

# Quantifying and Estimating the Predictive Accuracy for Censored Time-to-Event Data with Competing Risks

Cai Wu<sup>1,2</sup> and Liang Li<sup>\*2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Biostatistics, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, TX, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Biostatistics, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, TX, USA*

**Correspondence:** \*Liang Li, Department of Biostatistics, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX 77054. Email: lli15@mdanderson.org

This paper focuses on quantifying and estimating the predictive accuracy of prognostic models for time-to-event outcomes with competing events. We consider the time-dependent discrimination and calibration metrics, including the receiver operating characteristics curve and the Brier score, in the context of competing risks. To address censoring, we propose a unified nonparametric estimation framework for both discrimination and calibration measures, by weighting the censored subjects with the conditional probability of the event of interest given the observed data. We demonstrate through simulations that the proposed estimator is unbiased, efficient and robust against model misspecification in comparison to other methods published in the literature. In addition, the proposed method can be extended to time-dependent predictive accuracy metrics constructed from a general class of loss functions. We apply the methodology to a data set from the African American Study of Kidney Disease and Hypertension to evaluate the predictive accuracy of a prognostic risk score in predicting end-stage renal disease (ESRD), accounting for the competing risk of pre-ESRD death.

**Keywords:** Brier Score; Competing Risks; Diagnostic Medicine; Predictive Accuracy; Prognostic Model; Time-dependent ROC

## 1 Introduction

In modern evidence-based medicine, decisions on a diagnosis or personalized treatment plan are often guided by risk scores generated from prognostic models.<sup>1–3</sup> Such prognostic risk scores can be either a single risk factor, such as a biomarker, or a risk probability calculated from multiple risk factors. For a risk score to be utilized in clinical practice, its predictive accuracy is often assessed through two types of metrics: (1) the discrimination metric, which measures

how well the risk score can distinguish subjects with and without the disease condition, and (2) the calibration metric, which measures how well the predicted risk matches the observed risk in the target population. Motivated by the prediction of end-stage renal disease (ESRD) among a cohort of patients with chronic kidney disease, the goal of this paper is to propose a framework to estimate the predictive accuracy of a risk score from a prognostic model, accounting for right censoring and competing events.

For a continuous time-to-event outcome, the presence and absence of a disease condition at any time point  $\tau$  can be viewed as a binary outcome. To study the relationship between a continuous risk score and this binary outcome at any prespecified time point  $\tau$ , the time-dependent receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve is widely used for assessing discrimination, i.e., the separation of subjects with and without a given disease at time  $\tau$  by the risk score.<sup>4</sup> For example, the risk score is the  $\tau$ -year (e.g.,  $\tau = 5$ ) survival probability calculated based on the characteristics of a cancer patient at initial diagnosis, and the disease presence or absence is defined by whether the patient died of cancer within  $\tau$  years after the initial diagnosis. For such a risk score, the area under the ROC curve (AUC) presents the probability that a subject with the disease at time  $\tau$  has a higher predicted risk score than a subject without the disease. A challenge of estimating such time-dependent ROC curve is that the disease status at  $\tau$  is unknown among subjects who are censored prior to  $\tau$ . A number of methods have been developed to address this issue, including the nearest neighboring estimator (NNE)<sup>4</sup> and inverse probability censoring weighting (IPCW).<sup>5–7</sup> In addition to the metrics for discrimination, metrics for calibration<sup>8</sup> quantify the absolute deviance of the risk score from the observed outcome, known as the prediction error. Time-dependent prediction error metrics for survival outcomes have been proposed.<sup>8–11</sup> The prediction error can be constructed through a class of loss functions that link the risk score and the binary disease outcome at  $\tau$ .<sup>8</sup> Among those, the quadratic loss, known as the Brier score,<sup>12</sup> is a popular choice.<sup>13–15</sup> Censoring remains a challenge when estimating the Brier score, and an IPCW method was proposed to deal with it.<sup>8, 9</sup>

Competing risks are common in clinical research that involves time-to-event data. For example, in a cardiovascular study, one may be interested in the time to the first myocardial infarction after cardiovascular surgery, but patients may die before experiencing the event of interest. Limited statistical methodology is available to estimate the predictive accuracy metrics in the context of competing risks. To estimate the time-dependent ROC, Saha & Heagerty<sup>16</sup> extended the NNE method<sup>4</sup> to the competing risk context. Zheng et al.<sup>17</sup> further extended the method of Saha & Heagerty<sup>16</sup> to covariate-adjusted time-dependent ROC. Blanche et al.<sup>18</sup> studied the use of IPCW in estimating the time-dependent ROC with competing risk data. For the estimation of the Brier score with competing risk data, the available published methods are based on the IPCW,<sup>13, 19, 20</sup> with the censoring distribution estimated either by the Kaplan-Meier (KM) method without conditioning on the risk score<sup>8</sup> or by the Cox proportional hazards model conditional on the risk score.<sup>9</sup>

This paper focuses on the time-dependent discrimination and calibration estimation in the context of competing risk outcomes. We propose a novel nonparametric kernel-weighted estimation framework for both time-dependent discrimination and calibration measures. The proposed method first estimates the conditional probability of experiencing an event of interest at  $\tau$  given the observed data of the subjects. This is done through nonparametric kernel regression for the cumulative incidence function. Then the time-dependent predictive accuracy metrics, such as sensitivity, specificity, and Brier score, are estimated by weighting each subject with their own conditional probabilities.

The proposed method has some attractive properties. First, it is fully nonparametric, without any distributional or modeling assumptions. This is desirable for estimating predictive accuracy metrics since it reduces the bias from the estimation procedure itself. Second, the proposed method, unlike other nonparametric methods such as NNE,<sup>4</sup> is insensitive to the bandwidth choice. This is shown in this paper with both numerical and methodological justifications. Third, the method automatically accommodates correlation between the censoring time and the risk score. Furthermore, the proposed method can be invariant to monotone transformation of the risk score when the tuning parameter is specified by the span, the proportion of subjects included in the kernel estimation. Also, the estimated sensitivity, specificity, and ROC curve are monotone in the cut-off point  $c$ . Our simulation shows that the proposed method has competitive performance in terms of bias and the mean squared error (MSE) when compared with other published methods. Section 2 presents the notations and definitions for the time-dependent ROC and time-dependent prediction error. Section 3 describes the proposed estimators for the predictive accuracy metrics. Then the finite sample performance is evaluated by simulations in Section 4. In Section 5, we illustrate the method with data from the African American Study of Kidney Disease and Hypertension (AASK) in evaluating the prediction of ESRD. Section 6 concludes the paper by discussing the findings and providing some perspective.

## 2 Predictive Accuracy for Time-to-Event Data with Competing Risks

### 2.1 Notation

Let  $T$  denote the event time,  $C$  the censoring time,  $\delta$  the event type, and  $\Delta = 1(T \leq C)$  the censoring indicator, where  $1(\cdot)$  is the indicator function. We observe independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples of  $\{(\tilde{T}_i, U_i, \tilde{\delta}_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  in a validation data set, where  $\tilde{T}_i = \min(T_i, C_i)$  is the observed time to the event or censoring, whichever comes first. The observed status  $\tilde{\delta}_i = \Delta_i \delta_i$ , which equals zero for censored subjects and equals one of the  $K$  possible causes,  $\delta_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ , for uncensored subjects. Without loss of generality, we present our methodology with  $K = 2$  to match the data application in Section 5. The methodology still applies with other choices of  $K$  ( $K > 2$ ). For clarity, suppose that we are interested in assessing the predictive accuracy of event type  $\delta = 1$ . Let  $U_i$  denote the risk score for subject  $i$ , with higher values of  $U_i$  indicating higher risk of the event. For example,  $U_i$  can be the

predicted cumulative incidence probability from a competing risk regression model that we want to evaluate, i.e.,  $U_i = \pi_1(\tau|\mathbf{Z}_i) = P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1|\mathbf{Z}_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{Z}$  denotes the predictor and  $\tau$  is the predictive horizon. The predictive model is often developed from a training data set that is different from the validation data set. This paper focuses on estimating the predictive accuracy metrics in a validation data set. We do not study how the model for the risk score  $U$  is estimated or whether the model is correctly estimated. We assume that this model has already been developed, needs to be evaluated, and the risk score  $U$  has the interpretation of being the subject-specific predicted cumulative incidence probability at horizon  $\tau$ .

