

# SurvBETA: Ensemble-Based Survival Models Using Beran Estimators and Several Attention Mechanisms

Lev V. Utkin, Semen P. Khomets, Vlada A. Efremenko and Andrei V. Konstantinov  
Higher School of Artificial Intelligence Technologies  
Peter the Great St.Petersburg Polytechnic University  
St.Petersburg, Russia  
e-mail: lev.utkin@gmail.com, homets\_sp@spbstu.ru,  
efremenko\_va@spbstu.ru, andrue.konst@gmail.com

## Abstract

Many ensemble-based models have been proposed to solve machine learning problems in the survival analysis framework, including random survival forests, the gradient boosting machine with weak survival models, ensembles of the Cox models. To extend the set of models, a new ensemble-based model called SurvBETA (the Survival Beran estimator Ensemble using Three Attention mechanisms) is proposed where the Beran estimator is used as a weak learner in the ensemble. The Beran estimator can be regarded as a kernel regression model taking into account the relationship between instances. Outputs of weak learners in the form of conditional survival functions are aggregated with attention weights taking into account the distance between the analyzed instance and prototypes of all bootstrap samples. The attention mechanism is used three times: for implementation of the Beran estimators, for determining specific prototypes of bootstrap samples and for aggregating the weak model predictions. The proposed model is presented in two forms: in a general form requiring to solve a complex optimization problem for its training; in a simplified form by considering a special representation of the attention weights by means of the imprecise Huber's contamination model which leads to solving a simple optimization problem. Numerical experiments illustrate properties of the model on synthetic data and compare the model with other survival models on real data. A code implementing the proposed model is publicly available.

## 1 Introduction

In spite of developing many efficient machine learning models, the ensemble-based models can be regarded as one of the most powerful tools for solving various tasks. The main idea behind the ensemble-based models is based on combining a set of weak or base models to construct a strong model having a more accurate and generalizable prediction. The most famous ensemble-based models are Random Forests [7] and their numerous modifications based on the bagging technique [6], AdaBoost [17] and the Gradient Boosting Machines [18, 19], which use the boosting technique. The above ensemble-based models mainly differ in weak models or in various approaches to combining the weak model predictions. It is interesting to point out that many modern models contain some elements of the ensemble-based methodology, for example, the well-known multi-head attention [59] used in transformers can also be viewed as an ensemble of the attention mechanisms.

The efficiency and simplicity of ensemble-based models motivated to develop a huge amount of new models. Surveys and detailed descriptions of the ensemble-based methodology and various models can be found in [13, 14, 45, 47, 66, 70].

An important area of the ensemble-based model application and development is survival analysis which deals with a specific type of data, namely, with censored survival data. Survival analysis studies observations in the form of times to an event of interest [62]. Moreover, events might not have happened during the observation period [43]. In this case, the corresponding observed times is less than or equal to a true event time, and the observation is called censored. This implies that every dataset in survival analysis consists of two types of objects depending on the possibility to observe the event of interest: censored and uncensored.

Many ensemble-based models have been proposed to deal with survival data. A large part of the models can be regarded as survival extensions of the well-known ensemble-based models. In particular, random survival forests (RSFs) [29, 41, 50, 60, 58, 57, 67] are extensions of the random forests to survival data. Survival models proposed in [8, 37] are extensions of the gradient boosting machine.

An interesting ensemble-based model using the Cox proportional hazard model [9] as a weak model was proposed by Meier et al. [40]. The Cox model and its modifications are successfully applied to many survival problems. A reason of the success is that the Cox model takes into account feature vectors and allows us to obtain conditional survival measures. However, the Cox model does not take into account relative positions of feature vectors. For example, the Cox model may provide incorrect survival measures when a dataset has a multi-cluster structure. In order to overcome this limitation and to construct a more adequate model, we propose to apply the Beran estimator [5] which estimates the conditional survival function taking into account the relationship between feature vectors by assigning weights to instances depending on their proximity to the analyzed instance. It is implemented by means of kernels. Therefore, the Beran estimator can be viewed a type of the kernel regression.

The above positive property of the Beran estimator motivates to develop new ensemble-based models where the Beran estimators as weak learners. A simple way to implement an ensemble of the Beran estimators is to use the standard bagging approach and to average obtained predictions in the form of survival functions provided by each Beran estimator from the ensemble. However, survival functions predicted by different weak models may be sufficiently different especially when the weak models are trained on instances from different clusters. Therefore, in order to improve the whole ensemble-based model, we propose to apply the attention mechanism to predictions in the form of SFs such that the attention weights are determined through the feature vectors. The main idea to aggregate the conditional SFs is to take into account the distance between the analyzed feature vector and prototypes of all bootstrap samples obtained by using the attention mechanism in the form of the Nadaraya-Watson regression [42, 64]. It is important to point out that prototypes of each bootstrap subsample are determined depending on the analyzed feature vector by means of the attention mechanism, i.e., each bootstrap subsample can have different prototypes for different testing instances. As a result, we apply the attention mechanism to the ensemble-based model three times: for implementation of the Beran estimators, for determining specific prototypes of bootstrap samples and for aggregating the weak model predictions.

Another important difference between the proposed model and other ensemble-based models is its specific bootstrap sampling scheme. It is implemented in such a way that subsamples consist of instances that are close to each other and, at the same time, have certain areas of intersection with some of other subsamples, which is required for the correct use of prototypes.

The proposed ensemble-based survival model is called SurvBETA (the **S**urvival **B**eran estimator

Ensemble using Three Attention mechanisms). Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. A new bagging-based survival model using the Beran estimator as a weak model is proposed for predicting survival measures. The main idea behind the model is to aggregate the weak model predictions applying the attention mechanisms.
2. The proposed model is significantly simplified by considering a special representation of the attention weights by means of the imprecise Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model [28].
3. A specific scheme for generating the bootstrap subsamples is proposed that ensures comparable contributions of different Beran estimators from the ensemble,
4. Various numerical experiments compare the method with other survival models, including the RSF, GBM Cox [46], GBM AFT [2], and the single Beran estimator.

A code implementing the proposed model is publicly available at: <https://github.com/NTAILab/SurvBETA>.

## 2 Related work

**Machine learning models in survival analysis.** Detailed reviews of many survival models can be found in [62, 65]. Most models can be viewed as extensions of the base machine learning models when survival data is available. For example, the RSFs are based on ideas of the random forest, but it uses the specific node splitting rules and the specific calculation of predictions. Many survival models modify the Cox model by replacing the linear relationship of covariate with other machine learning models, for example, [54] replaced this relationship with the Lasso method. Similar replacement were proposed in order to take into account a high dimensionality of survival data. Following this paper, several modifications of the Lasso methods for censored data were proposed [34, 53]. Many survival models are based on applying neural networks and deep learning [35, 39, 43, 68]. Deep recurrent survival model was proposed in [44]. An interesting approach to add the pairwise ranking loss function based on ranking information of survival data to training of the deep survival model was considered in [32]. The convolutional neural networks also have been applied to the survival analysis [20]. Transformer-based survival models were studied in [27, 52, 63].

It should be noted that the survival model based on neural networks require a large amount of training data. This can be a problem in many applications. Moreover, tabular data can also encounter difficulties when survival neural networks are used to predict. Therefore, ensemble-based survival models using simple weak learners may provide better results for several cases.

