

On the limitations for causal inference in Cox models with time-varying treatment

Mark B. Knudsen¹, Erin E. Gabriel¹, Torben Martinussen¹, Helene C. W. Rytgaard¹, and Arvid Sjölander²

¹Section of Biostatistics, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

²Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden

April 2, 2025

Abstract

When using the Cox model to analyze the effect of a time-varying treatment on a survival outcome, treatment is commonly included, using only the current level as a time-dependent covariate. Such a model does not necessarily assume that past treatment is not associated with the outcome (the Markov property), since it is possible to model the hazard conditional on only the current treatment value. However, modeling the hazard conditional on the full treatment history is required in order to interpret the results causally, and such a full model assumes the Markov property when only including current treatment. This is, for example, common in marginal structural Cox models. We demonstrate that relying on the Markov property is problematic, since it only holds in unrealistic settings or if the treatment has no causal effect. This is the case even if there are no confounders and the true causal effect of treatment really only depends on its current level. Further, we provide an example of a scenario where the Markov property is not fulfilled, but the Cox model that includes only current treatment as a covariate is correctly specified. Transforming the result to the survival scale does not give the true intervention-specific survival probabilities, showcasing that it is unclear how to make causal statements from such models.

1 Introduction

Time-to-event methods are commonplace in medical research, and the Cox model (Cox 1972) is by far the most commonly used regression model among them. The Cox model parametrizes the hazard function, which is the instantaneous rate of events that occur among subjects who have not yet experienced the event. The hazard ratio (HR) comparing treated and untreated is often the primary effect measure reported in studies with a time-to-event outcome. In recent years, however, warnings have been issued about the subtle causal interpretation of the HR, as it mixes a (potentially) real treatment effect with an unavoidable selection effect if the treatment actually has a causal effect (Hernán 2010; Aalen et al. 2015; Martinussen et al. 2020). Due to this, Hernán (2010) recommends supplementing HRs with estimated survival curves for easier causal interpretation. Many recent contributions to the causal time-to-event literature likewise focus on non-hazard estimands such as the probability of survival/death or the restricted mean survival time. In the Cox model with baseline binary treatment, the HR parameter equals the ratio of the log-survival probabilities for the treated and untreated, yielding a probability-based causal interpretation of the HR parameter in the absence of unmeasured confounding (Martinussen et al. 2020). This interpretation is, however, less straightforward.

When the treatment/exposure is time-varying, it is common to apply the Cox model using only the current value of the treatment as a time-dependent covariate. There is some ambiguity in terms of what this expression is supposed to be a model for, since it is possible to consider the hazard conditional on either the current treatment only or the entire treatment history. In the latter case, a model that only includes the current treatment level as a covariate would assume that the hazard of the outcome occurring is conditionally independent of the treatment history, given the current treatment level. This assumption is referred to as the Markov property. Without the Markov property, the Cox model using only the current treatment level as a time-dependent covariate is a valid statistical model for the rate (the hazard conditional on only the current treatment) if the model is correctly specified. Unfortunately, the rate has no clear causal interpretation. Specifically, in particular settings, the results from such a Cox regression analysis are equivalent to the so-called extended Kaplan-Meier curve (Simon and Makuch 1984; Snapinn et al. 2005). Sjölander (2020) pointed out that extended Kaplan-Meier curve only has a valid causal interpretation under the Markov assumption, which is unrealistic except if the treatment has no effect, leaving no plausible causal interpretation.

We broaden the warning issued by Sjölander (2020) to include Cox regression with time-dependent treatment, MSMs that only include the current value of the treatment in the model (which is common practice), and multi-state models with an absorbing state. In particular, we focus on time-varying treatment Cox models. We point out that causal hazard models are (under identifiability conditions) identified through the hazard conditional on the entire treatment history, and thus a causal interpretation relies on the Markov property if only the current level of treatment is included in the model for the observed data. This is, for example, common in marginal structural Cox models (Cox MSMs) (Hernán et al. 2000; Hernán et al. 2001), which have become quite popular, and used in many studies in high-impact journals; for example Choi et al. (2002), Tiihonen et al. (2009), Chirgwin et al. (2016), Li et al. (2016), and Nahon et al. (2018). When conducting an MSM analysis, researchers typically report the obtained HR. However, just as in the baseline treatment setting, this parameter lacks a causal interpretation if interpreted as an HR. The only viable option forward seems to be to convert the HR into a survival probability like in the time-fixed treatment case. However, doing so requires the Markov property to hold, which, following the arguments of Sjölander (2020), is unrealistic except if the treatment has no effect. More specifically, the implausibility of the Markov property is caused by the presence of unmeasured frailty, or heterogeneity, in the population. Such frailty may be independent of the exposure process and it is therefore not a matter of unmeasured confounding. In practice, some amount of unmeasured frailty will always be present, for example in the form of genetic factors or environmental conditions, and thus it is important to consider the implications.

We find that this lack of a causal interpretation of the HR in the time-varying treatment setting, including those reported from the majority of MSM analyses, has been largely overlooked in the statistical literature. This represents another complication of using hazard models for causal inference, but unlike the interpretability concerns of the time-fixed treatment HR, transforming to the survival probability scale does not solve the problem, making it a tangible rather than a semantic issue.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2.1, we introduce notation and define some basic quantities. Section 2.2 formally defines the (full) hazard function and the rate function in the setting with a treatment that varies over time. In Section 2.3, we show that the Markov property only holds in unrealistic settings or if the treatment has no effect. Section 3 describes how the commonly used Cox MSMs rely on the Markov property for causal inference. In Section 4 we connect the rate function to extended Kaplan-Meier curves. In Section 5 we provide an example of a proportional rates model where the Markov assumption is not met, and highlight that one would estimate the interventional survival probability incorrectly in such a scenario if using a Cox MSM. Finally, in Section 6 we provide some further discussion. Technical derivations are deferred to an Appendix.

2 Notation and preliminaries

This section collects notation and key preliminaries. While the primary focus of this paper is a time-varying treatment setting with a time-to-event outcome, we first consider the simpler setting with a baseline treatment to provide context. Here we review the arguments that justify a certain causal interpretation of the hazard ratio under standard identifiability assumptions. We then move on to the time-varying treatment setting, where we carefully distinguish between hazards and rates and highlight the role of the Markov assumption. Note that we focus throughout on data settings without covariates (baseline or time-varying), and that we generally assume no confounding. We emphasize that introducing confounding would add further complications, and that the issues we point out persist even without the issue of confounding.

2.1 The Cox model for baseline treatment

Consider first the setting with a time-fixed (baseline) treatment A , where interest is in assessing how this affects a time-to-event outcome T . The *hazard function*

$$\lambda(t | A) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} P(T \in [t, t + \Delta t) | T \geq t, A) \quad (1)$$

uniquely determines the conditional distribution of T given A and is the target of most time-to-event regression models. The most common example is Cox' proportional hazards model (Cox 1972)

$$\lambda(t | A) = \lambda_0(t)e^{\beta A}, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda_0(t)$ is some unspecified baseline hazard function and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ a regression parameter. The ratio between the hazards for two different values of A is assumed constant over time, and when A is binary the HR comparing the two groups is e^β .

