}^{conc} = \int_0^t \alpha(s|Z_i)[Q_{ij}^1(s) + 0.5Q_{ij}^2(s)]Y_{ij}(s)ds.$$

To show that M_{ij}^{conc} is a martingale, and not just a local martingale, we use Theorem I.51 of Protter (2010), which requires us to show

$$E[\sup_{s \leq t} |M_{ij}^{conc}(s)|] < \infty \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

First we write

$$E[\sup_{s \leq t} |M_{ij}^{conc}(s)|] \leq E[\sup_{s \leq t} |N_{ij}^{conc}(t)|] + E[\sup_{s \leq t} |\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t)|] \leq 1 + E[\sup_{s \leq t} |\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t)|],$$

and then we bound the second term

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \leq t} |\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t)| &= \int_0^t (\alpha(s|Z_i)Q_{ij}^1(s) + \frac{\alpha(s|Z_i)Q_{ij}^2(s)}{2})Y_{ij}(s)ds \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \int_0^t \alpha(s|Z_i)Y_{ij}(s)ds \leq \frac{3}{2} \int_0^{X_i} \alpha_i(s|Z_i)ds = \frac{3}{2}H(X_i|Z_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $H(t|Z_i) = \int_0^t \alpha(s|Z_i)ds$ is the i th individual's integrated hazard rate. Suppose Y is a random variable with integrated hazard rate H and cumulative distribution function F .

Then $E[H(Y)] = E[-\log(F(Y))] = -\int \log(F(y))dF(y) = -\int_0^1 \log(u)du = 1$. Hence,

$$E[\sup_{s \leq t} |M_{ij}^{conc}(s)|] \leq 1 + \frac{3}{2}E[H(t|Z_i)] = 5/2 < \infty.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. For $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we define $N_{ij}^{comp}(t)$, $N_{ij}^{conc,1}(t)$, $N_{ij}^{conc,2}(t)$ and $N_{ij}^{conc}(t)$ as in Section 2, with the filtration defined as $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Z_i, \mathbb{I}(T_i \leq s), \mathbb{I}(T_i \leq s, D_i = 1), i \in \mathbb{N}, s = 1, \dots, t)$ and $\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(Z_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ we can derive compensators of the $N_{ij}^{conc}(t)$ with respect to \mathcal{F}_t .

Let

$$M_{ij}(t) = N_{ij}^{conc}(t) - \Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t)$$

where $\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t) = \sum_{s=1}^t Y_{ij}(s) [\mathbb{I}(q(s|Z_i) > q(s|Z_j)) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}(q(s|Z_i) = q(s|Z_j))] \alpha(s|Z_i)$ and $Y_{ij}(s) = \mathbb{I}(\tau_{ij} \geq s)$.

$M_{ij}(t)$ defines a discrete-time martingale with respect to (\mathcal{F}_t) because

$$E[N_{i,j}^{conc}(t) - N_{i,j}^{conc}(t-1) = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau_{i,j} < t] = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E[N_{i,j}^{conc}(t) - N_{i,j}^{conc}(t-1) = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau_{i,j} \geq t] &= \\ P(\Delta N_{i,j}^{conc,1}(t) = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau_{i,j} \geq t) + P(\Delta N_{i,j}^{conc,2}(t) = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}, \tau_{i,j} \geq t) &= \\ \mathbb{I}(q(t|Z_i) > q(t|Z_j)) \alpha(t|Z_i) + \mathbb{I}(q(t|Z_i) = q(t|Z_j)) \alpha(t|Z_i) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the compensator of $N_{ij}^{conc}(t)$ is $\Lambda_{ij}^{conc}(t)$. The proof from this point on is the same as that for Theorem 1 with integrals replaced by sums.

□

A.2 Effect of Tie Inclusion

Suppose we have discrete event data $\{T_i, D_i\}_{i=1}^n$ for which we have potential models M_1 and M_2 , with corresponding discrete hazard rates $q_1(t|Z_i)$ and $q_2(t|Z_i)$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n \{ \mathbb{I}[D_i = 1, T_i < T_j, q_1(T_i|Z_i) > q_1(T_i|Z_j)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I}[D_i = 1, T_i < T_j, q_1(T_i|Z_i) = q_1(T_i|Z_j)] \}, \\
b &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n \{ \mathbb{I}[D_i = 1, T_i < T_j, q_2(T_i|Z_i) > q_2(T_i|Z_j)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I}[D_i = 1, T_i < T_j, q_2(T_i|Z_i) = q_2(T_i|Z_j)] \}, \\
c &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n \mathbb{I}(D_i = 1, T_i < T_j) \\
\tilde{c} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n \mathbb{I}(D_i = 1, T_i = T_j), \\
w &= \frac{c}{c + 2\tilde{c}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $c > 0$ and $\tilde{c} > 0$. With these definitions we have $c_{q_1}^n = \frac{a}{c}$, $c_{q_2}^n = \frac{b}{c}$ if ties are not included and $c_{q_1}^n = \frac{a+\tilde{c}}{c+2\tilde{c}} = w\frac{a}{c} + (1-w)\frac{1}{2}$, $c_{q_2}^n = \frac{b+\tilde{c}}{c+2\tilde{c}} = w\frac{b}{c} + (1-w)\frac{1}{2}$ if they are. Hence ordering is the same in either case. We also have

