

Deep Neural Networks for Semiparametric Frailty Models via H-likelihood

Hangbin Lee¹, Il Do Ha^{2,*} and Youngjo Lee¹

¹Department of Statistics, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

²Department of Statistics, Pukyong National University, Busan 48513, South Korea

*Corresponding author. *E-mail address*: idha1353@pknu.ac.kr (I.D. Ha)

Abstract

For prediction of clustered time-to-event data, we propose a new deep neural network based gamma frailty model (DNN-FM). An advantage of the proposed model is that the joint maximization of the new h-likelihood provides maximum likelihood estimators for fixed parameters and best unbiased predictors for random frailties. Thus, the proposed DNN-FM is trained by using a negative profiled h-likelihood as a loss function, constructed by profiling out the non-parametric baseline hazard. Experimental studies show that the proposed method enhances the prediction performance of the existing methods. A real data analysis shows that the inclusion of subject-specific frailties helps to improve prediction of the DNN based Cox model (DNN-Cox).

Keywords: Deep neural network, Frailty model, H-likelihood, Prediction, Random effect.

1 Introduction

Recently, deep neural network (DNN) has provided a major breakthrough to enhance prediction in various areas (LeCun et al., 2015; Goodfellow, 2016). The DNN models allow extensions of Cox proportional hazards (PH) models (Kvamme et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2020). Recently, subject-specific prediction of the DNN models has been studied by including random effects in neural network (NN) predictor (Tran et al., 2020; Mandel et al., 2022). However, these DNN random-effect models have been studied for only complete data. In this paper we propose a new DNN-FM. To the best of our knowledge, there is no literature on the DNN-FM for censored survival data. Lee and Nelder (1996) introduced the h-likelihood for the inference of general models with random effects and Ha, Lee and Song (2001) extended it to the semi-parametric frailty models. We reformulate the h-likelihood to obtain maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) for fixed unknown parameters and best unbiased predictors (BUPs; Searle et al., 1992; Lee et al., 2017) for random frailties by a simple joint maximization of the profiled h-likelihood, which is constructed by profiling out

the non-parametric baseline hazard for semi-parametric DNN-FMs. Thus, the proposed DNN-FM can be trained by using a negative profiled h-likelihood as a loss function. Experimental studies show that the proposed method enhances the prediction performance of the existing DNN-Cox and FM in terms of Brier score and C-index, which are popular predictive measures in survival analysis.

In Section 2, we review the DNN-Cox model. We propose the DNN-FM and introduce its h-likelihood in Section 3 and learning algorithm in Section 4. The experimental study is presented to compare its predictive performance with various methods in Section 5. A real data analysis is in Section 6, followed by concluding remarks in Section 7. A theoretical framework for an online learning and all the technical details are in Appendix.

2 A review of DNN-Cox model

2.1 DNN-Cox model

Let T_i be the survival time (time-to-event) for subject $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})^T$ be a p -dimensional vector of input variables (covariates or features). The semi-parametric Cox model is as follows: For a given \mathbf{x}_i , the hazard function of T_i is

$$\lambda_i(t|\mathbf{x}_i) = \lambda_0(t) \exp(\eta_i), \quad \eta_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ is a non-parametric baseline hazard function, the linear predictor $\eta_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a parametric model for risk function (or risk score) of covariates \mathbf{x}_i , and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a vector of p -dimensional regression parameters without intercept (or bias) term. The survival function for T_i given \mathbf{x}_i is

$$S(t|\mathbf{x}_i) = P(T_i > t|\mathbf{x}_i) = \exp\{-\Lambda_0(t)e^{\eta_i}\},$$

where $\Lambda_0(t)$ is the baseline cumulative hazard.

The Cox model (1) is extended to the DNN-Cox model, by relaxing the parametric linear model $\eta_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ with a non-linear function of \mathbf{x}_i ,

$$\eta_i = \sum_{k=1}^{p_L} \beta_k g_k^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}) \equiv NN(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (2)$$

where $NN(\cdot)$ denotes neural network risk predictor of the output layer with the L th (last) hidden layer; $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{p_L})^T$ is a vector of the output weights, with p_L number of

nodes of the L th hidden layer; and $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}_1^T, \mathbf{w}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L^T)^T$ is a combined vectorization consisting of a vector \mathbf{w}_ℓ ($\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$) of the ℓ th hidden weights. Here, the $g_k^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w})$ is the k -th node of the last hidden layer $g^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}) = (g_1^{(L)T}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}), \dots, g_{p_L}^{(L)T}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}))^T$, which depends on the input variables \mathbf{x}_i and the hidden weights \mathbf{w} , and the last hidden layer can be expressed as the form of compositional functions

$$g^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}) = \sigma^{(L)}(\dots \sigma^{(2)}(\sigma^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}_1); \mathbf{w}_2) \dots ; \mathbf{w}_L),$$

where $\sigma^{(\ell)}(\cdot)$ denotes the activation function of hidden layer for each $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$, and each of the \mathbf{w}_ℓ vectors includes the bias term.

In survival analysis, the observable random variables are, for $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$y_i = \min(T_i, C_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_i = I(T_i \leq C_i)$$

where C_i is the censoring time corresponding to T_i . The DNN weights $(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ in (2) can be estimated by minimizing the negative Breslow (1972) log-likelihood (denoted by $-\ell$; Kvamme et al., 2019; Tarkhan and Simon, 2022) as a loss function, given by

$$\ell = \sum_i \delta_i \eta_i - \sum_k d_{(k)} \log \left\{ \sum_{i \in R_{(k)}} \exp(\eta_i) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\eta_i = NN(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is the NN predictor which also represents an output node of the DNN-Cox model, $R_{(k)} = \{i : y_i \geq y_{(k)}\}$ is the risk set at time $y_{(k)}$ which is the k th ($k = 1, \dots, K$) smallest distinct event time among the y_i 's, and $d_{(k)}$ is the number of events at $y_{(k)}$. The weights $(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ are usually obtained by optimizing the loss function based on the gradient decent method.

2.2 Prediction measures

For censored data, the two popular measures, namely the Brier score and the concordance index (C-index), have been used to evaluate the predictive performance of the DNN-Cox model (2) (Kvamme et al., 2019).

