

# A general joint latent class model of longitudinal and survival data with the covariance modelling

Ruoyu Miao; Christiana Charalambous  
The University of Manchester

## Abstract

Based on the proposed time-varying JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022), the heterogeneous random covariance matrix can also be considered, and a regression submodel for the variance-covariance matrix of the multivariate latent random effects can be added to the joint latent class model. A general joint latent class model with heterogeneous random-effects modelling is a natural extension of the time-varying JLCM, which consists of the linear and the log link functions to model the covariance matrices as the variance-covariance regression submodel based on the modified Cholesky decomposition, longitudinal submodel, survival submodel as well as the membership probability. It can help to get more information from the random covariance matrix through the regression submodel and get unbiased estimates for all parameters by modelling the variance-covariance matrix. By adding the regression model, the homogeneous random effects assumption can be tested and the issue of high-dimensional heterogeneous random effects can be easily solved. The Bayesian approach will be used to estimate the data. DIC value is the criterion for deciding the optimal  $k$  value. We illustrate our general JLCM on a real data set of AIDS study and we are interested in the prospective accuracy of our proposed JLCM as well as doing the dynamic predictions for time-to-death in the joint model using the longitudinal CD4 cell count measurements.

**Keywords:** Time-varying probability; Latent class; Joint latent class model; Covariance modelling; Cholesky decomposition; Heterogenous random; MCMC; Dynamic predictions; Shared multivariate normal distribution; Survival analysis.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the statistical literature, the random-effects model is usually used to deal with the repeated measures (Laird and Ware, 1982) and the Cox proportional hazards models are widely used to analyze the survival data and estimate the treatment effect on the time-dependent covariate (Cox, 1972). However, separate analyses of longitudinal and time-to-event outcomes can lead to biased estimation when the time-to-event process contains endogenous time-varying covariates, or both outcome processes are correlated. Ibrahim et al. (2010) pointed out that it will lead to the bias to treatment effects when the longitudinal measurements are ignored. They also proved that the joint model can help to provide more efficient estimates of the treatment effects on longitudinal and survival processes. Joint models are proposed to improve the inference of survival analysis with time-varying covariates measured with error, and analyze the relationship between longitudinal measurements and time-to-event process. What is more, even in the case of just longitudinal data, there could be issues with informative dropouts, which can also be addressed by considering the time to dropout in the joint modelling context. Under these situations, joint modelling of both longitudinal and time-to-event data can incorporate all information, increasing the efficiency and decreasing the bias of inferences (Ibrahim et al., 2010).

The early work on joint modelling dates back to the period from the late 80s to the early 90s. Schluchter (1992) pointed out the problem of non-ignorable censoring in longitudinal studies and gave an approach which was based on lognormal survival. In AIDS research, Self and Pawitan (1992), Degruittola and Tu (1994) and Tsiatis et al. (1995) adjusted the inferences on the longitudinal responses with informative missing data and considered a two-stage method to do the parameter estimations. The two-stage approach splits the estimation of joint modelling into two steps. First, the model is fitted for the longitudinal outcomes, and then the estimation outputs from the first step are used to fit the survival model. Although the two-stage method is easy to implement, it has the limitation of leading to biased parameter estimation because of the omission of the informatively censored events.

Fawcett and Thomas (1996) gave the structure of a joint model as a covariate tracking model with measurement error for the longitudinal submodel and the proportional hazards model for the survival submodel. In this work, Gibbs sampling was used for statistical inference. Moreover, Wulfsohn and Tsiatis (1997) introduced the standard joint model composed by the linear growth curve model with random intercept and slope and the proportional hazards model, using the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm to estimate the parameters. This standard structure of joint modelling with time-dependent relative risk also improved on two-stage methods. Empirical Bayes estimates of the covariate process were computed in the first stage and also treated as the time-dependent covariates and used in the second stage to get parameters which maximize the partial likelihood for the Cox model. Additionally, Henderson et al. (2000) proposed a flexible joint model, where the longitudinal and survival processes were linked via a latent Gaussian process, allowing for both serial correlation and measurement error in the longitudinal model. Albert et al. (2000) presented the joint model for longitudinal binary data with the shared Gaussian autoregressive latent process.

Tsiatis and Davidian (2004) provided an overview of the early work of joint modelling over the last two decades and

described two approaches: the conditional score method and the semiparametric likelihood method. Wang (2006) proposed the corrected score method and did the comparison with the conditional score method, naive estimator as well as regression calibration (RC). They found that under general situations, the RC method can significantly reduce biases from the naive estimator and the conditional score method outperforms the corrected score method slightly but the difference of these two methods is small. Rizopoulos (2009) proposed a new computational approach, in the form of a fully exponential Laplace approximation for the joint modelling of survival and longitudinal data, making it feasible to handle the high dimensional random effects structures in joint models. Motivated by primary biliary cirrhosis (PBC) study (Murtaugh et al., 1994), a joint modelling of multi-state event times and longitudinal data with informative observation time points was proposed by Dai and Pan (2018), in which the joint modelling was linked by random effects under no distribution assumption. This model helps to extend the corrected score method to cases with longitudinal data which is collected at informative time points.

Tseng et al. (2005) explored the joint modelling of the linear mixed effects model for longitudinal outcomes and the accelerated failure time model for the survival data under the EM algorithm to estimate the unknown parameters. They indicated that the accelerated failure time model could be considered an alternative to the Cox proportional hazards model when the assumption of proportionality failed to describe the relationship between the longitudinal and survival covariates. Viviani et al. (2014) proposed the generalized linear mixed joint models (GLMJMs) under the estimation approach of the EM algorithm. This kind of joint modelling provided methods to control the non-Gaussian longitudinal responses in the joint modelling frameworks. A Bayesian approach was also considered to robust joint modelling of longitudinal measurements and time-to-event outcomes by Baghfalaki et al. (2014). In this approach, Student's  $t$  distribution was applied to deal with outlier points. Among these various types of joint models, the typical and widely used submodel settings are the mixed-effects model for the longitudinal measurements and the Cox proportional hazards model for the time-to-event data, linked together by the shared random effects. Further extensions to consider multiple longitudinal outcomes and/or competing risks (Gichangi & Vach, 2005; Elashoff et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2009; Huang et al., 2011; Proust-Lima et al., 2015; Rouanet et al., 2016) have also been considered. Other work in the literature includes copula joint models (Kürüm et al., 2018, Zhang et al., 2021) as well as hidden Markov models (Bartolucci & Farcomeni, 2019; Zhou et al., 2022).

Hickey et al. (2016) gave a review of joint models with frequentist approaches, with the expectation maximization method, Bayesian approach for estimation and other estimation approaches also illustrated briefly. More recently, Alsefiri et al. (2020) presented a methodological review for Bayesian univariate and multivariate joint modelling of longitudinal and survival analysis, including model structures, estimation procedures, dynamic predictions as well as software implementation.

The development of specialised software, such as JM (Rizopoulos, 2010), joineR (Philipson et al., 2012), stjM (Crowther et al., 2013) and JMBayes (Rizopoulos, 2016) among others, has also helped popularise the use of joint models in practice. The JM package (Rizopoulos, 2012) and joineR (Philipson et al., 2012) were developed using the likelihood maximization estimation method for joint model. Rizopoulos (2016) proposed shared parameter models for the joint modelling of both longitudinal and time-to-event data using MCMC procedure with the JMBayes package.

The basic concept of latent class (LC) modelling was originally introduced by Lazarsfeld (1950) for creating typologies (or clusters) from dichotomous variables as part of his more comprehensive latent structure analysis. LC modelling was extended by Goodman (1974a, 1974b) with MLE methods, which the previous implementation problems were resolved. Haberman (1979) demonstrated the relationship between LC models and log-linear models. Hagenaaers (1990) and Vermunt (1993) developed a general framework for categorical data analysis with discrete latent variables (1997). LC models have been applied widely (Fergusson & Horwood, 1989; Fergusson et al., 1991; Fergusson et al., 1994; Buchholz, 1996) and have been developed for longitudinal data with a Markov model (van de Pol & Langeheine, 1989).

Reboussin and Anthony (2001) proposed the dynamic latent class regression model for longitudinal data, which could allow the conditional probabilities to vary over time. They added the time-varying covariates into the baseline-category logistic regression model, which was the first instance of time-varying probability model for the membership probability. Based on the time-varying latent class regression model proposed by Reboussin and Anthony (2001), Lin et al. (2014) added random effects to the dynamic latent class model for longitudinal data, which they jointly modelled the informative event with a class-specific logistic model with shared random effects.

One disadvantage of the basic joint models is that they cannot handle data with potential heterogeneous subgroups. Due to the issue of the existence on underlying patterns of subjects in many clinical trials (e.g. renal transplantation data with two underlying subpopulation for RC levels (Garre et al., 2008) and CPCRA AIDS study (Abrams et al., 1994; Neaton et al., 1994) with three latent classes for CD4 counts (Liu et al., 2015)), the joint latent class model (JLCM) is highly regarded as an important contribution to the joint modelling literature, firstly proposed by Lin et al. (2002) to deal with the non-ignorable missing data in longitudinal measurements and identify the pattern of longitudinal data over time. A multinomial logistic model with class-specific coefficients was considered as the membership submodel to do the subgroup specification, which was added to the joint modelling of longitudinal biomarkers and the event process. These three submodels were linked by the latent class number and the EM algorithm was used to do the estimation.

Joint latent class modelling of longitudinal measurements and time-to-event data with Bayesian approach has also been developed recently (Entink et al., 2011; Chen and Huang, 2015; Huang et al., 2016; Dagne, 2017; Andrinopoulou et al., 2020). Huang et al. (2016) proposed a mixture of nonlinear mixed-effects joint (MNLMEJ) models for longitudinal and survival

analysis with Bayesian approach. This MNLMEJ model presented three different processes (response, covariate as well as time-to-event), which three submodels were linked by the shared random effects and the membership probability was obtained from Dirichlet distribution. Andrinopoulou et al. (2020) applied the cystic fibrosis dataset into the joint model of longitudinal and survival outcomes with latent classes which were sampled from Dirichlet distribution, combining a new optimal latent class selection procedure with a mixture model assuming many more latent classes than present in the data. Unlike the classic frequentist estimation approach, they presented a Bayesian approach for the shared parameter joint latent class model. The overfitted mixture model was considered to identify the non-empty and the empty classes to select the optimal number of classes. Different from the membership probability based on the logistic model, they assumed each individual has a probability of being to the latent class which is obtained using a multinomial distribution.

Zhang and Simonoff (2020) discussed both the strengths and weaknesses of the joint latent class modelling (JLCM) and presented an idea of nonparametric joint modelling approach. They pointed that the joint latent class tree (JLCT) model with a tree-based approach could be a good alternative to JLCM, which can address the time-invariant limitation of JLCM. Zhang and Simonoff (2022) proposed a tree-based approach to model time-to-event and longitudinal data. This semiparametric joint latent class tree model is fast to fit and can allow time-varying covariates for all components in modelling time-to-event and latent class membership, which the time-varying covariates can be used as the splitting variables to construct tree. However, this JLCT cannot show how memberships of subjects change with time in details.

Motivated by Garre et al. (2008) and Liu et al. (2015), the subpopulations cannot be ignored in subjects. For example, treatment A, which might be effective for patient a could prove ineffective for patient b, which indicates classification can make a huge contribution to the data analysis depending on the characteristics of the dataset. Under this situation, patients may experience pathological changes such that a particular treatment regime might stop being effective for a patient and a different regime might need to be considered. This could be reflected by a change in the latent class for that patient. In order to handle this kind of particular dataset with jumping behaviours, we propose adding time-varying covariates into the latent class membership probability, which allows jumps among different subgroups (Miao and Charalambous, 2022).

Covariance modelling also has a long history of development over the past few years. For many years, the variances/covariances were considered as the ‘nuisance parameter’ with respect to the mean when modelling the repeated measures on the same individual (MacKenzie, 2004). For the classical ANOVA and multivariate approaches, they both ignore the covariance structure, which can have a bad impact on the efficiency of the mean parameters. Today, however, variance-covariance modelling is equally as important as the mean modelling. Anderson (1973) proposed a covariance model with linear structure, in which positive definiteness could not be guaranteed. Leonard and Hsu (1992) proposed a Bayesian approach to model the covariance matrix in a multivariate Normal distribution. Pinheiro and Bates (1996) and Chiu et al. (1996) considered various covariance parameterisations, including the Cholesky decomposition, which could guarantee the positive definiteness of the covariance matrix, leading to unconstrained estimation. Pourahmadi (1999) firstly proposed the modified Cholesky decomposition to get the positive-definiteness of the covariance matrix with unconstrained parameterizations, which was generalized to fit unbalanced longitudinal data by Pan and MacKenzie (2003). Pourahmadi (1999, 2000) proposed a modified Cholesky decomposition to reparameterize the inverse of the covariance matrix with  $T^T D^{-1} T$ , where  $T$  denotes a unique unit lower triangular matrix with 1’s as diagonal entries and  $D$  is a unique diagonal matrix with positive diagonal entries. Based on the modified Cholesky decomposition proposed by Pourahmadi (1999, 2000), Pan and MacKenzie (2006) modelled a marginal covariance, while modelling the conditional covariance for the linear mixed model was considered by Pan and MacKenzie (2007).