## 2.2 Definitions of the time-dependent ROC curve and AUC

In the presence of competing events, the definition of cases is straightforward. The cases at time  $\tau$  for event type  $k$  are defined as subjects who undergo event  $\delta = k$  before time  $\tau$ , i.e.,  $Case_k = \{i : T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = k\}$ . At a given threshold  $c$ , the cause-specific sensitivity at time  $\tau$  is defined as

$$Se(c, \tau) = P(U > c | T \leq \tau, \delta = k). \quad (1)$$

This is the definition of *cumulative/dynamic* sensitivity.<sup>4</sup> When  $U$  is higher than the threshold value  $c$ , the patient is predicted to experience event  $k$  within the time window  $(0, \tau]$ .

We consider two definitions of controls that lead to two different definitions of time-dependent specificity. Saha & Heagerty<sup>16</sup> originally defined the control group at time  $\tau$  as the event-free subjects, i.e.,  $\{i : T_i > \tau\}$ . According to this definition, subjects who experienced competing events other than  $k$  are neither cases nor controls. Therefore, Zheng et al.<sup>17</sup> introduced an alternative definition of the control group  $\{i : T_i > t\} \cup \{i : T_i \leq t, \delta_i \neq k\}$ , which includes both event-free subjects and subjects who experience other competing events. We study the estimation under both definitions:

**Definition A.** Case  $k$ :  $T \leq \tau, \delta = k$ ; Control<sub>A</sub>:  $(T > \tau) \cup (T \leq \tau \cap \delta \neq k)$ .

**Definition B.** Case  $k$ :  $T \leq \tau, \delta = k$ ; Control<sub>B</sub>:  $T > t$ .

The specificity at time  $\tau$  with respect to the two types of definitions is

$$\begin{aligned} Sp_A(c, \tau) &= P(U \leq c | \{T > \tau\} \cup \{T \leq \tau, \delta \neq k\}) \\ Sp_B(c, \tau) &= P(U \leq c | T > \tau). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Two different time-dependent ROC curves can be obtained by plotting  $Se(c, \tau)$  versus either  $1 - Sp_A(c, \tau)$  or  $1 - Sp_B(c, \tau)$ , i.e.,  $ROC_A(x, \tau) = Se(Sp_A^{-1}(1 - x, \tau), \tau)$  and  $ROC_B(x, \tau) = Se(Sp_B^{-1}(1 - x, \tau), \tau)$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . The corresponding AUCs can be defined as  $AUC(\tau) = \int_0^1 ROC(x, \tau) dx$  or as the proportion of concordance pairs among the population:<sup>18</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} AUC_A(\tau) &= P(U_i > U_j | T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = k, \{T_j > \tau\} \cup \{T_j \leq \tau, \delta_j \neq k\}) \\ AUC_B(\tau) &= P(U_i > U_j | T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = k, T_j > \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $i$  and  $j$  indicate two independent subjects under comparison. The subjects who experienced the competing events before  $\tau$  contribute to  $AUC_A(\tau)$  but not  $AUC_B(\tau)$ . The justification for both definitions is related to the clinical interpretation.<sup>17</sup>

### 2.3 Definitions of the time-dependent prediction error

The time-dependent prediction error in the competing risk framework is defined as the distance between the event-specific status  $1(T \leq \tau, \delta = k)$  and the subject-specific predicted cumulative incidence function at horizon  $\tau$ ,  $\pi_k(\tau | \mathbf{Z}) = P(T \leq \tau, \delta = k | \mathbf{Z})$ . Suppose we are interested in evaluating the prediction for event type 1, three types of prediction error measurements can be defined as follows:<sup>21</sup>

$$AbsErr(\tau) = E \left| 1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\} - \pi_1(\tau | \mathbf{Z}) \right| \quad (4)$$

$$Brier(\tau) = E \left[ 1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\} - \pi_1(\tau | \mathbf{Z}) \right]^2 \quad (5)$$

$$KL(\tau) = -E \left[ 1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\} \cdot \ln \pi_1(\tau | \mathbf{Z}) + 1\{(T > \tau) \cup (T \leq \tau, \delta \neq 1)\} \cdot \ln(1 - \pi_1(\tau | \mathbf{Z})) \right]. \quad (6)$$

Among the three measures,  $AbsErr(\tau)$  is not “proper” in the sense that it is not minimized by the predicted cumulative incidence function (CIF) from the true model.<sup>8</sup>  $Brier(\tau)$  is not only “proper”, but has the attractive property that it can be decomposed into a term related to the bias of the predictive survival probability and a term related to the variance of disease status.<sup>20</sup> The Kullback-Leibler score,  $KL(\tau)$ , has a close connection to the likelihood ratio test and the Akaike information criteria (AIC), but its disadvantage is that  $KL(\tau)$  goes to infinity when  $\pi_1(\tau | \mathbf{Z}) = 0$  and

$\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\}$ , or when  $\pi_1(\tau|\mathbf{Z}) = 1$  and  $\{T > \tau \text{ or } T \leq \tau, \delta \neq 1\}$ .<sup>21</sup> The Brier score is more widely used than the other two, and we will focus on the Brier score for the rest of this paper, even though our methodology also applies to the other two metrics.

### 3 The Proposed Nonparametric Weighting Estimators

Without censoring, sensitivity and specificity can be estimated empirically as the fraction of true positives and true negatives. However, when subjects are censored before  $\tau$ , the true disease status at  $\tau$  is unknown. The empirical fractions can no longer be used and proper adjustment for censoring is needed. In the context of right-censored data without competing events, Li et al.<sup>22</sup> proposed to weigh each subject by their respective conditional probability of having the disease at  $\tau$  given all the observed data for that subject. The conditional probability equals 0 if a subject survives beyond  $\tau$  without the disease or 1 if the subject acquires the disease prior to  $\tau$ . If a subject is censored prior to  $\tau$ , the conditional probability is estimated through a nonparametric kernel regression. In this paper, we extend that approach to the context of competing risk data. The weight is defined as the conditional probability of being a case prior to time  $\tau$  given the observed time to the event, event status and prognostic risk score:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1i} &= P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i) \\ &= \left\{ 1(\tilde{\delta}_i = 0) \cdot \frac{F_1(\tau|U_i) - F_1(\tilde{T}_i|U_i)}{S(\tilde{T}_i|U_i)} + 1(\tilde{\delta}_i = 1) \right\} \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $F_1(t|U_i) = P(T_i \leq t, \delta_i = 1|U_i)$  is the conditional cumulative incidence function for event 1, and  $S(t|U_i) = P(T_i > t|U_i)$  is the conditional overall survival probability. According to equation (7), we have  $W_{1i} = 1$  for subjects with observed event 1 before  $\tau$ :  $\{i : \tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i = 1\}$ ;  $W_{1i} = 0$  for subjects without any events before  $\tau$  or with competing events before  $\tau$ :  $\{i : \{\tilde{T}_i > \tau\} \cup \{\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i \notin \{0, 1\}\}\}$ ; and  $W_{1i} = \frac{F_1(\tau|U_i) - F_1(\tilde{T}_i|U_i)}{S(\tilde{T}_i|U_i)}$  for subjects censored before  $\tau$ :  $\{i : \tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i = 0\}$ . This weighting approach uses the observed status for uncensored subjects and only imputes the unknown status for censored subjects with a probability. A heuristic justification is that the case group includes not only those who are known to have experienced event 1 but also fractions of those whose status is unknown due to censoring. Similar justification applies to the controls. This differs from the IPCW method,<sup>18, 20</sup> which uses only uncensored subjects and reweights them to account for censoring. The IPCW weight is defined as  $W_i^{IPCW}(\tau) = \frac{1(T_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i \neq 0)}{G_n(\tilde{T}_i|\cdot)} + \frac{1(T_i > \tau)}{G_n(\tau|\cdot)}$ . It is the inverse of the probability of being censored, where  $G(t|\cdot)$  is the censoring distribution that can be estimated by the Kaplan-Meier estimator or conditionally given covariates.