2.2.1 Brier score

The time-dependent Brier score is defined as

$$BS(t) = E \{I(t) - S(t|\mathbf{x})\}^2,$$

where $BS(t)$ is the mean squared error of the difference between $I(t)$ and $S(t|\mathbf{x})$. Here, $I(t)$ is the event status at the time point t (i.e. $I(t) = I(T > t) = 1$ if $T > t$ and 0 otherwise) and $S(t|\mathbf{x})$ is a model-based survival function. The estimated Brier score (Graf et al., 1999) is given by

$$\widehat{BS}(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i(t) \left\{ y_i(t) - \hat{S}(t|\mathbf{x}_i) \right\}^2,$$

where $y_i(t) = I(y_i > t)$ at a specific time point t and $\hat{S}(t|\mathbf{x}_i)$ is estimated survival function given \mathbf{x}_i . Here, $\hat{w}_i(t)$ is the inverse probability of censoring weights (IPCW)

$$\hat{w}_i(t) = \frac{(1 - y_i(t))\delta_i}{\hat{G}(y_i)} + \frac{y_i(t)}{\hat{G}(t)}, \text{ with } \hat{G}(t) = \hat{P}(C > t),$$

and $\hat{G}(\cdot)$ indicates the estimated survival function of censoring time. Thus, the estimated Brier score can be viewed as the mean squared error between the observed event status $y_i(t)$ and the predicted survival function $\hat{S}(t|\mathbf{x}_i)$. The lower Brier score indicates a better predictive performance. For predictive performance of Brier score at all available times, the integrated Brier score (IBS) is usually used with the maximum survival time t_{max} :

$$IBS = \frac{1}{t_{max}} \int_0^{t_{max}} BS(s) ds.$$

2.2.2 C-index

The definition of C-index is based on the property that a survival model should predict a shorter survival time for subjects that fail earlier and a longer survival time for subjects that fail later. Let T_i and T_j be independent survival times with corresponding covariate vectors \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{x}_j , respectively. Then the C-index is defined by

$$C = P(S(t|\mathbf{x}_i) > S(t|\mathbf{x}_j) | T_i > T_j) = P(\eta_i < \eta_j | T_i > T_j).$$

where $\eta_k = NN(\mathbf{x}_k; \mathbf{w}, \beta)$ are the NN predictors of the DNN-Cox model (2). Following Harrell et al. (1996), the C-index can be estimated by

$$\hat{C} = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j \delta_i I(y_i < y_j) \{ I(\hat{\eta}_i > \hat{\eta}_j) + 0.5 I(\hat{\eta}_i = \hat{\eta}_j) \}}{\sum_i \sum_j \delta_i I(y_i < y_j)},$$

where $\hat{\eta}_k = NN(\mathbf{x}_k; \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\beta})$. The range of C-index is from 0 to 1, and a larger value indicates a better performance.

3 Proposed DNN for frailty model

The FMs have been introduced for prediction of clustered survival time. Consider a clustered survival dataset

$$D_N = \{(y_{ij}, \delta_{ij}, \mathbf{x}_{ij}), i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots, n_i\},$$

where $y_{ij} = \min(T_{ij}, C_{ij})$ is the j th observation of the i th subject (or cluster), T_{ij} and C_{ij} are the corresponding survival and censoring times, respectively, and $\delta_{ij} = I(T_{ij} \leq C_{ij})$ is censoring indicator, and $\mathbf{x}_{ij} = (x_{ij1}, \dots, x_{ijp})^T$ is a vector of p covariates corresponding to T_{ij} . Here, n is the number of clusters, n_i is cluster size and $N = \sum_{i=1}^n n_i$ is the total sample size. The dependency among T_{ij} 's can be modelled via a frailty in the hazard function. Let u_i denote the unobserved frailty of the i th cluster. Then, the semi-parametric FM is as follows. The conditional hazard function of T_{ij} given u_i and \mathbf{x}_{ij} takes the form of

$$\lambda_{ij}(t|u_i, \mathbf{x}_{ij}) = \lambda_0(t) \exp(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) u_i = \lambda_0(t) \exp(\eta_{ij}), \quad \eta_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + v_i, \quad (4)$$

where η_{ij} is linear predictor and $v_i = \log u_i$.

3.1 DNN-FM

The FM (4) is extended to a new DNN-FM by replacing $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ with

$$NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{k=1}^{pL} \beta_k g_k^{(L)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}). \quad (5)$$

In this paper, for the frailty u_i , we use a gamma distribution with $E(u_i) = 1$ and $\text{var}(u_i) = \alpha$, which is denoted by $\text{Gamma}(1/\alpha, \alpha)$. Figure 1 shows the extension of Cox model to the DNN-FM. Figure 2 presents a schematic diagram of architecture of the DNN-FM, which is constructed by allowing for output nodes $NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and \hat{u}_i from the two separate input layers, namely input vector \mathbf{x}_{ij} and one-hot encoding vector of subjects \mathbf{z}_i , respectively. In the DNN-FM, subject-specific prediction can be made by multiplying the risk predictor $\exp(NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ and frailty predictors \hat{u}_i .

3.2 Construction of h-likelihood

In FMs (4), it is important to define the likelihood to obtain the exact MLEs for fixed parameters and BUPs for random frailties. Let $\mathbf{y}^* = (y, \delta)$ with $y = \min(T, C)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\psi} =$

$(\boldsymbol{\theta}^T, \lambda_0(\cdot))^T$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \alpha)^T$ be the vector of fixed parameters. Under the conditional independence and non-informative censoring given v_i , Ha et al. (2001) proposed the use of a h-likelihood

$$\ell_e(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i,j} \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(y_{ij}, \delta_{ij}|v_i) + \sum_i \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(v_i), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(y_{ij}, \delta_{ij}|v_i) = \delta_{ij} \{\log \lambda_{ij}(y_{ij}|v_i)\} - \Lambda_{ij}(y_{ij}|v_i) = \delta_{ij} \{\log \lambda_0(y_{ij}) + \eta_{ij}\} - \Lambda_0(y_{ij}) \exp(\eta_{ij})$$

is the conditional censored log-likelihood of y_{ij} and δ_{ij} given v_i , $\Lambda_0(\cdot)$ is the cumulative baseline hazard function, $f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(v_i)$ is a density function of v_i with the parameter $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, and $\mathbf{v} = \log(\mathbf{u})$. Lee and Nelder's (1996) original aim of h-likelihood is to obtain MLEs for all fixed parameters and good predictors for random effects by its joint maximization. However, its joint maximization of the current h-likelihood above cannot give an exact MLE for variance component α . In this paper, we introduce a new h-likelihood for the gamma FM (4). Consider an extended likelihood (Lee et al., 2017) in the \mathbf{v}^c scale

$$h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}^c) = \ell(\boldsymbol{\psi}; \mathbf{y}^*) + \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{v}^c|\mathbf{y}^*), \quad (7)$$

where $\ell(\boldsymbol{\psi}; \mathbf{y}^*) = \log \int f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}$ is the marginal log-likelihood. Given $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c$ be

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c = \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}^c} h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}^c) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}^c} f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{v}^c|\mathbf{y}^*)$$

