

ARTICLE TYPE

Robust joint modelling of longitudinal and survival data with a time-varying degrees-of-freedom parameter

Lisa M. McFetridge^{†1} | Özgür Asar^{*†2} | Jonas Wallin³

¹Mathematical Sciences Research Centre,
School of Mathematics and Physics,
Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast,
United Kingdom

²Department of Biostatistics and Medical
Informatics, Faculty of Medicine,
Acibadem Mehmet Ali Aydınlar University,
İstanbul, Turkey

³Department of Statistics, Lund University,
Lund, Sweden

Correspondence

*Özgür Asar, Department of Biostatistics
and Medical Informatics, Faculty of
Medicine, Acibadem Mehmet Ali Aydınlar
University, İstanbul, Turkey. Email:
ozgur.asar@acibadem.edu.tr |
ozgurasarstat@gmail.com

Summary

Repeated measures of biomarkers have the potential of explaining hazards of survival outcomes. In practice, these measurements are intermittently measured and are known to be subject to substantial measurement error. Joint modelling of longitudinal and survival data enables us to associate intermittently measured error-prone biomarkers with risks of survival outcomes. Most of the joint models available in the literature have been built on the Gaussian assumption. This makes them sensitive to outliers. In this work, we study a range of robust models to address this issue. For medical data, it has been observed that outliers might occur with different frequencies over time. To address this, a new model with a time varying robustness is introduced. Through both a simulation study and analysis of two real-life data examples, this research not only stresses the need to account for longitudinal outliers in joint modelling research but also highlights the bias and inefficiency from not properly estimating the degrees-of-freedom parameter. Each technique presented in this work can be fitted using the R package `robjtm`.

KEYWORDS:

Degrees-of-freedom; longitudinal outliers; normal variance-mixtures; robust joint model; t-distribution

1 | INTRODUCTION

Biomarkers are used as proxies of one's health, and are known to be subject to substantial measurement error, due to biological and non-biological sources. In prospective studies, the biomarkers are repeatedly measured. These measurements are made at intermittent time-points in practice rather than continuously, and times elapsed between successive measurements are typically unequal. It is of scientific interest to explain risks of survival outcomes by repeated measures of biomarker data. Two main obstacles are the intermittent nature of the biomarker data and inherent measurement error. Joint modelling of longitudinal and survival outcomes enables us to associate repeated measures of biomarkers with the risks of survival events, while taking into account the aforementioned obstacles. The framework typically combines two sub-models, a mixed-effects model for repeated measures, and a Cox model for survival data. The sub-models are linked with shared parameters. Reviews of relevant literature can be found in Tsiatis and Davidian¹, Diggle, Sousa and Chetwynd², Rizopoulos³, McCrink, Marshall and Cairns⁴, Asar et al.⁵ and Elashoff⁶.

A prevailing assumption in the literature is that both random-effects and error terms in the mixed-effects sub-model follow Normal distributions. However, in most real-life problems, the data-sets include outliers for which the Normal assumption might be inadequate. Specifically, in prospective studies, two types of outliers may be present:

[†] L.M. McFetridge and Ö. Asar are equal contributing authors.

- i) **b-outliers**: Outlying individuals within the population that do not conform to population trends. These are outliers within the longitudinal random-effects.
- ii) **e-outliers**: Outlying observations within an individual's set of measurements that do not follow the individual's own trend over time. These are outliers within the longitudinal random error.

Only in recent years have studies been undertaken to investigate the negative impacts that the presence of longitudinal outliers under the Normal assumption can have^{7,8,9,10,11}. Robust joint models replace the Normality assumption with t-distributional assumptions for the random terms. In doing so, the heavier tails down-weight the detrimental impact of longitudinal outliers within the joint modelling framework. Initial research on robust joint modelling considered only the *e*-outliers^{7,8,12}, and both *e*- and *b*-outliers^{10,11,13,14}. Each of these studies found that the parameter estimates and corresponding standard errors are sensitive to the Normality assumptions when outliers are present, with t-distributional assumptions alleviating such bias. If utilised when outliers are not present, unbiased estimates are obtained, though Li, Elashoff and Li⁷ and Huang, Li and Elashoff⁸ noted that the robust joint models give slightly higher standard errors for the longitudinal parameters. This initial work however restrictively fixes the degrees-of-freedom at a constant chosen by the user, an assumption alleviated by Baghfalaki, Ganjali and Berridge⁹, Asar, Fournier and Dantan¹¹ and Baghfalaki, Ganjali and Hashemi¹⁴, who utilised Bayesian approaches, and McCrink¹⁰, who utilised a frequentist approach, to allow estimation of the degrees-of-freedom to be dictated by the data. With estimated degrees-of-freedom, the t-distributional assumptions of the robust joint model will approximate normality in the absence of outliers.

All of the aforementioned research, however, assumes that the degrees-of-freedom is constant, unchanging over time, an assumption prevalent in the literature for robust mixed models alongside their robust joint model counterparts. To address this issue, we propose a robust joint model which can account for the situation where the impact of outliers can change over time. Varying frequency of outliers is a very likely scenario, for example, when patients are given new treatments, they typically take time to stabilise and adjust to these treatments. This period of adjustment means that they are more prone to demonstrating responses which outlie from the expected and thus the patients' measurements may not be consistent with the population average and change over time as they grow accustomed to the new treatments. Incorrectly modelling such scenarios limits our ability to fully decipher the relationship between how patients' responses change over time and the impact this has on their risk of an adverse event.

This work explores two examples, one on dialysis, and another on liver cirrhosis. The first example analyses the haemoglobin levels of Northern Ireland (NI) renal patients after commencing haemodialysis treatment. The second example, utilising the Mayo Clinic Primary Biliary Cirrhosis data-set, analyses data obtained from patients with primary biliary cirrhosis who participated in a randomized placebo controlled trial of the drug D-penicillamine. In both case studies, it is reasonable to assume that patients may take time to adjust to the new treatments and thus would be more prone to outlying responses.

A more detailed discussion on the two motivational examples is given in Section 2. The rest of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 3, the methodology for the various joint modelling approaches investigated in the paper is presented, including the introduction of a robust joint model with time-varying degrees-of-freedom. Section 4 presents a simulation study comparing the approaches assuming an underlying structure of time-varying degrees-of-freedom. Analysis of the two motivating examples is presented in Section 5 followed by discussions in Section 6.

2 | MOTIVATING EXAMPLES

2.1 | NI Renal data

Recent renal research has shown the potential for patients' haemoglobin (Hb) levels as an emerging biomarker for chronic kidney disease¹⁵. It is known within the renal research that in the initial stages after commencing haemodialysis, patients' haemoglobin levels tend to fluctuate to a large degree and is detrimental to their survival. This research aims to capture and model these initial stages of variability where there is a greater potential for patients to either have outlying observations from their own trends over time or be an outlier themselves from the population.

This work will analyse data that has been collected from seven different renal centres by the NI Renal Information Service. The NI renal data-set contains longitudinal information on 1,339 patients who have undergone haemodialysis treatment between April 2002 and July 2011^{4,10,16}. In total, 27,064 Hb measurements were recorded, with a median of 14 observations per individual. Other health related measurements, including creatinine and urea levels, were additionally monitored. Individuals were

observed for a minimum of 2 days, and a maximum of approximately 9 years throughout the study follow-up period. 44% of the patients died during the study period with the remaining patients being right-censored.

