
Censor Dependent Variational Inference

Chuanhui Liu¹ Xiao Wang¹

Abstract

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of variational inference in latent variable models for survival analysis, emphasizing the distinctive challenges associated with applying variational methods to survival data. We identify a critical weakness in the existing methodology, demonstrating how a poorly designed variational distribution may hinder the objective of survival analysis tasks—modeling time-to-event distributions. We prove that the optimal variational distribution, which perfectly bounds the log-likelihood, may depend on the censoring mechanism. To address this issue, we propose censor-dependent variational inference (CDVI), tailored for latent variable models in survival analysis. More practically, we introduce CD-CVAE, a V-structure Variational Autoencoder (VAE) designed for the scalable implementation of CDVI. Further discussion extends some existing theories and training techniques to survival analysis. Extensive experiments validate our analysis and demonstrate significant improvements in the estimation of individual survival distributions. Codes can be found at <https://github.com/ChuanhuiLiu/CDVI>.

1. Introduction

Survival analysis, a fundamental topic in statistics, finds wide-ranging applications across healthcare, insurance, quality management, and finance. It focuses on modeling the relationship between time-to-event outcomes and individual demographic covariates, where the event of interest could be death, disease progression, or similar occurrences. A key challenge in survival analysis arises from censored observations, which provide only partial information about the survival time, necessitating specialized methods to handle such data effectively.

Deep learning has emerged as a powerful paradigm to advance survival analysis (Wiegrebe et al., 2024). Recent studies focus on modeling time-to-event distributions via

latent variable survival models (LVSMs), applying various probabilistic assumptions and inference techniques. For example, Ranganath et al. (2016) assumed that the prior of Z belongs to the class of deep exponential family distributions (Brown, 1986). Instead, deep survival machine (Nagpal et al., 2021a) considered the finite discrete latent space, and the time-to-event distribution is one of the finite Gumbel or normal distributions. For discrete time-to-event, (Xiu et al., 2020) modeled a softmax-activated neural network incorporating the Nelson-Aalen estimator (Aalen, 1978), while Apellániz et al. (2024) followed a similar setup, developing variational autoencoders (VAEs) (Kingma & Welling, 2014; Rezende et al., 2014) for continuous time-to-event. These new advances of LVSM have demonstrated superior performance across various metrics, including the time-dependent Concordance Index (Antolini et al., 2005), compared to Accelerated Failure Time (AFT) (Miller, 1976) and Cox Proportional Hazard (CoxPH) (Cox, 1972) models. The exacted latent information also enables various downstream tasks based on the extracted latent representation (Manduchi et al., 2022).

A unique aspect of LVSM optimization is its reliance on variational methods to maintain computational efficiency, due to the intractability of the objective function. Therefore, the variational inference (VI) framework in LVSM is critical to LVSM performance and must be tailored the core task of survival analysis—modeling the time-to-event distribution.

Despite extensive research on the optimality of Variational Inference (VI), its applicability and benefits for time-to-event modeling remain unclear due to the challenges posed by censored data. Furthermore, many aspects of the variational method in existing applications of LVSM remain unclear, including theoretical insights into the inference optimality of LVSM and domain-specific rationales for practical design choices.

This paper provides a comprehensive theoretical analysis of VI optimality and proposes a novel and insightful methodology of LVSM. The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a comprehensive review of LVSM. Section 3 identifies the limitations of variational methods in existing approaches and introduces censor-dependent variational inference (CDVI). Section 4 discusses the implementation of

¹Department of Statistics, Purdue University, USA. Correspondence to: Xiao Wang <wangxiao@purdue.edu>.

CDVI in VAE-based models, offering practical insights and several key implications. Section 5 validates CDVI and our proposed models through extensive experiments.

2. Preliminaries

Notations: Random variables (r.v.) are denoted by capital alphabetical letters, e.g. X, Z, Y, U, C , and their distribution functions have matching subscripts. \mathcal{X} denotes the sample space of X . $P(\cdot), F(\cdot), p(\cdot), S(\cdot), h(\cdot)$ respectively denote a general probability function, a cumulative distribution function, a density function, a survival (tail) function, and a hazard function. Subscripts in Greek letters θ, ϕ denote the unknown parameters. E.g. $S_{Y,\theta}(\cdot)$ refers to the survival function of Y parameterized by θ . Different densities are distinguished by additional letters, such as $f_\theta(\cdot) = p_{U,\theta}(\cdot), q_\phi(\cdot) = p_{Z,\phi}(\cdot)$. A proportional relationship over x is denoted as \propto_x . Estimates of functions or random variables are indicated with a caret or dot symbol above, e.g., $\hat{S}(\cdot)$ is an estimate of $S(\cdot)$. \log denotes natural logarithms. Bold symbol \mathbf{x} denotes vectors.

2.1. Right-censoring and Partial Log-likelihood

In survival analysis tasks, we are given a dataset consisting of n triplets $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \delta_i\}_{i=1}^n$. In a single-event right-censoring setting, the event indicator δ_i is binary valued. In particular, $\delta_i = 1$ signifies that y_i is the observed time of the event of interest (time-to-event), while $\delta_i = 0$ signifies that y_i is right-censored and the true time-to-event of subject i exceeds the observed value.

We assume the dataset consists of i.i.d. random variables $\{X, Y, I\}$, where Y is the continuous observed survival time, I is the binary event status, and X represents individual feature. Notably, (Y, I) is considered as surjective maps of two continuous random variables (U, C) , where U is the uncensored time-to-event and C is the censoring time. Specifically, assume that $U \perp\!\!\!\perp C | X$, we define

$$Y = \min(U, C), \quad I = \mathbb{1}(U \leq C). \quad (1)$$

For any data triplet $\{\mathbf{x}, y, \delta\}$, the parameters θ, η for U, C determine the *density*¹ of y, δ conditioned on \mathbf{x} . The logarithm of the partial likelihood $p_{U,\theta}(y|\mathbf{x})^\delta S_{U,\theta}(y|\mathbf{x})^{1-\delta}$, while not a proper density, defines the objective function $L(\theta)$ for time-to-event modeling. Formally, it is given as

$$L(\theta) := \delta \log f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \delta) \log S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}), \quad (2)$$

where $f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}) = p_{U,\theta}(y|\mathbf{x})$ and $S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x})$ represent the density and survival functions of U evaluated at y , respectively.

¹Radon–Nikodym derivative of the distribution $P(Y, I|X)$ w.r.t. the product of the Lebesgue and counting measure.

2.2. Latent Variable Survival Model

LVSMS construct $f_\theta(u|x)$ from (2) within a latent structure using a continuous latent variable Z , enabling a more flexible and expressive characterization than traditional methods. As shown in Fig.1, it is given by

$$f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}) = \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z) \pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x}) dz. \quad (3)$$

We refer to $\pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})$ as the prior of Z . Especially, an AFT model can be interpreted as LVSM in a d-separation latent structure, as illustrated in Fig 1.b, constrained by a linear latent, e.g., $Z|X = \alpha + \beta^\top X$.




Figure 1: Directed acyclic graphs of LVSM. The shaded nodes \mathbf{x}, y, δ are observed. (a) The dashed box shows a general generative graph of U . (b) D-separation, denoted in solid line, assumes $X \perp U | Z$; Dashed line shows a V-structure graph, assuming a X -independent latent Z .

While LVSM is more flexible, the M-estimation of θ , i.e., $\hat{\theta}_{mle} = \arg \max L(\theta)$ is challenging due to its computational cost. Specifically, f_θ in (2) may lack a closed-form integral, rendering it even harder to approximate S_θ reliably.

2.3. Vanilla Variational Inference for LVSM

As a solution, VI is one of the common techniques in LVSM. Here, we review a general framework of VI, referred to as the **Vanilla VI**, as seen in Ranganath et al. (2016); Xiu et al. (2020); Apellániz et al. (2024). Specifically, unbiased tractable estimators are proposed via a variational distribution $q_\phi(z|\mathbf{x}, y)$. By Jensen’s inequality, $\log f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}), \log S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x})$ in Eq. 2 can be lower bounded by

$$\log f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi} \log f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}, z) - \text{KL}[q_\phi || \pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})], \quad (4)$$

$$\log S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi} \log S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}, z) - \text{KL}[q_\phi || \pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})]. \quad (5)$$

The expectation of the plug-in estimator $\hat{L}(\theta)$ yields the lower bound of $L(\theta)$, which is given by in Xiu et al. (2020),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ELBO}(\theta, \phi) := & \delta \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi} \log f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}, z) \\ & + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi} \log S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x}, z) - \text{KL}[q_\phi || p_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In case that $p_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$ is intractable, Ranganath et al. (2016); Apellániz et al. (2024) further decomposed the $\text{KL}[q_\phi||p_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})]$ (KLD) as shown below. The intractable $\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is moved into $L(\theta)$ by rearrangement.

$$\text{KLD} = \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) + \text{KL}[q_\phi||\pi(\mathbf{z})] - \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi} \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}). \quad (7)$$

When the distributions in (6) (and (7)) are tractable, efficient computation of both the expectation and KL divergence improves scalability for large datasets. Often, optimizing $\text{ELBO}(\theta, \phi)$ can be done by amortized black-box VI algorithms (Ranganath et al., 2014) via the reparameterization trick (Kingma & Welling, 2014; Rezende et al., 2014).

2.4. Variational Inference Optimality

The key distinction in ELBO optimization lies in its pursuit of two distinct objectives *simultaneously*: 1) the M-estimation of θ and 2) the variational bound of the partial log-likelihood. The second objective aims to minimize the *inference gap* (Cremer et al., 2018), i.e., bias, of $L(\theta)$:

$$B(\theta, \phi) := L(\theta) - \text{ELBO}(\theta, \phi). \quad (8)$$

Since the optimum $(\theta^*, \phi^*) := \arg \max \text{ELBO}(\theta, \phi)$ balances the best of these two results, the accuracy of θ^* inherently relies on the optimality of VI. A suboptimal VI solution leads to a significant and irreducible inference gap, i.e., $\min_\phi B(\theta, \phi) \gg 0$, which prevents θ^* from correctly recovering true M-estimator $\hat{\theta}_{mle}$. Consequently, improper variational approximations introduce bias and degrade the reliability of parameter estimates.

Obviously, common knowledge of VI in a supervised setting, such as optimal $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, y)$ being related to intractable posterior $p_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, y)$, fails to extend to survival analysis. That said, variational methods proposed in existing applications lack adequate depth and often are counter-intuitive from a Bayesian perspective, leaving ambiguity about their purpose and effectiveness. For example, Nagpal et al. (2021a) adopted a lazy strategy in obtaining q_ϕ , where q_ϕ is manually set to be the tractable $p_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$. Similarly, Apellániz et al. (2024) limited q_ϕ to depend on X only, making it completely ignore the information of y .

