

Training Survival Models using Scoring Rules

Philipp Kopper^{1,2}, David Rügamer^{1,2}, Raphael Sonabend³, Bernd Bischl^{1,2}, and
Andreas Bender^{1,2}

¹ Department of Statistics, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

² Munich Center for Machine Learning, Munich, Germany

³ Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

Abstract. Survival Analysis provides critical insights for partially incomplete time-to-event data in various domains. It is also an important example of probabilistic machine learning. The probabilistic nature of the predictions can be exploited by using (proper) scoring rules in the model fitting process instead of likelihood-based optimization. Our proposal does so in a generic manner and can be used for a variety of model classes. We establish different parametric and non-parametric sub-frameworks that allow different degrees of flexibility. Incorporated into neural networks, it leads to a computationally efficient and scalable optimization routine, yielding state-of-the-art predictive performance. Finally, we show that using our framework, we can recover various parametric models and demonstrate that optimization works equally well when compared to likelihood-based methods.

1 Introduction

One of the main goals of survival analysis (SA) is to estimate the distribution of event times, e.g., via the survivor function $S(\tau) = P(T > \tau)$, $\tau \in (0, t_{max}] =: \mathcal{T}$, which defines the probability that the event of interest did not occur yet at time point τ . This task is particularly complicated in the presence of censoring. If censoring is not accounted for in the modeling of the time-to-event, the estimated survivor function $\hat{S}(\tau)$ will be biased, resulting in sub-optimal generalization and predictive capacity. As the predictions $\hat{S}(\tau) \in [0, 1]$ of many survival models are probabilistic by nature, designated scoring rules provide suitable mechanisms to evaluate such predictions.

Existing literature has mainly focused on using scoring rules to evaluate the performance of predictions using unseen data. Yet, the application of such scoring rules as an alternative to likelihood-based estimation has proven fruitful across different sub-disciplines. Within SA, Avati et al. (2020) were the first to present a similar approach. Likelihood-based estimations are the most common procedures for probabilistic model fitting. By relying on strong parametric assumptions or proportional hazards assumptions, many of these methods are prone to misspecification resulting in suboptimal performance. Furthermore, likelihood-based estimation of survival models can be computationally poorly conditioned (Alaa and van der Schaar, 2017) and overly emphasize extreme data points limiting practical generalization (Avati et al., 2020).




Fig. 1: Comparison of predictions of featureless learners for the power plants data set for the actual event times. Our non-parametric, network-based approach approximates the KM distribution very well, which in turn represents the actual distribution. The parametric model (Weibull), in contrast, fails to properly model the actual events.

Motivating Example As a motivating example, Figure 1 shows when parametric survival modeling fails. We consider a data set investigating the construction times of nuclear power plants (Thurner et al., 2014). Typically, these plant constructions take very long and have a long lead period resulting in a large minimum value. A parametric method will fail to recognize this lead period. This is best illustrated using featureless learners: We illustrate the estimated survival time distribution assuming a Weibull distribution optimized using maximum likelihood and compare it to our non-parametric approach optimizing a model-agnostic scoring rule (cf. Section 3). The latter seems to be in better accordance with the actual distribution approximated by the Kaplan-Meier (KM) estimator.

Our Contributions In this work, we propose to learn survival models directly based on proper loss functions in a generic, model-agnostic framework. The framework allows the optimization of a variety of different model classes for survival analysis (parametric, semi-, and non-parametric) using different methods (additive models, neural networks, etc.) based on proper loss functions. One key finding of our work is that we can use a variety of differentiable (proper) scoring rules to estimate parametric models. We also derive a distribution-free alternative that directly learns the survival function by optimizing proper metrics through discretization of the follow-up. For empirical comparisons, we provide an explicit neural implementation that enables cheap computation for both the parametric and the non-parametric approach. In numerical experiments, we show the efficacy of our approach by confirming that we can recover estimates of classical survival optimization routines and obtain state-of-the-art performance when compared against a large variety of other methods on common benchmark data sets.

2 Related Literature

In order to take into account the censoring in SA, most of the existing solutions model the hazard function (e.g., Cox, 1972), or use specific distributional assumptions and loss functions for censored data (e.g., Wei, 1992). More recently, a variety of machine learning and deep learning approaches have been proposed for SA (cf. Wang et al., 2019; Wiegrebe et al., 2024, for respective reviews).

