

Partial Linear Cox Model with Deep ReLU Networks for Interval-Censored Failure Time Data

Jie Zhou¹, Yue Zhang² and Zhangsheng Yu^{*2}

¹Department of Statistics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, PR China

²Department of Bioinformatics and Biostatistics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, PR China

Abstract

The partial linear Cox model for interval-censoring is well-studied under the additive assumption but is still under-investigated without this assumption. In this paper, we propose to use a deep ReLU neural network to estimate the nonparametric components of a partial linear Cox model for interval-censored data. This model not only retains the nice interpretability of the parametric component but also improves the predictive power compared to the partial linear additive Cox model. We derive the convergence rate of the proposed estimator and show that it can break the curse of dimensionality under some certain smoothness assumptions. Based on such rate, the asymptotic normality and the semiparametric efficiency are also established. Intensive simulation studies are carried out to demonstrate the finite sample performance on both estimation and prediction. The proposed estimation procedure is illustrated on a real dataset.

Keywords: deep neural network; partial linear Cox model; semiparametric inference; interval-censoring

*yuzhangsheng@sjtu.edu.cn; Corresponding author.

1 Introduction

In survival analysis, reliability studies and epidemiological studies, the accurate failure time is often not available but rather it is observed as an interval due to the regular follow-up. For example, in the Chinese Longitudinal Healthy Longevity Survey (CLHLS, Yi (2008)), a subject's cognitive ability is measured by the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE, Katzman et al. (1988); Gagnon et al. (1990)) at each visit, and the cognitive impairment (CI) is defined by scores lower than a pre-specified threshold. Therefore, CI appeared in the interval formed by two consecutive visits. In statistics, this type of data is called interval-censoring. Another important application of interval-censored data is in the studies of transfusion-related acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), where the positive status of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) can never be known exactly, while the change in status is only known between some monitoring times.

Regression analysis of interval-censored failure time data aims to estimate the covariate effects on it. Semiparametric regression models with linear assumptions on the covariates have been widely developed including the Cox model (Finkelstein (1986), Huang (1996)), proportional odds model (Huang and Rossini (1997)), accelerated failure time model (Rabinowitz et al. (1995); Betensky et al. (2001)), additive hazard model (Zeng et al. (2006); Wang et al. (2010)) and transformation model (Zhang et al. (2005); Wang et al. (2018)).

Although the linear assumption of covariate effects in the aforementioned models provides simplicity and interpretability, this assumption is often violated in applications. For example, Lv et al. (2017) depicted the U-shaped relationship between blood pressure and the risk of CI in the CLHLS dataset. Partial linear models have been developed to model non-linear and linear effects simultaneously, e.g., Ma and Kosorok (2005) first investigated a partial linear transformation model for current status data. Cheng and Wang (2011) ex-

tended the model to additively multivariate cases. Lu and McMahan (2018) and Liu et al. (2021) relaxed the the assumption of a stepwise constant baseline hazard function in these two models.

Nevertheless, none of the existing work has relaxed the additive assumption and allowed multivariate nonparametric function estimation in the partial linear Cox model for interval-censoring due to the curse of dimensionality. Intuitively, the overall convergence rate of these models decreases exponentially with respect to the dimension of the nonparametric component and will not be fast enough to establish the asymptotic normality for the parametric component(Shen (1997)).

Recently, deep neural networks(DNN, referred to as *deep learning* in LeCun et al. (2015)) have emerged as a promising tool to alleviate the curse of dimensionality and have demonstrated superior performance for high-dimensional problems such as image classification(Krizhevsky et al. (2012)), natural language processing(Devlin et al. (2019)), and speech recognition(Hinton et al. (2012)). Theoretical analysis attributes its success to its powerful ability to approximate functions from specific spaces such as the nested function space(Schmidt-Hieber (2017); Bauer and Kohler (2019)) or the mixed smoothness Besov space(Suzuki (2019))). For this reason, it has been extensively used in various types of survival models, such as the Cox model(Katzman et al. (2018); Zhong et al. (2022)), the accelerated failure time model(Chen and Norman (2019)), illness-death model(Cottin et al. (2022)), competing risk model(Lee et al. (2018)), cure rate model(Xie and Yu (2021a,b)), and nonparametric Cox model for interval-censoring(Meixide et al. (2022); Sun and Ding (2022)).

In this paper, we propose the deep partial linear Cox model(DPLC) for interval-censoring where covariates requiring interpretability are kept linear and all the remaining covariates

are modelled nonparametrically by a deep ReLU network. The proposed procedure enjoys some attractive properties. First, the convergence rate is justified to be free of the nonparametric dimension under some smoothness assumptions, suggesting that the model can break curse of dimensionality. Second, the parametric estimator is shown to be asymptotically normal and semiparametric efficient based on such rate. Third, a covariance estimator based on a least square regression rather than the computationally intensive bootstrap is provided to facilitate statistical inference.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notation, models, assumptions and the full likelihood of the observations for the interval-censored data. Section 3 presents the estimation procedure based on the deep ReLU network. The asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators are also discussed. In Section 4, the finite-sample performance as well as the comparisons with other models are evaluated by a simulation study. In Section 5, we apply the proposed model to two real datasets. Section 6 concludes with remarks and discussion. Technical details of all the proofs are given in Supplementary Material.

2 Model and Likelihood

Suppose \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} are \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{R}^r -valued covariates affecting the failure time T . We assume that given \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} , T follows the partial linear Cox model, e.g., its conditional cumulative hazard function has the form

$$\Lambda(t|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = \Lambda_0(t) \exp \{ \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + g(\mathbf{Z}) \}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Lambda_0(t)$ is the unspecified baseline hazard function and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and g correspond to the parametric coefficients and the nonparametric function, respectively.