From (7), a sufficient condition for $h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}^c)$ to give the exact MLEs for $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is that $f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c|\mathbf{y}^*)$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Let

$$v_i^c = v_i \exp \{a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+})\}, \quad (8)$$

where $a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+}) = (\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}) (\log(\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}) - 1) - \log \Gamma(\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1})$. Appendix A.1 shows that the predictive likelihood

$$\log f(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c|\mathbf{y}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tilde{v}_i^c|\mathbf{y}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{\log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tilde{v}_i|\mathbf{y}^*) - a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+})\} = 0$$

is free from $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Thus, $\ell(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{y}^*) = h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c)$. Let $h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v})$ be a reparameterization of the h-likelihood (7). Then

$$h = h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}) = \ell_e(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{v}) + \log \left| \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{d\mathbf{v}^c} \right| = h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}^c),$$

where $\ell_e(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{v})$ is the h-likelihood (6) of Ha et al. (2001) and $\log \left| \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{d\mathbf{v}^c} \right| = -\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+})$. Thus, $h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}) \neq \ell_e(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{v})$. Given $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, we have the BUP for \mathbf{u} , $E(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y}^*)$, by solving $\partial h/\partial \mathbf{v} = 0$ (or $\partial h/\partial \mathbf{u} = 0$), where $\mathbf{u} = \exp(\mathbf{v})$ (see Appendix A.1). The joint maximization of the new h-likelihood gives MLEs for whole parameters including variance component and BUPs for random frailties.

4 Learning algorithm using the profiled h-likelihood

In the DNN-FM (5), the new h-likelihood is

$$h = h(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[\delta_{ij} \{ \log \lambda_0(y_{ij}) + \eta_{ij} \} - \Lambda_0(y_{ij}) \exp(\eta_{ij}) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\log u_i - u_i}{\alpha} - \alpha^{-1} \log \alpha - \log \Gamma(\alpha^{-1}) - a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+}) \right] \quad (9)$$

where

$$\eta_{ij} = NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + v_i$$

and $a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+})$ is given in (8). For eliminating the non-parametric baseline hazard $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ in (9), following Ha et al. (2001) we can have a profiled h-likelihood,

$$h_p = h_p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = h_{\text{PL}} - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$h_{\text{PL}} = \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} \eta_{ij} - \sum_k d_{(k)} \log \left[\sum_{(i,j) \in R_{(k)}} \exp(\eta_{ij}) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\log u_i - u_i}{\alpha} - \frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha} - \log \Gamma \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \right]$$

is the penalized partial likelihood (PPL; Ripatti and Palmgren, 2000; Therneau and Grambsch, 2000). Here, $R_{(k)} = \{(i, j) : y_{ij} \geq y_{(k)}\}$ is risk set at time $y_{(k)}$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$), and $d_{(k)}$ is the number of events at $y_{(k)}$ which is the k th ($k = 1, \dots, K$) smallest distinct event times among the y_{ij} 's. Direct maximization of the PPL cannot provide MLEs. To obtain the MLEs, Gu et al. (2014) proposed the use of the marginal partial log-likelihood

$$\ell_p = \log \int \exp(h_{\text{PL}}) dv.$$

However, this integration is often numerically intractable. Thus, Ha et al. (2001, 2017) and Ripatti and Palmgren (2000) proposed the use of the Laplace approximation of ℓ_p , which

is still numerically difficult and does not give the exact MLEs. The Laplace approximation can yield a biased estimation for frailty models with a small cluster size or under heavy censoring (Jeon et al., 2012; Gorfine and Zuker, 2023).

An advantage of the h-likelihood approach is that the nuisance parameters associated with the non-parametric hazard $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ can be eliminated by profiling. Since the joint maximization of h_p gives the MLEs for fixed parameters and BUPs for random frailties, the DNN-FM (5) can be trained by using negative profiled h-likelihood (i.e. $-h_p$) as a loss function, which contains $NN(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and u_i . Thus, the two separate output nodes are necessary as in Figure 2.

4.1 Local minima problem

In FMs, for identifiability we impose the constraints $E(u_i) = 1$ because for any ϵ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ij}(t|u_i, \mathbf{x}_{ij}) &= \lambda_0(t) \exp \{NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\} u_i \\ &= \lambda_0(t) \exp \{NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \epsilon\} (u_i / \exp(\epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

However, DNN models often encounter local minima which violates the constraints. This causes a computational difficulty in the DNN-FM. To prevent poor prediction due to the local minima, we introduce an adjustment on the predictor of u_i

$$\hat{u}_i \leftarrow \frac{\hat{u}_i}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i} \quad (11)$$

to satisfy

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i = 1.$$

4.2 ML learning algorithm

We propose a h-likelihood learning algorithm:

- **Inner loop:** For given $\hat{\alpha}$, find optimal $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ under a loss function $-h_p$ (10).
- **Adjustment:** Transport $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ as in (11).
- **Outer loop:** For given $(\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$, find an optimal $\hat{\alpha}$ under a loss function $-h_p$ (10).

This algorithm describes double loop iterative procedures with an additional adjustment on the frailty predictors: for details, see **Algorithm 1**. Figure 3 displays a schematic diagram of the h-likelihood learning procedure of the DNN-FM (5).

Algorithm 1 H-likelihood Learning Algorithm.

REPEAT UNTIL α CONVERGES:

TRAIN THE NETWORK:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\mathbf{v}} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{v}} \{-h_p(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \widehat{\alpha}, \mathbf{v})\}$$

return $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}$

ADJUST THE FRAILTIES:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u} &\leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\widehat{v}_i) / n \\ \widehat{v}_i &\leftarrow \widehat{v}_i - \log \bar{u} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \\ \text{return } &\widehat{\mathbf{v}} \end{aligned}$$

COMPUTE VARIANCE COMPONENT:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\alpha} &\leftarrow \arg \min_{\alpha} \{-h_p(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \alpha, \widehat{\mathbf{v}})\} \\ \text{return } &\widehat{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

5 Experimental studies

To evaluate the performance of the proposed method, experimental studies are conducted based on 100 replications of simulated data. As performance measures, we use the extended forms of the IBS and C-index of FMs (Oirbeek and Lesaffre, 2010, 2016) in Appendix A.2.