Figures 1 and 2 show the tail behaviour of the standardised conditional residuals and random-effects, respectively, based on a joint model fitted for the NI renal data with Gaussian assumptions for both random-effects and error terms. Degrees-of-freedom estimates for Figure 1 were obtained by fitting a univariate t distribution such that $t(\mu, \sigma, \nu)$, where μ is the location parameter, σ the scale, ν the degrees-of-freedom. Time (in years) was divided into bins based on 20% percentiles of the follow-up time. As illustrated by Figures 1 and 2, there are departures from Normality for both random-effects and error terms. Figure 1 further indicates that the degrees-of-freedom parameter of the t -distribution for the residuals varies over time, an anticipated result based on the known impact on patients' Hb levels initially as they adjust to the commencement of haemodialysis treatment. Such changes over time will be accounted for through the time-varying degrees-of-freedom formulation introduced in Section 3.4.

2.2 | Primary biliary cirrhosis (PBC) data

A second motivating example arises from data collected from 312 patients with primary biliary cirrhosis (PBC), a rare autoimmune disease which results in cirrhosis of the liver and fatality. Patients suffering from PBC produce increased levels of alkaline in the blood. The PBC data-set was collected from the Mayo Clinic trial conducted between 1974 and 1984, which aimed to assess the effectiveness of the D-penicillamine drug¹⁷. Of the 312 patients, 158 were randomly assigned to the drug, and 154 to placebo. Median baseline age was 48.8 (minimum = 26.28, maximum = 78.44). In total, 1,885 repeated alkaline observations were collected over the 10 year trial period, with a median of 5 (minimum = 1, maximum = 16) observations per individual. Individuals were observed for a minimum of 0.1 years, and a maximum of 14.3 years. 140 (45%) patients died during the study-period.

The quantile-quantile plot for the standardised conditional residuals under the joint model with Gaussian assumption (left panel of Figure 3) indicates heavier tails than Gaussian. Estimated degrees-of-freedom from univariate t distributions fitted to residuals that fall into bins based on 20% percentiles of follow-up time indicate time-varying degrees-of-freedom structure up to some extent. Figure 4 indicates that normality may be a reasonable assumption for the random effects.

3 | APPROACHES FOR ROBUST JOINT MODELLING

3.1 | Notation

Before introducing the models, we present the general notation used throughout the paper. Let Y_{ij} denote the j^{th} ($j = 1, \dots, m_i$) repeated measurement belonging to subject i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) collected at time t_{ij} , $t_i = \{t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i}\}$ the set of the follow-up times at which Y_{ij} 's are collected, $a_i = \{a_{i1} \dots a_{iL}\}$ baseline covariate information, and S_i survival time. Here, S_i is subject to right-censoring. Hence, we introduce an additional random variable, E_i , defined by $E_i = I(S_i^* \leq C_i)$, where $I(\cdot)$ being indicator function, S_i^* true survival time for subject i , C_i censoring time for the subject. C_i is defined as $C_i = \min(C, D_i)$, with C is the study end-time and D_i is the drop-out time for subject i .

3.2 | Joint modelling of longitudinal and survival data

The framework for the so-called joint models for longitudinal and survival data under the shared-parameter paradigm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ij} &= Y_i^*(t_{ij}) + Z_{ij}, \\ &= \mathbf{x}_{ij}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{d}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{B}_i + Z_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$h_i(t) = h_0(t) \exp(\mathbf{c}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\omega} + f(\mathcal{Y}_i^*(t); \boldsymbol{\eta})). \quad (2)$$

The framework allows for biomarker values (the longitudinal data) to be measured with error, i.e. the observed data, Y_{ij} , is composed of underlying continuous-time signal at time t_{ij} , $Y_i^*(t_{ij})$, and noise, Z_{ij} . The signal is de-composed into fixed-effects, $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and random-effects, $\mathbf{d}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{B}_i$. Here, \mathbf{x}_{ij} is a $p \times 1$ matrix structured by a_i and t_i . $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a $p \times 1$ matrix of regression coefficients as in multiple linear regression. \mathbf{d}_{ij} is a $q \times 1$ matrix, that is typically a subset of \mathbf{x}_{ij} . \mathbf{B}_i are subject-specific coefficients that take into account heterogeneity between subjects. $h_i(t)$ is the hazard of survival event for subject i at time t . $h_0(t)$ is the baseline hazard that can be specified using hazard functions of parametric distributions, e.g. Weibull; left un-specified as in Cox¹⁸; assumed to be piece-wise constant; or be expressed in terms of splines, e.g. natural cubic or B-splines. \mathbf{c}_i is a $g \times 1$ matrix with elements

from a_i , $\omega g \times 1$ vector of regression coefficients. $f(\mathcal{Y}_i^*(t); \boldsymbol{\eta})$ is the term for taking into account the association between hazard of survival event and features of biomarker process, with $f(\cdot)$ being a known function. A popular choice is to use the current value parametrisation such that $f(\mathcal{Y}_i^*(t); \boldsymbol{\eta}) = \boldsymbol{\eta} Y_i^*(t)$. For other choices, see Hickey et al.¹⁹.

The classical model assumptions for the random-effects and error components are zero-mean Gaussian distributions such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \\ Z_{ij} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), \\ \mathbf{B}_i &\perp Z_{ij}, \quad Z_{ij} \perp Z_{ij'} \text{ for } j \neq j', \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the covariance matrix of the random-effects, and σ is the standard deviation of the measurement error. In what follows, we extend the assumptions beyond the Gaussian.

3.3 | Robust joint modelling

The robustness of the joint model will be determined by the distributions of the mixing variables, \mathbf{B}_i and Z_{ij} . The tail of the density for \mathbf{B}_i determines robustness against b -outliers and the tail of the density for Z_{ij} determines the robustness against e -outliers. We consider symmetric robust distributions for both the random-effects and error components through normal-variance mixtures such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_i &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \sqrt{V_i^B} \mathbf{B}_i^*, \\ Z_{ij} &= \sigma \sqrt{V_{ij}^Z} Z_{ij}^*, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{B}_i^* \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{q \times q})$ and $Z_{ij}^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. This formulation is flexible and includes widely used distributions as special cases²⁰. The tail behaviour is determined by the distribution of V_i^B and V_{ij}^Z . The special case $V_i^B = 1$ and $V_{ij}^Z = 1$ recovers the Gaussian joint model (see Section 3.2). In this study, we specifically consider inverse Gamma distribution \mathcal{IG} with equal shape and scale parameters for the V terms which results a t -distribution.

Ideally, one can use the posterior distribution of V_i^B or V_{ij}^Z to detect outliers. If the posterior distribution of V_i^B (V_{ij}^Z) is concentrated at large values this should indicate a b -outlier for subject i (e -outlier for observation j of patient i). However, in much of the robust modelling literature dependence between V_i^B and V_{ij}^Z , e.g. see²¹, and V_{ij}^Z and $V_{ij'}$, e.g. Baghfalaki, Ganjali and Berridge⁹, have been introduced (mainly to simplify the inferential procedure). These dependencies, however, make the aforementioned interpretation on outlier detection impossible.

