

A Transformation Perspective on Marginal and Conditional Models

Luisa Barbanti
Universität Zürich

Torsten Hothorn
Universität Zürich

Abstract

Clustered observations are ubiquitous in controlled and observational studies and arise naturally in multicenter trials or longitudinal surveys. We present a novel model for the analysis of clustered observations where the marginal distributions are described by a linear transformation model and the correlations by a joint multivariate normal distribution. The joint model provides an analytic formula for the marginal distribution. Owing to the richness of transformation models, the techniques are applicable to any type of response variable, including bounded, skewed, binary, ordinal, or survival responses. We discuss the analysis of two clinical trials aiming at the estimation of marginal treatment effects. In the first trial, pain was repeatedly assessed on a bounded visual analog scale and marginal proportional-odds models are presented. The second trial reported disease-free survival in rectal cancer patients, where the marginal hazard ratio from Weibull and Cox models is of special interest. An implementation is available in the **tram** add-on package to the R system and was benchmarked against established models in the literature.

Keywords: conditional mixed models, marginal models, marginal predictive distributions, survival analysis, categorical data analysis.

1. Introduction

In the context of the analysis of dependent data or clustered observations, many statistical models for fitting conditional and marginal models have been studied. Generalised mixed-models (GLMMs, [Stroup 2012](#)) are typically fit via maximum-likelihood and allow for conditional inference only. On the other hand, marginal covariate associations can be estimated by solving generalised estimating equations (GEEs, [Zeger *et al.* 1986, 1988](#)). Later, marginalised multilevel models ([Heagerty 1999](#); [Heagerty and Zeger 2000](#)) were introduced providing a likelihood-based approach to estimate marginal coefficients in the framework of a conditional model. [Gory *et al.* \(2021\)](#) contribute a model definition allowing parameters estimated in a conditional model to be interpreted in a marginal fashion, and [McGee and Stringer \(2022\)](#) discuss marginal additive models for potentially non-linear population-averaged associations, starting from a generalised additive mixed-model framework.

Marginal predictive distributions with interpretable parameters are easy to derive from normal linear mixed-effects models and binary probit generalised linear mixed-effects models as well as from some frailty models using a copula representation ([Goethals *et al.* 2008](#)). Regression coefficients in other generalised linear mixed-effects or frailty models for non-normal responses (binary logistic, Poisson, or Cox normal frailty models, for example) only have a conditional

interpretation, that is, given unobservable random effects. It is possible to obtain the marginal distribution by integrating out the random effects, however, the simple interpretability of the fixed-effects regression coefficients is then lost. In contrast, marginal models allowing a marginal interpretation of effects cannot be defined in an unambiguous way without the specification of a joint distribution and we refer to [Lee and Nelder \(2004\)](#) and [Muff *et al.* \(2016\)](#) for a broader discussion of these issues.

Herein, we address the problem of formulating and estimating linear transformation models in the presence of cluster-correlated observations arising, for example, in multicenter trials or when a subject is repeatedly examined over time. In contrast to many methods in the mixed-effects and frailty literature primarily aiming at explanation, that is, inference for regression coefficients conditional on random effects in the presence of correlated observations, the focus of this paper is on inference for marginal distributions.

Transformation models for correlated observations have been studied mostly in the survival analysis context. Parameter estimation is typically performed by non-parametric maximum likelihood estimation ([Cai *et al.* 2000](#); [Zeng *et al.* 2017](#)) where the transformation function is only allowed to jump at distinct observed event times and is conceptually understood as a infinite-dimensional nuisance parameter. [Lin *et al.* \(2017\)](#) even go a step further and propose a maximum rank correlation estimator for estimating the regression coefficients along with the mean of random effects while refraining from specifying neither the transformation function nor a distribution for the random effects. While this model is extremely general, interpretation of the parameters is unclear and predictive distributions cannot be derived. Transformation models estimated in a fully parametric way ([Manuguerra and Heller 2010](#); [McLain and Ghosh 2013](#); [Hothorn *et al.* 2014, 2018](#); [Garcia *et al.* 2019](#); [Klein *et al.* 2022](#); [Tang *et al.* 2018](#); [Sun and Ding 2021](#)) are practically as flexible as semiparametrically estimated models yet technically much easier to handle and we therefore follow this approach by choosing low-dimensional problem-specific parameterisations of the transformation function.

The results presented herein allow the formulation and estimation of models for the joint multivariate distribution of clustered non-normally distributed responses. The marginal distributions obtained from the joint distribution of observations in the same cluster feature directly interpretable marginal effects. Analytic formulae of the log-likelihood and the corresponding score function for absolute continuous and potentially non-normal responses observed without censoring are available. For censored and discrete observations, evaluation of the likelihood requires evaluation of multivariate normal probabilities, however, in low dimensions such that the approximation error can be made arbitrarily small in reasonable time. Applications from two different domains presented in [Section 3](#) highlight that the methodology helps to unify models and inference procedures for clustered observations across traditionally compartmentalised sub-disciplines of statistics.

2. Methods

Linear transformation models for the conditional distribution function

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = F\left(h(y) - \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \quad (1)$$

of some univariate and at least ordered response $Y \in \Xi$ given a configuration \mathbf{x} of explanatory variables \mathbf{X} are defined by three objects: An “inverse link function” F , a linear predictor

$F^{-1}(z)$	$F(z)$	Interpretation of $\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$
probit	$\Phi_{0,1}(z)$ Standard normal	conditional mean $\mathbb{E}(h(y) \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$
logit	$\text{logit}^{-1}(z) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-z)}$ Standard logistic	log-odds ratio $\frac{F(h(y) \mathbf{x})}{1-F(h(y) \mathbf{x})} = \exp(-\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \frac{F(h(y))}{1-F(h(y))}$
cloglog	$\text{cloglog}^{-1}(z) = 1 - \exp(-\exp(z))$ Gompertz/Min. Extreme Value	log-hazard ratio $1 - F(h(y) \mathbf{x}) = (1 - F(h(y)))^{\exp(-\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})}$
loglog	$\text{loglog}^{-1}(z) = \exp(-\exp(-z))$ Gumbel/Max. Extreme Value	log-reverse time hazard ratio $F(h(y) \mathbf{x}) = F(h(y))^{\exp(-\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})}$

Table 1: Interpretation of the linear predictor $\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ under different inverse link functions F . In practice, many models are known with respect to the link function F^{-1} , which we report accordingly. We denote the baseline ($\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} = 0$) cumulative distribution function by $F(h(y))$ and the conditional cumulative distribution function by $F(h(y) | \mathbf{x})$.