For interval-censored data, T is known to lie within a random interval (U, V) , where U and V are the two examination times that satisfy $U < T \leq V$ with probability 1. We assume that T is independent of (U, V) given (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) and the joint distribution of (U, V) given (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) is free of parameters $\theta = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$. Let $\Delta_1 := 1_{\{T \leq U\}}$, $\Delta_2 := 1_{\{U < T \leq V\}}$, $\Delta_3 := 1_{\{T > V\}}$, the observed information for a single object in the interval-censoring denoted by $O := (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, U, V, \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3)$ is distributed as

$$p(O) = (1 - S(U|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}))^{\Delta_1} \{S(U|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) - S(V|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})\}^{\Delta_2} S(V|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})^{\Delta_3} p_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}}(U, V) h(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}),$$

where $S(\cdot|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) = \exp(-\Lambda(\cdot|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}))$ is the conditional survival function and $p_{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $h(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})$ are the density functions of (U, V) and (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) , respectively. Under the assumption that the distribution of (U, V) is non-informative for T , then the log likelihood function of $\{(\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_i, U_i, V_i, \Delta_{1i}, \Delta_{2i}, \Delta_{3i}) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is $l_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda, g; \cdot) := \sum_{i=1}^n l(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda, g; O_i)$ where

$$l(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda, g; O) = \Delta_1 \log(1 - S(U|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) + \Delta_2 \log(S(U|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}) - S(V|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) + \Delta_3 \log(S(V|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})).$$

3 Estimation and asymptotic properties

In this section, we consider the estimation of unknown parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda_0, g)$. A natural approach is to consider the sieve method(Chen (2007)), e.g., maximizing $l_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda_0, g)$ over the product space of \mathbb{R}^d , sieve function spaces of Λ_0 and g that grow in capacity with respect to n . We choose these two spaces as a monotone B-Spline space and a deep ReLU network space.

The monotone B-Spline space \mathcal{M} is a non-negative linear span of the integrated spline basis functions M_k (Ramsay (1988)), i.e. $\mathcal{M} = \{\gamma_k M_k : \gamma_k \geq 0\}$. Since each M_k is non-decreasing function ranging from 0 to 1, constraining the coefficients to be non-negative

guarantees the non-negativity and monotonicity of the estimator of the baseline cumulative hazard function Λ_0 . As with B-splines, the $q_n = p_n + l$ basis functions are fully determined once the degree and the interior knot set are specified, where p_n is the cardinality of the interior knot set.

A deep ReLU network space with input dimension p_0 , depth K , hidden unit vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_0, \dots, p_K, p_{K+1})$, sparsity constraint s and norm constraint D is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}(K, \mathbf{p}, s, D) = \left\{ \begin{aligned} g(z) &= (W^{(K)}\sigma(\cdot) + b^{(K)}) \circ \dots \circ (W^{(1)}z + b^{(1)}) : \mathbb{R}^{p_0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{p_{K+1}}, \\ \|g\|_\infty &\leq D, W^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{\ell+1} \times p_\ell}, b^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{\ell+1}}, \ell = 0, \dots, K, \\ \sum_{\ell=0}^K (\|W^{(\ell)}\|_0 + \|b^{(\ell)}\|_0) &\leq s, \max_{\ell=0, \dots, K} \|W^{(\ell)}\|_\infty \vee \|b^{(\ell)}\|_\infty \leq 1 \end{aligned} \right\},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_0$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ are the ℓ_0 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm of a matrix, respectively and $W^{(\ell)}$ and $b^{(\ell)}$ are the weights and biases of the network, respectively.

The estimation of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda, g)$ is set to be the maximizer of l_n over $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{G}(K, \mathbf{p}, s, \infty)$ with $p_0 = r$ and $p_{K+1} = 1$ after empirical centralization, that is

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n, \hat{\Lambda}_n, \hat{g}_n) = \arg \max_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{G}(K, \mathbf{p}, s, \infty)} l_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Lambda, g; \cdot)$$

Such optimization poses several challenges. First, stochastic gradient descent (SGD, Robbins and Monro (1951)), the most widely used algorithm in deep learning and its variants such as Adam (Kingma and Ba (2014)) can not operate with the non-negativity constraint which is required on the coefficients of \mathcal{M} . We remove the non-negativity constraint by reparametrization, that is, $\mathcal{M} = \{\exp(\tilde{\gamma}_k)M_k : \tilde{\gamma}_k \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The second challenge is regarding the specification of the hyperparameters of the network, mainly the depth K and the knots \mathbf{p} . Unfortunately, there are no suitable model selection criteria

for deep neural networks, such as Akaike information criterion(AIC) or Bayesian information criterion(BIC)(Claeskens and Hjort (2001)) for linear sieve models. Meanwhile, cross-validation(CV), another popular method in model selection, is not applicable either due to the computational complexity of deep neural networks. Therefore, we select these hyperparameters in a lightweight and data-adaptive manner. A part of the dataset is randomly hold out as a validation set to select the hyperparameters among the candidates over K and \mathbf{p} , and then the selected hyperparameters are used to rerun the estimation on the whole dataset. The third challenge is to deal with the non-concavity with respect to the weights and biases of the network. We solve this problem to some extent by repeating this optimization for many times, each time with different initial values. Although the global maximizer is not reachable, this increases the probability of finding a better estimator. This claim is verified by numeric experiments later in Section 4.

We now describe the asymptotic properties of the estimator $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n, \hat{\Lambda}_n, \hat{g}_n)$. Denote $\delta_n = \max_{i=0, \dots, K} n^{-\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i / (2\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i)} \vee n^{-\alpha_\Lambda / (2\alpha_\Lambda + 1)}$ where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ and α_Λ is defined in the follow conditions.

Condition (C1). $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ belongs to a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d

Condition (C2). (1) $\mathbb{E}((\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})^{\otimes 2})$ is positive definite. (2) both \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} are bounded with probability 1.

Condition (C3). The support of U denoted as $[U_m, U_M]$ and that of V denoted as $[V_m, V_M]$ satisfy that $0 = U_m < U_M = V_m < V_M$. The densities of U and V are both bounded away from zero and infinity on their support.