In what follows, we will set three robust joint model formulations that are available in the literature and discuss implications.

3.3.1 | Approach 1

McCrink¹⁰ considered

$$\begin{aligned} V_i^B &= V_i, \\ V_{ij}^Z &= V_i, \\ V_i &\sim \mathcal{IG}(\gamma/2, \gamma/2). \end{aligned}$$

The mixing variable is equal for both random-effects and error components. This implies that b - and e -outliers must be present simultaneously for a subject, which would be a strong assumption. Note that under this assumption \mathbf{B}_i and $\mathbf{Z}_i = [Z_{i1} \dots Z_{im_i}]^\top$ will be jointly multivariate t with a single degrees-of-freedom parameter, and the following properties do not hold: $\mathbf{B}_i \perp Z_{ij}$, and $Z_{ij} \perp Z_{ij'}$ for $j \neq j'$.

3.3.2 | Approach 2

Baghfalaki, Ganjali and Berridge⁹ considered a robust joint model by setting

$$\begin{aligned} V_i^B &= V_i^B \sim \mathcal{IG}(\phi/2, \phi/2), \\ V_{ij}^Z &= V_i^Z \sim \mathcal{IG}(\delta/2, \delta/2). \end{aligned}$$

Under this approach, \mathbf{B}_i and \mathbf{Z}_i will be multivariate t , with separate degrees-of-freedom parameters; the property of $\mathbf{B}_i \perp \mathbf{Z}_{ij}$ holds, whereas $\mathbf{Z}_{ij} \perp \mathbf{Z}_{ij'}$ for $j \neq j'$ does not. As \mathbf{Z}_{ij} and $\mathbf{Z}_{ij'}$ for $j \neq j'$ share a common V_i^Z , this approach can be seen as a random-effects approach on the variance of \mathbf{Z} . This approach forces all the elements of $\{\mathbf{Z}_{ij} : j = 1, \dots, m_i\}$ to be outliers.

3.3.3 | Approach 3

Asar, Fournier and Dantan¹¹ considered the setting of

$$\begin{aligned} V_i^B &= V_i^B \sim \text{IG}(\phi/2, \phi/2), \\ V_{ij}^Z &= V_{ij}^Z \sim \text{IG}(\delta/2, \delta/2), \end{aligned}$$

for joint modelling. Under this approach the dependence between \mathbf{Z}_{ij} and $\mathbf{Z}_{ij'}$ that was present in Approach 2 has been removed. This is the most natural approach compared to the previous two, and will be used as a base for our time varying degrees-of-freedom formulation.

3.4 | Approach 4: Time-varying degrees-of-freedom formulation

By building on Approach 3, we consider time-varying degrees-of-freedom parameter, $\delta(t)$, for \mathbf{Z}_{ij} . In practice, we need to discretise time, i.e. $\delta(t) = \delta(t_{ij})$. This approach considers

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ij}^Z &\sim \text{IG}(\delta_{ij}/2, \delta_{ij}/2), \\ \delta_{ij} &= \exp(\delta_0 + \mathbf{a}_{ij}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, \mathbf{a}_{ij} is a $s \times 1$ to be specified by natural cubic splines or B-splines, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ associated coefficients. Note that one obtains time invariant degrees-of-freedom as $\delta_{ij} = \delta = \exp(\delta_0)$, when $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$.

3.5 | Priors

We only give details about the prior distributions that are assigned to the parameters based on Approach 4, since Approaches 1-3 are just special cases. We set weakly-informative prior distributions for the parameters. Elements of α are assigned zero-mean Cauchy prior with scale of 5, $C(0, 5)$, only α_0 was given $C(0, 20)$. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is re-written as $\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\Omega}\mathbf{R}$, with \mathbf{R} being a diagonal matrix of scale parameters of B_h ($h = 1, \dots, q$), and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ a correlation matrix²². Elements of \mathbf{R} are given half-Cauchy, $C_+(0, 5)$, whereas elements of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ are given LKJ with the parameter of 2, $\mathcal{LKJ}(2)$. Degrees-of-freedom parameter for \mathbf{B}_i , ϕ , and δ_0 of \mathbf{Z}_{ij} are given uniform priors, between 2 and 100. Elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are given $C(0, 5)$. σ is given $C_+(0, 5)$. Log-transformed elements of $h_0(t)$ and elements of $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ are given $C(0, 5)$.

3.6 | Inference

For inference, we use Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods to sample from the joint posterior densities of the parameters and latent variables given data. We specifically consider the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC)²³ as implemented in the No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS)²⁴. We do not present the details of neither the likelihood function, nor HMC and NUTS, since, whereas the former is quite straightforward (e.g. see¹¹), the second can be followed from the cited references.

Bespoke R²⁵ codes to fit the joint models under Approaches 1-4 are available from the `robjbm` package (<https://github.com/ozgurasarstat/robjbm>) that internally uses the HMC sampling engine Stan²⁶ through the R package Rstan²⁷.

4 | SIMULATION STUDY

A simulation study was conducted to investigate the effects of time-varying degrees-of-freedom in the estimation of parameters for the joint modelling approaches discussed in Section 3. A sample size of $n = 250$ individuals was considered with 200 data-sets being simulated under the assumption of time-varying degrees-of-freedom for the longitudinal residuals. Note that we consider 200 as the number of replications mainly because of the computational cost.

Data were generated under Approach 4. The assumed underlying structure for the time-varying degrees-of-freedom is illustrated in Figure 5. The longitudinal sub-model was given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ij} &= Y_i^*(t_{ij}) + Z_{ij}, \\ &= \alpha_1 + t_{ij}\alpha_2 + B_{1i} + t_{ij}B_{2i} + Z_{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where each individual has an average of 20 observations between time points 0 and 5. A random-intercept ($\alpha_1 + B_{1i}$) and random-slope ($\alpha_2 + B_{2i}$) model was assumed to replicate what is most commonly used in the joint modelling literature. Survival data was generated from the following model:

$$h_i(t) = h_0(t) \exp(X_i\omega + Y_i^*(t)\eta), \quad (4)$$

where $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$, $h_0(t)$ specified by a Weibull baseline hazard, i.e. $h_0(t) = \lambda vt^{\nu-1}$. There is a final truncation time of 5 after which non-informative right-censoring occurs. The true values for the unknown parameters are given in Table 1.

Each robust model and the model with Gaussian assumptions for \mathbf{B}_i and Z_{ij} , called the standard joint model, were estimated utilising the `robjtm` package with four chains each of length 2,000 with the first 1000 iterations considered as warm-up. The averages of posterior means, width of the corresponding 95% credibility intervals (CI) and coverage (Cov.) of 200 replications for each model are collated in Table 1.