$\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ with regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ *excluding* an intercept, and a monotone non-decreasing transformation, or “intercept”, function h . Only $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and h are unknowns to be estimated from data whereas F defines the scale linearity of the effects is assumed upon. This model class covers many prominent regression models, such as normal, log-normal, Weibull, or Cox models for absolute continuous responses, binary models with different link functions, proportional odds and hazards cumulative models for ordered responses, and many less well-known or even novel models (Hothorn *et al.* 2018). A summary of the possible inverse link functions F and of the corresponding interpretation of the linear predictor $\mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ is given in Table 1. This flexible modelling framework allows the formulation of probabilistic index models (Thas *et al.* 2012), *i.e.* models allowing for an interpretation of the effect size in terms the probability that a randomly selected subject has an outcome greater than the one of another randomly selected subject, given that the covariate values for both subjects are known (for instance, whether a subject received treatment or not). We illustrate the usefulness of this quantity in Sections 3.1 and 3.2.

For clustered or longitudinal data, we observe multiple values of the response Y for each observation unit (clusters or subjects). In what follows, we present a novel transformation model for the joint distribution that provides simple analytic expressions for marginal predictive distributions of the form (1). In this setup, $i = 1, \dots, N$ independent observational units, each consisting of N_i correlated observations of the response $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iN_i})^\top \in \Xi^{N_i}$, are available for estimating the joint distribution. While refraining to specify a certain parametric joint multivariate distribution for \mathbf{Y}_i , we assume that probabilities on the scale of a suitable *transformation* of \mathbf{Y}_i can be evaluated using a multivariate normal distribution whose structured covariance matrix captures the correlations between the transformed elements of \mathbf{Y}_i . The aim of this paper is to simultaneously estimate the transformation, regression coefficients, and the structured covariance from data using models which emphasise predictive distributions and parameter interpretability.

The non-decreasing transformation function $h : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is applied element-wise to the response vector $h_{N_i}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = (h(Y_{i1}), \dots, h(Y_{iN_i}))^\top$. Together with \mathbf{Y}_i , one observes a corresponding fixed effects design matrix $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{x}_{i1} | \dots | \mathbf{x}_{iN_i})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times Q}$ of full rank and a random effects

design matrix $\mathbf{U}_i = (\mathbf{u}_{i1} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{u}_{iN_i})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times R}$. We propose to study models for the joint distribution function of \mathbf{Y}_i given \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{U}_i of the form

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i \leq \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{U}_i) = \Phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \Sigma_i(\gamma)} \left(\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1} (F_{N_i} \{ \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} [h_{N_i}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \}) \right). \quad (2)$$

Here, $\Phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \Sigma_i(\gamma)}(\cdot)$ is the distribution function of an N_i -dimensional normal with mean vector zero and structured covariance matrix

$$\Sigma_i(\gamma) := \mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma)^\top \mathbf{U}_i^\top + \mathbf{I}_{N_i}$$

as defined by the random effects design matrix and a Cholesky factor $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R}$ depending on variance parameters $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{R(R+1)/2}$; \mathbf{I}_{N_i} denotes the $N_i \times N_i$ identity matrix. We isolate the square roots of the diagonal elements of $\Sigma_i(\gamma)$ in the matrix $\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma) = \text{diag}(\Sigma_i(\gamma))^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma)^\top \mathbf{U}_i^\top + \mathbf{I}_{N_i})^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i}$. A positive-semidefinite covariance matrix $\Sigma_i(\gamma)$ is given under the constraint $(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma))) \geq \mathbf{0}_R$. The key component is the shifted transformation $h_{N_i}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}$ modelling the impact of the fixed effects on the transformed scale.

The transformation function h , the regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and the variance parameters γ are unknowns to be estimated from data. In (2), $\Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(\mathbf{p}) = (\Phi^{-1}(p_1), \dots, \Phi^{-1}(p_{N_i}))^\top$ applies the quantile function Φ^{-1} of the standard normal element-wise to some vector of probabilities $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{N_i})^\top \in (0, 1)^{N_i}$. Furthermore, $F: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an a priori defined cumulative distribution function of some absolute continuous distribution with log-concave density f ; F_{N_i} and f_{N_i} are the element-wise applications of F and f , respectively.

For absolute continuous responses $\mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i}$, model (2) implies that the latent variable

$$\mathbf{Z}_i := \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1} (F_{N_i} \{ \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} [h_{N_i}(\mathbf{Y}_i) - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i} \quad (3)$$

defined as an element-wise transformation of the observations \mathbf{Y}_i follows a multivariate normal distribution $\mathbf{Z}_i \sim N_{N_i}(\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \Sigma_i(\gamma))$. The key aspect of an implementation of model (2) is the parameterisation of the transformation function as $h_{N_i}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}) \boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ where $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{a}(y_1) \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{a}(y_{N_i}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times P}$ is the matrix of evaluated basis functions $\mathbf{a}: \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$. Choices of basis functions \mathbf{a} are problem-specific and several options are discussed in Section 3 and, in more detail, in Hothorn *et al.* (2018) and Hothorn (2020).

