

# Scoring rules in survival analysis

Raphael Sonabend\*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Jameel Institute, Imperial College London, School of Public Health, UK.

December 13, 2022

## Abstract

Scoring rules promote rational and good decision making and predictions by models, this is increasingly important for automated procedures of ‘auto-ML’. The Brier score and Log loss are well-established scoring rules for classification and regression and possess the ‘strict properness’ property that encourages optimal predictions. In this paper we survey proposed scoring rules for survival analysis, establish the first clear definition of ‘(strict) properness’ for survival scoring rules, and determine which losses are proper and improper. We prove that commonly utilised scoring rules that are claimed to be proper are in fact improper. We further prove that under a strict set of assumptions a class of scoring rules is strictly proper for, what we term, ‘approximate’ survival losses. We hope these findings encourage further research into robust validation of survival models and promote honest evaluation.

## 1 Introduction

Scoring rules evaluate probabilistic predictions and (attempt to) measure the overall predictive ability of a model as a combination of calibration and discrimination [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007, Murphy, 1973]. Scoring rules have been gaining in popularity for the past couple of decades since probabilistic forecasts were recognised to be superior than deterministic predictions for capturing uncertainty in predictions [Dawid, 1984, 1986]. Formalisation and development of scoring rules has primarily been due to Dawid [Dawid, 1984, 1986, Dawid and Musio, 2014], Gneiting and Raftery [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]; though the earliest measures promoting “rational” and “honest” decision making date back to the 1950s [Brier, 1950, Good, 1952]. In classification and (probabilistic) regression [Gressmann et al., 2018] settings there are established definitions for scoring rules and specific losses have been defined, most popular of which are the Brier score and Logloss. However the literature has been lacking for survival analysis, with no definition of a scoring rule being proposed until very recently, despite this losses are frequently utilised in the literature without justification or proofs about their properties.

In this paper we will present a formal definition for a survival scoring rule as well as a second definition for an ‘approximate’ survival scoring rule that can be utilised under specific conditions. We provide a brief review of losses in the literature and collate claims, proofs, and disproofs for properness of these losses. We first define properness in the classification setting and justify the

---

\*raphaelsonabend@gmail.com

requirement for strict properness.

**Definition 1.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of distributions over  $[0, 1]$  and let  $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$  then, a classification loss  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  is called proper if for any  $p_Y, p$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  and for any  $Y \sim p_Y$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, Y)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, Y)]$ .  $L$  is called strictly proper if in addition to being proper,  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, Y)] \Leftrightarrow p = p_Y$ , for any  $p_Y, p$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  and for any  $Y \sim p_Y$ .*

A loss is proper if the correct prediction minimises the loss, a loss is strictly proper if the correct prediction uniquely minimises the loss. A scoring rule can only be useful if it is at least proper, otherwise there is no method of determining if one forecast is ‘better’ than another. However note that a proper loss may still not be useful, this is clear by example: let  $K : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be the loss defined by  $K(p, Y) := 42$ . Despite  $K$  being proper as it is minimised by the correct prediction, it is clearly useless.

Throughout this paper we use the following notation. Let  $X, Y, C$  be random variables taking values in  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  respectively. In addition, define  $T := \min(Y, C)$ , and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(Y = T)$ . We interpret these as follows:  $X$  is a vector of co-variates,  $Y$  is the theoretical survival time (or time of death event),  $C$  is the theoretical censoring time,  $T$  is the observed outcome time, and  $\Delta$  is the event indicator (1 if the outcome is the event of interest and  $T = Y$  or 0 otherwise and  $T = C$ ).

## 2 Survival scoring rules and losses

In this section we review the definition of proper survival losses. We first review the history of proposed survival scoring rules and properness definitions and then provide our own<sup>1</sup>.

As part of reviewing the landscape of losses it is important to separate validation and training. This is often conflated in papers, for example Goldstein et al. [2020] and Rindt et al. [2022] consider losses in the context of neural network optimisation. This approach may obfuscate the importance of properness for scoring rules as: 1) a fair method of evaluating model importance; 2) a robust loss for optimising models. For example, RSBS, which is described later, may be a robust method for training a neural network with a large number of samples and where outcome-independence can be demonstrated, but it is unlikely to provide a transparent estimate of future performance as these assumptions are rarely met. Therefore the assumptions discussed in this paper, and a good understanding of the limitations of these losses, is required when selecting losses for model optimisation, and separately for model evaluation. As survival neural networks become increasingly popular, e.g. DeepSurv [Katzman et al., 2018] and DeepHit [Lee et al., 2018], and as off-shelf implementations are increasingly available, e.g. pycox [Kvamme, 2018] and survivalmodels [Sonabend, 2020], understanding the properties of scoring rules is increasingly more important.

### 2.1 History and alternative definitions

Historically, the notion of scoring rules in survival analysis can be attributed to Erika Graf [Graf et al., 1999]. In this seminal manuscript, two scoring rules for survival analysis are defined and one is claimed to be proper (the other is implied to be but not claimed). However, no formal definition of a proper survival scoring rule is provided, nor proofs of properness. Subsequent papers have also

<sup>1</sup>The definition first appears in RS’ unpublished PhD thesis [Sonabend, 2021].

derived scoring rules without providing definitions or proofs (e.g. [Avati et al., 2018]). These papers provide informal explanations that appear to imply definition 2.3.

Literature on survival scoring rules has no historically included formal definitions of proper scoring rules in survival analysis. We searched for “scoring rule” AND “survival” on PubMed (n=1), arXiv (n=2), and JSTOR (n=91). After title, abstract, and full text filtering only one paper discussed a definition for a survival scoring rule [Rindt et al., 2022], in addition we were aware of our own definition, originally from [Sonabend, 2021].

The Rindt et al. [2022] paper provides a definition of a survival scoring rule conditional on the covariate random variable  $X$ . However, contrary to claims in the paper, results about properness do not differ whether a conditional or unconditional definition is adopted. We first prove this result and then provide our own definition of unconditional properness. We prepare the proof by formalising the definition provided by Rindt et al. [2022].

**Definition 2.1.** *A function  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called:*

- i) Conditional-Proper survival loss, if: for any random variables  $X$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $Y$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$ ; with  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ ; and any probabilistic prediction functional  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ , it holds that,*

$$\mathbb{E}[L(\omega(X), T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(f(X), T, \Delta)],$$

*where  $\omega(x) = p_{Y|X=x}$  is the functional producing the conditional law  $p_{Y|X=x}$  of the random variable  $Y|X = x$ . (and where the property is parametric over a distribution domain for the joint  $(X, Y, C)$ , we suppress this dependency for readability)*

- ii) Strictly Conditional-Proper survival loss, if in addition to being Conditional-Proper with  $X$ , for the same quantification of variables, that  $\mathbb{E}[L(\omega(X), T, \Delta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$  implies  $\omega = f$  (on a measure 1 domain w.r.t.  $X$ ).*

Now we formalise our proposition and show proof as to why the conditioning is redundant.