According to the modified Cholesky decomposition, Huang et al. (2010) proposed a joint model of longitudinal and competing risks survival data with heterogeneous random effects and outlying longitudinal measures, which indicated that  $t$ -distribution can help to deal with the potential outliers in the longitudinal measurements. And this was the first instance of covariance modelling being applied in joint models. They indicated that it would lead to bias parameter estimates for the survival endpoint if covariance modelling was ignored and unbiased estimated results can be obtained by the heterogeneous covariance matrix of the multivariate random effects with covariance modelling.

No covariance modelling has been proposed in the context of joint latent class models in previous work. Motivated by the literature in covariance modelling, we add covariance modelling to the time-varying JLCM. Based on the time-varying joint latent class model (JLCM) we mentioned before, we propose a general JLCM of longitudinal measurements and time-to-event outcomes with both time-varying membership probability as well as the covariance modelling, which the regression submodel is added to get more information in the variance covariance matrix. However, we do not have the same structure with the shared parameter in our proposed time-varying JLCM. We use the shared multivariate distribution for random effects in the longitudinal and survival submodels for the general JLCM. A Bayesian approach is used for estimation and inference. The detailed structure of the general JLCM is presented in section II. In section III, we conduct a simulation study to compare the performance of the proposed JLCM with the time-varying JLCM, while in section IV, we apply our model to analyse the AIDS dataset (Goldman et al., 1996). For both simulation and real data analyses, we also investigate the performance of the proposed model in the dynamic prediction of survival probabilities. Finally, section V summarises the work in this paper and discusses future extensions of the proposed model.

## II. JOINT LATENT CLASS MODEL WITH TIME-VARYING PROBABILITY AND HETEROGENEOUS RANDOM EFFECTS

Based on the improved time-varying JLCM with shared random effects proposed (Miao and Charalambous, 2022), a general joint latent class model with heterogeneous random effects modelling, is considered. This model is motivated by Huang et al. (2010) who proposed a joint model of longitudinal and competing risks survival data with heterogeneous random effects, with additional modelling of the covariance matrix of the random effects. As opposed to the time-varying JLCM with the shared random effects we proposed before, we assume that the random effects in the general JLCM are different for each process but share the same multivariate distribution.

In this section, we proposed a general joint latent class model of longitudinal and survival data with the time-varying membership probability and covariance modelling. Compared with basic joint latent class model, we add time-varying covariates into latent class submodel to get time-varying probability which we have proposed before. Here as the comparable JLCM, we develop the similar time-varying JLCM but the structure is different, which the shared distribution is used to link longitudinal and survival submodels. The detailed structure of the general JLCM and estimation method will be illustrated. A simulation study will be conducted to compare the performance of the proposed general JLCM with a time-varying JLCM. The proposed general JLCM is used to analyse the AIDS dataset (Goldman et al., 1996). For both simulation and real data analyses, we also investigate the performance of the proposed model in the dynamic prediction of survival probabilities.

### A. General latent class model with time varying probability

Here we model a general submodel which varies with time  $t$ . Since the value of the membership probability is between 0 and 1, we consider the logistic model. Consider a scenario with  $N$  subjects, indexed by  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , and  $K$  latent classes, indexed by  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ . The membership probability is assumed to vary over time at measurement points  $t$ . Let the design matrices  $\mathbf{X}_{1i}$  incorporate time-dependent covariates observed at specific time points  $t_i = t_{ij}|_{j=1,2,\dots,m_i} = (t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \dots, t_{im_i})^T$ . Define  $R_{ij} = k$  as the latent class indicator, signifying that subject  $i$  belongs to class  $k$  at time  $t_{ij}$ . The probability  $\pi_{ijk}$  that subject  $i$ , measured at time  $t_{ij}$ , belongs to class  $k$  satisfies the constraint  $\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{ijk} = 1$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ . This probability is modeled using a multinomial logistic regression, incorporating the covariate vector  $\mathbf{X}_{1i}$  along with the corresponding class-specific coefficient vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k$ . Thus, we present a generalized latent class framework where the probability of subject  $i$  belonging to class  $k$  at their  $j$ th visit is influenced by time-dependent covariates, as given by:

$$\pi_{ijk} = P(R_{ij} = k) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)}{\sum_{s=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\boldsymbol{\xi}_s)} \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, K \quad (1)$$

### B. Longitudinal submodel

Let  $y_{ijk}$  represent the repeated measurement for subject  $i$  at the  $j$ th visit within class  $k$ . The longitudinal submodel describing  $y_{ij}$  follows the framework proposed by Troxel et al. (1998):

$$y_{ij}|(R_{ij} = k) = \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\boldsymbol{\beta}_k + \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_{ik} + \epsilon_{ijk} \quad K \neq 1$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij})$  denote the covariate vector for subject  $i$  at the  $j$ th visit time  $t_{ij}$  and time is incorporated as a polynomial term in  $\mathbf{X}_{2i}$ . The parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$  corresponds to class  $k$  at each visit time. The class-specific random effects for class  $k$  are represented by  $\mathbf{U}_{ik}$ , which is a  $q \times 1$  vector. We define  $\mathbf{Z}_i(t_{ij})$  as the covariate vector at time  $t_{ij}$  that is associated with the class-specific random effects  $\mathbf{U}_{ik}$ . Both  $\mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij})$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_i(t_{ij})$  may contain time-dependent covariates measured at multiple time points, given by  $t_i = (t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \dots, t_{im_i})^T$ . The class-specific error term  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  is assumed to follow an independent normal distribution,  $\epsilon_{ijk} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} N(0, \tau_k)$ , with variance  $\tau_k$ . Furthermore, we assume that  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{U}_{ik}$  (Liu et al., 2015). The random effects  $\mathbf{U}_{ik}$  can be alternatively expressed as  $\mathbf{U}_{ik} = \mathfrak{Z}_k \mathbf{U}_i$ , where  $\mathbf{U}_{ik} \sim N_q(0, \Sigma_{u_{ik}})$ . For simplification, we assume  $\mathfrak{Z}_k = 1$ , leading to  $\mathbf{U}_i \sim N_q(0, \Sigma_{u_i})$ , which implies that the random effects remain consistent across different latent classes. Under this assumption, the longitudinal submodel can be rewritten as:

$$y_{ij}|(R_{ij} = k) = \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\boldsymbol{\beta}_k + \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i + \epsilon_{ijk} \quad K \neq 1 \quad (2)$$

### C. Cause-specific hazard distribution

Let  $T^*$  represent the true event time, which may or may not be observed for subjects indexed by  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . The censoring time for subject  $i$  is denoted by  $C_i$ , and the observed follow-up time is given by  $T_i = \min(T_i^*, C_i)$ . Define the censoring indicator as  $\delta_i = I(T_i^* \leq C_i)$ , where  $\delta_i = 1$  if the event is observed and  $\delta_i = 0$  otherwise, indicating censoring. The

time-to-event distribution within each latent class can be modeled using a Cox proportional hazards framework, incorporating a class-specific baseline hazard function and corresponding parameters:

$$\lambda_i(t|R_{ij} = k) = \lambda_{0k}(t) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(t)\boldsymbol{\omega}_k + v_i) \quad (3)$$

In this submodel, the baseline hazard function for class  $k$  is represented by  $\lambda_{0k}(t)$ . The covariate vector for subject  $i$  at time  $t$  is denoted as  $\mathbf{X}_{3i}(t)$ , while  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_k$  represents the corresponding parameter vector for class  $k$ . The term  $v_i$  accounts for the random effects in the time-to-event model. For simplicity, we adopt a Gompertz baseline hazard function, expressed as  $\lambda_{0k}(t) = \lambda_{0k} \exp(\gamma_k t)$ , where  $\lambda_{0k}(t)$  represents the parametric baseline hazard (Austin, 2012). Different from the survival submodel with the shared random effects (Miao and Charalambous, 2022), here we get a new form of survival submodel with random effects  $v$ , which shares the same distribution with longitudinal submodel.

#### D. Variance-covariance regression submodel

Motivated by Huang et al. (2011) and He & Luo (2016), we model the variance-covariance matrix to get more information through regression submodel, which may help to get unbiased estimates for all the parameters. We model the association between longitudinal measurements and survival outcomes by the assumption of the multivariate normal distribution for two random effects  $U_i$  and  $v_i$ :

$$\mathbf{W}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_i \\ v_i \end{pmatrix} \sim N_{(q+1)} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \Sigma_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{u_i} & \Sigma_{uv_i} \\ \Sigma_{uv_i}^T & \sigma_{v_i}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \quad (4)$$

Denote the random variables  $e_{ig} = W_{ig} - \sum_{l=1}^{g-1} \phi_{igl} W_{il}$ ,  $g = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, g-1$ .  $cov(e_{ig}, e_{ik}) = 0$  if  $g \neq k$  ( $1 \leq j, k \leq q+1$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ). Similar to Pourahmadi (1999) and Huang et al. (2011), we model the covariance matrices  $\Sigma_i$  by a modified Cholesky decomposition  $T_i \Sigma_i T_i^T = D_i$ , where  $D_i$  is a diagonal matrix with positive entries, the prediction error variances  $d_{ig}^2 = var(e_{ig})$  ( $g = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$ );  $T_i$  is the unique unit lower triangular matrix with 1's as diagonal entries and  $-\phi_{igl}$  as its  $(g, l)$ th entry. The modified Cholesky decomposition can ensure the positive definiteness of matrix  $\Sigma_i$ , without the need to impose constraints on any of the parameters.

We use linear and log linear models for the generalised autoregressive parameters  $\phi_{igl}$  and innovation variances of  $d_{ig}^2$ , accordingly, i.e. :

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{igl} = \mathbf{A}_{igl}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 \\ \log d_{ig}^2 = \mathbf{B}_{ig}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{igl}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_{ig}$  are covariates ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ;  $g = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$ ;  $l = 1, 2, \dots, g-1$ ) and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_2$  are low-dimensional parameter vectors. The association between the longitudinal and survival outcomes is partly described by  $\Sigma_{uv_i}$  and we can assess it's strength by testing the hypothesis  $\Sigma_{uv_i} = \mathbf{0}$ .

We can see that our general JLCM uses both latent classes and heterogeneous random effects to link the longitudinal and survival outcomes. The addition of the variance-covariance regression submodels, allows us to assess any effects of covariates on the association between the two processes. As previously, we employ an MCMC approach for estimation, which is described below.

#### E. Estimation

1) *The likelihood* : Let  $\Psi$  represent the collection of model parameters, defined as

$$\Psi = (\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\xi} &= (\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_K), \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_K), \quad \boldsymbol{\omega} = (\boldsymbol{\omega}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\omega}_K), \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_K), \\ \boldsymbol{\tau} &= (\boldsymbol{\tau}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_K), \quad \boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{01}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{0K}), \quad \mathbf{R}_i = (R_{i1}, \dots, R_{im_i}), \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 &= (\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{1n_{\alpha_1}}), \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2 = (\alpha_{21}, \dots, \alpha_{2n_{\alpha_2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $n_{\alpha_1}$  denotes the dimension of  $\mathbf{A}_{igl}$ , while  $n_{\alpha_2}$  represents the dimension of  $\mathbf{B}_{ig}$ . We assume that the observed data  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$  are independent given the latent class indicator  $\mathbf{R}$  and the random effects  $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{U}, v)$ . Additionally, we assume that  $(\mathbf{T}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$  depends only on  $R_{im_i}$ . Under these assumptions, the likelihood contribution for the  $i$ th patient is expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_i(\Psi | \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{y}_i, T_i, \boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \mathbf{W}_i) \\ = f(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi) f(T_i | \boldsymbol{\delta}_i, R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi) P(\mathbf{R}_i = k | \Psi) f(\mathbf{W}_i | \Psi) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we derive the expression for the joint likelihood function:

$$L(\Psi|\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \delta, \mathbf{W}) = \prod_{i=1}^N f(\mathbf{W}_i|\Psi) \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} \prod_{k=1}^K P_{ijk} \quad (6)$$

where

$$P_{ijk} = \begin{cases} \{P(R_{ij} = k|\Psi)f(y_{ij}|R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi)\}^{I(R_{ij}=k)} & \text{for } j \neq m_i \\ \{P(R_{im_i} = k|\Psi)f(y_{im_i}|R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi)f(T_i|\delta_i, R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi)\}^{I(R_{im_i}=k)} & \text{for } j = m_i, \end{cases}$$

$$f(y_{ij}|R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{W}_i) = (2\pi\tau_k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\{-1/(2\tau_k)(y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})(\mathbf{U}_i)^2)\},$$

$$f(T_i|\delta_i, R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi) = \lambda_{ik}(t|R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi)^{\delta_i} H_{ik}(t|R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{W}_i, \Psi)$$

and

$$P(R_{ij} = k) = \pi_{ijk} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)}{\sum_{s=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\boldsymbol{\xi}_s)} \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, K$$

$$\lambda_{ik}(t|R_{ij} = k)^{\delta_i} = (\lambda_{0k} \exp(\gamma_k t) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(t)\boldsymbol{\omega}_k + \mathbf{U}_i))^{I(T_i^* \leq C_i)}$$

$$H_{ik}(t) = \int_0^t \lambda_{0k} \exp(\gamma_k u) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(u)\boldsymbol{\omega}_k + v_i) du \quad (7)$$