2.1. Connection to Normal Linear Mixed-effects Models

We first consider the special case $F = \Phi$, where the transformation of \mathbf{Y}_i simplifies to $\mathbf{Z}_i = h_{N_i}(\mathbf{Y}_i) - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Model (2) contains the normal linear mixed-effects model as a special case. In its standard notation, the normal linear mixed-effects model reads

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \alpha + \mathbf{X}_i \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{R}_i + \sigma \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \quad (4)$$

with random effects $\mathbf{R}_i \sim N_R(\mathbf{0}_R, \mathbf{G}(\gamma))$, residuals $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \sim N_{N_i}(\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \mathbf{I}_{N_i})$ under the assumption $\mathbf{R}_i \perp \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$, intercept $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and residual standard deviation $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+$. This model can be reformulated as a model for the joint multivariate distribution

$$\mathbf{Z}_i = \frac{\mathbf{Y}_i - \alpha - \mathbf{X}_i \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\sigma} = \mathbf{U}_i \sigma^{-1} \mathbf{R}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \sim N_{N_i} \left(\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma)^\top \mathbf{U}_i^\top + \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \right) \quad (5)$$

based on the relative covariance factorisation $\sigma^{-2} \mathbf{G}(\gamma) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\gamma)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R}$. This is model (2) with $F = \Phi$, linear transformation $h_{N_i}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = (\sigma^{-1}(Y_{i1} - \alpha), \dots, \sigma^{-1}(Y_{iN_i} - \alpha))^\top =$

$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ with linear basis functions $\mathbf{a}(y) = (y, -1)^\top$ and parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta} = (\sigma^{-1}, \alpha\sigma^{-1})^\top$, and finally fixed effects $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \sigma^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

Using this notation, the conditional distribution function of some element $y \in \Xi$ of \mathbf{Y} , conditional on \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{u} , and unobservable random effects $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}$, is

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{r}) = \Phi\left(\mathbf{a}(y)^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} - \sigma^{-1} \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{r}\right).$$

The marginal distribution of some element $y \in \Xi$ of \mathbf{Y} , which is still conditional on \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} but integrates over the random effects \mathbf{R} , can be obtained from the joint multivariate normal (5) as

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \Phi\left(\frac{\mathbf{a}(y)^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}}\right).$$

The shrunken marginal fixed effects $\boldsymbol{\beta}/\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}$ were also described by [Wu and Wang \(2019\)](#) in a Bayesian implementation of this model. Understanding the normal linear mixed-effects model as special case of a transformation model allows to relax the normality assumption for \mathbf{Y}_i by introducing non-linear transformation functions $h(y) = \mathbf{a}(y)^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ defined by a non-linear basis \mathbf{a} ([Hothorn et al. 2018](#)). Section 2 in the Online Appendix ([Barbanti and Hothorn 2022](#)) contains a comparison of the two models.

2.2. Distinction from Generalised Mixed-effects and Frailty Models

Two important extensions of the normal linear mixed-effects model include generalised linear mixed-effects models and frailty models. For binary responses $Y \in \Xi = \{0, 1\}$, the logistic linear mixed-effects model has the conditional, given the random effects \mathbf{r} , interpretation

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 0 \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{r}) = \text{logit}^{-1}\left(\alpha + \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{r}\right).$$

In survival analysis with $Y \in \Xi = \mathbb{R}^+$, a Weibull normal frailty model leads to the conditional interpretation

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{r}) = \text{cloglog}^{-1}\left(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \log(y) + \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{r}\right).$$

Neither model can be understood in terms of model (2) and two main difficulties are associated with these types of models assuming additivity of the fixed and random effects on the log-odds ratio or log-hazard ratio scales. First, unlike in the normal linear mixed-effects model (4), there is no analytic expression for the marginal distribution and thus a marginal interpretation of the fixed effects $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is difficult. Second, evaluation of the likelihood typically relies on a Laplace approximation of the integral with respect to the random effects' distribution and problems with this approximation have been reported, for example by [Ogden \(2015\)](#). The novel multivariate transformation model for clustered observations based on (2) addresses both of these issues as shall be explained in the next subsections.

2.3. Transformation Models with Marginal Interpretation

Simple analytic expressions for the marginal distribution are available (also for $F \neq \Phi$), independent of the choice of the basis function \mathbf{a} , noting that the variance of the j th element of \mathbf{Z}_i (Equation 3) is $\mathbf{u}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u}_{ij} + 1$.

The Gaussian copula distribution of Equation 2 directly implies the marginal distribution function in form of a marginal transformation model (mtram):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) &= \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1} \Phi^{-1} \left(F \left(\frac{\mathbf{a}(y)^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}} \right) \right)}{\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}} \right) \\ &= F \left(\frac{\mathbf{a}(y)^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{mtram})$$

In this model, the fixed effects $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ divided by $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}$ are directly interpretable given $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u}$, for example as log-odds ratios ($F = \text{logit}^{-1}$) or log-hazard ratios ($F = \text{cloglog}^{-1}$). Because $\mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top$ is positive semidefinite, there might be a reduction in effect size when comparing the fixed effects $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ from formula (2) to the marginal effects $\boldsymbol{\beta} / \sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{u} + 1}$ from model (mtram). For random intercept-only models with $\mathbf{u} = 1$ we get a constant reduction by $1/\sqrt{\gamma_1^2 + 1}$. In longitudinal models with correlated random intercepts and random slopes, the marginal effect at time t is $\boldsymbol{\beta} / \sqrt{\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 t + (\gamma_2^2 + \gamma_3^2) t^2 + 1}$ because $\mathbf{u} = (1, t)^\top$. For positively correlated random intercepts and random slopes (*i.e.* $\gamma_2 > 0$), the marginal effect always decreases over time.

2.4. The Likelihood Function

For parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, the log-likelihood contribution $\ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ of the i th subject or cluster is based on the transformation

$$\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y} \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y})\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\}) \quad (6)$$

of some $\mathbf{y} \in \Xi^{N_i}$.

For discrete or interval-censored observations $(\mathbf{y}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^{N_i}$ the log-likelihood contribution is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \log \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{y}_i \leq \mathbf{Y}_i < \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i) = \log \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \leq \mathbf{Z}_i < \mathbf{z}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})) \\ &= \log \left\{ \Phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})} \left[\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}), \mathbf{z}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}(\underline{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) = \int_{\underline{\mathbf{z}}}^{\bar{\mathbf{z}}} \phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}$$

is the integral over the N_i -dimensional multivariate normal density ϕ_{N_i} with mean zero and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$. The structure of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ can be exploited to dramatically reduce the dimensionality of the integration problem. Applying the procedure by Marsaglia (1963), one can reduce this N_i -dimensional integral to an R -dimensional integral over the unit cube (see Appendix A).

For continuous observations $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i}$, it is common practice to approximate this log-likelihood by a log-density evaluated at the observations \mathbf{y}_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &\approx -\frac{1}{2} \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| + \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \\ &\quad \log_{N_i}(f_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i} + \\ &\quad \log_{N_i}(\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the Cholesky factorisation $\mathbf{L}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\mathbf{L}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ is utilised. It should be noted that the exact log-likelihood function (7) does not require the precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}$ to be computed. In the above approximation, \log_{N_i} is the element-wise natural logarithm and f_{N_i} the element-wise density of F . $\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i)$ denotes the matrix of evaluated derivatives \mathbf{a}' of the basis function \mathbf{a} . The log-likelihood of Equation 8 is derived in Appendix B.