Deep Learning Survival Analysis with Follow-Up Discretization Following the categorization of Wiegrebe et al. (2024), our proposed method falls into the category *discrete-time* methods at the estimation stage. There exist a few noteworthy algorithms in this domain. `nnet-survival` (Gensheimer and Narasimhan, 2019), also called the logistic hazard method, is a discrete-time deep survival model where the (discrete) hazard rates are parameterized by a neural network. The model uses a negative log-likelihood loss function for the hazards in each interval and applies mini-batch stochastic gradient descent (SGD) for optimization and scalability to large data sets. `nnet-survival` allows for both baseline hazards and feature effects to be time-varying. It can therefore handle non-linear effects, interactions, and also non-proportional hazards. It can also be specified as a deep proportional hazards (Cox) model. Another prominent discrete-time survival analysis method is DeepHit (Lee et al., 2018). DeepHit models the joint probability mass function of all (competing) event points simultaneously. It optimizes a custom loss function with a log-likelihood and a ranking term. The weighting of both terms is steered through a tunable parameter. While not being a discrete-time method, Avati et al. (2020) is most similar to our proposed method. They suggest a parametric approach that uses continuous-rank probability scores as a loss function. In contrast to classical likelihood-based methods, the loss function is evaluated on a discrete grid. The parameters of the survival distribution are the outputs of the neural network. While results in Avati et al. (2020) suggest the approach to work well, it is faced with poor computational conditioning in many settings.

Scoring Rules in Survival Analysis In SA, scoring rules are mainly used for model evaluation. However, if rules are differentiable, they can also be used as loss functions and optimized via gradient-based methods. Avati et al. (2020) present an adaption of this idea for a neural network. Scoring rules for survival analysis are usually defined point-wise, i.e., for specific time points τ , and different methods are evaluated by averaging or integrating over the scores over a fixed range of time points.

Scoring rules from classification and regression problems have been adapted for SA (Graf et al., 1999; Dawid and Musio, 2014), but without formally establishing properness of the scoring rules in this setting. Recently, several contributions (Yi et al., 2015; Rindt et al., 2022; Sonabend, 2022; Yanagisawa, 2023) showed that many of these previously used scoring rules in SA are not proper and suggested proper alternatives. In most of the literature, variations of the C-index and the integrated Brier Score (IBS) are used for evaluating survival problems (see, e.g., Sonabend, 2021; Wiegrebe et al., 2024). The use of the C-index has been increasingly discouraged for model comparison as it is not proper (Blanche et al., 2019), prone to misuse (Sonabend et al., 2022), and of limited relevance in many settings (Hartman et al., 2023).

Existing Loss Functions in Survival Analysis Many statistical models for survival analysis optimize a model-specific log-likelihood. While log-likelihoods work as loss functions to train the model, they cannot be used to compare predictive performance across different model classes, as they are typically model-specific. Rindt et al. (2022) promote approximating the density of the survival time distribution through numerical differentiation to solve this problem. In practice, this approach may still not result in a fair comparison due to approximation errors. Furthermore, Avati et al. (2020) note that

survival predictions from a likelihood-based approach can be poorly calibrated, lack “sharpness”, and be sensitive to outliers.

Losses typically used for evaluation of SA methods are all *approximate losses* (Sonabend, 2022) and are derived from the Graf score (Graf et al., 1999). These approximate losses all require access to the cumulative distribution function (CDF) or survival function. Rindt et al. (2022) and Sonabend (2022) show that approximate losses are not proper. Rindt et al. (2022) argue that they can be proper only if the survivor function is perfectly modeled and censoring is feature-independent. Through reweighting of existing approximate losses Sonabend (2022) derive a way to adjust the impropriety of approximate loss functions and derive so-called *outcome-independent properness*. A more complex approach is proposed by Yanagisawa (2023) where weights are determined via iterated reweighting.

3 Survival Prediction using Proper Loss Functions

We consider right-censored survival data where each individual’s observation stems from the random variables (T, C) , with T the actual time of the event and C the censoring time. As only one of T or C can be observed, we denote the outcome time $Y := \min(T, C)$, the status random variable by $\Delta := I(T \leq C)$ and their realizations with y and δ , respectively. The observed data is then given by tuples $(y_i, \delta_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$ for individual $i = 1, \dots, n$, with outcome time y_i , event indicator $\delta_i \in \{0, 1\}$ (1=event, 0=censoring) and feature row-vector $\mathbf{x}_i^\top = (x_{i,1} \cdots x_{i,p})$.

In SA, we are mostly interested in the cumulative distribution function (CDF) F_T and will often only need access to F_T rather than its density f_T . The main objective, hence, is estimating the CDF conditional on features \mathbf{x} over the follow-up time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Instead of estimating $F(\tau|\mathbf{x})$, we can also estimate $S(\tau|\mathbf{x}) = 1 - F(\tau|\mathbf{x})$, containing the same information.