Condition (C4). There exists some $\eta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathbf{u}^T \text{Var}(\mathbf{X}|U)\mathbf{u} \geq \eta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T|U)\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{u}^T \text{Var}(\mathbf{X}|V)\mathbf{u} \geq \eta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T|V)\mathbf{u}$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbf{u}^T \text{Var}(\mathbf{Z}|U)\mathbf{u} \geq \eta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T|U)\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{u}^T \text{Var}(\mathbf{Z}|V)\mathbf{u} \geq \eta \mathbf{u}^T \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T|V)\mathbf{u}$ for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$.

Condition (C5). $\Lambda_0 \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\alpha_\Lambda}([L, R], M)$, the Hölder space defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_r^\alpha(\mathcal{D}, M) = \left\{ g : \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathbb{R} : \sum_{\kappa:|\kappa|<\alpha} \|\partial^\kappa g\|_\infty + \sum_{\kappa:|\kappa|=\alpha} \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{D}, x \neq y} \frac{|\partial^\kappa g(x) - \partial^\kappa g(y)|}{\|x - y\|_\infty^{\alpha-\alpha}} \leq M \right\},$$

and is monotonically increasing from 0 with $\alpha_\Lambda \geq 2$.

Condition (C6). $g \in \mathcal{H}(q, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{d}, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}, M)$, the composite smoothness function space (Schmidt-Hieber (2017)) defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(q, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{d}, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}, M) &:= \{g = g_q \circ \cdots \circ g_0 : g_i = (g_{i1}, \cdots, g_{id_{i+1}}), \\ &g_i : \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d_{i+1}}, g_{ij} \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{d}_i}^{\alpha_i}([a_i, b_i]^{\tilde{d}_i}, M)\} \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbb{E}g(\mathbf{Z}) = 0$.

Condition (C7). The hyper-parameters of the deep ReLU network satisfies that $K = O(\log n)$, $s = O(n\delta_n^2 \log n)$, $n\delta_n^2 \lesssim \min_{k=1, \dots, K} \mathbf{p}_k \leq \max_{k=1, \dots, K} \mathbf{p}_k \lesssim n$ and $p_n = O(n^{1/(2\alpha_\Lambda+1)})$.

Conditions (C1)-(C4) are similar to those in Zhang et al. (2010). Condition (C5) and Condition (C6) restrict the function space of Λ and g , respectively. Condition (C7) describes the growing of hyperparameters of DNN with respect to n .

We have the following theorems as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1 (Convergence rate). Under Conditions (C1)-(C7), the estimator $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n, \hat{\Lambda}_n, \hat{g}_n)$ is consistent for $(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \Lambda_0, g_0)$ and the convergence rate is $\delta_n \log^2 n$, e.g.,

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2 + \|\hat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0\|_{L_2(U,V)} + \|\hat{g}_n - g_0\|_{L_2(\mathbf{Z})} = O_P(\delta_n \log^2 n).$$

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Normality and Efficiency). Suppose Conditions (C1)-(C7) hold, I_β is nonsingular and $n\delta_n^4 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \rightsquigarrow N(0, I_\beta^{-1}),$$

where I_β is the semiparametric information bound for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

It is interesting to notice that the polynomial term $\max_{i=0,\dots,K} n^{-\alpha_i/(2\alpha_i+\tilde{d}_i)} \sqrt{n^{-\alpha_\Lambda/(2\alpha_\Lambda+1)}}$ is free of the nonparametric dimension r which means curse of dimensionality is much eased in this model. Furthermore, the estimator of β attains the asymptotic normality and the semiparametric efficiency bound even though the overall convergence rate is slower than $n^{-1/2}$.

To perform statistical inference on β_0 with finite sample size according to Theorem 2, one has to estimate the information matrix I_β . Consider a parametric smooth submodel with parameter $(\beta, \Lambda_{(s)}, g_{(s)})$, where $\Lambda_{(0)} = \Lambda$, $g_{(0)} = g$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\Lambda_{(s)} = h_1$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}g_{(s)} = h_2$, the score operators are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{l}_\beta(\beta, \Lambda, g; o) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} l(\beta, \Lambda_0, g; o), \\ \dot{l}_1(\beta, \Lambda, g; o)[h_1] &= \frac{\partial}{\partial s} l(\beta, \Lambda_{(s)}, g; o) \Big|_{s=0}, \\ \dot{l}_2(\beta, \Lambda, g; o)[h_2] &= \frac{\partial}{\partial s} l(\beta, \Lambda_0, g_{(s)}; o) \Big|_{s=0}. \end{aligned}$$

The *least favourable direction* $(\mathbf{h}_1^*, \mathbf{h}_2^*)$ is obtained by projection \dot{l}_β into the product space of \dot{l}_1 and \dot{l}_2 , or equivalently, minimize

$$\rho(\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2) = \mathbb{E} \|\dot{l}_\beta(\beta, \Lambda, g; O) - \dot{l}_1(\beta, \Lambda, g; O)[\mathbf{h}_1] - \dot{l}_2(\beta, \Lambda, g; O)[\mathbf{h}_2]\|^2. \quad (2)$$

Then I_β can be calculated by

$$I_\beta = \mathbb{E}[\dot{l}_\beta^*(\beta, \Lambda, g; O)^{\otimes 2}] = \mathbb{E}[(\dot{l}_\beta(\beta, \Lambda, g; O) - \dot{l}_1(\beta, \Lambda, g; O)[\mathbf{h}_1^*] - \dot{l}_2(\beta, \Lambda, g; O)[\mathbf{h}_2^*])^{\otimes 2}], \quad (3)$$

where $\dot{l}_\beta^*(\beta, \Lambda, g; O)$ is the efficient score function. Because there are no closed form expressions for $(\mathbf{h}_1^*, \mathbf{h}_2^*)$, following Huang et al. (2008), we obtain $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_1^*$ and $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_2^*$, the estimation of \mathbf{h}_1^* and \mathbf{h}_2^* , by minimizing the empirical version of projection (2) over the product space of another two deep ReLU network spaces with properly chosen hyperparameters. The estimator of I_β is then defined by plugging $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_1^*$ and $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_2^*$ into the empirical version of (3).

