

Examining properness in the external validation of survival models with squared and logarithmic losses

Raphael Sonabend*
OSPO Now, UK
Imperial College London, UK
raphaelsonabend@gmail.com

John Zobolas*
Oslo University Hospital, Norway

Philipp Kopper
LMU Munich, Germany
Munich Center for Machine Learning (MCML), Germany

Lukas Burk
LMU Munich, Germany
Leibniz Institute for Prevention Research and Epidemiology - BIPS, Germany
Munich Center for Machine Learning (MCML), Germany
University of Bremen, Germany

Andreas Bender
LMU Munich, Germany
Munich Center for Machine Learning (MCML), Germany

*contributed equally

June 4, 2024

Abstract

Scoring rules promote rational and honest decision-making, which is becoming increasingly important for automated procedures in ‘auto-ML’. In this paper we survey common squared and logarithmic scoring rules for survival analysis and determine which losses are proper and improper. We prove that commonly utilised squared and logarithmic scoring rules that are claimed to be proper are in fact improper, such as the Integrated Survival Brier Score (ISBS). We further prove that under a strict set of assumptions a class of scoring rules is strictly proper for, what we term, ‘approximate’ survival losses. Despite the difference in properness, experiments in simulated and real-world datasets show there is no major difference between improper and proper versions of the widely-used ISBS, ensuring that we can reasonably trust

previous experiments utilizing the original score for evaluation purposes. We still advocate for the use of proper scoring rules, as even minor differences between losses can have important implications in automated processes such as model tuning. We hope our findings encourage further research into the properties of survival measures so that robust and honest evaluation of survival models can be achieved.

1 Introduction

The development of measures in survival analysis has historically focused on concordance type measures. Following the introduction of the C-index in Harrell et al. [1984], there followed decades of argument and counterargument in which the measure was criticized, lauded, and reworked. Notable contributions include works by Gönen and Heller [2005], Uno et al. [2007], Blanche et al. [2019], among others. Ultimately, Harrell’s C-index remains one of the most widely used measures in survival analysis. Further research has helped practitioners to understand which concordance measures to use and when [Pencina et al., 2012, Schmid and Potapov, 2012, Rahman et al., 2017, Sonabend et al., 2022]. Concordance indices can only measure the quality of ranking predictions, however survival models may also make survival time predictions (though rarely, e.g., [Van Belle et al., 2011]), and survival distribution predictions. Although concordance-type measures do exist for this latter prediction type [Antolini et al., 2005], these still only evaluate the discrimination ability of a model, i.e., the model’s ability to separate observations between low and high risk of the event of interest. In contrast, scoring rules evaluate probabilistic distribution predictions and attempt to measure the overall predictive ability of a model as a combination of calibration and discrimination [Murphy, 1973, Gneiting and Raftery, 2007].

Scoring rules have gained in popularity for the past couple of decades, since probabilistic forecasts were recognised to be superior to deterministic predictions in quantifying uncertainty [Dawid, 1984, 1986]. Formalisation and development of scoring rules have primarily been due to Dawid [Dawid, 1984, 1986, Dawid and Musio, 2014] and Gneiting and Raftery [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]; although the earliest measures promoting “rational” and “honest” decision making date back to the 1950s [Brier, 1950, Good, 1952]. In classification and (probabilistic) regression [Gressmann et al., 2018] settings there are established definitions for scoring rules and specific losses have been defined, most popular of which are the Brier score (or ‘squared loss’) and Log loss (or ‘logarithmic loss’). In contrast, the survival analysis setting lacked a scoring rule until Graf et al. [1999].

In this paper, our aim is to examine properness of a subset of scoring rules proposed in survival analysis. Following the popularity seen in classification and regression settings, we focus on squared and logarithmic losses, which are the most widely used to evaluate survival model performance. For comprehensive reviews incorporating absolute losses and other variations of scoring rules, including R^2 forms, see [Hielscher et al., 2010, Choodari-Oskooei et al., 2012a,b, Rahman et al., 2017]. We limit the scope to measures utilized for external validation of survival models and thus exclude losses that require estimation of any hyperparameters, such as those that may be used for the optimization of deep learning models [Lee et al., 2018, Ren et al., 2019, Tjandra et al., 2021, Han et al., 2021, Yanagisawa, 2023].

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we introduce mathematical notation and terminology used throughout; Section 3 revisits the definition of properness for losses in the classification setting and extends it to the survival setting; in Section 4 we review several squared and logarithmic survival losses and their claimed properness, making propositions to prove or disprove these claims (proofs in Appendix); Section 5 introduces a new class of strictly proper survival losses; in Section 6 we empirically compare the score introduced by Graf et al. with a proper derivative of the score

using simulated and real-world datasets; lastly, in Section 7 we provide a summary of our work and propose guidelines for future ML practitioners.

2 Notation

Throughout this paper we assume that only right-censoring is present in the data and focus only on continuous-time models and measures. We use the following notation. Let X, Y, C be random variables taking values in $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ respectively. In addition, define $T := \min(Y, C)$, and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(Y = T)$. We interpret these as follows: X is a vector of co-variates, Y is the theoretical survival time (or time of death event), C is the theoretical censoring time, T is the outcome time, and Δ is the event indicator or censoring status (1 if the outcome is the event of interest and $T = Y$, 0 otherwise and $T = C$). Let Z be some random variable, then $f_Z(z)$ is the probability density function, $F_Z(z) = \int_0^z f_Z(u)du$ is the the cumulative distribution function, $S_Z(z) = 1 - F_Z(z)$ is the survival function, $h_Z(z) = f_Z(z)/S_Z(z)$ is the hazard function, and $H_Z = -\log(S_Z(z)) = \int_0^z h_Z(u)du$ is the cumulative hazard function.

3 Properness definitions for survival losses

Before moving into the survival setting, we first revisit the definition of properness in the classification setting and justify the requirement for strict properness.

Definition 3.1. *Let \mathcal{P} be a family of distributions over $[0, 1]$ and let $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$ then, a classification loss $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is called **proper** if for any p_Y, p in \mathcal{P} and for any $Y \sim p_Y$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, Y)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, Y)]$. L is called **strictly proper** if in addition to being proper, $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, Y)] \Leftrightarrow p = p_Y$, for any p_Y, p in \mathcal{P} and for any $Y \sim p_Y$.*

A loss is proper if the correct prediction minimises the loss, a loss is strictly proper if the correct prediction uniquely minimises the loss. Even a proper loss may not be entirely useful, this is clear by example: let $K : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be the loss defined by $K(p, Y) := 42$. K is proper as it is minimised by the correct prediction, but it is useless since all predictions are assigned the same score and there is no way to determine if one model is better than another.

Historically, the notion of scoring rules in survival analysis can be attributed to Erika Graf [Graf et al., 1999]. In this seminal manuscript, two scoring rules for survival analysis are defined and one of them is claimed to be proper, while the other is implied to be but not claimed. However, no formal definition of a proper survival scoring rule is provided, nor proofs of properness. Subsequent papers have also derived scoring rules without providing definitions or proofs (e.g. Avati et al. [2020]). To our knowledge the first formal definitions of survival scoring rules appear in Sonabend [2021], Rindt et al. [2022] and Yanagisawa [2023]. Rindt et al. [2022] provides a definition of a survival scoring rule conditional on the covariate random variable X , and Yanagisawa [2023] provides a simpler, unconditional definition. Our definition, based on that in Sonabend [2021], closely resembles the one proposed by Yanagisawa [2023]. However, we include additional definitions to address various types of survival losses and to clarify key assumptions in survival analysis.

Definition 3.2. *Let \mathcal{P} be a family of distributions over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ then for any p_Y, p in \mathcal{P} and for any $Y \sim p_Y$ and C t.v.i. $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$; a survival loss $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \mapsto \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is called*

1. **proper** if $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$

2. **strictly proper** if $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$ with equality iff $p = p_Y$

When Y and C are independent, (strictly) proper survival losses are called **outcome-independent (strictly) proper**.

Note the definition reflects a central challenge of survival analysis, namely that survival models make predictions for Y but are evaluated against the ground truth T . The definition for outcome-independent properness is crucial for defining losses that can be proper in the presence of the infamous survival non-identifiability problem [Tsiatis, 1975]. By definition if a loss is: i) (strictly) proper then it is also outcome-independent (strictly) proper; ii) (outcome-independent) strictly proper then it is also (outcome-independent) proper.