3. Theories

This section focuses on the foundational theories of the inference optimality for LVSM in a single-event right-censoring scenario, assuming at least one censored and one uncensored survival time are observed. The results are formulated without taking into account the practical limitations.

3.1. Problems in vanilla VI

We start by analyzing the equality conditions of Eq. 4 and Eq. 5 *without* censoring involved. The notation u here stresses the dependency on U instead of survival time Y .

Lemma 3.1 (Equality conditions of Eq. 4 and Eq. 5).

Given any parameter θ , the point-wise equality in Eq. 4 holds for any $\{X = \mathbf{x}, U = u\}$, if and only if one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u) = f_\theta(u, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})/f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x})$, where $f_\theta(u, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) := f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\pi_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$;
- (b) \exists map c_1 , $f_\theta(u, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})/q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u) = c_1(\mathbf{x}, u)$;
- (c) $\text{KL}[q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u)||p_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u)] = 0$.

Likewise, Eq. 5 holds for any $\{X = \mathbf{x}, U = u\}$, if and only if the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (a') $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u) = S_\theta(u, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})/S_\theta(u|\mathbf{x})$, where we abuse $S_\theta(u, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) := \int_{s=u}^{\infty} f_\theta(s, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})ds$;
- (b') \exists map c_2 , $S_\theta(u, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})/q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u) = c_2(\mathbf{x}, u)$.

The conditions for Eq. 4 follow the standard VI argument, and the conditions for Eq. 5 are derived under the additional assumption of Fubini's Theorem. As these two conditions differ, a natural question arises: *Given any θ and (\mathbf{x}, u) , what kind of $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u)$ would satisfy both conditions?*

Perhaps surprisingly, Proposition 3.1 below shows that these conditions are more than conflicting, leading to notorious issues. For notation clarity, let $\Phi_1(\theta)$ denote the set of ϕ where Eq. 4 holds equal, $\Phi_2(\theta)$ denote the one for Eq. 5, so $\Phi_U(\theta) := \Phi_1(\theta) \cap \Phi_2(\theta)$ is the ideal parameter set for optimal q_ϕ with no constraints. We define $\Theta_U := \{\theta \mid \Phi_U(\theta) \neq \emptyset\}$ to denote the support set of θ .

Proposition 3.1 (Degradation for optimal $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u)$).

Assuming that 1) optimal VI is feasible: $\Theta_U \neq \emptyset$, and 2) $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is a location-scale density with location $\mu_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and scale σ . Then, given any \mathbf{x}, u ,

- (1) **Latent non-identifiability:** $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, $h_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is independent of \mathbf{z} ;
- (2) **Location degradation:** $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, location parameter $\mu_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is independent of \mathbf{z} ;
- (3) **Lazy posterior:** $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, $\forall \phi \in \Phi_U(\theta)$, the variational distribution $\text{KL}[q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u)||\pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})] = 0$;
- (4) **Surely posterior collapse:** If $\mathbf{z} \perp \mathbf{x}$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, $\phi \in \Phi_U(\theta)$, $\text{KL}[q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, u)||\pi(\mathbf{z})] = 0$.

To be specific, claims (1) and (2) assert that $h_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, or equivalently $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, is independent of \mathbf{z} , disregarding the latent information from prior $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$. Remarkably, such behavior of $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, called *latent non-identifiability* (Wang et al., 2021), is first identified in survival analysis. Furthermore, under the location-scale, i.e., distribution assumption of $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$, its mean $\mu_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ reduces to a univariate function, restricting LVSM to a

non-linear AFT regression. This observation may have explained why most of the applications assume a d-separation latent structure, where $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is fully dependent on \mathbf{z} , to mitigate or avoid issues in claim (2). As we mentioned in Section 2.3, the fact that optimal VI can only be achieved on extremely limited support of θ is devastating: optimizing ELBO may inadvertently shift towards its secondary objective.

Moreover, claim (3) demonstrates the negligibility of the optimal q_ϕ , i.e., such q_ϕ collapses to the conditional prior $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$, ignoring the information of u . The reason is simple—since both $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and $S_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ are independent of \mathbf{z} , their posterior equals nothing but their common prior. To this extent, the optimal q_ϕ becomes as lazy as the one in Nagpal et al. (2021a). It also explains the rationale in Apellániz et al. (2024), where the proposed $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$ is not dependent on u . Such an effect can be more detrimental in a V-structure, e.g., the latent \mathbf{z} represents an unseen individual-independent treatment. Claim (4) states that optimal q_ϕ is the prior $\pi(\mathbf{z})$, which leads to a notorious issue called posterior collapse.

We are now ready to incorporate the censored data. Indeed, Eq. 4 and Eq. 5 have different supports, namely, the event space \mathcal{D}_E and the censored space \mathcal{D}_C ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_E &:= \{(x, y) \mid (x, y, 1) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{I}\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_C &:= \{(x, y) \mid (x, y, 0) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{I}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Remark 3.1. For any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}_E \cap \mathcal{D}_C$, Proposition 3.1 is applicable to the optimal q_ϕ .

Remark 3.1 delineates the conditions under which Proposition 3.1 extends to censored data. Specifically, given the data triplets $\{\mathbf{x}, y, 0\}$ and $\{\mathbf{x}, y, 1\}$, the optimal variational distribution q_ϕ that simultaneously satisfies both cases encounters challenges within the framework of Proposition 3.1. Thus, if they are disjoint, e.g., by a Type-I censoring, it is *theoretically* possible for vanilla VI to achieve a zero inference gap, satisfying the conditions of Eq. 4 on \mathcal{D}_E and Eq. 5 on \mathcal{D}_C . That said, the type of censoring and its effect on the partition of the sample space are crucial to the vanilla VI optimality.

It should be stressed that the non-informative censoring assumption, containing random censoring, independent censoring, and Type-I censoring, is too general to define in its influence on the partition of the sample space and vanilla VI optimality. While it is commonly used in the existing literature, the optimality of vanilla VI can vary significantly across these cases. Evident in benchmark datasets (See Table 3), observational studies rarely have disjoint spaces; vanilla VI is at least suboptimal in these benchmark datasets.

3.2. Censor-dependent Variation Inference

We now establish a less restrictive VI framework for LVSM.

Theorem 3.2.1 (Point-wise optimal VI).

Given x, y, δ and parameter θ , the variational distribution $q_\phi(z|x, y, \delta)$ is optimal if and only if for almost every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta) = \lim_{\Delta z \rightarrow 0} P_{\theta, \eta}(z \leq Z \leq z + \Delta z | x, y, \delta) / \Delta z.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{D}_E = \mathcal{D}_C = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$, the optimal q_{ϕ^*} is independent of parameters of the censoring distribution η , and for almost every $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

- (a) $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, 1) = q_{\phi_1^*}(z|x, u)|_{u=y}$, where $\phi_1^* \in \Phi_1(\theta)$.
- (b) $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, 0) = q_{\phi_2^*}(z|x, u)|_{u=y}$, where $\phi_2^* \in \Phi_2(\theta)$.

Thm 3.2.1 states that the optimal density q_ϕ is equal to the posterior density of $P(Z|X, Y, \delta)$. In particular, if there is no overlap of sample spaces due to censoring, the optimal q_ϕ is the one satisfying Lemma 3.1.

Remark 3.2 (Vanilla VI propose a marginal q_ϕ).

Assuming that there is no partition $\mathcal{D}_E = \mathcal{D}_C = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$, the marginalized $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y)$ equals $q_{\phi_i^*}(z|X=x, U=y)$ for any $i = 1, 2$ if and only if $P(\delta = 2 - i | Y = y) = 1$.

Remark 3.2 offers an alternative perspective on Remark 3.1, i.e., the design of q_ϕ in Vanilla VI is at fault. To be specific, the inability of vanilla VI to obtain equality in both (4) and (5) arises from defining q_ϕ as a *marginal* distribution while expecting it to behave as a conditional one. To this extent, further limitations on q_ϕ described in Section 2.3, such as employing a lazy strategy, are irrational.

Remark 3.2 also implies, when there is no disjoint sample subspace, vanilla VI is as optimal as CDVI if and only if there is an absence of event or censoring data.

Definition 3.2. The censor-dependent variational distribution q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} is

$$q_{\phi_1, \phi_2}(z|x, y, \delta) := q_{\phi_1}(z|x, y)^\delta q_{\phi_2}(z|x, y)^{1-\delta}. \quad (10)$$

Then, the likelihood estimators derived from q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_1(z) &:= f_\theta(y, z|x) / q_{\phi_1}(z|x, y), \\ \hat{S}_1(z) &:= S_\theta(y, z|x) / q_{\phi_2}(z|x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Compared to Vanilla VI, we name it *censor-dependent* because of the necessary dependency of $q_{\phi_1, \phi_2}(z|x, y, \delta)$ on the indicator δ . We use ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 for notation purposes, and the subscript 1 for further discussions. Of importance, it leads to **Censor-dependent ELBO**:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ELBO-C} &:= \delta [\mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi_1}} \log f_\theta(y|x, z) - \text{KL}[q_{\phi_1} \parallel \pi_\theta(z|x)]] \\ &+ (1 - \delta) [\mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi_2}} [\log S_\theta(y|x, z)] - \text{KL}[q_{\phi_2} \parallel \pi_\theta(z|x)]]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Next, we show its suitability for optimal VI and how it resolves the previous issues. For brevity, an informal theorem is presented below, with the formal version in Appendix A.2. Let $\Phi_P(\theta) = \{(\phi_1, \phi_2) \mid \phi_1 \in \Phi_1(\theta), \phi_2 \in \Phi_2(\theta)\}$ denote the set of optimal parameters of CDVI.

Theorem 3.2.2 (Informal; CDVI optimality).

If $\Phi_P(\theta) \neq \emptyset$, $\forall (\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Phi_P(\theta)$, $q_{\phi_1, \phi_2}(z|x, y, 0) \propto_z h_\theta(y|x, z)q_{\phi_1, \phi_2}(z|x, y, 1)$ and q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} do not have issues in proposition 3.1 on a larger support of θ .

In a nutshell, Thm 3.2.2 highlights that CDVI formulates ELBO-C through a properly designed q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} , which eliminates the problematic constraint $\theta_1 = \theta_2$.

To conclude, our analysis has shown that the vanilla VI framework described in Ranganath et al. (2016); Xiu et al. (2020); Nagpal et al. (2021a); Apellániz et al. (2024) is insufficient and arguably inappropriate for LVSM. Without hindering the M-estimation of θ and the expressiveness of latent survival models, we have shown the importance of the censoring mechanism and CDVI for optimal VI in LVSM.