5.1 Experimental design

Given u_i and \mathbf{x}_{ij} , survival times T_{ij} are generated from the hazard function

$$\lambda_{ij}(t|u_i, \mathbf{x}_{ij}) = \lambda_0(t) \exp\{f(\mathbf{x}_{ij})\} u_i,$$

where $f(\mathbf{x}_{ij})$ is an unknown true risk function of x_{ij} and $\lambda_0(t) = \phi t^{\phi-1}$ is set to be a Weibull baseline hazard with shape parameter $\phi = 2$. The DNN-FM fits the true but unknown $f(\mathbf{x}_{ij})$ by $NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Here, the five input variables $\mathbf{x}_{ij} = (x_{1ij}, \dots, x_{5ij})^T$ are generated from AR(1) process with autocorrelation $\rho = 0.5$ and frailties u_i are generated

from gamma distribution with $E(u_i) = 1$ and $\text{Var}(u_i) = \alpha$, and

$$f(\mathbf{x}_{ij}) = 0.4 \cos(x_{1ij}) + 0.3 \cos(x_{2ij}) + 0.6 \cos(x_{3ij}) + 0.5x_{2ij} * x_{3ij} \\ + 0.4/(x_{4ij}^2 + 1) + 0.5/(x_{5ij}^2 + 1).$$

We set the frailty variance $\alpha = 0, 0.5, 1$ and 2 , where $\alpha = 0$ means the DNN-Cox model without frailty. The censoring times are generated from an exponential distribution with parameter empirically determined to achieve approximately two right censoring rates, low (around 15%) and high (around 45%). We set the total sample size $N = 8000$ with $(n, n_i) = (1000, 8)$ for all i . Thus, the dataset contains 1000 subjects and each subject has 8 observations. For each subject i , we assign 4 observations ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$) to the training set, 2 observations ($j = 5, 6$) to the validation set and the remaining 2 observations ($j = 7, 8$) to the test set.

For comparison, we consider the fitting of the following four models.

- **Cox:** Cox model (1)
- **DNN:** DNN-Cox model (2)
- **FM:** gamma frailty model (4)
- **DNN-FM:** The proposed DNN-FM (5)

The network architecture and hyper-parameters are tuned by using the vanilla DNN-Cox. As an optimal result, we set all the DNN models to have 3 hidden layers of 10 nodes with “relu” activation function. We use the full batch and “AdamW” optimizer with learning rate 0.01. Early stopping with validation loss is employed to prevent overfitting. The Cox model is implemented using `lifelines` package in Python, gamma FM is implemented using `frailtyEM` (Balan and Putter, 2019) package in R, and the DNN models (DNN-Cox, DNN-FM) are implemented using Python-based Keras and Tensorflow.

5.2 Experimental results

For evaluation of the prediction performances, IBS (12) and C-index (13) in Appendix are computed on the test set. Figure 4 shows box plots of IBS for each model under 15%

censoring. Figure 4(a) shows that all models have comparable results when there is no frailty. Even if there is no frailty ($\alpha = 0$), the proposed DNN-FM model is still comparable to the vanilla DNN-Cox, which should have the smallest IBC. Figure 4(b), (c) and (d) show that the DNN-FM has the smallest IBS values when frailty is presented. Figure 5 shows box plots of C-index for each model under 15% censoring. When there is no frailty term, Figure 5(a) shows that the two DNN models (DNN-Cox, DNN-FM) have comparable results, but that the two non-DNN models (Cox, FM) give poor results, which means they do not capture the nonlinear effect of input variables in terms of C-index. As expected, Figure 5(b), (c) and (d) show that the DNN-FM has the highest C-index. Next, Figures 6 and 7 present box plots of IBS and C-index under 45% censoring, respectively and they overall show similar trends to Figures 4 and 5. However, the trends in Figure 6(a) are somewhat different. That is, the two standard models (Cox and FM) in Figure 6(a) give poor results as compared to those in Figure 4(a), meaning that under 45% censoring, they do not again capture the nonlinear effect of input variables in terms of IBC.

Mean and standard deviation of IBS and C-index for each model with two censoring rates are summarized in Table 1. This confirms that the DNN-FM outperforms three existing models (Cox, DNN-Cox and FM). Table 2 reports mean and standard deviation of estimated frailty variance ($\hat{\alpha}$) from train sets under 100 replications of simulated data. When $\alpha = 0$, the true model does not have frailties, and the estimates of α under FM and DNN-FM with two censoring rates (15% and 45%) are closed to zero. As α increases, the MLE of α under FM is downward biased, whereas that under DNN-FM is consistent. As expected, we see that the standard deviations of $\hat{\alpha}$ tend to increase as α or censoring rate increases.

6 Real data analysis: multi-center bladder cancer data

We illustrate the DNN-FM method using a bladder cancer multi-center trial conducted by the EORTC (Sylvester et al., 2006). We consider 392 bladder-cancer patients from 21 centers that participated in EORTC trial 30791. The primary endpoint (event of interest) was time (day) to the first bladder cancer recurrence from randomization. Of the 392 patients, 200 (51.02%) had recurrence of bladder cancer (event of interest) and 81 (20.66%)

died prior to recurrence (a competing event). 111 (28.32%) patients who were still alive and without recurrence were censored at the date of the last available follow-up. Following Park and Ha (2019), we regarded the 81 competing risk events as censored, resulting that censoring rate is 49.98% with 192 censored patients. The data are unbalanced due to different number of patients in each center. In this paper, we used the data with 373 patients from 16 centers which have more than 5 patients in each center. The numbers of patients per center varied from 6 to 78, with mean 23.3 and median 17.5. In each center, we used two randomly selected patients as test set, another two randomly selected patients as validation set, and the remaining patients as training set.

We consider the following 12 categorical input variables (\boldsymbol{x}):

- Chemotherapy as the main covariate (CHEMO; no=0, yes=1),
- Age (0 if Age \leq 65 years, 1 if Age $>$ 65 years),
- Sex (male=0, female=1),
- Prior recurrent rate (PRIORREC; primary, \leq 1/yr, $>$ 1/yr);
 $\text{PRIORREC1} = \text{I}(\text{PRIORREC} \leq 1/\text{yr})$, $\text{PRIORREC2} = \text{I}(\text{PRIORREC} > 1/\text{yr})$
- Number of tumors (NOTUM; single, 2-7 tumors, \geq 8 tumors);
 $\text{NOTUM1} = \text{I}(\text{NOTUM} = 2\text{-}7 \text{ tumors})$, $\text{NOTUM2} = \text{I}(\text{NOTUM} \geq 8 \text{ tumors})$;
- Tumor size (TUM3CM; 0 if Tumor size $<$ 3cm, 1 if Tumor size \geq 3cm),
- T category (TLOCC; Ta=0, T1=1),
- Carcinoma in situ (CIS; no=0, yes=1),
- G grade (GLOCAL; G1, G2, G3);
 $\text{GLOCAL1} = \text{I}(\text{GLOCAL} = \text{G2})$, $\text{GLOCAL2} = \text{I}(\text{GLOCAL} = \text{G3})$.