**Proposition 2.2.** *(Assume all families of distributions of  $(X, Y, C)$  below include constant  $X$  and live on the same domains.) Consider a function  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :*

- i)  $L$  is a proper survival loss if and only if  $L$  is a Conditional-Proper survival loss.*
- ii)  $L$  is a strictly proper survival loss if and only if  $L$  is a strictly Conditional-Proper survival loss.*

*Proof.* We show proof in two directions.

**Proof of (i)** First, we show that a proper survival loss is Conditional-Proper. By assumption,  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$  for all  $p_Y, p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $Y \sim p_Y$  and  $T, \Delta$  compatible with  $Y$ . Therefore, by substituting  $\omega(X)|X$  for  $p_Y$  and  $f(X)|X$  for  $p$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}[L(\omega(X), T, \Delta)|X] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(f(X), T, \Delta)|X]$  for all  $\omega, f$ ,  $Y \sim p_Y$  and  $T, \Delta$  and for all  $X$  (since  $X$  was arbitrary). Taking additional expectations over  $X$ , we obtain  $\mathbb{E}[L(\omega(X), T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(f(X), T, \Delta)]$  with the right quantifier, showing that  $L$  is Conditional-Proper.

Now we show that a Conditional-Proper survival loss is also proper. By assumption,  $\mathbb{E}[L(\omega(X), T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(f(X), T, \Delta)]$ , for any random variables  $X$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $Y$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $T, \Delta$  compatible with  $Y$ , and  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ . Taking a constant  $X$  (which is in the family by assumption), it holds that  $\omega(X) = p_Y$ , and we can also pick  $f(X) = p$  for any  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$ ,

under the right quantifiers and a superfluous quantification by  $X$ . This shows that  $L$  is proper. ■

**Proof of (ii)** (ii) Proof follows in analogy to (i) and replacing the inequalities with strict inequalities. ■

□

## 2.2 A definition of properness for survival losses

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a family of distributions taking values over  $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{C}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}$  the projection of  $\mathcal{Q}$  on the first component. (intuition:  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the domain of distributions for  $Y, C$  in the setting)

A function  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called:

- i) Proper survival loss (for distributions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ ), if: for any distributions  $p_Y, p$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; and for any random variables  $Y \sim p_Y$ , and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$ ; with  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ ; it holds that,

$$\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)],$$

(where the quantification over random variables  $Y, C$  ranges over distributions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ )

- ii) Strictly proper survival loss if in addition to being proper it holds, for the same quantification of variables, that  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$  implies  $p = p_Y$ .

If clear from context, we omit the qualifier “for distributions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ ”. For such a context, we usually make assumptions on  $\mathcal{Q}$  in the frame of the exposition.

As a special case, if all distributions  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  yield independent  $(Y, C) \sim q$ , we refer to (strictly) proper survival losses as outcome-independent (strictly proper).

Note three key features of our definition. Firstly, the definition explicitly references the key challenge of survival analysis, which is the fact that survival models make predictions for the hypothetical survival time,  $Y$ , whereas these predictions are evaluation by the observed outcome time,  $T$ . Secondly, the definition is parsimonious as it does not involve superfluous conditioning on covariates. Finally, the statement includes a definition for outcome-independent properness, this is crucial for defining losses that can be proper even in the presence of the infamous survival non-identifiability problem [Tsiatis, 1975].

By definition if a loss is: i) (strictly) proper then it is also outcome-independent (strictly) proper; ii) (outcome-independent) strictly proper then it is also (outcome-independent) proper.

## 3 Existing survival losses

We now look at survival losses in the literature, discuss their claimed properness properties and make propositions to prove/disprove these claims.

Few survival losses could be found in the literature, as demonstrated in the short review above. As well as the losses found in our search, we were also aware of a few more losses from our own understanding of the literature. Below are listed survival losses that are commonly utilised. First let  $\zeta$  be an absolutely continuous distribution and let  $Y \sim \zeta$ . Let  $\gamma(x) := x\psi'(x) - \psi(x)$ , and let  $\psi : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  be some convex and differentiable function. Then we define,

- Survival Continuous Ranked Probability Score (SCRPS) [Avati et al., 2018]

$$L_{SCRPS}(\zeta, t, \delta) = \int_0^t F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \delta \int_t^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau \quad (1)$$

- Negative Log-likelihood (NLL)

$$L_{NLL}(\zeta, t, \delta) = -\log[f_Y(t)] \quad (2)$$

- Survival score (SS) [Dawid and Musio, 2014]

$$L_{SS}(\zeta, t, \delta|\psi) = \int_0^t \gamma[h_Y(\tau)] - \psi'[h_Y(t)]\delta \, d\tau \quad (3)$$

- Right-censored log-likelihood (RCLL) [Avati et al., 2018]

$$L_{RCLL}(\zeta, t, \delta) = -\log[\delta f_Y(t) + (1 - \delta)(S_Y(t))] \quad (4)$$

Avati et al. [2018] defined the SCRPS and assume properness of the loss (with no assumptions about censoring) by stating that it is simply the weighted CRPS, which is proper [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]. Rindt et al. [2022] claim outcome-independent improperness of this loss by first demonstrating that Avati’s assumption of properness due to the weighting is incorrect, and secondly by simulation. The NLL is a very well-established loss in the literature but its first application to survival data appears to be in Goldstein et al. [2020], who imply properness of the loss in the context of neural network optimisation, however they do not provide a definition of properness for survival nor any properness proof. The SS is defined as a proper scoring rule in [Dawid and Musio, 2014] but again without a definition of a survival scoring rule and without proof.

Finally, Avati et al. [2018] also defined the RCLL and claim this to be proper by assuming it is a weighted version of a known strictly proper scoring rule, in this case the negative log-likelihood [Dawid and Musio, 2014] – whilst not stated in the paper this follows by substituting  $\psi(x) = x \log(x) - x$ . Rindt et al. [2022] prove the RCLL to be outcome-independent improper under their covariate-dependent definition of properness.

The above claims are summarised in Table 2.

Under Definition 2.3 we prove analytically (i.e., not by simulation) that *SCRPS* and *NLL* are not outcome-independent proper (the weakest form of properness (Lemma A.1)) and that *RCLL* is outcome-independent strictly proper – we do not prove *SS* directly as there is no evidence of this being used in the literature.