**Ensemble-based survival machine learning models.** Starting from works [31] and [30], many approaches to constructing ensembles of survival models have been proposed. A fundamental work stating basic principles of survival ensembles was presented by Hothorn et al. [25]. Salerno et al. [48] reviewed various survival models dealing with high-dimensional data, including ensemble-based survival models. Ensembles of survival models with high-dimensional data were also studied in [61]. Time-varying covariates treated by ensemble-based survival models were studied in [69]. Bayesian survival tree ensembles were considered in [36]. Various ensemble-based survival models were also presented in [8, 37, 40, 41, 50, 60, 58, 57, 67]. However, it is interesting to point out that there are no ensemble-based models which use the Beran estimator as a weak model. At the same time, our experiments show that models based on the Beran estimators can compete with other models in case of complex data structure.

### 3 Elements of survival analysis

#### 3.1 Basic concepts

An instance (object) in survival analysis is often represented by a triplet  $(\mathbf{x}_i, \delta_i, T_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_i^T = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{id}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the vector of the instance features;  $T_i \in \mathbb{R}$  is the event time for the  $i$ -th instance. In survival analysis, all events can be divided into two groups [24]. The first group contains observed events called uncensored. For these events,  $T_i$  is the time between a baseline time and the time of event happening. The corresponding instances are identified by the censoring indicator  $\delta_i = 1$ . The second group consists of unobserved events. In this case,  $T_i$  is the time between the baseline time and the end of the observation. The corresponding instances are identified by the censoring indicator  $\delta_i = 0$ .

Let a training set  $\mathcal{A}$  consist of  $n$  triplets  $(\mathbf{x}_i, \delta_i, T_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Survival analysis aims to estimate the event time  $T$  for a new instance  $\mathbf{x}$  on the basis of the dataset  $\mathcal{A}$ . Important concepts in survival analysis are survival functions (SFs) and cumulative hazard functions (CHF). The conditional SF denoted as  $S(t | \mathbf{x})$  is the probability of surviving up to time  $t$ , that is  $S(t | \mathbf{x}) = \Pr\{T > t | \mathbf{x}\}$ . The CHF denoted as  $H(t | \mathbf{x})$  is expressed through the SF as follows:

$$H(t | \mathbf{x}) = -\ln S(t | \mathbf{x}). \quad (1)$$

Comparison of survival models is often carried out by means of the C-index [22]. It estimates the probability that the event times of a pair of instances are correctly ranking. Let  $\mathcal{J}$  is a set of all pairs  $(i, j)$  satisfying conditions  $\delta_i = 1$  and  $T_i < T_j$ . The C-index is formally computed as [55, 62]:

$$C = \frac{\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}[\widehat{T}_i < \widehat{T}_j]}{N}, \quad (2)$$

where  $N$  is the number of all pairs  $(i, j)$  from  $\mathcal{J}$ , i.e.,  $N = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} 1$ ;  $\widehat{T}_i$  and  $\widehat{T}_j$  are expected event times.

#### 3.2 The Beran estimator

According to the Beran estimator [5], the SF can be estimated on the bases of the dataset  $\mathcal{A}$  as follows:

$$S(t | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{A}) = \prod_{t_i \leq t} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)} \right\}^{\delta_i}, \quad (3)$$

where  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$  are ordered time moments obtained from the set  $\{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ ; the weight  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$  corresponds to location of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  relative to  $\mathbf{x}$  under condition that the closer  $\mathbf{x}_i$  to  $\mathbf{x}$ , the greater the weight  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ .

The weights  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$  can be viewed as attention weights and can be defined through kernels  $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$  as:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^n K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)}. \quad (4)$$

In particular, the Gaussian kernel with the parameter  $\tau$  leads to the weight:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{\tau} \right). \quad (5)$$

We can also write the CHF obtained by using the Beran estimator as:

$$H(t | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{A}) = - \sum_{t_i \leq t} \delta_i \ln \left\{ \frac{1 - \sum_{j=1}^i \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

The Beran estimator generalizes the Kaplan-Meier estimator [62] for which  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = 1/n$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

## 4 A simple ensemble of Beran estimators

Let  $\mathcal{A}_k \subset \mathcal{A}$  be a random subset of the training set  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of  $m$  instances having indices from the set  $\mathcal{I}_k$ . Let  $t_1^{(k)} < \dots < t_m^{(k)}$  be the distinct times to event of interest from the set  $\{T_j : j \in \mathcal{I}_k\}$ , where  $t_1^{(k)} = \min_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} T_j$  and  $t_m^{(k)} = \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}_k} T_j$ . It is important to note that the aggregation rule in many implementations of random survival forests is based on averaging the CHF's predicted by survival trees [31]. We also use another approach by averaging SFs  $S(t | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{A}_k) = S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x})$ . SF  $S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x})$  predicted by the Beran estimator trained on the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$  is determined as:

$$\begin{aligned} S(t | \mathbf{x}, \mathcal{A}_k) &= S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \prod_{t_i^{(k)} \leq t} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)} \right\}^{\delta_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

By having  $M$  random subsets  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ , we can adapt the bagging method to the Beran estimators as base models and construct an aggregated SF  $S(t | \mathbf{x})$  as the mean values of SFs predicted by the Beran estimators:

$$S(t | \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x}). \quad (8)$$

This is the simplest way to implement the ensemble of Beran estimators. However, a more flexible aggregation of the Beran estimators as base models can be proposed.

## 5 SurvBETA: Attention-based ensemble

One of the ways to improve the aggregation scheme in ensemble-based models is to introduce some weights  $\gamma_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , for the weak model predictions. The weights should take into account how an analyzed point  $\mathbf{x}$  is far from other points in the training set. Suppose that the training set  $\mathcal{A}$  consists of two clusters such that two bootstrap samples with indices  $i$  and  $j$  mainly coincide with these clusters. Let  $\mathbf{x}$  belong to the  $i$ -th cluster. The  $i$ -th Beran estimator trained on  $\mathcal{A}_i$  recognizes  $\mathbf{x}$  as an instance from the first cluster because it does not “know” the second cluster. It provides the prediction  $S^{(i)}(t | \mathbf{x})$ . The  $j$ -th Beran estimator trained on  $\mathcal{A}_j$  may provide a similar estimation of the SF  $S^{(j)}(t | \mathbf{x})$  because the corresponding weights are normalized and are not sensitive to the considered case. Therefore, new weights assigned to predictions and taking into account the distance between the analyzed feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$  and all subsets  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ , could overcome the above difficulty. Similar approach has been used [56, 57] where the random forests and random survival forest were considered as ensemble-based models.

## 5.1 Prototypes of subsets

Another problem is how to define the distance between the analyzed vector  $\mathbf{x}$  and the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . In [56, 57], the mean value  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k)$  of all feature vectors from  $\mathcal{A}_k$  was used to measure the distance, i.e. the distance between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k)$ . At that, in contrast to SurvBETA the set  $\mathcal{A}_k$  in [56, 57] was taken from leaves of trees. The mean value can be regarded as a prototype of instances from  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . However, the mean value can also lead to some difficulties when the bootstrap sample consists from instances belonging to different clusters. In this case, the corresponding prototype may be incorrect. Therefore, we propose to use the attention mechanism to find the prototype relative to the vector  $\mathbf{x}$  such that the attention weights depends on distances between  $\mathbf{x}$  and feature vectors from  $\mathcal{A}_k$ .

Formally, the mean value  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k)$  of the feature vectors from the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$  is defined as:

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{A}_k} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{A}_k} \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (9)$$

where  $\#\mathcal{A}_k$  denotes the number of instances in  $\mathcal{A}_k$ .