The ambition of most studies is to learn about the causal effect of a treatment or exposure on an outcome. For a binary baseline treatment, a causal effect is a contrast between the distributions of T^0 and T^1 , where T^a is the potential outcome under treatment a . The Cox model

$$\lambda^a(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} P(T^a \in [t, t + \Delta t) | T^a \geq t) = \lambda_0(t)e^{\beta a} \quad (3)$$

for the hazard $\lambda^a(t)$ of T^a is known as a marginal structural Cox model (Cox MSM) (Hernán et al. 2000; Robins et al. 2000; Hernán et al. 2001). Even though the HR, e^β , relates to the potential outcomes, its causal interpretation has been brought into question. We return to this point below. We assume the standard identifying conditions that 1) the observed outcome equals the potential one corresponding to received treatment, $T = T^A$ (consistency), and 2) treatment assignment is independent of the potential outcomes, $T^a \perp\!\!\!\perp A$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$, as would be the case in a randomized study (exchangeability). Then the potential outcome hazard $\lambda^a(t)$ equals the observed one $\lambda(t | A = a)$ and the HR can be estimated by fitting a Cox model to observed data with treatment as a covariate. This is standard practice in clinical trials with time-to-event endpoints.

However, as highlighted by Hernán (2010), hazard contrasts like the HR are difficult to interpret causally, even when treatment A is randomized at baseline. In the presence of unmeasured frailty (a cause of the outcome, independent of treatment), a non-zero effect of treatment will induce a selection effect over time: if the treatment is protective, more frail subjects will survive to time t with treatment than without treatment. The populations ($T^1 \geq t$) and ($T^0 \geq t$) that are being conditioned on in the potential outcome hazards (3) are therefore not directly comparable for $t > 0$. Even if the effect of treatment is really constant over time for subjects of equal frailty, the increasing frailty imbalance would cause the observed HR to be time-varying, potentially decaying to 1.

Such a time-varying HR has often been interpreted as an attenuation of the treatment effect, but it could also be caused purely by selection effects. Causal contrasts based on marginal quantities, such as survival probabilities or restricted mean survival times, avoid the issues mentioned above as they do not condition on survival past time 0. Particularly, Martinussen et al. (2020) point out that the Cox model (3) for baseline treatment is equivalent to assuming that

$$\frac{\log(P(T^1 > t))}{\log(P(T^0 > t))} = e^\beta, \quad (4)$$

such that the HR parameter can instead be interpreted as the ratio of the log-survival functions of the potential outcomes. This yields a probability-based interpretation of the regression parameter which is free from the issues described above, although the interpretation might still be somewhat tricky because of the log-transforms.

2.2 The Cox model with time-varying treatment

For the remainder of the paper we consider the setting where the treatment/exposure can vary over time, represented by a process $A(t)$. Examples of this includes drug usage, a surgery taking place post-baseline, or air pollution levels. This introduces some ambiguity in how the hazard function should be defined, as it is possible to condition on different parts of the history of $A(t)$. Hazard models are most often introduced as *intensity models*, where the hazard is defined conditional on the entire treatment history $\bar{A}(t) = \{A(u) \mid u \leq t\}$. We make the dependence on $\bar{A}(t)$ explicit in the notation and define the (*full*) *hazard* as

$$\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t)) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} P(T \in [t, t + \Delta t) \mid T \geq t, \bar{A}(t)). \quad (5)$$

The dependence on the history $\bar{A}(t)$ can be complex, making modeling of the hazard a difficult task without further assumptions. The *Markov property* is exactly such an assumption, stating that the hazard is only influenced by current treatment. More precisely, the Markov property asserts that $\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t)) = r(t \mid A(t))$, where the latter quantity is defined as

$$r(t \mid A(t)) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} P(T \in [t, t + \Delta t) \mid T \geq t, A(t)). \quad (6)$$

The only difference between $\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t))$ and $r(t \mid A(t))$ is the amount of treatment history they condition on. Thus, $r(t \mid A(t))$ can also be thought of as a type of hazard, but given different information. A similar quantity has been studied in the context of recurrent events and longitudinal data, where it has been referred to as the *rate function* (Lin et al. 2000) or the *partly conditional rate* (Pepe and Couper 1997). Kalbfleisch and Prentice (2002, section 6.5) describe this quantity in a survival time context. We will refer to $r(t \mid A(t))$ as the rate function, hence making a distinction between the hazard and the rate. The rate equals the average hazard in the population defined by $A(t)$,

$$r(t \mid A(t)) = E(\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t)) \mid T \geq t, A(t)), \quad (7)$$

such that the rate is defined even in non-Markov settings, in which case it does not equal the full hazard function. Note that if treatment is fixed at baseline, then there is no difference between the hazard and the rate. The Cox model with a time-varying treatment is typically obtained from (2) by substituting $A(t)$ in place of A , although other covariates based on summaries of $\bar{A}(t)$ could also be included. The question is whether this is supposed to be a model for the full hazard (5) or the rate (6). Sources are not always explicit about this, but mathematically precise treatments (such as Andersen and Gill 1982; Andersen et al. 1993) typically model the full hazard:

$$\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t)) = \lambda_0(t) e^{\beta A(t)}, \quad (8)$$

thereby making the Markov assumption. This is because the full hazard is closely connected to the intensity process in martingale theory, which is used to establish asymptotic properties of estimators. It is also possible to assume a

Cox structure for the rate function, such that

$$r(t | A(t)) = r_0(t)e^{\beta A(t)}, \quad (9)$$

where $r_0(t)$ is some unspecified baseline rate. The solution $\hat{\beta}$ to Cox’s score equation (Cox 1972) is a consistent estimator of β in either model (when correctly specified). As a side remark, we note that the usual martingale-based variance estimator, used in the hazard model (8), is not correct in the rate model. Instead a robust sandwich estimator must be used (Lin et al. 2000; Kalbfleisch and Prentice 2002, section 6.5). Since the rate does not condition on the past history, the Cox rate model (9) does not assume the Markov property.

2.3 Implausibility of the Markov property

As recently pointed out by Sjölander (2020), there is a fundamental problem with the Markov property, namely that even if there really is no delayed effect of treatment, the presence of unmeasured frailty will still induce a marginal violation of the Markov property in the observed data, and thus the extended Kaplan-Meier curve of Simon and Makuch (1984) and Snapinn et al. (2005) lacks a causal interpretation. However, the argument pertains to any situation with time-varying variables, and therefore does not apply only to the extended Kaplan-Meier curve, but to any method requiring the Markov property. The idea that unmeasured frailty can induce dependence on the history of a process, and thus a violation of the Markov property, has been explored previously by Putter and van Houwelingen (2015) in the context of multi-state models. However, their focus is on the feasibility and usefulness of frailty models in explaining dependence on the past of the process, instead of viewing frailty as a more fundamental issue for the Markov property.