4 Simulation

In this section, we demonstrate the numerical performance of DPLC and compare it in terms of both estimation and prediction with linear Cox regression and partial linear additive Cox regression for interval-censoring. These two models are implemented using the R packages *icenReg* and are abbreviated as CPH and PLAC, respectively. DPLC is implemented with the Python package *pycox* based on PyTorch(Paszke et al. (2019)).

We first generate covariates \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Z} as follows

$$\mathbf{X} \sim \text{Binomal}(1, 1/2)$$

$$\mathbf{Z} \sim \text{Clayton}(8, 0.5, [-2, 2])$$

T is generated with $\Lambda_0(t) = \mu t^\kappa, \kappa \in (0.5, 1, 2)$ and $\beta_0 = 1.2$. After T is generated, (U, V) is obtained by dividing $[0, 5]$ into 10 equal-distance intervals with visit probability $p \in (0.4, 0.7)$. g is chosen from the following candidates:

Case 1 (linear): $g(\mathbf{Z}) = 2.4 \sum_{k=1}^{10} (\mathbf{Z}_k - \frac{1}{2});$

Case 2 (additive): $g(\mathbf{Z}) = 1.2 \sum_{k=1}^{10} \cos(\frac{2\pi}{k} \mathbf{Z}_k);$

Case 3 (deep-1): $g(\mathbf{Z}) = 4.0 |\sum_{k=1}^{10} (\mathbf{Z}_k - \frac{1}{2})|;$

Case 4 (deep-2): $g(\mathbf{Z}) = 4.5 (\max_{k=1,2,3} \mathbf{Z}_k - \min_{i=1,2,3} \mathbf{Z}_k);$

Case 1 and Case 2 correspond to CPH and PLAC, respectively while Case 3 and Case 4 are designed for DPLC. The factors 2.4, 1.2, 4.0 and 4.5 in each case were used to scale $\text{Var}(\phi(\mathbf{Z}))/\text{Var}(\mathbf{X}^T\beta)$ within the range 4 – 6, i.e. to control the ratio of signals from the nonparametric and parametric components. Each dataset is randomly splitted with a 80:20 ratio as a training and validation set to select the best hyperparameters from

all combinations of $K \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $\mathbf{p}_k \in \{\lceil u/4r \rceil : u = 1, \dots, 8\}$. We repeat this 5 times with different initial values for the optimization in (3), with the chosen parameters corresponding to the maximal full likelihood in the validation set.

The bias for the parametric estimator $\hat{\beta}_n$ and its empirical standard error from 500 replications with $n \in \{500, 1000\}$ are summarized in Table 1. As expected, the bias of DPLC is comparable to, if not slightly worse than CPH and PLAC in Case 1 and Case 2, respectively, since these two cases are specifically designed for them. However, in Case 3 and Case 4, CPH and PLAC are more seriously biased than DPLC and do not improve with increasing n , whereas DPLC does. For example, in Case 3 with $n = 500, p = 0.5$ and $\kappa = 1$, the bias of β_1 for CPH and PLAC are -0.782 and -0.412 , respectively, while the bias for DPLC is -0.052 , a much smaller one and it decreases to -0.037 when n increases to 1000, but the bias for CPH and PLAC increases to -0.812 and -0.438 , respectively. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that the highly complicated nonparametric function g in Case 3 and Case 4 can be easily fitted by a deep ReLU network, whereas it can not be approximated well by any linear or additive function, and this inapproximability is further confirmed with increasing n . As might be expected, empirical standard error decreases with increasing n for all models and all censoring rates. Table 2 presents the coverage proportion of the 95% confidence intervals, suggesting that the empirical coverage probabilities for DPLC were generally around 95% and close to the nominal level in four cases while those for Cox and PLAC are far away from 95% in Case 3 and Case 4 due to the significant bias.

The performance in estimating of g measured on a test data formed of 4000 independent

samples with the relative mean of squared error(RMSE) defined as

$$RMSE(\hat{g}_n) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{Z}_i) - g_0(\mathbf{Z}_i))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (g_0(\mathbf{Z}_i) - \bar{g}_0)^2},$$

is reported in Table 3. The smaller the metric is, the more accurate an estimator is. Similar to the results for the parametric estimator, DPLC significantly outperforms both Cox and PLAC by a lot in Case 3 and Case 4. To name a few, 0.448 for DPLC versus 0.971 and 0.936 for CPH and PLAC in Case 4 with $n = 500, p = 0.4$ and $\kappa = 0.5$. In Case 1 and Case 2, DPLC performs only slightly worse than CPH and PLAC. We evaluate and compare the predictive power of CPH, PLAC and DPLC with the Intergrated Mean Square Error(IMSE) in Table 4 defined by

$$IMSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\int_0^{U_i} (1 - \hat{S}_n(t|\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_i))^2 dt + \int_{V_i}^{\tau} \hat{S}_n^2(t|\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_i) dt \right).$$

It is can be seen from this table that the IMSE of DPLC is much smaller than that of CPH and PLAC in Case 3 and Case 4. For example, it is 0.118 for DPLC while is 0.173 and 0.169 for CPH and PLAC, respectively. In Case 1 and Case 2, CPH and PLAC outperform DPLC by only about 0.005 IMSE. Further analysis of the simulation study can be found in Supplementary Material.

5 Application

The Chinese Longitudinal Healthy Longevity Survey(CLHLS) is a follow-up survey of the elderly in China organized by Peking University Healthy Aging and Development Research Center and the National Development Research Institute. This longitudinal study covered 23 provinces across the country with the elderly aged 65 and above and is the earliest and longest social science survey in China(1998-2018).