Using either log-likelihood, we obtain simultaneous maximum-likelihood estimates for all model parameters from

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_N, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_N, \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_N) = \arg \max_{(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \in \mathbb{R}^{P+Q+M}} \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}).$$

Some models require additional constraints on $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ to be implemented (Hothorn *et al.* 2018). Analytic score functions for all model parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ are available (see Appendix B). Score functions for the discrete or censored likelihood (7) and the observed Fisher information matrices for both likelihoods are obtained numerically. The full parameterisation of h allows application of standard results for likelihood asymptotics (van der Vaart 1998) to independent observations (Hothorn *et al.* 2018). Because the model (2) is a special case of the multivariate transformation model of (Klein *et al.* 2022) where the transformation function h and the fixed effects $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are constrained to be the same for all ‘‘coordinates’’ of the random vector \mathbf{Y}_i (that is, observations in the same cluster), model (2) benefits from the same asymptotic results reported by Klein *et al.* (2022).

3. Applications

In this Section, we discuss two potential applications of marginally interpretable transformation models. Data, numerical details, and code reproducing the results available from the Online Appendix (Barbanti and Hothorn 2022). This document contains additional applications from different domains and a number of head-to-head comparisons for situations where the models discussed here can be estimated by already existing software implementations for the purpose of validating the implementation of model (mtram) in the add-on package **tram** (Hothorn and Barbanti 2022) to the R system for statistical computing.

3.1. Models for Bounded Responses

Chow *et al.* (2006) report on a randomised two-arm clinical trial comparing a novel neck pain treatment to placebo. Neck pain levels of 90 subjects were assessed at baseline, after 7, and

after 12 weeks (complete trajectories are available for 84 subjects) on a visual analog scale. Manuguerra and Heller (2010) proposed a mixed-effects model for such a bounded response. The fixed effects are interpretable as log-odds ratios, conditional on random effects. The data are presented in the top panel of Figure 1. A transformation model (`mtram`) with $F = \text{logit}^{-1}$ featuring a transformation function $h(y) = \mathbf{a}(y)^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}$ defined by a polynomial in Bernstein form of order six on the unit interval, and correlated random intercept and random slope terms ($\mathbf{u} = (1, t)$ for times $t = 0, 7, 12$ weeks) is visualised by means of the corresponding marginal distribution functions in the bottom panel of Figure 1. Similar to the results reported earlier (Manuguerra and Heller 2010), the model highlights more severe pain in the active treatment group at baseline. A positive treatment effect can be inferred after 7 weeks which seemed to level-off when subjects were examined after 12 weeks. It is important to note that these results have a marginal interpretation and that the model does not assume a specific distribution of the response, such as a Beta distribution for example.

From the marginally interpretable transformation models, relevant quantities, like the probabilistic index, can be derived. This is explained in more detail in the Online Appendix (Barbanti and Hothorn 2022). In this application, the marginal probabilistic index is the probability that, for a randomly selected patient in the treatment group, the neck pain score at time t is higher than the score for a subject in the placebo group randomly selected at the same time point. We obtain a probability of 0.72 (95% confidence interval [0.58; 0.83]) at baseline, 0.29 (95% confidence interval [0.17; 0.43]) after 7 weeks and 0.38 (95% confidence interval [0.24; 0.54]) after 12 weeks.

3.2. Marginally Interpretable Weibull Models

The CAO/ARO/AIO-04 randomised clinical trial (Rödel *et al.* 2015) compared Oxaliplatin added to fluorouracil-based preoperative chemoradiotherapy and postoperative chemotherapy for rectal cancer patients to the same therapy using fluorouracil only. Patients were randomised in the two treatment arms by block randomisation taking the study center, the lymph node involvement (negative vs. positive), and tumour grading (T1-3 vs. T4) into account. The primary endpoint was disease-free survival, defined as the time between randomisation and non-radical surgery of the primary tumour (R2 resection), locoregional recurrence after R0/1 resection, metastatic disease or progression, or death from any cause, whichever occurred first. The observed responses are a mix of exact dates (time to death or incomplete removal of the primary tumour), right-censoring (end of follow-up or drop-out), and interval-censoring (local or distant metastases). The conditional hazard ratio 0.79 (0.64, 0.98) was reported as obtained from a Cox mixed-effects model with normal random intercepts and without stratification fitted to right-censored survival times (Rödel *et al.* 2015). This means that a rectal cancer patient treated with the novel combination therapy benefits from a 21% risk reduction compared to a patient *from the same block* treated with fluorouracil only.

We were interested in estimating a marginally interpretable treatment (acknowledging the fact that patients enrolled into the trial were *not* a random sample from all rectal cancer patients) based on a marginally interpretable stratified (with respect to lymph node involvement and tumour grading) Weibull model for clustered observations (blocks) in the presence of interval-censored survival times. This model can be formulated by (`mtram`) choosing $F = \text{cloglog}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{a}(y) = (1, \log(y))^\top$, $\mathbf{u} = 1$ being the block indicator, and variance parameter γ_1 (corresponding to the correlation structure of a random intercept only model) as well as a treatment




Figure 1: Neck pain. Pain trajectories of 90 subjects under active treatment or placebo evaluated at baseline, after 7 and 12 weeks (top) and marginal distribution functions of neck pain at the three different time points (bottom). These results were obtained from model (`mtram`) using $F = \text{logit}^{-1}$ and a Bernstein polynomial $h(y)$ on the unit interval.

parameter β (comparing the novum to fluorouracil only). Stratification was implemented by strata-specific parameters ϑ for each of the four strata. It should be noted that this model is not equivalent to a classical Weibull normal frailty model.

A confidence interval for the marginal hazard ratio $\exp(\beta/\sqrt{\hat{\gamma}_1^2 + 1})$ was computed by simulating from the joint normal distribution of $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma}_1)$. With a relatively small $\hat{\gamma}_1 = 0.15$ (with standard error 0.13), this resulted in a marginal hazard ratio of 0.80 (95% confidence interval [0.65; 0.98]), meaning that rectal cancer patients treated with the combination therapy benefit from a 20% risk reduction *on average*.