Table 3 presents IBS and C-index on the test set of the bladder cancer data. The DNN-FM shows the smallest IBS and the highest C-index which indicate the best prediction performance, and DNN-Cox outperforms the two non-DNN models (Cox and FM). In the train set, the estimated frailty variances are small with $\hat{\alpha} = 0.069$ for DNN-FM and

$\hat{\alpha} = 0.086$ for FM, leading to similar values of IBS and C-index from the Cox and FM. Thus, in this dataset the nonlinear effect of input variables are important in predicting the survival probability of patients in each center. Figure 8 shows the time-dependent Brier scores on the test set under the four models. Here, the Brier scores of the four models are similar at almost time points before 3 years. However, after 3 years, the Brier scores of the proposed DNN-FM are always noticeably lower than other three models. Accordingly, the DNN-FM improves prediction of the DNN-Cox model.

7 Concluding remarks

We have presented a new DNN-FM. The joint maximization of its profiled h-likelihood provides MLEs for fixed parameters and BUPs for random frailties. Our empirical results demonstrate that the proposed method improves the prediction performance of the existing DNN-Cox and FMs in terms of IBS and C-index. The specification of the gamma frailty distribution in semi-parametric FMs is insensitive to the estimates of fixed regression parameters (i.e. weights) if the variance of frailty is not very large (Hsu et al. 2007; Ha et al., 2001, 2017; Gorfine et al., 2023). Extension of the proposed method to other frailty distribution such as parametric (e.g. log-normal) or non-parametric distribution (Chee et al., 2021) would be an interesting further work. The proposed DNN-FM can be trained for very large clustered survival data by using an online learning, whose theoretical framework is in Appendix A.3.

Acknowledgements

The research of Il Do Ha was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (No. RS-2023-00240794). The research of Youngjo Lee was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. 2019R1A2C1002408).

Appendix: Supplementary Materials

A.1 Derivation for the predictive likelihood

Recall that $\mathbf{y}^* = (\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$, where the (i, j) th component of \mathbf{y} is $y_{ij} = \min(T_{ij}, C_{ij})$. Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathbf{v}} &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}} \{ \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{y}^*) \} \\
 &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}} \{ \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}^* | \mathbf{v}) + \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{v}) - \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}^*) \} \\
 &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\delta_{ij} v_i - \Lambda_{ij}^{(m)} e^{v_i}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{v_i - e^{v_i}}{\alpha} \right) \right\} \\
 &= \arg \max_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ v_i (\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}) - e^{v_i} (\Lambda_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}) \} \\
 &= \log \left(\frac{\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}}{\Lambda_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{i+} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij}$, $\Lambda_{i+} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \Lambda_{ij}^{(m)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \Lambda_0(y_{ij}) \exp(f(\mathbf{x}_{ij}))$. This implies that

$$\tilde{u}_i = \exp(\tilde{v}_i) = \frac{\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}}{\Lambda_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}} = E(u_i | \mathbf{y}_i^*)$$

is the BUP (Searle et al., 1992) for $u_i (= \exp(v_i))$ in sense that it gives minimum mean squared error of prediction (“best”) and $E(\tilde{u}_i - u_i) = 0$ (“unbiased”) with $E(\tilde{u}_i) = E(u_i) = 1$, since

$$u_i | \mathbf{y}_i^* \sim \text{Gamma}(\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}, (\Lambda_{i+} + \alpha^{-1})^{-1}),$$

which is easily derived from the fact that the gamma distribution is conjugate of the frailty model. From the density function of gamma distribution above, the predictive likelihood at $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log f(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^c | \mathbf{y}^*) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tilde{v}_i^c | \mathbf{y}^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tilde{v}_i | \mathbf{y}^*) - a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+}) \} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \log f_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\tilde{u}_i | \mathbf{y}^*) + \log \tilde{u}_i - a_i(\alpha, \delta_{i+}) \} = 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u}_i = \exp(\tilde{v}_i)$.

A.2 Evaluation measures for DNN-FM

The BS in Section 2.1 can be extended to the DNN-FM (5) as a conditional form:

$$BS_c(t) = E \{ Y(t) - S(t|u, x) \}^2,$$

where $S(t|u, x)$ is the conditional survival function given u , and the estimated conditional BS (Oirbeek and Lesaffre, 2016) is given by

$$\widehat{BS}_c(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij \in D_N} \hat{w}_{ij}(t) \left\{ y_{ij}(t) - \hat{S}(t|\hat{u}_i, x_{ij}) \right\}^2, \quad (12)$$

where $N = \sum_{i=1}^N$ is the total sample size and the IPCW is

$$\hat{w}_{ij}(t) = \frac{(1 - y_{ij}(t))\delta_{ij}}{\hat{G}(y_{ij})} + \frac{y_{ij}(t)}{\hat{G}(t)}, \text{ with } \hat{G}(t) = \hat{P}(C > t).$$

The BS can be also summarized as the integrated Brier score (IBS) in Section 2.2.1.

The C-index in Section 2.2 can be also extended to the DNN-FM with clustered survival data (Oirbeek and Lesaffre, 2010; Mauguen et al., 2013). For the clustered data, we consider the overall conditional C-index, i.e. the concordant probability defined for all comparable pairs; it can distinguish two different types of pairs, within-cluster pairs and between-cluster pairs, i.e. pairs whose members belong to the same cluster or to different clusters, respectively. Thus, the overall C-index (C_O) can be split up into a between-cluster C-index (C_B) and a within-cluster C-index (C_W). Let $i = 1, \dots, n$ define the cluster and let ij be the subset j of the cluster i ($j = 1, \dots, n_i$). We also denote by ij and ij' two patients from the same cluster i and by ij and $i'j'$ two patients from two different clusters i and i' ($i \neq i'$). For simplicity, we consider no ties, even if it can handle similarly to the case in Section 2.2.2 when there are ties. Then the estimated within-cluster C-index (\hat{C}_W) is given by

$$\hat{C}_W = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \sum_{j'=1}^{n_i} \delta_{ij} I(y_{ij} < y_{ij'}) I(\hat{\eta}_{ij}^{(m)} > \hat{\eta}_{ij'}^{(m)})}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \sum_{j'=1}^{n_i} \{\delta_{ij} I(y_{ij} < y_{ij'})\}} \right],$$

where $\hat{\eta}_{ij}^{(m)} = NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and the frailty terms are not included directly in the calculation of the within-cluster concordance since they are the same for the compared patients in each pair. Next, the estimated between-cluster C-index (\hat{C}_B) considers only comparison between patients of different clusters and includes the estimated frailty terms; it is given by

$$\hat{C}_B = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=1}^{n_{i'}} \delta_{ij} I(y_{ij} < y_{i'j'}) I(\hat{\eta}_{ij} > \hat{\eta}_{i'j'}) \right]}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[\sum_{i'=1}^n \sum_{j'=1}^{n_{i'}} \{\delta_{ij} I(y_{ij} < y_{i'j'})\} \right]},$$

where $\hat{\eta}_{ij} = \hat{\eta}_{ij}^{(m)} + \hat{v}_i = NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \hat{\mathbf{w}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \hat{v}_i$ and $\hat{v}_i = \log \hat{u}_i$. Thus, the estimated overall C-index (\hat{C}_O) can be expressed as a weighted mean of \hat{C}_B and \hat{C}_W (Oirbeek and Lesaffre, 2010), given by

$$\hat{C}_O = \frac{n_{T,comp}}{n_{W,comp}} \hat{C}_W + \frac{n_{T,comp}}{n_{B,comp}} \hat{C}_B, \quad (13)$$

where $n_{T,comp}$ is the number of comparable pairs, and $n_{W,comp}$ and $n_{B,comp}$ are the number of comparable within-and between-cluster pairs, respectively. Note that \hat{C}_B can be easily calculated based on the function, `concordance-index()`, in the `lifelines` of Python.