For all the models, including the standard joint model, fixed effects for both the longitudinal and survival models and baseline hazard parameters demonstrate similar biases and coverages. In terms of averages of the credibility intervals for α_1 and α_2 , the standard joint model produces larger values compared to the other models. Coverages for the elements of Σ are lower than expected for the standard joint model, and almost 0 for Approach 1, whereas they are at the expected level for Approaches 2, 3 and 4. Approaches 1 and 2 produces biased and 0 coverage results for σ^2 . This highlights the need to remove the dependence between Z_{ij} and $Z_{ij'}$. Approach 3 provides similar estimates and levels of coverage compared to Approach 4. Therefore, whilst Approach 3 has the inability to fully capture the time-varying nature of the degrees-of-freedom for the residuals, this appears to have limited impact on the estimation of the other parameters.

5 | ILLUSTRATIVE DATA EXAMPLES

5.1 | Renal Example

The first case-study considers NI haemodialysis patients' data with a joint model specified as:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ij} &= Y_i(t_{ij}) + Z_{ij}, \\ &= \alpha_1 + t_{ij}\alpha_2 + \text{age}_i\alpha_3 + \text{creatinine}_{ij}\alpha_4 + \text{MCHC}_{ij}\alpha_5 + \text{MCV}_{ij}\alpha_6 + \text{urea}_{ij}\alpha_7 \\ &\quad + \text{male}_i\alpha_8 + \text{I(EPO}_{ij}=\text{Aranesp})}\alpha_9 + \text{I(EPO}_{ij}=\text{Alfa})}\alpha_{10} + \text{I(EPO}_{ij}=\text{Other})}\alpha_{11} \\ &\quad + \text{Prior2007}_i\alpha_{12} + \text{IronHydroxide}_{ij}\alpha_{13} + \text{Venofer}_{ij}\alpha_{14} + B_{1i} + t_{ij}B_{2i} + Z_{ij} \\ h_i(t) &= h_0(t) \exp(\text{age}_i\omega + Y_i^*(t)\eta), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the response Y is an individual's Hb level, $h_0(t)$ is assumed to be Weibull baseline hazard, MCHC represents mean corpuscular haemoglobin concentration, MCV represents mean corpuscular volume and EPO represents erythropoietin drug treatments.

The models were fitted using the `robjtm` package with four chains each of length 8,000 with the first 2,000 iterations considered as warm-up. Posterior summaries for each of the approaches are given within Table 2. Convergence was confirmed using traceplots and R-hat statistics²⁸.

Similar to the findings of the simulation study in Section 4, in general, results based on Approaches 3 and 4 are quite similar. There are differences in the results of these two models and the others, some parameters were overestimated whereas some were underestimated. For example, the association parameter, η , appears to be affected by the choice of model. It is underestimated by the standard joint model, which was overcome by Approach 1 up to some extent. Smoothed density plots for η are displayed in the left panel of Figure 6. Posterior summaries of degrees-of-freedom for Approach 3 and Approach 4 with 7 knots are displayed in the right panel of Figure 6.

5.2 | PBC Example

The second case-study uses data from the PBC study. The model we fit has the following form:

$$Y_{ij} = Y_i^*(t_{ij}) + Z_{ij} \\ = \alpha_1 + \text{age}_i \alpha_2 + t_{ij} \alpha_3 + \text{I}(\text{drug}_i = \text{D-penicillamine}) \alpha_4 + B_{i1} + t_{ij} B_{i2} + Z_{ij}, \quad (7)$$

$$h_i(t) = h_0(t) \exp(\text{age}_i \omega_1 + \text{I}(\text{drug}_i = \text{D-penicillamine}) \omega_2 + Y_i^*(t) \eta), \quad (8)$$

where $Y = \log(\text{alkaline})$, age is baseline age, t follow-up time, $h_0(t)$ Weibull baseline hazard function.

For Approaches 2–4, the results for ϕ indicated that Normal assumption might be reasonable for \mathbf{B}_i . Therefore, only Z term was assumed to be t -distributed. For Approach 4, we considered number of knots ranging from 1 to 5. The knots were put into the empirical quantiles of the time variable. Four chains, each length of 6,000, were started from random initials. Half of each chain was considered as warm-up. Convergence was checked through traceplots and R-hat statistics²⁸. Posterior summaries, specifically the 2.5%, 50% and 97.5% percentiles, are displayed in Table 3.

The association parameter, η , seems to be affected by the model choice. Regarding model comparisons in terms of parameter estimates, similar observations to those made for the NI renal application were observed for this case-study. The smoothed densities of the MCMC samples of η and the degrees-of-freedom estimates for Approach 3 and Approach 4 with 1 knot are displayed in the left and right panels of Figure 7, respectively.

R codes to run the models for the PBC data could be reach at https://github.com/ozgurasarstat/robjrm/blob/master/tests/testthat/test_pbc_analysis.R.

6 | DISCUSSION

This work introduces a new flexible approach to model longitudinal outliers in a joint modelling framework, where the degrees-of-freedom parameter for the residuals is assumed to vary over time. This scenario replicates the common situation when patients take time to adjust to new treatments, resulting in more outlying measurements (e-outliers) at different times across the period of observation. In addition, this paper contrasts the new time-varying approach with three alternative time-invariant formulations of robust joint models currently found in the literature and the standard joint model with Gaussian assumptions for the random terms. Each of the approaches presented can be fitted in the accompanying robjrm software package.

Throughout the results presented within the simulation study and the real-life data analysis, the need to properly account for longitudinal outliers is evident, a practice not widely adopted in the current joint modelling literature. This paper highlights the need to investigate the presence of outliers and provides a flexible approach to downweighing their negative impact, contrasting the effect of various assumptions made by the different approaches to robust joint modelling. It is evident that bias and inefficiency results from ignorance of longitudinal outliers and the assumption of normality for the random terms. In addition, this work highlights the need to remove the restrictive assumptions of Approaches 1 and 2.

Unexpectedly, despite a true underlying assumption of time-varying degrees-of-freedom within the simulation study, Approach 3 was found to be in good agreement with the time-varying model. Within the simulation study and in the two real-life examples, the degrees-of-freedom were assumed or estimated to be consistently low and varying over a limited range throughout the period of observation. Under such scenarios, Approach 3 appears to provide a time-invariant average of the time-varying degrees-of-freedom for the residuals over the period of observation, as demonstrated within Figure 6 for the renal analysis. Given the limited change in estimated parameters between the two approaches, it is not therefore unexpected to find high levels of agreement when comparing the posterior summaries of the predictions for the longitudinal random effects, as illustrated in Figure 8 from the PBC analysis.

This work highlights the robustness provided by Approach 3 in the estimation of the degrees-of-freedom, providing similar estimates as the time-varying approach inspite of the presence of time-varying degrees-of-freedom. It signifies that in cases where the degrees-of-freedom parameter does not vary widely, Approach 3 is recommended when longitudinal outliers are present.

We did not consider model selection methods to select the number of knots, mainly because the number of knots does not seem to change the results considerably. In the time-varying degrees-of-freedom model we assumed the scale parameter, σ being time-constant. This parameter might also be assumed to be time-varying.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [Reference: EP/P026028/1]

Acknowledgment

Dr. Laura Boyle's (The University of Adelaide) helps are gratefully acknowledged.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interests.