3.1 Proper Scoring in Survival Analysis

In this work, we use the class of reweighted scoring rules (Sonabend, 2022), for an existing approximate loss L and individual i given as

$$L_{R,i}(t) = \frac{\delta_i L_i(t)}{\hat{G}(t)}, \quad (1)$$

where $L_i(t)$ is a suitable point-wise loss of observation i at time t and $\hat{G}(t)$ a Kaplan-Meier estimate of the censoring distribution at time t , which is estimated beforehand. Effectively, the weighting is carried out through sample weights in the optimization. Instead of using the reweighted loss as an evaluation metric, we use it as the loss for training and tuning the model. More specifically, we use the *reweighted survival Brier score* (RSBS)

$$L_{RSBS,i}(t|\hat{G}) = \frac{\delta_i L_{SBS,i}(t)}{\hat{G}(t)}, \quad (2)$$

where $L_{SBS,i}$ is the survival Brier score

$$L_{SBS,i}(t) = \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{1}(t_i \leq \tau) - F(\tau|\mathbf{x}_i) \right)^2 d\tau.$$

3.2 Model-Agnostic Learning Procedures

We now describe the proposed procedure for training survival models using proper scoring rules in more detail. While the framework is model-agnostic, we focus on fully connected feed-forward neural networks in this paper. Our proposal can be subdivided into two classes.

- 1.) *Parametric Learning*: Estimation of the parameters of an assumed distribution;
- 2.) *Distribution-free Approach*: Direct estimation of the survival function without distributional assumption.

In both cases, we discretize the follow-up into J intervals represented by discrete time points $\tau_j, j = 1, \dots, J$. Let $j(t_i)$ be the index for the interval in which subject i is either censored or experienced the event and define $\delta_i^\top = (\delta_{i,1}, \dots, \delta_{i,j(t_i)})$ with elements

$$\delta_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 0, & j > j(t_i) \\ \delta_i, & j \leq j(t_i). \end{cases}$$

Given the current prediction $\hat{S}(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i)$ and hence an estimate for the CDF, we can then optimize the model based on a total loss

$$L = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{i,j} L_{RSBS,i}(t_j|\hat{G}) \quad (3)$$

defined by aggregating the point-wise losses for each observation i in each interval j as in Eq. (1) and reweighting it as proposed in Eq. (2). Both, approaches 1.) and 2.) share the same objective function (3) and only differ in the way the predictions $\hat{S}(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_j)$ are obtained, as described below.

Parametric Learning One choice to obtain estimates for $S(\tau)$ is by assuming a parametric distribution of event times and learning the distribution's parameters. Let $F(\tau|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be a suitable distribution for event times $T > 0$, with parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ depending on the input features, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = (\theta_1(\mathbf{x}), \theta_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \theta_m(\mathbf{x}))^\top$. Some popular parametric survival distributions include the Weibull, log-logistic and log-normal distribution. Given parameter estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$, all quantities of the distribution, including the survival function $\hat{S}(\tau|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) = 1 - \hat{F}(\tau|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}))$, are fully specified and thus prediction can be obtained at any time point τ . The distribution parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are learned by minimizing Eq. (3) concerning the model parameters.

Distribution-free Approach Instead of obtaining an estimate of the survival function by learning the parameters of an assumed distribution, we can also learn the survival function by estimating the increments $\alpha_{i,j} := \alpha_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}_i) = S(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i) - S(\tau_{j-1}|\mathbf{x}_i)$ between the survival functions at subsequent discrete time points/intervals τ_j, τ_{j-1} . We require $S(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i)$ to have the following properties to be a valid and meaningful survivor function:

- (a) $S(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i)$ needs to be monotonically decreasing in τ , i.e. $\alpha_{i,j} \leq 0$;
- (b) $S(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i)$ is bounded to $[0, 1]$;
- (c) $\alpha_{i,j} \in [-1, 0]$.

Let $\gamma_u(x) \in [0, 1], u \in \{1, 2\}$ be appropriate activation functions such as the sigmoid or truncated ReLU function $f(\cdot) = \min(1, \max(0, \cdot))$ and g_l be a model (e.g., neural network) for the l th interval. By defining

$$\hat{S}(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i) = \gamma_2 \left(\sum_{l=1}^j (-\gamma_1(g_l(\mathbf{x}_i))) \right)$$

through increments $\hat{\alpha}_{i,l} := -\gamma_1(g_l(\mathbf{x}_i)) \in [-1, 0]$, we obtain a monotonically decreasing survival function $\hat{S}(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i) = \gamma_2(\sum_{l=1}^j \hat{\alpha}_{i,l}) \in [0, 1]$ for each time interval τ_j . In contrast to the parametric learning approach, this approach initially only produces discrete survival probabilities $\hat{S}(\tau_j|\mathbf{x})$. However, simple interpolation or smoothing can be applied to obtain meaningful predictions at time points between initial interval points τ_j . This will likely improve the model's performance if J is chosen to be small.