To explain the issue, we consider the treatment process A_k and outcome counting process $N_k = I(T \leq t_k)$ at two discrete time-points $k \in \{1, 2\}$, and introduce also an unobserved positive frailty variable Z affecting the outcome, but not the exposure (so Z is not a confounder). This setting is enough to describe the problem, and the argument easily generalizes to more time-points. The discreteness allows us to draw the causal directed acyclic graph (DAG) shown on figure 1. For an introduction to causal DAGs and how they encode conditional independencies via so-called d -separation see e.g. Hernán and Robins (2024, chapter 6). We assume that there is no direct causal effect of A_1 on N_2 , which is encoded as a lack of an arrow $A_1 \rightarrow N_2$. Nevertheless, conditioning on surviving past time 1 ($N_1 = 0$) opens up a collider path $A_1 \rightarrow N_1 \leftarrow Z \rightarrow N_2$ implying that N_2 is not independent of A_1 given $N_1 = 0$. That is, in the marginal model where we do not condition on the unobserved frailty, the hazard $P(N_2 = 1 | N_1 = 0, A_1, A_2)$ of dying at time 2 will depend on A_1 even though there is no direct effect, thus violating the Markov property. This cannot be avoided, unless the collider path is broken by 1): removing the effect $A_1 \rightarrow N_1$ of treatment at time 1, or 2): removing the unobserved frailty. Obviously, option 1 is of no interest, since assuming no treatment effect would make an analysis pointless from the outset. In practice there will always be unmeasured frailty, for example genetic- or environmental factors, so option 2 is also out of the question. There is a third option: there is a direct effect of A_1 on N_2 that exactly cancels out the association induced by the path through Z . It is hard to imagine plausible situations where one would expect a time-lagged effect of the treatment that exactly cancels out other associations. This would also yield a DAG where the lack of d -separation does not imply association, i.e. a DAG not faithful to the distribution (Zhang and Spirtes 2016), which is an unnatural assumption in most scenarios. We conclude that the Markov property cannot hold for the observed data, i.e. there is an association between past treatment and current survival induced by the unobserved frailty Z , even if there is no direct causal effect. This argument highlights the fact that the Markov property is generally implausible from a causal point of view. It is not just a matter of whether the treatment has time-lagged effects or not — this is a problem with unobserved frailty, which is something we believe is always present in practice. The discretization of time allows us to argue using the language of causal DAGs, but it is not material to the conclusion. In a continuous-time setup, one can show that the Markov property cannot hold in any situation where there is




Figure 1: A directed acyclic graph with only instantaneous effects of the exposure A_k . Dashed lines indicate a problematic path between A_1 and N_2 that is opened up by conditioning on the outcome not having occurred yet.

unobserved frailty with a multiplicative effect on the hazard, and where there is only an instantaneous effect of exposure on the hazard conditional on this frailty, see Appendix A for a detailed treatment of this.

3 Causal inference in Cox models for time-varying treatment

For a time-varying treatment, each possible trajectory \bar{a} has an associated potential outcome $T^{\bar{a}}$ that would have been observed, had treatment been forced to follow \bar{a} . We are particularly interested in the "never-treat" and "always-treat" trajectories, which we denote as $\bar{0}$ and $\bar{1}$, respectively. For the hazard $\lambda^{\bar{a}}(t)$ of the potential outcome $T^{\bar{a}}$ it is common to assume a Cox MSM including only the treatment $a(t)$ currently prescribed by the strategy \bar{a} (Hernán et al. 2000; Hernán et al. 2001):

$$\lambda^{\bar{a}}(t) = \lambda_0(t)e^{\beta a(t)}. \quad (10)$$

Time-varying treatments are mostly seen in observational studies, where it is necessary to control for time-varying confounders. In the MSM framework, this is accomplished by fitting a time-varying Cox model to observed data weighted by time-varying inverse probability of treatment weights (IPTW) and assuming sequential exchangeability conditional on the confounders (Hernán et al. 2000; Hernán et al. 2001). In order to focus our discussion, we will assume that there are no confounders, such that the potential outcome hazard simply equals the observed one for the subjects whose observed treatment up to time t happens to agree with \bar{a} . Then the MSM (10) is equivalent to the observational time-varying Cox model (8) for the full hazard. If the Markov property and proportional hazards assumption hold, the parameter e^{β} estimated from observed data can then be expressed as a relation between the log-survival functions of the potential outcomes under the always-treat and never-treat strategies:

$$\frac{\log(P(T^{\bar{1}} > t))}{\log(P(T^{\bar{0}} > t))} = e^{\beta} \quad (11)$$

resulting in a proper causal interpretation. The interpretation depends crucially on the model only including current treatment as a covariate, and thus assuming the Markov property. Without the Markov property, the model cannot be given the desired causal interpretation.

In light of the implausibility of the Markov condition, one would perhaps strive to include the entire treatment history in the model. An important special case, where this is actually feasible, is when a binary time-varying exposure is increasing, such that a subject cannot discontinue treatment once it has started. In this case, the complete exposure history can be parametrized through the current treatment $A(t)$ and the time $D(t)$ since treatment initiation ($D(t) = 0$ if untreated), which can be included in a Cox model

$$\lambda^{\bar{a}}(t) = \lambda(t | \bar{A}(t) = \bar{a}(t)) = \lambda_0(t) \exp(\beta a(t) + \gamma d(t)). \quad (12)$$

This model includes all information about the past, so there is no issue with the Markov property. But the effect of treatment is now quantified through two parameters rather than one. The causal log-survival ratio can be written

as

$$\frac{\log(P(T^{\bar{1}} > t))}{\log(P(T^{\bar{0}} > t))} = \frac{\int_0^t \lambda_0(u) \exp(\beta + \gamma u) du}{\Lambda_0(t)} = \exp(\beta) \frac{\int_0^t \lambda_0(u) \exp(\gamma u) du}{\Lambda_0(t)}. \quad (13)$$

The ratio has a causal interpretation, but it depends on time, and the translation between regression parameters and log-survival ratio is not straightforward. Consequently, there is little practical appeal in basing interpretation on (13) also keeping in mind that it is based on (12) being correctly specified.

The history of more general time-varying treatments cannot be summarized through a finite number of covariates, and therefore one might hope that the inclusion of certain summaries is enough to make the model plausible in practice. This could be total time on treatment or cumulative dose (in cases where treatment is not binary). In principle, the argument in Section 2.3 could be repeated for the summary covariates, unless *the entire exposure history* is included. Therefore, including summary covariates does not fundamentally change the fact that one should expect dependence on the entire treatment history.