4 Squared and logarithmic losses

This paper focuses on squared and logarithmic scoring rules, to motivate a discussion around these different classes of losses and when they should be used in different experiments to evaluate survival models performance. We discuss the claimed properness properties of these losses in the literature and make propositions to prove or disprove these claims.

We differentiate between *exact* and *approximate* losses. Approximate losses require separate estimation of the censoring distribution in order to calculate the loss. Exact losses evaluate the model’s predictions without further quantities needing to be estimated (only requiring the knowledge of the censoring status, which is an implicit consideration in survival analysis).

4.1 Exact survival losses

These losses are listed below. Let (t, δ) be an observed survival outcome (time and status) and let Y be as defined in Section 2, then we define:

- Survival Continuous Ranked Probability Score (SCRPS) [Avati et al., 2020]

$$L_{SCRPS}(Y, t, \delta) = \int_0^t F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \delta \int_t^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau \quad (1)$$

- Negative Log-Likelihood (NLL)

$$L_{NLL}(Y, t) = -\log[f_Y(t)] \quad (2)$$

- Right-Censored Log-Likelihood (RCLL) [Avati et al., 2020]

$$L_{RCLL}(Y, t, \delta) = -\log[\delta f_Y(t) + (1 - \delta)S_Y(t)] \quad (3)$$

Avati et al. [2020] defined the SCRPS and assumed the properness of the loss (with no assumptions about censoring) by stating that it is simply the weighted CRPS, which is proper [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]. Rindt et al. [2022] claim outcome-independent improperness of this loss by first demonstrating that Avati’s assumption of properness due to the weighting is incorrect, and secondly by simulation. The NLL is a very well-established loss in the literature, but its first application to survival data appears to be in Goldstein et al. [2020], who imply properness of the loss in the context of neural network optimisation, however they do not provide a definition of properness for

survival nor any properness proof. Finally, Avati et al. [2020] also defined the RCLL, which is also a special case of the survival scoring rule proposed by Dawid and Musio [2014]. Rindt et al. [2022] prove the RCLL to be outcome-independent proper under their own definition of properness. These claims are summarised in Table 1.

Contrary to the aforementioned claims, under Definition 3.2 we prove analytically (i.e., not by simulation) that *SCRPS* and *NLL* are not outcome-independent proper (the weakest form of properness (Lemma A.1)).

Proposition 4.1. *L_{SCRPS} and L_{NLL} , are not: a) outcome-independent proper; b) outcome-independent strictly proper; c) proper; d) strictly proper.*

Proof. The proof of (a) is given in Appendix B.1. Proofs of (b)-(d) follow from (a) and lemma A.1. \square

We note that no losses are claimed to be (strictly) proper in general (i.e. when Y and C are not independent), which holds due to the non-identifiability problem in survival analysis [Tsiatis, 1975].

4.2 Approximate survival losses

The most common survival loss appears to be an adaptation of the Brier (or squared) score derived in Graf et al. [1999]. This loss employs an inverse probability of censoring weighting (IPCW) approach to weight the loss by an estimate of the censoring distribution. We term losses of this form as ‘approximate losses’ as they imply perfect knowledge of the censoring distribution, which is of course impossible in practice, and therefore estimators of these losses can only be ‘approximate’ at best. Proper approximate losses can be useful in modern predictive settings in which ‘big data’ is accessible and thus estimators, such as the Kaplan-Meier, can converge to the true censoring distribution [Kaplan and Meier, 1958]. However, approximate losses may provide misleading results when the sample size is small and the true censoring distribution is poorly estimated. Note that convergence for Kaplan-Meier (or similar) estimators usually requires the assumption that C and Y are independent [Gerds and Schumacher, 2006], hence we expect these losses to be outcome-independent proper at best.

All approximate losses appear to be attributed to Graf et al. [1999] or are derivatives of this work, see list below. Let \hat{G} be the estimated survival function of the censoring distribution S_C , $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$ the time cutoff to integrate the score up to, (t, δ) the observed survival outcome (time and status), and let the other variables below be as defined in Section 2. Then we define,

- Integrated Survival Brier Score [Graf et al., 1999]

$$L_{ISBS}(Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}) = \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{S_Y^2(\tau) \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} + \frac{F_Y^2(\tau) \mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (4)$$

- Integrated Survival Log-Likelihood [Graf et al., 1999]

$$L_{ISLL}(Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}) = - \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{\log[F_Y(\tau)] \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} + \frac{\log[S_Y(\tau)] \mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (5)$$

- Integrated Binomial Log-Likelihood [Rindt et al., 2022]

$$L_{IBLL}(Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}) = \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{\log[F_Y(\tau)] \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} + \frac{S_Y(\tau) \mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (6)$$

In practice it is common to estimate \hat{G} with the Kaplan-Meier estimator fit on $\{(t_1, 1-\delta_1), \dots, (t_n, 1-\delta_n)\}$, due to the fact that $\hat{G} \rightarrow S_C$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ when calculated using the Kaplan-Meier estimator [Kaplan and Meier, 1958]. We use \hat{G}_{KM} to specifically refer to \hat{G} estimated with the Kaplan-Meier method.

The ISBS is defined in Graf et al. [1999] with properness claimed without definition of a survival scoring loss and without proof. This claim (assuming outcome-independence) is supported by Rindt et al. [2022] and Han et al. [2021].

ISLL is also defined by Graf et al. [1999] but properness is not claimed. We note that Han et al. [2021] claim ISLL to be proper. This loss exhibits limited usage in both literature and software with one implementation available in **mlr3proba** [Sonabend et al., 2021].

Contrary to Graf et al. [1999], Rindt et al. [2022] claim that the ISBS is improper generally but outcome-independent proper, which we disprove. We do not show improperness of ISLL but note that proofs would follow analogously. Moreover, we note that Rindt et al. [2022] introduces the IBLL, which is similar to the ISLL, and prove it to be improper. We also note the work of Kvamme and Ørnulf Borgan [2023], which extends the ISBS to Type I censoring. It is worth noting that no claims of properness are made for this extension and since it uses the same weighting scheme as the ISBS, it is unlikely to be proper.

Proposition 4.2. *L_{ISBS} is not: a) outcome-independent proper; b) outcome-independent strictly proper; c) proper; d) strictly proper.*

Proof. Proof of (a) is in Appendix B.2. The proofs of (b)-(d) follow from (a) and lemma A.2. \square

Intuitively, these losses are not proper as they depend on the underlying censoring distribution. The IPC weighting introduced in Graf et al. tries to compensate for this dependency, but is only partially successful. By splitting the weighting between $\hat{G}_{KM}(t)$ and $\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)$, a residual term in the loss remains, as demonstrated in the decomposition outlined in Appendix B.2, which is still dependent on the censoring distribution. The practical implications of this lack of properness are discussed in Section 6.

5 A class of strictly proper losses

In this section, we prove that there exists a class of approximate outcome-independent survival losses and demonstrate three losses that fall within this category. In the following, \hat{G}_{KM} is the Kaplan-Meier estimator of the censoring distribution, $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$ the time cutoff to integrate the score up to and (t, δ) the observed survival outcome (time and status).

Theorem 5.1. *Let L_R be a regression scoring rule, then an approximate survival loss, L_S , defined by*

$$L_S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}; \quad (Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) \mapsto \frac{\delta L_R(Y, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (7)$$

is outcome-independent strictly proper if and only if L_R is strictly proper.

Proof. Proof in appendix B.3. \square

This means that any (strictly) proper regression scoring rule can yield a (strictly) proper approximate survival loss by weighting the underlying loss by the probability of being censored at the observed outcome time and removing censored observations. Applying this to common regression losses yields Proposition 5.2.

Table 1: Summary of losses and properness claims. Key: 1 - Claimed outcome-independent (OI) proper without proof; 2 Claimed OI proper with proof; † - We prove OI strictly proper; ♣ - We prove OI improper.