Since  $e_{ig} = W_{ig} - \sum_{l=1}^{g-1} \phi_{i,gl} W_{il}$ ,  $\phi_{i,gl} = \mathbf{A}_{igl}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1$  and  $\log d_{ig}^2 = \mathbf{B}_{ig}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ;  $g = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$ ;  $l = 1, 2, \dots, g-1$ ), we can get  $e_{ig} \sim N(0, d_{ig}^2)$ . So we can get the pdf of  $f(\mathbf{W}_i|\Psi)$  as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{W}_i|\Psi) = \prod_{g=1}^{q+1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi d_{ig}^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{g=1}^{q+1} \frac{(W_{ig} - \sum_{l=1}^{g-1} \phi_{i,gl} W_{il})^2}{d_{ig}^2}\right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{g=1}^{q+1} \left[\log d_{ig}^2 + (W_{ig} - \sum_{l=1}^{g-1} \phi_{i,gl} W_{il})^2 \cdot d_{ig}^{-2}\right]\right\} \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{g=1}^{q+1} \left[\mathbf{B}_{ig}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2 + (W_{ig} - \sum_{l=1}^{g-1} \mathbf{A}_{i,gl}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 W_{il})^2 \cdot \exp(-\mathbf{B}_{ig}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2)\right]\right\}$$

2) *MCMC sampling procedure:* A Bayesian estimation approach is employed to obtain parameter estimates in the proposed JLCM. Given the likelihood in (6), the posterior distribution is expressed as:

$$\pi(\Psi|\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \delta, \mathbf{W}) \propto L(\Psi|\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \delta, \mathbf{W})\pi(\Psi),$$

where  $\pi(\Psi)$  represents the prior distribution of the parameter vector  $\Psi$ . Assuming independence among prior distributions,  $\pi(\Psi)$  can be factorized as the product of individual priors for each parameter component.

Using Gibbs sampling, parameters  $\beta$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\lambda$  are drawn directly from their full conditional distributions. Normal priors are assigned to  $\beta$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\xi$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\mathbf{W}$ , yielding conjugate posterior distributions for  $\beta$ . A gamma prior is chosen for  $\lambda$ , while an inverse gamma prior is used for  $\tau$ . The full conditional densities for  $\beta$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $\lambda$  are detailed in Supplementary Appendix A.

Additionally, the latent class membership indicator  $R_{ij}$  is sampled directly from its discrete posterior distribution. The posterior probability that subject  $i$  at time  $j$  belongs to latent class  $k$  is given by:

$$P(R_{ij} = k | \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \delta, \mathbf{W}) = \frac{P_{ijk}}{P_{ij1} + \dots + P_{ijK}}.$$

For parameters  $\omega$ ,  $\xi$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\alpha_2$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\mathbf{W}$ , the corresponding conditional distributions do not follow standard forms, making direct sampling more challenging. While the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Metropolis et al., 1953; Hastings, 1970) is widely used and straightforward to implement, it can suffer from convergence issues in complex models.

To address this challenge, adaptive MCMC algorithms provide an effective alternative by dynamically adjusting key tuning parameters during the sampling process, thereby improving efficiency and convergence (Roberts & Rosenthal, 2009). Consequently, an adaptive MCMC approach is employed in our proposed JLCM to sample parameters with non-standard distributions.

Following the Adaptive Metropolis (AM) algorithm outlined by Haario et al. (2001), we define a  $\ddot{d}$ -dimensional target distribution  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \mathbf{W})$ . We then partition  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  into  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p = (\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ , with  $\ddot{d}_p$  representing the dimension of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p$ . The dimensions of  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  are denoted by  $\ddot{d}_\tau$  and  $\ddot{d}_\lambda$ , respectively.

We assume that the elements of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p$  follow independent standard normal priors,  $N(0, 1)$ , with the associated density function denoted as  $f_{N(0,1)}$ . Similarly, the components of  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  are assigned independent vague inverse Gamma priors,  $IG(0.01, 0.01)$ , with the density denoted as  $f_{IG(0.01,0.01)}$ . For the elements of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , we use independent uninformative Gamma priors,  $\Gamma(0.01, 0.01)$ , with density function  $f_{\Gamma(0.01,0.01)}$ .

The resulting posterior distribution is:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda} | \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{-(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}) \propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N f(\mathbf{W}_i | \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{-(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}) \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} \prod_{k=1}^K P_{ijk} \right\} \prod_{\ddot{d}_p} f_{N(0,1)} \prod_{\ddot{d}_\tau} f_{IG(0.01,0.01)} \prod_{\ddot{d}_\lambda} f_{\Gamma(0.01,0.01)} \quad (9)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{-(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}^*$  represent the parameter vector excluding the components of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ . We can then construct an adaptive Metropolis algorithm with the proposal distribution

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda} | \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \ddot{\mathbf{A}}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{-(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}^*)$$

which is evaluated at iteration  $m$  as follows:

$$Q_m((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), \cdot) = \begin{cases} N((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), (0.1)^2 I_{\ddot{d}} / \ddot{d}) & \text{for } m \leq 2\ddot{d} \\ (1 - \alpha_{prop}) N((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), \sigma^2 \cdot \Sigma_m / \ddot{d}) \\ + \alpha_{prop} \cdot N((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), (0.1)^2 I_{\ddot{d}} / \ddot{d}) & \text{for } m > 2\ddot{d} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where  $\Sigma_m$  represent the current empirical estimate of the covariance structure of the target distribution, based on the results obtained so far. The term  $\sigma^2$  is a fixed variance constant that we select to assess the performance of the adaptive algorithm, and  $\alpha_{prop}$  is a small positive constant. Gelman et al. (1997) and Roberts and Rosenthal (2001) observed that the proposal distribution  $N(\boldsymbol{\theta}, (2.38)^2 \Sigma_m / \ddot{d})$  is optimal in certain large-dimensional scenarios. In our case, we found that the proposal  $N(\boldsymbol{\theta}, (0.1)^2 I_{\ddot{d}} / \ddot{d})$  provides a better fit.

According to the standard Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Hastings, 1970), a proposal from  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$  to  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\tau}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$  is accepted with the probability

$$\alpha((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), (\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\tau}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)) = \min \left( \frac{\pi((\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\tau}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*) | \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \ddot{\mathbf{A}}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{-(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}^*)}{\pi((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) | \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \ddot{\mathbf{A}}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{-(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}^*)}, 1 \right)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\boldsymbol{w}^*, \boldsymbol{\delta}^*, \boldsymbol{\xi}^*, \mathbf{U}^*)$  represents the new parameter vector consisting of  $\boldsymbol{w}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$  are the new parameter vectors for  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , generated as "candidate values" from the proposal distribution  $Q_m((\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), \cdot)$ .

Through the MCMC sampling process, we can also compute the posterior membership probability for model-based classification. The posterior probability of subject  $i$  belonging to class  $k$  at time  $j$  is given by

$$\hat{\pi}_{ijk}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) = \frac{\pi_{ijk} L_{ijk}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}})}{\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{ijk} L_{ijk}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}})}$$

where  $L_{ijk}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) = f(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_i | \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}) \hat{P}_{ijk}$  is computed using the posterior sample of the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$  and random effects  $\mathbf{W}$ , and  $\pi_{ijk}$  is the prior probability as defined in (1). The higher the value of the posterior probability  $\hat{\pi}_{ijk}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}})$ , the more likely it is that the subject belongs to this group.

3) *Dynamic prediction of time-to-death in survival analysis:* Similar to the procedure described in time-varying JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022), we can compute dynamic predictions of the time-to-event probabilities based on our proposed JLCM. The survival function for subject  $i$  is given by

$$S_i(t + \Delta t | T \geq t, y_i(t), \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i) = \frac{S_i\{t + \Delta t | y_i(t), \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i\}}{S_i\{t | y_i(t), \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i\}} \quad (11)$$

where  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_i$  denote the posterior means of the parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$  and random effects  $\mathbf{W}_i$ , and  $y_i(t)$  contains the longitudinal measurements up to time  $t$  to imply survival up to this time point.  $\hat{S}_i\{t | y_i(t), R_{ij} = k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i\} = \exp(-\hat{H}_{ik}(t | y_i(t), R_{ij} = k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i))$  with  $\hat{H}_{ik}(\cdot)$  given in (7).

The posterior predictive survival function  $S_i$  at  $t$  to predict the survival of a patient up to time  $t$  is given by

$$\hat{S}_i\{t|y_i(t), \hat{\Psi}, \hat{W}_i\} = \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{P}(R_{im_i} = k | \hat{\Psi}) \hat{S}_i(t|y_i(t), R_{im_i} = k, \hat{\Psi}, \hat{W}_i) \quad (12)$$

which is a mixture of survival distributions for patient  $i$  conditional on subgroup  $k$  to get survival probabilities for each subject. Other notations and equations, such as the misclassification rate and the dynamic predictions of the time-to-event probabilities, are defined in the time-varying JLCM with shared random effects, as proposed by Miao and Charalambous (2022).

### III. SIMULATION STUDY OF JOINT LATENT CLASS MODEL WITH TIME-VARYING PROBABILITY IN BAYESIAN APPROACH

We aim to simulate 100 datasets from the proposed general JLCM, classified clearly into different groups, which allows the existence of jumping behaviours among subgroups and the assessment of any effects of covariates on the association between the longitudinal and survival processes. For each simulation, we have 6 different model settings, including the proposed general JLCM with 1 to 3 subgroups and the time-varying JLCM with 1 to 3 classifications. The Bayesian approach is adopted for estimation and the DIC criterion is used to decide the optimal number of classes. Simulation results show that the proposed general JLCM can produce more accurate results with smaller bias values and the general JLCM outperforms the time-varying JLCM with better classification and prediction.

#### A. Generated data information

In order to illustrate the importance of the inclusion of covariance modelling in the joint latent class model, we conduct a simulation study to compare the performance of the general JLCM with a time-varying JLCM without covariance modelling. The latter is similar to the time-varying JLCM proposed in time-varying JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022). However, different from shared random effects, here we assume heterogeneous random effects sharing the same distribution as described earlier. For simplicity, in our simulation study we just consider two latent classes and use baseline covariates in  $X_{3i}$  but a more complex model with time-varying  $X_{3i}$  is also possible. The fixed covariate  $X_{1i}$  which is generated from a standard normal distribution, is used to capture certain baseline characteristics of each subject and  $X_{3i}$  corresponds to a treatment indicator simulated from the bernoulli distribution (1 if subject receives treatment and 0 otherwise). The longitudinal submodel and membership probability are in the same form as the ones in time-varying JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022). But survival submodel is in the different form  $\lambda_{ik}(t) = \lambda_{0k} \exp(\gamma_k t) \exp(w_k X_{3i} + v_i)$ . For the baseline hazard function with the form of  $h_{0k}(t) = \lambda_{0k} \exp(\gamma_k t)$ , we can simulate survival times from  $T_k = \log(1 - \gamma_k \log(u) / (\lambda_{0k} \exp(w_k X_3 + v))) / \gamma_k$  where  $u \sim U(0, 1)$ . Due to the complexity of the model, we only consider 100 Monte Carlo samples in our simulation study. The random effects are simulated from the multivariate normal distribution with variance covariance matrix  $\Sigma_i$  as in equation (4), with the associated regression covariates set as  $\mathbf{A}_{igl} = \mathbf{B}_{ig} = (1, X_{3i})$ , where  $X_{3i}$  denotes the treatments corresponding to each individual. For simplicity, we set  $q = 2$  which results in a 3x3 dimensional covariance matrix for the random effects. As we have assumed that random effects will not change among different subgroups (i.e.  $U_i, v_i$  will be the same across classes),  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  should also remain the same for different groups. i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{igl} = \mathbf{A}_{igl}^T \alpha_1 \\ \log d_{ig}^2 = \mathbf{B}_{ig}^T \alpha_2 \end{cases}$$

where  $\alpha_1 = (-0.2, -0.5)^T$ ,  $\alpha_2 = (0.1, 0.3)^T$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $g = 1, 2, \dots, q + 1$  and  $l = 1, 2, \dots, g - 1$ .