4 The rate function

We stress that under the usual identifiability conditions, the potential outcome hazard can be identified as the observed hazard, not the observed rate. Thus, while fitting a rate regression model avoids the Markov assumption altogether when studying associations, there is no such luxury when attempting causal inference. The rate, by definition, has no information about past treatment, and therefore it seems unlikely that it could in general be connected to a potential outcome under some treatment strategy. The rate function turns out to be connected to the extended Kaplan-Meier curve (Simon and Makuch 1984; Snapinn et al. 2005) which was proposed as a tool to visualize the effect of a time-varying covariate on survival, analogously to the way that ordinary Kaplan-Meier curves are used for baseline covariates. The idea is to let subjects swap risk sets over time according to the discrete time-varying covariate $A(t)$. More precisely, the extended Kaplan-Meier curves are defined for each covariate level a as

$$\hat{S}_a(t) = \prod_{u \in [0, t]} \left(1 - \frac{\Delta N_a(u)}{Y_a(u)} \right), \quad (14)$$

where $\Delta N_a(t)$ is the number of events at time t among people with $A(t) = a$, and $Y_a(t)$ is the number of people with $A(t) = a$ who are currently at risk. The product is over the event times in $[0, t]$. In Appendix C, we show that under mild regularity conditions, the extended Kaplan-Meier curve estimates the exponential of minus the cumulative rate $R_a(t) = \int_0^t r(u | A(u) = a) du$ in the sense that

$$\hat{S}_a(t) \xrightarrow{P} e^{-R_a(t)}. \quad (15)$$

Under the Cox rate model (9), the ratio of the logarithm of the extended Kaplan-Meier curves for the two treatment levels therefore estimates the rate ratio

$$\frac{\log(\hat{S}_1(t))}{\log(\hat{S}_0(t))} \xrightarrow{P} e^\beta. \quad (16)$$

The interpretation of the rate ratio is therefore intimately tied to that of the extended Kaplan-Meier curve. As shown by Sjölander (2020), the extended Kaplan-Meier curve does not have an obvious causal interpretation without the Markov property, indicating that neither does the rate ratio.

5 Consequences of not capturing the effect of past treatment

To illustrate the importance of correctly modeling the effect of past treatment, and not just the current level, we present a hypothetical scenario where a proportional rates model (9) holds, but where the Markov property is

violated. Thus, the commonly used MSM approach of fitting a Cox model with current treatment only results in a model that is correctly specified for the rate. Nevertheless, the true "causal" HR is not constant over time, and the true average treatment effect does not equal what one would get from transforming the rate model to survival scale.

We consider a data generating process that can be described by an irreversible illness-death model. All subjects start without treatment (state 0) and can then start treatment at some (individual) random point in time (state 1), and once treatment is initiated, it cannot be discontinued. Death corresponds to state 2. The hazard of treatment initiation is given by $\lambda_{01}(t) = 0.3$, the hazard of death is

$$\lambda(t | \bar{A}(t)) = \begin{cases} \lambda_{02}(t) & \text{if } A(t) = 0 \\ \lambda_{12}(t | U) & \text{if } A(t) = 1 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $U = \inf\{t | A(t) = 1\}$ is the time of treatment initiation and

$$\lambda_{12}(t | u) = \begin{cases} 0.4 & \text{if } t - u \leq 1 \\ 0.2 & \text{if } t - u > 1 \end{cases}. \quad (18)$$

The hazard $\lambda_{02}(t)$ for the untreated is chosen such that it solves the proportional rates equation

$$r(t | A(t) = 1) = e^\beta r(t | A(t) = 0) \quad (19)$$

with $\beta = \log\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)$. Since there is only one possible treatment history for the currently untreated (i.e. they were always untreated), the rate equals the hazard for these: $r(t | A(t) = 0) = \lambda_{02}(t)$. The rate $r(t | A(t) = 1)$ among the treated also depends on $\lambda_{02}(t)$, and solving (19) for $\lambda_{02}(t)$ exactly is not trivial, but it can be done numerically, see Appendix B for details. Figure 2, left panel, shows the resulting rate ratio, constantly equal to 2/3 by design, and the ratio of the potential outcome hazards under the always-treat and never-treat regimes, that is the ratio $\lambda_{12}(t | 0)/\lambda_{02}(t)$, which is strictly smaller than 2/3 for $t > 1$. Figure 2, right panel, shows the potential survival function under both treatment strategies, and the survival function that would be obtained by transforming the rate to survival scale through exponentiating the negative cumulative rate. For the never-treat strategy, the orange and green curves are identical, as the rate equals the hazard. However, under the always-treat strategy, the two curves are different from time point 1 and onward. At $t = 3$ the correct causal contrast is $P(T^{\bar{1}} > t) - P(T^{\bar{0}} > t) = 0.22$ while the rate-based estimate is only 0.14. This highlights the fact that although the dependence on current treatment is correctly captured, the model does not lead to correct inference about causal quantities since the dependence on treatment history is not modeled.

6 Discussion

In this paper, we have shown that Sjölander's warning against the causal validity of the extended Kaplan-Meier curve (Sjölander 2020) is equally valid when causal conclusions are attempted based on a Cox-regression analysis with a time-dependent treatment, where only the current value of treatment is used in the model as a time-varying covariate. This is also true for the popular MSM approach, which was otherwise expected to deliver valid causal results by handling the issue of time-dependent confounding.

The argument given in this paper about lack of the Markov property holds in even more general settings such as any multi-state model with an absorbing state (death). We showcased this for the simple illness-death model in the previous section, but it is equally valid for more general multi-state models. This also includes models for recurrent events with a terminal event; such data are common in biomedical science and models for such data has




Figure 2: Left: The rate ratio that would be estimated by a Cox MSM vs. the true causal hazard ratio comparing the always-treat and never-treat strategies. Right: The survival probability estimated by transforming the rate estimated by a Cox MSM to survival scale vs. the true survival probability under the always-treat and never-treat strategies. The curves are identical for the never-treat strategy.

recently gained renewed interest. For instance, in a qualification opinion, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) emphasized that treatments are expected to impact not only the first event but also subsequent ones, thus advocating for methods based on recurrent event endpoints (Akacha et al. 2018). We have in this work focused on the Cox model, since it is by far the most widely used hazard model, but we emphasize that the issues are not due to the proportional structure of this model, and so apply equally to other hazard models. We have detailed this for the additive model in Appendix D.

The multi-state model literature has for a while acknowledged the fact that many methods rely on the Markov property and that it might not be satisfied. This had lead to work on non-Markov methods for estimating state transition probabilities (Meira-Machado et al. 2006; de Uña-Álvarez and Meira-Machado 2015; Titman 2015; Putter and Spitoni 2018; Andersen et al. 2022). More recently, there has been some work on testing the Markov property (Rodríguez-Girondo and de Uña-Álvarez 2012; Soutinho and Meira-Machado 2022; Titman and Putter 2022; Soutinho and Meira-Machado 2023). This is seemingly motivated by a sentiment that "in the multi-state setting, it is of practical interest to determine whether the Markov property holds within a particular data set" (Soutinho and Meira-Machado 2023). Our work stresses the fact that the Markov property cannot realistically hold in any particular dataset. As indicated by our argument, any test of the Markov property is essentially testing for the absence of unmeasured frailty.