References

1. Tsiatis A.A. and Davidian M. (2004). Joint modeling of longitudinal and time-to-event data: An overview. *Statistica Sinica* **14**(3), 809-834.
2. Diggle P.J., Sousa I. and Chetwynd A.G. (2008). Joint modelling of repeated measurements and time-to-event outcomes: The fourth Armitage lecture. *Statistics in Medicine* **27**(16), 2981-2998.
3. Rizopoulos D. (2012). *Joint Models for Longitudinal and Time-To-Event Data: With Applications in R*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
4. McCrink L.M., Marshall A.H. and Cairns K.J. (2013). Advances in Joint Modelling: A review of recent developments in software and techniques using the modelling of survival of end stage renal disease patients as a working example. *International Statistical Review* **81**, 249-269.
5. Asar Ã., Ritchie J., Kalra P. A. and Diggle P. J. (2015). Joint modelling of repeated measurement and time-to-event data: an introductory tutorial. *International Journal of Epidemiology* **44**(1), 334-344.
6. Elashoff R.M. (2017). *Joint modeling of longitudinal and time-to-event data*. CRC Press.
7. Li N., Elashoff R.M. and Li G. (2009). Robust joint modeling of longitudinal measurements and competing risks failure time data. *Biometrical Journal* **51**(1), 19-30.
8. Huang X., Li G. and Elashoff R. (2010). A joint model of longitudinal and competing risks survival data with heterogeneous random effects and outlying longitudinal measurements. *Statistics and Its Interface* **3**(2), 185-195.
9. Baghfalaki T., Ganjali M. and Berridge D. (2013). Robust joint modeling of longitudinal measurements and time to event data using normal/independent distributions: A Bayesian approach. *Biometrical Journal* **34**(2), 187-220.
10. McCrink L.M. (2014). Outlier effects on robust joint modelling of longitudinal and survival data. *PhD Thesis, Queen's University Belfast*.
11. Asar Ã., Fournier M.-C. and Dantan E. (2019). Dynamic predictions of kidney graft survival in the presence of longitudinal outliers. *Under review*. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.00816>.
12. Taylor J.M.G., Park Y., Ankerst D.P., Proust-Lima C., Williams S., Kestin L., Bae K., Pickles T., and Sandler H. (2013). Real-time individual predictions of prostate cancer recurrence using joint models. *Biometrics* **69**(1), 206-213.
13. Song H., Peng Y., and Tu D. (2012). A new approach for joint modelling of longitudinal measurements and survival times with a cure fraction. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* **40**(2), 207-224.
14. Baghfalaki T., Ganjali M. and Hashemi R. (2014). Bayesian Joint Modeling of Longitudinal Measurements and Time-to-Event Data Using Robust Distributions. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* **24**(4), 834-855.

15. Chen Y., Qin M., Zheng J., Yan H., Li M., Cui Y., Zhang R., Zhao W. and Guo Y. (2015). Hemoglobin discriminates stages of chronic kidney disease in elderly patients. *Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine* **10**, 567-571.
16. Donnelly, C., McFetridge, L. M., Marshall, A. H. and Mitchell, H. J. (2017). A two-stage approach to the joint analysis of longitudinal and survival data utilising the Coxian phase-type distribution. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **27(12)**, 3577-3594.
17. Murtaugh P., Dickson E., Van Dam G., Malincho M., Grambsch P., Langworthy A., and Gips C. (1994) Primary biliary cirrhosis: prediction of short-term survival based on repeated patient visits. *Hepatology* **20**, 126-134.
18. Cox D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Methodological)* **34(2)**, 187-220.
19. Hickey G. L., Philipson P., Jorgensen A. and Kolamunnage-Dona R. (2016). Joint modelling of time-to-event and multivariate longitudinal outcomes: recent developments and issues. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* **16**, 117.
20. Asar A. U., Bolin D., Diggle P. J. and Wallin J. (2018). Linear mixed-effects models for non-gaussian repeated measurement data. *Under review*. Available at arxiv.org/abs/1804.02592.
21. Pinheiro J. C., Liu C., and Wu Y. N. (2001). Efficient algorithms for robust estimation in linear mixed-effects models using the multivariate t distribution. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **10**, 249-276.
22. Stan Development Team (2019). Stan User's Guide, Version 2.19. URL mc-stan.org/docs/2_19/stan-users-guide-2_19.pdf.
23. Neal R. (2011). *MCMC Using Hamiltonian Dynamics* in Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo, pages 113-162. Eds. Brooks S., Gelman A., Jones G. L. and Meng, X. L. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
24. Hoffman, M. D. and Gelman, A. (2014). The No-U-Turn sampler: adaptively setting path lengths in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **15**, 1593-1623.
25. R Core Team(2018). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
26. Carpenter B., Gelman A., Hoffman M. D., Lee D., Goodrich B., Betancourt M., Brubaker M., Guo J., Li P. and Riddell A. (2017). Stan: A Probabilistic Programming Language. *Journal of Statistical Software* **1**, 1-32.
27. Stan Development Team (2018). RStan: the R interface to Stan. R package version 2.17.3. URL <http://mc-stan.org/>.
28. Brooks S. P. and Gelman A. (1997). General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative simulations. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **7**, 434-455.




FIGURE 1 Plots to inspect tail behavior of the standardised conditional residuals obtained from the joint model with Gaussian assumptions for the renal dataset. Details of calculations are provided within Section 2.1. Left: Quantile-quantile plot against standard Normal distribution; Right: Degrees-of-freedom parameter estimates.




FIGURE 2 Plots to inspect the distributions of the random-intercept (left) and random-slope (right) terms against standard Normal based on the renal data.



TABLE 1 Table showing the simulation results based on data assuming time-varying degrees-of-freedom

True	Standard Joint			Approach 1			Approach 2			Approach 3			Approach 4		
	Mean	CI	Cov.	Mean	CI	Cov.	Mean	CI	Cov.	Mean	CI	Cov.	Mean	CI	Cov.
α_1	1.00	0.992	0.329	0.930	0.986	0.291	0.935	0.994	0.247	0.920	0.995	0.247	0.910	0.995	0.246
α_2	0.40	0.391	0.233	0.940	0.389	0.209	0.950	0.396	0.175	0.935	0.396	0.176	0.930	0.396	0.175
$\Sigma(1, 1)^*$	0.60	1.703	0.638	0.495	1.234	0.523	0.005	0.622	0.377	0.955	0.619	0.373	0.970	0.616	0.372
$\Sigma(2, 1)^*$	0.25	0.673	0.363	0.590	0.497	0.287	0.070	0.251	0.184	0.960	0.251	0.183	0.955	0.252	0.183
$\Sigma(2, 2)^*$	0.30	0.823	0.328	0.490	0.608	0.265	0.000	0.311	0.188	0.960	0.311	0.188	0.965	0.310	0.187
γ^{**}	—	—	—	—	20.719	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ϕ	3.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.169	2.285	0.930	3.163	2.286	0.940	3.159	2.270
σ^{2***}	0.25	0.351	—	—	0.322	0.044	0.000	0.325	0.043	0.000	0.250	0.042	0.965	0.259	0.044
δ^{***}	5.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.350	—	—	7.149	—	—	—	—
δ_0	5.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.801	6.160
β_1	0.50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.536	2.285
β_2	0.50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.668	2.648
β_3	0.50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.612	2.508
β_4	0.50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.614	2.41
β_5	0.50	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.693	2.921
β_6	-0.25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.152	2.400
λ	0.04	0.040	0.036	0.950	0.040	0.036	0.955	0.040	0.036	0.950	0.040	0.036	0.945	0.040	0.036
ν	1.20	1.207	0.433	0.950	1.206	0.434	0.955	1.210	0.430	0.945	1.210	0.431	0.950	1.211	0.432
ω	0.50	0.494	0.709	0.945	0.494	0.709	0.945	0.494	0.708	0.940	0.494	0.709	0.935	0.494	0.713
η	0.30	0.308	0.139	0.955	0.309	0.140	0.945	0.306	0.137	0.960	0.307	0.138	0.950	0.307	0.138