By relaxing the Weibull assumption (log-linear transformation h) to a Cox proportional

hazards model (nonlinear transformation h), we obtain a hazard ratio of 0.78 (95% confidence interval [0.64; 0.96]) and a marginal probabilistic index of 0.56 (95% confidence interval [0.51; 0.61]), meaning that over all study centers, a randomly selected patient receiving Oxaliplatin has a 56% probability of staying disease-free longer than a randomly selected patient receiving the standard treatment only, given that they both have the same lymph node involvement and tumor grading.

3.3. Simulation Studies

Linear transformation models (1) have been extended to conditional mixed-effects transformation models by including normal random effects (Támási *et al.* 2022) to allow the estimation of flexible regression models with correlated outcomes. In this class of models, the conditional distribution of the response given the fixed and random effects is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_Y(Y \leq y \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{r}) = F(h(y) - \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{r}) \quad (\text{tramME})$$

where $\mathbf{r} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. Similarly to GLMMs, marginal effects cannot be read off directly from the output of a mixed-effects transformation model. Moreover, the maximum-likelihood estimation of the model parameters relies on the Laplace approximation of the log-likelihood.

We compare the performance of mixed-effects models ([tramME](#)) and marginally interpretable linear transformation models ([mtram](#)) in cases where the model fitted is misspecified with respect to the data generating process. We report results obtained when simulating a continuous response in three scenarios; details and code for the data generating process are outlined in the Online Appendix ([Barbanti and Hothorn 2022](#)).

First, we simulate from a transformation model with inverse link function $F = \Phi$. In this setting, the conditional and the marginally interpretable linear transformation model coincide, so we expect coefficients from model ([tramME](#)) and those from the model ([mtram](#)) to coincide. This is shown in Figure 2. Then, we simulate from a conditional transformation model with inverse link function $F = \text{logit}^{-1}$. In this setting, model ([tramME](#)) should outperform model ([mtram](#)). Lastly, we simulate from a marginally interpretable transformation model with inverse link function $F = \text{logit}^{-1}$. In this setting, model ([mtram](#)) should outperform the model ([tramME](#)). In Figure 3 we observe that the estimate of variance obtained from model ([tramME](#)) suffers from a slight bias. This known and documented effect is due to the estimation of the parameters in a maximum-likelihood framework. However, we clearly see that when the fitted model does not reflect the data generating process on a theoretical level, the marginal effects are still recovered correctly, but the variance is visibly over- or underestimated. This is also the case for Figure 4. Similar effects are obtained in all three scenarios when simulating interval-censored data (Online Appendix, [Barbanti and Hothorn 2022](#)).

4. Discussion

There is a difference between a marginal and a marginally interpretable model. A marginal model, for example defined by generalised estimation equations (Zeger *et al.* 1988), does not specify the joint distribution. A marginally interpretable model is a model for the joint or conditional (given random effects) distribution from which one can infer the marginal distribution (Lee and Nelder 2004). The models proposed here follow the latter approach with




Figure 2: Simulated continuous data from a transformation model with $F = \Phi$. The models (`mtram`) and (`tramME`) coincide and the resulting estimates from two distinct implementations are found identical. The red dashed lines indicate the true values of the model parameters.

the important distinctive feature that very simple expressions for the marginal distribution function are available. Thus, there is no need to apply numerical integration to the joint or conditional model formulation. In our view, model (`mtram`) is especially attractive because it allows the interpretation of scaled regression coefficients as marginal effects acting on the marginal predictive distribution in terms of a log-odds ratio or a log-hazard ratio, for example. The Gaussian copula approach for obtaining marginally interpretable models has gained some interest in the last years (Zhang *et al.* 2021; Masarotto and Varin 2012), however, the simple framework of transformation models allows estimation for a wide range of responses without encountering computational burdens or challenges that other methods typically do. The Online Appendix (Barbanti and Hothorn 2022) illustrates this point discussing additional applications from different domains.

Naturally, the question arises which model is to be preferred: a marginal, a conditional, or a marginally interpretable one? In this case, the “right” model is not the model which most closely reflects the data generating process, which is usually unknown, but rather the model that allows the user to answer the research question at hand by interpreting the estimated parameters, as McGee and Stringer (2022) point out. An advantage of transformation models is that besides allowing for interpretation of the fixed-effects on a marginal level, they also yield valid models for the whole marginal distribution (1) of the response given the covariates.

The models and estimation procedures introduced here are limited by some practical and some conceptual constraints. Response-varying regression coefficients $\beta(y)$ define distribution regression models (Foresi and Peracchi 1995; Chernozhukov *et al.* 2013) where corresponding




Figure 3: Simulated continuous data from a conditional model (*tramME*) with $F = \text{logit}^{-1}$. A small expected bias for the variance parameter γ (due to maximum likelihood estimation) is visible for this model. In contrast, model (*mtram*) was not able to recover the true value of γ . The red dashed lines indicate the true values of the model parameters.

mixed-effects models have been presented recently (Garcia *et al.* 2019). This would be relatively straightforward to implement in the framework presented here, in fact, stratification in Weibull models was parameterised in a similar way (see Section 5 in the Online Appendix, Barbanti and Hothorn 2022). A mix of continuous and censored observations within one cluster would require to compute the likelihood by partial integration over an N_i -dimensional normal, this is currently not implemented. On a more conceptual level, it seems impossible to implement multilevel models for discrete or censored responses, because the likelihood (8) is only defined for contributions by independent clusters.

Computational Details

The empirical analyses presented in Section 3 are reproducible using the *mtram* package vignette (Online Appendix, Barbanti and Hothorn 2022) in package *tram* (Hothorn and Barbanti 2022). Infrastructure for transformation models from package *mlt* was used to define marginal models. Augmented Lagrangian Minimization implemented in the `auglag()` function of package *alabama* (Varadhan 2022) was used for optimising the log-likelihood. Numerical integration to compute the discrete and censored version of the log-likelihood was performed by *SparseGrid* (Ypma 2013). All results were obtained using R version 4.2.0 (R Core Team 2022).