4. Methods

In this section, we propose a novel implementation of CDVI in VAE-based LVSMs, as well as share insights into ELBO optimization and CDVI augmentation techniques.

4.1. Censor-dependent Conditional VAE




Figure 2: Implementations of Vanilla VI and CDVI.

We propose the Censor-dependent Conditional VAE (CD-CVAE) that estimates parameters θ, ϕ as weights of neural networks. As shown in Fig.2, our proposed CDVI implementation incorporates both y and the event indicator δ as input of the encoder. Fig.3 illustrates that its decoder leverages a V-structure and employs both Gaussian and Gumbel-minimum distribution families of ε , interpretable as an infinite LogNormal or Weibull mixture survival regression on

positive survival time.




Figure 3: Generative graph of CD-CVAE.

4.2. Training Strategy of Decoder Variance

As shown in Fig.3b, σ is an *independent* model parameter that is *jointly* updated with all other parameters. Here, we emphasize in Prop.4.2 that the estimate of decoder variance *cannot* be obtained in closed form. Consequently, a dual-step algorithm that updates it separately, as seen in Rybkin et al. (2021) and Liu & Wang (2025), is not applicable to VAE-based LVSM, although it is preferred. For notation clarity, we decompose $\theta = \{\zeta, \sigma\}$ in this subsection.

Proposition 4.2 (No closed form update of σ). Given the dataset $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \delta_i\}$ and ζ, ϕ_1, ϕ_2 , the optimum of σ by $\frac{\partial \text{ELBO-C}(\theta, \zeta, \sigma)}{\partial \sigma} = 0$ has no closed-form solution. In particular, if ε follows a normal distribution, we have

$$\frac{\partial \text{ELBO-C}}{\partial \sigma} = \mathbb{E}_q \left[\sum_{i: \delta_i=1} \frac{\tilde{y}_i^2}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{\sigma} \right] + \sum_{i: \delta_i=0} h(\tilde{y}_i) \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sigma},$$

where $\tilde{y} = (y - \mu_\zeta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})) / \sigma$ is the location-scale standardized time y .

4.3. Augmented CDVI and the implementations

This section formulates different log-likelihood estimators, and its expectation as ELBO and introduces the variant of our proposed model, adopting established VI techniques: 1) importance sampling and 2) delta methods to generalize CDVI,

Definition 4.3 (Importance weighted estimator for CDVI). Following Definition 3.2, the unbiased Monte Carlo estimators of likelihood $f_\theta(y|x)$, $S_\theta(y|x)$ are defined as

$$\hat{f}_m := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{z}_i), \quad \hat{S}_k := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \hat{S}_1(\mathbf{z}_j), \quad (13)$$

where \mathbf{z}_i and \mathbf{z}_j are independent samples from q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} , assuming $\delta = 1, 0$, respectively.

As expected, (13) defines a general $\hat{L}_{m,k} := \log(\hat{f}_m^\delta \hat{S}_k^{1-\delta})$ for $L(\theta)$. Computing its expectation allows us to generalize (12) to ELBO-C $_{(m,k)}$, as well as (8) to $B(m, k)$

Next, we establish 3 key results about the properties of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$, providing deeper insights into augmented CDVI in both the finite m, k case and the asymptotic regime as $m, k \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 4.3.1 (Monotonicity of $B(m, k)$).

Given any θ, ϕ , for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}_+$,
 $B(1, 1) \geq B(m, k) := L(\theta) - \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k}(\theta, \phi)$
 $\geq \max(B(m, k+1), B(m+1, k))$
 $\geq B(m+1, k+1) \geq \lim_{m', k' \rightarrow \infty} B(m', k') = 0$

The dependency of $B(m, k)$ on model parameters θ, ϕ is omitted; $B(1, 1)$ is equal to the gap of (12) in Thm 4.3.1.

Thm 4.3.1 generalizes the well-known property of Burda et al. (2015) to CDVI. Specifically, we prove that the generalized inference gap $B(m, k)$ is monotonic in both size m and k . In other words, ELBO-C $_{m,k}$ yields a smaller inference gap for any $m > 1, k > 1$ given a fixed θ, ϕ_1, ϕ_2 , which vanishes as $m, k \rightarrow \infty$. That said, Thm 4.3.1 holds for any ϕ_1, ϕ_2 , including the constrained ones $\phi_1 = \phi_2$, as seen in Xiu et al. (2020).

Theorem 4.3.2 (Self-normalized Importance Sampling).

Let $Q_1(m), Q_2(k)$ be the augmented variational distribution, and $P_1(m), P_2(k)$ be the augmented posterior distribution, defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(m) &= \hat{f}_1 \prod_{i=1}^m q_{\phi_1}(z_i|x, y), & Q_1(m) &= J_1(m)/\hat{f}_m \\ J_2(k) &= \hat{S}_1 \prod_{j=1}^k q_{\phi_2}(z_j|x, y), & Q_2(k) &= J_2(k)/\hat{S}_k \\ P_1(m) &\propto_{z_{1:m}} J_1(m), & P_2(k) &\propto_{z_{1:k}} J_2(k). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Then, given any x, y, δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{Q_1, Q_2}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] \\ = \text{KL}[Q_1(m)||P_1(m)]^\delta \text{KL}[Q_2(k)||P_2(k)]^{(1-\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Thm 4.3.2 extended and corrected the results from Domke & Sheldon (2018), formulating augmented CDVI as another lower bound and KL divergence. This result generalizes the established connection of self-normalized importance sampling (SNIS) to CDVI. For example, (\hat{f}_1/\hat{f}_m) can be seen as a self-normalized weight. However, as we point out, it does not enable a direct comparison between $B(m, k)$ and $B(1, 1)$, since the expectation is taken over Q_1 and Q_2 . Detailed discussion can be found in Appendix B.6.

Theorem 4.3.3 (Informal; Consistency).

Under some moment assumptions, for $m \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty$, the variance of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$ goes to zero, and thus $\hat{L}_{m,k}$ is a bi-

ased yet consistent estimator of $L(\theta)$, i.e., for any $\xi > 0$,

$$\lim_{m, k \rightarrow \infty} P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - L(\theta)| > \xi) = 0.$$

Despite that Thm 4.3.1 has shown a vanishing bias of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$, Thm 4.3.3 quantifies the asymptotic behavior of its variance, thereby establishing its consistency. This result is extended from Nowozin (2018), enhancing CDVI under ideal assumptions with theoretical guarantees. Thm 4.3.3 also leads to the tradeoff of unbiasedness and asymptotic bias below.

Definition 4.3 (Delta method estimator for CDVI).

A biased variant of Definition 4.3 is defined as

$$\hat{f}_m := \exp\{\hat{\alpha}_2/(2m\hat{f}_m^2)\}\hat{f}_m, \quad (16)$$

$$\hat{S}_k := \exp\{\hat{\beta}_2/(2k\hat{S}_k^2)\}\hat{S}_k, \quad (17)$$

where we define $\hat{\alpha}_2$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$ as the corresponding sample variances of $\{\hat{f}_1(z_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{\hat{S}_1(z_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, e.g., $\hat{\alpha}_2 := \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^m (\hat{f}_1(z_i) - \hat{f}_m)^2$.

We show in Appendix A.4 that the Delta method (Teh et al., 2006) induced log-likelihood estimator $\hat{L}_{m,k}$ enjoys less asymptotic bias of $L(\theta)$ compared to (13), if m, k are sufficiently large.

5. Experiments

We refer to the above-mentioned techniques as IS, and DVI. The additional details of experiments are in Appendix C.

5.1. Evaluation Metrics

Concordance index (Harrell et al., 1982) : Concordance measures the effectiveness of a discriminative model in ranking survival times correctly. Specifically, it assesses whether the model assigns a shorter predicted time to the event, \hat{u}_i , or a lower survival probability, $\hat{S}(t|x_i)$, at any test time t , for a subject with features x_i who experienced the event at time u_i , compared to a subject with features x_j who survived longer. Due to censoring, only comparable pairs $y_i \leq y_j, \delta_i = 1$ are considered. Thus, Harrell's C-index is defined as:

$$C(t) = P(\hat{S}(t|x_i) \leq \hat{S}(t|x_j) \mid y_i \leq y_j, \delta_i = 1).$$

We evaluate the trained models by calculating the average C-index over ten quantiles, ranging from 10th to 100th quantile in increments of 10, of event test times.

Brier score (Graf et al., 1999): It is a weighted squared prediction error reweighted by Inverse Probability of Censoring Weighting (IPCW), which assesses the model's con-

formity/calibration, as well as prediction accuracy.

$$\text{Brs}(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbb{I}(y_i \leq t, \delta_i = 1) \frac{(0 - \hat{S}(t|\mathbf{x}_i))^2}{\hat{S}_C(y_i)} + \mathbb{I}(y_i > t) \frac{(1 - \hat{S}(t|\mathbf{x}_i))^2}{\hat{S}_C(t)}],$$

where $\hat{S}_C(\cdot)$ is the estimated survival distribution of the censoring random variable C . We evaluate the Brier score at the 75th quantile of event time on the test dataset.

Time-dependent C-index (Antolini et al., 2005): Compared to the Harrell’s C -index, it considers a more limited yet practical set of comparable pairs, where selected subjects who developed the event earlier can’t survive longer than the event horizon t . Formally, it is defined as

$$C^{td}(t) = P(\hat{S}(t|x_i) \leq \hat{S}(t|x_j) | y_i \leq y_j, \delta_i = 1, y_i \leq t).$$

Following conventions, we set the event horizon at the 75th quantile of the event time, and we compute it using IPCW and truncations, aiming to obtain an unbiased estimate of $u_i < u_j$ by giving more weight to test samples with similar features that are not censored.

5.2. Inference Optimality on Simulated Datasets

Table 1: Summary table for simulated datasets (SD1-SD6). Sample size for each dataset is 10,000. Event/Censored time refers to sample statistics of Y . The generated samples of U is independently sampled across each datasets. The starting point of Gibbs sampling is fixed at $z = (0, 0)$.

Summary	SD1	SD2	SD3	SD4	SD5	SD6
Censor rate	0%	5%	20%	30%	50%	100%
Population mean μ_C	-	16.00	8.50	5.50	0.00	16.00
Censored time mean	-	2.99	-0.11	-1.51	-4.49	16.18
Event time median	1.43	1.29	0.41	-0.30	-3.13	-
Event time min	-12.64	-15.85	-22.47	-22.59	-24.28	-
Event time max	21.27	21.60	17.49	18.45	14.29	-

Firstly, we investigate whether amortized CDVI can practically reduce the inference gaps compared to the vanilla VI. Table 1 provides a detailed view of population parameters and sample statistics of 6 simulated datasets. To be specific, we use Gibbs sampling, where the true posterior is known and predefined. Both $P(Z|X, Y, I = 1)$ and $P(Z|X, Y, I = 0)$ are set to normal distributions, which enable the closed-form computation of the inference gaps. We vary the mean of censoring time μ_C to generate datasets with different censoring rates, in which C follow an independent normal distribution. The values of the censoring rate are rounded, with an error of 1%.