Table 1: Bias and empirical standard error(in parentheses) of parametric estimator for the linear Cox model(CPH), partial linear additive Cox model(PLAC) and deep partial linear Cox model(DPLC)

setting	ρ	p	n	$\kappa = 0.5$			$\kappa = 1$			$\kappa = 2$			
				CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC	
linear	0.5	0.4	500	0.064 (0.320)	0.168 (0.394)	-0.035 (0.368)	0.048 (0.320)	0.127 (0.372)	-0.097 (0.294)	0.084 (0.356)	0.161 (0.401)	-0.05 (0.358)	
			1000	0.026 (0.273)	0.064 (0.294)	0.021 (0.283)	0.093 (0.233)	0.128 (0.244)	-0.004 (0.231)	0.072 (0.223)	0.099 (0.228)	0.002 (0.222)	
	0.7	500	0.128 (0.393)	0.229 (0.458)	-0.074 (0.378)	0.063 (0.332)	0.121 (0.366)	-0.093 (0.301)	0.11 (0.261)	0.168 (0.289)	0.024 (0.265)		
		1000	0.024 (0.236)	0.055 (0.254)	-0.079 (0.271)	0.043 (0.216)	0.073 (0.225)	-0.026 (0.213)	0.052 (0.204)	0.076 (0.208)	-0.009 (0.198)		
	additive	0.5	0.4	500	-0.443 (0.289)	0.186 (0.369)	-0.22 (0.328)	-0.422 (0.287)	0.114 (0.316)	-0.258 (0.300)	-0.519 (0.223)	0.074 (0.314)	-0.238 (0.281)
				1000	-0.524 (0.185)	0.037 (0.239)	-0.206 (0.222)	-0.508 (0.215)	0.029 (0.246)	-0.193 (0.223)	-0.481 (0.186)	0.105 (0.242)	-0.145 (0.224)
0.7		500	-0.445 (0.326)	0.104 (0.407)	-0.216 (0.333)	-0.454 (0.270)	0.151 (0.315)	-0.174 (0.270)	-0.512 (0.198)	0.087 (0.264)	-0.208 (0.243)		
		1000	-0.445 (0.194)	0.073 (0.256)	-0.147 (0.232)	-0.497 (0.197)	0.011 (0.230)	-0.178 (0.211)	-0.503 (0.155)	0.051 (0.203)	-0.167 (0.185)		
deep-1		0.5	0.4	500	-0.799 (0.309)	-0.348 (0.447)	-0.064 (0.414)	-0.782 (0.252)	-0.412 (0.384)	-0.052 (0.391)	-0.751 (0.272)	-0.362 (0.366)	-0.1 (0.371)
				1000	-0.771 (0.210)	-0.414 (0.314)	-0.025 (0.304)	-0.812 (0.211)	-0.438 (0.277)	-0.037 (0.261)	-0.803 (0.192)	-0.446 (0.261)	-0.041 (0.241)
	0.7	500	-0.754 (0.300)	-0.398 (0.380)	-0.07 (0.420)	-0.775 (0.280)	-0.44 (0.403)	-0.128 (0.357)	-0.739 (0.294)	-0.361 (0.344)	0.028 (0.342)		
		1000	-0.795 (0.215)	-0.437 (0.286)	0.018 (0.253)	-0.779 (0.192)	-0.39 (0.231)	0.006 (0.253)	-0.765 (0.188)	-0.423 (0.230)	0.004 (0.195)		
	deep-2	0.5	0.4	500	-0.365 (0.320)	-0.287 (0.344)	-0.091 (0.393)	-0.374 (0.292)	-0.325 (0.313)	-0.13 (0.343)	-0.374 (0.268)	-0.3 (0.308)	-0.004 (0.333)
				1000	-0.408 (0.189)	-0.392 (0.200)	-0.061 (0.224)	-0.432 (0.180)	-0.388 (0.191)	-0.054 (0.203)	-0.422 (0.179)	-0.387 (0.190)	-0.024 (0.197)
0.7		500	-0.353 (0.288)	-0.299 (0.286)	-0.042 (0.331)	-0.43 (0.264)	-0.372 (0.310)	-0.092 (0.288)	-0.409 (0.242)	-0.381 (0.231)	-0.086 (0.273)		
		1000	-0.367 (0.195)	-0.326 (0.221)	-0.04 (0.211)	-0.41 (0.170)	-0.377 (0.183)	-0.06 (0.193)	-0.395 (0.186)	-0.364 (0.184)	-0.034 (0.184)		

Table 2: 95% coverage probability of β for CPH, PLAC and DPLC

setting	ρ	p	n	$\kappa = 0.5$			$\kappa = 1$			$\kappa = 2$		
				CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC
linear	0.5	0.4	500	0.980	0.990	0.940	1.000	0.980	0.980	0.940	0.960	0.920
			1000	0.970	0.970	0.910	0.929	0.960	0.949	0.940	0.950	0.970
	0.7	500	0.920	0.920	0.920	0.970	0.960	0.960	0.980	0.980	0.980	
		1000	0.980	0.980	0.889	0.980	0.970	0.960	0.970	0.960	0.960	
additive	0.5	0.4	500	0.750	0.983	0.933	0.667	0.983	0.883	0.567	1.000	0.833
			1000	0.317	0.950	0.850	0.333	0.950	0.817	0.217	0.867	0.867
	0.7	500	0.600	0.983	0.867	0.617	0.983	0.900	0.500	0.950	0.900	
		1000	0.367	0.950	0.833	0.267	0.967	0.817	0.150	0.950	0.833	
deep-1	0.5	0.4	500	0.280	0.880	0.980	0.200	0.870	0.950	0.230	0.900	0.950
			1000	0.051	0.646	0.919	0.040	0.670	0.950	0.020	0.566	0.949
	0.7	500	0.310	0.910	0.920	0.240	0.820	0.950	0.280	0.870	0.940	
		1000	0.051	0.636	0.929	0.030	0.690	0.950	0.000	0.500	0.970	
deep-2	0.5	0.4	500	0.683	0.867	0.883	0.767	0.800	0.883	0.733	0.817	0.917
			1000	0.533	0.617	0.900	0.383	0.517	0.917	0.383	0.567	0.950
	0.7	500	0.817	0.933	0.950	0.650	0.783	0.933	0.617	0.767	0.950	
		1000	0.533	0.650	0.967	0.317	0.450	0.950	0.350	0.433	0.983	