The above mean value can be regarded as a prototype of the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ , but this prototype does not depend on the analyzed vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . Therefore, it is proposed another prototype which relates the vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . The prototype vector of  $\mathcal{A}_k$  relative to  $\mathbf{x}$  can be written by using the Nadaraya-Watson regression as follows:

$$\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{A}_k} \mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)$  is the attention weight establishing the relationship between  $\mathbf{x}$  and each element of  $\mathcal{A}_k$  such that

$$\mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2}{\eta_k} \right). \quad (11)$$

Here  $\eta_k$  is a hyperparameter or the training parameter depending on the implementation strategy. To simplify calculations, we can learn only one parameter  $\eta$  for all base learners.

The first definition of the prototype  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k)$  does not depend on  $\mathbf{x}$  and can be calculated in advance for all models in the ensemble and then used for any  $\mathbf{x}$ . This reduces calculations. However, vectors in  $\mathcal{A}_k$  may be too different, for example, they may be from different clusters. This fact leads to a significant bias of the prototype. Therefore, the second definition is preferable when the data structure is known to be complex.

## 5.2 A specific scheme of generating subsets

Let us analyze how a prototype  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})$  is located in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})$  is a convex combination of all  $\mathbf{x}_j$  from  $\mathcal{A}_k$ , then the prototype is located inside the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . Moreover, contribution of points  $\mathbf{x}_j$  which are close to  $\mathbf{x}$  is large due to the kernel definition of weights  $\mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)$ . Hence, we can conclude that the prototype  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})$  is close to  $\mathbf{x}$  if  $\mathbf{x}$  is inside the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . On the other hand, the prototype  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})$  may be far from  $\mathbf{x}$  if  $\mathbf{x}$  is outside the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ . As a result, if bootstrap samples  $\mathcal{A}_k$  and  $\mathcal{A}_l$  are far from each other or just different and  $\mathbf{x}$  is outside the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ , then the weight  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}))$  of the  $k$ -th Beran estimator will be very large whereas the weight  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_l, \mathbf{x}))$  will be very small. This implies that the ensemble does not improve the prediction accuracy in comparison with a single Beran estimator. In contrast to many ensemble models, for example, random forests, the subsets  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ , should be intersected. In this case, if  $\mathbf{x}$  is located in the intersection area of two

samples, then the corresponding weights, say  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}))$  and  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_l, \mathbf{x}))$ , will have comparable values and the corresponding Beran estimators significantly contribute into the final estimate. This is important property of the proposed ensemble. On the one hand, we aim to achieve independence of subsamples. On the other hand, this independence may lead to the ensemble degradation. Therefore, we propose the following procedure for generating subsets  $\mathcal{A}_k$ .

1.  $M$  points  $\mathbf{x}$  from the training set  $\mathcal{A}$  are randomly selected.
2.  $K$  nearest neighbors for the  $k$ -th randomly selected point are taken from  $\mathcal{A}$  to construct the subset  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ .
3. The obtained subsets  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ , are specific bootstrap samples.

Here  $K$  can be regarded as a hyperparameter. It is determined based on the fact that subsets should have certain areas of intersection.

### 5.3 Global attention

Let us apply the attention mechanism to computing the ensemble-based prediction of the Beran estimators. By using notation introduced in the previous sections, we can write

$$S(t | \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})) \cdot S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x}), \quad (12)$$

where the attention weight  $\gamma$  is determined as

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})\|^2}{w_k} \right), \quad (13)$$

where  $w_k$  is the training parameter.

The considered structure of the above attention mechanisms with the corresponding attention weights, including the Beran estimator weights, is depicted in Fig. 1.

Let us write for short:

$$\gamma_i^{(k)} = \gamma(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}_i)). \quad (14)$$

In sum, we have three type of attention weights: first, weights in the Beran estimator denoted as  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)$ ; second, weights for computing the prototype  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})$  of  $\mathcal{A}_k$  for  $\mathbf{x}$  denoted as  $\mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)$ ; third, weights for aggregating the Beran estimator predictions  $S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x})$  denoted as  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}))$ . The above weights can be training as well as tuning.

### 5.4 Loss functions

By supposing that SFs are aggregated in accordance with (12), it is obvious that the expected event time  $\widehat{T}_i$  of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  for the ensemble is computed as weighted sum of expected event times  $\widehat{T}_i^{(k)}$  of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  predicted by weak models:

$$\widehat{T}_i = \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_i^{(k)} \cdot \widehat{T}_i^{(k)}. \quad (15)$$




Figure 1: A structure of attention mechanisms with the corresponding attention weights



Finally, parameters  $w_k$  and  $\eta_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ , can be found by minimizing the C-index loss  $L^C$  written in terms of expected times:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{k=1, \dots, M} L^C &= \min_{k=1, \dots, M} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1} [\widehat{T}_i - \widehat{T}_j > 0] \\ &= \min_{k=1, \dots, M} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^M \left( \gamma_i^{(k)} \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} - \gamma_j^{(k)} \widehat{T}_j^{(k)} \right) > 0 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Since we have a finite number of events, then the SF is step-wised, then we can write for the  $k$ -th Beran estimator

$$S^{(k)}(t | \mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{t \in [t_l^{(k)}, t_{l+1}^{(k)})\}, \quad (17)$$

where  $S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i) = S^{(k)}(t_l | \mathbf{x}_i)$  is the SF in the time interval  $[t_l^{(k)}, t_{l+1}^{(k)})$ ;  $S_0^{(k)} = 1$  by  $t_0 = 0$ ;  $N_k$  is the number of elements in  $\mathcal{A}_k$ ;  $t_1^{(k)} < t_2^{(k)} < \dots < t_{N_k}^{(k)}$  are ordered times to events from  $\mathcal{A}_k$ .

Hence, the expected time  $\widehat{T}_i^{(k)}$  is determined as

$$\widehat{T}_i^{(k)} = \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i) (t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}). \quad (18)$$

Then the optimization problem (16) is rewritten as

$$\min_{k=1, \dots, M} L^C = \min_{k=1, \dots, M} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1} [G_{ij} > 0], \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij} &= \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_i^{(k)} \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i) (t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_j^{(k)} \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_j) (t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

It should be noted that the indicator function in the C-index can be replaced with the sigmoid function  $\sigma$  to simplify the optimization problem.

The C-index has been used above as a loss function. A more complex loss function was proposed in [26]. Besides the C-index, it the loss function additionally contains several terms. It additionally contains several terms:  $L^{obs}$ ,  $L^{cen}$ ,  $L^{MAE}$ . The first term is determined only for uncensored observations as follows:

$$L^{obs} = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{t_j \leq T_i} \ln S(t_j | \mathbf{x}_i) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{t_j > T_i} \ln (1 - S(t_j | \mathbf{x}_i)). \quad (21)$$

Here  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is the set of all uncensored observation indices. The loss  $L^{obs}$  maximizes the SF  $S(t_j | \mathbf{x}_i)$  for  $t_j \leq T_i$  and minimizes it for  $t_j > T_i$ .

The second term is determined for censored observations whose index set denoted as  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ . It is of the form:

$$L^{cen} = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{t_j \leq T_i} \ln S(t_j | \mathbf{x}_i). \quad (22)$$

The third term is determined as

$$L^{MAE} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left| T_i - \widehat{T}_i \right| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left| T_i - \sum_{l=1}^m S_l(\mathbf{x}_i)(t_{l+1} - t_l) \right|. \quad (23)$$

## 5.5 General case

Generally, the above attention weights can be represented through the scaled dot product as follows:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{(\mathbf{q}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{x}_i)}{\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}}} \right), \quad (24)$$

$$\mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j) = \text{softmax} \frac{((\mathbf{q}_\mu \otimes \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\mu \otimes \mathbf{x}_j))}{\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}}}, \quad (25)$$

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})) = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{(\mathbf{q}_\gamma \otimes \mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{k}_\gamma \otimes \mathbf{x}_j)}{\sqrt{d_{\mathbf{x}}}} \right). \quad (26)$$

Here  $\mathbf{q}_\alpha, \mathbf{q}_\mu, \mathbf{q}_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are trainable vectors of query parameters;  $\mathbf{k}_\alpha, \mathbf{k}_\mu, \mathbf{k}_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are trainable vectors of key parameters;  $\otimes$  is the symbol of the Hadamard product of vectors;  $d_{\mathbf{x}}$  is the dimensionality of the vector  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Replacing the indicator function with the sigmoid function  $\sigma(z, \tau) = 1/(1 + \exp(-\tau z))$ , the optimization problem (19) is represented as

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{q}_\alpha, \mathbf{q}_\mu, \mathbf{q}_\gamma, \\ \mathbf{k}_\alpha, \mathbf{k}_\mu, \mathbf{k}_\gamma}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\tau G_{ij})}. \quad (27)$$

The parameter  $\tau$  should be larger 1 to ensure proximity of the sigmoid function to the indicator function.