Estimation of the proposed weight (7) includes estimation of two quantities: the conditional CIF  $F_1(\cdot|U_i)$  and the conditional overall survival probability  $S(\cdot|U_i)$ . We propose to use a nonparametric kernel-weighted Kaplan-Meier estimator:<sup>22</sup>

$$\hat{S}_T(t|U_i) = \prod_{\zeta \in \Omega, \zeta \leq t} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\sum_j K_h(U_j, U_i) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_j = \zeta, \tilde{\delta}_j \neq 0)}{\sum_j K_h(U_j, U_i) \cdot 1(\tilde{T}_j \geq \zeta)} \right\}, \quad (8)$$

and the kernel-weighted CIF:<sup>23</sup>

$$\hat{F}_1(t|U_i) = \sum_{\zeta \in \Omega, \zeta \leq t} \frac{\sum_j K_h(U_j, U_i) 1(\tilde{T}_j = \zeta, \tilde{\delta}_j = 1)}{\sum_j K_h(U_j, U_i) 1(\tilde{T}_j \geq \zeta)} \cdot \hat{S}_T(\zeta - |U_i). \quad (9)$$

$\Omega$  is the set of distinct  $\tilde{T}_i$ 's for  $\tilde{\delta}_j \neq 0$ ; and  $K_h(x, x_0) = \frac{1}{h} K(\frac{x-x_0}{h})$  is the kernel weight with kernel function  $K(\cdot)$  and bandwidth  $h$ . Alternatively, we can specify a *span* instead of a fixed bandwidth. A span is the proportion of subjects around the neighborhood involved in the kernel estimation with a uniform kernel function. In implementation, the CIF in (9) can be estimated as a Kaplan-Meier type product-limit estimator, with the hazard function being replaced by the sub-distribution hazard. The at-risk set in the sub-distribution hazard is obtained by reweighting the individuals who had competing events. This process can be achieved by reformatting the competing risk data into a counting process with `crprep()` function from the `mstate` package, and using `survfit()` in the `survival` package by specifying a time-dependent *weight* in R.<sup>24</sup>

### 3.1 The proposed weighting estimators for the time-dependent ROC curve and AUC

The estimated weight  $\widehat{W}_{1i}$  can be obtained by replacing the CIF and survival functions in (7) with their estimators given by (9) and (8). The  $Se(c, \tau)$ ,  $Sp_A(c, \tau)$  and  $Sp_B(c, \tau)$  can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Se}(c, \tau) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{W}_{1i} \cdot 1(U_i > c)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{W}_{1i}} \\ \widehat{Sp}_A(c, \tau) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i}) \cdot 1(U_i \leq c)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i})} \\ \widehat{Sp}_B(c, \tau) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{W}_{ki}) \cdot 1(U_i \leq c)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{W}_{ki})}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The estimator of sensitivity can be justified theoretically as

$$\begin{aligned}
Se(c, \tau) &= P(U > c | T \leq \tau, \delta = 1) \\
&= \frac{E(1\{U > c\} \times 1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\})}{E(1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\})} \\
&= \frac{E\{1\{U > c\} \times E(1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\} | \tilde{T}, \tilde{\delta}, U)\}}{E\{E(1\{T \leq \tau, \delta = 1\} | \tilde{T}, \tilde{\delta}, U)\}} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 1(U_i > c) \cdot P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The justification for the specificity estimator is similar. The time-dependent ROC curve is an increasing function obtained by plotting the time-dependent sensitivity and 1-specificity over a range of threshold  $c$ 's. By definition, the AUC can be calculated by trapezoidal integration:  $\int_0^1 \widehat{ROC}_A(x, \tau) dx = \int_0^1 \widehat{Se}(\widehat{Sp}_A^{-1}(1-x, \tau), \tau) dx$  and  $\int_0^1 \widehat{ROC}_B(x, \tau) dx = \int_0^1 \widehat{Se}(\widehat{Sp}_B^{-1}(1-x, \tau), \tau) dx$ . Alternatively, it can be estimated by the empirical estimator of the proportion of concordance pairs, with the proposed weight estimator  $\widehat{W}_{1i}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau) &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j \widehat{W}_{1i} (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i}) \cdot 1(U_i > U_j)}{\sum_i \sum_j \widehat{W}_{1i} (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i})} \\
\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau) &= \frac{\sum_i \sum_j \widehat{W}_{1i} (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{W}_{ki}) \cdot 1(U_i > U_j)}{\sum_i \sum_j \widehat{W}_{1i} (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{W}_{ki})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In practice, we can add  $0.5 \times 1(U_i = U_j)$  to the group of  $1(U_i > U_j)$  to account for ties between the  $U$ 's. The theoretical justification for the AUC estimators above is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
AUC_A(\tau) &= P(U_i > U_j | T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1, \{T_j > \tau\} \cup \{T_j \leq \tau, \delta_j \neq 1\}) \\
&= \frac{E(1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1) \times 1(\{T_j > \tau\} \cup \{T_j \leq \tau, \delta_j \neq 1\}) \times 1(U_i > U_j))}{E(1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1) \times 1(\{T_j > \tau\} \cup \{T_j \leq \tau, \delta_j \neq 1\}))} \\
&= \frac{E\{1(U_i > U_j) \cdot E(1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1) \cdot 1(\{T_j > \tau\} \cup \{T_j \leq \tau, \delta_j \neq 1\}) | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i, \tilde{T}_j, \tilde{\delta}_j, U_j)\}}{E\{E(1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1) \cdot 1(\{T_j > \tau\} \cup \{T_j \leq \tau, \delta_j \neq 1\}) | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i, \tilde{T}_j, \tilde{\delta}_j, U_j)\}} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_i \sum_j 1(U_i > U_j) \cdot P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i) \cdot (1 - P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i))}{\sum_i \sum_j P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i) \cdot (1 - P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i))} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_i \sum_j 1(U_i > U_j) \times W_{1i} \times (1 - W_{1i})}{\sum_i \sum_j W_{1i} \times (1 - W_{1i})}
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$



A similar justification for  $AUC_B(\tau)$  is obtained by replacing  $(1 - W_{1i})$  in the formula (12) with  $(1 - \sum_{k=1}^K W_{ki})$  for the control definition B. In our numerical studies, the estimator in (11) is almost identical (up to four digits after the decimal) to the AUC estimator obtained by trapezoidal integration. The confidence intervals for sensitivity, specificity and AUC can be estimated numerically by bootstrapping.

### 3.2 The Proposed Weighting Estimators for the Brier Score

By definition, the Brier score is the expected quadratic loss function between the true disease status  $1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1)$  and the risk score for event 1,  $U_i = \pi_1(\tau|\mathbf{Z}_i)$ , calculated from a prognostic model to be evaluated. We propose the following estimator for the Brier score, weighting observations according to their probability of having the event of interest:

$$\widehat{Brier}(\tau) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \widehat{W}_{1i} \cdot (1 - U_i)^2 + (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i}) \cdot (0 - U_i)^2 \right). \quad (13)$$

The justification for consistency of the above estimator is

$$\begin{aligned} Brier(\tau) &= E \left\{ 1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1) - U_i \right\}^2 \\ &= E \left\{ E \left( \left[ 1(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1) - U_i \right]^2 \middle| \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i \right) \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i) \cdot (1 - U_i)^2 + (1 - P(T_i \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1 | \tilde{T}_i, \tilde{\delta}_i, U_i)) \cdot (0 - U_i)^2 \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( W_{1i} \cdot (1 - U_i)^2 + (1 - W_{1i}) \cdot (0 - U_i)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the  $AbsErr(\tau)$  and  $KL(\tau)$  can be estimated with the proposed conditional probability weight:

$$\widehat{KL}(\tau) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \widehat{W}_{1i} \cdot \log U_i + (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i}) \cdot \log(1 - U_i) \right) \quad (14)$$

and

$$\widehat{AbsErr}(\tau) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \widehat{W}_{1i} \cdot (1 - U_i) + (1 - \widehat{W}_{1i}) \cdot U_i \right). \quad (15)$$

To summarize, the proposed method is a nonparametric method for estimating the time-dependent predictive

accuracy for competing risk data. It extends the methodology in Li et al.<sup>22</sup> for a single right-censored time-to-event outcome to competing risk outcomes and to time-dependent calibration metrics. The proposed methodology has a connection to some existing methods. In the context of semi-competing risks with interval censoring, Jacqmin-Gadda et al.<sup>25</sup> proposed an imputation estimator that weights the data with a similar conditional probability of observing an event in the presence of interval censoring. But their estimator of the conditional probability is calculated from a parametric illness-death model using the survival and marker. Schemper & Henderson<sup>11</sup> also proposed an imputation method with a Cox model-based estimator for  $AbsErr(\tau)$ . But this method was shown to be biased when the prognostic model was misspecified, and an alternative IPCW estimator was proposed in that situation.<sup>26</sup> In contrast, our method is nonparametric, without modeling assumptions, and is applicable to both time-dependent discrimination and calibration metrics. We demonstrated the robustness of the nonparametric method to the selection of tuning parameters in Section 4.3.