The other submodels vary across classes and are given as follows:

#### Class 1:

Latent class:  $p_{ij1} = \frac{\exp(0.01X_{1i} + 0.2Time_{ij})}{\exp(0.01X_{1i} + 0.2Time_{ij}) + \exp(Time_{ij})}$

Longitudinal submodel:  $y_{ij1} = 2X_{1i} + 1.5Time_{ij} + U_{1i} + U_{2i}Time_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij1}$

We specify  $\epsilon_{ij1} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 0.1)$  (0 mean and the variance is 0.1)

Survival submodels:  $\lambda_{i1}(t) = 0.2 \exp(0.2t) \exp(0.5X_{3i} + v_i)$  for  $t \leq T_i$

#### Class 2:

Latent class:  $p_{ij2} = \frac{\exp(Time_{ij})}{\exp(0.01X_{1i} + 0.2Time_{ij}) + \exp(Time_{ij})}$

Longitudinal submodel:  $y_{ij2} = 4X_{1i} + 3Time_{ij} + U_{1i} + U_{2i}Time_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij2}$

We specify  $\epsilon_{ij2} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 0.5)$

Survival submodels:  $\lambda_{i2}(t) = 0.1 \exp(-0.2t) \exp(0.8X_{3i} + v_i)$  for  $t \leq T_i$

The true values above in the simulation studies are the most sensible values for the general JLCM, chosen from different tries of value settings.



### B. Simulation results

We have the same settings as the simulation setup in time-varying JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022) for total numbers of individuals and records. For each simulation run, we set  $N$  as the total number of subjects and  $m_i$  as the number of repeated longitudinal measurements for each subject  $i$ . We illustrate the features of the datasets created under our general JLCM with shared random effects and covariance modelling, by focusing on one simulated dataset. Firstly we focus on the basic JLCM which does not allow the group membership probability to change with time. The plot of longitudinal trajectories is shown in the left of Figure 1.




Fig. 1. Left: Longitudinal trajectories with certain classification (orange: class 1/low level; purple: class 2/high level); Middle: Mean longitudinal trajectories; Right: K-M plot (black: no classification; red: class 1/low level; green: class 2/high level)

The mean longitudinal trace and Kaplan-Meier plot, based on the basic JLCM without time-varying changes or covariance modelling, are also presented in Figure 1. It is clear that incorporating classification is crucial to differentiate between the two distinct subgroups in this dataset. However, this static classification approach does not provide insight into how individuals may shift group membership over time.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the results of our simulation study, which involved 100 simulated datasets and 5000 MCMC iterations, with 2000 iterations used for burn-in. The optimal number of classes for each model was determined using the Deviance Information Criterion (DIC). From Table 1, we observe strong evidence supporting the correct model, which is the proposed general JLCM with covariance modelling and 2 classes, as indicated by the DIC. In 40% of cases, when the time-varying JLCM was selected as the optimal model (according to the error rate), we found that a model with 2 classes was preferred. This is not surprising, as the time-varying JLCM is a special case of the general JLCM, and we would expect the correct number of classes to be identifiable regardless of whether covariance modelling is included. Additionally, we note that when the simpler time-varying JLCM was selected as the optimal model, the error rates were very similar to those observed in the general JLCM. In Table 2, we observe that parameter estimation is accurate, with minimal bias. However, the posterior standard deviations for most parameters are inflated, likely due to the use of only 3000 MCMC iterations (after burn-in) for posterior inference. As a result, the credible intervals for some smaller effects, such as  $\xi_{11}$ ,  $\xi_{21}$ , and  $\alpha_{21}$ , include 0.

Table 1: DIC and error rate over 100 simulated datasets and 3000 MCMC iterations

Model	the general JLCM			time-varing JLCM			
	$K=1$	$K=2$	$K=3$	$K=1$	$K=2$	$K=3$	$K=4$
Model selection via DIC	0.01	0.99	0	0	0	0	0
Model selection via error rate	0	0.6	0	0	0.4	0	0

Table 2: Estimation results over 100 simulated datasets and 3000 MCMC iterations, based on the general JLCM with  $K=2$

time-varying JLCM with $K=2$							
Class 1				Class 2			
Parameter	Estimate (Bias)	sd	CI(89%)	Parameter	Estimate (Bias)	sd	CI(89%)
$\beta_{11}$	2.0952 (0.0952)	0.3310	[2.03, 2.20]	$\beta_{21}$	3.9029(-0.0971)	0.2184	[3.81, 3.98]
$\beta_{12}$	1.5834 (0.0834)	0.6463	[1.24, 2.02]	$\beta_{22}$	2.9065 (-0.0935)	0.4587	[2.51, 3.23]
$\tau_1$	0.1067 (0.0067)	0.0715	[0.08, 0.16]	$\tau_2$	0.4419 (-0.0581)	0.2776	[0.34, 0.55]
$\lambda_1$	0.1679 (-0.0321)	0.1108	[0.13, 0.21]	$\lambda_2$	0.0835 (-0.0165)	0.0585	[0.05, 0.13]
$\gamma_1$	0.1846(-0.0154)	0.1912	[0.12, 0.26]	$\gamma_2$	-0.1912 (0.0088)	0.2161	[-0.28, -0.13]
$w_1$	0.4490 (-0.0510)	0.3351	[0.35, 0.58]	$w_2$	0.7246 (-0.0754)	0.5036	[0.57, 0.91]
$\xi_{11}$	0.0112(0.0012)	0.1776	[-0.06, 0.08]	$\xi_{21}$	-0.0079 (-0.0079)	0.1606	[-0.10, 0.06]
$\xi_{12}$	0.1738 (-0.0262)	0.2243	[0.10, 0.25]	$\xi_{22}$	0.9017 (-0.0983)	0.5934	[0.71, 1.09]
Same value across two classes							
$\alpha_{11}$	-0.1727 (0.0232)	0.2070	[-0.26, -0.11]	$\alpha_{12}$	-0.4540(0.0460)	0.3526	[-0.58, -0.35]
$\alpha_{21}$	0.0855 (-0.0145)	0.1966	[-0.01, 0.18]	$\alpha_{22}$	0.2655 (-0.0345)	0.2633	[0.16, 0.39]

### C. Dynamic predictions of time to death

We further evaluate the performance of our proposed general model by comparing the expected survival outcomes of individuals with those obtained using the time-varying JLCM. The survival predictions are calculated using equations (11) and (12), and the results for eight selected subjects are presented in Figures 2 and 3. These plots display the combined information on longitudinal trajectories and survival probabilities for each chosen subject. The green dotted line represents the dynamic predictions from the proposed general JLCM with 2 classes (the true model), while the blue dotted line corresponds to the survival probabilities from the time-varying JLCM with 2 subgroups (the best alternative model, selected based on the smallest error rate). The vertical dashed line marks the time to event (in red) or censoring (in purple).

For subject 25 in Figure 2, we observe that at the time of the event, the survival probability from the proposed model is slightly lower than that from the basic JLCM, with values of 0.9792 and 0.9860, respectively. For subjects with stable trajectories (e.g., subjects 15, 19, and 35), the proposed model with covariance modelling yields marginally lower but similar survival probabilities compared to the time-varying JLCM. In contrast, for individuals exhibiting abrupt changes, as shown in Figure 3, the general JLCM is more conservative, providing lower predictive survival probabilities than the time-varying JLCM.

In other words, the general JLCM is more responsive to changes in group membership. For example, for subject 8, the survival probability is more sensitive to the drop in the response at the final two measurements. This is not unexpected, as subjects exhibiting abrupt changes tend to have more volatile trajectories, and failing to account for this variability may affect their survival predictions. The dynamic prediction plots for six of these subjects are presented in Figure C1 of Appendix C.




Fig. 4 Boxplots of the IPCW estimator of AUC when assuming the general and time-varying JLCM at time point  $t = 0.5$  with  $\Delta t = 0.3$




Fig. 2 Prediction of simulated data for four cases from both proposed and basic JLCM (black point: class 1/low level; red point: class 2/high level; black dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 1; red dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 2; black full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 1; red full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 2; green dotted line: survival probability from proposed JLCM; blue dotted line: survival probability from basic JLCM; purple vertical dashed line: subject censored; red vertical dotted line: time to event happened)




Fig. 3 Prediction of simulated data for four cases from both proposed and basic JLCM (black point: class 1/low level; red point: class 2/high level; black dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 1; red dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 2; black full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 1; red full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 2; green dotted line: survival probability from proposed JLCM; blue dotted line: survival probability from basic JLCM; purple vertical dashed line: subject censored; red vertical dotted line: time to event happened)

To assess the prediction accuracy of the general and time-varying JLCM, we calculate the IPCW estimator of the AUC within the time interval  $[0.5, 0.8)$  at  $t = 5$  with  $\Delta t = 0.3$  over 100 simulations, following the AUC equation from JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022). The boxplots of the IPCW estimator of AUC, denoted as  $\widehat{AUC}(0.5, 0.8)$ , are presented in Figure 4.

In Figure 4, we can obtain higher IPCW estimators from the general JLCM, which indicates that the general JLCM outperforms the time-varying JLCM due to better predictions.

#### IV. REAL DATA APPLICATION

##### A. Data information

The AIDS dataset (Goldman et al., 1996) comprises both longitudinal and survival data from a randomized clinical trial aimed at comparing the efficacy and safety of two antiretroviral drugs in patients who had either failed or were intolerant to zidovudine (AZT) therapy. The dataset consists of 1,408 observations across 9 variables: *patient*, *Time*, *death*, *CD4*, *obstime*, *drug*, *gender*, *prevOI*, and *AZT*. There are a total of 467 distinct patients, each identified by a unique patient identifier. The variable *Time* represents the time to death or censoring, while *death* is a binary indicator (0 for censoring, 1 for death).

The *CD4* variable represents the CD4 cell count in the blood, measured at study entry and at 2, 6, 12, and 18 months. CD4 cells are white blood cells crucial for fighting infections and are used to assess the health of the immune system in HIV-infected individuals. The variable *obstime* indicates the time points at which CD4 cell counts were recorded.

The *drug* variable is a factor with two levels: ddC (zalcitabine) and ddI (didanosine). *gender* is also a factor with two levels: female and male. The variable *prevOI* is a factor with levels AIDS (denoting previous opportunistic infections, specifically AIDS diagnosis at study entry) and noAIDS (denoting no previous infection). Finally, *AZT* is a factor with two levels: intolerance and failure, indicating whether the patient experienced intolerance or failure to AZT therapy.

For the real data analysis, we select the AIDS dataset and fit both the proposed general JLCM and the time-varying JLCM, considering models with 1, 2, or 3 latent classes.

##### B. Estimation results and do the comparison with results from time-varying JLCM

We choose AIDS drug trial data to do the comparison between the proposed general and time-varying JLCM. AIDS dataset is firstly to be applied in joint modelling research. Six different model settings are chosen as the simulation modelling setting, including the proposed general JLCM with subgroup numbers from 1 to 3 and the time-varying JLCM with classification settings from 1 to 3. A bayesian approach is used through MCMC to implement the these models.

For the AIDS data, we set the low CD4 level as class 1 and high CD4 level as class 2 (same settings as simulation study). To fit the general JLCM for the AIDS data, the longitudinal submodel is as follows:

$$CD4_{ijk} = \beta_{1k} + \beta_{2k}Time_{ij} + \beta_{2k}gender_{ij} + \beta_{4k}prevOI_{ij} + \beta_{5k}AZT_{ij} + U_{1i} + U_{2i}Time_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

For the hazards submodel, we consider:

$$\lambda_{ik}(t) = \lambda_{0k} \exp(\gamma_k t) \exp(w_{k1}gender_i + w_{k2}prevOI_i + w_{k3}AZT_i + w_{k4}drug_i + v_i) \\ \text{for } t \leq T_i$$

The random effects follow a multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and the variace covariance  $\Sigma_i$ , as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_i \\ v_i \end{pmatrix} \sim N_{(q+1)} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \Sigma_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{u_i} & \Sigma_{uv_i} \\ \Sigma_{uv_i} & \sigma_{v_i}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

For the regression submodel, we set that

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{igl} = \mathbf{A}_{igl}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 & i = 1, 2, \dots, N; \quad g = 1, 2, \dots, q+1 \\ \log d_{ig}^2 = \mathbf{B}_{ig}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2 & l = 1, 2, \dots, g-1 \end{cases}$$

where we specifically choose  $\mathbf{A}_{igl} = \mathbf{B}_{ig} = (drug_i, AZT_i)^T$ , such that a heterogeneous covariance matrix is allowed for

different treatment groups.