A main difficulty for implementing the general case is the large number of training parameters which lead to overfitting especially when the model is trained on small datasets. Therefore, we propose an important special case which significantly simplifies the optimization problem and reduces the number of training parameters.

## 5.6 Important special case

If we suppose that  $\eta_k, k = 1, \dots, M$ , in (11) are hyperparameters which can be identical for all base learners, but are generally different, then the optimization problem for computing parameters  $v_k, k = 1, \dots, M$ , in (19) can significantly be simplified. Let us use the definition of the attention weight  $\gamma^{(k)} = \gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}))$  in the following form proposed in [56]:

$$\gamma_i^{(k)} = (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}_i)\|^2}{w} \right) + \epsilon \cdot v_k, \quad (28)$$

$$k = 1, \dots, M.$$

This attention weight is derived from the imprecise Huber's  $\epsilon$ -contamination model [28] which is represented as

$$F = (1 - \epsilon) \cdot P + \epsilon \cdot V, \quad (29)$$

where  $P$  is a discrete probability distribution contaminated by another probability distribution  $V$  that is arbitrary in the unit simplex  $\Delta^M$  such that conditions  $v_1 + \dots + v_M = 1$  and  $v_k \geq 0$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, M$  are valid for components of  $V$ ; the contamination parameter  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  controls the size of the small simplex produced by the  $\epsilon$ -contamination model. In particular, if  $\epsilon = 0$ , then the model is reduced to the softmax operation with hyperparameter  $w$ , and the attention weight does not depend on  $v_k$  in this case. The distribution  $P$  has elements  $\text{softmax}\left(-\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})\|^2 / w\right)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, M$ . The distribution  $V$  defines the vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_M)$  of training parameter of the attention mechanism.

The next step to simplify the optimization problem for computing parameters  $v_k$  is to replace the indicator function in (19) with the hinge loss function  $l(x) = \max(0, x)$  similarly to the replacement proposed by Van Belle et al. [3].

By adding the regularization term, the optimization problem can be written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \Delta^M} \left\{ \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \max(0, G_{ij}) \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Let us introduce the variables

$$\xi_{ij} = \max(0, G_{ij}). \quad (31)$$

Then the optimization problem can be written as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}, \xi_{ij}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij}, \quad (32)$$

subject to  $\mathbf{v} \in \Delta^M$  and  $\xi_{ij} \geq G_{ij}$ ,  $\xi_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{J}$ .

Denote

$$P_i^{(k)} = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}_i)\|^2}{w} \right), \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ij} = & (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{k=1}^M P_i^{(k)} \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i)(t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}) \\ & - (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{k=1}^M P_j^{(k)} \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_j)(t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$R_{ij}^{(k)} = \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_i)(t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}) - \sum_{l=0}^{N_k-1} S_l^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}_j)(t_{l+1}^{(k)} - t_l^{(k)}) \right). \quad (35)$$

Then we obtain the linear optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}, \xi_{ij}} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij}, \quad (36)$$

subject to  $\mathbf{v} \in \Delta^M$  and

$$\xi_{ij} - \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^M R_{ij}^{(k)} v_k \geq Q_{ij}, \quad \xi_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (37)$$

The above problem has  $M$  variables  $v_1, \dots, v_M$  and  $\#\mathcal{J}$  variables  $\xi_{ij}$ .

Let us extend the loss function by adding the term  $L^{MAE}$  defined in (23). The predicted mean value  $\widehat{T}_i$  is determined through the predicted mean times  $\widehat{T}_i^{(k)}$  of each Beran estimator as

$$\widehat{T}_i = \sum_{k=1}^M \gamma_i^{(k)} \cdot \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} = \sum_{k=1}^M \left( (1 - \epsilon) P_i^{(k)} \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} + \epsilon \cdot v_k \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} \right). \quad (38)$$

Denote

$$U_i^{(k)} = (1 - \epsilon) P_i^{(k)} \widehat{T}_i^{(k)}. \quad (39)$$

Then the extended objective function (36) becomes

$$\sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} |T_i - \widehat{T}_i| = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^M \left( U_i^{(k)} + \epsilon \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} \cdot v_k \right) - T_i \right|. \quad (40)$$

Let us introduce new optimization variables  $\psi_i$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that

$$\psi_j = \left| \sum_{k=1}^M \left( U_i^{(k)} + \epsilon \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} \cdot v_k \right) - T_i \right|. \quad (41)$$

Then we obtain the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}, \xi_{ij}, \psi_i} \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \psi_i \right), \quad (42)$$

subject to  $\mathbf{v} \in \Delta^M$  and

$$\xi_{ij} - \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^M R_{ij}^{(k)} v_k \geq Q_{ij}, \quad \xi_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{J}, \quad (43)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_i - \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^M \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} v_k &\geq \sum_{k=1}^M U_i^{(k)} - T_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \psi_i + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^M \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} v_k &\geq T_i - \sum_{k=1}^M U_i^{(k)}, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We again have the linear optimization problem with additional variables  $\psi_i$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{C}$ .

The optimization problem (36)-(37) can be also represented as a quadratic programming problem if to add the regularization term  $\|\mathbf{v}\|^2$  with the hyperparameter  $\lambda$  controlling the strength of the regularization. In this case, we obtain the objective function

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}, \xi_{ij}, \psi_i, \epsilon} \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \psi_i + \lambda \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \right). \quad (45)$$

The parameter  $\epsilon$  can be considered as the trainable parameter if to introduce new variables  $\beta_k = \epsilon v_k$ . This replacement leads to new constraints

$$\sum_{k=1}^M \beta_k = \epsilon, \quad \beta_k \geq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, M. \quad (46)$$

Then the above optimization problem is rewritten as

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}, \xi_{ij}, \psi_i, \beta_k} \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{ij} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \psi_i \right), \quad (47)$$

subject to (46) and

$$\xi_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^M R_{ij}^{(k)} \beta_k \geq Q_{ij}, \quad \xi_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \{i, j\} \in \mathcal{J}, \quad \epsilon \geq 0, \quad \epsilon \leq 1, \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_i - \sum_{k=1}^M \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} \beta_k &\geq \sum_{k=1}^M U_i^{(k)} - T_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \psi_i + \sum_{k=1}^M \widehat{T}_i^{(k)} \beta_k &\geq T_i - \sum_{k=1}^M U_i^{(k)}, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

## 5.7 Computational problems

The above model has an important obstacle. When a training set is rather large, numbers of variables in (27) and (45) as well as constraints in (45) are extremely large. This is a common computational problem of survival machine learning problems where the loss function uses the C-index. To simplify the problem, Hu et al. [26] proposed to apply a simplified randomized algorithm. According to the algorithm, for each observed object  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in the training set, we randomly sample another object  $\mathbf{x}_j$  is randomly sampled with replacement, where  $T_i < T_j$ .