$$\left| \frac{a + \tilde{c}}{c + 2\tilde{c}} - \frac{1}{2} \right| = w \left| \frac{a}{c} - \frac{1}{2} \right| < \left| \frac{a}{c} - \frac{1}{2} \right|,$$

showing that the inclusion of ties pulls c_q^n closer to 0.5. Finally, the inclusion of ties pulls the estimates $c_{q_1}^n$ and $c_{q_2}^n$ closer together as

$$\left| \frac{a + \tilde{c}}{c + 2\tilde{c}} - \frac{b + \tilde{c}}{c + 2\tilde{c}} \right| = \left| w\frac{a}{c} + (1-w)\frac{1}{2} - w\frac{b}{c} - (1-w)\frac{1}{2} \right| = w \left| \frac{a}{c} - \frac{b}{c} \right| < \left| \frac{a}{c} - \frac{b}{c} \right|.$$

A.3 Code

Code for all experiments reported in this document can be found at

<https://github.com/tmatcham/CrossingHazardConcordance>

Funding

This article presents independent research supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) under the Applied Health Research (ARC) programme for Northwest

London. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health. TM was supported by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Modern Statistics and Statistical Machine Learning (EP/S023151/1).

B Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

References

- Andersen, P. K., O. Borgan, R. D. Gill, and N. Keiding (2012). *Statistical models based on counting processes*. Springer.
- Antolini, L., P. Boracchi, and E. Biganzoli (2005). A time-dependent discrimination index for survival data. *Statistics in Medicine* 24(24), 3927–3944.
- Blanche, P., M. W. Kattan, and T. A. Gerds (2019). The c-index is not proper for the evaluation of year predicted risks. *Biostatistics* 20(2), 347–357.
- Brown Jr, B. W., M. Hollander, and R. M. Korwar (1973). Nonparametric tests of independence for censored data with application to heart transplant studies. Technical report, Florida State Univ Tallahassee, Dept of Statistics.
- Davidson-Pilon, C. (2019). Lifelines: survival analysis in python. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4(40), 1317.
- Goodman, L. A. and W. H. Kruskal (1954). Measures of association for cross classifications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 49(268), 732–764.

- Haider, H., B. Hoehn, S. Davis, and R. Greiner (2020). Effective ways to build and evaluate individual survival distributions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21(85), 1–63.
- Harrell, F. E., K. L. Lee, R. M. Califf, D. B. Pryor, and R. A. Rosati (1984). Regression modelling strategies for improved prognostic prediction. *Statistics in Medicine* 3(2), 143–152.
- Harrell Jr, F. E., K. L. Lee, and D. B. Mark (1996). Multivariable prognostic models: issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors. *Statistics in Medicine* 15(4), 361–387.
- James, N. D., J. S. de Bono, M. R. Spears, N. W. Clarke, M. D. Mason, D. P. Dearnaley, A. W. Ritchie, C. L. Amos, C. Gilson, R. J. Jones, et al. (2017). Abiraterone for prostate cancer not previously treated with hormone therapy. *New England Journal of Medicine* 377(4), 338–351.
- Lee, C., W. Zame, J. Yoon, and M. Van Der Schaar (2018). Deephit: A deep learning approach to survival analysis with competing risks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Volume 32.
- Mantel, N. and D. M. Stablein (1988). The crossing hazard function problem. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series D (The Statistician)* 37(1), 59–64.
- Protter, P. E. (2010). *Stochastic integration and differential equations*. Berlin: Springer.
- Rindt, D., R. Hu, D. Steinsaltz, and D. Sejdinovic (2022). Survival regression with proper scoring rules and monotonic neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1190–1205. PMLR.

- Rothwell, P. M. and C. P. Warlow (1999). Prediction of benefit from carotid endarterectomy in individual patients: a risk-modelling study. *The Lancet* 353(9170), 2105–2110.
- Schemper, M. (1984). Analyses of associations with censored data by generalized Mantel and Breslow tests and generalized Kendall correlation coefficients. *Biometrical journal* 26(3), 309–318.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zhong, Q., J. W. Mueller, and J.-L. Wang (2021). Deep extended hazard models for survival analysis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34, 15111–15124.