Finally, for the latent class sumodel, we specify

$$p_{ijk} = \frac{\exp(\xi_{1k} + \xi_{2k}Time_{ij})}{\sum_{s=1}^2 \exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\xi_s)} \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, K$$

where  $Time_{ij}$  denotes the measurement time for the patient  $i$  at time  $j$ .  $gender_{ij}$  is a factor with levels female (0) and male (1).  $prevOI_{ij}$  is the a factor with levels AIDS denoting previous opportunistic infection (AIDS diagnosis) at study entry, and no AIDS denoting no previous infection.  $AZT_{ij}$  is the factor with levels intolerance and failure denoting AZT intolerance and AZT failure, respectively.  $U_{1i}$  is the random intercept and  $U_{2i}$  is treated as the random slope for time in this linear mixed-effects model with the bivariate normal distribution  $\mathbf{U}_i \sim N_{(2)}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{ui})$  and  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  is the measurement errors which follow a normal distribution:  $\epsilon_{ijk} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} N(0, \tau_k)$ .

For comparison, we also fit a time-varying JLCM with shared distribution. The longitudinal submodel, survival submodel and latent class submodel are set the same as the fitted general JLCM above.

Table 3: DIC table of AIDS data for both general and time-varying JLCMs in Bayeian approach

Model	the general JLCM			time-varying JLCM		
	$K=1$	$K=2$	$K=3$	$K=1$	$K=2$	$K=3$
DIC	537.2458	483.5541	572.3161	894.5011	864.4287	902.6324

As shown in Table 3, the proposed general JLCM with 2 classes is identified as the optimal model. For the time-varying JLCM, the optimal model is also the one with 2 classes, which aligns with the results from our simulation study. Further details on the estimation results from the time-varying JLCM can be found in Appendix B.

Following 2000 iterations for burn-in, the posterior means, standard deviations, and 89% credible intervals for each parameter in both the time-varying and general JLCMs are presented in Table B1 (Appendix B) and Table 4, respectively.

Table 4: Estimation results for the analysis of the AIDS data based on the general JLCM with  $K=2$

Parameter	Class 1			Class 2			
	Estimate	sd	CI(89% )	Parameter	Estimate	sd	CI(89% )
$\beta_{11}$	8.2885	1.5744	[5.79, 10.72]	$\beta_{21}$	13.1232	1.4409	[10.66, 15.15]
$\beta_{12}$	-0.1405	0.0683	[-0.26, -0.06]	$\beta_{22}$	-0.0738	0.0580	[-0.15, 0.02]
$\beta_{13}$	-0.1776	0.8046	[-1.53, 0.95]	$\beta_{23}$	-0.1365	0.7517	[-1.33, 1.05]
$\beta_{14}$	-2.6537	1.7399	[-4.75, -0.76]	$\beta_{24}$	-5.5382	1.9633	[-7.91, -2.30]
$\beta_{15}$	-0.7411	1.1475	[-2.77, 0.26]	$\beta_{25}$	-0.6024	1.0515	[-1.80, 0.41]
$\tau_1$	23.7434	17.0624	[2.14, 54.96]	$\tau_2$	23.7272	17.0331	[2.10, 54.86]
$\lambda_1$	0.0140	0.0111	[0.00, 0.03]	$\lambda_2$	0.0047	0.0037	[0.00, 0.01]
$\gamma_1$	-0.1311	0.1434	[-0.39, 0.07]	$\gamma_2$	0.0130	0.3364	[-0.50, 0.59]
$w_{11}$	-0.2472	0.2854	[-0.73, 0.16]	$w_{21}$	-0.2602	0.4126	[-0.94, 0.36]
$w_{12}$	7.8945	5.6776	[0.75, 18.27]	$w_{22}$	7.7558	5.5825	[0.69, 17.91]
$w_{13}$	1.0155	0.7336	[0.11, 2.37]	$w_{23}$	0.6779	0.5517	[-0.05, 1.69]
$w_{14}$	1.0866	0.7651	[0.14, 2.50]	$w_{24}$	0.7978	0.6004	[0.00, 1.87]
$\xi_{11}$	6.1220	4.4319	[0.48, 14.19]	$\xi_{21}$	-0.1610	0.2938	[-0.65, 0.29]
$\xi_{12}$	-0.1578	0.2070	[-0.52, 0.13]	$\xi_{22}$	-0.0678	0.2378	[-0.49, 0.27]

Same value across two classes							
$\alpha_{11}$	-0.2195	0.3365	[-0.79, 0.28]	$\alpha_{21}$	0.1438	0.3741	[-0.44, 0.77]
$\alpha_{12}$	-0.2957	0.3892	[-0.97, 0.28]	$\alpha_{22}$	-0.1694	0.3914	[-0.84, 0.39]

Only variable *Time* has different trends in the longitudinal model between the general and time-varying JLCMs. Compared with the results of time-varying JLCM with optimal  $K = 2$  obtained using same Bayesian approach, we notice the CD4 level decreases, on average, with time for the general JLCM whereas increases, on average, with time for the comparative model. *Gender*, *PrevOI* and *AZT* also have a negative effects with time in the longitudinal submodel but *PrevOI* accounts for a sharper decrease in the CD4 level. We also notice similar trends except *Gender* in terms of the effect of variables in the survival models compared to time-varying JLCM. In particular, *PrevOI*, *AZT* and *drug* can increase risks in both proposed general and time-varying JLCM, however, *gender* reduces risks in our general JLCM. Estimators of both  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  values in the regression submodel are not zero, which indicates that *drug* and *AZT* can affect the association in the variance-covariance matrix. Although the CIs of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  include zero values, the CI values are mostly concentrated around negative values. Perhaps this issue could be resolved with running a longer MCMC chain. Huang et al. (2011) pointed that the hypothesis  $\Sigma_{uw_i} = \mathbf{0}$  can be tested to determine whether there is a latent relationship between the longitudinal measurements and survival outcomes. According to the estimated values of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ , we can get the estimated variance-covariance matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1.0259356 & -0.5285108 & -0.2562484 \\ -0.5285108 & 1.2981980 & -0.3965044 \\ -0.2562484 & -0.3965044 & 1.3622013 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the correlation matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1.0000000 & -0.4579556 & -0.2167607 \\ -0.4579556 & 1.0000000 & -0.2981652 \\ -0.2167607 & -0.2981652 & 1.0000000 \end{pmatrix}$$

for subject 5. We can see that  $\Sigma_{uw_5} = (-0.2562484, -0.3965044)^T$  and there exist negative correlations for random effects between longitudinal and survival processes. For subject 7,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the correlation matrix, which implies the homogeneous random covariance matrix can be included as the special case with covariance modelling. The general JLCM can provide the assessment of the homogeneous covariance assumption. Non-zero  $\xi_{k2}$  values indicate there is evidence of a time-varying membership probability. Both  $\xi_{12}$  and  $\xi_{22}$  are negative, which implies the membership probability of these two classes decreases with time and class 1 gets a sharper decrease.

Table 5: Jumping behaviours in the aids dataset based on the general JLCM with  $K=2$  using a Bayesian approach

	no moves		jumping behaviours	
Classification	class 1/low level	class 2/high level	in class 1 at the final time point	in class 2 at the final time point
Frequency	327	68	46	26
total	395		72	

Table 5 summarizes the jumping behaviors of individuals in the AIDS dataset. It is evident that the majority of patients remain stable within the same class, with only 15% exhibiting jumping behaviors. Among those with jumping behaviors, approximately 64% transition from the higher CD4 group (indicating better health) to the lower CD4 group, suggesting a potential decline in their health.

Table 6 presents a comparison of the posterior predictive probabilities for each group between the time-varying JLCM and the proposed general JLCM under a Bayesian framework. It is observed that the majority of individuals are classified into class 1 at the final time-point for both models, with comparable percentages across the two. Both models are reasonable for the

AIDS dataset, and by allowing group membership to vary over time, they effectively capture the variability in the data without requiring an additional class. However, as previously discussed, the estimation results suggest that the general JLCM provides a better fit for the data, offering stronger evidence of the effects of predictors on the relationship between the longitudinal and survival processes.

Table 6: Comparison of posterior membership probabilities between the proposed and time-varying JLCM

Model	Estimation method	$K$	%class1/low level	%class2/high level
time-varying JLCM (Final group)	Bayesian approach	2	77.30	22.70
proposed JLCM (Final group)	Bayesian approach	2	79.87	20.13

### C. Predicted survival time to event

Similar to the simulation study, our objective is to utilize the CD4 measurements to estimate the expected survival probabilities and assess our ability to discriminate between patients with high and low mortality risks. Using equations (11) and (12), we compute the survival predictions for eight specific subjects based on our proposed JLCM, which are presented in Figures 5 and 6. Both the longitudinal trajectories and survival probabilities are plotted together to evaluate how different jumping behaviors influence survival outcomes. The green dotted line represents the survival predictions derived from the proposed JLCM with 2 classes (the optimal model), while the blue dotted line corresponds to the survival probabilities from the time-varying JLCM with 2 classes (the best time-varying model). The vertical brown dotted and purple dashed lines denote the time of event and censoring time, respectively. In the longitudinal trajectories, black (red) circles indicate that the subject is classified in class 1 (2) at the specific time point, according to the proposed JLCM.

Based on the survival prediction figures above, subjects 60, 263, 350, and 459, who exhibit stable trajectories with no jumps, show a gradual decline in survival probability, stabilizing around 95% by the end of the study. For subject 60, the survival probability at the time of event, as predicted by the general JLCM (0.9933 vs 0.8367), is slightly more accurate than that from the time-varying JLCM. Additionally, the general JLCM responds more rapidly to the steep decline in survival probabilities for subjects 414 and 436, adjusting accordingly. For subject 436, who remains in class 2 with a significant jump to class 1 at the final time point, the proposed JLCM predicts a lower survival probability, reflecting this transition. Similarly, subjects 188 and 455 demonstrate a jump to a higher CD4 group. Compared to the time-varying JLCM, the general JLCM delivers more accurate dynamic predictions by incorporating random effects and covariance modelling. This approach provides a more nuanced understanding of survival probabilities and highlights the relationship between the dynamic predictions of the general JLCM and the jumping behaviors observed in the longitudinal trajectories. The dynamic prediction plots for these eight subjects are presented in Figure C2 of Appendix C.

## V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we proposed an extended time-varying JLCM incorporating additional covariance modelling. The general JLCM introduces two additional regression submodels to describe the heterogeneous random covariance matrix, which is decomposed using the Cholesky decomposition technique. This covariance modelling allows us to assess the impact of covariates on the association between the longitudinal and survival processes, while also enabling changes in each subject's group classification over time. Results from both the simulation study and the real-data analysis of the AIDS dataset demonstrate that the general JLCM outperforms the time-varying JLCM in terms of error rates and prediction accuracy. Moreover, in dynamic survival probability predictions, the general JLCM is more responsive to changes in class membership over time compared to the time-varying JLCM, yielding more accurate survival probability forecasts.

There are various extensions to consider for further work on the JLCM. One limitation of the proposed models in this paper is the assumption that the distribution of the survival event only depends on the classification at the last time point. As we have seen over both simulation and real data analysis, it might prevent our analysis from fully and accurately capturing the dynamic survival predictions. We could overcome this issue by considering the joint distribution of the longitudinal response and survival time at each time point, conditional on the longitudinal history and survival up to that point. A robust joint modelling approach may also be considered to deal with outlying longitudinal measurements. The assumption of normal distribution for the random errors can be relaxed by a skew-normal distribution. In addition, rather than assume that every subgroup has the same random effects, we can get a more general and flexible model by setting class-specific random effects. For further investigation, we can also consider a more efficient method to identify the optimal  $k$  value besides BIC, DIC etc. E.g. the overfitted mixture model (Rousseau & Mengersen, 2011) can increase the efficiency of group number selection.

1) *Relax the assumption that the distribution of the survival event only depends on the classification at the last time point.* In this paper, we assume that only the classification at the last time point is taken into account for the time-to-event outcomes, which leads to the limitation to capture the dynamic survival predictions accurately. For further improvement, we can consider the joint distribution of the longitudinal and survival processes at each time point, assuming the longitudinal history and the fact the individual survived up to that point. Then, we can use the conditional independence assumption to separate the joint distributions. Under this assumption, we can rewrite the likelihood in time-varying JLCM (Miao and Charalambous, 2022) for an example as below.