A nearest neighbor algorithm to reduce the computational complexity was proposed in [4]. According to this algorithm, the number of constraints can be reduced by selecting a subset  $\mathcal{J}_i$  of  $k$  objects with a survival time nearest to the survival time of the object  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . Another approach presented in [58] is to reduce the number of pairs in  $\mathcal{J}$  by random selection of  $K$  pairs.

## 6 Numerical experiments

In numerical experiments, we study properties the proposed models SurvBETA trained on synthetic and real data and compare them with other available survival models. A performance measure for studying and comparing models is the C-index computed on the testing set. To evaluate the C-index for each dataset, we perform a cross-validation with 100 repetitions by taking 20% of instances from each dataset for testing, 60% of instances for training and 20% of instances for validation. Instances for training, validation and testing are randomly selected in each run. Hyperparameters are optimized by using the Optuna library [1]. For SurvBETA without optimization and the Beran estimator, the complete enumeration of all hyperparameter values in predefined intervals is performed.

In numerical experiments, three models are considered which can be regarded as special cases of SurvBETA. The first model is just a single Beran estimator. It is a special case of SurvBETA when the number of estimators equal to 1. This case is mainly used for comparison purposes. Another special case is when all parameters of the SurvBETA are tuning, i.e., they are determined by means of testing. Actually, the second special case corresponds to computing the attention weights  $\gamma_i^{(k)}$  in (28) under condition that  $\epsilon = 0$ . This case will be called ‘‘SurvBETA without optimization’’ because the corresponding modification of SurvBETA does not use any optimization problem for computing parameters. The third special case of SurvBETA is based on applying the optimization problem (42) for computing optimal values of training variables  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_M)$  in (28). This case will be called ‘‘SurvBETA with optimization’’.

In all experiments, four standard kernels are used for computing the Beran estimator and for the prototype computation: the Gaussian kernel, the Epanechnikov kernel  $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - u^2)$ , the triangular kernel  $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = (1 - |u|)$ , and the quartic kernel  $K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{15}{16}(1 - u^2)^2$ , where  $u = -\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 / \tau$ ;  $\tau$  is the hyperparameter which is selected from the set  $10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3$  for each weak learner. For every subsample, one kernel is randomly selected from the above four kernels, and it is used in the corresponding Beran estimator and in the attention mechanism for determining the prototype  $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x})$ . This approach allows us to make the weak models in the ensemble more diverse. Weights  $\gamma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{A}_k, \mathbf{x}))$  use only the Gaussian kernels.

It is important to note that we do not consider the problem (27) with attention weights in general forms (24)-(26) because the large number of training parameters (vectors  $\mathbf{q}_\alpha, \mathbf{q}_\mu, \mathbf{q}_\gamma, \mathbf{k}_\alpha, \mathbf{k}_\mu, \mathbf{k}_\gamma$ ) leads to overfitting when the number of instance is restricted. Therefore, we consider only the important special case which is provided in Subsection 5.6.

## 6.1 Synthetic data

Two clusters of covariates  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d = 5$ ) are randomly generated such that points of every cluster are generated from the uniform distribution in a hyper-rectangle  $\prod_{j=1}^d [l_i^{(j)}, r_i^{(j)}]$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . The number of points denoted as  $N$  in the clusters varies to study its impact on the model performance. The censored data are generated randomly according to the Bernoulli distribution with probabilities  $\Pr\{\delta = 0\} = 0.2$  and  $\Pr\{\delta_i = 1\} = 0.8$ . Event times are generated in accordance with the Weibull distribution with the shape parameter  $k$ , which depends on one of the dimensions  $x_1$  and has the following form:

$$T = \frac{\sin(c \cdot x_1) + c}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{1}{k})} \cdot (-\log(u))^{\frac{1}{k}}, \quad (50)$$

where  $c$  is a parameter;  $u$  is a random variable uniformly distributed in the interval  $[0, 1]$ .

In order to complicate synthetic data, we take the expectation of  $T$  in accordance with the Weibull distribution as  $\sin(c \cdot x_1) + c$ . In other words, the mean value of the event time is changed as the sinusoid function.

Intervals of hyperparameter values for different models are the following:

1. SurvBETA with optimization:  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ ;  $w \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3\}$ .
2. SurvBETA without optimization of weights:  $w \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3\}$ .
3. The single Beran estimator:  $\tau \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3\}$ .

These hyperparameters are determined by using the Optuna library [1]. Other hyperparameters are manually tested, choosing those leading to the best results.




Figure 2: Dependence of the C-index on the number of the Beran estimators

In order to investigate how the performance results (the C-index) depend on the different parameters, the corresponding experiments are performed. In all experiments, training parameters are optimized by using Adam with the initial learning rate 0.1 and 60 epochs. Initial parameters of synthetic data are  $c = 3$ ,  $k = 6$ ,  $l_1^{(j)} = -2.0$ ,  $r_1^{(j)} = l_1^{(j)} + 4$ ,  $l_2^{(j)} = 20.0$ ,  $r_2^{(j)} = l_2^{(j)} + 10$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 5$ . The initial number of points in every cluster is 500. The initial size of each bootstrap subsample for constructing the ensemble is 40%. The number of weak models is 20. Some of the above parameters are changed in experiments to study their impact on the resulting C-index.

*Dependence of the C-index on the number of the Beran estimators in the ensemble:* the number of estimators varies in the range [3, 26] with step 2. The corresponding dependence is shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen from Fig. 2 that the C-index of SurvBETA without optimization as well as SurvBETA with optimization increases as the number of the Beran estimators increases. However, one can see also that this growth is slowing down. It can also be seen from Fig. 2 that SurvBETA with optimization of parameters outperforms SurvBETA without optimization. An important result is that SurvBETA significantly outperforms the single Beran estimator.

*Dependence of the C-index on the number of points in each cluster:* the number of points varies in the range [40, 500] with step 50. The corresponding dependence is shown in Fig. 3, where all models illustrate the growth of the C-index with increase of the number of points in clusters. It follows from the fact that the sample size increases and the models are better trained. It is interesting to note that the single Beran estimator also improves its performance with the number of points in clusters. However, this improvement in the C-index growth is weaker than the improvement that the models show. Some convergence of the different modifications of SurvBETA can also be observed with the increase in the number of points.

*Dependence of the C-index on the distance between clusters:* parameters of the first cluster remains without changes, but hyper-rectangles determining the second cluster generation are constructed such that their parameters are shifted relative to the first cluster as follows:  $l_2^{(j)} = r_1^{(j)} + h$ ,  $r_2^{(j)} = l_2^{(j)} + 10$ ,




Figure 3: Dependence of the C-index on the number of points in each cluster

$j = 1, \dots, 5$ , where  $h$  varies in the range  $[1, 30]$  with step  $29/30$ . Interesting results are depicted in Fig. 4. It can be seen from Fig. 4 that the single Beran estimator, despite its kernel basis, does not cope with the situation when the distance between clusters increases and becomes quite large whereas the proposed models practically do not deteriorate their performance. This is an important property of the proposed models which can be regarded as one of the reasons why the models have been developed.

*Dependence of the C-index on the parameter  $k$ :* parameter  $k$  varies in the range  $[1, 21]$  with step 2. We study how the C-index of the models depends on the parameter  $k$  of the Weibull distribution. In particular, if  $k = 1$ , then the exponential distribution is used for generation. If  $k = 2$ , then the Rayleigh distribution is used in this case. As the parameter increases, the event time is more concentrated around a certain value, which should reduce the uncertainty of predictions. This is precisely reflected in Fig. 5 depicting the dependence of the C-index on the parameter  $k$  for different models. It can be seen that the C-index increases with increasing  $k$ , which fully corresponds to the intuitive idea of how the model should behave. At the same time, it can be seen from Fig. 5 that the proposed models demonstrate better characteristics compared to the single Beran estimator.