Our proposed baseline model CD-CVAE, as shown in Table 2, significantly reduces the average KL divergence between the learned posterior and the true posterior in both event

Table 2: Variational inference on simulated datasets. E-KL/C-KL: the average KL divergence between the encoder and true posterior of all Events/Censoring observations in the dataset. Lower is better. We set $m = k = 10$.

Data	CD-CVAE		CVAE		CD-CVAE ^{IS}		CD-CVAE ^{IS-DVI}	
	E-KL	C-KL	E-KL	C-KL	E-KL	C-KL	E-KL	C-KL
SD1	1.65	-	1.65	-	1.53	-	1.56	-
SD2	1.66	1.93	1.75	2.70	1.64	2.17	1.66	2.55
SD3	2.38	3.13	2.79	3.18	2.23	3.21	2.17	3.13
SD4	2.88	3.89	3.45	4.04	2.64	4.09	2.29	3.60
SD5	4.45	5.55	5.42	5.86	4.11	5.56	3.89	5.51
SD6	-	.0871	-	.0871	-	.0862	-	.0848

and censoring subsets, and so the inference gap, which is a weighted sum of these two metrics. Leveraging VI improvement techniques, CD-CVAE further reduces the inference gap across various settings of censoring.

In cases of extreme censoring/event scenarios, where Y is manually set to U or C , CD-CVAE performs identically to CVAE, which is expected by Remark 3.2. Interestingly, all models perform considerably better in the all-event scenario compared to the all-censoring scenario, and neither IS nor DVI yields significant performance improvements. Although learning a data-independent distribution of C should be simpler, such a large discrepancy between these two extreme cases may imply that the amortization effect (Cremer et al., 2018) can dominate the inference gap. This observation highlights potential opportunities for practical inference improvements of amortized CDVI.

During the experiment, we also found that CD-CVAE models can converge to various local optima with nearly the same inference gap, while having different ratios of E-KL and C-KL. This observation implies a unique trade-off in the amortization CDVI, i.e., the censor/event KL trade-off. A follow-up work on the interpretation of such trade-off would be meaningful.

Table 3: Summary table for benchmark clinical datasets. $\bar{y}|\delta$ refers to the average event/censored survival times after applying a log transformation.

Dataset	Size	Censored	Dim(X)	$\bar{y} \delta = 1$	$\bar{y} \delta = 0$
SUPPORT	9104	2904	14	6.17	6.97
FLCHAIN	6524	4662	8	8.20	8.37
NWTCO	4028	3457	6	7.73	7.86
METABRIC	1980	854	8	7.99	8.14
WHAS	1638	948	5	6.95	7.17
GBSG	1546	965	7	3.80	4.18
PBC	418	257	17	4.16	4.32

5.3. Time-to-event Modeling on Benchmark Datasets

Lastly, we present a comprehensive evaluation of our proposed model, comparing CD-CVAE with state-of-the-art models. These models include Cox-PH (Cox, 1972), DeepSurv (Katzman et al., 2018), Deep Survival Machine

Table 4: Comparisons of CD-CVAE on benchmark datasets. The best model is selected based on the cross-validated C -index C value. The experiments are repeated five times using the same random seeds, with a train-validation-test split ratio of 0.6, 0.2, 0.2. The highest metrics on the test dataset is reported. Higher is better: random guessing has a value of 0.5 and 1 means all comparable pairs are perfected ranked.

Model	SUPPORT		FLCHAIN		NWTCO		METABRIC		WHAS		GBSG		PBC	
	C	C^{td}												
CoxPH	0.666	0.668	0.789	0.789	0.689	0.703	0.641	0.644	0.781	0.782	0.682	0.689	0.848	0.848
DeepSurv	0.648	0.649	0.780	0.805	0.674	0.741	0.664	0.676	0.786	0.762	0.609	0.618	0.855	0.852
DSM	0.666	0.674	0.801	0.802	0.706	0.694	0.666	0.669	0.811	0.805	0.615	0.663	0.862	0.869
RSF	0.683	0.655	0.768	0.793	0.677	0.726	0.686	0.684	0.808	0.811	0.706	0.731	0.857	0.867
DCM	0.682	0.676	0.788	0.803	0.680	0.736	0.689	0.691	0.803	0.811	0.625	0.637	0.866	0.865
CD-CVAE	0.685	0.678	0.811	0.804	0.708	0.751	0.681	0.675	0.868	0.812	0.706	0.702	0.863	0.865

Table 5: Comparisons of CD-CVAE in Brier Scores. The best model is selected based on the cross-validated Brier score. Experiments are repeated five times with the same random seeds, reporting the lowest test metric. Lower is better.

Model	SUPPORT	FLCHAIN	NWTCO	MTBC	WHAS	GBSG	PBC
CoxPH	0.216	0.121	0.097	0.214	0.174	0.222	0.125
DeepSurv	0.212	0.115	0.078	0.230	0.198	0.242	0.131
DSM	0.235	0.113	0.078	0.223	0.175	0.242	0.128
RSF	0.224	0.120	0.077	0.218	0.162	0.217	0.119
DCM	0.217	0.113	0.075	0.216	0.171	0.229	0.136
CD-CVAE	0.218	0.110	0.075	0.203	0.168	0.218	0.124

(DSM) (Nagpal et al., 2021a), Deep Survival Forest (DSF) (Ishwaran et al., 2008), and Deep Cox Mixture (DCM) (Nagpal et al., 2021b). All of these models were implemented via a Python package by Nagpal et al. (2022).

Our implementation follows the same API of this package from input to output, making it easier for reproducing the results. In this experiment, we evaluate the baseline CD-CVAE model as IS and DVI do not exhibit significant improvements in evaluation metrics, while adding computational costs and complexity of hyper-parameter selection. Table 3 summarizes the real-world datasets.

Table 4 illustrates the superior performance of CD-CVAE, evaluated by C and C^{td} metrics. Our proposed model overall outperforms most of the state-of-the-art models: RSF and DCM are notably competitive in terms of both computation efficiency and hyper-parameter selection. Nonetheless, we also find that the performance of CoxPH with a l_2 regularization is not significantly worse than ours in many datasets.

To conclude, we show in Table 5 that CD-CVAE also outperforms the majority of the state-of-the-art survival models in terms of the Brier score, showing its superior performance.

6. Related Work

Deep Learning in Survival analysis. Machine learning and deep learning techniques for survival analysis are not

limited to LVSM. Faraggi & Simon (1995) introduced the first neural-network-based Cox regression model, allowing nonlinear relationships between covariates. A modern yet similar one is DeepSurv (Katzman et al., 2018). Deep Cox Mixture (Nagpal et al., 2021b) extends this idea to finite mixture models, but all these Coxian models rely on the proportional hazards (PH) assumption, which results in separated survival functions (Antolini et al., 2005) and may be unrealistic. A famous nonparametric tree ensemble approach, Random Survival Forest (Ishwaran et al., 2008), builds multiple decision trees to model the cumulative hazard function, leveraging Nelson-Aalen estimator (Aalen, 1978). That said, hazard function estimation for discrete time-to-event can also be framed as a series of binary classification problems, which can be solved by black-box methods via various network architectures. DeepHit (Lee et al., 2018) uses a simple shared network to model competing risks, while RNN- (Giunchiglia et al., 2018) and Transformer-based (Hu et al., 2021) structures capture sequential relationships in time-specific predictions. These methods often require additional techniques to mitigate overfitting.

Inference Optimality in Survival Analysis. Improving VI of latent variable models has been extensively discussed in general learning tasks. For instance, Cremer et al. (2018) suggests utilizing a more expressive variational family than the commonly used factorized Gaussians. Fu et al. (2019) suggests that an annealed training dynamic for model parameters can enhance the estimated q_ϕ and θ . We subjectively summarize the types of strategies to facilitate a better estimate θ^* : (1) maximize the availability of optimal VI for more θ , i.e., increasing the support of θ , where $\min_\phi B(\theta, \phi) = 0$; (2) propose a tighter lower bound than ELBO to reduce $\min_\phi B(\theta, \phi)$ for general θ ; (3) training strategies to avoid some notorious suboptimal inference like posterior collapse. As contributions, our criticism on vanilla VI, the extensions of IS and DVI on CDVI, and the discussion on decoder variance fall under each type, respectively.

Variational method for other tasks. Variational methods in survival analysis are not limited to time-to-event modeling. One unsupervised task is identifying potential sub-populations, providing valuable insights for treatment recommendations and clinical decision-making (Chapfuwa et al., 2020; Franco et al., 2021; Manduchi et al., 2022; Cui et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2024). These clustering models, if used as an intermediate step of time-to-event modeling, can be seen as a restricted LVSM, often in a D-separation latent structure. While a restrictive approach can help prevent overfitting, our criticism remains valid: the objective of VI in unsupervised tasks can be misaligned with M-estimation of the time-to-event distribution, undermining the performance of survival time prediction.

7. Conclusion

To the best of our knowledge, this paper has represented the first comprehensive study of variational methods for latent variable survival models in survival analysis. It provides a detailed review of existing approaches, delivers an in-depth analysis of variational inference optimality, and offers valuable practical insights. The superiority of our proposed models validates a pioneering paradigm for LVSMs.