## 4 Simulation

In this section, we present simulation studies to evaluate the performance of the proposed method in estimating both the time-dependent ROC and time-dependent Brier score in the context of competing risk data. The performance of the proposed method is compared with those of NNE<sup>16, 17</sup> and IPCW<sup>18, 20</sup> methods from the published literature.

### 4.1 Simulation design

We generate two independent baseline covariates  $\mathbf{Z}_i = (Z_{i1}, Z_{i2})$ , where  $Z_{i1}$  is a biomarker variable of standard normal distribution, and  $Z_{i2}$  is a baseline characteristic (e.g., gender) of Bernoulli distribution with probability 0.5. The event times are generated according to a Fine-Gray model by using the procedure described in Fine & Gray<sup>27</sup> with a baseline sub-distribution hazard (SDH) function and additive covariate effects on the log SDH. The baseline SDH of event 1 follows a mixture of Weibull distribution with scale  $\lambda_1$  and shape  $\alpha_1$ , and a point mass with probability  $1 - p$  at  $\infty$ . The log SDH ratios for covariates  $Z_{i1}$  and  $Z_{i2}$  are denoted by  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2)'$  for event 1 and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)'$  for event 2. In our simulations, we set  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (-0.6, 0.5)'$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (-0.1, -0.2)'$ . The event indicator is generated from a Bernoulli distribution with the probability of event 1 being  $P_1 = F_1(\infty|\mathbf{Z}) = 1 - (1 - p)^{\exp(\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta})}$ . The values of  $p$  are set to be (0.22, 0.42, 0.61) to achieve 30%, 50% and 70% of event 1 given the covariate effects. Unless otherwise specified, the random censoring times are generated from a mixture of uniform distributions on the intervals of  $(0, 3] \cup (3, 6] \cup (6, 9] \cup (9, 12] \cup (12, 15] \cup (15, 18]$ . We adjust the probability of falling into each interval to control the censoring rate. Each simulated data set consists of i.i.d. samples of  $\{(\tilde{T}_i, U_i, \tilde{\delta}_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ : the observed event time  $\tilde{T}_i$  is the true event time or censoring time, whichever comes first; the prognostic score  $U_i$  is

the probability of experiencing event 1 prior to  $\tau$ ; and the event indicator  $\tilde{\delta}_i$  takes values of 0, 1, or 2. We use the simulated data sets as validation data sets to evaluate the predictive accuracy of prognostic score  $U_i$  at horizon  $\tau$ .

We organize the simulation scenarios into a  $3 \times 2 \times 2$  factorial design. We consider three proportions for event type 1 (70%, 50% and 30%), two levels of censoring rates (medium: 25%-30% and high: 45%-50%) and two sample sizes (300 and 600). The predictive accuracy is estimated at a time horizon  $\tau$ , which is approximately at the 65% quantile of the observed event time distribution for each scenario. We compute the true values of  $AUC(\tau)$  and  $Brier(\tau)$  by a Monte Carlo method using 20,000 independent data sets without censoring. The prognostic score  $U_i$  is computed from the true CIF at  $\tau$ :  $F_1(\tau; \mathbf{Z}) = P(T \leq \tau, \delta = 1 | \mathbf{Z}) = 1 - \{1 - p(1 - e^{-\lambda_1 \tau^{\alpha_1}})\}^{\exp(\mathbf{Z}\beta)}$ . In each setting, 500 Monte Carlo repetitions are performed and the results are aggregated to compute the bias percentage (bias%) and MSE in estimating  $AUC(\tau)$  and  $Brier(\tau)$ .

The results are presented in Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. In Section 4.2, we compare the finite sample performance of the proposed method with those of some existing methods. For the estimation of the time-dependent ROC, we compare the proposed estimator with those of the NNE<sup>16, 17</sup> and IPCW methods.<sup>18</sup> The NNE method is available in the R package `CompRisksROC`<sup>16</sup> for Definition B of Section 2.2, and package `SurvCompetingRisk`<sup>17</sup> for Definition A. The IPCW method is available in the R package `timeROC`.<sup>18</sup> For the estimation of the Brier score, the proposed estimator is compared with that of the IPCW method.<sup>20</sup> Since the proposed method is nonparametric with a tuning parameter (bandwidth or span), we study the sensitivity of the results to the tuning parameter selection in Section 4.3 and compare the performance with that of another nonparametric method (NNE) that also uses a bandwidth. In Section 4.4, we take a closer examination of the relative performance of the proposed method and IPCW when the censoring time is correlated with the risk score. We consider two versions of IPCW methods that have been reported in the literature. The first one is the IPCW.KM method,<sup>8, 18</sup> where the censoring distribution in the weight function is estimated by the Kaplan-Meier estimator without conditioning on the risk score:

$$\widehat{W}_i^{IPCW.KM}(\tau) = \frac{1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i \neq 0)}{\widehat{G}(\tilde{T}_i)} + \frac{1(\tilde{T}_i > \tau)}{\widehat{G}(\tau)}. \quad (16)$$

The second one is the IPCW.Cox method,<sup>9, 20</sup> where the censoring distribution in the weight function is estimated from a Cox proportional hazard model, conditioning on the risk score

$$\widehat{W}_i^{IPCW.Cox}(\tau) = \frac{1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i \neq 0)}{\widehat{G}(\tilde{T}_i | U)} + \frac{1(\tilde{T}_i > \tau)}{\widehat{G}(\tau | U)}. \quad (17)$$

The sensitivity, specificity and Brier score based on the IPCW weight  $\widehat{W}^{IPCW}(t) = 1/\widehat{G}(t|\cdot)$  from the equations above are estimated as

$$\widehat{S_e}^{IPCW}(c, \tau) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 1(U_i > c) \times 1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i = 1) \times \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tilde{T}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n 1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i = 1) \times \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tilde{T}_i)}$$

$$\widehat{S_{p_A}}^{IPCW}(c, \tau) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 1(U_i \leq c) \times 1(\tilde{T}_i > \tau) \times \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tau)}{\sum_{i=1}^n 1(\tilde{T}_i > \tau) \times \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tau)}$$

$$\widehat{S_{p_B}}^{IPCW}(c, \tau) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 1(U_i \leq c) \times \left( 1(\tilde{T}_i > \tau) \cdot \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tau) + 1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i \notin \{0, 1\}) \cdot \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tilde{T}_i) \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ 1(\tilde{T}_i > \tau) \cdot \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tau) + 1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i \notin \{0, 1\}) \cdot \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}(\tilde{T}_i) \right\}}$$

$$\widehat{Brier}^{IPCW}(\tau) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( 1(\tilde{T}_i \leq \tau, \tilde{\delta}_i = 1) - \pi(\tau|\mathbf{Z}) \right)^2 \times \widehat{W}_i^{IPCW}.$$

## 4.2 Simulation results on the finite sample performance of the proposed method.

Table 1 shows the performances of the proposed method, IPCW and NNE for estimating  $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$  under 12 simulation scenarios. For IPCW, we use the estimator with the weight calculated by (16). In general, the proposed method has smaller bias than the IPCW, and the magnitude of the bias is negligible ( $< 1\%$  in most settings). The NNE method has notably larger bias, especially for  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$ . The MSE for the proposed method is also the smallest among the three methods studied. Table 2 shows the performance of the proposed estimators and IPCW estimators for estimating the Brier score. The bias percentages of the proposed estimator are less than 1.5% in all settings and are in general smaller than those from the IPCW method. The MSEs of the proposed estimators are also similar to or smaller than those from the IPCW method. The NNE method was proposed in the literature only for estimating the AUC and hence was not included in the simulation about the Brier score. We conclude that the proposed method performs similarly or better than the IPCW method, and both methods are substantially better than the NNE method.

