

Why comparing survival curves between two prognostic subgroups may be misleading

Damjan Krstajic

Research Centre for Cheminformatics, Jasenova 7, 11030 Beograd, Serbia

Email address: damjan.krstajic@rcc.org.rs

Abstract

We consider the validation of prognostic diagnostic tests that predict two prognostic subgroups (high-risk vs low-risk) for a given disease or treatment. When comparing survival curves between two prognostic subgroups the possibility of misclassification arises, i.e. a patient predicted as high-risk might be de facto low-risk and vice versa.

This is a fundamental difference from comparing survival curves between two populations (e.g. control vs treatment in RCT), where there is not an option of misclassification between members of populations. We show that there is a relationship between prognostic subgroups' survival estimates at a time point and positive and negative predictive values in the classification settings. Consequently, the prevalence needs to be taken into account when validating the survival of prognostic subgroups at a time point. Our findings question current methods of comparing survival curves between prognostic subgroups in the validation set because they do not take into account the survival rates of the population.

Introduction

The goal of personalised medicine is to apply treatments only to individuals who will benefit from them. This presumes that we have available clinical and genetic

information about the patients as well as statistical methodology to identify a subgroup which benefits from a treatment. From the statistical point of view, the future of personalised medicine depends on how well we can separate a subgroup of patients that benefits from a treatment. Our starting point is a single survival population. Our goal is to use all available data about the patients to build a predictive model in order to find two sub-groups, one with better and the other with worse survival prognoses. However, in order to achieve the goal we need to have a set of well-defined statistics which measure, as accurately as possible, the differences between the subgroups' survival prognoses.

A common procedure when validating prognostic separation is to perform the same actions as when comparing two survival populations, i.e. to estimate survivor functions for each prognostic group with Kaplan-Meier (KM) survival curve [1], to calculate hazard ratio (HR) [2] and to compare the curves with the log-rank test [3]. Royston and Altman [4] say the following on this subject: *“Kaplan-Meier survival curves for risk groups provide informal evidence of discrimination. The more widely separated are the curves, the better is the discrimination. A Kaplan-Meier graph for both datasets allows a visual comparison of discrimination between datasets. We strongly recommend producing such plots.”*. In Fig. 1 we show an example of KM survival curves for two prognostic subgroups as well as calculated HR and the p-value for the log-rank test.

Our thesis is that current statistical methods for comparing survival curves between two prognostic subgroups may be misleading because they do not take into account the survival rates of the population.

Methods

It is very important that we clearly define the terms we use. The *survival population* is a homogeneous population of individuals each having a “failure time”. Let T be a non-negative random variable representing the “failure time” of an individual from the survival population. The *survivor function* $S(t) = P(\{T>t\})$ is the probability that T exceeds the value t [5][6]. In practice we usually do not know the survivor functions, but we are able to estimate them. We use the term *survival curve* when we refer to an estimate of a survivor function. The *population survival rate* at time T_0 $S(T_0)$ is the proportion of the population with “failure time” after T_0 .

We use a predictive model to separate a survival population into two prognostic subgroups: *high-risk* and *low-risk*. In practice the prognostic sub-groups are usually created after dichotomising a prognostic index, a numerical output of a prognostic model [4]. We are interested in the process of *external validation*, which means assessing a model of prognostic separation already developed when applied to an independent dataset [4]. We refer to a dataset used in external validation as the *validation dataset*. In order to explain our point we will suppose that there is no censored data in our validation dataset, i.e. we know the exact failure time for each subject.

Estimating the survival of high-risk and low-risk patients at time T_0

To start with, we are interested in estimating the survival of high-risk and low-risk patients at time T_0 , i.e. $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$. In the absence of censoring, we can estimate it for each prognostic subgroup as a ratio of the number of patients who had an event after T_0 over the size of the subgroup in the validation dataset.

Therefore, if we categorise patients with an event before or equal to T_0 as *positive*, and with an event after T_0 as *negative*, then we can create a contingency table as in Table 1. In that case $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)=c/(c+d)$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)=a/(a+b)$ and we refer to them as *naive estimates*.