References

- Aalen, O. Nonparametric inference for a family of counting processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 701–726, 1978.
- Angelova, J. A. On moments of sample mean and variance. *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math*, 79(1):67–85, 2012.
- Antolini, L., Boracchi, P., and Biganzoli, E. A time-dependent discrimination index for survival data. *Statistics in medicine*, 24(24):3927–3944, 2005.
- Apellániz, P. A., Parras, J., and Zazo, S. Leveraging the variational bayes autoencoder for survival analysis. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):24567, Oct 2024. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-76047-z.
- Baricz, Á. Mills’ ratio: Monotonicity patterns and functional inequalities. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 340(2):1362–1370, 2008.
- Brown, L. D. Fundamentals of statistical exponential families: with applications in statistical decision theory. Ims, 1986.
- Burda, Y., Grosse, R., and Salakhutdinov, R. Importance weighted autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.00519*, 2015.
- Chapfuwa, P., Li, C., Mehta, N., Carin, L., and Henao, R. Survival cluster analysis. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pp. 60–68, 2020.
- Cox, D. R. Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 34(2):187–202, 1972.
- Cremer, C., Li, X., and Duvenaud, D. Inference suboptimality in variational autoencoders. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1078–1086. PMLR, 2018.
- Cui, C., Tang, Y., and Zhang, W. Deep contrastive survival analysis with dual-view clustering. *Electronics*, 13(24), 2024. ISSN 2079-9292. doi: 10.3390/electronics13244866.
- Domke, J. and Sheldon, D. R. Importance weighting and variational inference. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- Faraggi, D. and Simon, R. A neural network model for survival data. *Statistics in medicine*, 14(1):73–82, 1995.
- Franco, E. F., Rana, P., Cruz, A., Calderon, V. V., Azevedo, V., Ramos, R. T., and Ghosh, P. Performance comparison of deep learning autoencoders for cancer subtype detection using multi-omics data. *Cancers*, 13(9):2013, 2021.
- Fu, H., Li, C., Liu, X., Gao, J., Celikyilmaz, A., and Carin, L. Cyclical annealing schedule: A simple approach to mitigating KL vanishing. In Burstein, J., Doran, C., and Solorio, T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 240–250, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1021.
- Giunchiglia, E., Nemchenko, A., and van der Schaar, M. Rnn-surv: A deep recurrent model for survival analysis. In *Artificial Neural Networks and Machine Learning—ICANN 2018: 27th International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks, Rhodes, Greece, October 4-7, 2018, Proceedings, Part III 27*, pp. 23–32. Springer, 2018.
- Graf, E., Schmoor, C., Sauerbrei, W., and Schumacher, M. Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Statistics in medicine*, 18(17-18):2529–2545, 1999.
- Harrell, F. E., Califf, R. M., Pryor, D. B., Lee, K. L., and Rosati, R. A. Evaluating the yield of medical tests. *Jama*, 247(18):2543–2546, 1982.
- Hu, S., Fridgeirsson, E., van Wingen, G., and Welling, M. Transformer-based deep survival analysis. In *Survival Prediction-Algorithms, Challenges and Applications*, pp. 132–148. PMLR, 2021.
- Ishwaran, H., Kogalur, U. B., Blackstone, E. H., and Lauer, M. S. Random survival forests. 2008.
- Jiang, L., Xu, C., Bai, Y., Liu, A., Gong, Y., Wang, Y.-P., and Deng, H.-W. Autosurv: interpretable deep learning framework for cancer survival analysis incorporating clinical and multi-omics data. *NPJ precision oncology*, 8(1):4, 2024.
- Katzman, J. L., Shaham, U., Cloninger, A., Bates, J., Jiang, T., and Kluger, Y. Deepsurv: personalized treatment recommender system using a cox proportional hazards deep neural network. *BMC medical research methodology*, 18: 1–12, 2018.
- Kingma, D. P. and Welling, M. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.

- Kvamme, H., Borgan, Ø., and Scheel, I. Time-to-event prediction with neural networks and cox regression. *Journal of machine learning research*, 20(129):1–30, 2019.
- Lee, C., Zame, W., Yoon, J., and Van Der Schaar, M. DeepHit: A deep learning approach to survival analysis with competing risks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Liu, C. and Wang, X. Doubly robust conditional VAE via decoder calibration: An implicit KL annealing approach. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2025. ISSN 2835-8856.
- Manduchi, L., Marcinkevičs, R., Massi, M. C., Weikert, T., Sauter, A., Gotta, V., Müller, T., Vasella, F., Neidert, M. C., Pfister, M., Stieltjes, B., and Vogt, J. E. A deep variational approach to clustering survival data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- Miller, R. G. Least squares regression with censored data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):449–464, 1976.
- Mitrinovic, D. Analytic inequalities, 1970.
- Nagpal, C., Li, X., and Dubrawski, A. Deep survival machines: Fully parametric survival regression and representation learning for censored data with competing risks. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 25(8):3163–3175, 2021a.
- Nagpal, C., Yadlowsky, S., Rostamzadeh, N., and Heller, K. Deep cox mixtures for survival regression. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, pp. 674–708. PMLR, 2021b.
- Nagpal, C., Potosnak, W., and Dubrawski, A. auton-survival: an open-source package for regression, counterfactual estimation, evaluation and phenotyping with censored time-to-event data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07276*, 2022.
- Nowozin, S. Debiasing evidence approximations: On importance-weighted autoencoders and jackknife variational inference. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2018.
- Pölsterl, S. scikit-survival: A library for time-to-event analysis built on top of scikit-learn. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(212):1–6, 2020.
- Ranganath, R., Gerrish, S., and Blei, D. Black box variational inference. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 814–822. PMLR, 2014.
- Ranganath, R., Perotte, A., Elhadad, N., and Blei, D. Deep survival analysis. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, pp. 101–114. PMLR, 2016.
- Rezende, D. J., Mohamed, S., and Wierstra, D. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1278–1286. PMLR, 2014.
- Rybkin, O., Daniilidis, K., and Levine, S. Simple and effective vae training with calibrated decoders. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9179–9189. PMLR, 2021.
- Teh, Y., Newman, D., and Welling, M. A collapsed variational bayesian inference algorithm for latent dirichlet allocation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 19, 2006.
- Wang, Y., Blei, D., and Cunningham, J. P. Posterior collapse and latent variable non-identifiability. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- Wiegrebe, S., Kopper, P., Sonabend, R., Bischl, B., and Bender, A. Deep learning for survival analysis: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(3):65, 2024.
- Xiu, Z., Tao, C., and Henao, R. Variational learning of individual survival distributions. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pp. 10–18, 2020.
- Zhang, L. Sample mean and sample variance: Their covariance and their (in) dependence. *The American Statistician*, 61(2):159–160, 2007.

A. Facts and Formal Theorems

A.1. Facts of Probability Theory

Why do we claim "CD-CVAE is interpretable as an infinite LogNormal or Weibull mixture survival regression on positive survival time"? But the choice of ε that determines the location-scale family of $p_\theta(u|x, z)$ is implemented as a Normal or Gumbel-minimum distribution.

Answer: A Weibull (Lognormal) AFT of positive valued survival time T is a log-linear regression assuming a Gumbel-min (Gaussian) noise (Miller, 1976). In our setting, continuous time-to-event U is considered to be real-valued after the log-transform of T .

Table 6: Connection between AFT and the degraded LVSM

choice of ε	standarization	$p_\theta(y x, z)$	linear degradation	degraded model w.r.t T
standard Gaussian		$\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{y}^2)/(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)$		Log-normal AFT
standard Gumbel minimum	$\tilde{y} = \frac{y - \mu_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{\sigma}$	$\exp\{\tilde{y} - \exp(\tilde{y})\}/\sigma$	$\mu_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta^\top \mathbf{x}$	Weibull AFT

A.2. Formal Theorem 3.2.2

We have the following *Notations*:

1) The product of sets $\Phi_P(\theta) = \{(\phi_1, \phi_2) \mid \phi_1 \in \Phi_1(\theta), \phi_2 \in \Phi_2(\theta)\}$ denotes the set of optimal parameters of q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} , and $\Theta_P = \{\theta \mid \Phi_P(\theta) \neq \emptyset\}$ denotes its support.

2) $\Phi_{EU}(\theta) = \{(\phi, \phi) \mid \phi \in \Phi_1(\theta, \sigma) \cap \Phi_2(\theta, \sigma)\}$ denotes the embedding set of $\Phi_U(\theta)$. The support $\Theta_{EU} = \{\theta \mid \Phi_{EU}(\theta) \neq \emptyset\}$. For any θ , $\Phi_{EU}(\theta) \subseteq \Phi_P(\theta)$. Optimal q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} is degenerated to the optimal q_ϕ in Vanilla VI if $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Phi_{EU}(\theta)$.

Theorem 3.2.2 (Inference optimality of CDVI).

Following the assumptions. If $\Theta_P \neq \emptyset$, then

(5) **Constraint on optimal ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 .** $\forall (\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Phi_P(\theta), q_{\phi_1}(z|x, y) \propto_z h_\theta(y|x, z)q_{\phi_2}(z|x, y)$.

If $\Theta_P \setminus \Theta_{EU} \neq \emptyset$, we have the following results.

(6) **Strict better optimal ϕ .** $\forall \theta \in \Theta_P \setminus \Theta_{EU}$, we have $\emptyset = \Phi_{EU}(\theta) \subset \Phi_P(\theta)$, and more importantly, $\forall (\phi_1, \phi_2)$, s.t. $\phi_1 = \phi_2, \exists (\phi_1^*, \phi_2^*) \in \Phi_P(\theta)$,

$$L(\theta) = \text{ELBO-C}(\theta, \phi_1^*, \phi_2^*) > \text{ELBO}(\theta, \phi_1, \phi_2).$$

(7) **Non-degraded location parameter.** If $U|X, Z$ is a location-scale distribution parameterized by the location parameter $\mu_\theta(x, z)$ and the deterministic scale parameter σ , then for all $\theta \in \Theta_P \setminus \Theta_{EU}$, there exists $z_1 \neq z_2, \mu_\theta(x, z_1) \neq \mu_\theta(x, z_2)$ for almost all x

(8) **Lazy posterior free.** $\forall \theta \in \Theta_P \setminus \Theta_{EU}, \forall (\phi_1, \phi_2) \in \Phi_P(\theta)$, such that

$$\delta \text{KL}[q_{\phi_1} \parallel p_\theta(z|x)] + (1 - \delta) \text{KL}[q_{\phi_2} \parallel p_\theta(z|x)] > 0.$$

If $z \perp x$ is assumed, i.e., $p_\theta(z|x) = p(z)$, optimal censor-dependent VI is posterior collapse free.

Theorem 3.2.2 demonstrates how the CDVI resolves the issues of vanilla VI. Claim (5) states that the optimal q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} captures the constraints on the parameters ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , preventing it from being reduced to the naive q_ϕ . As we show in Remark 3.2, the assumption of $\phi_1 = \phi_2$ is the root cause of latent non-identifiability in Proposition 3.1. Claim (6) shows that the optimal q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} enjoys expanded support Θ_P , enabling our q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} to achieve VI optimality at specific θ values where vanilla VI would fail. To be specific, Claim (7) demonstrates that θ maintains the complexity and expressive power of the latent variable model $f_\theta(y|x)$. Consequently, Claim (8) shows that the optimal q_{ϕ_1} or q_{ϕ_2} will not remain lazy or suffer from the posterior collapse issue.

A.3. Formal Theorem 4.3.3

Following the definition 4.3, let $\alpha_i := \mathbb{E}[(\hat{f}_m - f)^i]$, and $\beta_i := \mathbb{E}[(\hat{S}_k - S)^i]$ be the i^{th} central moments of unbiased estimators \hat{f}_m and \hat{S}_k . Obviously, $\alpha_1 = 0, \beta_1 = 0$.