Funding

M.B.K. is funded by Novo Nordisk Fonden grant NNF22OC0076595.

References

Aalen, O. O., R. J. Cook, and K. Røysland (2015). "Does Cox Analysis of a Randomized Survival Study Yield a Causal Treatment Effect?" In: *Lifetime Data Analysis* 21.4, pp. 579–593. DOI: [10.1007/s10985-015-9335-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10985-015-9335-y).

- Akacha, M., B. Binkowitz, F. Bretz, A. Fritsch, P. Hougaard, A. Jahn-Eimermacher, F. Mendolia, H. Ravn, J. Roger, P. Schlömer, et al. (2018). “Request for CHMP Qualification Opinion: Clinically Interpretable Treatment Effect Measures Based on Recurrent Event Endpoints That Allow for Efficient Statistical Analyses”. In: *Recurrent Event Qualification Opinion Consortium*. Accessed January 31, p. 2024.
- Andersen, P. K. and R. D. Gill (1982). “Cox’s Regression Model for Counting Processes: A Large Sample Study”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 10.4, pp. 1100–1120. DOI: [10.1214/aos/1176345976](https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176345976).
- Andersen, P. K., Ø. Borgan, R. D. Gill, and N. Keiding (1993). *Statistical Models Based on Counting Processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer US. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4612-4348-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4348-9).
- Andersen, P. K., E. N. S. Wandall, and M. Pohar Perme (2022). “Inference for Transition Probabilities in Non-Markov Multi-State Models”. In: *Lifetime Data Analysis* 28.4, pp. 585–604. DOI: [10.1007/s10985-022-09560-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10985-022-09560-w).
- Chirgwin, J. H. et al. (2016). “Treatment Adherence and Its Impact on Disease-Free Survival in the Breast International Group 1-98 Trial of Tamoxifen and Letrozole, Alone and in Sequence”. In: *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. DOI: [10.1200/JCO.2015.63.8619](https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2015.63.8619).
- Choi, H. K., M. A. Hernán, J. D. Seeger, J. M. Robins, and F. Wolfe (2002). “Methotrexate and Mortality in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Prospective Study”. In: *The Lancet* 359.9313, pp. 1173–1177. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(02\)08213-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08213-2).
- Cox, D. R. (1972). “Regression Models and Life-Tables”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 34.2, pp. 187–220. JSTOR: [2985181](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2985181). URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2985181>.
- De Uña-Álvarez, J. and L. Meira-Machado (2015). “Nonparametric Estimation of Transition Probabilities in the Non-Markov Illness-Death Model: A Comparative Study”. In: *Biometrics* 71.2, pp. 364–375. DOI: [10.1111/biom.12288](https://doi.org/10.1111/biom.12288). pmid: [25735883](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25735883/).
- Gill, R. D. and S. Johansen (1990). “A Survey of Product-Integration with a View Toward Application in Survival Analysis”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 18.4, pp. 1501–1555. DOI: [10.1214/aos/1176347865](https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347865).
- Hernán, M. A., B. Brumback, and J. M. Robins (2001). “Marginal Structural Models to Estimate the Joint Causal Effect of Nonrandomized Treatments”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96.454, pp. 440–448. DOI: [10.1198/016214501753168154](https://doi.org/10.1198/016214501753168154).
- Hernán, M. A. (2010). “The Hazards of Hazard Ratios”. In: *Epidemiology* 21.1, pp. 13–15. DOI: [10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181c1ea43](https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181c1ea43).
- Hernán, M. A., B. Brumback, and J. M. Robins (2000). “Marginal Structural Models to Estimate the Causal Effect of Zidovudine on the Survival of HIV-Positive Men”. In: *Epidemiology* 11.5, p. 561. URL: https://journals.lww.com/epidem/fulltext/2000/09000/marginal_structural_models_to_estimate_the_causal.12.aspx.
- Hernán, M. A. and J. M. Robins (2024). *Causal Inference: What If*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC. 312 pp.
- Kalbfleisch, J. D. and R. L. Prentice (2002). *The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons.
- Li, S., M. J. Stampfer, D. R. Williams, and T. J. VanderWeele (2016). “Association of Religious Service Attendance With Mortality Among Women”. In: *JAMA Internal Medicine* 176.6, pp. 777–785. DOI: [10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.1615](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.1615).
- Lin, D. Y., L. J. Wei, I. Yang, and Z. Ying (2000). “Semiparametric Regression for the Mean and Rate Functions of Recurrent Events”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 62.4, pp. 711–730. JSTOR: [2680616](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2680616). URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2680616>.
- Martinussen, T., S. Vansteelandt, and P. K. Andersen (2020). “Subtleties in the Interpretation of Hazard Contrasts”. In: *Lifetime Data Analysis* 26.4, pp. 833–855. DOI: [10.1007/s10985-020-09501-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10985-020-09501-5).
- Meira-Machado, L., J. de Uña-Álvarez, and C. Cadarso-Suárez (2006). “Nonparametric Estimation of Transition Probabilities in a Non-Markov Illness–Death Model”. In: *Lifetime Data Analysis* 12.3, pp. 325–344. DOI: [10.1007/s10985-006-9009-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10985-006-9009-x).
- Nahon, P. et al. (2018). “Incidence of Hepatocellular Carcinoma After Direct Antiviral Therapy for HCV in Patients With Cirrhosis Included in Surveillance Programs”. In: *Gastroenterology* 155.5, 1436–1450.e6. DOI: [10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.015](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.015).
- Nießl, A., A. Allignol, J. Beyersmann, and C. Mueller (2023). “Statistical Inference for State Occupation and Transition Probabilities in Non-Markov Multi-State Models Subject to Both Random Left-Truncation and Right-Censoring”. In: *Econometrics and Statistics* 25, pp. 110–124. DOI: [10.1016/j.ecosta.2021.09.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosta.2021.09.008).