It is important to understand that when we apply prognostic separation of a single population mistakes will occur. An individual who is in reality high-risk may be wrongly predicted as low-risk and vice versa. With a prognostic separation we have the possibility of misclassifying individuals, and we can introduce the following convention. Patients who had an event after T_0 and who are predicted as low-risk would be true negatives (TN), while those who are predicted as high-risk would be false negatives (FN). Similarly, patients with an event before or equal to T_0 who are predicted as high-risk would be true positives (TP), while those who are predicted as low-risk would be false positives (FP). Using this simple diagnostic test we can calculate sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) [7][8]. We can estimate the sensitivity and specificity from a validation set, but without the knowledge of prevalence we are unable to estimate PPV or NPV [8]. The prevalence is the proportion of positive patients in the population, also known as the prior probability of being positive. It is a measure independent of the validation dataset. If, however, we know the prevalence then the predictive values would be estimated with the following equations [8]:

$$PPV = \frac{sens \cdot prev}{sens \cdot prev + (1 - spec) \cdot (1 - prev)} \quad (\text{Eq1})$$

$$NPV = \frac{spec \cdot (1 - prev)}{spec \cdot (1 - prev) + prev \cdot (1 - sens)} \quad (\text{Eq2})$$

In our case then $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$ would be estimates of proportions of negative samples in the high-risk and low-risk prognostic subgroups, i.e.

$$S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0) = (1 - \text{PPV}) \quad (\text{Eq3})$$

$$S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0) = \text{NPV} \quad (\text{Eq4})$$

And here we have a problem. Their estimates depend on the prevalence. In our case prevalence is the proportion of patients in the population who had an event before or equal to time T_0 , i.e.

$$\text{prevalence} = 1 - S(T_0) \quad (\text{Eq5})$$

Therefore, we cannot estimate $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ or $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$ without the knowledge of the population survival rate at T_0 . Consequently, we cannot use the naive estimates $c/(c+d)$ and $a/(a+b)$ as our estimates for $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$.

In survival settings the most common method of estimating survival at time T_0 is to use Kaplan-Meier product-estimator [1]. However, in the absence of censoring, as we will show in our simulation example, the KM estimates for both prognostic subgroups at T_0 are identical to the naive estimates. We thus conclude that in the absence of censoring we cannot use KM to estimate the survival of prognostic subgroups at T_0 because it does not take into account the population survival rate at $T=T_0$.

Furthermore, as this holds for any time-point T_0 , we also conclude that in the absence of censoring we cannot use KM curves to compare the survival of two prognostic subgroups.

Comparing survival curves of two prognostic subgroups

We argue that our conclusion holds when a validation dataset is with censored data and when we use estimates of survival curve other than KM [5][10]. The fundamental question here is what we are trying to estimate, and not how. In the case of prognostic subgroups, the possibility of misclassification exists and, as we have shown, estimates of survival for each prognostic subgroup at a time-point are related to predictive values. This means that for each time-point we have to take into account the population survival rate at the time-point in order to estimate the survival of prognostic subgroups. Therefore, regardless of having censored data or not, and regardless of applying KM to estimate survival curves or not, we need to take into account the population survival rates in order to estimate the survival of the prognostic sub-groups. Consequently, comparing survival curves between two prognostic subgroups without taking into account the population survival rates may produce incorrect estimates.

How to estimate the survival of high-risk and low-risk patients at time T_0 in practice?

In order to estimate the survival of high-risk and low-risk patients at time T_0 we need to know the population survival rate at T_0 , i.e. $S(T_0)$. Furthermore, the survivalROC R package [9][11] provides a way of estimating sensitivity and specificity at T_0 using survival data. Therefore, by knowing prevalence (Eq5), and with estimated sensitivity and specificity at T_0 , we can then apply equations (Eq1)-(Eq4) to calculate $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$.

Difference in the survival of high-risk and low-risk patients at time T_0

We now examine whether the difference between estimates of the survival of high-risk and low-risk patients at time T_0 depends on the population survival rate at T_0 . In the equation Eq6 we show that it clearly does.

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0) - S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0) &= \text{PPV} + \text{NPV} - 1 \\ S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0) - S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0) &= \\ &= \frac{\text{prev} \cdot (1 - \text{prev}) \cdot (\text{spec} + \text{sens} - 1)}{[\text{prev} \cdot (1 - \text{sens}) + \text{spec} \cdot (1 - \text{prev})] \cdot [\text{sens} \cdot \text{prev} + (1 - \text{spec}) \cdot (1 - \text{prev})]} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{Eq6})$$

However, it is not clear from the equation how the population survival rate affects the difference and to what extent. In Fig. 2 we show the difference between $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$ and $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ as the function of the population survival rate where specificity and sensitivity are constants. The function is constant, i.e. equal to zero, when $\text{spec} + \text{sens} = 1$. However, when $\text{spec} + \text{sens} > 1$ then the function has a single maximum value and as the survival rate approaches 0 or 1 the difference is closer to zero.