Competing Risks In the single event scenario, it is equivalent to model the survival probability $\hat{S}(\tau|\mathbf{x}_i)$ or the cumulative incidence function (CIF) $\hat{F}(\tau|\mathbf{x}_i) = 1 - \hat{S}(\tau|\mathbf{x}_i)$ due to their inverse relationship. For competing risks, the CIFs are the outcome of interest by vectorizing and using the identity $F(t) = 1 - S(t)$. In the case of our parametric framework, we either learn the set of parameters for each competing risk $k = 1, \dots, K$, with separate sub-models for distribution parameters θ_k or train a single joint model for all parameters $\Theta = \{\theta\}_{k=1}^K$.

The CIF in the non-parametric case is modeled via

$$\hat{F}_k(\tau_j|\mathbf{x}_i) = \gamma_2 \left(\sum_{l=1}^j (\gamma_1(g_{l,k}(\mathbf{x}_i))) \right),$$

where $g_{l,k}$ are now interval- and risk-specific models. As loss functions, we can use L_{SBS} or L_{RSBS} , but need to derive δ_i and $\delta_{i,j}$ differently. More specifically, we define for every risk k an indicator $\delta_{i,k} = \delta_i \mathbb{1}(\sigma = k)$ whether the event $\sigma \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ observed is equal to the k th risk, and

$$\delta_{i,j,k} = \begin{cases} 0, & j > j(t_i) \\ \delta_{i,k}, & j \leq j(t_i). \end{cases}$$

This means that for each separate risk, observations are considered censored when a competing event is observed. We further constrain $\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{F}_k(\tau_j | \mathbf{x}_i) = 1$. This is facilitated by a softmax output (explicit choice for γ_2) with $K + 1$ dimensions. Putting everything together, we optimize the loss

$$L_{CR} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{i,j,k} L_{RSBS,i}(t_j | \hat{G}). \quad (4)$$

3.3 Implementation

As a proof-of-concept, we investigate the newly established idea of directly estimating the survivor status with an exemplary feed-forward neural network (while other model choices would also be possible). Both variants, the parametric and non-parametric approach, result in a network with $J \times K$ output units. However, for the parametric variant, the final output layer is deterministic and backpropagation is carried out for the parameters θ_k of the chosen survival distribution for each risk k . For example, in the case of the log-normal distribution with three competing risks and unknown scale parameters (i.e., $m = 1$), the relevant estimated distributional layer has shape 1×3 . While the estimation of θ is independent of the model choice, estimating $\hat{\alpha}_{i,j}$ can be done conveniently in a neural network. Exemplary architectures are shown in Figure 2.

As the distribution-free approach can easily overfit the data due to its expressiveness, it is necessary to employ regularization techniques. The presented experiments in the following section suggest that L2 regularization (particularly in the last layer) and dropout are sufficient to overcome problems with overfitting.

4 Numerical Experiments

In the following sections, we evaluate our approach empirically. While our parametric approach can be used to estimate any parametric survival model, we focus on the model class of accelerated failure time models (AFT) in our experiments. We will denote non-deep versions of AFT models estimated by maximum likelihood methods as AFT_{MLE} . The deep version of these models is denoted by AFT_{NN} . Our scoring rule based approach that estimates a fixed parametric distribution will be denoted by SRP and its distribution-free alternative by SRDF. Additionally, we use the Cox proportional hazards model (Cox).

4.1 Comparison to Maximum Likelihood Estimation

We first check empirically, that our approach can recover the parameters of an assumed event time distribution without explicitly using its likelihood for estimation. To do so, we simulate event times from an AFT model via

$$\log(T_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \theta_2 \epsilon_i \quad (5)$$




Fig. 2: Examples for architectures of our proposed method in the single risk case. Left: Parametric approach. We pass the data through a fully connected neural network to estimate the parameters (here θ_1 and θ_2) of a survival distribution). We generate predictions for each $t = \tau_j$ using the parameterized $F(\cdot)$. Right: Non-parametric approach. We pass the data through a fully-connected neural network to estimate the survival increments α_j and use them to generate survival predictions for each τ_j , where $\xi(\cdot) := \gamma_2(-\sum(\cdot))$.

with $\beta^\top = (2, -0.5, 0.2, 0)$ and let ϵ follow the Extreme value (i), Normal (ii), and Logistic (iii) distribution, which leads to event times $T \sim F(\theta_1(x_1, x_2, x_3), \theta_2)$ following a Weibull (i), Log-normal (ii) and Log-logistic (iii) distribution, respectively. For the simulation, we only let one parameter of the distribution depend on features, here $\theta_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3$. In general, however, all parameters could depend on features, as depicted in Figure 2.