Models and figures can be replicated by

```
> demo("mtram", package = "tram")
```




Figure 4: Simulated continuous data from a marginally interpretable transformation model (`mtram`) with $F = \text{logit}^{-1}$. The estimates from this model recover all four model parameters whereas a substantial bias for the variance parameter γ can be observed for the misspecified model (`tramME`). The red dashed lines indicate the true values of the model parameters.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Leonhard Held, Thomas Kneib, Nadja Klein and Bálint Támási for interesting discussions. Luisa Barbanti received a GRC travel grant for a research stay in Berlin, during which this paper was finalised. Torsten Hothorn received funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation, grant number 200021_184603.

References

- Barbanti L, Hothorn T (2022). *Some Applications of Marginally Interpretable Linear Transformation Models for Clustered Observations*. R package vignette version 0.7-1, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tram>.
- Cai T, Wei LJ, Wilcox M (2000). “Semiparametric Regression Analysis for Clustered Failure Time Data.” *Biometrika*, **87**(4), 867–878. doi:10.1093/biomet/87.4.867.
- Chernozhukov V, Fernández-Val I, Melly B (2013). “Inference on Counterfactual Distributions.” *Econometrica*, **81**(6), 2205–2268. doi:10.3982/ECTA10582.
- Chow RT, Heller GZ, Barnsley L (2006). “The Effect of 300 mW, 830 nm Laser on Chronic Neck Pain: A Double-blind, Randomized, Placebo-controlled Study.” *Pain*, **124**(1–2), 201–210. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.05.018.

- Foresi S, Peracchi F (1995). “The Conditional Distribution of Excess Returns: An Empirical Analysis.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **90**(430), 451–466. doi:10.1080/01621459.1995.10476537.
- Garcia TP, Marder K, Wang Y (2019). “Time-varying Proportional Odds Model for Mega-analysis of Clustered Event Times.” *Biostatistics*, **20**(1), 129–146. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxx065.
- Genz A, Bretz F (2009). *Computation of Multivariate Normal and t Probabilities*. Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-01688-2.
- Goethals K, Janssen P, Duchateau L (2008). “Frailty Models and Copulas: Similarities and Differences.” *Journal of Applied Statistics*, **35**(9), 1071–1079. doi:10.1080/02664760802271389.
- Gory JJ, Craigmile PF, MacEachern SN (2021). “A Class of Generalized Linear Mixed Models Adjusted for Marginal Interpretability.” *Statistics in Medicine*, **40**(2), 427–440. doi:10.1002/sim.8782.
- Heagerty PJ (1999). “Marginally Specified Logistic-Normal Models for Longitudinal Binary Data.” *Biometrics*, **55**(3), 688–698. doi:10.1111/j.0006-341X.1999.00688.x.
- Heagerty PJ, Zeger SL (2000). “Marginalized Multilevel Models and Likelihood Inference (with comments and a rejoinder by the authors).” *Statistical Science*, **15**(1), 1–26. doi:10.1214/ss/1009212671.
- Heiss F, Winschel V (2008). “Likelihood Approximation by Numerical Integration on Sparse Grids.” *Journal of Econometrics*, **144**(1), 62–80. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2007.12.004.
- Hothorn T (2020). “Most Likely Transformations: The mlt Package.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **92**(1), 1–68. doi:10.18637/jss.v092.i01.
- Hothorn T, Barbanti L (2022). *tram: Transformation Models*. R package version 0.7-1, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tram>.
- Hothorn T, Kneib T, Bühlmann P (2014). “Conditional Transformation Models.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **76**(1), 3–27. doi:10.1111/rssb.12017.
- Hothorn T, Möst L, Bühlmann P (2018). “Most Likely Transformations.” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **45**(1), 110–134. doi:10.1111/sjos.12291.
- Klein N, Hothorn T, Barbanti L, Kneib T (2022). “Multivariate Conditional Transformation Models.” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **49**, 116–142. doi:10.1111/sjos.12501.
- Lee Y, Nelder JA (2004). “Conditional and Marginal Models: Another View.” *Statistical Science*, **19**(4), 219–238. doi:10.1214/088342304000000305.
- Lin Y, Luo Y, Xie S, Chen K (2017). “Robust Rank Estimation for Transformation Models with Random Effects.” *Biometrika*, **104**(4), 971–986. doi:10.1093/biomet/asx055.
- Manuguerra M, Heller GZ (2010). “Ordinal Regression Models for Continuous Scales.” *International Journal of Biostatistics*, **6**(1), 14. doi:10.2202/1557-4679.1230.

- Marsaglia G (1963). “Expressing the Normal Distribution with Covariance Matrix $A + B$ in Terms of One with Covariance Matrix A .” *Biometrika*, **50**(3–4), 535–538.
- Masarotto G, Varin C (2012). “Gaussian Copula Marginal Regression.” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **6**, 1517–1549. doi:10.1214/12-EJS721.
- McGee G, Stringer A (2022). “Flexible Marginal Models for Dependent Data.” *Technical report*, arXiv 2204.07188. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07188>.
- McLain AC, Ghosh SK (2013). “Efficient Sieve Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Time-Transformation Models.” *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, **7**(2), 285–303. doi:10.1080/15598608.2013.772835.
- Muff S, Held L, Keller LF (2016). “Marginal or Conditional Regression Models for Non-normal data?” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **7**, 1514–1524. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12623.
- Ogden HE (2015). “A Sequential Reduction Method for Inference in Generalized Linear Mixed Models.” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **9**, 135–152. doi:10.1214/15-EJS991.
- R Core Team (2022). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rödel C, Graeven U, Fietkau R, Hohenberger W, Hothorn T, Arnold D, Hofheinz RD, Ghadimi M, Wolff HA, Lang-Welzenbach M, Raab HR, Wittekind C, Ströbel P, Staib L, Wilhelm M, Grabenbauer GG, Hoffmanns H, Lindemann F, Schlenska-Lange A, Folprecht G, Sauer R, Torsten Liersch on behalf of the German Rectal Cancer Study Group (2015). “Oxaliplatin Added to Fluorouracil-based Preoperative Chemoradiotherapy and Postoperative Chemotherapy of Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer (the German CAO/ARO/AIO-04 study): Final Results of the Multicentre, Open-label, Randomised, Phase 3 Trial.” *The Lancet Oncology*, **16**(8), 979–989. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00159-X.
- Stroup WW (2012). *Generalized Linear Mixed Models: Modern Concepts, Methods and Applications*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, New York, U.S.A.
- Sun T, Ding Y (2021). “Copula-based Semiparametric Transformation Model for Bivariate Data under General Interval Censoring.” *Biostatistics*, **22**(2), 315–330. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxz032.
- Támasi B, Crowther M, Puhan MA, Steyerberg E, Hothorn T (2022). “Individual Participant Data Meta-analysis with Mixed-effects Transformation Models.” *Biostatistics*. doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxab045.
- Tang N, Wu Y, Chen D (2018). “Semiparametric Bayesian Analysis of Transformation Linear Mixed Models.” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **166**, 225–240. doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2018.03.007.
- Thas O, Neve JD, Clement L, Ottoy JP (2012). “Probabilistic Index Models.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **74**(4), 623–671. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.01020.x.
- van der Vaart AW (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