<i>Loss</i>	<i>Claimed Properness</i>	<i>Claimed Improperness</i>
SCRPS♣	Avati et al. [2020] ¹	Rindt et al. [2022]
NLL♣	Goldstein et al. [2020] ¹	-
RCLL	Rindt et al. [2022] ² , Avati et al. [2020] ¹	-
ISBS♣	Rindt et al. [2022] ² , Han et al. [2021] ² , Graf et al. [1999] ¹	-
ISLL♣	Han et al. [2021] ²	-
IBLL♣	-	Rindt et al. [2022]
RISBS†	Sonabend [2021]	-
RISLL†	Sonabend [2021]	-
RNLL†	Sonabend [2021]	-

Proposition 5.2. *The following novel approximate survival losses, L_{RISBS} , L_{RISLL} , L_{RNLL} are all outcome-independent strictly proper.*

- *Re-weighted Integrated Survival Brier Score (RISBS)*

$$L_{RISBS}(Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta \int_0^{\tau^*} (\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) - F_Y(\tau))^2 d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (8)$$

- *Re-weighted Integrated Survival Log-Likelihood (RISLL)*

$$L_{RISLL}(Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta \int_0^{\tau^*} \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) \log[F_Y(\tau)] + \mathbb{I}(t > \tau) \log[S_Y(\tau)] d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (9)$$

- *Re-weighted Negative Log-Likelihood (RNLL)*

$$L_{RNLL}(Y, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = -\frac{\delta \log[f_Y(t)]}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (10)$$

Proof. Proof in appendix B.4. □

In contrast to the earlier losses, these are strictly proper as this IPC weighting means that the loss is no longer dependent on the underlying censoring distribution, which can be seen in Appendix B.3, and therefore becomes a standard probabilistic regression comparison between true and predicted distributions.

6 Experiments

In this section, we empirically investigate the impact of scoring rules on model performance. Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the scoring rules considered in our study, along with their properness properties. Among the scoring rules examined, four are identified as outcome-independent proper. These include the Right-Censored Log-Likelihood (RCLL) originally proposed

Table 2: Summary of losses, references and score formulas. Key: α - loss is approximate. (t, δ) is an observed survival outcome (time and status), Y is the random time-to-event variable and $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$ the time cutoff to integrate the score up to. \hat{G} is the estimated survival function of the censoring distribution and \hat{G}_{KM} is the Kaplan-Meier estimator of the censoring distribution.

<i>Loss</i>	<i>Proper</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Formula</i>
SCRPS	✗	Avati et al. [2020]	$\int_0^t F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \delta \int_t^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau$
NLL	✗	Goldstein et al. [2020]	$-\log[f_Y(t)]$
RCLL	✓	Avati et al. [2020]	$-\log[\delta f_Y(t) + (1 - \delta)S_Y(t)]$
ISBS $^\alpha$	✗	Graf et al. [1999]	$\int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{S_Y^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta=1)}{\hat{G}(t)} + \frac{F_Y^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau$
ISLL $^\alpha$	✗	Graf et al. [1999]	$-\int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{\log[F_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta=1)]}{\hat{G}(t)} + \frac{\log[S_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)]}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau$
IBLL $^\alpha$	✗	Rindt et al. [2022]	$\int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{\log[F_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta=1)]}{\hat{G}(t)} + \frac{S_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau$
RISBS $^\alpha$	✓	Sonabend [2021]	$\frac{\delta \int_0^{\tau^*} (\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) - F_Y(\tau))^2 d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)}$
RISLL $^\alpha$	✓	Sonabend [2021]	$\frac{\delta \int_0^{\tau^*} \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) \log[F_Y(\tau)] + \mathbb{I}(t > \tau) \log[S_Y(\tau)] d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)}$
RNLL $^\alpha$	✓	Sonabend [2021]	$-\frac{\delta \log[f_Y(t)]}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)}$

by Avati et al. [2020], along with the three newly proposed scoring rules discussed in Section 5, namely the Re-weighted Integrated Survival Brier Score (RISBS), the Re-weighted Integrated Survival Log-Likelihood (RISLL) and the Re-weighted Negative Log-Likelihood (RNLL).

As of the time of writing this paper, the prevailing standard for assessing the overall performance of a survival model is the ISBS [Graf et al., 1999], a scoring rule we have demonstrated to be improper. Although recent attention has turned towards proper survival scoring rules [Sonabend, 2021, Rindt et al., 2022, Yanagisawa, 2023], empirical evaluations are primarily based on improper metrics such as the ISBS [Herrmann et al., 2021, Jaeger et al., 2023, Wissel et al., 2023]. Consequently, our focus in this section is to investigate the bias introduced by ISBS, compared to a proper alternative (RISBS), when evaluating survival model performance. We carry out this investigation using both simulated and real-world data, with the primary goal of assessing the consistency between proper and improper scoring rules as well as elucidating the practical implications of substituting an improper scoring rule with a proper one. Furthermore, this analysis also aims to provide an initial estimate of the extent to which the use of improper scoring rules may have influenced previous evaluations.

6.1 Simulation Study

We used the *coxed* R package [Harden and Kropko, 2019] to simulate datasets with outcome times T that do not assume a specific functional form for the hazard function. This allows for a more flexible and realistic data generation approach. Across the generated datasets, we systematically varied key characteristics, such as the *proportion of censored observations* (10%, 20%, ..., 80%), which were randomly and uniformly selected to guarantee outcome-independence, and the *number of total observations* (100, 200, ..., 1000). Additionally, we assessed and kept only the data that adhered to the *proportional hazards assumption* using the Grambsch-Therneau test [Grambsch and Therneau, 1994]. For each combination of censoring proportion and number of observations, we generated 100 datasets, so our analysis considered a total of 8000 datasets. Each dataset, contained a random number of covariates ranging from 3 to 10, reflecting a low-dimensional experimental setting. Lastly, all datasets shared a common *time horizon*, defined as the maximum duration during which an

observation might experience the event, capped at 365 days.

For all datasets in our experiments, we performed a straightforward train/test resampling approach, allocating 70% of the data for training and the remaining 30% for testing. To reduce the bias in model evaluation due to inconsistent proportions of censored observations across train and test sets, we employed stratification based on the censoring status variable. In each train set, we trained three distinct models: the baseline Kaplan-Meier estimator, the Cox Proportional Hazards (CoxPH) model, and an Accelerated Failure Time (AFT) model utilizing the Weibull distribution for the time-to-event output variable. Subsequently, we assessed the performance of each model on the respective test sets using the ISBS and RISBS, integrating up to the 80% quantile of event times from each train set (τ^* time cutoff in Eq. 4 and 8 respectively). The censoring distribution $\hat{G}_{KM}(t)$ was estimated using all the training data in each respective resampling in order to have a more robust estimation, including observations for which the observed time was larger than the time cutoff ($t > \tau^*$).

Across this exhaustive examination of simulated outcome-independent datasets which also satisfied the proportional hazards assumption, we consistently observed minimal discrepancies between the improper ISBS and the proper RISBS. Specifically, the root mean squared error (RMSE) between ISBS and RISBS fell within the range of 0.003 to 0.026 across the tested models, with Pearson correlation values consistently ranging between 0.94 to 1. We note that similar results were obtained for simulated datasets where censoring was covariate-dependent or the proportional hazards assumption was violated, see [Supplementary Material](#). These robust findings demonstrate evidence that there is negligible practical difference between the improper ISBS and the proper RISBS for evaluating the overall performance of a survival model.

6.2 Real-World Data Study

In this sub-section, we wanted to assert if the minimal discrepancy observed between the proper RISBS and improper ISBS in simulated datasets would persist when applying these scoring rules to real-world datasets. In total, we selected 26 publicly available datasets for this study, encompassing a diverse range of characteristics such as varying numbers of observations (137 – 5578) and covariates (2 – 20), different censoring patterns (including presence of covariate-dependent censoring and varying proportions of censored observations, from 5% up to 92%), with half of the datasets adhering to the proportional hazards assumption and the remaining exhibiting non-proportional hazards (as per the Grambsch-Therneau test). For clarity, we focus on only two datasets: a population study of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) [Allen et al., 2018] and the Veterans’ Administration Lung Cancer dataset (VETERAN) [Kalbfleisch and Prentice, 2011], both available via the survival R package [Therneau, 2024]. These two datasets were chosen primarily because of their contrasting proportion of censored observations across the studied datasets. Specifically, the VETERAN dataset has 137 observations, 7% of which are censored, and demonstrates non-proportional hazards, while NAFLD includes a lot more observations (4000), with most of them being censored (92%), and exhibits proportional hazards. We note that in the subsequent analysis, similar results were obtained across the remaining datasets (see [Supplementary Material](#) for more details).

Both datasets underwent a (80%/20%) train/test resampling, repeated 100 times, with stratification based on the status censoring variable. In each resampling, we trained both a Cox Proportional Hazards (CoxPH) and an Accelerated Failure Time (AFT) model (Weibull distribution), and assessed performance using the RISBS and the ISBS scoring rules. The AFT model results were omitted for the sake of clarity, as they were similar to those of the CoxPH model. We selected the 80% quantile of event times from each train set as the time cutoff (τ^*), and estimated the censoring distribution $\hat{G}_{KM}(t)$ using all training data in each resampling.