* For standard joint model, true values for these parameters were considered as $1.8 \left(0.6 * \frac{3}{3-2}\right)$, $0.75 \left(0.3 * \frac{3}{3-2}\right)$ and $0.9 \left(0.3 * \frac{3}{3-2}\right)$.

** For this parameter, CI and Cov. were not calculated, since the truth is unknown.

*** For these parameters, CI and Cov. were not calculated, since the truths are time-varying.




FIGURE 3 Plots to inspect the standardised conditional residuals obtained from the joint model with Gaussian assumptions for the PBC data-set. Left: Quantile-quantile plot against standard Normal distribution, Right: degrees-of-freedom parameter estimates. Degrees-of-freedom are obtained similar to Figure 1.




FIGURE 4 Plots to inspect the distributions of the random-intercept (left) and random-slope (right) terms against standard Normal.




FIGURE 5 Underlying degrees-of-freedom assumption for simulation study.




FIGURE 6 Left panel: Posterior densities of η under different models. Right panel: Medians of degrees-of-freedom parameters (mid-lines) and 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of the MCMC samples under Approach 3 (solid) and time-varying model with 7 knots (dashed) based on NI renal data.




FIGURE 7 Left panel: smoothed MCMC samples of η under different models. Right panel: Medians of degrees-of-freedom parameters (mid-lines) and 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of the MCMC samples under model 3 and tv model with 1 knot.




FIGURE 8 Posterior summaries (2.5%, 50% and 97.5% percentiles of the MCMC samples) for Approach 3 against the time-varying model with 5 knots from the PBC analysis for the predictions of the longitudinal random intercept (top row) and slope (bottom row).

TABLE 2 Posterior summaries of the joint model parameters fitted to the NI renal dataset. Values in the upper rows for each parameter are the 50% percentiles, whereas the brackets in the lower rows are the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles, respectively.