**Proposition 3.1.** *L<sub>SCRPS</sub> and L<sub>NLL</sub>, are not: a) outcome-independent proper; b) outcome-independent strictly proper; c) proper; d) strictly proper.*

*Proof.* Proof of (a) is in Appendix B.1. Proofs of (b)-(d) follow from (a) and lemma A.1. □

**Proposition 3.2.** *L<sub>RCLL</sub> is outcome-independent strictly proper.*

*Proof.* Proof follows from Rindt et al. [2022] and proposition 2.2. □

We note that no losses are claimed to be (strictly) proper in general (i.e. when *Y* and *C* are not independent). This holds due to the non-identifiability problem in survival analysis [Tsiatis, 1975].

## 4 Approximate survival losses

The most common survival loss appears to be an adaptation of the Brier (or quadratic) score derived in Graf et al. [1999]. This loss employs an inverse probability of censoring weighted (IPCW) approach to weight the loss by an estimate of the censoring distribution. We term losses of this form as ‘approximate losses’ as they imply perfect knowledge of the censoring distribution, which is of course impossible in practice, and therefore estimators of these losses can only be ‘approximate’ at best. IPCW approaches are seen in many survival measures outside of scoring rules, most prominently in concordance indices and AUC type measures [Uno et al., 2007]. We provide a formal definition here in order to explicitly highlight the required assumptions to establish (strict) properness.

**Definition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a family of distributions taking values over  $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{C}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}$  the projection of  $\mathcal{Q}$  on the first component. (intuition:  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the domain of distributions for  $Y, C$  in the setting)*

*A function  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called:*

- i) Proper approximate survival loss (for distributions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ ), if: for any distributions  $p_Y, p$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; and for any random variables  $Y \sim p_Y$ , and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$ ; with  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ ; it holds that,*

$$\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta|c)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta|c)],$$

*(where the quantification over random variables  $Y, C$  ranges over distributions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ )*

- ii) Strictly proper approximate survival loss if in addition to being proper it holds, for the same quantification of variables, that  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta|c)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta|c)]$  implies  $p = p_Y$ .*

*If clear from context, we omit the qualifier “for distributions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ ”. For such a context, we usually make assumptions on  $\mathcal{Q}$  in the frame of the exposition.*

*As a special case, if all distributions  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  yield independent  $(Y, C) \sim q$ , we refer to (strictly) proper approximate survival losses as outcome-independent (strictly proper).*

As the true censoring distribution,  $c$ , can never be known exactly, this definition allows for approximate losses to be proper in the asymptotic (with infinite training data) if they include estimators of  $c$  that are convergent in distribution. Proper approximate losses are therefore useful in modern predictive settings in which ‘big data’ is accessible and thus estimators, such as the Kaplan-Meier, can converge to the true censoring distribution [Kaplan and Meier, 1958]. Note that convergence for these estimators usually requires the assumption that  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$  [Gerds and Schumacher, 2006], hence the outcome-independent definitions required above. Approximate losses may provide misleading results when the sample size is small and the true censoring distribution is poorly estimated.

## 5 Existing approximate survival losses are not outcome-independent proper

All approximate losses appear to be attributed either to Graf et al. [1999] or derivatives of this work, these are listed below. Let  $\zeta$  be an absolutely continuous distribution and let  $Y \sim \zeta$ . Also let  $\hat{G}$  be the estimated survival function of the censoring distribution,  $S_C$ , and let  $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$  be an upper cutoff. Then we define,

- Survival Brier Score [Graf et al., 1999]

$$L_{SBS}(\zeta, t, \delta|\hat{G}) = \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{S_Y^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}(t)} + \frac{F_Y^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (5)$$

- Survival Absolute Score [Schmid et al., 2011]

$$L_{SAS}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}) = \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{S_Y(\tau) \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}(t)} + \frac{F_Y(\tau) \mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (6)$$

- Integrated Survival Logloss [Graf et al., 1999]

$$L_{ISLL}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}) = - \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{\log[F_Y(\tau)] \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}(t)} + \frac{\log[S_Y(\tau)] \mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (7)$$

In practice it is common to estimate  $\hat{G}$  with the Kaplan-Meier estimator fit on  $\{(T_1, 1 - \Delta_1), \dots, (T_n, 1 - \Delta_n)\}$ , due to the fact that  $\hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  [Kaplan and Meier, 1958]. We denote this estimate  $\hat{G}_{KM}$ .

The SBS is defined in Graf et al. [1999] with properness claimed without definition of a survival scoring loss and without proof. Rindt et al. [2022] claim that ‘under the assumption of censoring independent of the covariate and a perfectly estimated censoring distribution’, the SBS is a proper scoring rule. Gerds and Schumacher [2006] demonstrated via simulation experiments that if the censoring time is not independent of the covariates, then the loss will be misspecified if  $\hat{G}$  is estimated with a marginal estimator (i.e.  $\hat{G}_{KM}$  as suggested by Graf et al. [1999]). Instead, Gerds and Schumacher [2006] suggest estimation of  $\hat{G}$  with a Cox, or nonparametric Aalen, model. We advise against such practice as this requires validation of yet another model to establish its success in estimating the censoring distribution, and thus the procedure continues ad-infinitum. Supporting Gerds, Rindt et al. [2022] demonstrates by simulation that SBS is not proper when the censoring distribution is dependent on covariates. ISLL is also defined by Graf et al. [1999] but properness is not claimed, nor could we find usage of this loss in the literature or in software, with only one implementation found in **mlr3proba** [Sonabend et al., 2021]. Finally, SAS is defined in Schmid et al. [2011] however improperness of the loss is stated as the underlying loss (mean absolute distance) is known to be improper.

Under Definition 4.1, contrary to the claims in Graf et al. [1999] and Rindt et al. [2022], we prove that SBS is not outcome-independent proper (the weakest form of properness (Lemma A.2)), we do not show improperness of ISLL as no claims are made for this loss and we note proofs would follow analogously.

**Proposition 5.1.**  *$L_{SBS}$  is not: a) outcome-independent proper; b) outcome-independent strictly proper; c) proper; d) strictly proper.*

*Proof.* Proof of (a) is in Appendix B.2. Proofs of (b)-(d) follow from (a) and lemma A.2.  $\square$

## 6 A class of strictly proper losses

Finally we will now prove that there exists a class of approximate survival losses that *are* strictly proper under a set of strict assumptions.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $L_R$  be a regression scoring rule, then an approximate survival loss,  $L_S$ , defined by*

$$L_S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}; \quad (\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) \mapsto \frac{\delta L_R(\zeta, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (8)$$

*is outcome-independent strictly proper if and only if  $L_R$  is strictly proper.*



*Proof.* Proof in appendix B.3. □

Explicitly this means that any (strictly) proper regression scoring rule can yield a (strictly) proper approximate survival loss by weighting the underlying loss by the probability of being censored at the observed outcome time. Applying this to the most common regression losses yields the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.2.** *The following novel approximate survival losses,  $L_{RSBS}, L_{RISL}, L_{SNL}$  are all outcome-independent strictly proper.*

- *Reweighted Survival Brier Score (RSBS)*

$$L_{RSBS}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta \int_{\mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) - F_Y(\tau))^2 d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (9)$$

- *Reweighted Integrated Survival Logloss (RISL)*

$$L_{RISL}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) \log[F_Y(\tau)] + \mathbb{I}(t > \tau) \log[S_Y(\tau)] d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (10)$$

- *Survival negative log-likelihood (SNL)*

$$L_{SNL}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = -\frac{\delta \log[f_Y(t)]}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* Proof in appendix B.4. □

Hence, under the assumptions that: i) the outcome time is independent of the censoring time; and ii) we can theoretically perfectly estimate the censoring distribution (e.g. via convergence of Kaplan-Meier estimator), then we have established a class of outcome-independent strictly proper approximate survival losses.