## 4.3 Simulation results on the sensitivity to tuning parameter selection.

One advantage of the proposed method is that it is nonparametric, which prevents the predictive accuracy from being affected by the modeling assumptions involved in calculating the predictive accuracy metrics themselves. However, it does involve a tuning parameter, which is the bandwidth or span that is used in the kernel weight calculation. Therefore, it is important to study whether this estimator is sensitive to the tuning parameter selection. Since the NNE method also uses the tuning parameter, and to our knowledge no previous work has studied its sensitivity to

the tuning parameter selection, we include that method in the comparison. Table 3 presents the performance of the proposed and NNE methods in estimating the AUC under different spans. This table only includes the results with 70% of event 1; the results under other scenarios lead to the same general conclusion and are hence omitted for brevity. When the *span* varies from 0.05 to 0.5, the proposed method is quite stable and the bias remains under 1.5% in all scenarios. Slightly larger biases are observed under two scenarios: small sample size ( $n = 300$ ) with small span ( $span = 0.05$ ), and large sample size ( $n = 600$ ) with unrealistically large span ( $span = 0.5$ ). When both the sample size and span are small, there is not enough data for estimation; and when both the sample size and span are large, bias may be introduced. In contrast, the NNE estimator is very sensitive to the span and can result in a large bias when the span is not chosen properly. We speculate that this led to the relatively large bias shown in Table 1. A similar performance is observed in Table 4 when the Brier score is estimated. A heuristic explanation of the robustness of the proposed method to the tuning parameter selection is as follows. First, the tuning parameter only affects subjects who are censored prior to time  $\tau$  because their disease status at  $\tau$  is unknown. This is a smaller proportion than the overall censoring proportion of the data. Second, the probability weight  $W_{1i} = \frac{F_1(\tau|U_i) - F_1(\tilde{T}_i|U_i)}{S(\tilde{T}_i|U_i)}$  is defined as the ratio of two conditional probabilities for subjects censored before  $\tau$ . The numerator of  $W_{1i}$  can be expressed as the cause-specific survival probability between  $\tilde{T}_i$  and  $\tau$ :  $S_1(\tilde{T}_i|U_i) - S_1(\tau|U_i) = Pr(\tilde{T}_i < T \leq \tau, \delta_i = 1|U_i)$ ; and the denominator is the overall survival probability beyond  $\tilde{T}_i$ . The asymptotic bias of two conditional survival probabilities as a function of bandwidth are in the same direction.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, the bias of their ratio can be canceled out to some extent, particularly when  $\tilde{T}_i$  and  $\tau$  are close.

#### 4.4 Simulation results for the performance of the proposed method under dependent censoring.

In this section, we compare the proposed method and IPCW under a dependent censoring scenario where the event time  $T$  and censoring time  $C$  are marginally dependent but are conditionally independent given the risk score  $U$ . In practice, the censoring time is often correlated with baseline covariates. Since  $U$  is a function of these covariates,  $C$  and  $U$  may also be correlated. Literature on the time-dependent ROC and time-dependent Brier score describes estimation under dependent censoring of this kind using the IPCW approach, where a Cox model is used to estimate the censoring distribution, conditioning on the risk score.<sup>9, 20</sup> In contrast, our proposed method does not model the censoring distribution, which is a nuisance for scientific purposes. We directly estimate the conditional survival and CIF nonparametrically. In this simulation, we consider two settings. In setting (a), we generate censoring time  $C_i$  from a Weibull( $\lambda_c, \alpha_c$ ) distribution with the mean  $\mu_C = \frac{\Gamma(1+1/\alpha_c)}{\lambda_c^{1/\alpha_c}} = a * 1\{(\zeta > 0.4) \cup (\zeta < -0.6)\} + b * 1\{-0.6 \leq \zeta \leq 0.4\}$ , where  $\zeta = \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}$  is a monotone transformation of  $U$ . Different values of  $(a, b)$  and  $\alpha_c$  are chosen to achieve a medium or high censoring rate. The dependency between the censoring distribution and  $U$  is not monotone and cannot be

correctly estimated by a proportional hazard model. We use setting (a) to study the robustness of the methods to model misspecification. In setting (b), we generate the censoring time from a Cox model on  $\zeta$ , so that the censoring time is correctly modeled by the IPCW. For both settings, we compare the performance of the proposed method and IPCW methods with both weight estimators (16) and (17).

Tables 5 and 7 compare the performance of the proposed method with that of the IPCW in estimating  $AUC(\tau)$ . All bias percentages for the proposed method are under 1.5% and 1% for settings (a) and (b), respectively. In contrast, the IPCW.KM method, which ignores the dependent censoring, produces results with a large bias under both mechanisms. Compared to IPCW.KM, the IPCW.Cox estimator in setting (a) alleviates the bias by accounting for the dependence but still has larger bias and MSE than the proposed method, especially when the type 1 event rate is low (e.g., 30%). When the censoring times are generated from the Cox model in setting (b), the bias from the IPCW.Cox method is controlled under 1.5% but is still slightly larger than that from the proposed method in general. This indicates that the proposed method is more robust than the IPCW methods under different dependence structures of  $C$  and  $U$ .

Tables 6 and 8 present similar comparisons between the proposed method and IPCW in estimating the Brier score. The overall performance is similar to that of  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$ . However, we notice that when the IPCW.Cox method is used under a misspecified censoring mechanism in setting (a), it produces a larger bias in the estimation of the Brier score than the AUC. In contrast, the performance of IPCW.Cox under setting (b) is similar in both estimands, with the biases well controlled under 1.5%. The results indicate that estimation of  $\widehat{Brier}(\tau)$  appears to be more sensitive to misspecification than that of  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$ . We speculate that this is because  $AUC(\tau)$  is based on the rankings of the data, whereas  $Brier(\tau)$  measures the actual deviation from the true status in quantity and therefore is more sensitive to the misspecification of the estimation procedure.

The results above suggest that our nonparametric method does not suffer from bias caused by model dependence. The rationale for developing a nonparametric estimation method is that the estimator of a predictive accuracy metric should be an objective reflection of the model under evaluation, without introducing another source of bias due to the modeling assumption of the estimation method. In this spirit, one can extend the IPCW method by using a nonparametric estimator for the conditional distribution of the censoring time given the risk score. But from a clinical perspective, this conditional distribution is less intuitive than directly modeling the conditional survival distribution, which offers additional insight into the relationship between the risk score and disease development. In addition, the relationship between the risk score and the survival time is expected to be monotone by the definition of the ROC, but this is not necessarily the case for the relationship between the risk score and the censoring time. The nonparametric smoothing literature suggests that the nonparametric regression result is less sensitive to the tuning parameters when the relationship between the outcome and covariate is monotone.<sup>29</sup>

In summary, the simulation results from Table 1 to Table 8 demonstrate that the proposed method has similar or better performance than other published methods. While the NNE method only estimates the time-dependent ROC, the proposed method works with the time-dependent ROC, time-dependent Brier score and other predictive accuracy metrics, with notably smaller bias and MSE. Unlike the NNE, the proposed method is robust to tuning parameter selection, which makes it easy to use in practice. As a nonparametric method, the proposed method outperforms the IPCW under dependent censoring, particularly in light of the possibility that IPCW may use a misspecified model for the censoring distribution.