We denote  $\Psi$  as the collection of model parameters, such that  $\Psi = (\xi, \beta, \omega, \delta, \tau, \lambda, \Sigma_{ui})$  where  $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K)$ ,  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_K)$ ,  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K)$ ,  $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_K)$ ,  $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_K)$ ,  $\lambda = (\lambda_{01}, \dots, \lambda_{0K})$ . The likelihood contribution for the  $i$ th patient is written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_i(\Psi | \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{y}_i, T_i, \ddot{\Delta}_i, \mathbf{U}_i) \\ = f(\mathbf{y}_i, T_i, \ddot{\Delta}_i | \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) P(\mathbf{R}_i = k | \Psi) f(\mathbf{U}_i | \Psi) \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that the observed data  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \ddot{\Delta})$  are independent conditional on the latent class indicator  $R$  and the random effects  $\mathbf{U}$ , and that every subgroup has the same random effects, considering  $\mathbf{y}_i$  is observed at  $t_{ij} = (t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})^T$ , then we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\mathbf{y}_i, T_i, \ddot{\Delta}_i | \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) \\ &= f(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) f(T_i | \ddot{\Delta}_i, \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) \\ &= \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} f(y_{ij} | R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{R}_i = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) \right\} f(T_i > t_{i1} | \ddot{\Delta}_i, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) \\ & \quad \prod_{j=1}^{m_i-1} f(T_i > t_{i(j+1)} | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{ij}) \\ & \quad f(T_i | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{im_i}) \end{aligned}$$

The joint likelihood function is

$$L(\Psi | \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{T}, \ddot{\Delta}, \mathbf{U}) = \prod_{i=1}^N f(\mathbf{U}_i | \Psi) \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} \prod_{k=1}^K P_{ijk}$$

Where

$$P_{ijk} = \begin{cases} \left\{ P(R_{ij} = k | \Psi) f(y_{i1} | R_{i1} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) f(T_i > t_{i1} | \ddot{\Delta}_i, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) \right. \\ \left. f(T_i > t_{i2} | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{i1} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{i1}) \right\}^{I(R_{i1}=k)} & \text{for } j = 1, t_{i1} \neq 0; \\ \left\{ P(R_{ij} = k | \Psi) f(y_{i1} | R_{i1} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) f(T_i > t_{i2} | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{i1} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{i1}) \right\}^{I(R_{i1}=k)} & \text{for } j = 1, t_{i1} = 0; \\ \left\{ P(R_{ij} = k | \Psi) f(y_{ij} | R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) f(T_i > t_{i(j+1)} | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{ij}) \right\}^{I(R_{ij}=k)} & \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq m_i - 1; \\ \left\{ P(R_{im_i} = k | \Psi) f(y_{im_i} | R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi) f(T_i | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{im_i}) \right\}^{I(R_{im_i}=k)} & \text{for } j = m_i \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(R_{ij} = k) &= \pi_{ijk} = \exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\xi_k) / \sum_{s=1}^K \exp(\mathbf{X}_{1i}^T(t_{ij})\xi_s), k = 1, \dots, K; \\ f(y_{ij} | R_{ij} = k, \mathbf{U}_i) &= (2\pi\tau_k)^{-1/2} \exp\{-1/(2\tau_k)(y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2\}; \\ f(T_i | \ddot{\Delta}_i, R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi, T_i > t_{im_i}) &= \lambda_{ik}(t | R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi)^{\ddot{\Delta}_i} \exp(-H_{ik}(t | R_{im_i} = k, \mathbf{U}_i, \Psi)); \\ f(\mathbf{U}_i | \Psi) &= (2\pi)^{-q/2} \det(\Sigma_{ui})^{-1/2} \exp(-tr(\Sigma_{ui}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{U}_i^T)/2). \end{aligned}$$

We expect that the estimation results could be more accurate with all classification information of each time point for survival submodel considered into calculation.

2) *Robust longitudinal submodel* : Denote  $y_{ijk}$  as a repeated measurement for subject  $i$  at the  $j$ th visit in the class  $k$ , and the longitudinal submodel for  $y_{ij}$  is:

$$y_{ij} | (R_{ij} = k) = \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k + \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i + \epsilon_{ijk}$$

Where  $\mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij})$  is the covariate vector of subject  $i$ ,  $t_{ij}$  is denoted as the  $j$ th visit time of subject  $i$ , time is treated as the polynomial term in the covariate vector  $\mathbf{X}_{2i}$ ;  $\beta_k$  is the parameter vector for class  $k$ ;  $\mathbf{U}_i$  ( $q \times 1$ ) are the random effects for subject



$i$ .  $\mathbf{Z}_i(t_{ij})$  denotes the vector of covariates at the  $j$ th visit time associated with the random effects  $\mathbf{U}_i$ . We assume that these two design matrices,  $\mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij})$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_i(t_{ij})$ , may have time-dependent covariates measured at time points  $t_i = (t_{i1}, t_{i2}, \dots, t_{in_i})^T$ . We assume  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{U}_i$  (Liu et al., 2015).

In order to deal with some outlying data points, we propose  $\epsilon_{ijk} \sim t(0, \tau_k^2, \nu)$ , where  $\nu$  represents the degrees of freedom (Li et al., 2009). The normal distribution is included as a special case when  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  (For simplicity, we may assume  $\nu$  is prespecified by the limited empirical experience in practice). This robust longitudinal submodel can be considered as a more general longitudinal submodel than the linear mixed submodel (including both normal and  $t$  distributions).

Using the fact that the  $t$ -distributed error can be represented by a gamma-normal mixture distribution, we can write the  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  in the form of  $\epsilon_{ijk} = \gamma_{ijk}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \varepsilon_{ijk}$ , where  $\gamma_{ijk} \sim \Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{\nu}{2})$  and  $\varepsilon_{ijk} \sim N(0, \tau_k^2)$ . We assume that  $\gamma_{ijk}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_i$  and  $\varepsilon_{ijk}$  are independent (Huang et al., 2010). This formulation can help reduce the complexity in computation involved with the MCMC implementation for the robust joint model.

3) *Selection of optimal number of classes:* An important issue arising in joint latent class models is the selection of the optimal number of classes. Common approaches to identify the optimal  $k$  values in both Bayesian and Frequentist settings are the deviance information criterion (DIC)(Celeux et al., 2006), Bayesian information criterion (BIC)(Schwarz et al., 1978), Bayes factor as well as reversible jump MCMC algorithm(Green, 1995) etc. The main disadvantage of these methods is the issue of recomputation for all model settings with different  $k$  values.

Apart from criteria we used in the paper (BIC, DIC etc.), Rousseau and Mengersen (2011) Criterion, which assumes an overfitted mixture model with more latent subclasses than present in the dataset, might be implemented instead. This criterion could be considered in our approach to avoid having to fit JLCM over several different  $k$ , which may make computation more efficient.

The overfitted mixture model can converge to the true mixture model when the non empty classes are specified by giving a small proportion of subjects to empty classes. Firstly a large enough number of classes is setted for the latent class submodel. Then the group number  $K$  (the number of non empty classes) at every iteration  $i$  can be calculated by  $k_{i,opt} = K - \sum_{k=1}^K I(\frac{n_{ik}}{n} \leq v)$ , where  $k$  is the numer of class,  $K$  is the total number of classifications,  $n$  is the total number of subjects,  $n_{ik}$  defines as the number of subjects in class  $k$  at the  $i$ th iteration. After getting the non empty classes at each iteration, the posterior classifications of non empty classes is calculated. This is how Rousseau and Mengersen Criterion works to refit the model with non-empty optimal number of classes. This approach can help decrease the computational burden, because model need only be fitted twice (once for the highest number of classes and once for the optimal  $k$  value).




Fig. 5 Prediction of AIDS data for four cases from both proposed and time-varying JLCM (black point: class 1/low level; red point: class 2/high level; black dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 1; red dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 2; black full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 1; red full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 2; green dotted line: survival probability from proposed JLCM; blue dotted line: survival probability from basic JLCM; purple vertical dashed line: subject censored; red vertical dotted line: time to event happened)




Fig. 6 Prediction of AIDS data for four cases from both proposed and time-varying JLCM (black point: class 1/low level; red point: class 2/high level; black dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 1; red dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 2; black full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 1; red full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 2; green dotted line: survival probability from proposed JLCM; blue dotted line: survival probability from basic JLCM; purple vertical dashed line: subject censored; red vertical dotted line: time to event happened)

## APPENDIX

### Appendix A: Full conditional densities

(1) Sampling  $\beta_k$  from normal distribution.

We set the prior distribution for  $\beta_k$  as  $\pi(\beta_k) \sim MVN(\beta_0, \Sigma_{\beta_k})$  and then we can get:  $\pi(\beta_k) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\beta_k - \beta_0)^T \Sigma_{\beta_k}^{-1} (\beta_k - \beta_0))$ . (Note: Denote  $\pi(\cdot)$  as the density of the prior distribution and  $\pi(\cdot|\cdot)$  as the density of the conditional distribution).

Now, we get the conditional distribution for  $\beta_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi(\beta_k|\cdot) \\
& \propto \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} \left\{ \exp \left[ -\frac{(y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2}{2\tau_k} \right] \right\}^{I(R_{ij}=k)} \cdot \pi(\beta_k) \\
& \propto \exp \left[ -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} 2(y_{ij} - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)(\mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k)I(R_{ij}=k) - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij})\beta_k^T \beta_k I(R_{ij}=k)}{2\tau_k} \right] \\
& \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\beta_k - \beta_0)^T \Sigma_{\beta_k}^{-1} (\beta_k - \beta_0)\right) \\
& = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \beta_k^T \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij})I(R_{ij}=k)}{\tau_k} + \Sigma_{\beta_k}^{-1} \right) \beta_k \right\} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left. - 2(\beta_k^T \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (y_{ij} - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i) \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij}) I(R_{ij} = k)}{\tau_k} + \Sigma_{\beta_k}^{-1} \beta_0) \right\}$$

If  $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} I(R_{ij} = k) = 0$ , which means the likelihood makes no contributions to the posterior distribution, we sample  $\beta_k$  from the prior distribution  $\pi(\beta_k)$ .

We know that if  $y$  has the pdf  $g(y) \propto \exp\{-1/2(Ay^2 - 2By)\}$ , then we can say  $y \sim N(B/A, 1/A)$ . And, for  $\beta_k$ , if  $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} I(R_{ij} = k) \neq 0$ ,

$$\beta_k | \cdot \sim N\left(\frac{B}{A}, \frac{1}{A}\right)$$

Where  $A = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij}) \mathbf{X}_{2i}(t_{ij}) I(R_{ij} = k) / \tau_k + \Sigma_{\beta_k}^{-1}$ ,  $B = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (y_{ij} - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i) \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij}) I(R_{ij} = k) / \tau_k + \Sigma_{\beta_k}^{-1} \beta_0$ .

(2) Sample  $\lambda_{0k}$  from Gamma distribution.

Specify the inverse Gamma prior for the gamma prior for  $\lambda_{0k}$ , leading to the conjugate posterior for  $\lambda_{0k}$ . i.e.  $\pi(\lambda_{0k})$  follows Gamma distribution. And then we can get  $\pi(\lambda_{0k}) \sim \Gamma(\alpha_\lambda, \beta_\lambda)$ . We can get the posterior distribution of  $\lambda_{0k}$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi(\lambda_{0k} | \cdot) \\ & \propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N \lambda_{0k}^{I(T_i^* \leq C_i) I(R_{ij}=k)} \exp \left\{ - I(R_{ij} = k) \lambda_{0k} \int_0^t \exp(\gamma_k(u)) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(u) \boldsymbol{\omega}_k + \mathbf{W}_i[q+1]) du \right\} \right\} \pi(\lambda_{0k}) \\ & = \lambda_{0k}^{\sum_{i=1}^N I(T_i^* \leq C_i, R_{ij}=k)} \exp \left\{ - \lambda_{0k} \sum_{i=1}^N I(R_{ij} = k) \int_0^t \exp(\gamma_k(u)) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(u) \boldsymbol{\omega}_k + \mathbf{W}_i[q+1]) du \right\} (\lambda_{0k})^{\alpha_\lambda - 1} \exp(-\beta_\lambda \lambda_{0k}) \\ & = \lambda_{0k}^{\sum_{i=1}^N I(T_i^* \leq C_i, R_{ij}=k) + \alpha_\lambda - 1} \exp \left\{ - \lambda_{0k} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N I(R_{ij} = k) \int_0^t \exp(\gamma_k(u)) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(u) \boldsymbol{\omega}_k + \mathbf{W}_i[q+1]) du + \beta_\lambda \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

So we can see that if  $\sum I(R_{ij} = k) \neq 0$ ,

$$\lambda_{0k} | \cdot \sim \Gamma(E, F)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \alpha_\lambda + \sum_{i=1}^N I(T_i^* \leq C_i, R_{ij} = k) + 1 \\ F &= \sum_{i=1}^N I(R_{ij} = k) \int_0^t \exp(\gamma_k(u)) \exp(\mathbf{X}_{3i}^T(u) \boldsymbol{\omega}_k + \mathbf{W}_i[q+1]) du + \beta_\lambda \\ \mathbf{W}_i &= (\mathbf{U}_i, v_i)^T \end{aligned}$$

If  $\sum I(R_{ij} = k) = 0$ ,  $\lambda_{0k} | \cdot \sim \pi(\lambda_{0k})$ .

(3) Sampling  $\tau_k$  from inverse gamma distribution.