A.3 Online learning for the DNN-FM

Since the loss function of the DNN-Cox model does not naturally decouple, it causes computational difficulties in large data sets. To overcome this difficulty, Tarkhan and Simon (2022) proposed an online framework. In this section, we extend the online framework to DNN-FM by a simple modification (14) of h_p in (10).

Let D_s be a set of random samples of size $s_i \geq 0$ drawn from the population of each patient (or cluster) $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $s_i (\leq n_i)$ are non-negative integers. Under the assumption of no ties and no censoring, define the profiled h-likelihood from the mini-batch D_s as

$$h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \left[\eta_{ij} - \log \left\{ \sum_{(k,l) \in R_{ij}^{(s)}} \exp(\eta_{kl}) \right\} + \frac{v_i - \exp(v_i)}{n_i \alpha} + c_i(\alpha, n_i) \right], \quad (14)$$

where $c_i(\alpha, n_i) = \{-\alpha^{-1} \log \alpha - \log \Gamma(\alpha^{-1}) - a_i(\alpha, n_i)\} / n_i$ and $R_{ij}^{(s)} = \{(k, l) : y_{kl} \geq y_{ij} \text{ and } (i, j, k, l) \in D_s\}$ is the risk set at the (i, j) th ordered failure time y_{ij} . Note here that profiled h-likelihood (14) from the mini-batch gives $h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = h_p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$ when $D_s = D_n$. Let $U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$, $U_{\alpha}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$, and $U_{\mathbf{v}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$ be the score functions of profiled h-likelihood from D_s with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, α , and \mathbf{v} , respectively,

$$U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\partial h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}, \quad U_{\alpha}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\partial h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad U_{\mathbf{v}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\partial h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \mathbf{v}}.$$

Then, if $s_i > 0$ for some i and $s_j = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, we have the following Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \alpha^*)$ be the vector of true values of fixed parameters and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ be the mode of profiled h-likelihood at $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$, then*

$$E \left[U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \right] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad E \left[U_{\alpha}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \right] = 0.$$

Remark 1: Tarkhan and Simon (2022) studied the online learning framework for the DNN-Cox model. Theorem 1 extends the framework to the DNN-FM, with restriction that a mini-batch should be sampled within a cluster.

Theorem 2. Let \mathbf{v}^* be the vector of realized values of random parameters (i.e. log-fraillities), then

$$E \left[U_{\mathbf{v}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n_i \rightarrow \infty \text{ for all } i.$$

Remark 2: When the cluster size n_i approaches infinity for all i , Theorem 2 shows that the frailty predictors converge in probability to their true realized values. It implies that the frailty predictors approach the fixed effect estimators of \mathbf{v} of the Cox model with fixed parameters \mathbf{v} . Therefore, the online learning framework of Tarkhan and Simon (2022) can be directly used for DNN-FM when $n_i \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, mini-batches can be drawn from multiple clusters.

A.3.1 Proof of Theorem 1

(a) Here, it is enough to consider

$$h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \left[\eta_{ij} - \log \left\{ \sum_{(k,l) \in R_{ij}^{(s)}} \exp(\eta_{kl}) \right\} \right],$$

since $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ does not involve the remaining terms of profiled h-likelihood. Here, $\eta_{ij} = \eta_{ij}^{(m)} + v_i$ and $\eta_{ij}^{(m)} = \eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = NN(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Analogous to Tarkhan and Simon (2022), we define a counting process $dN_{ij}(t)$ as

$$\int_a^b g(t) dN_{ij}(t) = g(t_{ij}) I(t_{ij} \in [a, b]),$$

and define $dN^{(s)}(t) = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} dN_{ij}(t)$ to be a counting process for failure times over all patients in D_s under the assumption that the failure time process is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on time, which implies that there is no ties at any time t . Then, $h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$ can be expressed as

$$h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \eta_{ij} - \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^\tau \log \left\{ \sum_{(k,l) \in R_{ij}^{(s)}} M_{kl}(t) \exp(\eta_{kl}) \right\} dN_{ij}(t),$$

where τ is the duration of the study, and its derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) &= \frac{\partial h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} \sum_{k,l} w_{kl}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{kl}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) dN_{ij}(t) \\ &= \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) dN^s(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is the gradient of $\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, $w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{M_{ij}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) + v_i\}}{\sum_{k,l} M_{kl}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{kl}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) + v_i\}}$ is a weight proportional to the hazard of failure and $M_{ij}(t)$ is an indicator representing whether ij is at risk at time t , i.e., $t_{ij} \geq t$. Thus, the score function $U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})$ is given by

$$U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) - \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) dN^s(t),$$

and it is enough to show that $E(U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})) = E(E(U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) | \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^*)) = 0$. As in Tarkhan and Simon (2022), we have

$$E \left(\sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) \middle| \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^* \right) = \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} E(w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) dN^s(t)),$$

Then the score function becomes

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) | \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^*) &= E \left(\sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) - \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) dN^s(t) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} E[w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) dN^s(t)] - \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} E[w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) dN^s(t) | \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^*] \\ &= \sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \int_0^{\tau} \eta'(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) E[\{w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) - w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})\} dN^s(t) | \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}^*]. \end{aligned}$$

If the mini-batch is sampled within the i -th cluster only,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) - w_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) &= \frac{M_{ij}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) + v_i^*\}}{\sum_{l=1}^{s_i} M_{il}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{il}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) + v_i^*\}} - \frac{M_{ij}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) + \tilde{v}_i\}}{\sum_{l=1}^{s_i} M_{il}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{il}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) + \tilde{v}_i\}} \\ &= \frac{M_{ij}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\}}{\sum_{l=1}^{s_i} M_{il}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{il}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\}} - \frac{M_{ij}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\}}{\sum_{l=1}^{s_i} M_{il}(t) \exp\{\eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{il}; \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\}} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to $E(U_{\beta}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})) = 0$.