## 7 Conclusions

In this paper we examined proposed definitions of scoring rules in the survival analysis literature as well as claims of properness and definitions of these claims. We defined properness in a hierarchical manner, first considering the strictest form of strict properness with no assumptions made about the underlying data, progressing to the weakest form which assumes independence of the event and censoring time. We then extended this definition to a class of losses that incorporate perfect knowledge of the censoring distribution, which are heavily used in the literature. We listed existing claims in the literature and proofs and supplemented these with our own analytical proofs of properness and improperness. We found that the right-censored log-loss is the only outcome-independent proper loss in survival analysis. We also disproved the very common claim that the score proposed by Graf et al. [1999] is proper. This proof, also discussed in Rindt et al. [2022], should not be dismissed lightly. This means that all prior papers that make claims about survival model performance based on the Graf score, are thrown into doubt. To the best of our knowledge there is no proper loss (approximate or otherwise) where outcome-independence is not required, which is due to the non-identifiability problem Tsiatis [1975]. We believe this means a higher burden should be placed on



Table 1: Summary of losses, definitions, and references. Key:  $\alpha$  - loss is approximate.  $\psi$  is any convex and differentiable, real-valued function.  $\hat{G}$  is the estimated survival function of the censoring distribution and  $\hat{G}_{KM}$  is the Kaplan-Meier estimator of the censoring distribution

<i>Loss</i>	<i>Reference</i>	$(\zeta, t, \delta) \mapsto$
SCRPS	Avati et al. [2018]	$\int_0^t F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \delta \int_t^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau$
NLL	Goldstein et al. [2020]	$-\log[f_Y(t)]$
RCLL	Avati et al. [2018]	$-\log[\delta f_Y(t) + (1 - \delta)(S_Y(t))]$
SS	Dawid and Musio [2014]	$\int_0^t \gamma[h_Y(\tau)] - \psi'[h_Y(t)]\delta d\tau$
SBS $^\alpha$	Graf et al. [1999]	$\int_0^{\tau^\alpha} \frac{S_Y^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta=1) + F_Y^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(t) + \frac{\hat{G}(\tau)}{\hat{G}(t)}} d\tau$
SAS $^\alpha$	Schmid et al. [2011]	$\int_0^{\tau^\alpha} \frac{S_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta=1) + F_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}(t) + \frac{\hat{G}(\tau)}{\hat{G}(t)}} d\tau$
ISLL $^\alpha$	Graf et al. [1999]	$-\int_0^{\tau^\alpha} \frac{\log[F_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta=1) + \log[S_Y(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)]}{\hat{G}(t) + \frac{\hat{G}(\tau)}{\hat{G}(t)}} d\tau$
RSBS $^\alpha$	Sonabend [2021]	$\frac{\delta \int_{\mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) - F_Y(\tau))^2 d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)}$
RISL $^\alpha$	Sonabend [2021]	$\frac{\delta \int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau) \log[F_Y(\tau)] + \mathbb{I}(t > \tau) \log[S_Y(\tau)] d\tau}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)}$
SNL $^\alpha$	Sonabend [2021]	$-\frac{\delta \log[f_Y(t)]}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)}$

Table 2: Summary of losses and properness claims; we claim RCLL to be outcome-independent strictly proper and all others outcome-independent improper. Key: 1 - Claimed proper without proof; 2 - Proved proper under covariate-dependent definition; † - We prove outcome-independent proper; ♣ - We prove outcome-independent improper.

<i>Loss</i>	<i>Claimed Properness</i>	<i>Claimed Improperness</i>
SCRPS♣	Avati et al. [2018] <sup>1</sup>	Rindt et al. [2022]
NLL♣	Goldstein et al. [2020] <sup>1</sup>	-
RCLL†	Rindt et al. [2022] (OI) <sup>2</sup> , Avati et al. [2018] <sup>1</sup>	-
SS†	Dawid and Musio [2014] (OI) <sup>1</sup>	-
SBS♣	Rindt et al. [2022] (CI) <sup>2</sup> , Graf et al. [1999] (OI) <sup>1</sup>	-
SAS	-	Schmid et al. [2011]
ISLL♣	-	-
RSBS†	Sonabend [2021]	-
RISL†	Sonabend [2021]	-
SNL†	Sonabend [2021]	-

authors to demonstrate (or clearly argue) why censoring is truly independent to the outcome time, and if this case cannot be made, then competing risk frameworks must be used.

However we have demonstrated a simple reweighting of this loss that can result in a proper loss – this finding is also generalisable to a whole class of measures. In reality, whilst this class of approximate survival losses provides some interesting insights to the close connections of probabilistic regression and survival analysis, these losses are unlikely to be useful in practice due to the requirement to estimate the unknown censoring distribution. Instead we recommend routine use and reporting of RCLL. This latter loss is interpretable, analogously to the well-known negative log-likelihood.

We hope that this paper will help support more transparent model evaluation with two concrete recommendations: 1) the RCLL should be reported as standard alongside common concordance issues (though we note the issues set forward in Sonabend et al. [2022]) and measures of calibration (for example D-Calibration Haider et al. [2020]); 2) journals should insist clear explanation for why censoring is believed to be non-informative if any of the losses above are utilised.

Finally, we hope this paper helps machine learning practitioners more efficiently optimise survival models by making use of losses that are genuinely strictly proper and can therefore be more effectively minimised in automated tuning.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge early contributions from Dr Franz Király including framing of properness definitions and the proof in section 2.