- Varadhan R (2022). *alabama: Constrained Nonlinear Optimization*. R package version 2022.4-1, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=alabama>.
- Wang T, Merkle EC (2018). “**merDeriv**: Derivative Computations for Linear Mixed Effects Models with Application to Robust Standard Errors.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **87**(c01). doi:10.18637/jss.v087.c01.
- Wu H, Wang L (2019). “Normal Frailty Probit Model for Clustered Interval-censored Failure Time Data.” *Biometrical Journal*, **61**(4), 827–840. doi:10.1002/bimj.201800114.
- Ypma J (2013). *SparseGrid: Sparse grid integration in R*. R package version 0.8.2, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=SparseGrid>.
- Zeger SL, Liang KY, Albert PS (1986). “Longitudinal Data Analysis Using Generalized Linear Models.” *Biometrika*, **73**(1), 13–22. doi:10.1093/biomet/73.1.13.
- Zeger SL, Liang KY, Albert PS (1988). “Models for Longitudinal Data: A Generalized Estimating Equation Approach.” *Biometrics*, **44**(4), 1049–1060. doi:10.2307/2531734.
- Zeng D, Gao F, Lin DY (2017). “Maximum Likelihood Estimation for Semiparametric Regression Models with Multivariate Interval-censored Data.” *Biometrika*, **104**(3), 505–525. doi:10.1093/biomet/asx029.
- Zhang Z, Charalambous C, Foster P (2021). “A Gaussian copula joint model for longitudinal and time-to-event data with random effects.” *Technical report*, arXiv 2112.01941. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.01941>.

A. Likelihood Function: Censored and Discrete Case

The i th contribution to the likelihood (7) is given by the N_i -dimensional normal integral

$$\exp(\ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})) = \int_{\mathbf{z}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}^{\mathbf{z}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})} \phi_{N_i} \left(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{U}_i^\top + \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \right) d\mathbf{z}.$$

With $\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \text{diag}(\mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \mathbf{U}_i^\top + \mathbf{I}_{N_i}) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i}$ we obtain the corresponding correlation matrix as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1/2} = \mathbf{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top + \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times N_i} \\ \mathbf{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1/2} \mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times R} \end{aligned}$$

and the integration limits become (again with $\mathbf{z}(\cdot)$ defined in (6))

$$\underline{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \text{ and } \bar{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1/2} \mathbf{z}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}).$$

According to Marsaglia (1963), the above normal probability can be written as

$$\int_{\underline{\mathbf{z}}}^{\bar{\mathbf{z}}} \phi_{N_i}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \mathbf{C}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})) d\mathbf{z} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^R} \phi_R(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{0}_R, \mathbf{I}_R) \int_{\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{V}\mathbf{w}}^{\bar{\mathbf{z}}-\mathbf{V}\mathbf{w}} \phi_{N_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}) d\mathbf{w} d\mathbf{y}$$

and can, following Genz and Bretz (2009) here, further be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^R} \phi_R(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{0}_R, \mathbf{I}_R) \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} \left[\Phi \left(\frac{\bar{z}_i - \sum_{r=1}^R v_{ir} w_r}{\sqrt{d_i}} \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{z_i - \sum_{r=1}^R v_{ir} w_r}{\sqrt{d_i}} \right) \right] d\mathbf{w} \\ &\stackrel{\mathbf{w} = \Phi_R^{-1}(\mathbf{q})}{=} \int_{[0,1]^R} \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} \left[\Phi \left(\frac{\bar{z}_i - \sum_{r=1}^R v_{ir} \Phi^{-1}(q_r)}{\sqrt{d_i}} \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{z_i - \sum_{r=1}^R v_{ir} \Phi^{-1}(q_r)}{\sqrt{d_i}} \right) \right] d\mathbf{q}. \end{aligned}$$

The elements d_i are the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}$ and thus standardisation of \mathbf{z} and $\mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ cancel out in this case such that we get

$$= \int_{[0,1]^R} \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} \left[\Phi \left(\frac{\bar{\tilde{z}}_i - \sum_{r=1}^R \tilde{v}_{ir} \Phi^{-1}(q_r)}{\sqrt{d_i}} \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{\tilde{z}_i - \sum_{r=1}^R \tilde{v}_{ir} \Phi^{-1}(q_r)}{\sqrt{d_i}} \right) \right] d\mathbf{q}$$

with $\tilde{\tilde{z}}_i$ and \tilde{z}_i being the elements of $\mathbf{z}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ and $\mathbf{z}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$, respectively, and \tilde{v}_{ir} are the elements of $\mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$.

The latter expression is an R -dimensional integral over the unit cube (random intercept models have $R = 1$ and correlated random intercept/random slope models correspond to $R = 3$) of products of univariate normal probabilities. It should be noted that, unlike using an Laplace or other approximation of the likelihood, the above term is the exact likelihood contribution. It can be approximated up to any desired accuracy using numerical integration procedures. An analytic expression for the score function seems quite challenging and one thus has to rely on numerical approaches such as sparse grids (Heiss and Winschel 2008).