(b) The score function with respect to α is

$$U_{\alpha}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \frac{\partial h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{s_i}{n_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left[\frac{\log u_i - u_i}{\alpha} - \frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha} - \log \Gamma(\alpha^{-1}) - a_i(\alpha, n_i) \right]$$

where $a_i(\alpha, n_i) = (n_i + \alpha^{-1}) \{ \log(n_i + \alpha^{-1}) - 1 \} - \log \Gamma(n_i + \alpha^{-1})$. Since

$$u_i | \mathbf{y}_i^* \sim \text{Gamma}(\delta_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}, (\Lambda_{i+} + \alpha^{-1})^{-1})$$

and $\tilde{u}_i = \tilde{u}_i(\alpha) = (n_i + \alpha^{-1}) / (\Lambda_{i+} + \alpha^{-1}) = E(u_i | \mathbf{y}_i^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) &= U_\alpha^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}=\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \\ &= \frac{s_i}{n_i} \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \left[(u_i - \log u_i - 1) + \log\left(n_i + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) - \psi\left(n_i + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \right] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}=\tilde{\mathbf{v}}} \\ &= \frac{s_i}{n_i} \frac{1}{\alpha^{*2}} \left[(\tilde{u}_i - \log \tilde{u}_i - 1) + \log\left(n_i + \frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) - \psi\left(n_i + \frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{s_i}{n_i} \frac{1}{\alpha^{*2}} \left[(\tilde{u}_i - 1) + \log\left(\Lambda_{i+} + \frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) - \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) - \psi\left(n_i + \frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{s_i}{n_i} \frac{1}{\alpha^{*2}} \left[E(u_i | \mathbf{y}^*) - 1 - E(\log u_i | \mathbf{y}^*) - \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi(\cdot)$ is the digamma function. Thus, we have

$$E \left[U_\alpha^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \right] = \frac{s_i}{n_i} \frac{1}{\alpha^{*2}} \left[E(u_i) - 1 - E(\log u_i) - \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) + \psi\left(\frac{1}{\alpha^*}\right) \right] = 0$$

since $E(u_i) = 1$ and $E(\log u_i) = \psi(1/\alpha^*) + \log(\alpha^*)$.

A.3.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Let \mathbf{z}_{ij} be the one-hot encoded vector of cluster number, so that $\mathbf{z}_{ij}^T \mathbf{v} = v_i$, then the predictor η_{ij} can be expressed as $\eta_{ij} = \eta^{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) + v_i = \eta^*(\mathbf{x}_{ij}, \mathbf{z}_{ij}; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{v})$. For example,

$$\eta_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + v_i = (\mathbf{x}_{ij}^T, \mathbf{z}_{ij}^T)(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}).$$

Define $h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$ as

$$h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i: s_i > 0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \left[\eta_{ij} - \log \left\{ \sum_{(k,l) \in R_{ij}^{(s)}} \exp(\eta_{kl}) \right\} \right],$$

then the profiled h-likelihood in (14) can be expressed as

$$h_p^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) = h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v}) + \sum_{i: s_i > 0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \left[\frac{v_i - \exp(v_i)}{n_i \alpha} + c_i(\alpha, n_i) \right].$$

Thus, $h_1^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{v})$ is equivalent to the log-partial likelihood (Tarkhan and Simon, 2022) when \mathbf{v} is treated as the fixed parameters, and the remaining terms does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Therefore, by the results of Tarkhan and Simon (2022),

$$E \left[U_\beta^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) \right] = 0,$$

and

$$E \left[U_{\mathbf{v}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) \right] = E \left[\sum_{i:s_i>0} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \left[\frac{v_i - \exp(v_i)}{n_i \alpha} + c_i(\alpha, n_i) \right] \right]_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}^*}.$$

When $n_i \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial v_i} \left[\frac{v_i - \exp(v_i)}{n_i \alpha^*} + c_i(\alpha^*, n_i) \right] = \frac{1}{n_i} \left[\frac{1 - \exp(v_i^*)}{\alpha^*} \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus,

$$E \left[U_{\mathbf{v}}^{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{v}^*) \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Reference

- Balan, T. A. and Putter, H. (2019). frailtyEM: An R package for estimating semiparametric shared frailty models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **90**, 1–29.
- Breslow, N.E. (1972) Discussion on Professor Cox’s paper. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 34, 216–217.
- Chee, C.-S., Ha, I.D., Seo, B. and Lee, Y. (2021). Semiparametric estimation for nonparametric frailty models using nonparametric maximum likelihood approach. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, **30**, 2485–2502.
- Fan, J., Ma, C. and Zhong, Y. (2021). A selective overview of deep learning. *Statistical Science*, 36, 264–290.
- Farrell, M. H., Liang, T. and Misra, S. (2021). Deep neural networks for estimation and inference. *Econometrica*, 89, 181–213
- Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., and Courville, A. (2016). *Deep learning*. MIT Press.
- Gorfine, M. and Zuker, D.M. (2023). Shared frailty models for complex survival data: a review of recent advances. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 10, 1-23.
- Graf, E., Schmoor, C., Sauerbrei, W. and Schumacher, M. (1999) Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 18, 2529-2545.

- Gu, M. G., Sun, L. and Huang, C. (2004). A universal procedure for parametric frailty models. *J. Statist. Comput. Simulation*, 74, 1–13.
- Tarkhan, A. and Simon, N. (2022). An online framework for survival analysis: reframing Cox proportional hazards model for large data sets and neural networks. *Biostatistics*, in press.
- Ha, I. D., Jeong, J. H. and Lee, Y. (2017). *Statistical modeling of survival data with random effects: h-likelihood approach*. Springer.
- Ha, I.D., Lee, Y. and Song, J.K. (2001) Hierarchical likelihood approach for frailty models. *Biometrika*, 88, 233-243.
- Harrell, F.E, Lee, K.L. and Mark, D.B. (1996) Multivariable prognostic models: issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors. *Statistics in Medicine*, 15, 361–387.
- Hsu, L., Gorfine, M., Malone, K. (2007). Effect of frailty distribution misspecification on marginal regression estimates and hazard functions in multivariate survival analysis. *Statistics in Medicine*, **26**, 4657–4678.
- Jeon, J., Hsu, L. and Gorfine, M. (2012). Bias correction in the hierarchical likelihood approach to the analysis of multivariate survival data. *Biostatistics* 13, 384–397.
- Kvamme, H., Borgan and Scheel, I. (2019). Time-to-event prediction with neural networks and Cox Regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20, 1-30.
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., and Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature* 521:436.
- Lee, Y. and Nelder, J. A. (1996). Hierarchical generalized linear models (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **58**, 619–678.
- Lee, Y., Nelder, J. A., and Pawitan, Y. (2017). *Generalised linear models with random effects: Unified analysis via h-likelihood*. 2nd edn., Chapman and Hall: London.
- Mandel, F., Ghosh, R. P. and Barnett, I. (2022) Neural networks for clustered and longitudinal data using mixed effects models. *Biometrics*, in press.