## References

- Tilman Gneiting and Adrian E Raftery. Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and Estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477): 359–378, mar 2007. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.1198/016214506000001437. URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1198/016214506000001437>.
- Allan H Murphy. A New Vector Partition of the Probability Score. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 12(4):595–600, 1973. doi: 10.1175/1520-0450(1973)012<0595:ANVPOT>2.0.CO; 2.
- A P Dawid. Present Position and Potential Developments: Some Personal Views: Statistical Theory: The Prequential Approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)*, 147(2):278–292, jun 1984. ISSN 00359238. doi: 10.2307/2981683. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2981683>.
- A Philip Dawid. Probability Forecasting. *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*, 7:210—218, 1986.
- A Philip Dawid and Monica Musio. Theory and Applications of Proper Scoring Rules. *Metron*, 72(2):169–183, 2014.
- Glenn Brier. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Monthly Weather Review*, 78(1):1–3, 1950.
- I J Good. Rational Decisions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 14(1):107–114, jun 1952. ISSN 00359246. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2984087>.
- Frithjof Gressmann, Franz J. Király, Bilal Mateen, and Harald Oberhauser. Probabilistic supervised learning. 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1801.00753>.
- Raphael Edward Benjamin Sonabend. *A Theoretical and Methodological Framework for Machine Learning in Survival Analysis: Enabling Transparent and Accessible Predictive Modelling on Right-Censored Time-to-Event Data*. Phd, University College London (UCL), 2021. URL <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10129352/>.
- Mark Goldstein, Xintian Han, Aahlad M. Puli, Adler J. Perotte, and Rajesh Ranganath. X-CAL: Explicit Calibration for Survival Analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/d4a93297083a23cc099f7bd6a8621131-Abstract.html>.
- David Rindt, Robert Hu, David Steinsaltz, and Dino Sejdinovic. Survival Regression with Proper Scoring Rules and Monotonic Neural Networks. mar 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.14755>.
- Jared L Katzman, Uri Shaham, Alexander Cloninger, Jonathan Bates, Tingting Jiang, and Yuval Kluger. DeepSurv: personalized treatment recommender system using a Cox proportional hazards deep neural network. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18(1):24, 2018. ISSN 1471-2288. doi: 10.1186/s12874-018-0482-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0482-1>.
- Changhee Lee, William R Zame, Jinsung Yoon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. Deephit: A deep learning approach to survival analysis with competing risks. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.

- Håvard Kvamme. pycox, 2018. URL <https://pypi.org/project/pycox/>.
- Raphael Sonabend. survivalmodels: Models for Survival Analysis, 2020. URL <https://raphaels1.r-universe.dev/ui#package:survivalmodels>.
- Erika Graf, Claudia Schmoor, Willi Sauerbrei, and Martin Schumacher. Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 18(17-18):2529–2545, 1999. ISSN 0277-6715. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19990915/30)18:17/18<2529::AID-SIM274>3.0.CO;2-5.
- Anand Avati, Tony Duan, Sharon Zhou, Kenneth Jung, Nigam H. Shah, and Andrew Ng. Countdown Regression: Sharp and Calibrated Survival Predictions. jun 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.08324>.
- A Tsiatis. A nonidentifiability aspect of the problem of competing risks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 72(1):20–22, jan 1975. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.72.1.20. URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1054494https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC432231/>.
- Hajime Uno, Tianxi Cai, Lu Tian, and L J Wei. Evaluating Prediction Rules for t-Year Survivors with Censored Regression Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(478):527–537, 2007. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27639883>.
- E. L. Kaplan and Paul Meier. Nonparametric Estimation from Incomplete Observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53(282):457–481, 1958. ISSN 01621459. doi: 10.2307/2281868.
- Thomas A Gerds and Martin Schumacher. Consistent Estimation of the Expected Brier Score in General Survival Models with Right-Censored Event Times. *Biometrical Journal*, 48(6):1029–1040, dec 2006. ISSN 0323-3847. doi: 10.1002/bimj.200610301.
- Matthias Schmid, Thomas Hielscher, Thomas Augustin, and Olaf Gefeller. A Robust Alternative to the Schemper-Henderson Estimator of Prediction Error. *Biometrics*, 67(2):524–535, 2011. ISSN 0006341X. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0420.2010.01459.x.
- Raphael Sonabend, Franz J Király, Andreas Bender, Bernd Bischl, and Michel Lang. mlr3proba: An R Package for Machine Learning in Survival Analysis. *Bioinformatics*, feb 2021. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btab039. URL <https://cran.r-project.org/package=mlr3proba>.
- Raphael Sonabend, Andreas Bender, and Sebastian Vollmer. Avoiding C-hacking when evaluating survival distribution predictions with discrimination measures. *Bioinformatics*, 38(17):4178–4184, sep 2022. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btac451. URL <https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/advance-article/doi/10.1093/bioinformatics/btac451/66401>.
- Humza Haider, Bret Hoehn, Sarah Davis, and Russell Greiner. Effective ways to build and evaluate individual survival distributions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(85):1–63, 2020. ISSN 1533-7928.

# Appendices

## A Lemmas and Definitions

Proofs follow after these definitions and lemmas.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be a survival loss. Let  $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$ , let  $Y \sim p_Y$  and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$  be random variables where  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ . Let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ . Then if  $\exists p \in \mathcal{P}, p \neq p_Y$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] > \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \quad (12)$$

Then,  $L$  is not:

- i) *outcome-independent proper;*
- ii) *outcome-independent strictly proper;*
- iii) *proper;*
- iv) *strictly proper.*

*Proof. Proof of (i)* By definition  $L$  is outcome-independent proper if  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] \leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$  but this is a contradiction to the statement, hence  $L$  is not outcome-independent proper, proving (i). ■

*Proof of (ii)* By definition  $L$  is outcome-independent strictly proper if  $L$  is outcome-independent proper and  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \Leftrightarrow p = p_Y$ , however by (i)  $L$  is not outcome-independent proper and therefore by definition cannot be outcome-independent strictly proper, proving (ii). ■

*Proof of (iii)* Proof is identical to (i). ■

*Proof of (iv)* Proof of (iv): By definition  $L$  is strictly proper if  $L$  is proper and  $\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \Leftrightarrow p = p_Y$ , however by (iii)  $L$  is improper and therefore by definition cannot be strictly proper, proving (iv). ■

□

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be an approximate survival loss. Let  $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$  and let  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $Y \sim p_Y$  and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$  be random variables. Let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ . Then if  $\exists p \in \mathcal{P}, p \neq p_Y$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta|c)] > \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta|c)] \quad (13)$$

Then,  $L$  is not:

- i) *outcome-independent proper;*
- ii) *outcome-independent strictly proper;*
- iii) *proper;*
- iv) *strictly proper.*

*Proof.* Proof follows similarly to lemma A.1.  $\square$

**Definition A.3.** Let  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be a proper scoring rule and let  $p, p_Y$  be distributions in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Y \sim p_Y$  and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$  be random variables and let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ . Then, [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007]

- i)  $S_L(p_Y, p) := \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)]$  is defined as the expected penalty.
- ii)  $H_L(p_Y) := S_L(p_Y, p_Y)$  is defined as the (generalised) entropy of  $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$ .
- iii)  $D_L(p_Y, p) := S_L(p_Y, p) - H_L(p_Y)$  is defined as the discrepancy or divergence of  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  from  $p_Y \in \mathcal{P}$ .