Further specify the inverse Gamma prior for the variance of the measurement error  $\tau_k$ , i.e. we set the prior distribution for  $\tau_k$ :  $\pi(\tau_k) \sim \text{InverseGamma}(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$  and then we can write:  $\pi(\tau_k) = \frac{\beta^{*\alpha^*}}{\Gamma(\alpha^*)} (\tau_k)^{-\alpha^* - 1} \exp(-\frac{\beta^*}{\tau_k})$  ( $\alpha^* > 0, \beta^* > 0$ ). Thus, we can get the conditional distribution for  $\tau_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi(\tau_k | \cdot) \\ & \propto \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} \left[ (\tau_k)^{(-\frac{1}{2})} \exp \left[ - \frac{(y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2}{2\tau_k} \right] \right]^{I(R_{ij}=k)} \right\} \cdot (\tau_k)^{-\alpha^* - 1} \exp(-\frac{\beta^*}{\tau_k}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^{m_i} (\tau_k)^{-\frac{I(R_{ij}=k)}{2}} \right\} (\tau_k)^{-\alpha^* - 1} \exp \left\{ - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2}{2} I(R_{ij} = k) + \beta^*}{\tau_k} \right\} \\
&= (\tau_k)^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} I(R_{ij}=k)}{2} - \alpha^* - 1} \exp \left\{ - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2 I(R_{ij}=k)}{2} + \beta^*}{\tau_k} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_k | \cdot \sim \text{InverseGamma} &\left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} I(R_{ij} = k)}{2} + \alpha^*, \right. \\
&\left. \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2 I(R_{ij} = k)}{2} + \beta^* \right)
\end{aligned}$$

If  $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} I(R_{ij} = k) = 0$ , we sample  $\tau_k$  from  $\text{InverseGamma}(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$ ; if not, we sample  $\tau_k$  from

$$\text{InverseGamma} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} I(R_{ij}=k)}{2} + \alpha^*, \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (y_{ij} - \mathbf{X}_{2i}^T(t_{ij})\beta_k - \mathbf{Z}_i^T(t_{ij})\mathbf{U}_i)^2 I(R_{ij}=k)}{2} + \beta^* \right).$$









## Appendix B: Estimation results for real data application on time-varying JLCM









We use time-varying JLCM with bayesian estimation method to do the inference. We set time-varying JLCM with group numbers from 1 to 3. Table 3 in real data application shows the summary information for time-varying JLCMs of AIDS data with various k settings. AIDS data with 2 classes gets the smallest DIC value among three model settings. Time-varying JLCM with two subgroups is picked up as the optimal model here. Estimation results of time-varying JLCM with  $K = 2$  are shown in Table B1.

Table B1: Estimation results for the analysis of the AIDS data based on time-varying JLCM with  $K=2$

Class 1				Class 2			
Parameter	Estimate	sd	CI(89% ETI)	Parameter	Estimate	sd	CI(89% ETI)
$\beta_{11}$	9.6901	1.5798	[6.61, 11.60]	$\beta_{21}$	10.2169	2.15924	[6.90, 13.52]
$\beta_{12}$	0.0690	0.2261	[-0.18, 0.50]	$\beta_{22}$	0.0656	0.2329	[-0.21, 0.50]
$\beta_{13}$	-0.2238	1.2406	[-2.00, 1.92]	$\beta_{23}$	-0.2663	1.3244	[-2.14, 1.93]
$\beta_{14}$	-3.2468	1.7205	[-5.28, -0.03]	$\beta_{24}$	-3.5140	2.2258	[-6.73, 0.13]
$\beta_{15}$	-0.8531	1.3973	[-3.46, 0.81]	$\beta_{25}$	-0.9335	1.7431	[-3.70, 0.77]
$\tau_1$	42.1118	35.2914	[4.16, 112.67]	$\tau_2$	43.0151	36.1066	[4.43, 115.30]
$\lambda_1$	0.1192	0.0866	[0.01, 0.28]	$\lambda_2$	0.6856	0.5287	[0.07, 1.69]
$\gamma_1$	4.9863	8.0815	[-5.12, 19.47]	$\gamma_2$	-0.8465	1.5649	[-3.66, 1.13]
$w_{11}$	0.7213	1.7076	[-1.58, 3.75]	$w_{21}$	-1.2827	1.5676	[-4.20, 0.55]
$w_{12}$	14.7123	12.1755	[1.59, 39.05]	$w_{22}$	14.7653	12.1698	[1.64, 39.24]
$w_{13}$	3.0325	3.6380	[-1.27, 9.90]	$w_{23}$	0.8254	1.3862	[-1.25, 3.20]
$w_{14}$	1.1191	1.2803	[-0.45, 3.44]	$w_{24}$	1.4222	1.2401	[0.08, 3.84]
$\xi_{11}$	12.0947	10.0225	[1.42, 32.15]	$\xi_{21}$	0.2629	0.7500	[-0.78, 1.58]
$\xi_{12}$	1.2660	1.5814	[-0.63, 4.23]	$\xi_{22}$	0.4070	0.5235	[-0.24, 1.39]

## Appendix C: Dynamic prediction plots of simulation and real data application


































Fig. C1. Dynamic Survival predictions of simulated data for six cases from both proposed and basic JLCM (black point: class 1/low level; red point: class 2/high level; black dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 1; red dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 2; black full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 1; red full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 2; green dotted line: survival probability from proposed JLCM; blue dotted line: survival probability from basic JLCM; purple vertical dashed line: subject censored; red vertical dotted line: time to event happened)












Fig. C2. Dynamic Survival predictions of simulated data for eight cases from both proposed and basic JLCM (black point: class 1/low level; red point: class 2/high level; black dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 1; red dashed line: longitudinal trajectory which stayed in class 2; black full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 1; red full line: fitted trajectory which stayed in class 2; green dotted line: survival probability from proposed JLCM; blue dotted line: survival probability from basic JLCM; purple vertical dashed line: subject censored; red vertical dotted line: time to event happened)

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abrams, D. I., Goldman, A. I., Launer, C., Korvick, J. A., Neaton, J. D., Crane, L. R., Grodesky, M., Wakefield, S., Muth, K., Kornegay, S., Cohn, D. L., Harris, A., Luskin-Hawk, R., Markowitz, N., Sampson, J. H., Thompson, M., and Deyton, L. (1994). A Comparative Trial of Didanosine or Zalcitabine after Treatment with Zidovudine in Patients with Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 330(10), 657–662. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199403103301001>
- [2] Aninopoulou, E., Nasserinejad, K., Szczesniak, R., and Rizopoulos, D. (2020). Integrating Latent Classes in the Bayesian Shared Parameter Joint Model of Longitudinal and Survival Outcomes. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 29(11), pp.3294–3307.
- [3] Alsefri, M., Sudell, M., García-Fiñana M., and Kolamunnage-Dona, R. (2020). Bayesian Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Time to Event Data: A Methodological Review. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 20(1), pp.94–94.
- [4] Albert, P.S., and Follmann, D.A. (2000). Modelling Repeated Count Data Subject to Informative Dropout. *Biometrics*, 56(3), pp.667–677.
- [5] Anderson, T.W. (1973). Asymptotically Efficient Estimation of Covariance Matrices with Linear Structure. *The Annals of Statistics*, pp.135–141.
- [6] Austin, P.C. (2012). Generating Survival Times to Simulate Cox Proportional Hazards Models with Time-Varying Covariates. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31(29), pp.3946–3958.
- [7] Bartolucci, F., and Farcomeni, A. (2019). A Shared-Parameter Continuous-Time Hidden Markov and Survival Model for Longitudinal Data with Informative Dropout. *Statistics in Medicine*, 38(6), pp.1056–1073.
- [8] Baghfalaki, T., Ganjali, M., and Hashemi, R. (2014). Bayesian Joint Modelling of Longitudinal Measurements and Time-to-Event Data Using Robust Distributions. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics*, 24(4), pp.834–855.
- [9] Blanche, P., Proust-Lima, C., Loubère, L., Berr, C., Dartigues, J. F., and Jacqmin-Gadda, H. (2015). Quantifying and Comparing Dynamic Predictive Accuracy of Joint Models for Longitudinal Marker and Time-to-Event in Presence of Censoring and Competing Risks. *Biometrics*, 71(1), 102–113.
- [10] Bucholz, K. K., Heath, A. C., Reich, T., Hesselbrock, V. M., Kramner, J. R., Nurnberger Jr, J. I., and Schuckit, M. A. (1996). Can We Subtype Alcoholism? A Latent Class Analysis of Data from Relatives of Alcoholics in A Multicenter Family Study of Alcoholism. *Alcoholism; Clinical and Experimental Research*; 20(8):1462-1471.
- [11] Cox, D.R. (1972) Regression Models and Life-Tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 34, 187-202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1972.tb00899.x>
- [12] Chiang, C.T. (2009). A More Flexible Joint Latent Model for Longitudinal and Survival Time Data. *Metrika*, 73(2), pp.151–170.
- [13] Celeux, G., Forbes, F., Robert, C.P., and Titterton, D.M. (2006). Deviance Information Criteria for Missing Data Models. *Bayesian Analysis*, 1(4).
- [14] Crowther, M.J., Abrams, K.R. and Lambert, P.C. (2013). Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Survival Data. *The Stata Journal*, 13(1), pp.165–184.
- [15] Chen, J., and Huang, Y. (2015). A Bayesian Mixture of Semiparametric Mixed-Effects Joint Models for Skewed-Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 34:2820–43.
- [16] Chiu, T.Y.M., Leonard, T., and Tsui, K.W. (1996). The Matrix-Logarithm Variance Model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 91, 198-210. 34:2820–43.
- [17] Dai, H. and Pan, J. (2018). Joint Modelling of Survival and Longitudinal Data with Informative Observation Times. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics: Theory and applications*, 45 (3). pp. 571-589. ISSN 0303-6898.
- [18] de Bruijne, M.H., Sijkens, Y.W., Paul, L.C., Westendorp, R.G., van Houwelingen, H.C., and Zwiderman, A.H. (2003). Predicting Kidney Graft Failure Using Time-Dependent Renal Function Covariates. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 56(5), pp.448–455.
- [19] Degrootola, V., and Tu, X.M. (1994). Modelling Progression of CD4-Lymphocyte Count and Its Relationship to Survival Time. *Biometrics*, 50(4), pp.1003–1014.