Figure 1: Comparing the RISBS (Eq. 8) and ISBS (Eq. 4) across 100 train/test partitions of two public datasets. In each resampling, a Cox proportional hazards model was fitted on the train set and its performance was evaluated on the test set using the two scoring rules. Each dot represents one resampling evaluation and the output scores are the average of the score values per observation in each respective test set. The number of test observations in each resampling after the 80% event times quantile cutoff is applied were between 18 to 28 for the VETERAN dataset and 509 to 597 for the NAFLD dataset. In both plots, the regression line is drawn with 95% confidence intervals. R, p : Pearson correlation coefficient and associated p-value, $RMSE$: Root Mean Square Error.

Figure 1 confirms that the improper ISBS and proper RISBS are highly correlated and differ insignificantly, with $RMSE$ values < 0.01 , thus reaffirming our findings based on the simulated datasets. Notably, the VETERAN dataset exhibits higher absolute values compared to the NAFLD dataset for the tested scoring rules, possibly due to model misspecification, as we fitted a CoxPH model on data that failed to meet the proportionality test. Despite this disparity, the differences between RISBS and ISBS remain marginal across both datasets, indicating robustness to variations in absolute score values.

To gain a more in-depth understanding of the differences between the RISBS and ISBS, we calculated the *observation-wise* losses for each score (note that in Fig. 1 the score values were averaged across all observations in each respective test set). This decomposition of the studied scoring rules at the observation level enables us to examine possible discrepancies separately for censored and non-censored observations. Figure 2 illustrates that the differences between the observation-wise RISBS and ISBS remain minimal across all observations, independent if they are censored or not ($RMSE < 0.05$). Moreover, both scoring rules yield comparable values when focusing solely on observations with events ($RMSE < 0.01$). Differences in IPC weighting occasionally cause RISBS to be slightly larger than ISBS, as illustrated in Figure 2, where many observations with events are below the $y = x$ reference line. This is explained by the formulas in Table 2, where in the cases when the observed time (t) exceeds the current evaluation time (τ), RISBS receives a slightly higher weighting, as $t \geq \tau \rightarrow \hat{G}(t) \leq \hat{G}(\tau) \rightarrow 1/\hat{G}(t) \geq 1/\hat{G}(\tau)$.

Small discrepancies between RISBS and ISBS arise when evaluating observation-wise scores for censored observations, where the RISBS is always 0 (as follows from Eq. 8), leading to a higher $RMSE$ in this scenario compared to observations with events. In particular, we observe that in the VETERAN dataset, which is characterized by a low proportion of censored observations (180 in




Figure 2: Comparing the *observation-wise* RISBS (Eq. 8) and ISBS (Eq. 4) across 100 train/test partitions of two public datasets. In each resampling, a Cox proportional hazards model was fitted on the train set and its performance was evaluated on the test set using the two scoring rules. Each dot represents one observation from a test set. Overall, the VETERAN dataset comprised 2,143 observations with events and 180 censored instances across all test sets. In contrast, for the NAFLD dataset, we had a total of 5,181 observations with events and 50,194 were censored. In both plots, the reference $y = x$ line is drawn. R, p : Pearson correlation coefficient and associated p-value, $RMSE$: Root Mean Square Error.

total across 100 resamplings), the $RMSE$ (censored) is 0.158, akin to the absolute values for the observation-wise scores. Conversely, the NAFLD dataset, with over 50,000 censored observations across all tested resamplings, attains a notably lower $RMSE$ of 0.02 for the censored observations. These findings underscore how censoring influences both scoring rules, where factors such as the degree of censoring or the presence of a few outlier censored observations with poor predictions can result in notable differences in the observation-wise scores, which are nevertheless counterbalanced by the event-based scores (which are more similar) in the overall assessment.

We note that both RISBS and ISBS suffer from arithmetic instability due to the presence of censored observations at the last observed times in the training set, causing \hat{G}_{KM} to approach zero for these time points and leading to exceptionally large or even infinite IPC weights. To address this, we typically apply a very small positive number $\epsilon > 0$ to weight the score, mitigating the division by zero problem. This instability has also been acknowledged by researchers who utilize such scoring rules in extensive benchmarks [Wissel et al., 2023]. Therefore, we strongly recommend to evaluate time-dependent scoring rules up to a set cutoff (τ^*), as was performed in the aforementioned experiments (we recommend the 80% quantile of event times as a rule of thumb).

7 Conclusions

Survival analysis is an important field of statistics with applications in healthcare, finance, engineering, and other sectors that have a large impact on the public. Machine learning survival analysis [Wang et al., 2019, Sonabend and Bender, 2024] is also increasingly prevalent, especially the use of deep learning models [Wiegrebe et al., 2024], which are hard to interpret and require robust

methods of external validation to ensure they are appropriate for a given task. As these models frequently make probabilistic predictions, scoring rules are essential to fully capture the quality of these predictions. Proper scoring rules ensure that the loss accurately separates ‘good’ and ‘bad’ predictions, i.e., which are closer to the truth. Strictly proper scoring rules are uniquely minimised by the ‘correct’ prediction, i.e. those that exactly equal the truth. The most commonly used scoring rules in survival analysis are squared and logarithmic losses, which are also found in regression and classification settings.

In this paper, we introduced definitions of scoring rules and properness in a survival context, with specialised definitions for outcome-independent settings. We listed existing claims in the literature about commonly used squared and logarithmic losses for external validation, and supplemented these with our own analytical proofs of properness and improperness, as well as benchmark experiments to examine the effect of these claims. Despite several claims of properness, we could only verify properness for the RCLL [Avati et al., 2020]. We also disproved the common claim that the ISBS score proposed by Graf et al. [1999] is proper. Finally, we demonstrated a simple re-weighting of this loss that results in a strictly proper outcome-independent score (RISBS) – this finding is also generalisable to a whole class of measures. A limitation of this paper is the restricted scope to right-censored settings. Future research should explore other areas, such as competing risks, multi-state models, and left/interval censoring/truncation.

To understand the implication of our findings, we ran benchmark experiments to understand how use of these measures affects model interpretation and how results differ between measures. Our investigation revealed minimal discrepancies between proper and improper scores, indicating that prior research relying on the widely-used ISBS for evaluating survival models remains reliable. Neither the RISBS and ISBS is perfect: RISBS excludes censored observations completely and ISBS is improper. When considering alternatives, note that RCLL and RNLL both require the probability density function, f_Y , to be estimated from the predicted survival function, S_Y . This can be problematic when models are built for continuous-time settings. However, in practice, the majority of models depend on a discrete baseline survival estimator, making the computation of the probability mass function p_Y from S_Y straightforward. This substitution is commonly accepted as a practical alternative to f_Y . Overall, to ensure robust assessments of survival model performance, we advocate for the reporting of multiple scoring rules. To enhance interpretation, concordance indices and measures of calibration should also be included [Zhao et al., 2024].

No losses have been shown to be universally proper; at best, they exhibit only outcome-independence. This is due to the non-identifiability problem as outlined by Tsiatis [1975], wherein accurately estimating true survival times becomes exceedingly challenging, if not impossible, when censoring and survival times are not independent. Despite the common assumption of outcome-independence in survival analysis, this assumption is rarely discussed or supported in experimental studies and is unlikely to hold in healthcare settings. While researchers may dismiss this assumption’s violation by expecting poor model performance to be evident during evaluation, it’s important to note that all scoring rules assume outcome-independence. Consequently, models that perform poorly may falsely appear to perform well due to the inability of scoring rules to accurately rank them. We believe there should be a higher burden on authors to demonstrate or at least clearly argue why censoring is truly independent to the outcome time, and if this case cannot be made, employing competing risk frameworks [Kragh Andersen et al., 2021] or alternative measures that incorporate a working model for the conditional censoring distribution [Gerds and Schumacher, 2006] should be considered.

As well as issues arising from the inability to satisfy or prove the outcome-independence assumption of most scoring rules in survival analysis, these measures are also difficult to interpret. This is due to the fact that, unlike regression and classification settings, there are no intuitive baselines that

can be used to quickly identify if a resulting score is ‘good’ as most losses are approximate and thus depend on the estimation of the censoring distribution. To make scoring rules more interpretable, models can be compared to a baseline estimator, such as the Kaplan-Meier, either by comparing the absolute difference between the resulting losses, or using an explained residual variation representation [Graf et al., 1999, Kattan and Gerds, 2018], which is the percentage difference between the losses.