Lemma 1 (Asymptotic bias of $\log \hat{f}_m$, and $\log \hat{S}_k$). *If f and α_i is finite for all $i \geq 1$, then for $m \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \log f - \frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{2f^2} + \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2}{4f^4} \right) + o(m^{-2}). \quad (18)$$

If S and β_i are finite for all $i \geq 1$, then for $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}[\log \hat{S}_k] = \log S - \frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{2S^2} + \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{3S^3} - \frac{3\beta_2}{4S^4} \right) + o(k^{-2}). \quad (19)$$

The expectation is taken over $\mathbf{z}_{1:m}$, or $\mathbf{z}_{1:k}$ for any given $\mathbf{x}, y, \theta, \phi_1, \phi_2$.

Lemma 1 demonstrates the asymptotic bias of importance sampling induced loglikelihood estimators $\log \hat{f}_m$ and $\log \hat{S}_k$, which has an order of magnitude of m^{-1} or k^{-1} .

Lemma 2 (Asymptotic variance of $\log \hat{f}_m$, and $\log \hat{S}_k$). *If f and α_i are finite for all $i \geq 1$, then for $m \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{V}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{5\alpha_2}{f^4} \right) + o(m^{-2}). \quad (20)$$

Similarly, if S and β_i are finite for all $i \geq 1$, then for $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{V}[\log \hat{S}_k] = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{S^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{S^3} - \frac{5\beta_2}{S^4} \right) + o(k^{-2}). \quad (21)$$

Recall that $\hat{L}_{m,k} := \delta \log \hat{f}_m + (1 - \delta) \log \hat{S}_k$, we use lemma 1 & 2 to get the following.

Lemma 3 (Asymptotic bias of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$). *Under the assumption of Lemma 1, for $m, k \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta)\text{-ELBO-C}_{m,k} &= \delta \left[\frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{2f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2}{4f^4} \right) \right] \\ &+ (1 - \delta) \left[\frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{2S^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{3S^3} - \frac{3\beta_2}{4S^4} \right) \right] + o(m^{-2}) + o(k^{-2}). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Lemma 4 (Asymptotic variance of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$). *Under the assumption of Lemma 1, for $m, k \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}[(\hat{L}_{m,k} - L(\theta))^2] = \delta \left[\frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{20\alpha_2}{4f^4} + \frac{\alpha_2^2}{f^4} \right) \right] + (1 - \delta) \left[\frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{S^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{S^3} - \frac{20\beta_2}{4S^4} + \frac{\beta_2^2}{S^4} \right) \right] + o(m^{-2}) + o(k^{-2}). \quad (23)$$

Theorem 4.3.3 (Formal; Consistency of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$).

Under the assumption in Lemma 1, for $m \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\xi > 0$,

$$\lim_{m,k \rightarrow \infty} P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - L(\theta)| > \xi) = 0.$$

The proof is almost a direct result of Lemma 3 and Lemma 4.

A.4. Theorem for Delta method CDVI

We prove that the Delta method CDVI yields a smaller asymptotic inference gap/bias, as we mentioned after Definition 4.3. Following Eq.16 and Eq.17, let $\dot{L}_{m,k} := \delta \log \dot{f}_m + (1 - \delta) \log \dot{S}_k$.

Theorem A.4 (less asymptotic bias of delta method CDVI).

Under the assumption in Lemma 1, for $m \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{2m(\hat{f}_m)} \right] = \frac{\alpha_2}{2mf^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2^2}{2f^4} \right) + o(m^{-2}), \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{\beta}_2}{2k(\hat{S}_k)} \right] = \frac{\beta_2}{2kS^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{S^3} - \frac{3\beta_2^2}{2S^4} \right) + o(k^{-2}),$$

and

$$L(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}[\log \dot{L}_{m,k}] = \delta \left[\frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{2\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2}{4f^4} \right) \right] + (1 - \delta) \left[\frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{2\beta_3}{3S^3} - \frac{3\beta_2}{4S^4} \right) \right] + o(m^{-2}) + o(k^{-2}).$$

Compared with Lemma 3, the asymptotic inference gap/bias is reduced by one order of magnitude of m and k .

B. Proofs

B.1. Proof for Proposition 3.1

Proof of (1): From Lemma 3.1 and assumption 1), for any optimal parameter $\phi \in \Phi_U$, we have

$$q_\phi(z|\mathbf{x}, u) = f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z)\pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})/f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}) = S_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z)\pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})/S_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}),$$

which means for any z ,

$$h_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z) = f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z)/S_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z) = f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x})/S_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}) = h_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}).$$

Proof of (2): Since U is continuous, $h(\cdot)$ in the above equation can be replaced by f, F, S, H due to the 1-1 relationship, e.g. $h(u) = -\frac{\partial \log S(u)}{u}$, leading to $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z) = f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x})$.

Since $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z) \stackrel{d}{=} \mu_\theta(x, z) + \sigma \times \varepsilon$, we claim that $\mu_\theta(x, z)$ is independent of the value of z

Proof of (3): Also based on $f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z) = f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x})$ for any z ,

$$q_\phi(z|\mathbf{x}, u) = f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}, z)\pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x})/f_\theta(u|\mathbf{x}) = \pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x}).$$

Proof of (4): If a V-structure latent graph is assumed, i.e., $z \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{x}$, then the prior $\pi_\theta(z|\mathbf{x}) = \pi(z)$.

Now, (4) can be drawn immediately from the conclusion of (3).

B.2. Proof for Theorem 3.2.1

In the section 2.1, we mentioned that the partial likelihood $f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x})^\delta S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x})^{1-\delta}$, although it contains all the information of θ , is not a proper density. Here we further emphasize that the appropriate variational distribution cannot be discussed separately on the subspace \mathcal{D}_E and \mathcal{D}_C targeting distribution function $f_\theta(y|\mathbf{x})$ and $S_\theta(y|\mathbf{x})$ in the vanilla VI framework (Xiu et al., 2020; Nagpal et al., 2021a), because it leads to ignoring the information of δ .

Proof: Abusing the "density" notation $p(y, \delta, z|x)$ and $p(y, \delta|x)$ for the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $P(Y, I, Z|X)$ and $P(Y, I|X)$, the general variational bound defined in Domke & Sheldon (2018) is

$$\log p(y, \delta|x) = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_z[\log R]}_{\text{bound}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_z[\log \frac{p(y, \delta|x)}{R}]}_{\text{looseness}}.$$

For a simple non-augmented variational bound enabling Jensen's inequality, R should be

$$R(z) = \frac{p(y, \delta, z|x)}{q_\phi(z)}.$$

A tight "looseness" requires the KL divergence being zero, leading to optimal $q_{\phi^*}(z) := p(z|x, y, \delta)$, which is parameterized by both θ from U and η from C . Now we prove that both $p(z|x, y, \delta = 1)$ and $p(z|y, \delta = 0, x)$ will be independent of C and free from η . Assuming that 1) continuous $U|X, C|X$ have the same support \mathcal{U} , 2) conditional independent censoring, 3) independence between C and Z given X , 4) Fubini's theorem is applicable, we have

$$p(z|x, y, \delta = 1) = \frac{p(y, \delta = 1, z|x)}{p(y, \delta = 1|x)} = \frac{p_{U,Z}(y, z|\mathbf{x})P(C \geq y|x)\mathbb{1}(y \in \mathcal{U})}{p_U(y|\mathbf{x})P(C \geq y|x)\mathbb{1}(y \in \mathcal{U})} = \frac{p_U(y|\mathbf{x}, z)p(z|\mathbf{x})}{p_U(y|x)}\mathbb{1}(y \in \mathcal{U}).$$

Reorganizing terms, we get $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 1) = p(z|x, y, \delta = 1) = f_\theta(y, z|x)/f_\theta(y|x)$. We use the similar proof for $q_\phi(z|x, y, \delta = 0)$. We note that the assumption of the same support is inadmissible, and we can also express q_{ϕ^*} as follows

$$q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta) = q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 1)^\delta q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 0)^{1-\delta},$$

which leads to the notation of Definition 3.2.

Proof for Remark 3.2 follows naturally. The marginalized $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y) = p(z|x, y, \delta = 1) * P(\delta = 1|x, y) + p(z|x, y, \delta = 0) * P(\delta = 0|x, y)$, which will not equal $p(z|x, y, \delta = 1)$ or $p(z|x, y, \delta = 0)$ unless one of $P(\delta|x, y)$ is zero.

B.3. Proof for Formal Theorem 3.2.2

Proof of (5): Using the above conclusion of q_{ϕ^*} ,

$$h_{\theta}(y|x, z) := \frac{f_{\theta}(y|x, z)}{S_{\theta}(y|x, z)} = \frac{q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 1) * f_{\theta}(y|x)/p(z|x)}{q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 0) * S_{\theta}(y|x)/p(z|x)}.$$

Denoting $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 1)$ by $q_{\phi_1^*}(z|x, y)$ and reorganizing the terms, we have

$$q_{\phi_1^*}(z|x, y) = \frac{1}{h_{\theta}(y|x)} q_{\phi_2^*}(z|x, y) h_{\theta}(y|x, z) \propto_z q_{\phi_2^*}(z|x, y) h_{\theta}(y|x, z).$$

Proof of (6): The proof is trivial, following the definition of optimal $q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta)$.

Proof of (7): We have already proved in (1) that if $\theta \in \Theta_p$ then $f_{\theta}(u|x, z) = f_{\theta}(u|x)$ and also in (2) that if $f_{\theta}(u|x, z)$ is a location-scale family, it leads to $\mu_{\theta}(x, z)$ independent of z . We now prove the reverse is also true: if $\mu_{\theta}(x, z)$ is independent of z , and $f(u|x, z)$ the density of location-scale family, it leads to $f_{\theta}(u|x, z) = f_{\theta}(u|x)$; $S_{\theta}(u|x, z) = S_{\theta}(u|x)$, thus we have

$$q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 0) = q_{\phi^*}(z|x, y, \delta = 1) = p_{\theta}(z|x).$$

Equivalently, following the notation, we have $\phi_1^* = \phi_2^*$. Thus, $\phi_1^*, \phi_2^* \in \Phi_{EU}$, meaning that $\theta \in \Theta_{EU}$.

Then we complete the proof by contrapositive.

Proof of (8): By non-negativity of KL divergence, the KL divergence is zero if and only if the above equation in (7) holds true. Thus, it is a direct result of (7). If V-structure is assumed, prior $p_{\theta}(z|x)$ is replaced by $p(z)$.

B.4. Proof for Proposition 4.2

Here, we prove that if ε is standard normal or standard Gumbel-minimum distribution, there is no closed-form solution of $\partial \text{ELBO-C} / \partial \sigma$ given the parameter of ζ, ϕ_1, ϕ_2 . For notation clarity, we decompose $\theta = (\zeta, \sigma)$ where $\mu_{\zeta}(x, z)$ is the location parameter of the decoder, and σ is its scale parameter.