For the simulation, we draw $n = 1500$ event times from each distribution based on (5) and introduce censoring assuming a uniform distribution over the follow-up, resulting in approximately 28% censoring. We repeat this $B = 100$ times, each time splitting the data into train (75%) and test (25%) data. In each iteration we calculate

$$\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_{j,m}; j = 1, \dots, 3; m \in \{\text{AFT}_{MLE}, \text{Cox}, \text{SRP}\},$$

where AFT is a parametric model optimized by maximizing the model’s correctly specified likelihood, Cox is a semi-parametric alternative, and SRP is our parametric scoring rule-based approach 1.) proposed in Section 3. We repeat the simulation 100 times.

The results are presented in Figure 3. Our approach recovers the true coefficients well, with all models yielding similar root mean squared errors. In contrast to other approaches, our method allows the estimation of a variety of distributions using the parametric framework, including the Weibull distribution which has repeatedly been reported to suffer from poor computational conditioning (e.g., Avati et al., 2020). This is further illustrated in Section 4.2.




Fig. 3: L_2 -distance between estimated and true coefficients of the AFT, Cox PH, and our proposal (SRP) for different features (columns) and different distributions (rows) across 100 replications.

As a secondary analysis, we use the experimental results from the recovery analysis to compute the predictive performance across different settings and (mis-)specifications. Particularly, we fit for each simulation setting a correctly specified SRP and AFT_{MLE} , and two misspecifications regarding the assumed survival distribution across the three

options previously discussed. Alongside, we fit the methods not relying on distributional assumptions, i.e. SRDF, Cox PH, and Kaplan-Meier. The results are presented in Table 1. Columns show the data-generating setting. Rows the respective modeling approaches. The models specified using the correct distributional assumption usually perform best. Our non-parametric neural network approach consistently performs close to the correctly specified model and outperforms the misspecified ones. Thus, the non-parametric approach is preferable when no prior information regarding the distribution of event times is available.

Table 1: Average predictive performance (SBS at 50% quantile of the follow-up; lower is better) with standard deviation in brackets of different survival models in different simulated settings. The best performances per column are highlighted in bold.

		Setting		
		Weibull	Log-norm.	Log-log.
AFT _{MLE}	Weibull	2.3 (0.09)	2.3 (0.17)	1.9 (0.08)
	Log-normal	2.7 (0.13)	2.2 (0.14)	2.3 (0.11)
	Log-logistic	2.6 (0.11)	2.5 (0.14)	1.7 (0.10)
SRP	Weibull	2.3 (0.10)	2.3 (0.16)	2.0 (0.10)
	Log-normal	2.6 (0.15)	2.1 (0.17)	2.1 (0.12)
	Log-logistic	2.6 (0.13)	2.4 (0.18)	1.8 (0.09)
Non/Semi-parametric	SRDF	2.3 (0.08)	2.1 (0.15)	1.9 (0.13)
	Cox	2.4 (0.13)	2.3 (0.12)	1.9 (0.10)
	KM	3.1 (0.10)	2.9 (0.11)	2.7 (0.05)

4.2 Numerical Stability

To investigate the numerical stability of our approach (SRP) compared to a maximum likelihood-based approach (AFT_{NN}), we initialize two networks with random (identical) weights and analyze the variance in their gradients. The gradient variance will give an idea of how much (small) changes in the input will affect the output and give insights into possible vulnerability to exploding gradients. Both models are specified identically except for the output layer, which is different by nature. In Figure 4 we illustrate the development of the (normalized) variance for different model sizes (x-Axis) and 100 experiment replications with different initializations. We observe that the variance is notably larger for larger models and grows faster for the model using the right censored log-likelihood loss. While depending on many factors such as the model size and \mathcal{T} , the given results suggest that the variance of SRP’s gradients increases linearly in the parameters while those of the AFT_{NN} model grow superlinearly.




Fig. 4: Aggregated variance of the gradients of all model weights of our approach (SRP, right) vs AFT (left) over a grid of different model sizes (x-axis) measured in the number of parameters in thousands.

4.3 Benchmark Study

In this section, we evaluate the models’ predictive performance on synthetic and real-world data for both, single-event (Table 2 and competing risks (Table 3) settings.