As well as helping in robust model evaluation, we hope this paper helps machine learning practitioners to more efficiently optimise survival models by making use of losses that are strictly proper and can therefore be more effectively minimised in automated tuning.

Supplementary Material

R scripts and data for the benchmark studies in Section 6 and a summary report of the results, are all available online at <https://github.com/survival-org/scoring-rules-2024>.

Funding

JZ received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 101016851, project PANCAIM.

References

- F E Jr Harrell, K L Lee, R M Califf, D B Pryor, and R A Rosati. Regression modelling strategies for improved prognostic prediction. *Statistics in medicine*, 3(2):143–152, 1984. ISSN 0277-6715 (Print). doi: 10.1002/sim.4780030207.
- Mithat Gönen and Glenn Heller. Concordance Probability and Discriminatory Power in Proportional Hazards Regression. *Biometrika*, 92(4):965–970, 2005.
- Hajime Uno, Tianxi Cai, Lu Tian, and L J Wei. Evaluating Prediction Rules for t-Year Survivors with Censored Regression Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(478): 527–537, 2007. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27639883>.
- Paul Blanche, Michael W Kattan, and Thomas A Gerds. The c-index is not proper for the evaluation of t-year predicted risks. *Biostatistics*, 20(2):347–357, apr 2019. ISSN 1465-4644. doi: 10.1093/biostatistics/kxy006. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxy006>.
- Michael J Pencina, Ralph B D’Agostino Sr, and Linye Song. Quantifying discrimination of framing-ham risk functions with different survival c statistics. *Statistics in medicine*, 31(15):1543–1553, 2012. doi: 10.1002/sim.4508.
- Matthias Schmid and Sergej Potapov. A comparison of estimators to evaluate the discriminatory power of time-to-event models. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31(23):2588–2609, oct 2012. ISSN 1097-0258. doi: 10.1002/SIM.5464.
- M. Shafiqur Rahman, Gareth Ambler, Babak Choodari-Oskooei, and Rumana Z. Omar. Review and evaluation of performance measures for survival prediction models in external validation settings. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 17(1):1–15, 2017. ISSN 14712288. doi: 10.1186/s12874-017-0336-2.
- Raphael Sonabend, Andreas Bender, and Sebastian Vollmer. Avoiding C-hacking when evaluating survival distribution predictions with discrimination measures. *Bioinformatics*, 38(17):4178–4184, sep 2022. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btac451. URL <https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/38/17/4178/6640155>.
- Vanya Van Belle, Kristiaan Pelckmans, Sabine Van Huffel, and Johan A.K. Suykens. Support vector methods for survival analysis: a comparison between ranking and regression approaches. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 53(2):107–118, oct 2011. ISSN 0933-3657. doi: 10.1016/J.ARTMED.2011.06.006.
- Laura Antolini, Patrizia Boracchi, and Elia Biganzoli. A time-dependent discrimination index for survival data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 24(24):3927–3944, dec 2005. ISSN 0277-6715. doi: 10.1002/sim.2427. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sim.2427>.
- Allan H Murphy. A New Vector Partition of the Probability Score. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 12(4):595–600, 1973.
- Tilmann Gneiting and Adrian E Raftery. Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and Estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477):359–378, mar 2007. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.1198/016214506000001437. URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1198/016214506000001437>.

- A P Dawid. Present Position and Potential Developments: Some Personal Views: Statistical Theory: The Prequential Approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 147(2): 278–292, jun 1984. ISSN 00359238. doi: 10.2307/2981683. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2981683>.
- A Philip Dawid. Probability Forecasting. *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, 7:210—218, 1986.
- Alexander Philip Dawid and Monica Musio. Theory and applications of proper scoring rules. *Metron*, 72(2):169–183, 2014.
- Glenn Brier. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Monthly Weather Review*, 78(1):1–3, 1950.
- I J Good. Rational Decisions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 14(1):107–114, jun 1952. ISSN 00359246. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2984087>.
- Frithjof Gressmann, Franz J. Király, Bilal Mateen, and Harald Oberhauser. Probabilistic supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00753*, 2018. ISSN 1521-6551. doi: 10.1002/iub.552. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1801.00753>.
- Erika Graf, Claudia Schmoor, Willi Sauerbrei, and Martin Schumacher. Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 18(17-18):2529–2545, 1999. ISSN 0277-6715. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19990915/30)18:17/18<2529::AID-SIM274>3.0.CO;2-5.
- T. Hielscher, M. Zucknick, W. Werft, and A. Benner. On the prognostic value of survival models with application to gene expression signatures. *Statistics in Medicine*, 29(7-8):818–829, mar 2010. ISSN 1097-0258. doi: 10.1002/SIM.3768. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/sim.3768>.
- Babak Choodari-Oskooei, Patrick Royston, and Mahesh K.B. Parmar. A simulation study of predictive ability measures in a survival model I: Explained variation measures. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31(23):2627–2643, oct 2012a. ISSN 1097-0258. doi: 10.1002/SIM.4242.
- B. Choodari-Oskooei, P. Royston, and Mahesh K.B. Parmar. A simulation study of predictive ability measures in a survival model II: explained randomness and predictive accuracy. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31(23):2644–2659, oct 2012b. ISSN 1097-0258. doi: 10.1002/SIM.5460.
- Changhee Lee, William R Zame, Jinsung Yoon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. Deephit: A deep learning approach to survival analysis with competing risks. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- Kan Ren, Jiarui Qin, Lei Zheng, Zhengyu Yang, Weinan Zhang, Lin Qiu, and Yong Yu. Deep Recurrent Survival Analysis. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):4798–4805, jul 2019. ISSN 2374-3468. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V33I01.33014798. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/4407>.
- Donna Tjandra, Yifei He, and Jenna Wiens. A Hierarchical Approach to Multi-Event Survival Analysis. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(1):591–599, may 2021. ISSN 2374-3468. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V35I1.16138. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/16138>.

- Xintian Han, Mark Goldstein, Aahlad Puli, Thomas Wies, Adler Perotte, and Rajesh Ranganath. Inverse-weighted survival games. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:2160–2172, 2021.
- Hiroki Yanagisawa. Proper scoring rules for survival analysis. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’23*. JMLR.org, 2023.
- Anand Avati, Tony Duan, Sharon Zhou, Kenneth Jung, Nigam H Shah, and Andrew Y Ng. Countdown Regression: Sharp and Calibrated Survival Predictions. In Ryan P Adams and Vibhav Gogate, editors, *Proceedings of The 35th Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence Conference*, volume 115 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 145–155. PMLR, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v115/avati20a.html>.
- Raphael Edward Benjamin Sonabend. *A Theoretical and Methodological Framework for Machine Learning in Survival Analysis: Enabling Transparent and Accessible Predictive Modelling on Right-Censored Time-to-Event Data*. Phd, University College London (UCL), 2021. URL <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10129352/>.
- David Rindt, Robert Hu, David Steinsaltz, and Dino Sejdinovic. Survival regression with proper scoring rules and monotonic neural networks. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J R Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *Proceedings of The 25th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1190–1205. PMLR, 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v151/rindt22a.html>.
- A Tsiatis. A nonidentifiability aspect of the problem of competing risks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 72(1):20–22, jan 1975. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.72.1.20. URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1054494https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC432231/>.
- Mark Goldstein, Xintian Han, Aahlad M. Puli, Adler J. Perotte, and Rajesh Ranganath. X-CAL: Explicit Calibration for Survival Analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- E. L. Kaplan and Paul Meier. Nonparametric Estimation from Incomplete Observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53(282):457–481, 1958. ISSN 01621459. doi: 10.2307/2281868.
- Thomas A Gerds and Martin Schumacher. Consistent Estimation of the Expected Brier Score in General Survival Models with Right-Censored Event Times. *Biometrical Journal*, 48(6):1029–1040, dec 2006. ISSN 0323-3847. doi: 10.1002/bimj.200610301.
- Raphael Sonabend, Franz J Király, Andreas Bender, Bernd Bischl, and Michel Lang. mlr3proba: An R Package for Machine Learning in Survival Analysis. *Bioinformatics*, feb 2021. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btab039. URL <https://cran.r-project.org/package=mlr3proba>.
- Håvard Kvamme and Ørnulf Borgan. The brier score under administrative censoring: Problems and a solution. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(2):1–26, 2023. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/19-1030.html>.
- Moritz Herrmann, Philipp Probst, Roman Hornung, Vindi Jurinovic, and Anne Laure Boulesteix. Large-scale benchmark study of survival prediction methods using multi-omics data. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 22(3):1–15, may 2021. doi: 10.1093/BIB/BBAA167. URL <https://academic.oup.com/bib/article/22/3/bbaa167/5895463>.