Table 3: Mean of the squared prediction errors evaluated on the test set for the CPH, PLAC and DPLC methods.

setting	ρ	p	n	$\kappa = 0.5$			$\kappa = 1$			$\kappa = 2$		
				CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC
linear	0.5	0.4	500	0.021	0.150	0.087	0.019	0.111	0.067	0.023	0.098	0.065
				(0.018)	(0.140)	(0.084)	(0.017)	(0.072)	(0.058)	(0.023)	(0.064)	(0.055)
			1000	0.008	0.052	0.037	0.010	0.045	0.039	0.008	0.034	0.027
				(0.006)	(0.045)	(0.032)	(0.008)	(0.028)	(0.037)	(0.006)	(0.022)	(0.019)
		0.7	500	0.022	0.127	0.124	0.017	0.095	0.071	0.015	0.062	0.047
				(0.021)	(0.109)	(0.504)	(0.014)	(0.066)	(0.056)	(0.011)	(0.035)	(0.031)
			1000	0.008	0.044	0.041	0.008	0.033	0.033	0.007	0.022	0.022
			(0.005)	(0.024)	(0.041)	(0.006)	(0.021)	(0.027)	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.014)	
additive	0.5	0.4	500	0.922	0.114	0.374	0.927	0.088	0.340	0.918	0.084	0.312
				(0.028)	(0.062)	(0.091)	(0.022)	(0.040)	(0.076)	(0.022)	(0.044)	(0.062)
			1000	0.915	0.041	0.280	0.919	0.032	0.244	0.915	0.031	0.235
				(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.042)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.050)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.043)
		0.7	500	0.921	0.095	0.368	0.925	0.072	0.311	0.922	0.055	0.287
				(0.024)	(0.057)	(0.110)	(0.016)	(0.029)	(0.049)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.052)
			1000	0.914	0.038	0.251	0.925	0.029	0.222	0.914	0.024	0.214
			(0.015)	(0.021)	(0.048)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.047)	(0.014)	(0.009)	(0.031)	
deep-1	0.5	0.4	500	0.984	0.335	0.124	0.983	0.312	0.090	0.985	0.310	0.076
				(0.012)	(0.081)	(0.110)	(0.013)	(0.026)	(0.052)	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.060)
			1000	0.979	0.290	0.060	0.981	0.298	0.056	0.979	0.301	0.033
				(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.039)	(0.009)	(0.017)	(0.042)	(0.007)	(0.018)	(0.040)
		0.7	500	0.987	0.325	0.103	0.977	0.293	0.085	0.983	0.291	0.062
				(0.014)	(0.028)	(0.063)	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.065)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.119)
			1000	0.983	0.303	0.071	0.976	0.287	0.052	0.980	0.295	0.025
			(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.123)	(0.010)	(0.017)	(0.054)	(0.007)	(0.020)	(0.017)	
deep-2	0.5	0.4	500	0.971	0.936	0.448	0.977	0.939	0.397	0.980	0.947	0.316
				(0.023)	(0.039)	(0.243)	(0.023)	(0.036)	(0.155)	(0.014)	(0.033)	(0.132)
			1000	0.953	0.874	0.188	0.960	0.883	0.163	0.967	0.900	0.142
				(0.012)	(0.018)	(0.059)	(0.011)	(0.019)	(0.046)	(0.010)	(0.016)	(0.043)
		0.7	500	0.974	0.932	0.361	0.989	0.951	0.323	0.981	0.924	0.248
				(0.020)	(0.031)	(0.122)	(0.023)	(0.035)	(0.130)	(0.023)	(0.034)	(0.100)
			1000	0.960	0.886	0.173	0.972	0.898	0.154	0.966	0.877	0.120
			(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.058)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.054)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.046)	

Table 4: IMSE evaluated on the test set for the CPH, PLAC and DPLC methods.

setting	ρ	p	n	$\kappa = 0.5$			$\kappa = 1$			$\kappa = 2$		
				CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC	CPH	PLAC	DPLC
linear	0.5	0.4	500	0.088	0.093	0.093	0.072	0.076	0.078	0.053	0.056	0.057
				(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)
			1000	0.086	0.088	0.088	0.070	0.072	0.073	0.052	0.053	0.054
				(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
		0.7	500	0.093	0.098	0.098	0.083	0.087	0.088	0.062	0.065	0.066
				(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.003)
			1000	0.091	0.093	0.094	0.081	0.083	0.084	0.062	0.063	0.063
			(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	
additive	0.5	0.4	500	0.209	0.131	0.159	0.186	0.109	0.138	0.141	0.079	0.103
				(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.006)
			1000	0.206	0.125	0.150	0.184	0.105	0.129	0.139	0.076	0.096
				(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)
		0.7	500	0.220	0.134	0.166	0.202	0.116	0.146	0.163	0.088	0.115
				(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.004)
			1000	0.217	0.128	0.154	0.199	0.112	0.137	0.161	0.086	0.107
			(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.003)	
deep-1	0.5	0.4	500	0.231	0.129	0.082	0.214	0.117	0.070	0.184	0.100	0.057
				(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)
			1000	0.228	0.123	0.076	0.212	0.114	0.066	0.181	0.096	0.052
				(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
		0.7	500	0.239	0.139	0.087	0.227	0.122	0.075	0.203	0.109	0.061
				(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
			1000	0.236	0.133	0.082	0.225	0.118	0.070	0.200	0.107	0.058
			(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	
deep-2	0.5	0.4	500	0.208	0.209	0.166	0.175	0.176	0.135	0.129	0.129	0.095
				(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.014)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.012)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.007)
			1000	0.204	0.201	0.147	0.173	0.169	0.118	0.127	0.124	0.086
				(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
		0.7	500	0.218	0.217	0.169	0.195	0.196	0.148	0.150	0.148	0.106
				(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.010)	16(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.011)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.006)
			1000	0.216	0.211	0.154	0.192	0.190	0.135	0.148	0.143	0.098
			(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	

Its main objective is to identify the prevalent factors affecting the health and quality of life of the China’s elderly. The questionnaire for the respondents includes the basic conditions of the elderly and their families, socio-economic background, self-assessment of health and quality of life, cognitive function, personality and psychological characteristics, daily activities, lifestyle, diseases and treatment, etc.