We compare our approach (SRDF) to other popular deep models for survival analysis, namely *nnet-survival* (Gensheimer and Narasimhan, 2019), *DeepHit* (Lee et al., 2018), and *DeepSurv* (Katzman et al., 2018), as well as the *Countdown* model (with an assumed log-normal distribution) as proposed in Avati et al. (2020). As simpler baselines, we include the featureless KM estimator and the Cox model. Tuning (if applicable) has been carried out using four-fold cross-validation and a budget of 25 configurations.

We selected common data sets in the survival analysis literature primarily related to various cancers with observations in the high hundreds or low thousands. The data sets range from 5 to 36 features, excluding *breast* which represents a high-dimensional data example with almost 2000 gene expressions. Details can be obtained from the respective publications: *tumor* (Bender et al., 2019), *gbgs2* (Schumacher et al., 1994), *metabric* (Curtis et al., 2012), *breast* (Ternès et al., 2017) and *mgus2* (Kyle et al., 2002). In addition, synthetic data was generated such that the data-generating process includes complex feature effects (non-linearity and interactions) as well as non-proportional hazards.

In all experiments, models are evaluated using the RSBS as the evaluation metric, evaluated at different quantiles (25, 50 and 75 percent) of the follow-up. The final performance is obtained from aggregation over 25 distinct train-test splits.

In summary, three methods perform notably better than the other three. These include our contribution, *nnet-survival*, and *Countdown* (Avati et al. (2020)), with our method often being the best-performing one. Among the methods implemented in *pycox* (*nnet*, *DeepSurv*, *DeepHit*), *nnet* seems to be the most stable one requiring the least tuning making it consistently better performing than its peers.

Table 2: Predictive performance of different learning algorithms for different data sets (single event) using the relative increase of the RSBS compared to the KM estimator (larger is better). We report the mean and standard deviation (in brackets) from 25 distinct train-test splits.

Data Set		Cox PH	nnet	DeepSurv	DeepHit	Countdown	SRDF
tumor	Q25	8.3 (3.31)	16.7 (2.39)	9.7 (3.07)	5.6 (4.61)	15.3 (3.42)	13.9 (3.51)
	Q50	8.1 (2.40)	11.0 (1.93)	9.6 (2.82)	8.1 (2.60)	10.9 (2.14)	12.5 (1.92)
	Q75	6.3 (0.99)	8.9 (1.42)	7.4 (1.15)	6.8 (1.20)	9.5 (1.43)	10.5 (1.05)
gbsg2	Q25	-3.0 (2.32)	3.0 (2.54)	0.2 (4.01)	-6.0 (5.13)	2.9 (2.21)	3.0 (2.18)
	Q50	4.0 (4.92)	8.2 (6.56)	4.1 (5.41)	4.1 (5.70)	6.8 (4.45)	8.2 (4.61)
	Q75	6.8 (6.88)	9.0 (7.90)	7.5 (7.07)	6.0 (6.38)	8.2 (5.98)	9.7 (5.57)
metabric	Q25	0.3 (2.98)	4.7 (4.21)	2.6 (3.13)	4.9 (3.91)	7.2 (4.09)	7.2 (3.85)
	Q50	3.4 (3.31)	10.2 (4.67)	6.7 (3.50)	5.5 (3.70)	8.0 (4.56)	10.1 (4.59)
	Q75	5.6 (3.08)	7.1 (3.20)	7.0 (3.25)	5.7 (3.15)	5.7 (3.53)	7.7 (3.43)
breast	Q25	-	-0.5 (3.01)	-1.4 (2.50)	-9.3 (4.32)	-9.5 (3.97)	1.1 (4.04)
	Q50	-	3.1 (2.95)	4.9 (3.12)	0.9 (3.34)	1.6 (3.51)	4.8 (1.95)
	Q75	-	3.8 (3.17)	1.5 (3.40)	-0.1 (3.00)	1.8 (2.78)	4.9 (2.81)
synthetic	Q25	4.2 (3.88)	2.6 (3.56)	5.1 (3.83)	1.9 (3.76)	5.6 (3.81)	5.6 (3.32)
	Q50	3.8 (3.11)	8.8 (4.10)	6.5 (4.05)	7.5 (4.07)	8.5 (3.72)	9.6 (4.13)
	Q75	3.0 (4.19)	9.6 (3.89)	7.5 (3.49)	7.4 (3.52)	9.3 (3.77)	9.6 (3.79)

5 Discussion

We proposed a new method for estimating event time distributions from censored data, including competing risks. The advantages of our proposal include numerical stability, the ability to use any suitable scoring rule as loss function, and flexibility w.r.t. to the estimation backend, including variants of neural networks. Experimental results suggest that our method generates survival predictions on par with other state-of-the-art methods.