## 5 Application

We illustrate the proposed method with a data set from AASK, a randomized clinical trial for 1,094 patients with chronic kidney disease, whose baseline estimated glomerular filtration rates (eGFRs) were between 20 – 65 mL/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>.<sup>30</sup> The patients were followed for 6.5 years during the trial period. Among them, 179 developed ESRD and 85 died before developing ESRD. We evaluate the predictive accuracy of a prognostic risk score developed from a proportional sub-distributional hazard model with five baseline covariates: the eGFR, urine protein creatinine ratio, age, gender, the randomized blood pressure group (low and medium) and the randomized anti-hypertensive therapy (ramipril, metoprolol, amlodipine). The prognostic score is the predicted CIF for ESRD at prespecified horizons.

Figure 1 compares the time-dependent ROC curves estimated from the proposed method (red), IPCW.KM (black), IPCW.Cox (blue) and NNE (green) at three predictive horizons: 3, 4 and 5 years from baseline. The span used in the proposed and NNE methods is 0.05, which includes 5% of the neighborhood data. The two rows in the panel present the estimated ROC curves based on the two definitions (Section 2.2). Definition A discriminates patients with ESRD within  $\tau$  years from ESRD-free patients, which include patients who are event-free and who die by year  $\tau$ . Definition B discriminates patients with ESRD within  $\tau$  years from those who are event-free at year  $\tau$ . The ROC curves from the two IPCW methods, IPCW.KM and IPCW.Cox, are almost identical. The curves by IPCW and the proposed method are also very close, and the differences between the  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$  are within 5%. The estimated  $\widehat{AUC}^A(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}^B(\tau)$  are also very close within the different estimation methods except for NNE. This indicates that the sub-distribution hazard model we used can discriminate well between ESRD patients and ESRD-free or event-free patients. A possible explanation is that the patients who died in the study period are a relatively small population and may have died from causes unrelated to kidney disease. Therefore, adding these patients to the control group may not substantially change the discrimination of the risk score, which primarily consists of risk factors for ESRD. There is some discussion of how to use different definitions of controls in the ROC estimation;<sup>17</sup> the choice is related to the clinical context and here we provide estimation methods for both.

In Figure 2, we show further results of our study of the proposed and NNE methods with varying spans of 0.05, 0.1, and 0.3. The proposed method produces stable  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$  around 0.88 while the NNE method is very sensitive to the span specification. This result is consistent with the simulation results in Table 4. Such robustness to the tuning parameter selection is a very attractive feature for our nonparametric estimator.

The Brier scores over all the predictive horizons are plotted in Figure 3, along with the percentages of ESRD and censoring at each predictive horizon. The prediction error increases with the predictive horizon. This result implies that the predictive accuracy decreases as the predictive horizon moves away from the time of prediction. Overall the estimated Brier scores are small, between 0 and 0.11. Prior to year 3.5, when there is little censoring, the three estimation methods produce almost identical results. When the percentage of censoring increases beyond 3.5 years, the results from the three methods begin to diverge but the absolute differences among them remain small.

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we propose an analytical framework for estimating time-dependent predictive accuracy metrics with competing risk data that are subject to right censoring. The method is illustrated with the time-dependent ROC and time-dependent Brier score. The proposed framework first computes a nonparametric estimator of the conditional probability of the true event status given the observed data and then uses it to weigh the data in an empirical calculation of the time-dependent metrics. This is a unified approach to estimating the time-dependent ROC, time-dependent Brier score, and time-dependent metrics constructed from other loss functions. The proposed method requires no parametric assumptions about the marginal, conditional or joint distribution of the risk score and time to the event of interest. It can be applied to evaluate the discrimination for a single biomarker or a risk score constructed from a prognostic model with multiple biomarkers, and to evaluate the calibration of the prognostic model. The method is applicable when the censoring time and the risk score are correlated. It is also insensitive to the tuning parameter specification. Such robustness to the tuning parameter specification has not been studied in nonparametric estimations of time-dependent predictive accuracy metrics<sup>4, 16, 17</sup> and no guidelines are yet available for practical users. When compared with competing methods in simulations, our proposed method demonstrates better overall performance and robustness to tuning parameters, particularly when the censoring is correlated with the risk score. The R code that implements the proposed methodology is available upon request and will be added to the `tdROC` package in R.

One limitation with the proposed method is that, like many other nonparametric methods, it works better with larger sample sizes. When the sample size is very small, there may not be enough subjects with events for calculating  $\widehat{F}_1(t|U_i)$  and  $\widehat{S}_T(t|U_i)$  within some local neighborhoods defined by the kernel. In such case, the bandwidth may need to be increased for those neighborhoods.



## 7 Acknowledgment

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and publication of this article. This research was supported by the U.S. National Institutes of Health (grants 5P30CA016672 and 5U01DK103225).

## References

1. Baskin-Bey ES, Kremers W, Nyberg SL. A recipient risk score for deceased donor renal allocation. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2007;49(2):284–293.
2. Hernández D, Sánchez-Fructuoso A, González-Posada JM, Arias M, Campistol JM, et al. A novel risk score for mortality in renal transplant recipients beyond the first posttransplant year. *Transplantation.* 2009;88(6):803–809.
3. Lorent M, Giral M, Pascual M, Koller MT, Steiger J, et al. Mortality prediction after the first year of kidney transplantation: An observational study on two european cohorts. *PLoS ONE.* 2016;11(5).
4. Heagerty PJ, Lumley T, Pepe MS. Time-dependent roc curves for censored survival data and a diagnostic marker. *Biometrics.* 2000;56(2):337–344.
5. Blanche P, Dartigues J, Jacqmin-Gadda H. Review and comparison of roc curve estimators for a time-dependent outcome with marker-dependent censoring. *Biom J.* 2013;55(5):687–704.
6. Chiang CT, Hung H. Non-parametric estimation for time-dependent auc. *J Stat Plan Inference.* 2010;140(5):1162–1174.
7. Uno H, Cai T, Tian L, Wei LJ. Evaluating prediction rules for t-year survivors with censored regression models. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 2007;102(478):527–537.
8. Graf E, Schmoor C, Sauerbrei W, Schumacher M. Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Stat Med.* 1999;18(17-18):2529–2545.
9. Gerds TA, Schumacher M. Consistent estimation of the expected brier score in general survival models with right-censored event times. *Biom J.* 2006;48(6):1029–1040.
10. Korn EL, Simon R. Measures of explained variation for survival data. *Stat Med.* 1990;9(5):487–503.
11. Schemper M, Henderson R. Predictive accuracy and explained variation in cox regression. *Biometrics.* 2000;56(1):249–255.
12. Brier G. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Mon Weather Rev.* 1950;78(1):1–3.
13. Blanche P, Proust-Lima C, Loubère L, Berr C, Dartigues JF, Jacqmin-Gadda H. Quantifying and comparing dynamic predictive accuracy of joint models for longitudinal marker and time-to-event in presence of censoring and competing risks. *Biometrics.* 2015;71(1):102–113.
14. Cortese G, Gerds TA, Andersen PK. Comparing predictions among competing risks models with time-dependent covariates. *Stat Med.* 2013;32(18):3089–3101.