**Lemma A.4.** Let  $L : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  be a survival loss and let  $p_Y$  be a distribution in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Y \sim p_Y$  and  $C$  t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$  be random variables and let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ . Then,

- $D_L(p_Y, p) \geq 0$  for all  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  if  $L$  is proper
- $D_L(p_Y, p) > 0$  iff  $L$  is strictly proper and  $p \neq p_Y$

*Proof. Proof of (i)* Proof follows by definition of properness and substituting the expressions defined above. If  $L$  is proper then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[L(p_Y, T, \Delta)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[L(p, T, \Delta)] \\ \Rightarrow S_L(p_Y, p_Y) &\leq S_L(p_Y, p) \\ \Rightarrow H_L(p_Y) &\leq S_L(p_Y, p) \\ \Rightarrow 0 &\leq S_L(p_Y, p) - H_L(p_Y) \\ \Rightarrow D_L(p_Y, p) &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is substituting definition of  $S_L$ , the third is substituting definition of  $H_L$ , the third is subtracting  $H_L$  from both sides, and the final by substituting definition of  $D_L$  and reversing the inequality.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of (ii)** Proof follows similarly to (i) after replacing the inequalities by strict inequalities.  $\blacksquare$

$\square$

**Definition A.5.** Let  $X$  be an absolutely continuous random variable and let  $Y$  be a discrete random variable. Then,

- i) The mixed joint density of  $(X, Y)$  is defined by

$$f_{X,Y}(x, y) = f_{X|Y}(x|y)P(Y = y) \tag{14}$$

where  $f_{X|Y}(x|y)$  is the conditional probability density function of  $X$  given  $Y = y$ .

- ii) The mixed joint cumulative distribution function of  $(X, Y)$  is given by

$$F_{X,Y}(x, y) = \sum_{z \leq y} \int_{u=-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(u, z) du \tag{15}$$

**Lemma A.6.** *Let  $X, Y$  be jointly absolutely continuous random variables supported on the Reals with joint density function  $f_{X,Y}(x, y)$  and let  $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$ , then the mixed joint density of  $(X, Z)$  is given by*

$$f_{X,Z}(x, z) = \begin{cases} \int_x^\infty f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

*Proof.* Proof follows by transformation of random variables via the joint cdf.

The joint cdf of  $(X, Y)$  is defined by,

$$F_{X,Y}(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^y f_{X,Y}(s, t) dt ds \quad (17)$$

By definition of indicator variables,  $Z = 1$  iff  $Y \geq X$  and 0 otherwise and so on substituting  $Z$  for  $Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{X,Z}(x, z) &= P(X \leq x, Z \leq z) \\ &= \begin{cases} P(X \leq x), & z = 1 \\ P(X \leq x, Z = 0) = P(X \leq x, Y < X), & z = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the first case follows as  $Z \in \{0, 1\}$  and hence  $P(X \leq x, Z \leq 1) = P(X \leq x)$  as  $Z$  is marginalised out. The second case follows as  $Z \in \{0, 1\}$  and so  $P(Z \leq 0) = P(Z = 0)$ , and by definition of indicator variables  $Z = 0$  iff  $Y < X$ . Now focusing on the second case,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X \leq x, Y < X) &= \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^\infty f_{X,Y}(t, y) \mathbb{I}_x(t, y) dt dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_x = \mathbb{I}(a \leq x, b < a)$ . The first line follows by definition of joint probabilities and the second by change of notation. Now,

$$F_{X,Z}(x, z) = \begin{cases} F_X(x), & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

For mixed joint distributions,  $F_{X,Y}(x, y) = \sum_{t \leq y} \int_{s=-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(s, t) ds$ , hence the joint density is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X,Z}(x, z) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial F_{X,Z}(x, 1) - F_{X,Z}(x, 0)}{\partial x}, & z = 1 \\ \frac{\partial F_{X,Z}(x, 0)}{\partial x}, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^\infty f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds - \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 1 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_{-\infty}^\infty f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy - \int_{-\infty}^s f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{-\infty}^x \int_s^\infty f_{X,Y}(s, y) dy ds, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$



$$= \begin{cases} \int_x^\infty f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x,y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases}$$

where the first equality is the definition of the joint mixed pdf in terms of the cdf, the second equality follows by substituting eq. (18), the third by taking the partial derivative of the second case over  $x$  and by linearity of integration in the first case, the fourth by subtracting the inner integrals, and the fifth by taking the partial derivative of the first case over  $x$ . The proof is now complete.  $\square$

**Corollary A.7.** *Let  $X, Y$  be jointly absolutely continuous random variables supported on the Reals with joint density function  $f_{X,Y}(x, y)$  and let  $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$ . As a direct corollary to lemma A.6, if  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent then the mixed joint density of  $(X, Z)$  is given by*

$$f_{X,Z}(x, z) = \begin{cases} f_X(x)S_Y(x), & z = 1 \\ f_X(x)F_Y(x), & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* From lemma A.6, for any jointly absolutely continuous random variables,  $X, Y$  supported on the Reals and  $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$  it holds that,

$$f_{X,Z}(x, z) = \begin{cases} \int_x^\infty f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_{X,Y}(x, y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

If  $X, Y$  are independent then  $f_{X,Y}(x, y) = f_X(x)f_Y(y)$  by definition of independence. Substituting this result into the above equation,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X,Z}(x, z) &= \begin{cases} \int_x^\infty f_X(x)f_Y(y) dy, & z = 1 \\ \int_{-\infty}^x f_X(x)f_Y(y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f_X(x) \int_x^\infty f_Y(y) dy, & z = 1 \\ f_X(x) \int_{-\infty}^x f_Y(y) dy, & z = 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f_X(x)S_Y(x), & z = 1 \\ f_X(x)F_Y(x), & z = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds as  $X, Y$  independent, the second by properties of integration, and the third by definition of the cumulative distribution and survival functions. The proof is now complete.  $\square$

**Lemma A.8.** *Let  $X, Y$  be jointly absolutely continuous random variables supported on the Reals with joint density function  $f_{X,Y}(x, y)$  and let  $Z = \mathbb{I}(X \leq Y)$ , then the mixed joint density of  $(Y, Z)$  is given by*

$$f_{Y,Z}(y, z) = \begin{cases} \int_{-\infty}^y f_{X,Y}(x, y) dx, & z = 1 \\ \int_y^\infty f_{X,Y}(x, y) dx, & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

*In addition if  $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ , then*

$$f_{Y,Z}(y, z) = \begin{cases} f_Y(y)F_X(y), & z = 1 \\ f_Y(y)S_X(y), & z = 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Proofs follow analogously to lemma A.6 and corollary A.7; further details are not provided.  $\square$