Results

We created an example with simulated survival dataset without any censored data. Our intention is to analyse the effect of various population survival rates on our estimates of the 5-year survival of high-risk and low-risk patients. Later we use the same dataset and randomly transform 30% of it into censored data. We then apply the same analysis to it.

Simulated example

We generated samples of 400 high-risk and 400 low-risk patients with different exponential survival distributions and without any censored data. KM graphs for both prognostic subgroups are shown in Fig.3. We are interested in estimating 5-year survival for both prognostic subgroups . Using the KM product estimator we calculate that $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})=0.205$ while $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})=0.3575$. Similarly, if we categorise patients with an event before or equal to 5 years as *positive*, and with an event after 5 years as *negative*, then we would have a confusion matrix as shown in Table 2 with sensitivity=0.553, specificity=0.636. It is worth noting that in the validation dataset the 5-year survival rate is 28.125%. Furthermore, as expected, KM estimates are identical to the naive estimates, $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})=82/400=0.205$ $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})=143/400=0.3575$

What happens if the 5-year population survival rate is different from 28.125%? In Table 3 we show estimates of $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ calculated with equations (Eq1)-(Eq5) for various 5-year population survival rates. KM estimates for $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ are also presented. Various estimates for $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ show their dependency on the 5-year population survival rate. Furthermore, it confirms that if the 5-year survival rate in the validation dataset is different from the 5-year population survival rate then the KM estimates would be misleading.

Censored data

We modified the simulated dataset so that it contains censored data. We randomly selected 30% of patients in both prognostic subgroups to be censored. For each

censored patient we assigned its last known survival time to be a random number between 0 and its actual “failure” time. KM graphs for both prognostic subgroups are shown in Fig.4. Using the KM product estimator we calculated that $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})=0.2463$ while $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})=0.4238$. We calculated specificity and sensitivity at 5 years (5-year-spec=0.6374, 5-year-sens=0.5706) with the survivalROC R package. Similar as in Table 3, we show in Table 4 estimates of $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ calculated with equations (Eq1)-(Eq5) for various 5-year population survival rates, as well as KM estimates. Again we see different estimates for $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ and $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(5 \text{ years})$ depending on the 5-year population survival rate.

Discussion

In practice we have never worked with a validation dataset that does not have censored data. Consequently, we have never had a chance to use naive estimates nor to create a confusion matrix for a particular time-point as described above. The most common method for estimating survival with censored data is to use KM estimates. However, even though with censored data we cannot clearly show the close relationship between KM and naive estimates, we argue that if the relationships exist in the non-censored case then they must exist in the censored.

In theory an external validation dataset ought to be representative of the population, but in practice it seldom is, or it is difficult to prove that it is. If we want to compare survival curves of prognostic subgroups, we have shown that the external validation dataset ought to have the same survival rates as the population for all time-points. Furthermore, we have shown that without prior knowledge of the population survival

rates we cannot estimate survival curves of prognostic sub-groups. As a consequence, Kaplan-Meier survival curves for prognostic sub-groups, as well as their hazard ratio and the p-value for the log-rank test, may be wrong.

We disagree with the strong recommendation by Royston and Altman [4] to produce a plot with KM survival curves for both prognostic subgroups as a visual comparison of discrimination between them. We think the plot might be an inaccurate representation of the discrimination between prognostic subgroups. In Table 5 we show the differences in the 5-year survival between prognostic subgroups for various combinations of specificity, sensitivity, 5-year population survival rate and 5-year survival rate in the validation dataset. The “5-year survival difference” is calculated taking into account the 5-year population survival rate, while the “naive 5-year survival difference” is based on the 5-year survival rate in the validation dataset. It shows that we can overestimate as well as underestimate the difference in the 5-year survival between prognostic subgroups if the 5-year population survival rate is not taken into account.

In our opinion, the way forward is not to compare survival curves of prognostic subgroups but to report their survival at specific time-points. They would be calculated using the population survival rate, specificity and sensitivity (Eq5). If no historical data exist from which one could generate a population survival rate, then one would report specificity and sensitivity at specific time-points.

Conclusion

We have shown that we are not able to estimate the survival of prognostic subgroups without the knowledge of population survival rates. We have shown that the relationship is the same as between negative and positive predictive values and prevalence.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank dr Ljubomir Buturovic, for his constructive criticism and countless number of hours discussing this subject, and Linda Louise Krstajic, for her help with correcting English typos.