*Dependence of the C-index on the bootstrap subsample size:* the bootstrap subsample size varies in the range  $[0.1, 0.9]$  with step 0.1 (here the portion of the training set is considered). Fig. 6 illustrates how the bootstrap subsample size impacts on the model performance. It can be seen from Fig. 6 that there are some optimal values of the subsample size, which depend on the model analyzed. In particular, optimal values of portions are 0.2 and 0.3 for SurvBETA with optimization and without optimization, respectively. It can also be seen that the SurvBETA performance converges to the single Beran estimator performance when the size of bootstrap subsamples increases. This is due to the fact that the samples become too dependent in order to implement a proper ensemble.






Figure 4: Dependence of the C-index on the distance between cluster




Figure 5: Dependence of the C-index on the parameter  $k$




Figure 6: Dependence of the C-index on the subsample size

## 6.2 Real data

In order to compare SurvBETA with different survival models on real data, we use the following survival models: the single Beran estimator, SurvBETA without optimization, SurvBETA with optimization, RSF [29], GBM Cox [46], GBM AFT [2].

The models is tested on the following real benchmark datasets.

The *Veterans’ Administration Lung Cancer Study (Veteran) Dataset* [33] contains observations of 137 patients characterized by 8 features. It can be obtained via the “survival” R package.

The *AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study (AIDS) Dataset* [21] contains healthcare statistics and categorical information about 1151 patients with 19 features who have been diagnosed with AIDS. It is available at <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/tanshihjen/aids-clinical-trials>.

The *(Breast Cancer) Dataset* [12] has 198 samples and 80 features. The endpoint is the presence of distance metastases, which occurred for 51 patients (25.8%). The dataset can be obtained via the Python “scikit-survival” package.

The *German Breast Cancer Study Group 2 (GBSG2) Dataset* contains observations of 686 patients with 9 features [49]. It can be obtained via the “TH.data” R package.

The *Worcester Heart Attack Study (WHAS500) Dataset* [24] considers 500 patients with 14 features. The dataset can be obtained via the “smoothHR” R package or the Python “scikit-survival” package.

The *Primary Biliary Cirrhosis (PBC) Dataset* studies 418 patients with 17 features [15]. It has 257 censored observations. The dataset can be downloaded via the “randomForestSRC” R package.

The *Wisconsin Prognostic Breast Cancer (WPBC) Dataset* [51] contains 198 instances having 32 features. It can be obtained via the “TH.data” R package.

The *Heart Transplant Dataset (HTD)* consists of observations of 103 patients with 8 features [33]. This dataset is available at <http://lib.stat.cmu.edu/datasets/stanford>.

The *Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia Survival (CML) Dataset* is simulated according to structure

of the data by the German CML Study Group used in [23]. The dataset consists of 507 observations with 8 features: a factor with 54 levels indicating the study center; a factor with levels trt1, trt2, trt3 indicating the treatment group; sex (0 = female, 1 = male); age in years; risk group (0 = low, 1 = medium, 2 = high); censoring status (FALSE = censored, TRUE = dead); time survival or censoring time in days. The dataset can be obtained via the “multcomp” R package (cml).

The *Molecular Taxonomy of Breast Cancer International Consortium (METABRIC) Database* [10] contains the records of 1904 breast cancer patients and has 9 gene indicator features and 5 clinical features.

The *North Central Cancer Treatment Group (Lung Cancer) Dataset* [38] contains observations of 228 patients with 7 features and shows performance scores rate how well the patient can perform usual daily activities. The dataset can be downloaded via the “survival” R package.

The *(Rossi) Dataset* [16] contains 432 convicts who were released from Maryland state prisons in the 1970s. The dataset has 7 features.

SurvBETA is implemented by means of a software in Python. The corresponding software is available at <https://github.com/NTAILab/SurvBETA>.

The following sets of hyperparameters are used to implement the compared models:

1. *SurvBETA with optimization*: the learning rate is from  $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}\}$ ; the number of epochs is taken from the interval  $[50, 500]$ ; the largest number of pairs for each instance is from the interval  $[1, p_{\max}]$ ;  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ ;  $w \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3\}$ ; the bootstrap subsample size varies in the interval  $[0.1, 0.7]$ ; the number of the Beran estimators  $M$  is from the interval  $[10, e_{\max}]$ .
2. *SurvBETA without optimization*:  $w \in \{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3, 10^4\}$ ; the bootstrap subsample size varies in the interval  $[0.1, 0.7]$ ; the number of the Beran estimators  $M$  is taken from  $[10, e_{\max}]$ .
3. *The single Beran estimator*:  $\tau \in \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 10^0, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3\}$ .
4. *RSF*: the number of trees in the RSF varies in the interval  $[20, 500]$ ; the largest tree depth varies in the interval  $[2, 15]$ ; the smallest number of instances in each leaf is from the interval  $[2, 15]$ .
5. *GBM Cox*: the learning rate is from  $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}\}$ ; the number of iterations is from the interval  $[20, 500]$ ; the largest tree depth varies in the interval  $[2, 10]$ .
6. *GBM AFT*: the learning rate is from  $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}\}$ ; the number of iterations  $\in [20, 500]$ ; the largest tree depth varies in the interval  $[2, 10]$ .

Parameters  $e_{\max}$  and  $p_{\max}$  depend on the dataset analyzed. They are equal to the number of instances in the training set.

The comparison results of different models for the above datasets are shown in Table 1. It can be seen from Table 1 that SurvBETA with optimization outperforms other models for most datasets. It is interesting that RSF and GBM Cox also show the outperforming results for some datasets.

In order to formally show that SurvBETA with optimization outperforms other methods, we apply the  $t$ -test, which has been considered by Demsar [11] for testing whether the average difference in the performance of a pair of classifiers is significantly different from zero. The  $t$  statistic in this case is distributed according to the Student’s  $t$ -distribution with  $12 - 1$  degrees of freedom. The  $t$  statistics for the differences lead to the  $p$ -values. The  $p$ -values for pairs of models (SurvBETA with optimization - another model) and (SurvBETA without optimization - another model) are shown

Table 1: C-indices obtained for different datasets by using the single Beran estimator, SurvBETA without optimization, SurvBETA with optimization, RSF, GBM Cox, GBM AFT.

Datasets	Beran estimator	SurvBETA without opt.	SurvBETA with opt.	RSF	GBM Cox	GBM AFT
Veterans	0.6346	0.7051	<b>0.7254</b>	0.7001	0.6821	0.7004
AIDS	0.6466	0.7340	<b>0.7460</b>	0.7339	0.7198	0.5800
Breast Cancer	0.6595	0.7045	<b>0.7184</b>	0.6806	0.7021	0.6979
GBSG2	0.6552	0.6764	0.6826	<b>0.6885</b>	0.6823	0.6777
Whas500	0.7181	0.7580	<b>0.7644</b>	0.7610	0.7528	0.7492
PBC	0.7619	0.7781	0.7879	0.8099	<b>0.8153</b>	0.7969
WPBC	0.6495	0.7191	<b>0.7499</b>	0.6387	0.6159	0.6078
HTD	0.7421	0.8099	<b>0.8279</b>	0.7809	0.7749	0.7932
CML	0.7009	0.7062	0.7100	0.7129	<b>0.7136</b>	0.7114
METABRIC	0.5879	0.6017	0.6244	<b>0.6334</b>	0.6301	0.6321
Lung	0.6256	0.6611	<b>0.6741</b>	0.6115	0.5799	0.5588
Rossi	0.5245	0.6023	<b>0.6177</b>	0.5182	0.5117	0.5380

Table 2: P-values of the model comprison

	Beran estimator	SurvBETA without opt.	RSF	GBM Cox	GBM AFT
SurvBETA with opt.	0.00007	0.00007	0.035	0.038	0.019
SurvBETA without opt.	0.0002	—	0.194	0.112	0.068

in the corresponding rows of Table 2. It can be seen from the results provided in Table 2 that the proposed model significantly outperforms all the considered models because the corresponding p-values are less than 0.05. One can also see from the results that SurvBETA without optimization mostly outperforms other models, but this outperformance cannot be viewed as significant because the corresponding p-values are not less than 0.05. At the same time, SurvBETA without optimization significantly outperforms the single Beran estimator.