**Lemma A.9.** *Let  $\phi$  be any real-valued function and let  $Y, C, T$  be as defined above and assume  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(T)] = \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_C(y)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \int_0^\infty f_C(c)S_Y(c)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc \quad (23)$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\phi(T)] \\ &= q\mathbb{E}[\phi(T)|\Delta = 1] + (1 - q)\mathbb{E}[\phi(T)|\Delta = 0] && \text{law of total expectation; } q := P(\Delta = 1) \\ &= q\mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)|\Delta = 1] + (1 - q)\mathbb{E}[\phi(C)|\Delta = 0] && Y \equiv T|\Delta = 1; C \equiv T|\Delta = 0 \\ &= q \int_0^\infty f_{Y|\Delta}(y|1)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + (1 - q) \int_0^\infty f_{C|\Delta}(c|0)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc && \text{def. conditional expectation} \\ &= \int_0^\infty f_{Y,\Delta}(y, 1)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \int_0^\infty f_{C,\Delta}(c, 0)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc && \text{def. conditional probability} \\ &= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_C(y)\phi(y|\Delta = 1) dy + \int_0^\infty f_C(c)S_Y(c)\phi(c|\Delta = 0) dc && \text{corollary A.7 and lemma A.8 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## B Proofs

### B.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

**Proposition B.1.** *i)  $L_{SCRPS}$  and ii)  $L_{NLL}$ , are not: a) outcome-independent proper; b) outcome-independent strictly proper; c) proper; d) strictly proper.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over  $\mathcal{T}$  containing at least two elements. Let  $\zeta, \xi$  be some distributions in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Y \sim \xi$  and let  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$  be an r.v. t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ . Finally let  $\hat{Y} \sim \zeta$  be an r.v. independent of  $Y, C, T$ , and  $\Delta$ .

Improperness follows for any loss  $L$  if  $D_L(\zeta, \xi) < 0$  (lemma A.4), we will prove  $\exists \zeta, \xi$  for each of these losses in turn but for all will make the following assumption that  $C \sim \xi$ .

**Proof of (i)** For this counter-example we let  $\xi = \text{Exp}(1)$  and  $\zeta = \text{Exp}(\mu)$ . First calculating  $S_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \zeta)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \zeta) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \Delta \int_T^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau\right] && \text{def. } L_{SCRPS} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_C(y)\left[\int_0^y F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \int_y^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau\right] dy + \\
&\quad \int_0^\infty f_C(c)S_Y(c)\left[\int_0^c F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau\right] dc && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_Y(y)\left[2\int_0^y F_Y^2(\tau) d\tau + \int_y^\infty S_Y^2(\tau) d\tau\right] dy && \text{let } C \sim \xi \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-2y}\left[2\int_0^y 1 - 2e^{-\mu\tau} + e^{-2\mu\tau} d\tau + \int_y^\infty e^{-2\mu\tau} d\tau\right] dy && \text{let } \xi = \text{Exp}(1), \zeta = \text{Exp}(\mu) \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-2y}\left[\frac{-6 - e^{-2y\mu} + 8e^{-y\mu} + 4y\mu}{2\mu}\right] dy && \text{integration} \\
&= \frac{2\mu^3 + \mu + 2}{4(\mu + 2)\mu(\mu + 1)} && \text{integration}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let  $\mu = 1.5$  so  $\zeta = \text{Exp}(1.5)$ , then

$$D_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \zeta) = S_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \zeta) - H_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi) = 0.1952 - 0.208333 = -0.0131 < 0 \quad (24)$$

By lemma A.4 as  $D_{L_{SCRPS}}(\xi, \zeta) < 0$  and as  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  it follows that  $L_{SCRPS}$  is not outcome-independent proper.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of (ii)** For this counter-example we let  $\xi = \text{Exp}(1)$  and  $\zeta = \text{Exp}(\mu)$ . First calculating  $S_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \zeta)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \zeta) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[-\log[f_{\hat{Y}}(T)]] && \text{def. } L_{NLL} \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_C(y)[- \log[f_{\hat{Y}}(y)]] dy + \int_0^\infty f_C(c)S_Y(c)[- \log[f_{\hat{Y}}(c)]] dc && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
&= \int_0^\infty f_Y(y)S_Y(y)[-2 \log[f_{\hat{Y}}(y)]] dy && \text{let } C \sim \xi \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-2y}(-2 \log[\mu e^{-\mu y}]) dy && \text{let } \xi = \text{Exp}(1), \zeta = \text{Exp}(\mu) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(\mu - 2 \log(\mu)) && \text{integration}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let  $\mu = 2$  so  $\zeta = \text{Exp}(3)$ , then

$$D_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \zeta) = S_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \zeta) - H_{L_{NLL}}(\xi) = -1.1479 - 0.5 = -1.6479 < 0 \quad (25)$$

By lemma A.4 as  $D_{L_{NLL}}(\xi, \zeta) < 0$  and as  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  it follows that  $L_{NLL}$  is not outcome-independent proper.  $\blacksquare$

$\square$

## B.2 Proof of Proposition 5.1

**Proposition B.2.** Let  $\zeta.S^2(\tau) = (\zeta.S(\tau))^2$ ,  $\zeta.F^2(\tau) = (\zeta.F(\tau))^2$  and let  $\tau^* \in \mathcal{T}$  be an upper cutoff. Then the approximate survival loss,  $L_{SBS}$  [Graf et al., 1999], defined by

$$L_{SBS}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{\zeta.S^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t \leq \tau, \delta = 1)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} + \frac{\zeta.F^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(t > \tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau \quad (26)$$

is not outcome-independent proper.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and let  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}$  be two distinct families of distributions over  $\mathcal{T}$  containing at least two elements. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and let  $\zeta, \xi$  be some distributions in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Y \sim \xi$  and let  $C \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$  be an r.v. t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ . Finally let  $\hat{Y} \sim \zeta$  be an r.v. independent of  $Y, C, T$ , and  $\Delta$ .

Improperness follows for any loss  $L$  if  $D_L(\zeta, \xi) < 0$  (lemma A.4). We will prove  $\exists \zeta, \xi$  by starting with the following assumptions: 1)  $C \sim \xi$ , 2) there is a sufficiently large sample size  $n$  such that  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C$  [Kaplan and Meier, 1958]. For this counter-example, we let  $\xi = \text{Exp}(1)$  and  $\zeta = \text{Exp}(b)$ .