- Byron C. Jaeger, Sawyer Welden, Kristin Lenoir, Jaime L. Speiser, Matthew W. Segar, Ambarish Pandey, and Nicholas M. Pajewski. Accelerated and Interpretable Oblique Random Survival Forests. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pages 1–16, 2023. ISSN 15372715. doi: 10.1080/10618600.2023.2231048. URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10618600.2023.2231048>.
- David Wissel, Daniel Rowson, and Valentina Boeva. Systematic comparison of multi-omics survival models reveals a widespread lack of noise resistance. *Cell Reports Methods*, 3(4):100461, apr 2023. ISSN 2667-2375. doi: 10.1016/J.CRMETH.2023.100461.
- Jeffrey J. Harden and Jonathan Kropko. Simulating Duration Data for the Cox Model. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 7(4):921–928, oct 2019. ISSN 2049-8470. doi: 10.1017/PSRM.2018.19. URL <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/political-science-research-and-methods/article/simulating-duration-data-for-the-cox-model/1945D7548766E76FB31C6C833976822E>.
- Patricia M Grambsch and Terry M. Therneau. Proportional hazards tests and diagnostics based on weighted residuals. *Biometrika*, 81(3):515–526, 1994. ISSN 0006-3444. doi: 10.1093/biomet/81.3.515. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/81.3.515>.
- Alina M Allen, Terry M Therneau, Joseph J Larson, Alexandra Coward, Virend K Somers, and Patrick S Kamath. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease incidence and impact on metabolic burden and death: a 20 year-community study. *Hepatology*, 67(5):1726–1736, 2018.
- John D Kalbfleisch and Ross L Prentice. *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- Terry M Therneau. *A Package for Survival Analysis in R*, 2024. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survival>. R package version 3.5-8.
- Ping Wang, Yan Li, and Chandan K. Reddy. Machine Learning for Survival Analysis. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 51(6):1–36, nov 2019. ISSN 0360-0300. doi: 10.1145/3214306. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3214306>.
- Raphael Sonabend and Andreas Bender. *Machine Learning in Survival Analysis*. CRC Press, 2024. URL <https://www.mlsabook.com>.
- Simon Wiegbe, Philipp Kopper, Raphael Sonabend, Bernd Bischl, and Andreas Bender. Deep learning for survival analysis: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(3):1–34, 2024. ISSN 1573-7462. doi: 10.1007/S10462-023-10681-3. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10462-023-10681-3>.
- Zhi Zhao, John Zobolas, Manuela Zucknick, and Tero Aittokallio. Tutorial on survival modeling with applications to omics data. *Bioinformatics*, mar 2024. ISSN 1367-4811. doi: 10.1093/BIOINFORMATICS/BTAE132. URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btae132>.
- Per Kragh Andersen, Maja Pohar Perme, Hans C. van Houwelingen, Richard J. Cook, Pierre Joly, Torben Martinussen, Jeremy M.G. Taylor, Michal Abrahamowicz, and Terry M. Therneau. Analysis of time-to-event for observational studies: Guidance to the use of intensity models. *Statistics in Medicine*, 40(1):185–211, jan 2021. ISSN 1097-0258. doi: 10.1002/SIM.8757. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/sim.8757>.

Michael W Kattan and Thomas A Gerds. The index of prediction accuracy: an intuitive measure useful for evaluating risk prediction models. *Diagnostic and prognostic research*, 2:1–7, 2018. doi: 10.1186/s41512-018-0029-2.

Appendices

A Lemmas and Definitions

Proofs follow after these definitions and lemmas.

Lemma A.1. *Let $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a survival loss. Let $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$, let $Y \sim p_Y$ and C t.v.i. \mathcal{T} be random variables where $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$. Let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$. Then if $\exists p \in \mathcal{P}, p \neq p_Y$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] > \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \quad (11)$$

Then, L is not:

- i) outcome-independent proper;
- ii) outcome-independent strictly proper;
- iii) proper;
- iv) strictly proper.

Proof.

Proof of (i). By definition L is outcome-independent proper if $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$ but this is a contradiction to the statement, hence L is not outcome-independent proper, proving (i). ■

Proof of (ii). By definition L is outcome-independent strictly proper if L is outcome-independent proper and $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \Leftrightarrow p = p_Y$, however by (i) L is not outcome-independent proper and therefore by definition cannot be outcome-independent strictly proper, proving (ii). ■

Proof of (iii). Proof is identical to (i). ■

Proof of (iv). Proof of (iv): By definition L is strictly proper if L is proper and $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \Leftrightarrow p = p_Y$, however by (iii) L is improper and therefore by definition cannot be strictly proper, proving (iv). ■

□

□

Lemma A.2. *Let $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be an approximate survival loss. Let $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$ and let $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $Y \sim p_Y$ and C t.v.i. \mathcal{T} be random variables. Let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$. Then if $\exists p \in \mathcal{P}, p \neq p_Y$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta|c)] > \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta|c)] \quad (12)$$

Then, L is not:

- i) outcome-independent proper;
- ii) outcome-independent strictly proper;
- iii) proper;

iv) strictly proper.

Proof. Proof follows similarly to lemma A.1. □ □

Definition A.3. Let $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a proper scoring rule and let p, p_Y be distributions in \mathcal{P} . Let $Y \sim p_Y$ and C t.v.i. \mathcal{T} be random variables and let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$. Then, [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]

- i) $S_L(p_Y, p) := \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$ is defined as the expected penalty.
- ii) $H_L(p_Y) := S_L(p_Y, p_Y)$ is defined as the (generalised) entropy of $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$.
- iii) $D_L(p_Y, p) := S_L(p_Y, p) - H_L(p_Y)$ is defined as the discrepancy or divergence of $p \in \mathcal{P}$ from $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$.

Lemma A.4. Let $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a survival loss and let p_Y be a distribution in \mathcal{P} . Let $Y \sim p_Y$ and C t.v.i. \mathcal{T} be random variables and let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$. Then,

- $D_L(p_Y, p) \geq 0$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$ if L is proper
- $D_L(p_Y, p) > 0$ iff L is strictly proper and $p \neq p_Y$

Proof.

Proof of (i). Proof follows by definition of properness and substituting the expressions defined above. If L is proper then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \\
 &\Rightarrow S_L(p_Y, p_Y) \leq S_L(p_Y, p) \\
 &\Rightarrow H_L(p_Y) \leq S_L(p_Y, p) \\
 &\Rightarrow 0 \leq S_L(p_Y, p) - H_L(p_Y) \\
 &\Rightarrow D_L(p_Y, p) \geq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is substituting definition of S_L , the third is substituting definition of H_L , the third is subtracting H_L from both sides, and the final by substituting definition of D_L and reversing the inequality. ■ ■

Proof of (ii). Proof follows similarly to (i) after replacing the inequalities by strict inequalities. ■ ■

□

□

Definition A.5. Let X be an absolutely continuous random variable and let Y be a discrete random variable. Then,

- i) The mixed joint density of (X, Y) is defined by

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = f_{X|Y}(x|y)P(Y = y) \tag{13}$$

where $f_{X|Y}(x|y)$ is the conditional probability density function of X given $Y = y$.

ii) The mixed joint cumulative distribution function of (X, Y) is given by

$$F_{X,Y}(x, y) = \sum_{z \leq y} \int_{u=-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(u, z) du \quad (14)$$

Lemma A.6. Let X, Y be jointly absolutely continuous random variables supported on the Reals with joint density function $f_{X,Y}(x, y)$ and let $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$, then the mixed joint density of (X, Z) is given by

$$f_{X,Z}(x, z) = \begin{cases} \int_x^\infty f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Proof. Proof follows by transformation of random variables via the joint cdf.