B. Likelihood and Score Function: Continuous Case

The joint probability of $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i}$ is given by:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i \leq \mathbf{y}_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{U}_i) = \Phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \Sigma_i(\gamma)} \left(\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1} \left(F_{N_i} \{ \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \} \right) \right).$$

To simplify the notation, we define $\mathbf{z}(\cdot)$ as in (6):

$$\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) = \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1} (F_{N_i} \{ \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \}).$$

We can derive the corresponding joint density for an arbitrary F :

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\mathbf{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) &= \left((2\pi)^{N_i} \left| \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma) \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^\top \right| \right)^{-1/2} \times \\ &\quad \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma)^\top \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^{-1} \right\|_2^2 \right) \times \\ &\quad \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} \frac{\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)_{ii} f \{ (\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1})_{ii} [\mathbf{a}(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \}}{\phi(\Phi^{-1}(F\{\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} [\mathbf{a}(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}]\}))} (\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1})_{ii} \mathbf{a}'(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \\ &= \left| \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma) \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^\top \right|^{-1/2} \times \\ &\quad \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma)^\top \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^{-1} \right\|_2^2 \right) \times \\ &\quad \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) \right\|_2^2 \right) \times \\ &\quad \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} f \{ (\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1})_{ii} [\mathbf{a}(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \} \mathbf{a}'(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \\ &= \left| \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma) \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^\top \right|^{-1/2} \times \\ &\quad \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma)^\top \Sigma_i(\gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) \right) \times \\ &\quad \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma)^\top \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-2} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) \right) \times \\ &\quad \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} f \{ (\mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1})_{ii} [\mathbf{a}(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \} \mathbf{a}'(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta}. \end{aligned}$$

The resulting log-likelihood contribution (8) for the i th observation is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) &\approx \log(f_{\mathbf{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma)) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log \left| \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma) \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^\top \right| - \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma)^\top \mathbf{L}_i(\gamma)^{-1} \right\|_2^2 + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \gamma) \right\|_2^2 + \\ &\quad \log_{N_i} (f_{N_i} \{ \mathbf{D}_i(\gamma)^{-1} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}] \})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i} + \\ &\quad \log_{N_i} (\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma_i(\gamma)| + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2})\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \\
& \log_{N_i}(f_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i} + \\
& \log_{N_i}(\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

The score function for all model parameters $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ can be derived based on the results of [Stroup \(2012\)](#) as applied to normal linear mixed-effects models by [Wang and Merkle \(2018\)](#). With the $M = R(R+1)/2$ unique elements $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M)^\top$ of the lower Cholesky factor $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ we get

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} = \mathbf{U}_i \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top}{\partial \gamma_m} \mathbf{U}_i^\top = \mathbf{U}_i \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \mathbf{U}_i^\top.$$

The derivative of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ with respect to an element γ_m of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is a matrix of zeros with the exception of a single one at the position of γ_m . Moreover, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(\mathbf{U}_i \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \mathbf{U}_i^\top \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \\
\frac{\partial \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_m} &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \right)^3 \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \\
\frac{\partial (\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1})^2}{\partial \gamma_m} &= -\left(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \right)^4 \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \\
&= -(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})))^{-2} \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})}{\partial \gamma_m} \\
&= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_m} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \right) \Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\}) + \\
&+ \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_m} \Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\}) + \\
&+ \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \frac{f_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\}}{\phi_{N_i}[\Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})]} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}] \frac{\partial \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_m} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2} \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \\
&- \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2} \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \frac{f_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]}{\phi_{N_i}[\Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})]} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2} \text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \times
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left[z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \frac{f_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]}{\phi_{N_i}[\Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})]} \right]$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} &= -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) + \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right)^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \right. \\ &\quad \quad z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_m} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) \right) z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \\ &\quad \quad \left. z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_m} z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \right) \right] + \\ &\quad + \frac{f'_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])}{f_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}] \frac{\partial \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_m} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) + \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right)^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \right. \\ &\quad \quad -z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} + \\ &\quad \quad \quad \left. (\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1})^4 \operatorname{diag} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \cdot \mathbf{I}_{N_i} \right) z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \\ &\quad \quad \left. z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) \left(\frac{\partial z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) \right] + \\ &\quad + \frac{f'_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])}{f_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])} [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}] \frac{\partial \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}}{\partial \gamma_m} \\ \frac{\partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} &= z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) \times \\ &\quad \frac{f_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])}{\phi_{N_i}(\Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})} \mathbf{X}_i + \\ &\quad -\mathbf{1}_{N_i}^\top \left(\frac{f'_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])}{f_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i \right) \\ \frac{\partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\vartheta}} &= -z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} - \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-2}) \times \\ &\quad \frac{f_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])}{\phi_{N_i}(\Phi_{N_i}^{-1}(F_{N_i}\{\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}]\})} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) + \\ &\quad \mathbf{1}_{N_i}^\top \left(\frac{f'_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])}{f_{N_i}(\mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1}[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}])} \mathbf{D}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \right) + \mathbf{1}_{N_i}^\top \frac{1}{\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta}} \mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i). \end{aligned}$$

For $F = \Phi$, $z(\mathbf{y}_i | \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta}$, the joint distribution simplifies to

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_i \leq \mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{U}_i) = \Phi_{\mathbf{0}_{N_i}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)\boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i\boldsymbol{\beta})$$

and the joint density becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_{\mathbf{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \left((2\pi)^{N_i} \left| \mathbf{L}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{L}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^\top \right| \right)^{-1/2} \times \\
 &\quad \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right) \times \\
 &\quad \prod_{i=1}^{N_i} \mathbf{a}'(y_{ii})^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We obtain the corresponding log-likelihood:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) &\approx \log(f_{\mathbf{Y}_i}(\mathbf{y}_i \mid \boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})) \\
 &\propto -\frac{1}{2} \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| + \\
 &\quad -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \\
 &\quad \log_{N_i} (\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i} \\
 &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| - \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + \\
 &\quad -\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + \log_{N_i} (\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta})^\top \mathbf{1}_{N_i}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The scores are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} &= -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \right) + \\
 &\quad \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \gamma_m} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} (\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
 \frac{\partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} &= \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i \\
 \frac{\partial \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\vartheta}} &= -\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) + \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})^{-1} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{y}_i) + \mathbf{1}_{N_i}^\top \frac{1}{\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i) \boldsymbol{\vartheta}} \mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{y}_i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Affiliation:

Luisa Barbanti, Torsten Hothorn
 Institut für Epidemiologie, Biostatistik und Prävention
 Universität Zürich
 Hirschengraben 84, CH-8001 Zürich, Switzerland
 Torsten.Hothorn@R-project.org