References

1. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *Journal of the American statistical association*. 1958 Jun 1;53(282):457-81.
2. Spruance SL, Reid JE, Grace M, Samore M. Hazard ratio in clinical trials. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy*. 2004 Aug 1;48(8):2787-92.
3. Mantel N. Evaluation of survival data and two new rank order statistics arising in its consideration. *Cancer chemotherapy reports*. Part 1. 1966 Mar;50(3):163-70.
4. Royston P, Altman DG. External validation of a Cox prognostic model: principles and methods. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2013 Mar 6;13(1):1.
5. Cox DR, Oakes D. *Analysis of survival data*. CRC Press; 1984 Jun 1.
6. Kalbfleisch JD, Prentice RL. *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. John Wiley & Sons; 2011 Jan 25.

7. Altman DG, Bland JM. Diagnostic tests. 1: Sensitivity and specificity. BMJ: British Medical Journal. 1994 Jun 11;308(6943):1552.
8. Altman DG, Bland JM. Statistics Notes: Diagnostic tests 2: predictive values. Bmj. 1994 Jul 9;309(6947):102.
9. Heagerty PJ, Lumley T, Pepe MS. Time-dependent ROC curves for censored survival data and a diagnostic marker. Biometrics. 2000 Jun 1;56(2):337-44.
10. Miller Jr RG. What Price Kaplan-Meier?. Biometrics. 1983 Dec 1:1077-81.
11. Heagerty PJ, Saha P. survivalROC: Time-dependent ROC curve estimation from censored survival data. R package version 1.0. 3.

Figures

Figure 1 - An example of Kaplan-Meier survival curves for two prognostic sub-groups with calculated hazard ratio and its 95% confidence interval




Figure 2 - Difference between $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}(T_0)$ and $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}(T_0)$ as the function of the population survival rate for five pairs of (sensitivity, specificity)




Figure 3 - Kaplan-Meier survival curves of the prognostic sub-groups for the simulated example with no censored data





Figure 4 - Kaplan-Meier survival curves of the prognostic sub-groups for the simulated example with 30% censored data



Tables

Table 1 - A contingency table between positive and negative patients and predicted low-risk and high-risk patients

	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
LOW-RISK	a	b
HIGH-RISK	c	d

Table 2 - A confusion matrix between positive and negative patients and predicted low-risk and high-risk patients in the simulated example

	NEGATIVE	POSITIVE
LOW-RISK	143 (TN)	257 (FN)
HIGH-RISK	82 (FP)	318 (TP)

Table 3 - Estimates of $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}$ (5 years) and $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}$ (5 years) for the simulated example with no censored data taking into account various 5-year population survival rates

5-year survival rate	Slow-risk (5 years)	Shigh-risk (5 years)
0.1	0.1364	0.0682
0.2	0.2623	0.1414
0.28125	0.3575	0.205
0.5	0.5871	0.3972
0.7	0.7684	0.6059
0.9	0.9275	0.8557
KM estimate	0.3575	0.205

Table 4 - Estimates of $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}$ (5 years) and $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}$ (5 years) for the simulated example with 30% censored data taking into account various 5-year population survival rates

5-year survival rate	Slow-risk (5 years)	Shigh-risk (5 years)
0.1	0.1416	0.0659
0.2	0.2707	0.1371
0.28125	0.3675	0.1991
0.5	0.5975	0.3885
0.7	0.776	0.5972
0.9	0.9304	0.8512
KM estimate	0.4238	0.2463

Table 5 - Estimates of the difference between $S_{\text{LOW-RISK}}$ (5 years) and $S_{\text{HIGH-RISK}}$ (5 years) for various combinations of specificity, sensitivity and the 5-year population survival rate. Naive estimates which don't take into account the 5-year population survival rate are presented as well.

Sensitivity	Specificity	5-year population survival rate	5-year survival rate in the validation dataset	5-year survival difference	Naive 5-year survival difference
0.9	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4336	0.499
0.9	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.4762	0.299
0.6	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.0739	0.1691
0.6	0.6	0.4	0.25	0.1923	0.1515
0.7	0.7	0.15	0.35	0.2214	0.3693
0.7	0.7	0.45	0.25	0.3966	0.3125
0.5	0.9	0.25	0.45	0.3125	0.455
0.5	0.9	0.55	0.35	0.4911	0.395