- Pepe, M. S. and D. Couper (1997). “Modeling Partly Conditional Means With Longitudinal Data”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92.439, pp. 991–998. DOI: [10.2307/2965563](https://doi.org/10.2307/2965563). JSTOR: 2965563.
- Putter, H. and C. Spitoni (2018). “Non-Parametric Estimation of Transition Probabilities in Non-Markov Multi-State Models: The Landmark Aalen-Johansen Estimator”. In: *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 27.7, pp. 2081–2092. DOI: [10.1177/0962280216674497](https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280216674497). pmid: 29846146.
- Putter, H. and H. C. van Houwelingen (2015). “Frailties in Multi-State Models: Are They Identifiable? Do We Need Them?”. In: *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 24.6, pp. 675–692. DOI: [10.1177/0962280211424665](https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280211424665).
- Robins, J. M., M. Á. Hernán, and B. Brumback (2000). “Marginal Structural Models and Causal Inference in Epidemiology”. In: *Epidemiology* 11.5, p. 550. URL: https://journals.lww.com/epidem/fulltext/2000/09000/marginal_structural_models_and_causal_inference_in.11.aspx.
- Rodríguez-Gironde, M. and J. de Uña-Álvarez (2012). “A Nonparametric Test for Markovianity in the Illness-Death Model”. In: *Statistics in Medicine* 31.30, pp. 4416–4427. DOI: [10.1002/sim.5619](https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.5619).
- Simon, R. and R. W. Makuch (1984). “A Non-Parametric Graphical Representation of the Relationship between Survival and the Occurrence of an Event: Application to Responder versus Non-Responder Bias”. In: *Statistics in Medicine* 3.1, pp. 35–44. DOI: [10.1002/sim.4780030106](https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4780030106).
- Sjölander, A. (2020). “A Cautionary Note on Extended Kaplan–Meier Curves for Time-varying Covariates”. In: *Epidemiology* 31.4, p. 517. DOI: [10.1097/EDE.0000000000001188](https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0000000000001188).
- Snapinn, S. M., Q. Jiang, and B. Iglewicz (2005). “Illustrating the Impact of a Time-Varying Covariate With an Extended Kaplan–Meier Estimator”. In: *The American Statistician* 59.4, pp. 301–307. DOI: [10.1198/000313005X70371](https://doi.org/10.1198/000313005X70371).
- Soutinho, G. and L. Meira-Machado (2023). “markovMSM: An R Package for Checking the Markov Condition in Multi-State Survival Data”. In: *R Journal* 15.1, pp. 195–211. DOI: [10.32614/RJ-2023-032](https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2023-032).
- Soutinho, G. and L. Meira-Machado (2022). “Methods for Checking the Markov Condition in Multi-State Survival Data”. In: *Computational Statistics* 37.2, pp. 751–780. DOI: [10.1007/s00180-021-01139-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-021-01139-7).
- Tiihonen, J., J. Lönnqvist, K. Wahlbeck, T. Klaukka, L. Niskanen, A. Tanskanen, and J. Haukka (2009). “11-Year Follow-up of Mortality in Patients with Schizophrenia: A Population-Based Cohort Study (FIN11 Study)”. In: *The Lancet* 374.9690, pp. 620–627. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)60742-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60742-X).
- Titman, A. C. and H. Putter (2022). “General Tests of the Markov Property in Multi-State Models”. In: *Biostatistics* 23.2, pp. 380–396. DOI: [10.1093/biostatistics/kxaa030](https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxaa030).
- Titman, A. C. (2015). “Transition Probability Estimates for Non-Markov Multi-State Models”. In: *Biometrics* 71.4, pp. 1034–1041. DOI: [10.1111/biom.12349](https://doi.org/10.1111/biom.12349). pmid: 26148652.
- Zhang, J. and P. Spirtes (2016). “The Three Faces of Faithfulness”. In: *Synthese* 193.4, pp. 1011–1027. DOI: [10.1007/s11229-015-0673-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-015-0673-9).

A The Markov property and continuous-time marginal hazards in the presence of unobserved frailty

We here show, for the continuous-time case, how an exposure process with only an instantaneous effect on the outcome will give rise to a marginal hazard that is not Markovian when there is unmeasured frailty affecting the hazard multiplicatively.

We consider an exposure process $\{A(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, a time-to-event outcome T with associated counting process $\{N(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, and an unobserved positive frailty variable Z . To simplify the notation we assume that $A(t)$ is a binary counting process, but this is not important to the conclusion, as we show below. The crucial assumption is that the hazard of exposure initiation does not depend on Z :

$$\lambda^A(t | Z) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P(A(t + \Delta t) = 1 | A(t) = 0, T \geq t, Z)}{\Delta t} \quad (20)$$

$$= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P(A(t + \Delta t) = 1 | A(t) = 0, T \geq t)}{\Delta t} \quad (21)$$

$$= \lambda^A(t). \quad (22)$$

This encodes a continuous-time version of the assumption in figure 1 that the exposure process does not depend directly on Z . We assume that the complete-data hazard of T has the form

$$\lambda(t | \bar{A}(t), Z) = Zh(t, A(t)), \quad (23)$$

where $h(t, a)$ is some non-negative function. Thus, only the current exposure affects the hazard, given complete information. The observed hazard $\lambda(t | \bar{A}(t))$ can be found via iterated expectation (or more formally, the innovation theorem) as

$$\lambda(t | \bar{A}(t)) = E(\lambda(t | \bar{A}(t), Z) | \bar{A}(t), T \geq t) \quad (24)$$

$$= h(t, A(t))E(Z | \bar{A}(t), T \geq t). \quad (25)$$

The expectation can be calculated by considering partial likelihood processes (Andersen et al. 1993, chapter IX). The partial likelihood of $(\bar{N}(t), \bar{A}(t), Z)$ is, on the event $(T \geq t)$, given as the product integral

$$p(Z) \prod_{s \in (0, t]} (1 - Zh(s, A(s)) ds) (1 - (1 - A(t)) \lambda^A(s) ds)^{1 - \Delta A(s)} ((1 - A(t)) \lambda^A(s) ds)^{\Delta A(s)} \quad (26)$$

$$= p(Z) \exp(-ZH(t, \bar{A}(t))) \prod_{s \in (0, t]} (1 - (1 - A(t)) \lambda^A(s) ds)^{1 - \Delta A(s)} ((1 - A(t)) \lambda^A(s) ds)^{\Delta A(s)}, \quad (27)$$

where $p(Z)$ is the density of Z , $\Delta A(t) = A(t+) - A(t-)$ the increment of $A(t)$ and $H(t, \bar{A}(t)) = \int_0^t h(s, A(s)) ds$. Likewise, the marginal partial likelihood of $(\bar{N}(t), \bar{A}(t))$ is, on the event $(T \geq t)$,

$$\exp\left(-\int_0^t \lambda(s | \bar{A}(s)) ds\right) \prod_{s \in (0, t]} (1 - (1 - A(t)) \lambda^A(s) ds)^{1 - \Delta A(s)} ((1 - A(t)) \lambda^A(s) ds)^{\Delta A(s)}. \quad (28)$$

Dividing (26) by (28) gives the conditional distribution of Z given $\bar{A}(t), T \geq t$:

$$p(Z | \bar{A}(t), T \geq t) = p(Z) \exp(-ZH(t, \bar{A}(t))) \exp\left(\int_0^t \lambda(s | \bar{A}(s)) ds\right). \quad (29)$$