Proof: Notice that KL divergence terms in ELBO-C do not involve σ , and the expectation is taken over q_{ϕ_1, ϕ_2} . Given dataset $\{x_i, y_i, \delta_i\}_{i=1}^n$

$$\frac{\partial \text{ELBO-C}}{\partial \sigma} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i: \delta_i=1} \frac{\partial \log f_{\theta}(y_i|x_i, z)}{\partial \sigma} + \sum_{i: \delta_i=0} \frac{\partial \log S_{\theta}(y_i|x_i, z)}{\partial \sigma} \right].$$

Using chain rule and the density in Table 6, we have the following result:

(1) If the decoder is normal, these two terms can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial \log f_{\theta}(y_i|x_i, z)}{\partial \sigma} = -\frac{1}{\sigma} + \frac{\tilde{y}_i^2}{\sigma}, \quad \frac{\partial \log S_{\theta}(y_i|x_i, z)}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{\partial \log 1 - \Phi(\tilde{y}_i)}{\partial \tilde{y}_i} * \frac{\partial \tilde{y}_i}{\partial \sigma} = \lambda(\tilde{y}_i) * \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sigma},$$

where $\lambda(s)$ is the hazard function of the standard normal distribution that 1) has no closed-form expression, 2) is convex, 3) can be bounded. One naive bound is $\lambda(s) > s$; a tighter bound $\lambda(s) \geq \frac{3}{4s} + \frac{\sqrt{s^2+8}}{4}$ for $s > 0$ is provided by Baricz (2008) via Mill's ratio Mitrinovic (1970)

(2) If the decoder is Gumbel-minimum ($S(s) = \exp(-\exp(s))$), these two terms can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial \log f_{\theta}(y_i|x_i, z)}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{\partial(\tilde{y}_i - \exp(\tilde{y}_i))}{\partial \tilde{y}_i} \frac{\partial \tilde{y}_i}{\partial \sigma} - \frac{1}{\sigma} = -\frac{\tilde{y}_i + 1}{\sigma} + \exp(\tilde{y}_i) \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sigma}, \quad \frac{\partial \log S_{\theta}(y_i|x_i, z)}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{\partial -\exp(\tilde{y}_i)}{\partial \tilde{y}_i} * \frac{\partial \tilde{y}_i}{\partial \sigma} = \exp(\tilde{y}_i) \frac{\tilde{y}_i}{\sigma}.$$

Neither of these expressions leads to a closed form solution of σ when $\frac{\partial \text{ELBO-C}}{\partial \sigma} = 0$.

B.5. Proof for Theorem 4.3.1

The proof mainly follows (Burda et al., 2015): we are going to prove the monotonicity of ELBO-C_{m,k}, instead of $B(m, k)$.

Proof: Given m, k , let m', k' be any integers less than m, k , respectively. Denote the subset of index $I_{m'} = \{i_1, \dots, i_{m'}\} \subset \{1, 2, 3, \dots, m\}$ as a uniformly distributed subset of distinct indices where $|I_{m'}| = m'$. $I_{k'}$ follows the same definition for $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, k\}$. For any bounded sequence of a_1, \dots, a_m ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{I_{m'}} \left[\frac{a_{i_1} + \dots + a_{i_{m'}}}{m'} \right] = \frac{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_m}{m}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k} &:= \mathbb{E}[\log(\hat{f}_m^\delta \hat{S}_k^{1-\delta})] = \delta \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:m}}[\log(\hat{f}_m)] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:k}}[\log(\hat{S}_k)] \\ &= \delta \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:m}}[\log \frac{\hat{f}_1(z_1) + \hat{f}_1(z_2) + \dots + \hat{f}_1(z_m)}{m}] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:k}}[\log(\hat{S}_k)] \\ &= \delta \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:m}}[\log \mathbb{E}_{I_{m'}} \frac{\hat{f}_1(z_{i_1}) + \hat{f}_1(z_{i_2}) + \dots + \hat{f}_1(z_{i_{m'}})}{m'}] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:k}}[\log(\hat{S}_k)] \\ &\geq \delta \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:m}}[\mathbb{E}_{I_{m'}}[\log \frac{\hat{f}_1(z_{i_1}) + \hat{f}_1(z_{i_2}) + \dots + \hat{f}_1(z_{i_{m'}})}{m'}]] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:k}}[\log(\hat{S}_k)] \\ &= \delta \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:m'}}[\log \hat{f}_{m'}] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:k}}[\log(\hat{S}_k)] = \text{ELBO-C}_{m',k}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\text{ELBO-C}_{m,k} \geq \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k'}$. Thus,

$$\text{ELBO-C}_{m,k} \geq \max(\text{ELBO-C}_{m',k}, \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k'}) > \min(\text{ELBO-C}_{m',k}, \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k'}) \geq \text{ELBO-C}_{m',k'} \geq \text{ELBO-C}.$$

Here $\text{ELBO-C}_{m,k} \leq L(\theta)$ is ensured by Jensen's inequality and Fubini's theorem.

Assuming a bounded $\hat{f}_1; \hat{S}_1$, we use the strong law of large numbers: for $m \rightarrow \infty, \hat{f}_m \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_1] = f$.

Similar results apply to \hat{S}_k . The results imply convergence in expectation

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty} \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k} = L(\theta).$$

Then, using the definition of $B(m, k) := L(\theta) - \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k}$, we complete the proof by reversing the inequality.

B.6. Proof for Theorem 4.3.2

This theorem is a **corrected** extension of Theorem 1 in Domke & Sheldon (2018). Our proof follows a similar structure, but we first highlight the mistake in the original proof in Theorem 1 in Domke & Sheldon (2018). In their original proof, the definition of Eq.5 is not consistent in Theorem 1, where the expectation in Eq.5 is taken over z_1, \dots, z_m from q_ϕ , while the expectation in Theorem 1 is taken over the augmented variational distribution, as shown on Page 15. Thus, when generalizing their results, we must warn the reader that the KL divergence term does not correspond to the inference gap defined in Thm. 4.3.1

Proof: Some basic facts from the definition: 1) $Q_1(1) = q_{\phi_1}(z|x, y), Q_2(1) = q_{\phi_2}(z|x, y)$; 2) $P_1(1) = f_\theta(y, z|x)$; 3) $P_2(1) = S_\theta(y|x, z)\pi_\theta(z|x)$; 4) For any $m > 0, \int \int J_1(m) dz_{1:m} = \log f(y|x)$; 5) For any $k > 0, \int J_2(k) dz_{1:k} = \log S(y|x)$.

Since $\log p(x) = E_{q(z)} \log \frac{p(x, z)}{q(z)} + \text{KL}[q(z)||p(z|x)]$, we have

$$\log f(y|x) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_1(m)} \log \frac{J_1(m)}{Q_1(m)} + \text{KL}[Q_1(m)||P_1(m)]; \log S(y|x) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_2(m)} \log \frac{J_2(m)}{Q_2(m)} + \text{KL}[Q_2(m)||P_2(m)].$$

By definition, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_1(m)} \log \frac{J_1(m)}{Q_1(m)} = \mathbb{E}_{Q_1(m)}[\log \frac{J_1(m)}{J_1(m)/\hat{f}_m}] = \mathbb{E}_{Q_1(m)}[\log \hat{f}_m].$$

Similar results for $Q_2(m)$ can be obtained. Adding these two equations with multiplication of δ or $1 - \delta$, we have

$$L(\theta) := \delta \log f(y|x) + (1 - \delta) \log S(y|x) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_1, Q_2}[\log \hat{f}_m^\delta \hat{S}_k^{1-\delta}] + \text{KL}[Q_1(m)||P_1(m)]^\delta \text{KL}[Q_2(k)||P_2(k)]^{(1-\delta)}.$$

The above equation completes the proof. We highlight that the mentioned mistake limits further interpretation. It is easy to see that

$$B(1, 1) := \text{KL}[Q_1(1)||P_1(1)]^\delta \text{KL}[Q_2(1)||P_2(1)]^{1-\delta}.$$

However, we cannot subtract these two KL divergences by the chain rule of KL divergence as in [Domke & Sheldon \(2018\)](#). Since $L(\theta) - \mathbb{E}_{Q_1, Q_2}[\log \hat{f}_m^\delta \hat{S}_k^{1-\delta}]$ does not correspond to $B(m, k)$, the subtraction does not give any meaningful interpretation.

B.7. Proof for Lemma 1-6 and Formal Theorem 4.3.3

The chain of proofs follows the same structure as [Nowozin, 2018](#), with minor corrections and better consistency of notations.

B.7.1. PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Given the assumptions, which are sufficient for Fubini's theorem to apply, the Taylor expansion of $\mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}]$ at $\log f$ is given as

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \mathbb{E}[\log(f - (\hat{f}_m - f))] = \log f - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i f^i} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{f}_m - f)^i] := \log f - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i f^i} \alpha'_i.$$

From Theorem 1 of [Angelova \(2012\)](#), using the definition of α_i, β_i , we can get the relationship between α'_i and α_i :

$$\alpha'_2 = \frac{\alpha_2}{m}; \alpha'_3 = \frac{\alpha_3}{m^2}; \alpha'_4 = \frac{3}{m^2} \alpha_2^2 + o(m^{-2}).$$

By substituting α'_i with α_i we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \log f - \frac{1}{2f^2} \frac{\alpha_2}{m} + \frac{1}{3f^3} \frac{\alpha_3}{m^2} - \frac{1}{4f^4} \left(\frac{3}{m^2} \alpha_2^2 \right) + o(m^{-2}).$$

After rearrangement, we complete the proof for $\mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m]$. By applying the same proof as for $\mathbb{E}[\log \hat{S}_k]$, we complete the whole proof. We denote $\mathbb{B}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \frac{1}{2f^2} \frac{\alpha_2}{m} - \frac{1}{3f^3} \frac{\alpha_3}{m^2} + \frac{1}{4f^4} \left(\frac{3}{m^2} \alpha_2^2 \right)$ and similarly for $\mathbb{B}[\log \hat{S}_k]$.

B.7.2. PROOF OF LEMMA 2

By the definition of variance and using the same expansion on both $\log \hat{f}_m$ and its expectation at $\log f$, we have

$$\mathbb{V}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \mathbb{E}[(\log \hat{f}_m - \mathbb{E} \log \hat{f}_m)^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{i f^i} (\mathbb{E}[(\hat{f}_m - f)^i] - (\hat{f}_m - f)^i) \right)^2 \right].$$

By expanding the above equation to the third order, we have

$$\mathbb{V}[\log \hat{f}_m] \approx \frac{\alpha'_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{f^3} (\alpha'_3 - \alpha'_1 \alpha'_2) + \frac{2}{3f^4} (\alpha'_4 - \alpha'_1 \alpha'_3) + \frac{1}{4f^4} (\alpha'_4 - (\alpha'_2)^2) - \frac{1}{3f^5} (\alpha'_5 - \alpha'_2 \alpha'_3) + \frac{1}{9f^6} (\alpha'_6 - (\alpha'_3)^2).$$

By substituting α'_i with α_i , we complete the proof for $\mathbb{V}[\log \hat{f}_m]$. By applying the same proof as for $\mathbb{V}[\log \hat{S}_k]$, we complete the whole proof.