- [20] Dagne, G.A. (2017). Joint Two-Part Tobit Models for Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 36:4214–29.
- [21] Elashoff, R.M., Li, G. and Li, N. (2008). A Joint Model for Longitudinal Measurements and Survival Data in the Presence of Multiple Failure Types. *Biometrics*, 64(3), pp.762–771.
- [22] Entink, R.H.K., Fox, J.P., and Avd, H. (2011). A Mixture Model for the Joint Analysis of Latent Developmental Trajectories and Survival. *Statistics in Medicine*, 30:2310–25.
- [23] Fergusson, D.M., and Horwood, L.J. (1989) A Latent Class Model of Smoking Experimentation in Children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*; 30(5):761-773.
- [24] Fergusson, D.M., Horwood, L.J., and Lloyd, M. A. (1991) Latent Class Model of Child Offending. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*; 1(1):90-106.
- [25] Fergusson, D.M., Horwood, L.J., and Lynskey, M.T. (1994) The Comorbidities of Adolescent Problem Behaviours: A Latent Class Model. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*; 22(3):339-354.
- [26] Garre, F.G., Zwinderman, A.H., Geskus, R.B., and Sijpkens, Y.W.J. (2008). A Joint Latent Class Change-point Model to Improve the Prediction of Time to Graft Failure. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A, Statistics in Society*, 171(1), pp.299–308.
- [27] Gelman, A., Gilks, W.R., and Roberts, G.O. (1997). Weak Convergence and Optimal Scaling of Random Walk Metropolis Algorithms. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 7(1), pp.110–120.
- [28] Goldman, A.I., Carlin, B.P., Crane, L.R., Launer, C., Korvick, J.A., Deyton, L., and Abrams, D.I. (1996). Response of CD4 Lymphocytes and Clinical Consequences of Treatment Using ddI or ddC in Patients with Advanced HIV Infection. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 11(2), p.161–169.
- [29] Goodman, L. A. (1974a). The Analysis of Systems of Qualitative Variables When Some of the Variables Are Unobservable: Part I—A Modified Latent Structure Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79, 1179–1259. Reproduced in Goodman (with J.Magidson, editor), *Analyzing Qualitative/Categorical Data: Log-Linear Models and Latent Structure Analysis* (J.Magidson, Ed.). University Press, 1978, Lanham, MD.
- [30] Goodman, L. A. (1974b). Exploratory Latent Structure Analysis Using Both Identifiable and Unidentifiable Models. *Biometrika*, 61, 215–231. Reproduced in Goodman, *Analyzing Qualitative/Categorical Data: Log-Linear Models and Latent-Structure Analysis* (J. Magidson, Ed.). University Press, 1978.
- [31] Green, P.J. (1995). Reversible Jump Markov Chain Monte Carlo Computation and Bayesian Model Determination. *Biometrika*, 82(4), pp.711–732.
- [32] Gilks, W.R., and Wild, P. (1992). Adaptive Rejection Sampling for Gibbs Sampling. *Applied Statistics*, 41(2), pp.337–348.
- [33] Hickey, G.L., Philipson, P., Jorgensen, A., and Kolamunnage-Dona, R. (2016). Joint Modelling of Time-to-Event and Multivariate Longitudinal Outcomes: Recent Developments and Issues. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 16(1), pp.117–117.
- [34] Haario, H., Saksman, E., and Tamminen, J. (2001). An Adaptive Metropolis Algorithm. *Bernoulli: Official Journal of the Bernoulli Society for Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, 7(2), pp.223–242.
- [35] Hougaard, P. (1995). Frailty Models for Survival Data. *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 1(3), pp.255–273.
- [36] Henderson, R., Diggle, P., and Dobson, A. (2000). Joint Modelling of Longitudinal Measurements and Event Time Data. *Biostatistics (Oxford, England)*, 1(4), pp.465–480.
- [37] Haberman, S.J. (1979). *Analysis of Qualitative Data, Vol 2, New Developments*. New York: Academic Press.
- [38] Hagenaars, J.A. (1990). *Categorical Longitudinal Data-Loglinear Analysis of Panel, Trend and Cohort Data*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- [39] Hu, W., Li, G., and Li, N. (2009). A Bayesian Approach to Joint Analysis of Longitudinal Measurements and Competing Risks Failure Time Data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 28(11), pp.1601–1619.
- [40] Huang, X., Li, G., Elashoff, R.M., and Pan, J. (2011). A General Joint Model for Longitudinal Measurements and Competing Risks Survival Data with Heterogeneous Random Effects. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 17(1):80-100.
- [41] Huang, Y., Dagne, G.A., and Park, J.G. (2016). Mixture Joint Models for Event Time and Longitudinal Data with Multiple Features. *Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research*, 8(2):194–206.
- [42] Ibrahim, J.G., Chu, H., and Chen, L.M. (2010). Basic Concepts and Methods for Joint Models of Longitudinal and Survival Data. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 28(16), 2796–2801.
- [43] Kürüm, E., Jeske, D.R., Behrendt, C.E., and Lee, P. (2018). A Copula Model for Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Time-Invariant Mixed Outcomes. *Statistics in Medicine*, 37(27), pp.3931–3943.
- [44] Kruschke, J. (2014). *Doing Bayesian Data Analysis: A Tutorial with R, JAGS, and Stan*. Academic Press.
- [45] Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1950). The Logical and Mathematical Foundation of Latent Structure Analysis & the Interpretation and Mathematical Foundation of Latent Structure Analysis. In S. A.Stouffer, L.Guttman, E. A.Suchman, P. F.Lazarsfeld, S. A.Star, J. A.Clausen (Eds.), *Measurement and Prediction* (pp. 362–472). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [46] Lin, H., Han, L., Peduzzi, P.N., Murohy, T.E., Gill, T.M., and Allore, H.G. (2014). A Dynamic Trajectory Class Model for Intensive Longitudinal Categorical Outcome. *Statistics in Medicine*, 33(15), pp.2645–2664.
- [47] Lin, H., Turnbull, B.W., McCulloch, C.E., and Slate, E.H. (2002). Latent Class Models for Joint Analysis of Longitudinal Biomarker and Event Process Data: Application to Longitudinal Prostate-Specific Antigen Readings and Prostate Cancer. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457), pp.53–65.
- [48] Liu, Y., Liu, L., and Zhou, J. (2015). Joint Latent Class Model of Survival and Longitudinal Data: An Application to CPCRA Study. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 91, pp.40–50.
- [49] Laird, N.M., and Ware, J.H. (1982). Random-Effects Models for Longitudinal Data. *Biometrics*, 38(4), pp.963–974.
- [50] Leonard, T., and Hsu, J.S.J. (1992). Bayesian Inference for A Covariance Matrix. *The Annals of Statistics*. 20, 1669-96.
- [51] Magidson, J., Vermunt, J. K., Madura, J. P., Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., Cernat, A., Sakshaug, J. W., and Williams, R. A. (2020). *Latent Class Analysis* (P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, and R. A. Williams, Eds.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [52] Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth A.W., Rosenbluth, M.N., Teller A.H., and Teller, E. (1953). Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing Machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21(6), pp.1087–1092.
- [53] MacKenzie, G. (2004). Advances in Covariance Modelling. *Statistical Modelling: Proceedings of the 19th International Workshop on Statistical Modelling, Florence (Italy), 4-8 July, 2004*. Firenze University Press.
- [54] Murtaugh, P.A., Dickson, E., Vandam, G., Malinchoc, M., Grambsch, P., Langworthy, A., and Gips, C. (1994). Primary Biliary Cirrhosis: Prediction of Short-Term Survival Based on Repeated Patient Visits. *Hepatology (Baltimore, Md.)*, 20(1), pp.126–134.
- [55] Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M. S., and Lüdtke, D. (2019). BayestestR: Describing Effects and Their Uncertainty, Existence and Significance within the Bayesian Framework. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(40), 1541. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01541>
- [56] McElreath, R. (2018). *Statistical Rethinking: A Bayesian Course with Examples in R and Stan*. Chapman; Hall/CRC.
- [57] Neaton, J. D., Wentworth, D. N., Rhame, F., Hogan, C., Abrams, D. I., and Deyton, L. (1994). Considerations in Choice of A Clinical Endpoint for Aids Clinical Trials. Terry Beinr Community Programs for Clinical Research on Aids (CPCRA). *Statistics in Medicine*, 13(19-20), 2107–2125. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780131919>
- [58] Proust-Lima, C., Sène, M., Taylor, J.M., and Jacqmin-Gadda, H. (2014). Joint Latent Class Models for Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data: A Review. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 23(1), pp.74–90.
- [59] Proust-Lima, C., Philipps, V., and Liqueur, B. (2017). Estimation of Extended Mixed Models Using Latent Classes and Latent Processes: The R Package Lcmm. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 78(2), pp.1–56.
- [60] Proust-Lima, C., Dartigues, J.F., and Jacqmin-Gadda, H. (2016). Joint Modelling of Repeated Multivariate Cognitive Measures and Competing Risks of Dementia and Death: A Latent Process and Latent Class Approach. *Statistics in Medicine*, 35(3), pp.382–398.

- [61] Philipson, P., Diggle, P.J., and Sousa, I. (2012). Joiner: Joint Modelling of Repeated Measurements and Time-to-Event Data. R Package Version 1.0-3. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=joineR>
- [62] Pinheiro, J.D., and Bates, D.M. (1996). Unconstrained Parameterizations for Variance-Covariance Matrices. *Statistics and Computing*, 6, 289-96.
- [63] Pourahmadi, M. (1999). Joint Mean-Covariance Models with Applications to Longitudinal Data: Unconstrained Parameterisation. *Biometrika*, 86(3), pp.677-690.
- [64] Pourahmadi, M. (2000). Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Generalised Linear Models for Multivariate Normal Covariance Matrix. *Biometrika*, 87(2), pp.425-435.
- [65] Pan, J., and MacKenzie, G. (2003). Model Selection for Joint Mean-Covariance Structures in Longitudinal Studies. *Biometrika* Vol. 90, No.1, 239-44.
- [66] Pan, J., and MacKenzie, G. (2006). Regression Models for Covariance Structures in Longitudinal Studies. *Statistical Modelling* Vol. 6, No. 1, 4357.
- [67] Pan, J., and MacKenzie, G. (2007). Modelling Conditional Covariance in the Linear Mixed Model. *Statistical Modelling* Vol. 7, No. 1, 49-71.
- [68] Rouanet, A. , Joly, P., Dartigues, J.F., Proust-Lima, C., and Jacqmin-Gadda, H. (2016). Joint Latent Class Model for Longitudinal Data and Interval-Censored Semi-Competing Events: Application to Dementia. *Biometrics*, 72(4), pp.1123-1135.
- [69] Rizopoulos, D. (2010). JM: An R Package for the Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 35(9), pp.1-33.
- [70] Miao, R. and Charalambous, C. (2022). A joint latent class model of longitudinal and survival data with a time-varying membership probability. [arXiv:2206.11384](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11384) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.11384>
- [71] Rizopoulos, D. (2011). Dynamic Predictions and Prospective Accuracy in Joint Models for Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data. *Biometrics*, 67(3), pp.819-829.
- [72] Rizopoulos, D., Verbeke, G., and Lesaffre, E. (2009). Fully Exponential Laplace Approximations for the Joint Modelling of Survival and Longitudinal Data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical Methodology*, 71(3), pp.637-654.
- [73] Rizopoulos, D. (2016). The R Package JMbayes for Fitting Joint Models for Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data Using MCMC. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 72(7), pp.1-46.
- [74] Roberts, G.O., and Rosenthal, J.S. (2001). Optimal Scaling for Various Metropolis-Hastings Algorithms. *Statistical Science*, 16(4), pp.351-367.
- [75] Roberts, G.O., and Rosenthal, J.S. (2009). Examples of Adaptive MCMC. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 18(2), pp.349-367.
- [76] Rousseau, J., and Mengersen, K. (2011). Asymptotic Behaviour of the Posterior Distribution in Overfitted Mixture Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical Methodology*, 73(5), pp.689-710.
- [77] Reboussin, B.A., and Anthony, J.C. (2001). Latent Class Marginal Regression Models for Modelling Youthful Drug Involvement and Its Suspected Influences. *Statistics in Medicine*, 20(4), pp.623-639.
- [78] Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the Dimension of A Model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(2), pp.461-464.
- [79] Schuurman, N.K., Grasman, R.P.P.P., and Hamaker, E.L. (2016). A Comparison of Inverse-Wishart Prior Specifications for Covariance Matrices in Multilevel Autoregressive Models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 51(2-3), pp.185-206.
- [80] Schluchter, M.D. (1992). Methods for the Analysis of Informatively Censored Longitudinal Data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 11(14-15), pp.1861-1870. *Behavioral Research*, 51(2-3), pp.185-206.
- [81] Self, S., and Pawitan, Y. (1992). Modelling A Marker of Disease Progression and Onset of Disease. In: Jewell, N.P., Dietz, K., Farewell, V.T. (eds) *AIDS Epidemiology*. Birkhäuser, Boston, MA. pp. 231-255.
- [82] Troxel, A.B., Harrington, D.P., and Lipsitz, S.R. (1998). Analysis of Longitudinal Data with Non-Ignorable Non-Monotone Missing Values. *Applied Statistics*, 47(3), pp.425-438.
- [83] Tsiatis, A.A., Degruetola, V., and Wulfsohn, M.S. (1995). Modelling the Relationship of Survival to Longitudinal Data Measured with Error. Applications to Survival and CD4 Counts in Patients with AIDS. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429), pp.27-37.
- [84] Tsiatis, A. A., and Davidian, M. (2004). Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data: An Overview. *Statistica Sinica*, 14(3), 809-834.
- [85] Tseng, Y.K., Hsieh, F., and Wang, J.L. (2005). Joint Modelling of Accelerated Failure Time and Longitudinal Data. *Biometrika*, 92(3), pp.587-603.
- [86] Vermunt, J.K. (1997). *Log-linear Models for Event Histories*. Thousand Oakes: Sage Publications.
- [87] van de Pol, F., and Langeheine, R. (1989). Mover-Stayer Models, Mixed Markov Models and the EM Algorithm; with An Application to Labour Market Data from the Netherlands Socio Economic Panel. In *Multiway Data Analysis*. North Holland: Amsterdam; 485-495.
- [88] Viviani, S., Alfo, M., and Rizopoulos, D. (2014). Generalized Linear Mixed Joint Model for Longitudinal and Survival Outcomes. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(3), pp.417-427.
- [89] Wulfsohn, M.S., and Tsiatis, A.A. (1997). A Joint Model for Survival and Longitudinal Data Measured with Error. *Biometrics*, 53(1), pp.330-339.
- [90] Wang, C. Y. (2006). Corrected Score Estimator for Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Failure Time Data. *Statistica Sinica*, 16(1), 235-253.
- [91] Zhou, X., Kang, K., Kwok, T., and Song, X. (2022). Joint Hidden Markov Model for Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data with Latent Variables. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 57(2-3):441-457.
- [92] Zhang, N., and Simonoff, J.S. (2020). The Potential for Nonparametric Joint Latent Class Modelling of Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data. In: La Rocca, M., Liseo, B., Salmaso, L. (eds) *Nonparametric Statistics. ISNPS 2018. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics*, vol 339. Springer, Cham.
- [93] Zhang, N. and Simonoff, J.S. (2022). Joint Latent Class Trees: A Tree-Based Approach to Modelling Time-to-Event and Longitudinal Data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 31(4), pp.719-752.
- [94] Zhang, Z., Charalambous, C., and Foster, P. (2021). A Gaussian Copula Joint Model for Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data with Random Effects. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.01941>