In this section, our primary purpose is to assess the effectiveness of our method in adjusting for non-linear covariate effects associated with cognitive impairment while still maintaining good interpretability of some covariates. We use the 2008 wave of the CLHLS, which includes 5813 subjects. To determine the interval that brackets the time to cognitive impairment, the cognitive status is measured at each visit using the Chinese version of MMSE, which includes 24 cognitive questions with scores ranging from 0-30. The right endpoint of this interval is considered to be the last visit time after which all MMSE scores are below 18, and the left endpoint is the previous visit time. The average length of the interval is 5.328 years if not right-censored. Following Lv et al. (2019), we include continuous covariates age, years of education, body mass index(BMI), systolic blood pressures (SBP) and diastolic blood pressures (DBP) as \mathbf{Z} , and the binary covariates sex, exercise, diabetes and stroke or cardiovascular disease as \mathbf{X} . These covariates are summarized in Table 3 in Supplementary Material. We randomly divided the sample into a training set (80%of the total) and a test set (the remaining 20%). As in the simulation study, the DNN architecture is chosen from some pre-specified candidates.

Similar to the simulation study, we compare the predictive power between the DPLC, CPH and PLAC in terms of the IMSE. After fitting the model, the IMSE for DPLC is 0.098 while for CPH and PLAC, it is 0.131 and 0.119, respectively. This shows that the performance of our approach is empirically superior to PLAC which is also superior to CPH. This can be intuitively explained by the fact that those covariate effects are highly nonlinear and the more complex the sieve, the better the fit. The estimated coefficients

Table 5: estimation of β with exercise, diabetes and stroke or cardiovascular diseases

	EST	HR	SE	Z-value	p-value
Gender(Femal=1)	0.148	1.159	0.019	7.789	0.000
Exercise	-0.283	0.753	0.023	-12.304	0.000
Diabetes	-0.025	0.975	0.020	-1.25	0.182
Stroke or cardiovascular diseases	0.029	1.029	0.023	1.26	0.171

of the linearly modelled covariates are shown in Table 5. From this table, it can be seen that being male rather than female and more exercise are significantly associated with a lower risk of cognitive impairment while diabetes and stroke or cardiovascular disease are not significant. These conclusions are consistent with those of Lv et al. (2019).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a partial linear Cox model with a deep neural network estimated nonparametric component for interval-censored failure time data. This model increases predictive power compared to the partial linear additive Cox model(Lu and McMahan (2018)), while retaining interpretation for the covariates of primary interest. The estimators are showed to converge at a rate independent of the nonparametric covariate dimensionality and the parametric estimator is rigorously proved to be asymptotically normal and semiparametric efficient. As shown in simulation studies, the proposed model significantly outperforms the linear Cox model and the partial linear additive Cox model with respect to both estimation and prediction when the nonparametric function is enormously complex.

This model is suitable for moderate sample sizes, but otherwise may encounter some problems due to the high non-convexity and complexity of DNN. With a small sample size, the optimization becomes unstable and one has to re-initialize for more often, while

with a large sample, a large capacity DNN is preferred and the optimization becomes quite time-consuming.

This work can be extended in several ways. For example, other types of semiparametric survival models such as the partial linear transformation model(Ma and Kosorok (2005)) can be developed using the same procedure. Another interesting future work is to use deep convolutional neural networks(CNN, LeCun et al. (1989)), a popular variant of DNN, to estimate the function g when the nonparametric covariate is a high-dimensional image(Zhu et al. (2016)) or other types of unstructured data.

References

- Bauer, B. and M. Kohler (2019). On deep learning as a remedy for the curse of dimensionality in nonparametric regression. *Annals of Statistics* 47(4), 2261–2285.
- Betensky, R. A., D. Rabinowitz, and A. A. Tsiatis (2001, 10). Computationally simple accelerated failure time regression for interval censored data. *Biometrika* 88(3), 703–711.
- Chen, B. E. and P. Norman (2019). Deep learning for aft model in survival. <https://github.com/statapps/deepAFT/>.
- Chen, X. (2007). Chapter 76 Large Sample Sieve Estimation of Semi-Nonparametric Models. *Handbook of Econometrics* 6(SUPPL. PART B), 5549–5632.
- Cheng, G. and X. Wang (2011). Semiparametric additive transformation model under current status data. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 5, 1735–1764.
- Claeskens, G. and N. L. Hjort (2001, January). *Model Selection and Model Averaging*. Cambridge University Press.

- Cottin, A., N. Pecuchet, M. Zulian, A. Guilloux, and S. Katsahian (2022). IDNetwork: A deep illness-death network based on multi-state event history process for disease prognostication. *Statistics in Medicine* 41(9), 1573–1598.
- Devlin, J., M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova (2019). Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL*.
- Finkelstein, D. M. (1986, December). A proportional hazards model for interval-censored failure time data. *Biometrics* 42(4), 845.
- Gagnon, M., L. Letenneur, J. Dartigues, D. Commenges, J. Orgogozo, P. Barberger-Gateau, A. Alpérovitch, A. Décamps, and R. Salamon (1990). Validity of the Mini-Mental State Examination as a Screening Instrument for Cognitive Impairment and Dementia in French Elderly Community Residents. *Neuroepidemiology* 9(3), 143–150.
- Hinton, G., L. Deng, D. Yu, G. E. Dahl, A.-r. Mohamed, N. Jaitly, A. Senior, V. Vanhoucke, P. Nguyen, T. N. Sainath, and B. Kingsbury (2012). Deep neural networks for acoustic modeling in speech recognition: The shared views of four research groups. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 29(6), 82–97.
- Huang, J. (1996). Efficient estimation for the proportional hazards model with interval censoring. *Annals of Statistics* 24(2), 540–568.
- Huang, J. and A. J. Rossini (1997). Sieve estimation for the proportional-odds failure-time regression model with interval censoring. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92(439), 960–967.
- Huang, J., Y. Zhang, and L. Hua (2008). A least-squares approach to consistent information estimation in semiparametric models. pp. 1–41.