While the choice of the number of evaluation points J was not the focus in the main part, we found that selecting a larger number of intervals and applying rigorous regularization works well in practice. However, selecting more intervals than necessary may result in unnecessarily complex models. Tuning the number of intervals could improve results, however, it will also increase computational costs.

In future work, other regularisation techniques (for the final layer) could be investigated, for example, smoothing techniques as discussed in Wood (2017); Kopper et al. (2022), which would also improve upon the linear interpolation employed currently to obtain predictions at arbitrary time points.

Further extensions that were not investigated here, but would be straightforward to implement (Wiegerebe et al., 2024) and could be of practical relevance are extensions of the architecture (Figure 2) to include parameter- and cause-specific sub-networks in order to allow more flexibility, the inclusion of further sub-networks to process non-tabular data, and the combination of the suggested loss with further loss functions tailored to specific use cases.

Table 3: Prediction accuracy of different learning algorithms for different real-world data sets (competing risk) using the relative increase of the SBS compared with KM estimator (larger is better). We report the mean and standard deviation (in brackets) from 25 distinct train-test splits. The Cox PH model is fit with cause-specific hazards.

Data Set		Cox PH	DeepHit	SRDF
mgus2 (cause 1)	Q25	-0.8 (2.29)	1.5 (2.11)	1.2 (2.25)
	Q50	4.3 (1.66)	4.7 (1.45)	5.5 (1.64)
	Q75	2.5 (1.75)	2.2 (1.71)	5.2 (1.62)
mgus2 (cause 2)	Q25	3.9 (0.92)	5.3 (0.95)	5.2 (0.83)
	Q50	7.0 (1.21)	10.5 (1.99)	10.3 (2.10)
	Q75	11.6 (3.44)	14.6 (4.09)	15.4 (3.67)
synthetic (CR) (cause 1)	Q25	2.0 (2.39)	5.1 (2.94)	6.7 (3.11)
	Q50	6.1 (3.82)	6.9 (3.88)	13.1 (5.40)
	Q75	6.4 (3.12)	6.1 (3.32)	9.8 (3.81)
synthetic (CR) (cause 2)	Q25	9.9 (5.01)	9.9 (5.23)	9.7 (4.67)
	Q50	2.2 (2.10)	6.0 (2.79)	6.3 (2.98)
	Q75	3.0 (1.97)	5.5 (2.30)	5.8 (2.22)

While technically our method can also be used for image or text data, training multimodal regression approaches is non-trivial. A general approach combining such data modalities and tabular inputs was proposed by Rügamer et al. (2023); Rügamer (2023) and has also been extended to survival applications Kopper et al. (2021, 2022). As use cases of such models are often found in safety-critical applications, a future research project is to investigate proposals that provide statistical inference results such as the ones proposed in Dorigatti et al. (2023); Dold et al. (2024).

References

Ahmed M Alaa and Mihaela van der Schaar. Deep multi-task gaussian processes for survival analysis with competing risks. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2326–2334. Curran Associates Inc., 2017.

Anand Avati, Tony Duan, Sharon Zhou, Kenneth Jung, Nigam H Shah, and Andrew Y Ng. Countdown regression: sharp and calibrated survival predictions. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 145–155. PMLR, 2020.

Andreas Bender, Fabian Scheipl, Wolfgang Hartl, Andrew G. Day, and Helmut Küchenhoff. Penalized estimation of complex, non-linear exposure-lag-response associations. *Biostatistics*, 20(2):315–331, April 2019.

Paul Blanche, Michael W Kattan, and Thomas A Gerds. The c-index is not proper for the evaluation of year predicted risks. *Biostatistics*, 20(2):347–357, 2019.