- Montesinos-Lopez, et al. (2021). Application of a Poisson deep neural network model for the prediction of count data in genome-based prediction. *Plant Genome*. e20118.
- Park, E. and Ha, I.D. (2019) Penalized variable selection for accelerated failure time models with random effects. *Statistics in Medicine*, 38, 878–892.
- Polson, N.G. and Sokolov, V. (2017). Deep learning: a Bayesian perspective. *Bayesian Analysis*, 12, 1275-1304.
- Rodrigo, H. and Tsokos, C. (2020) Bayesian modelling of nonlinear poisson regression with artificial neural networks. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 47, 757–774.
- Searle, S. R., Casella, G., and McCulloch, C. E. (1992). *Variance components*. Wiley: New York.
- Sun, T., Wei, Y., Chen, W., Ding, Y. (2020). Genome-wide association study-based deep learning for survival prediction. *Statistics in Medicine*, 39, 4605–4620.
- Sylvester R, van der Meijden APM, Oosterlinck W, Witjes J, Bouffieux C, Denis L, Newling DWW, Kurth K. (2006) Predicting recurrence and progression in individual patients with stage Ta T1 bladder cancer using EORTC risk tables: a combined analysis of 2596 patients from seven EORTC trials. *Eur Urol*, 49, 466-477
- Tarkhan, A. and Simon, N. (2022). An online framework for survival analysis: reframing Cox proportional hazards model for large data sets and neural networks. *Biostatistics*, in press.
- Tran, M.-N., Nguyen, N., Nott, D. and Kohn, R. (2020). Bayesian deep net GLM and GLMM. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 29. 97-113.
- Van Oirbeek, R and Lesaffre, E. (2010) An application of Harrell’s c-index to PH frailty models. *Statistics in Medicine*, 29, 3160-3171.
- Van Oirbeek, R and Lesaffre, E. (2016) Exploring the clustering effect of the frailty survival model by means of the Brier score. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 45, 3294-3306.




Figure 1: Extension of the Cox model to DNN-FM: $NN(\cdot)$, NN predictor; v , log-frailty




Figure 2: An example of model architecture for DNN-FM




Figure 3: A schematic diagram of DNN-FM fitting procedure; $\log f_{\theta}^*(\cdot)$, conditional profiled log-likelihood obtained by profiling out the baseline hazard $\lambda_0(t)$.




Figure 4: 15% censoring: Box plot of IBS from 100 replications for each frailty variance, $\text{var}(u) = \alpha$.




Figure 5: 15% censoring: Box plot of C-index from 100 replications for each frailty variance, $\text{var}(u) = \alpha$.




Figure 6: 45% censoring: Box plot of IBS from 100 replications for each frailty variance, $\text{var}(u) = \alpha$.




Figure 7: 45% censoring: Box plot of C-index from 100 replications for each frailty variance, $\text{var}(u) = \alpha$.




Figure 8: Time-dependent Brier score for four survival prediction models on the test set of the bladder cancer data.

Table 1: Mean (standard deviation) of IBS and C-index from 100 replications for each frailty variance α .

Censoring	Measure	Cox	DNN-Cox	FM	DNN-FM
15%	IBS				
	$\alpha = 0$	0.062 (0.0127)	0.056 (0.0119)	0.062 (0.0127)	0.056 (0.0119)
	$\alpha = 0.5$	0.058 (0.0066)	0.055 (0.0063)	0.053 (0.0061)	0.048 (0.0055)
	$\alpha = 1$	0.077 (0.0043)	0.075 (0.0042)	0.058 (0.0030)	0.053 (0.0026)
	$\alpha = 2$	0.090 (0.0047)	0.090 (0.0047)	0.046 (0.0027)	0.042 (0.0042)
	C-index				
	$\alpha = 0$	0.499 (0.0085)	0.615 (0.0084)	0.499 (0.0069)	0.618 (0.0078)
	$\alpha = 0.5$	0.500 (0.0082)	0.596 (0.0087)	0.627 (0.0081)	0.675 (0.0076)
	$\alpha = 1$	0.499 (0.0081)	0.580 (0.0093)	0.697 (0.0078)	0.730 (0.0070)
	$\alpha = 2$	0.502 (0.0072)	0.559 (0.0088)	0.779 (0.0056)	0.802 (0.0051)
45%	IBS				
	$\alpha = 0$	0.151 (0.0031)	0.139 (0.0030)	0.151 (0.0031)	0.139 (0.0030)
	$\alpha = 0.5$	0.160 (0.0026)	0.151 (0.0032)	0.147 (0.0025)	0.137 (0.0031)
	$\alpha = 1$	0.176 (0.0029)	0.169 (0.0031)	0.141 (0.0029)	0.133 (0.0032)
	$\alpha = 2$	0.191 (0.0033)	0.188 (0.0038)	0.117 (0.0039)	0.112 (0.0042)
	C-index				
	$\alpha = 0$	0.498 (0.0107)	0.616 (0.0087)	0.498 (0.0106)	0.617 (0.0092)
	$\alpha = 0.5$	0.500 (0.0108)	0.599 (0.0096)	0.619 (0.0108)	0.667 (0.0092)
	$\alpha = 1$	0.498 (0.0085)	0.587 (0.0108)	0.689 (0.0088)	0.720 (0.0081)
	$\alpha = 2$	0.502 (0.0089)	0.567 (0.0099)	0.772 (0.0068)	0.789 (0.0064)

Table 2: Mean (standard deviation) of estimated frailty variance ($\hat{\alpha}$) from 100 replications.

Frailty variance α	FM	DNN-FM
15% censoring		
$\alpha = 0$	0.006 (0.009)	0.008 (0.010)
$\alpha = 0.5$	0.390 (0.035)	0.485 (0.050)
$\alpha = 1$	0.823 (0.051)	1.000 (0.062)
$\alpha = 2$	1.711 (0.084)	2.043 (0.094)
45% censoring		
$\alpha = 0$	0.008 (0.012)	0.011 (0.014)
$\alpha = 0.5$	0.417 (0.047)	0.496 (0.054)
$\alpha = 1$	0.859 (0.060)	0.995 (0.090)
$\alpha = 2$	1.748 (0.102)	2.065 (0.123)

Table 3: IBS and C-index for four survival prediction models on the test set of the bladder cancer data

Measure	Cox	DNN-Cox	FM	DNN-FM
IBS	0.189	0.183	0.187	0.168
C-index	0.675	0.682	0.668	0.693