15. Parast L, Cheng SC, Cai T. Landmark prediction of long-term survival incorporating short-term event time information. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 2012;107(500):1492–1501.
16. Saha P, Heagerty PJ. Time-dependent predictive accuracy in the presence of competing risks. *Biometrics.* 2010;66(4):999–1011.
17. Zheng Y, Cai T, Jin Y, Feng Z. Evaluating prognostic accuracy of biomarkers under competing risk. *Biometrics.* 2012;68(2):388–396.
18. Blanche P, Dartigues JF, Jacqmin-Gadda H. Estimating and comparing time-dependent areas under receiver operating characteristic curves for censored event times with competing risks. *Stat Med.* 2013;32(30):5381–5397.
19. Liu Q, Tang G, Costantino JP, Chang CH. Robust prediction of the cumulative incidence function under non-proportional subdistribution hazards. *Can J Stat.* 2016;44(2):127–141.
20. Schoop R, Beyersmann J, Schumacher M, Binder H. Quantifying the predictive accuracy of time-to-event models in the presence of competing risks. *Biom J.* 2011;53(1):88–112.
21. van Houwelingen H, Putter H. *Dynamic prediction in clinical survival analysis*: CRC Press; 2011.
22. Li L, Greene T, Hu B. A simple method to estimate the time-dependent receiver operating characteristic curve and the area under the curve with right censored data. *Stat Methods Med Res.* 2016 In press.
23. Kalbfleisch JD, Prentice RL. *The statistical analysis of failure time data*, Vol. 360: John Wiley & Sons; 2011.
24. Geskus RB. Cause-specific cumulative incidence estimation and the fine and gray model under both left truncation and right censoring. *Biometrics.* 2011;67(1):39–49.
25. Jacqmin-Gadda H, Blanche P, Chary E, Touraine C, Dartigues JF. Receiver operating characteristic curve estimation for time to event with semicompeting risks and interval censoring. *Stat Methods Med Res.* 2016;25(6):2750–2766.
26. Schmid M, Hielscher T, Augustin T, Gefeller O. A robust alternative to the schemper–henderson estimator of prediction error. *Biometrics.* 2011;67(2):524–535.
27. Fine JP, Gray RJ. A proportional hazards model for the subdistribution of a competing risk. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 1999;94(446):496–509.
28. Bordes L, Gneyou KE. Uniform convergence of nonparametric regressions in competing risk models with right censoring. *Stat Probabil Lett.* 2011;81(11):1654–1663.
29. Meyer MC. Inference using shape-restricted regression splines. *Ann Appl Stat.* 2008:1013–1033.
30. Wright Jr JT, Bakris G, Greene T, Agodoa LY, Appel LJ, et al. Effect of blood pressure lowering and antihypertensive drug class on progression of hypertensive kidney disease: results from the aask trial. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 2002;288(19):2421–2431.

Table 1: Simulation results of  $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$  for the proposed method, IPCW, and NNE under different event 1 rate (70%, 50% and 30%), censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Event 1	Censoring	True	n	Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$			MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$		
				proposed	IPCW	NNE	proposed	IPCW	NNE
70%	Medium	0.698	300	0.358	0.720	-3.024	1.281	1.299	1.600
			600	0.789	1.129	-1.577	0.591	0.638	0.646
	High	0.693	300	0.487	0.950	-2.986	1.605	1.620	1.853
			600	0.700	1.158	-1.714	0.797	0.846	0.869
50%	Medium	0.691	300	0.519	0.877	-2.869	1.567	1.593	1.826
			600	0.447	0.800	-2.046	0.774	0.789	0.931
	High	0.685	300	0.106	0.651	-3.430	1.850	1.886	2.255
			600	0.827	1.311	-1.718	0.974	1.054	1.030
30%	Medium	0.685	300	0.544	0.924	-2.907	2.020	2.050	2.290
			600	0.885	1.272	-1.662	0.985	1.020	1.042
	High	0.683	300	0.580	0.981	-2.949	2.305	2.436	2.560
			600	0.246	0.759	-2.359	1.173	1.253	1.375

				Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$			MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$		
				proposed	IPCW	NNE	proposed	IPCW	NNE
70%	Medium	0.661	300	0.500	0.887	-1.027	1.656	1.721	1.710
			600	0.985	1.347	-0.796	0.733	0.797	0.757
	High	0.663	300	0.585	1.054	-1.270	1.848	1.890	1.975
			600	0.693	1.164	-1.336	0.904	0.982	1.017
50%	Medium	0.652	300	0.711	1.065	-1.354	2.080	2.154	2.207
			600	0.650	1.020	-1.709	0.934	0.956	1.063
	High	0.653	300	0.403	0.983	-1.820	2.093	2.208	2.355
			600	1.051	1.519	-1.664	1.136	1.264	1.203
30%	Medium	0.672	300	0.914	1.330	-1.375	2.404	2.487	2.492
			600	1.122	1.508	-2.020	1.162	1.229	1.325
	High	0.672	300	0.728	1.081	-1.853	2.632	2.828	2.726
			600	0.343	0.841	-2.981	1.294	1.418	1.619




Figure 1:  $\widehat{ROC}(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$  from the proposed method (red), IPCW.KM (black), IPCW.Cox (blue) and NNE (green) evaluated at three prediction horizons: 3, 4 and 5 years from baseline. ROC curve A corresponds to Definition A and ROC curve B corresponds to Definition B. The  $span = 0.05$  was used.

Table 2: Simulation results of  $\widehat{Brier}(\tau)$  for the proposed method and IPCW under different event 1 rate (70%, 50% and 30%), censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Event 1	Censoring	True	n	Bias% BS		MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ BS	
				proposed	IPCW.KM	proposed	IPCW.KM
70%	Medium	0.195	300	-0.282	-0.702	0.143	0.146
			600	-0.759	-1.105	0.066	0.070
	High	0.182	300	-0.125	-0.530	0.179	0.176
			600	0.178	-0.223	0.096	0.097
50%	Medium	0.165	300	-1.337	-1.575	0.187	0.187
			600	-1.478	-1.698	0.102	0.105
	High	0.149	300	-0.697	-1.052	0.227	0.230
			600	-1.137	-1.401	0.116	0.121
30%	Medium	0.140	300	-1.069	-1.085	0.213	0.211
			600	-0.906	-0.977	0.100	0.101
	High	0.122	300	0.079	-0.006	0.235	0.237
			600	-0.103	-0.201	0.112	0.112

Table 3: Simulation results of  $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$  for the proposed method and NNE on the robustness of span specification. Setting: 70% event 1 rate, censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Censoring	True	n	Span	Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$		$\text{MSE} \times 10^{-3} \widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$	
				proposed	NNE	proposed	NNE
Medium	0.698	300	0.05	1.089	-2.775	1.164	1.343
			0.1	0.798	-6.821	1.342	3.141
			0.3	-0.202	-21.348	1.131	22.313
			0.5	-0.523	-25.287	1.009	31.188
		600	0.05	0.625	-2.518	0.697	0.912
			0.1	0.543	-6.790	0.606	2.649
			0.3	-0.278	-21.502	0.604	22.588
			0.5	-0.530	-25.392	0.551	31.441
High	0.693	300	0.05	1.128	-3.017	1.543	1.689
			0.1	0.550	-7.950	1.517	3.944
			0.3	-0.355	-21.845	1.478	23.002
			0.5	-1.368	-25.278	1.415	30.690
		600	0.05	0.754	-2.796	0.862	1.099
			0.1	0.756	-7.537	0.703	3.143
			0.3	-0.355	-21.991	0.781	23.262
			0.5	-1.371	-25.383	0.723	30.938
				Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$		$\text{MSE} \times 10^{-3} \widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$	
				proposed	NNE	proposed	NNE
Medium	0.661	300	0.05	1.222	0.705	1.407	1.440
			0.1	0.790	-0.718	1.641	1.717
			0.3	-0.161	-4.624	1.358	2.079
			0.5	-0.247	-6.180	1.197	2.528
		600	0.05	0.810	0.144	0.819	0.855
			0.1	0.620	-0.956	0.736	0.790
			0.3	-0.073	-5.270	0.754	1.814
			0.5	-0.202	-6.651	0.655	2.368
High	0.663	300	0.05	1.158	0.534	1.914	1.998
			0.1	0.527	-1.291	1.711	1.836
			0.3	-0.267	-5.147	1.671	2.528
			0.5	-1.199	-7.061	1.550	3.260
		600	0.05	0.796	-0.092	0.953	0.947
			0.1	0.786	-1.296	0.816	0.956
			0.3	-0.286	-6.143	0.904	2.336
			0.5	-1.231	-7.893	0.800	3.271

Table 4: Simulation results of  $\widehat{Brier}(\tau)$  for the proposed method on the robustness of span specification. Setting: 70% event 1 rate, censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Censoring	True	n	Span	Bias% $\widehat{Brier}(\tau)$	MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{Brier}(\tau)$		
Medium	0.195	300	0.05	-1.159	0.143		
			0.1	-0.470	0.162		
			0.3	0.065	0.121		
			0.5	0.614	0.140		
		600	0.05	-0.831	0.078		
			0.1	-0.466	0.069		
			0.3	0.320	0.073		
			0.5	0.439	0.071		
		High	0.182	300	0.05	-1.004	0.182
					0.1	-0.232	0.182
0.3	0.360				0.194		
0.5	1.086				0.180		
600	0.05			-0.439	0.099		
	0.1			-0.069	0.079		
	0.3			0.425	0.096		
	0.5			1.086	0.095		