D. R. Cox. Regression Models and Life-Tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 34(2):187–220, 1972.

- Christina Curtis, Sohrab P Shah, Suet-Feung Chin, Gulisa Turashvili, Oscar M Rueda, Mark J Dunning, Doug Speed, Andy G Lynch, Shamith Samarajiwa, Yinyin Yuan, et al. The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature*, 486(7403):346–352, 2012.
- Alexander Philip Dawid and Monica Musio. Theory and applications of proper scoring rules. *Metron*, 72(2):169–183, 2014.
- Daniel Dold, David Rügamer, Beate Sick, and Oliver Dürr. Semi-structured subspace inference. In *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2024. Accepted.
- Emilio Dorigatti, Benjamin Schubert, Bernd Bischl, and David Rügamer. Frequentist uncertainty quantification in semi-structured neural networks. In *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 206 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1924–1941. PMLR, 2023.
- Michael F. Gensheimer and Balasubramanian Narasimhan. A scalable discrete-time survival model for neural networks. *PeerJ*, 7:e6257, January 2019.
- Erika Graf, Claudia Schmoor, Willi Sauerbrei, and Martin Schumacher. Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Statistics in medicine*, 18:2529–2545, 1999.
- Nicholas Hartman, Sehee Kim, Kevin He, and John D Kalbfleisch. Pitfalls of the concordance index for survival outcomes. *Statistics in Medicine*, 2023.
- Jared L Katzman, Uri Shaham, Alexander Cloninger, Jonathan Bates, Tingting Jiang, and Yuval Kluger. DeepSurv: personalized treatment recommender system using a cox proportional hazards deep neural network. *BMC medical research methodology*, 18(1):1–12, 2018.
- Philipp Kopper, Sebastian Pölsterl, Christian Wachinger, Bernd Bischl, Andreas Bender, and David Rügamer. Semi-structured deep piecewise exponential models. In *Survival Prediction-Algorithms, Challenges and Applications*, pages 40–53. PMLR, 2021.
- Philipp Kopper, Simon Wiegrebe, Bernd Bischl, Andreas Bender, and David Rügamer. DeepPAMM: Deep piecewise exponential additive mixed models for complex hazard structures in survival analysis. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 249–261, 2022.
- Robert A. Kyle, Terry M. Therneau, S. Vincent Rajkumar, Janice R. Offord, Dirk R. Larson, Matthew F. Plevak, and L. Joseph Melton. A Long-Term Study of Prognosis in Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 346(8):564–569, February 2002.
- Changhee Lee, William R. Zame, Jinsung Yoon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. DeepHit: A Deep Learning Approach to Survival Analysis With Competing Risks. In *23rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- David Rindt, Robert Hu, David Steinsaltz, and Dino Sejdinovic. Survival regression with proper scoring rules and monotonic neural networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1190–1205. PMLR, 2022.
- David Rügamer. A new PHO-rmula for improved performance of semi-structured networks. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 29291–29305. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.

- David Rügamer, Chris Kolb, and Nadja Klein. Semi-structured distributional regression. *The American Statistician*, 0(0):1–12, 2023.
- M Schumacher, G Bastert, H Bojar, K Hübner, M Olschewski, W Sauerbrei, C Schmoor, C Beyerle, RL Neumann, and HF Rauschecker. Randomized 2 x 2 trial evaluating hormonal treatment and the duration of chemotherapy in node-positive breast cancer patients. german breast cancer study group. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 12(10):2086–2093, 1994.
- Raphael Sonabend. *A theoretical and methodological framework for machine learning in survival analysis: Enabling transparent and accessible predictive modelling on right-censored time-to-event data*. PhD thesis, UCL (University College London), 2021.
- Raphael Sonabend. Scoring rules in survival analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05260*, 2022.
- Raphael Sonabend, Andreas Bender, and Sebastian Vollmer. Avoiding C-hacking when evaluating survival distribution predictions with discrimination measures. *Bioinformatics*, 38(17):4178–4184, 07 2022. ISSN 1367-4803. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btac451>.
- Nils Ternès, Federico Rotolo, Georg Heinze, and Stefan Michiels. Identification of biomarker-by-treatment interactions in randomized clinical trials with survival outcomes and high-dimensional spaces. *Biometrical Journal*, 59(4):685–701, 2017. ISSN 1521-4036. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bimj.201500234>.
- Paul W. Thurner, Laura Mittermeier, and Helmut Küchenhoff. How long does it take to build a nuclear power plant? A non-parametric event history approach with P-splines. *Energy Policy*, 70:163–171, July 2014. ISSN 0301-4215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.03.015>. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421514001621>.
- Ping Wang, Yan Li, and Chandan K. Reddy. Machine Learning for Survival Analysis: A Survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(6):110:1–110:36, February 2019.
- Lee-Jen Wei. The accelerated failure time model: a useful alternative to the cox regression model in survival analysis. *Statistics in medicine*, 11(14-15):1871–1879, 1992.
- Simon Wiegrebe, Philipp Kopper, Raphael Sonabend, Bernd Bischl, and Andreas Bender. Deep learning for survival analysis: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(3):65, 2024.
- Simon N. Wood. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. Chapman & Hall/Crc Texts in Statistical Science, Boca Raton, 2 rev ed. edition, June 2017.
- Hiroki Yanagisawa. Proper scoring rules for survival analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00621*, 2023.
- Zhihao Yi, Danning Wang, Kai Hu, and Qiang Li. Purchase behavior prediction in m-commerce with an optimized sampling methods. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW)*, pages 1085–1092. IEEE, 2015.