This shows why the exact type of exposure process $A(t)$ is irrelevant: as long as the infinitesimal evolution does

not depend on Z , the likelihood will cancel out in the calculation above. Thus the conditional expectation of Z can be calculated to be

$$E(Z \mid \bar{A}(t), T \geq t) = \exp\left(\int_0^t \lambda(s \mid \bar{A}(s)) ds\right) \int zp(z) \exp(-zH(t, \bar{A}(t))) dz \quad (30)$$

$$= -\exp\left(\int_0^t \lambda(s \mid \bar{A}(s)) ds\right) \varphi'_Z(H(t, \bar{A}(t))), \quad (31)$$

where $\varphi_Z(t) = E(\exp(-Zt))$ is the Laplace-transform of the distribution of Z and $\varphi'_Z(t)$ its derivative. Plugging back into (24) and rearranging, we get the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \exp\left(-\int_0^t \lambda(s \mid \bar{A}(s)) ds\right) = \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_Z(H(t, \bar{A}(t))), \quad (32)$$

which finally implies that the marginal hazard of T is completely characterized in terms of H and φ_Z via the relation

$$\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t)) = -\frac{d}{dt} \log(\varphi_Z(H(t, \bar{A}(t)))) \quad (33)$$

$$= -\frac{\varphi'_Z(H(t, \bar{A}(t)))}{\varphi_Z(H(t, \bar{A}(t)))} h(t, A(t)). \quad (34)$$

In order for the marginal hazard not to depend on $\bar{A}(t)$ other than $A(t)$, the fraction would have to be constant implying that $\varphi'_Z(t) = c\varphi_Z(t)$ for all t and some c . Thus, $\varphi_Z(t) = \exp(ct)$ is the exponential function. The distribution with this Laplace-transform is the Dirac measure in c , showing that the marginal hazard is Markov if and only if the frailty distribution is degenerate.

Note that this conclusion relies crucially on the assumption that $h(t, A(t))$ does not depend on the exposure history other than through $A(t)$. It is possible to have a marginal hazard $\lambda(t \mid \bar{A}(t)) = r(t \mid A(t))$ which equals the rate (and therefore is Markov), by choosing a history-dependent $\tilde{h}(t, \bar{A}(t))$ as

$$\tilde{h}(t, \bar{A}(t)) = \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_Z^{-1}\left(\exp\left(-\int_0^t r(s \mid A(s)) ds\right)\right), \quad (35)$$

which is obtained by solving (33) for h .

B Constructing a non-Markov proportional rates model

One might wonder if there even exists joint distributions of $(\bar{A}(t), \bar{N}(t))$ with the proportional rates property (9). The answer is trivially yes, since a Markovian proportional hazards model (8) — which it is not hard to construct — implies a proportional rates model. A more interesting question is whether it can be done without the Markov property. We discuss the difficulties in constructing such an example explicitly, and then give a numerical procedure which seems to work.

We first rephrase the problem as an illness-death model with states $\{0, 1, 2\}$ corresponding to untreated, treated and dead, and corresponding state transition hazards $\lambda_{01}(t)$, $\lambda_{02}(t)$ and $\lambda_{12}(t \mid U)$ where U is the time of arrival into state 1. The process $X(t)$ indicates the current state. Note that the hazards going out of state 0 cannot depend on the past, and therefore in particular $r_{02}(t) = \lambda_{02}(t)$ is the rate of death for untreated.

We can calculate rate of death among the treated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{12}(t) &= E(\lambda_{12}(t | U) | X(t) = 1) \\
&= \int \lambda_{12}(t | u) p(U = u | X(t) = 1) du \\
&= \int \lambda_{12}(t | u) \frac{p(U = u, X(t) = 1)}{P(X(t) = 1)} du \\
&= \frac{\int_0^t \lambda_{12}(t | u) p(U = u, T \geq t) du}{P_{01}(0, t)} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) P_{11}(u, t | u) \lambda_{12}(t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u)}{P_{01}(0, t)} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^t e^{-(\Lambda_{01}(u) + \Lambda_{02}(u))} e^{-\int_u^t \lambda_{12}(s|u) ds} \lambda_{12}(t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u)}{\int_0^t e^{-(\Lambda_{01}(u) + \Lambda_{02}(u))} e^{-\int_u^t \lambda_{12}(s|u) ds} d\Lambda_{01}(u)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Here $P_{lm}(s, t) = P(X(t) = m | X(s) = l)$ are the state transition probabilities, with $P_{11}(s, t | u) = P(X(t) = 1 | X(s) = 1, U = u)$ depending also on the time of arrival to state 1.

B.1 An integral equation

A proportional rates model requires that $r_{12}(t) = \lambda_{02}(t)e^\beta$ for some β , i.e. that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) P_{11}(u, t | u) \lambda_{12}(t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u) &= e^\beta \lambda_{02}(t) P_{01}(0, t) \\
&= e^\beta \lambda_{02}(t) \int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) P_{11}(u, t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u).
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

We note that the LHS can be rewritten using Leibniz' rule as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) P_{11}(u, t | u) \lambda_{12}(t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u) \\
&= - \int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) \frac{d}{dt} P_{11}(u, t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u) \\
&= - \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) P_{11}(u, t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u) + P_{00}(0, t) \lambda_{01}(t) P_{11}(t, t | t) \\
&= - \frac{d}{dt} P_{01}(0, t) + P_{00}(0, t) \lambda_{01}(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The equation we want to solve can thus be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt} P_{01}(0, t) = -e^\beta \lambda_{02}(t) P_{01}(0, t) + P_{00}(0, t) \lambda_{01}(t), \tag{39}$$

which is an inhomogeneous linear ODE of order 1 with the solution

$$P_{01}(0, t) = e^{-\Lambda_{02}(t)e^\beta} \left(c + \int_0^t P_{00}(0, s) \lambda_{01}(s) e^{\Lambda_{02}(s)e^\beta} ds \right) \tag{40}$$

for some c . Using the fact that $P_{01}(0, 0) = 0$ we see that $c = 0$ such that

$$P_{01}(0, t) = e^{-\Lambda_{02}(t)e^\beta} \int_0^t P_{00}(0, s) \lambda_{01}(s) e^{\Lambda_{02}(s)e^\beta} ds. \tag{41}$$




Figure 3: The obtained rates and rate ratio (RR) for each iteration of the iterative scheme.

Replacing $P_{01}(0, t)$ with its definition we get the equation

$$\int_0^t P_{00}(0, u) P_{11}(u, t | u) d\Lambda_{01}(u) = \int_0^t e^{-e^\beta \int_u^t \lambda_{02}(s) ds} P_{00}(0, u) d\Lambda_{01}(u), \quad (42)$$

which seems simpler than the original one, since $P_{11}(u, t | u)$ only enters into one side. However, it is still not obvious how to find a solution $(\lambda_{01}, \lambda_{02}, \lambda_{12})$ to the equation, except for the Markov case where $\lambda_{12}(t | u) = \lambda_{12}(t)$ does not depend on u .

B.2 A numerical solution

One can try to find a solution numerically. From (36) we know how to calculate $r_{12}(t)$ for given choice of hazard functions. Thus, one could try the following procedure:

1. Choose $\lambda_{01}(t)$, $\lambda_{12}(t | u)$ and some desired log rate ratio β .
2. Choose some initial $\lambda_{02}^{(0)}(t)$.
3. Calculate $r_{12}^{(0)}(t)$ based on these.