The obtained results of numerical experiments show that the proposed model SurvBETA with trainable parameters can be regarded as an alternative tool for survival analysis when datasets have a complex structure.

## 7 Conclusion

A new method called SurvBETA for solving the survival analysis problem under censored data has been presented. It extends and combines ideas behind the Beran estimator and ensemble models to provide a more flexible and robust model. The model is based on three-level attention mechanism. The first attention level is a part of the Beran estimators which assigns weights to pairs of instances. The second attention level aims to find prototypes of bootstrap subsamples related to a new analyzed instance. The first and second levels can be viewed as local attention mechanisms because the mechanisms are applied to weak learners of the ensemble whereas the third attention level is global. It aims to aggregate predictions of all Beran estimators.

The proposed model architecture is flexible. It allows us to replace the Beran estimators with

different models. In this case, the second and third attention mechanisms are not changed. This is important peculiarity of the model because it is able to deal with multimodal data. For example, the Beran estimators as a part of the ensemble model can be trained on tabular data whereas transformer-based models [27] as another part of the ensemble models can be trained on images. The whole architecture can also be trained in the end-to-end manner. Various modifications of the ensemble-based architectures can be regarded as a direction for further research.

On the one hand, we have presented simple modifications of the general model when the imprecise Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model [28] is used to implement the third-level attention mechanism. On the other hand, the general problem has been stated, but not implemented due to the large number of training parameters and the complexity procedure of training. However, several approaches can be applied to implementing intermediate modifications which could provide better results. This is another direction for further research.

Explicit kernels, for example, the Gaussian kernels, have been used in attention mechanisms of all attention levels. However, an interesting direction for further research is to apply universal kernels implemented by means of neural networks which are trained among other training parameters of the whole model. In this case, the neural networks can significantly extend the set of possible ensemble-based models.

## References

- [1] T. Akiba, S. Sano, T. Yanase, T. Ohta, and M. Koyama. Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 2623–2631, 2019.
- [2] A. Barnwal, H. Cho, and T. Hocking. Survival regression with accelerated failure time model in xgboost. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 31(4):1292–1302, 2022.
- [3] V. Van Belle, K. Pelckmans, J.A.K. Suykens, and S. Van Huffel. Support vector machines for survival analysis. In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Computational Intelligence in Medicine and Healthcare (CIMED2007)*, pages 1–8, 2007.
- [4] V. Van Belle, K. Pelckmans, J.A.K. Suykens, and S. Van Huffel. Survival svm: a practical scalable algorithm. In *ESANN*, pages 89–94, 2008.
- [5] R. Beran. Nonparametric regression with randomly censored survival data. Technical report, University of California, Berkeley, 1981.
- [6] L. Breiman. Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning*, 24(2):123–140, 1996.
- [7] L. Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- [8] Yifei Chen, Zhenyu Jia, Dan Mercola, and Xiaohui Xie. A gradient boosting algorithm for survival analysis via direct optimization of concordance index. *Computational and mathematical methods in medicine*, 2013(1):873595, 2013.
- [9] D.R. Cox. Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Methodological)*, 34(2):187–220, 1972.
- [10] C. Curtis, S.P. Shah, S.F. Chin, and et al. The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature*, 486(7403):346–352, 2012.

- [11] J. Demsar. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:1–30, 2006.
- [12] C. Desmedt, F. Piette, S. Loi, Y. Wang, F. Lallemand, B. Haibe-Kains, G. Viale, M. Delorenzi, Y. Zhang, M.S. d’Assignies, and J. Bergh. Strong time dependence of the 76-gene prognostic signature for node-negative breast cancer patients in the TRANSBIG multicenter independent validation series. *Clinical cancer research*, 13(11):3207–3214, 2007.
- [13] Xibin Dong, Zhiwen Yu, Wenming Cao, Yifan Shi, and Qianli Ma. A survey on ensemble learning. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 14:241–258, 2020.
- [14] A.J. Ferreira and M.A.T. Figueiredo. Boosting algorithms: A review of methods, theory, and applications. In C. Zhang and Y. Ma, editors, *Ensemble Machine Learning: Methods and Applications*, pages 35–85. Springer, New York, 2012.
- [15] T.R. Fleming and D.P. Harrington. *Counting processes and survival analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1991.
- [16] J. Fox and M.S. Carvalho. The rcmdrplugin. survival package: Extending the R commander interface to survival analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 49:1–32, 2012.
- [17] Y. Freund and R.E. Schapire. A decision theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):119–139, 1997.
- [18] J.H. Friedman. Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *Annals of Statistics*, 29:1189–1232, 2001.
- [19] J.H. Friedman. Stochastic gradient boosting. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 38(4):367–378, 2002.
- [20] C. Haarbuerger, P. Weitz, O. Rippel, and D. Merhof. Image-based survival analysis for lung cancer patients using CNNs. arXiv:1808.09679v1, Aug 2018.
- [21] S.M. Hammer, D.A. Katzenstein, M.D. Hughes, H. Gundacker, R.T. Schooley, R.H. Haubrich, W.K. Henry, M.M. Lederman, J.P. Phair, M. Niu, and M.S. Hirsch. A trial comparing nucleoside monotherapy with combination therapy in hiv-infected adults with cd4 cell counts from 200 to 500 per cubic millimeter. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 335(15):1081–1090, 1996.
- [22] F. Harrell, R. Califf, D. Pryor, K. Lee, and R. Rosati. Evaluating the yield of medical tests. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 247:2543–2546, 1982.
- [23] R. Hehlmann, H. Heimpel, J. Hasford, H.J. Kolb, H. Pralle, D.K. Hossfeld, W. Queisser, H. Loeffler, A. Hochhaus, and B. Heinze. Randomized comparison of interferon-alpha with busulfan and hydroxyurea in chronic myelogenous leukemia. the german cml study group. *Blood*, 84(12):4064–4077, 1994.
- [24] D. Hosmer, S. Lemeshow, and S. May. *Applied Survival Analysis: Regression Modeling of Time to Event Data*. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 2008.
- [25] T. Hothorn, P. Bühlmann, S. Dudoit, A. Molinaro, and M.J. van der Laan. Survival ensembles. *Biostatistics*, 7(3):355–373, 2006.