B.7.3. PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Notice that δ is binary valued and finite, thus for $m \rightarrow \infty$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$, where the sequence of limitation doesn't matter, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ELBO-C}_{m,k} &= \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] = \delta \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{S}_k] \\ &= \delta \log f + (1 - \delta) \log S - \delta \left[\frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{2f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2}{4f^4} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + (1 - \delta) \left[\frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{2S^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{3S^3} - \frac{3\beta_2}{4S^4} \right) \right] + o(m^{-2}) + o(k^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

By substituting $L(\theta) = \delta \log f + (1 - \delta) \log S$, we complete the proof.

B.7.4. PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Notice that 1) ϕ_1, ϕ_2 here are not optimally constrained in Claim (5) of Theorem 3.2.2, 2) the expectation w.r.t $z_{1:m}$ and $z_{1:k}$ can be separated due to independence, 3) $L(\theta)$ is not a function of z , and 4) $\delta^2 = \delta$. For $m \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{L}_{m,k} - L(\theta))^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:m}} \left[\left(\delta \log \hat{f}_m - \delta \log f \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_{z_{1:k}} \left[\left((1 - \delta) \log \hat{S}_k - (1 - \delta) \log S \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \delta \mathbb{E}[(\log \hat{f}_m - \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] + \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] - \log f)^2] + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{E}[(\log \hat{S}_k - \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{S}_k] + \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{S}_k] - \log S)^2] \\ &= \delta \mathbb{V}[\log \hat{f}_m] + \delta (\mathbb{B}[\log \hat{f}_m])^2 + (1 - \delta) \mathbb{V}[\log \hat{S}_k] + (1 - \delta) (\mathbb{B}[\log \hat{S}_k])^2 \\ &= \delta \left[\frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{5\alpha_2}{f^4} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{2f^2} \right)^2 \right] + (1 - \delta) \left[\frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{S^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{S^3} - \frac{5\beta_2}{S^4} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{2S^2} \right)^2 \right] + o(m^{-2}) + o(k^{-2}) \\ &= \delta \left[\frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{20\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^2}{4f^4} \right) \right] + (1 - \delta) \left[\frac{1}{k} \frac{\beta_2}{S^2} - \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\frac{\beta_3}{S^3} - \frac{20\beta_2 + \beta_2^2}{4S^4} \right) \right] + o(m^{-2}) + o(k^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

B.7.5. PROOF OF FORMAL THEOREM 4.3.3

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - L(\theta)| \geq \xi) &= P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] + \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] - L(\theta)| \geq \xi) \\ &\leq P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}]| + |\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] - L(\theta)| \geq \xi) \\ &\leq \underbrace{P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}]| \geq \xi/2)}_{\textcircled{1}} + \underbrace{P(|\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] - L(\theta)| \geq \xi/2)}_{\textcircled{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Notice that $|\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] - L(\theta)|$ is not random, and based on the result of Lemma 3, for sufficiently large m_1, k_1 , we have $|\mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] - L(\theta)| < \xi/2$, regardless of the value of δ . This proves that $\textcircled{2} \rightarrow 0$ as $m, k \rightarrow \infty$

By Chebyshev's inequalities,

$$P(|\hat{L}_{m,k} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{L}_{m,k}]| \geq \xi/2) \leq \frac{4}{\xi^2} \mathbb{V}[\hat{L}_{m,k}].$$

Based on the result of Lemma 4, we have $\frac{4}{\xi^2} \mathbb{V}[\hat{L}_{m,k}] \rightarrow 0$ as $m, k \rightarrow \infty$, regardless of the value of δ . This proves that $\textcircled{1} \rightarrow 0$ as $m, k \rightarrow \infty$.

Together, we establish the convergence in probability and hence consistency of $\hat{L}_{m,k}$.

B.7.6. PROOF OF THEOREM A.4

Following Definition 4.3, we consider the induced log-likelihood estimator

$$\dot{L}_{m,k} = \delta \log \dot{f}_m + (1 - \delta) \log \dot{S}_k.$$

Recall lemma 1, we have proved that

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] = \log f - \frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{2f^2} + \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2^2}{4f^4} \right) + o(m^{-2}).$$

By Definition 4.3, we have

$$\log \dot{f}_m := \log \hat{f}_m + \frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{2m\hat{f}_m^2}, \quad \log \dot{S}_k := \log \hat{S}_k + \frac{\hat{\beta}_2}{2k\hat{S}_k^2}.$$

Next we show how this extra term in $\log \dot{f}_m$ or $\log \dot{S}_k$ leads to the cancellation of the leading terms in the bias, e.g., $-\frac{\alpha_2}{2mf^2}$.

Proof: The $\frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{\hat{f}_m^2}$ is considered as a function of $g(x, y)$ in the form of x/y^2 .

We expand its second-order Taylor expansion at (α_2, f) :

$$\frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{\hat{f}_m^2} = g(\alpha_2 + (\hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_2), f + (\hat{f}_m - f)) \approx \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} + \frac{1}{f^2}(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_2) - \frac{2\alpha_2}{f^3}(\hat{f}_m - f) - \frac{2}{f^3}(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_2)(\hat{f}_m - f) + \frac{6\alpha_2}{2f^4}(\hat{f}_m - f)^2.$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_m] = f$; $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\alpha}_2] = \alpha_2$. Taking expectation on both sides and after the rearrangement, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{\hat{f}_m^2} \right] \approx \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{2}{f^3} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_2)(\hat{f}_m - f)] + \frac{3\alpha_2}{f^4} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{f}_m - f)^2].$$

Using the results in Zhang (2007), we have $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_2)(\hat{f}_m - f)] = \alpha_3/m$ and $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{f}_m - f)^2] = \alpha_2/m$. Thus, by substituting,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{\hat{f}_m^2} \right] = \frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{m} \left(\frac{2\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2^2}{f^4} \right) + o(m^{-1}).$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \log f - \mathbb{E}[\log \dot{f}_m] &= \log f - \mathbb{E}[\log \hat{f}_m] - \frac{1}{2m} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_2}{\hat{f}_m^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \frac{\alpha_2}{2f^2} - \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2^2}{4f^4} \right) - \frac{1}{2m} \left[\frac{\alpha_2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{m} \left(\frac{2\alpha_3}{f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2^2}{f^4} \right) \right] + o(m^{-2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{m^2} \left(\frac{2\alpha_3}{3f^3} - \frac{3\alpha_2^2}{4f^4} \right) + o(m^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

By applying the same proof as for $\mathbb{E}[\log \dot{S}_k]$, and $\dot{L}_{m,k}$, we complete the whole proof.

C. Details of Experiments

C.1. Experimental Setup

The experiments are on Python 3.9 with Pytorch on the Windows 11 system. GPU is not required.

C.2. Simulated dataset (SD1-SD6)

The dimension of x, y, u, c is 1. The latent dimension of $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2)$ is 2. The Gibbs sampling process is designed as follows:

First, in the $P(X, Y, I|Z)$ step, we have a sample of X, U, C, Y, I as follows

- The prior of x : $p(x) \sim N(1, 1)$, which is independent of Z .
- Given Z , $P(U|X, Z) \sim N(\mu(x, z), \sigma^2)$, where $\mu(x, z) = 1 * z_1 + x * z_2$.
- Given Z , $P(C|X, Z) \sim N(\mu_C, e^2)$. The mean for SD1-SD6 is reported in the Table 1, which controls the rate of censoring.
- We compare the sampled u, c to get y and the event indicator δ .

Second, in the $P(Z|X, Y, I)$ step, we define the distribution as follows:

- For $\delta = 0, 1$, $P(Z|X, Y, \delta)$ is normal distributed with mean $\mu_z = (2\delta - 1)(3/\exp(x + y), 3/\exp(x + y))$.
- Covariance is fixed as identity matrix for both cases.

Then we start the simulation at $z = (0, 0)$ and burn the first 10k observations.

C.3. Hyper-parameters of training CD-CVAE and the variants

The details of the models can be found in the model folder via the repository link. In model specification, we have tuned the following hyper-parameters:

- Distribution Family of decoders: we choose from normal or gumbel-minimum.
- Network structure: the size of encoder and decoder networks and their depth.
- Dropout: the probability of dropout in the last layer of both encoder and decoders network. We select it from $\{0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.9\}$.
- Latent dimension: the dimension of Z : we select from $2 * \dim(x)$ or $0.5 * \dim(x)$.
- For the variants with importance sampling, we set $m = k$ and choose it from $\{10, 30, 100\}$.

In the training stage, we have tuned the following hyper-parameters:

- Learning rate: 0.01, 0.001.
- batch size: 20, 100, 250, 500, 1000.
- Patience: the maximum number of epoch waiting until we stop the algorithm if no better validated metric is found. This helps reduce training time on overfitting the model.
- Temperature: reweighting parameter for the loss of censored observation, as introduced in Deep survival machine (Nagpal et al., 2021a). We choose 1, 1.3 or 0.9.

C.4. Details in training-validating-testing stages of the experiments

For the simulation dataset and inference gap in Table 2.

- We set the hyper-parameter $m = k = 10$ for IS and DVI variants.
- No validation and testing, since we know the truth. Best metric throughout the training process is reported.
- We use a Normal family for the decoder that aligns with the truth. Encoder/Decoder network shares the same network structure. Technical or adhoc hyper-parameters are avoided, e.g., temperature is set at 1, dropout is 0.

For the evaluation experiments on C/C^{td} /Brs in Table 4.

- Train-validation-test split ratio is 0.6, 0.2, 0.2. Experiment repetition is 5, using the same seeds of dataset split.
- Best model is selected from best cross-validated C index or Brier score of the model taking on quantiles of survival time, predicting from validation x . We select it for a overall good fitting of the model, which is not the best validated metrics C^{td} and Brier Score are valuated at specific test times to prevent overfitting.
- The hyper-parameters tuned for training SOTA models in the training stage follows the recommendations from Nagpal et al. (2022). For details, please refer to the package website or the source codes attached.

For the implementation of metrics, we note that

- C index is implemented via Python package Pycox by the authors of Kvamme et al. (2019)
- C^{td} and Brier score is implemented via Python package Scikit-Survival (Pölsterl, 2020).