Then we repeat until convergence:

4. Calculate $\lambda_{02}^{(j+1)}(t) = r_{12}^{(j)}(t)e^{-\beta}$.
5. Calculate $r_{12}^{(j+1)}(t)$ based on $\lambda_{01}(t)$, $\lambda_{12}(t | u)$ and $\lambda_{02}^{(j)}(t)$.

Step 4 ensures that $\lambda_{02}^{(j+1)}(t)$ is proportional to $r_{12}^{(j)}(t)$. However, changing $\lambda_{02}(t)$ also changes $r_{12}(t)$, so $r_{12}^{(j)}(t)$ is not the rate in the new model given by $\lambda_{01}(t)$, $\lambda_{02}^{(j+1)}(t)$, $\lambda_{12}(t | u)$. Therefore step 5 updates the rate to match again. This generally breaks the proportionality, but our hope is that the new pair $\lambda_{02}^{(j+1)}(t)$, $r_{12}^{(j+1)}(t)$ is closer to proportionality than at step j .

We do not currently have a proof that the procedure converges. But numerically it seems to work. Figure 3 shows obtained rates and rate ratio when applying the above procedure to the setup described in section 5 with the initial choice $\lambda_{02}^{(0)}(t) = 1$. On the third iteration, the rate ratio is essentially constant, and we have obtained a non-Markov proportional rates model.

C The extended Kaplan-Meier curve and the rate ratio

We here show that the extended Kaplan-Meier curve estimates the exponential of the negative cumulative rate function. Each observation $(T_i, \Delta_i, \{A_i(t)\}_{t \geq 0})$ will, as is common in time-to-event analysis, be represented in counting process format as $\{(Y_i(t), N_i(t), A_i(t))\}_{t \geq 0}$, where $Y_i(t)$ is a predictable at-risk indicator and $N_i(t) = I(T_i \leq t, \Delta_i = 1)$ indicates an event having occurred at- or before time t . We assume an iid. sample of n such observations.

Define for each treatment level a the derived processes $N_{a,i}(t) = I(T_i \leq t, \Delta_i = 1, A_i(T_i) = a) = N_i(t)I(A_i(T_i) = a)$ that count event occurrences stratified according to treatment status at the event time. Let also $Y_{a,i}(t) = I(t \leq T_i, A_i(t) = a) = Y_i(t)I(A_i(t) = a)$ be the treatment-specific at-risk indicators. Note that $N_i(t) = \sum_a N_{a,i}(t)$ and $Y_i(t) = \sum_a Y_{a,i}(t)$. Define the aggregate versions $N_a(t) = \sum_i N_{a,i}(t)$ and $Y_a(t) = \sum_i Y_{a,i}(t)$.

Let the treatment-specific Nelson-Aalen estimator be given as

$$\hat{R}_a(t) = \int_0^t \frac{J_a(u)}{Y_a(u)} dN_a(u), \quad (43)$$

where $J_a(t) = I(Y_a(t) > 0)$. The extended Kaplan-Meier estimator (14) can then be written as a product integral (Gill and Johansen 1990) of the Nelson-Aalen estimator

$$\hat{S}_a(t) = \prod_{u \in [0, t]} (1 - d\hat{R}_a(u)). \quad (44)$$

Under mild regularity conditions, the Nelson-Aalen estimator converges uniformly to the cumulative treatment-specific rate functions $R_a(t) = \int_0^t r(u | A(u) = z) du$ (Nießl et al. 2023).

Theorem 1. *Assume that there exists an integrable function k that dominates the hazard on $[0, t]$ in the sense that $\lambda(t | \bar{A}(u)) \leq k(u)$ for $u \leq t$ with probability 1 and $\int_0^t k(u) du < \infty$. Assume for each a also the following regularity conditions:*

$$\int_0^t \frac{J_a(u)}{Y_a(u)} k(u) du \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \int_0^t (1 - J_a(u)) k(u) du \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (45)$$

where \xrightarrow{P} denotes convergence in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\sup_{u \in [0, t]} |\hat{R}_a(u) - R_a(u)| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (46)$$

Proof. The time-to-event setup with a discrete time-varying treatment $A(t) \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ corresponds to a multi-state model in the following sense: let $X(t)$ be a multi-state process with $k+1$ states:

$$X(t) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } A(t) = a \text{ and } N(t) = 0 \\ k & \text{if } N(t) = 1 \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

With this notation, the theorem is exactly that of Nießl et al. (2023, theorem 2.1) for what they refer to as the cumulative partly conditional transition rates for the state-transition $a \rightarrow k$. \square

With this result in hand, it follows from properties of product integration that the extended Kaplan-Meier estimator converges to the exponential of the cumulative rate.

Corollary 2. *Assume the conditions of theorem 1. Then*

$$\hat{S}_a(t) \xrightarrow{P} e^{-R_a(t)}. \quad (48)$$

Proof. Since the product integral is a continuous operator in supremum norm (Gill and Johansen 1990, theorem 7), the conclusion of theorem 1 implies that

$$\hat{S}_a(t) = \prod_{u \in [0, t]} (1 - d\hat{R}_a(u)) \xrightarrow{P} \prod_{u \in [0, t]} (1 - dR_a(u)) = e^{-R_a(t)}. \quad (49)$$

□

D Additive rates

The Aalen additive rate model

$$r(t|A(t)) = \beta_0(t) + \beta_1(t)A(t)$$

is always correctly specified for binary $A(t)$, so we can estimate $B_j(t) = \int_0^t \beta_j(s) ds$, $j = 0, 1$, consistently (and also the corresponding standard error using a sandwich estimator). The Aalen least squares estimator $\hat{B}(t)$ of $B(t) = \{B_0(t), B_1(t)\}^T$ is

$$\hat{B}(t) = \int_0^t \{Y^T(s)Y(s)\}^{-1} Y^T(s) dN(s),$$

where $N(t) = \{N_i(t)\}$ and the i th row of the $n \times 2$ matrix $Y(t)$ is $Y_i(t)\{1, A_i(t)\}$. Doing the calculations gives

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{B}_0(t) &= \sum_i Y_i(t)(1 - A_i(t)) dN_i(t)/Y_0(t), \\ d\hat{B}_1(t) &= \sum_i Y_i(t)A_i(t) dN_i(t)/Y_1(t) - d\hat{B}_0(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $Y_0(t) = \sum_i Y_i(t)(1 - A_i(t))$ and $Y_1(t) = \sum_i Y_i(t)A_i(t)$. If we let $\hat{R}_0(t)$ and $\hat{R}_1(t)$ denote the two Nelson-Aalen estimates corresponding to the two treatment groups, and using the technique from (Snapinn et al. 2005) (ie. risk sets for the two treatment groups changes when subjects changes treatment) we then see that $d\hat{B}_0(t) = d\hat{R}_0(t)$ and $d\hat{B}_1(t) = d\hat{R}_1(t) - d\hat{R}_0(t)$ so that the rate analysis corresponds to the extended Kaplan-Meier analysis of (Snapinn et al. 2005).