- Katzman, J. L., U. Shaham, A. Cloninger, J. Bates, T. Jiang, and Y. Kluger (2018). Deep-Surv: personalized treatment recommender system using a Cox proportional hazards deep neural network. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 18, 24.
- Katzman, R., M. Zhang, Ouang-Ya-Qu, Z. Wang, W. T. Liu, E. Yu, S.-C. Wong, D. P. Salmon, and I. Grant (1988, jan). A Chinese version of the mini-mental state examination; Impact of illiteracy in a Shanghai dementia survey. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 41(10), 971–978.
- Kingma, D. and J. Ba (2014, 12). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Krizhevsky, A., I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton (2012). Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In F. Pereira, C. Burges, L. Bottou, and K. Weinberger (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 25. Curran Associates, Inc.
- LeCun, Y., Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton (2015, May). Deep learning. *Nature* 521(7553), 436–444.
- LeCun, Y., B. Boser, J. S. Denker, D. Henderson, R. E. Howard, W. Hubbard, and L. D. Jackel (1989). Backpropagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition. *Neural Computation* 1(4), 541–551.
- Lee, C., W. R. Zame, J. Yoon, and M. Van Der Schaar (2018). DeepHit: A deep learning approach to survival analysis with competing risks. *32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2018*, 2314–2321.
- Liu, Y., M. Lu, and C. S. McMahan (2021). A penalized likelihood approach for efficiently

- estimating a partially linear additive transformation model with current status data. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 15(1), 2247–2287.
- Lu, M. and C. S. McMahan (2018). A partially linear proportional hazards model for current status data. *Biometrics* 74(4), 1240–1249.
- Lv, X., W. Li, Y. Ma, H. Chen, Y. Zeng, X. Yu, A. Hofman, and H. Wang (2019). Cognitive decline and mortality among community-dwelling Chinese older people. *BMC Medicine* 17(1), 1–10.
- Lv, Y., P.-F. Zhu, Z.-X. Yin, V. Kraus, D. Threapleton, C. L. Chei, M. Brasher, J. Zhang, H.-Z. Qian, C. Mao, D. Matchar, J.-S. Luo, Y. Zeng, and X. Shi (2017, 02). A u-shaped association between blood pressure and cognitive impairment in chinese elderly. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 18, 193.e7–193.e13.
- Ma, S. and M. R. Kosorok (2005). Penalized log-likelihood estimation for partly linear transformation models with current status data. *Annals of Statistics* 33(5), 2256–2290.
- Meixide, C. G., M. Matabuena, and M. R. Kosorok (2022). Neural interval-censored cox regression with feature selection.
- Paszke, A., S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Kopf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala (2019). Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32, pp. 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rabinowitz, D., A. Tsiatis, and J. Aragon (1995). Regression with interval-censored data. *Biometrika* 82(3), 501–513.

- Ramsay, J. O. (1988, November). Monotone regression splines in action. *Statistical Science* 3(4).
- Robbins, H. and S. Monro (1951). A Stochastic Approximation Method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 22(3), 400 – 407.
- Schmidt-Hieber, J. (2017). Nonparametric Regression Using Deep Neural Networks With Relu Activation Function. *arXiv* 48(4), 1875–1897.
- Shen, X. (1997). On methods of sieves and penalization. *Annals of Statistics* 25(6), 2555–2591.
- Sun, T. and Y. Ding (2022). Neural network on interval-censored data with application to the prediction of Alzheimer’s disease. *Biometrics* (October 2021), 1–14.
- Suzuki, T. (2019). Adaptivity of Deep R E Lu Network for Learning in Besov and Mixed Smooth Besov Spaces :. *Iclr* (2017), 1–25.
- Wang, L., J. Sun, and X. Tong (2010). Regression analysis of case II interval-censored failure time data with the additive hazards model. *Statistica Sinica* 20(4), 1709–1723.
- Wang, P., H. Zhao, M. Du, and J. Sun (2018). Inference on semiparametric transformation model with general interval-censored failure time data. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 30(3), 758–773.
- Xie, Y. and Z. Yu (2021a). Mixture cure rate models with neural network estimated nonparametric components. *Computational Statistics* 36(4), 2467–2489.
- Xie, Y. and Z. Yu (2021b). Promotion time cure rate model with a neural network estimated nonparametric component. *Statistics in Medicine* 40(15), 3516–3532.

- Yi, Z. (2008). *Introduction to the Chinese Longitudinal Healthy Longevity Survey (CLHLS)*, pp. 23–38. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Zeng, D., J. Cai, and Y. Shen (2006). Semiparametric additive risks model for interval-censored data. *Statistica Sinica* 16(1), 287–302.
- Zhang, Y., L. Hua, and J. Huang (2010). A Spline-Based Semiparametric Maximum Likelihood Estimation Method for the Cox Model with Interval-Censored Data. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 37(2), 338–354.
- Zhang, Z., L. Sun, X. Zhao, and J. Sun (2005). Regression analysis of interval-censored failure time data with linear transformation models. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics / La Revue Canadienne de Statistique* 33(1), 61–70.
- Zhong, Q., J. Mueller, and J.-L. Wang (2022, June). Deep learning for the partially linear cox model. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(3).
- Zhu, X., J. Yao, and J. Huang (2016, dec). Deep convolutional neural network for survival analysis with pathological images. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, Number 2, pp. 544–547. IEEE.