The joint cdf of (X, Y) is defined by,

$$F_{X,Y}(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^y f_{X,Y}(s, t) dt ds \quad (16)$$

By definition of indicator variables, $Z = 1$ iff $Y \geq X$ and 0 otherwise and so on substituting Z for Y ,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{X,Z}(x, z) &= P(X \leq x, Z \leq z) \\ &= \begin{cases} P(X \leq x), & z = 1 \\ P(X \leq x, Z = 0) = P(X \leq x, Y < X), & z = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the first case follows as $Z \in \{0, 1\}$ and hence $P(X \leq x, Z \leq 1) = P(X \leq x)$ as Z is marginalised out. The second case follows as $Z \in \{0, 1\}$ and so $P(Z \leq 0) = P(Z = 0)$, and by definition of indicator variables $Z = 0$ iff $Y < X$. Now focusing on the second case,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X \leq x, Y < X) &= \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty f_{X,Y}(t, y) \mathbb{I}_x(t, y) dt dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{I}_x = \mathbb{I}(a \leq x, b < a)$. The first line follows by definition of joint probabilities and the second by change of notation. Now,

$$F_{X,Z}(x, z) = \begin{cases} F_X(x), & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

For mixed joint distributions, $F_{X,Y}(x, y) = \sum_{t \leq y} \int_{s=-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(s, t) ds$, hence the joint density is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X,Z}(x, z) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial F_{X,Z}(x,1) - F_{X,Z}(x,0)}{\partial x}, & z = 1 \\ \frac{\partial F_{X,Z}(x,0)}{\partial x}, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^\infty f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds - \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 1 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{X,Y}(s,y) dy - \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s,y) dy ds, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_s^{\infty} f_{X,Y}(s,y) dy ds, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \int_x^{\infty} f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is the definition of the joint mixed pdf in terms of the cdf, the second equality follows by substituting eq. (17), the third by taking the partial derivative of the second case over x and by linearity of integration in the first case, the fourth by subtracting the inner integrals, and the fifth by taking the partial derivative of the first case over x . The proof is now complete. \square

Corollary A.7. *Let X, Y be jointly absolutely continuous random variables supported on the Reals with joint density function $f_{X,Y}(x,y)$ and let $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$. As a direct corollary to lemma A.6, if X and Y are independent then the mixed joint density of (X, Z) is given by*

$$f_{X,Z}(x,z) = \begin{cases} f_X(x)S_Y(x), & z = 1 \\ f_X(x)F_Y(x), & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Proof. From lemma A.6, for any jointly absolutely continuous random variables, X, Y supported on the Reals and $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$ it holds that,

$$f_{X,Z}(x,z) = \begin{cases} \int_x^{\infty} f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

If X, Y are independent then $f_{X,Y}(x,y) = f_X(x)f_Y(y)$ by definition of independence. Substituting this result into the above equation,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{X,Z}(x,z) &= \begin{cases} \int_x^{\infty} f_X(x)f_Y(y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_X(x)f_Y(y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} f_X(x) \int_x^{\infty} f_Y(y) dy, & z = 1 \\ f_X(x) \int_{-\infty}^x f_Y(y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} f_X(x)S_Y(x), & z = 1 \\ f_X(x)F_Y(x), & z = 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds as X, Y independent, the second by properties of integration, and the third by definition of the cumulative distribution and survival functions. The proof is now complete. \square

Lemma A.8. *Let X, Y be jointly absolutely continuous random variables supported on the Reals with joint density function $f_{X,Y}(x,y)$ and let $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$, then the mixed joint density of (Y, Z) is given by*

$$f_{Y,Z}(y, z) = \begin{cases} \int_{-\infty}^y f_{X,Y}(x, y) dx, & z = 1 \\ \int_y^{\infty} f_{X,Y}(x, y) dx, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

In addition if $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$, then

$$f_{Y,Z}(y, z) = \begin{cases} f_Y(y)F_X(y), & z = 1 \\ f_Y(y)S_X(y), & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Proof. Proofs follow analogously to lemma A.6 and corollary A.7; further details are not provided. \square

Lemma A.9. Let ϕ be any real-valued function and let Y, C, T be as defined above and assume $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(T)] = \int_0^{\infty} f_Y(y)S_C(y)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \int_0^{\infty} f_C(c)S_Y(c)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc \quad (22)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\phi(T)] \\ &= q\mathbb{E}[\phi(T)|\Delta = 1] + (1 - q)\mathbb{E}[\phi(T)|\Delta = 0] && \text{law of total expectation; } q := P(\Delta = 1) \\ &= q\mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)|\Delta = 1] + (1 - q)\mathbb{E}[\phi(C)|\Delta = 0] && Y \equiv T|\Delta = 1; C \equiv T|\Delta = 0 \\ &= q \int_0^{\infty} f_{Y|\Delta}(y|1)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \\ & (1 - q) \int_0^{\infty} f_{C|\Delta}(c|0)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc && \text{def. conditional expectation} \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} f_{Y,\Delta}(y, 1)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \\ & \int_0^{\infty} f_{C,\Delta}(c, 0)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc && \text{def. conditional probability} \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} f_Y(y)S_C(y)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \\ & \int_0^{\infty} f_C(c)S_Y(c)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc && \text{corollary A.7 and lemma A.8 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \end{aligned}$$

\square

\square

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proposition B.1. L_{SCRPS} and L_{NLL} , are not: a) outcome-independent proper; b) outcome-independent strictly proper; c) proper; d) strictly proper.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let \mathcal{P} be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over \mathcal{T} containing at least two elements. Let ν, ξ be some distributions in \mathcal{P} . Let $Y \sim \xi$ and let $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ be an r.v. t.v.i. \mathcal{T} . Let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$. Finally let $\hat{Y} \sim \nu$ be an r.v. independent of Y, C, T , and Δ .

Improperness follows for any loss L if $D_L(\nu, \xi) < 0$ (lemma A.4), we will prove $\exists \nu, \xi$ for each of these losses in turn but for all will make the following assumption that $C \sim \xi$.

L_{SCRPS} improper. For this counter-example we let $\xi = \text{Exp}(1)$ and $\nu = \text{Exp}(\mu)$. First calculating $S_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \nu)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& S_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \nu) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau + \Delta \int_T^\infty S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau\right] && \text{def. } L_{SCRPS} \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_C(y)\left[\int_0^y F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau + \int_y^\infty S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau\right] dy + \\
&\quad \int_0^\infty f_C(c)S_Y(c)\left[\int_0^c F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau\right] dc && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_Y(y)\left[2\int_0^y F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau + \int_y^\infty S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau\right] dy && \text{let } C \sim \xi \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-2y}\left[2\int_0^y 1 - 2e^{-\mu\tau} + e^{-2\mu\tau} d\tau + \int_y^\infty e^{-2\mu\tau} d\tau\right] dy && \text{let } \xi = \text{Exp}(1), \nu = \text{Exp}(\mu) \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-2y}\left[\frac{-6 - e^{-2y\mu} + 8e^{-y\mu} + 4y\mu}{2\mu}\right] dy && \text{integration} \\
&= \frac{2\mu^3 + \mu + 2}{4(\mu + 2)\mu(\mu + 1)} && \text{integration}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $\mu = 1.5$ so $\nu = \text{Exp}(1.5)$, then

$$D_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \nu) = S_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \nu) - H_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi) = 0.1952 - 0.208333 = -0.0131 < 0 \quad (23)$$

By lemma A.4 as $D_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \nu) < 0$ and as $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ it follows that L_{SCRPS} is not outcome-independent proper. ■

L_{NLL} improper. For this counter-example we let $\xi = \text{Exp}(1)$ and $\nu = \text{Exp}(\mu)$. First calculating $S_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \nu)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& S_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \nu) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[-\log[f_{\hat{Y}}(T)]] && \text{def. } L_{NLL} \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_C(y)[-\log[f_{\hat{Y}}(y)]] dy + \int_0^\infty f_C(c)S_Y(c)[-\log[f_{\hat{Y}}(c)]] dc && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_Y(y)[-2\log[f_{\hat{Y}}(y)]] dy && \text{let } C \sim \xi \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-2y}(-2\log[\mu e^{-\mu y}]) dy && \text{let } \xi = \text{Exp}(1), \nu = \text{Exp}(\mu)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}(\mu - 2\log(\mu)) \quad \text{integration}$$

Now let $\mu = 2$ so $v = \text{Exp}(3)$, then

$$D_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, v) = S_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, v) - H_{L_{NLL}}(\xi) = -1.1479 - 0.5 = -1.6479 < 0 \quad (24)$$

By lemma A.4 as $D_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, v) < 0$ and as $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ it follows that L_{NLL} is not outcome-independent proper. ■

□

B.2 Proof of Proposition 4.2

Proposition B.2. Let $v.S^2(\tau) = (v.S(\tau))^2$, $v.F^2(\tau) = (v.F(\tau))^2$ and let $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$ be an upper cutoff. Then the approximate survival loss, L_{ISBS} [Graf et al., 1999], defined by

$$L_{ISBS}(v, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{v.S^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} + \frac{v.F^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (25)$$

is not outcome-independent proper.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and let \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P} be two distinct families of distributions over \mathcal{T} containing at least two elements. Let \mathcal{P} be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let v, ξ be some distributions in \mathcal{P} . Let $Y \sim \xi$ and let $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ be an r.v. t.v.i. \mathcal{T} . Let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$. Finally let $\hat{Y} \sim v$ be an r.v. independent of Y, C, T , and Δ .