Table 5: Simulation results of  $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$  for the proposed method and IPCW methods under dependent censoring setting (a). Setting: event 1 rate (70%, 50% and 30%), censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Event 1	Censoring	True	n	Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$			MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$		
				proposed	IPCW.KM.	IPCW.Cox	proposed	IPCW.KM	IPCW.Cox
70%	Medium	0.698	300	0.980	-5.587	1.600	1.359	3.042	1.308
			600	0.510	-5.810	1.193	0.588	2.300	0.586
	High	0.692	300	0.838	-9.515	0.975	1.718	6.109	1.463
			600	0.927	-9.175	1.098	0.864	4.910	0.740
50%	Medium	0.702	300	-0.673	3.351	0.322	1.413	1.884	2.014
			600	-0.720	3.264	0.490	0.739	1.193	1.126
	High	0.687	300	1.312	-6.183	1.073	2.090	3.676	1.746
			600	1.332	-6.192	0.995	1.076	2.811	0.892
30%	Medium	0.685	300	0.906	-4.493	1.821	1.897	2.758	1.763
			600	0.745	-4.512	1.748	0.854	1.791	0.863
	High	0.686	300	-0.602	4.627	1.951	2.352	3.287	5.925
			600	-0.217	4.915	2.057	1.237	2.310	6.800

				Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$			MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$		
				proposed	IPCW.KM.	IPCW.Cox	proposed	IPCW.KM	IPCW.Cox
70%	Medium	0.661	300	1.041	-8.929	1.443	1.684	5.483	1.609
			600	0.561	-9.103	0.996	0.752	4.533	0.717
	High	0.665	300	0.831	-13.040	0.350	1.992	9.687	1.705
			600	0.820	-12.736	0.409	1.002	8.257	0.835
50%	Medium	0.674	300	-0.784	6.233	0.596	1.809	3.367	2.972
			600	-0.536	6.322	0.876	0.874	2.601	1.622
	High	0.663	300	1.373	-9.341	0.484	2.368	6.113	1.981
			600	1.559	-9.275	0.472	1.222	5.000	0.994
30%	Medium	0.670	300	1.096	-8.818	2.223	2.356	5.948	2.141
			600	0.948	-8.836	2.098	1.011	4.679	1.028
	High	0.676	300	-0.266	7.490	2.504	2.648	5.034	7.830
			600	-0.113	7.651	2.043	1.329	3.928	8.537

Table 6: Simulation results of  $\widehat{Br\dot{ier}}(\tau)$  for the proposed method and IPCW methods under dependent censoring setting (a). Setting: event 1 rate (70%, 50% and 30%), censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Event 1	Censoring	True	n	Bias% BS		MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ BS	
				proposed	IPCW.KM	IPCW.Cox	IPCW.Cox
70%	Medium	0.195	300	-0.849	6.737	1.533	0.160
			600	-0.625	6.823	1.729	0.082
	High	0.175	300	-0.576	11.201	3.742	0.272
			600	-0.494	11.240	3.776	0.128
50%	Medium	0.187	300	-0.072	-5.733	-1.541	0.155
			600	-0.098	-5.775	-1.709	0.080
	High	0.153	300	-0.768	8.387	2.426	0.286
			600	-1.277	8.219	2.280	0.126
30%	Medium	0.142	300	-0.584	5.406	1.359	0.222
			600	-0.892	4.900	0.881	0.097
	High	0.130	300	-0.081	-8.491	-2.294	0.236
			600	-0.555	-8.617	-2.244	0.109
							0.258
							0.134
							0.343
							0.233
							0.206
							0.089
							0.252
							0.127



Table 7: Simulation results of  $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$  for the proposed method and IPCW methods under dependent censoring setting (b). Setting: event 1 rate (70%, 50% and 30%), censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Event 1	Censoring	True	n	Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$			MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{AUC}_A(\tau)$		
				proposed	IPCW.KM.	IPCW.Cox	proposed	IPCW.KM	IPCW.Cox
70%	Medium	0.702	300	0.267	2.709	0.668	1.277	1.576	1.335
			600	-0.069	2.426	0.412	0.562	0.829	0.596
	High	0.693	300	0.251	4.718	1.216	1.542	2.463	1.945
			600	0.336	4.888	1.401	0.690	1.839	1.029
	Medium	0.691	300	0.180	2.689	1.035	1.578	1.861	1.811
			600	0.094	2.474	0.899	0.703	0.985	0.843
50%	High	0.693	300	-0.347	4.802	1.190	1.782	2.708	2.734
			600	0.008	4.890	1.313	0.857	1.970	2.133
	Medium	0.685	300	0.613	2.621	1.148	1.669	1.963	1.800
			600	0.453	2.471	1.125	0.843	1.125	0.915
	High	0.687	300	-0.444	3.525	0.742	2.029	2.590	2.558
			600	0.123	4.125	1.282	0.991	1.772	1.355
				Bias% $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$			MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ $\widehat{AUC}_B(\tau)$		
				proposed	IPCW.KM.	IPCW.Cox	proposed	IPCW.KM	IPCW.Cox
70%	Medium	0.662	300	0.181	3.931	0.603	1.610	2.231	1.733
			600	-0.183	3.630	0.322	0.743	1.286	0.802
	High	0.663	300	0.193	6.244	1.211	1.812	3.330	2.358
			600	0.265	6.467	1.353	0.814	2.651	1.251
	Medium	0.652	300	0.537	4.874	1.383	1.986	2.862	2.403
			600	0.353	4.542	1.154	0.898	1.738	1.156
50%	High	0.671	300	-0.277	7.155	1.311	2.115	4.140	3.395
			600	0.214	7.323	1.401	1.016	3.346	2.802
	Medium	0.671	300	0.997	4.794	1.467	2.205	3.153	2.512
			600	0.617	4.454	1.236	1.115	1.975	1.231
	High	0.676	300	-0.227	5.541	0.913	2.264	3.572	3.054
			600	0.412	6.265	1.494	1.136	2.876	1.668

Table 8: Simulation results of  $\widehat{Bias}(\tau)$  for the proposed method and IPCW methods under dependent censoring setting (b). Setting: event 1 rate (70%, 50% and 30%), censoring rate (Medium: 25-30%, High: 45-50%).

Event 1	Censoring	True	n	Bias% BS		MSE $\times 10^{-3}$ BS	
				proposed	IPCW.KM	proposed	IPCW.KM
70%	Medium	0.199	300	-0.434	-4.019	-0.935	0.207
			600	-0.311	-3.907	-0.747	0.128
	High	0.182	300	-0.387	-6.949	-1.165	0.339
			600	0.107	-6.543	-0.530	0.238
50%	Medium	0.165	300	-1.326	-5.477	-1.638	0.262
			600	-0.979	-5.048	-1.266	0.166
	High	0.171	300	-0.615	-8.321	-1.468	0.402
			600	-0.923	-8.610	-1.463	0.315
30%	Medium	0.150	300	-0.566	-3.731	-0.777	0.228
			600	-0.966	-4.094	-1.149	0.127
	High	0.132	300	-0.840	-6.320	-0.954	0.286
			600	-0.675	-6.127	-0.818	0.168




Figure 2:  $\widehat{ROC}(\tau)$  and  $\widehat{AUC}(\tau)$  from the proposed method (red) and NNE (green) using different  $span$  evaluated at year 4. ROC curve A corresponds to Definition A and ROC curve B corresponds to Definition B.




Figure 3:  $\widehat{Brier}(\tau)$  using proposed method (red), IPCW.KM (black) and IPCW.Cox (blue). The orange bar indicates percent of ESRD and green bar indicates percent of censoring prior to the prediction horizons, plotted against the vertical axis on the right.