	nor-nor	tt-mod1	tt-mod2	tt-mod3	tv-2knot	tv-3knot	tv-4knot	tv-5knot	tv-6knot	tv-7knot
α_1	10.138 (10.018, 10.259)	10.239 (10.117, 10.354)	10.261 (10.145, 10.376)	10.246 (10.133, 10.361)	10.245 (10.130, 10.357)	10.248 (10.132, 10.360)	10.247 (10.134, 10.360)	10.251 (10.135, 10.364)	10.249 (10.132, 10.364)	10.250 (10.136, 10.365)
α_2	-0.133 (-0.163, -0.103)	-0.138 (-0.167, -0.110)	-0.130 (-0.157, -0.103)	-0.127 (-0.154, -0.100)	-0.126 (-0.154, -0.099)	-0.127 (-0.154, -0.099)	-0.126 (-0.154, -0.099)	-0.126 (-0.154, -0.099)	-0.126 (-0.154, -0.099)	-0.126 (-0.154, -0.099)
α_3	0.124 (0.089, 0.159)	0.112 (0.077, 0.147)	0.104 (0.071, 0.136)	0.104 (0.073, 0.137)	0.105 (0.073, 0.138)	0.105 (0.073, 0.137)	0.105 (0.073, 0.137)	0.105 (0.072, 0.137)	0.105 (0.073, 0.138)	0.105 (0.073, 0.138)
α_4	0.138 (0.121, 0.154)	0.125 (0.109, 0.142)	0.123 (0.107, 0.140)	0.127 (0.111, 0.144)	0.128 (0.111, 0.145)	0.128 (0.111, 0.144)	0.128 (0.112, 0.144)	0.128 (0.111, 0.144)	0.128 (0.111, 0.144)	0.128 (0.111, 0.145)
α_5	0.257 (0.239, 0.275)	0.259 (0.242, 0.276)	0.257 (0.240, 0.274)	0.259 (0.241, 0.276)	0.259 (0.241, 0.276)	0.259 (0.241, 0.276)	0.259 (0.241, 0.276)	0.259 (0.241, 0.276)	0.259 (0.241, 0.276)	0.258 (0.241, 0.276)
α_6	0.265 (0.222, 0.308)	0.290 (0.245, 0.334)	0.281 (0.238, 0.325)	0.274 (0.231, 0.318)	0.277 (0.234, 0.320)	0.277 (0.234, 0.321)	0.277 (0.233, 0.319)	0.277 (0.233, 0.320)	0.276 (0.233, 0.320)	0.276 (0.232, 0.320)
α_7	0.097 (0.075, 0.120)	0.102 (0.080, 0.125)	0.101 (0.079, 0.123)	0.109 (0.087, 0.132)	0.110 (0.087, 0.132)	0.109 (0.087, 0.132)	0.110 (0.087, 0.132)	0.110 (0.087, 0.132)	0.109 (0.087, 0.131)	0.109 (0.087, 0.132)
α_8	-0.155 (-0.255, -0.055)	-0.142 (-0.238, -0.045)	-0.178 (-0.270, -0.082)	-0.187 (-0.281, -0.095)	-0.187 (-0.279, -0.095)	-0.190 (-0.280, -0.100)	-0.190 (-0.280, -0.097)	-0.191 (-0.282, -0.098)	-0.191 (-0.282, -0.099)	-0.191 (-0.282, -0.100)
α_9	0.207 (0.136, 0.278)	0.187 (0.117, 0.257)	0.176 (0.107, 0.243)	0.195 (0.125, 0.261)	0.193 (0.124, 0.261)	0.193 (0.125, 0.263)	0.192 (0.123, 0.261)	0.192 (0.124, 0.258)	0.191 (0.123, 0.261)	0.191 (0.122, 0.258)
α_{10}	-0.037 (-0.147, 0.074)	-0.062 (-0.171, 0.045)	-0.064 (-0.170, 0.041)	-0.053 (-0.161, 0.054)	-0.051 (-0.160, 0.054)	-0.051 (-0.158, 0.055)	-0.050 (-0.157, 0.057)	-0.051 (-0.157, 0.054)	-0.052 (-0.160, 0.055)	-0.052 (-0.158, 0.057)
α_{11}	-0.100 (-0.342, 0.151)	-0.140 (-0.381, 0.099)	-0.152 (-0.385, 0.089)	-0.119 (-0.346, 0.101)	-0.131 (-0.357, 0.092)	-0.130 (-0.357, 0.096)	-0.135 (-0.356, 0.093)	-0.139 (-0.364, 0.088)	-0.139 (-0.366, 0.087)	-0.140 (-0.364, 0.089)
α_{12}	0.348 (0.246, 0.451)	0.333 (0.236, 0.433)	0.331 (0.239, 0.426)	0.325 (0.231, 0.419)	0.324 (0.230, 0.417)	0.324 (0.231, 0.418)	0.324 (0.228, 0.418)	0.322 (0.206, 0.419)	0.323 (0.228, 0.417)	0.323 (0.230, 0.419)
α_{13}	0.329 (0.271, 0.388)	0.292 (0.236, 0.348)	0.282 (0.227, 0.337)	0.310 (0.255, 0.367)	0.310 (0.254, 0.366)	0.310 (0.254, 0.367)	0.311 (0.254, 0.367)	0.311 (0.254, 0.367)	0.311 (0.255, 0.367)	0.311 (0.254, 0.368)
α_{14}	0.241 (0.201, 0.282)	0.223 (0.185, 0.261)	0.218 (0.180, 0.255)	0.221 (0.182, 0.260)	0.221 (0.182, 0.259)	0.221 (0.182, 0.260)	0.221 (0.182, 0.260)	0.220 (0.179, 0.259)	0.220 (0.181, 0.259)	0.220 (0.182, 0.259)
Σ_{11}	1.043 (0.940, 1.158)	0.901 (0.806, 1.005)	0.551 (0.452, 0.664)	0.543 (0.452, 0.648)	0.540 (0.448, 0.644)	0.538 (0.445, 0.640)	0.539 (0.446, 0.644)	0.534 (0.442, 0.638)	0.536 (0.447, 0.638)	0.536 (0.444, 0.643)
Σ_{12}	-0.256 (-0.303, -0.213)	-0.218 (-0.258, -0.182)	-0.136 (-0.172, -0.108)	-0.140 (-0.175, -0.110)	-0.138 (-0.173, -0.108)	-0.137 (-0.171, -0.107)	-0.137 (-0.173, -0.108)	-0.136 (-0.171, -0.107)	-0.137 (-0.170, -0.108)	-0.137 (-0.172, -0.107)
Σ_{22}	0.134 (0.111, 0.162)	0.113 (0.094, 0.138)	0.075 (0.059, 0.095)	0.080 (0.063, 0.101)	0.078 (0.061, 0.098)	0.078 (0.061, 0.097)	0.077 (0.061, 0.098)	0.076 (0.060, 0.097)	0.077 (0.061, 0.097)	0.077 (0.061, 0.098)
σ^2	1.260 (1.238, 1.283)	0.969 (0.972, 1.048)	0.894 (0.931, 1.008)	0.894 (0.866, 0.925)	0.894 (0.865, 0.925)	0.894 (0.866, 0.925)	0.895 (0.866, 0.926)	0.897 (0.868, 0.925)	0.895 (0.866, 0.926)	0.897 (0.866, 0.928)
γ	—	8.685 (7.708, 9.802)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ϕ	—	—	3.150 (2.504, 4.132)	2.764 (2.280, 3.419)	2.760 (2.273, 3.407)	2.742 (2.263, 3.382)	2.751 (2.283, 3.417)	2.727 (2.244, 3.364)	2.726 (2.261, 3.370)	2.727 (2.256, 3.392)
δ	—	—	7.789 (6.908, 8.804)	6.847 (6.296, 7.561)	—	—	—	—	—	—
δ_0	—	—	—	—	5.532 (4.722, 6.600)	5.071 (4.167, 6.250)	4.671 (3.782, 5.911)	4.894 (3.874, 6.338)	4.554 (3.553, 6.016)	4.355 (3.347, 5.833)
β_1	—	—	—	—	0.609 (0.272, 0.957)	0.277 (0.041, 0.513)	0.212 (-0.056, 0.489)	0.501 (0.182, 0.833)	0.336 (-0.032, 0.695)	0.261 (-0.122, 0.652)
β_2	—	—	—	—	0.089 (-0.346, 0.529)	0.704 (0.333, 1.097)	0.589 (0.258, 0.921)	0.044 (-0.348, 0.435)	0.546 (0.106, 0.984)	0.694 (0.234, 1.178)
β_3	—	—	—	—	-0.865 (-1.363, -0.328)	0.281 (-0.249, 0.830)	0.432 (0.006, 0.858)	0.781 (0.447, 1.115)	0.129 (-0.263, 0.513)	0.233 (-0.181, 0.667)
β_4	—	—	—	—	—	-0.991 (-1.548, -0.379)	0.468 (-0.165, 1.074)	0.165 (-0.288, 0.619)	0.983 (0.600, 1.396)	0.542 (0.086, 0.984)
β_5	—	—	—	—	—	—	-0.812 (-1.407, -0.162)	0.198 (-0.483, 0.879)	-0.049 (-0.548, 0.459)	0.939 (0.526, 1.340)
β_6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-0.526 (-1.156, 0.204)	0.399 (-0.317, 1.132)	-0.004 (-0.516, 0.499)
β_7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-0.358 (-1.052, 0.442)	0.524 (-0.230, 1.263)
β_8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-0.411 (-1.138, 0.390)
λ	0.261 (0.079, 0.868)	0.314 (0.095, 1.030)	0.415 (0.140, 1.312)	0.482 (0.164, 1.505)	0.467 (0.160, 1.508)	0.479 (0.166, 1.524)	0.476 (0.159, 1.499)	0.484 (0.163, 1.565)	0.480 (0.159, 1.536)	0.476 (0.153, 1.512)
ν	1.278 (1.195, 1.363)	1.277 (1.194, 1.361)	1.272 (1.187, 1.356)	1.272 (1.191, 1.357)	1.273 (1.192, 1.358)	1.273 (1.191, 1.357)	1.273 (1.191, 1.357)	1.272 (1.191, 1.356)	1.273 (1.190, 1.358)	1.273 (1.192, 1.356)
ω	0.268 (0.203, 0.334)	0.269 (0.203, 0.336)	0.273 (0.209, 0.339)	0.274 (0.209, 0.339)	0.273 (0.209, 0.340)	0.273 (0.210, 0.340)	0.273 (0.209, 0.339)	0.273 (0.209, 0.339)	0.273 (0.208, 0.341)	0.273 (0.208, 0.340)
η	-0.113 (-0.219, -0.009)	-0.129 (-0.234, -0.024)	-0.154 (-0.257, -0.059)	-0.168 (-0.270, -0.073)	-0.165 (-0.269, -0.071)	-0.167 (-0.270, -0.073)	-0.166 (-0.268, -0.070)	-0.168 (-0.273, -0.073)	-0.167 (-0.271, -0.070)	-0.166 (-0.270, -0.068)

TABLE 3 Posterior summaries of the joint model parameters fitted to the PBC dataset. Values in the upper rows for each parameter are the 50% percentiles, whereas the brackets in the lower rows are the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles, respectively.