Improperness follows for any loss L if $D_L(v, \xi) < 0$ (lemma A.4). We will prove $\exists v, \xi$ by starting with the following assumptions: 1) $C \sim \xi$, 2) there is a sufficiently large sample size n such that $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C$ [Kaplan and Meier, 1958]. For this counter-example, we let $\xi = \text{Exp}(1)$ and $v = \text{Exp}(b)$.

First calculating $S_{L_{ISBS}}(\xi, v)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{L_{ISBS}}(\xi, v) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(T \leq \tau, \Delta = 1)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)} + \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(T > \tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau \right\} && \text{definition } L_{ISBS} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_T^{\tau^*} \frac{S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)\Delta}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)} d\tau \right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau \right] && \text{change limits} \\ &= \int f_Y(y)S_C(y) \int_y^{\tau^*} \frac{S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} d\tau dy + \int f_Y(y)S_C(y) \int_0^y \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau dy + && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\ & \quad \int f_C(c)S_Y(c) \int_0^c \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau dc \\ &= \int f_Y(y) \int_y^{\tau^*} S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau dy + \int f_Y(y)S_C(y) \int_0^y \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{S_C(\tau)} d\tau dy + && \text{as } \hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C \\ & \quad \int f_C(c)S_Y(c) \int_0^c \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{S_C(\tau)} d\tau dc \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int f_Y(y) \int_y^1 S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau dy + 2 \int f_Y(y) S_Y(y) \int_0^y \frac{F_Y^2(\tau)}{S_Y(\tau)} d\tau dy && \text{let } C \sim \xi, \tau^* = 1 \\
&= \int (2e^{-2y}) \int_y^1 (e^{-2b\tau}) d\tau dy + 4 \int e^{-4y} \int_0^y \frac{1 - 2e^{-b\tau} + e^{-2b\tau}}{(e^{-2\tau})} d\tau dy && \text{let } \xi = \text{Exp}(2), v = \text{Exp}(b) \\
&= \int (e^{-2y}) \frac{e^{-by} - e^{-2b}}{2b} dy + && \\
&\quad 4 \int e^{-4y} \left[\frac{e^{y(2-2b)}}{2-2b} - \frac{2e^{y(2-b)}}{2-b} + \frac{2}{2-b} + \frac{1}{2b-2} + \frac{e^{2y}-1}{2} \right] dy && \text{integration} \\
&= -\frac{e^{-2b}(2+2b-ae^{2b})}{2b(2+2b)} - 4 \left(\frac{e^{-4y} \left(\frac{b^2}{4-6b+2b^2} - e^{2y} \right)}{4} + \frac{2e^{y(-(2+b))}}{4-b^2} - \frac{e^{y(-(2+2b))}}{4-4b^2} \right) && \text{integration} \\
&= -\frac{e^{-2b}(2+2b-2e^{2b})}{2b(2+2b)} - \frac{b^2}{(2+b)(2+2b)}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $b = 3$ so $v = \text{Exp}(3)$, then

$$D_{L_{ISBS}}(\xi, v) = S_{L_{ISBS}}(\xi, v) - H_{L_{ISBS}}(\xi) = -0.1837 - -0.0879 = -0.0958 < 0 \quad (26)$$

By lemma A.4 as $D_{L_{ISBS}}(\xi, v) < 0$ and as $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ it follows that L_{ISBS} is not outcome-independent proper. \square \square

B.3 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Theorem B.3. *Let L_R be a regression scoring rule, then an approximate survival loss L_S defined by*

$$L_S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}; \quad (v, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) \mapsto \frac{\delta L_R(v, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (27)$$

is outcome-independent strictly proper if and only if L_R is strictly proper.

Proof.

Proof L_S strictly proper $\Rightarrow L_R$ strictly proper. Let \mathcal{P} be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over the positive Reals and let v, ξ be distinct distributions in \mathcal{P} . Let Y be some random variable distributed according to ξ and let C be an r.v. t.v.i. \mathcal{T} with $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$. Let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$, $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$, and $q := P(\Delta = 1)$.

Proof follows by definition of strict properness,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[L_S(\xi, T, \Delta | \hat{G}_{KM})] < \mathbb{E}[L_S(v, T, \Delta | \hat{G}_{KM})] \\
&\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] < \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(v, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] && \text{def. of strictly proper} \\
&\Rightarrow \int f_Y(y) S_C(y) \frac{L_R(\xi, y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy < \int f_Y(y) S_C(y) \frac{\Delta L_R(v, y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
&\Rightarrow \int f_Y(y) L_R(\xi, Y) dy < \int f_Y(y) L_R(v, Y) dy && \hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\
&\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[L_R(\xi, Y)] < \mathbb{E}[L_R(v, Y)]
\end{aligned}$$

As $v \neq \xi$ and $Y \sim \xi$ it follows that L_R is strictly proper by definition, as required. \blacksquare \blacksquare

Proof L_R strictly proper $\Rightarrow L_S$ strictly proper. Again let \mathcal{P} be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over the positive Reals and let v, ξ be distinct distributions in \mathcal{P} . Let Y be some random variable distributed according to ξ and let C be an r.v. t.v.i. \mathcal{T} with $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$. Let $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ and $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$.

Proof follows by definition of strict properness,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[L_R(\xi, Y)] < \mathbb{E}[L_R(v, Y)] && \text{def. strictly proper} \\
& \Rightarrow \int f_Y(y) L_R(\xi, Y) dy < \int f_Y(y) L_R(v, Y) dy && \text{def. expectation} \\
& \Rightarrow \int \frac{f_Y(y) S_C(y) L_R(\xi, Y)}{S_C(y)} dy < \int \frac{f_Y(y) S_C(y) L_R(v, Y)}{S_C(y)} dy && \text{multiply } S_C(y) \\
& \Rightarrow \int \frac{f_Y(y) S_C(y) L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy < \int \frac{f_Y(y) S_C(y) L_R(v, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy && \hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\
& \Rightarrow \int \frac{f_{Y|\Delta}(y|1) L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy < \int \frac{f_{Y|\Delta}(y|1) L_R(v, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy && \text{corollary A.7 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
& \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] < \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(v, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] && \text{def. conditional expectation} \\
& \Rightarrow q \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + 0 < q \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(v, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + 0 && \text{multiply } q := P(\Delta = 1) \text{ add } 0 \\
& \Rightarrow q \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + (1 - q) \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, C)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(C)} \mid \Delta = 0\right] && \text{sub. expressions equalling } 0 \\
& \quad < q \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(v, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + (1 - q) \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(v, C)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(C)} \mid \Delta = 0\right] \\
& \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] < \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(v, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] && \text{law of total expectation}
\end{aligned}$$

As $v \neq \xi$ and $Y \sim \xi$ and $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ it follows that $L_S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is outcome-independent strictly proper by definition as required. \blacksquare \blacksquare

□

□

B.4 Proof of Proposition 5.2

Proposition B.4. $L_{RISBS}, L_{RISLL}, L_{RNLL}$ are all outcome-independent strictly proper.

Proof. Proofs follow from theorem 5.1 and noting that:

$$L_{RISBS}(v, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta L_{IBS}(v, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (28)$$

$$L_{RISLL}(v, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta L_{ILL}(v, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (29)$$

$$L_{RNLL}(v, t, \delta|\hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta L_{NLL}(v, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (30)$$

where $L_{IBS} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is the integrated Brier score, $L_{ILL} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is the integrated log-loss, and $L_{NLL} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ is the log-loss; and all three are strictly proper [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007, Gressmann et al., 2018]. □ □