- [26] Shi Hu, E. Fridgeirsson, G. van Wingen, and M. Welling. Transformer-based deep survival analysis. In *Survival Prediction-Algorithms, Challenges and Applications*, pages 132–148. PMLR, 2021.
- [27] Shi Hu, Egill Fridgeirsson, Guido van Wingen, and Max Welling. Transformer-based deep survival analysis. In *Survival Prediction-Algorithms, Challenges and Applications*, pages 132–148. PMLR, 2021.
- [28] P.J. Huber. *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, New York, 1981.
- [29] N.A. Ibrahim, A. Kudus, I. Daud, and M.R. Abu Bakar. Decision tree for competing risks survival probability in breast cancer study. *International Journal Of Biological and Medical Research*, 3(1):25–29, 2008.
- [30] H. Ishwaran and U.B. Kogalur. Random survival forests for r. *R News*, 7(2):25–31, 2007.
- [31] H. Ishwaran, U.B. Kogalur, E.H. Blackstone, and M.S. Lauer. Random survival forests. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2:841–860, 2008.
- [32] Bingzhong Jing, Tao Zhang, Zixian Wang, Ying Jin, Kuiyuan Liu, Wenze Qiu, Liangru Ke, Ying Sun, Caisheng He, Dan Hou, et al. A deep survival analysis method based on ranking. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 98:1–9, 2019.
- [33] J. Kalbfleisch and R. Prentice. *The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1980.
- [34] S. Kaneko, A. Hirakawa, and C. Hamada. Enhancing the lasso approach for developing a survival prediction model based on gene expression data. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 2015(Article ID 259474):1–7, 2015.
- [35] J.L. Katzman, U. Shaham, A. Cloninger, J. Bates, T. Jiang, and Y. Kluger. DeepSurv: Personalized treatment recommender system using a Cox proportional hazards deep neural network. *BMC medical research methodology*, 18(24):1–12, 2018.
- [36] A.R. Linero, P. Basak, Yinpu Li, and D. Sinha. Bayesian survival tree ensembles with submodel shrinkage. *Bayesian Analysis*, 17(3):997–1020, 2022.
- [37] Pei Liu, Bo Fu, and Simon X Yang. Hitboost: survival analysis via a multi-output gradient boosting decision tree method. *IEEE Access*, 7:56785–56795, 2019.
- [38] C.L. Loprinzi, J.A. Laurie, H.S. Wieand, J.E. Krook, P.J. Novotny, J.W. Kugler, J. Bartel, M. Law, M. Bateman, and N.E. Klatt. Prospective evaluation of prognostic variables from patient-completed questionnaires. north central cancer treatment group. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 12(3):601–607, 1994.
- [39] M. Luck, T. Sylvain, H. Cardinal, A. Lodi, and Y. Bengio. Deep learning for patient-specific kidney graft survival analysis. arXiv:1705.10245, May 2017.
- [40] R. Meier, S. Graw, J. Usset, R. Raghavan, J. Dai, P. Chalise, S. Ellis, B. Fridley, and D. Koestler. An ensemble-based Cox proportional hazards regression framework for predicting survival in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mcrpc) patients. *F1000Research*, 5:2677, 2016.

- [41] U.B. Mogensen, H. Ishwaran, and T.A. Gerds. Evaluating random forests for survival analysis using prediction error curves. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 50(11):1–23, 2012.
- [42] E.A. Nadaraya. On estimating regression. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 9(1):141–142, 1964.
- [43] M.Z. Nezhad, N. Sadati, K. Yang, and D. Zhu. A deep active survival analysis approach for precision treatment recommendations: Application of prostate cancer. arXiv:1804.03280v1, April 2018.
- [44] Kan Ren, Jiarui Qin, Lei Zheng, Zhengyu Yang, Weinan Zhang, Lin Qiu, and Yong Yu. Deep recurrent survival analysis. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 4798–4805, 2019.
- [45] Y. Ren, L. Zhang, and P. N. Suganthan. Ensemble classification and regression-recent developments, applications and future directions [review article]. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, 11(1):41–53, 2016.
- [46] G. Ridgeway. The state of boosting. *Computing science and statistics*, 31:172–181, 1999.
- [47] O. Sagi and L. Rokach. Ensemble learning: A survey. *WIREs Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 8(e1249):1–18, 2018.
- [48] Stephen Salerno and Yi Li. High-dimensional survival analysis: Methods and applications. *Annual review of statistics and its application*, 10:25–49, 2023.
- [49] W. Sauerbrei and P. Royston. Building multivariable prognostic and diagnostic models: transformation of the predictors by using fractional polynomials. *Journal of the Royal Statistics Society Series A*, 162(1):71–94, 1999.
- [50] M. Schmid, M.N. Wright, and A. Ziegler. On the use of harrell’s c for clinical risk prediction via random survival forests. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 63:450–459, 2016.
- [51] W.N. Street, O.L. Mangasarian, and W.H. Wolberg. An inductive learning approach to prognostic prediction. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 522–530, San Francisco, 1995. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [52] Zhihao Tang, Li Liu, Zongyi Chen, Guixiang Ma, Jiyan Dong, Xujie Sun, Xi Zhang, Chaozhuo Li, Qingfeng Zheng, Lin Yang, et al. Explainable survival analysis with uncertainty using convolution-involved vision transformer. *Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics*, 110:102302, 2023.
- [53] N. Ternes, F. Rotolo, and S. Michiels. Empirical extensions of the lasso penalty to reduce the false discovery rate in high-dimensional cox regression models. *Statistics in medicine*, 35(15):2561–2573, 2016.
- [54] R. Tibshirani. The lasso method for variable selection in the cox model. *Statistics in medicine*, 16(4):385–395, 1997.
- [55] H. Uno, Tianxi Cai, M.J. Pencina, R.B. D’Agostino, and Lee-Jen Wei. On the c-statistics for evaluating overall adequacy of risk prediction procedures with censored survival data. *Statistics in medicine*, 30(10):1105–1117, 2011.



- [56] L.V. Utkin and A.V. Konstantinov. Attention-based random forest and contamination model. *Neural Networks*, 154:346–359, 2022.
- [57] L.V. Utkin and A.V. Konstantinov. Random survival forests incorporated by the nadaraya-watson regression. *Informatics and Automation*, 21(5):851–880, 2022.
- [58] L.V. Utkin, A.V. Konstantinov, V.S. Chukanov, M.V. Kots, M.A. Ryabinin, and A.A. Meldo. A weighted random survival forest. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 177:136–144, 2019.
- [59] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A.N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [60] H. Wang and L. Zhou. Random survival forest with space extensions for censored data. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 79:52–61, 2017.
- [61] Hong Wang and Gang Li. A selective review on random survival forests for high dimensional data. *Quantitative bio-science*, 36(2):85, 2017.
- [62] P. Wang, Y. Li, and C.K. Reddy. Machine learning for survival analysis: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(6):1–36, 2019.
- [63] Zifeng Wang and Jimeng Sun. Survtrace: Transformers for survival analysis with competing events. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM International Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Health Informatics*, pages 1–9, 2022.
- [64] G.S. Watson. Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 359–372, 1964.
- [65] Simon Wiegrebe, Philipp Kopper, Raphael Sonabend, Bernd Bischl, and Andreas Bender. Deep learning for survival analysis: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(65):1–34, 2024.
- [66] M. Wozniak, M. Grana, and E. Corchado. A survey of multiple classifier systems as hybrid systems. *Information Fusion*, pages 3–17, 2014.
- [67] M.N. Wright, T. Dankowski, and A. Ziegler. Unbiased split variable selection for random survival forests using maximally selected rank statistics. *Statistics in Medicine*, 36(8):1272–1284, 2017.
- [68] J. Yao, X. Zhu, F. Zhu, and J. Huang. Deep correlational learning for survival prediction from multi-modality data. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2017*, volume 10434 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 406–414. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [69] Weichi Yao, H. Frydman, D. Larocque, and J.S. Simonoff. Ensemble methods for survival function estimation with time-varying covariates. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 31(11):2217–2236, 2022.
- [70] Z.-H. Zhou. *Ensemble Methods: Foundations and Algorithms*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2012.