	nor-nor	mod1	nor-t-mod2	nor-t-mod3	nor-t-iv-1knot	nor-t-iv-2knots	nor-t-iv-3knots	nor-t-iv-4knots	nor-t-iv-5knots
α_1	7.851 (7.259, 7.907)	7.468 (7.159, 7.779)	7.479 (7.161, 7.792)	7.515 (7.205, 7.840)	7.521 (7.191, 7.848)	7.517 (7.194, 7.832)	7.521 (7.206, 7.856)	7.526 (7.210, 7.863)	7.529 (7.197, 7.842)
α_2	-0.008 (-0.014, -0.001)	-0.007 (-0.013, -0.001)	-0.006 (-0.012, 0.001)	-0.007 (-0.013, -0.001)	-0.007 (-0.014, -0.003)	-0.007 (-0.013, -0.001)	-0.007 (-0.014, -0.001)	-0.007 (-0.014, -0.001)	-0.007 (-0.013, -0.001)
α_3	-0.046 (-0.058, -0.034)	-0.041 (-0.051, -0.030)	-0.040 (-0.052, -0.028)	-0.035 (-0.046, -0.024)	-0.035 (-0.046, -0.024)	-0.035 (-0.046, -0.023)	-0.035 (-0.046, -0.024)	-0.035 (-0.046, -0.023)	-0.035 (-0.046, -0.023)
α_4	-0.066 (-0.185, 0.054)	-0.020 (-0.133, 0.095)	-0.059 (-0.184, 0.062)	-0.072 (-0.199, 0.051)	-0.073 (-0.200, 0.049)	-0.071 (-0.193, 0.054)	-0.072 (-0.198, 0.050)	-0.070 (-0.192, 0.051)	-0.073 (-0.192, 0.046)
Σ_{11}	0.339 (0.286, 0.406)	0.230 (0.186, 0.284)	0.320 (0.268, 0.384)	0.349 (0.295, 0.414)	0.357 (0.301, 0.425)	0.359 (0.304, 0.426)	0.360 (0.303, 0.428)	0.359 (0.303, 0.428)	0.358 (0.302, 0.427)
Σ_{12}	-0.018 (-0.026, -0.011)	-0.009 (-0.015, -0.004)	-0.012 (-0.019, -0.005)	-0.015 (-0.022, -0.009)	-0.016 (-0.023, -0.009)	-0.016 (-0.023, -0.009)	-0.016 (-0.024, -0.010)	-0.016 (-0.023, -0.010)	-0.016 (-0.024, -0.010)
Σ_{22}	0.004 (0.003, 0.005)	0.003 (0.002, 0.004)	0.004 (0.003, 0.006)	0.005 (0.004, 0.006)	0.005 (0.004, 0.006)	0.005 (0.004, 0.006)	0.005 (0.004, 0.006)	0.005 (0.004, 0.006)	0.005 (0.004, 0.006)
σ^2	0.107 (0.099, 0.115)	0.047 (0.040, 0.054)	0.040 (0.034, 0.047)	0.021 (0.018, 0.025)	0.023 (0.020, 0.027)	0.024 (0.021, 0.028)	0.024 (0.021, 0.028)	0.024 (0.021, 0.029)	0.024 (0.021, 0.029)
γ	— (2.810, 4.394)	— (2.810, 4.394)	— (2.759, 3.451)	— (2.091, 2.432)	— (1.449, 1.704)	— (0.994, 1.410)	— (0.940, 1.361)	— (0.931, 1.360)	— (0.935, 1.367)
δ	— (2.207, 3.451)	— (2.207, 3.451)	— (2.207, 3.451)	— (1.824, 2.432)	— (1.449, 1.704)	— (0.994, 1.410)	— (0.940, 1.361)	— (0.931, 1.360)	— (0.935, 1.367)
δ_0	— (2.207, 3.451)	— (2.207, 3.451)	— (2.207, 3.451)	— (1.824, 2.432)	— (1.449, 1.704)	— (0.994, 1.410)	— (0.940, 1.361)	— (0.931, 1.360)	— (0.935, 1.367)
β_1	— (0.064, 0.373)	— (0.068, 0.372)	— (0.076, 0.380)	— (0.069, 0.366)	— (0.065, 0.367)	— (0.062, 0.367)	— (0.065, 0.364)	— (0.062, 0.362)	— (0.066, 0.363)
β_2	— (0.033, 0.070)	— (0.035, 0.070)	— (0.036, 0.072)	— (0.035, 0.071)	— (0.035, 0.072)	— (0.036, 0.072)	— (0.035, 0.071)	— (0.036, 0.071)	— (0.035, 0.072)
β_3	— (-0.157, -0.121)	— (-0.121, -0.144)	— (-0.144, -0.137)	— (-0.137, -0.137)	— (-0.137, -0.137)	— (-0.136, -0.136)	— (-0.136, -0.136)	— (-0.133, -0.133)	— (-0.139, -0.139)
β_4	— (-0.519, 0.206)	— (-0.460, 0.229)	— (-0.508, 0.212)	— (-0.488, 0.217)	— (-0.492, 0.220)	— (-0.498, 0.228)	— (-0.494, 0.215)	— (-0.483, 0.217)	— (-0.490, 0.215)
β_5	— (0.391, 1.216)	— (0.423, 1.193)	— (0.511, 1.293)	— (0.502, 1.244)	— (0.491, 1.253)	— (0.497, 1.255)	— (0.487, 1.245)	— (0.482, 1.250)	— (0.488, 1.248)
β_6	— (-11.276, -14.850)	— (-11.427, -14.814)	— (-12.129, -15.584)	— (-11.952, -15.215)	— (-11.901, -15.300)	— (-11.911, -15.256)	— (-11.861, -15.178)	— (-11.854, -15.200)	— (-11.872, -15.242)
$\log(\lambda)$	— (-11.276, -14.850)	— (-11.427, -14.814)	— (-12.129, -15.584)	— (-11.952, -15.215)	— (-11.901, -15.300)	— (-11.911, -15.256)	— (-11.861, -15.178)	— (-11.854, -15.200)	— (-11.872, -15.242)
$\log(\nu)$	— (0.064, 0.373)	— (0.068, 0.372)	— (0.076, 0.380)	— (0.069, 0.366)	— (0.065, 0.367)	— (0.062, 0.367)	— (0.065, 0.364)	— (0.062, 0.362)	— (0.066, 0.363)
ω_1	— (0.033, 0.070)	— (0.035, 0.070)	— (0.036, 0.072)	— (0.035, 0.071)	— (0.035, 0.072)	— (0.036, 0.072)	— (0.035, 0.071)	— (0.036, 0.071)	— (0.035, 0.072)
ω_2	— (-0.157, -0.121)	— (-0.121, -0.144)	— (-0.144, -0.137)	— (-0.137, -0.137)	— (-0.137, -0.137)	— (-0.136, -0.136)	— (-0.136, -0.136)	— (-0.133, -0.133)	— (-0.139, -0.139)
η	— (0.391, 1.216)	— (0.423, 1.193)	— (0.511, 1.293)	— (0.502, 1.244)	— (0.491, 1.253)	— (0.497, 1.255)	— (0.487, 1.245)	— (0.482, 1.250)	— (0.488, 1.248)