First calculating  $S_{L_{SBS}}(\xi, \zeta)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{L_{SBS}}(\xi, \zeta) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^{\tau^*} \frac{S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(T \leq \tau, \Delta = 1)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)} + \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)\mathbb{I}(T > \tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau \right\} && \text{definition } L_{SBS} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[ \int_T^{\tau^*} \frac{S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)\Delta}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)} d\tau \right] + \mathbb{E}\left[ \int_0^T \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau \right] && \text{change limits} \\ &= \int f_Y(y)S_C(y) \int_y^{\tau^*} \frac{S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} d\tau dy + \int f_Y(y)S_C(y) \int_0^y \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau dy + \\ &\quad \int f_C(c)S_Y(c) \int_0^c \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(\tau)} d\tau dc && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\ &= \int f_Y(y) \int_y^{\tau^*} S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau dy + \int f_Y(y)S_C(y) \int_0^y \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{S_C(\tau)} d\tau dy + \\ &\quad \int f_C(c)S_Y(c) \int_0^c \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{S_C(\tau)} d\tau dc && \text{as } \hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C \\ &= \int f_Y(y) \int_y^1 S_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau) d\tau dy + 2 \int f_Y(y)S_Y(y) \int_0^y \frac{F_{\hat{Y}}^2(\tau)}{S_Y(\tau)} d\tau dy && \text{let } C \sim \xi, \tau^* = 1 \\ &= \int (2e^{-2y}) \int_y^1 (e^{-2b\tau}) d\tau dy + 4 \int e^{-4y} \int_0^y \frac{1 - 2e^{-b\tau} + e^{-2b\tau}}{(e^{-2\tau})} d\tau dy && \text{let } \xi = \text{Exp}(2), \zeta = \text{Exp}(b) \\ &= \int (e^{-2y}) \frac{e^{-by} - e^{-2b}}{2b} dy + && \text{integration} \\ &\quad 4 \int e^{-4y} \left[ \frac{e^{y(2-2b)}}{2-2b} - \frac{2e^{y(2-b)}}{2-b} + \frac{2}{2-b} + \frac{1}{2b-2} + \frac{e^{2y}-1}{2} \right] dy \\ &= -\frac{e^{-2b}(2+2b-ae^{2b})}{2b(2+2b)} - 4 \left( \frac{e^{-4y}(\frac{b^2}{4-6b+2b^2} - e^{2y})}{4} + \frac{2e^{y(-(2+b))}}{4-b^2} - \frac{e^{y(-(2+2b))}}{4-4b^2} \right) && \text{integration} \end{aligned}$$

$$= -\frac{e^{-2b}(2+2b-2e^{2b})}{2b(2+2b)} - \frac{b^2}{(2+b)(2+2b)}$$

Now let  $b = 3$  so  $\zeta = \text{Exp}(3)$ , then

$$D_{L_{SBS}}(\xi, \zeta) = S_{L_{SBS}}(\xi, \zeta) - H_{L_{SBS}}(\xi) = -0.1837 - -0.0879 = -0.0958 < 0 \quad (27)$$

By lemma A.4 as  $D_{L_{SBS}}(\xi, \zeta) < 0$  and as  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  it follows that  $L_{SBS}$  is not outcome-independent proper.  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 6.1

**Theorem B.3.** *Let  $L_R$  be a regression scoring rule, then an approximate survival loss  $L_S$  defined by*

$$L_S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}; \quad (\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) \mapsto \frac{\delta L_R(\zeta, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (28)$$

*is outcome-independent strictly proper if and only if  $L_R$  is strictly proper.*

*Proof.* **Proof  $L_S$  strictly proper  $\Rightarrow L_R$  strictly proper** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over the positive Reals and let  $\zeta, \xi$  be distinct distributions in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Y$  be some random variable distributed according to  $\xi$  and let  $C$  be an r.v. t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ . Let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$ ,  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ , and  $q := P(\Delta = 1)$ .

Proof follows by definition of strict properness,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[L_S(\xi, T, \Delta | \hat{G}_{KM})] &< \mathbb{E}[L_S(\zeta, T, \Delta | \hat{G}_{KM})] \\ \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] &< \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] && \text{def. of strictly proper} \\ \Rightarrow \int f_Y(y) S_C(y) \frac{L_R(\xi, y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy &< \int f_Y(y) S_C(y) \frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} && \text{lemma A.9 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\ \Rightarrow \int f_Y(y) L_R(\xi, Y) dy &< \int f_Y(y) L_R(\zeta, Y) dy && \hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[L_R(\xi, Y)] &< \mathbb{E}[L_R(\zeta, Y)] \end{aligned}$$

As  $\zeta \neq \xi$  and  $Y \sim \xi$  it follows that  $L_R$  is strictly proper by definition, as required.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof  $L_R$  strictly proper  $\Rightarrow L_S$  strictly proper** Again let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a family of absolutely continuous distributions over the positive Reals and let  $\zeta, \xi$  be distinct distributions in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $Y$  be some random variable distributed according to  $\xi$  and let  $C$  be an r.v. t.v.i.  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ . Let  $T := \min\{Y, C\}$  and  $\Delta := \mathbb{I}(T = Y)$ .

Proof follows by definition of strict properness,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[L_R(\xi, Y)] &< \mathbb{E}[L_R(\zeta, Y)] && \text{def. strictly proper} \\ \Rightarrow \int f_Y(y) L_R(\xi, Y) dy &< \int f_Y(y) L_R(\zeta, Y) dy && \text{def. expectation} \\ \Rightarrow \int \frac{f_Y(y) S_C(y) L_R(\xi, Y)}{S_C(y)} dy &< \int \frac{f_Y(y) S_C(y) L_R(\zeta, Y)}{S_C(y)} dy && \text{multiply } S_C(y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Rightarrow \int \frac{f_Y(y)S_C(y)L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy < \int \frac{f_Y(y)S_C(y)L_R(\zeta, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy && \hat{G}_{KM} \rightarrow S_C \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\
&\Rightarrow \int \frac{f_{Y|\Delta}(y|1)L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy < \int \frac{f_{Y|\Delta}(y|1)L_R(\zeta, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(y)} dy && \text{corollary A.7 as } Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C \\
&\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] < \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] && \text{def. conditional expectation} \\
&\Rightarrow q\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + 0 < q\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + 0 && \text{multiply } q := P(\Delta = 1) \text{ add } 0 \\
&\Rightarrow q\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + (1-q)\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, C)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(C)} \mid \Delta = 0\right] && \text{sub. expressions equalling } 0 \\
&\quad < q\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, Y)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(Y)} \mid \Delta = 1\right] + (1-q)\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, C)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(C)} \mid \Delta = 0\right] \\
&\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\xi, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] < \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta L_R(\zeta, T)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(T)}\right] && \text{law of total expectation}
\end{aligned}$$

As  $\zeta \neq \xi$  and  $Y \sim \xi$  and  $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  it follows that  $L_S : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  is outcome-independent strictly proper by definition as required.  $\blacksquare$

$\square$

## B.4 Proof of Proposition 6.2

**Proposition B.4.**  $L_{RSBS}, L_{RISL}, L_{SNL}$  are all outcome-independent strictly proper.

*Proof.* Proofs follow from theorem 6.1 and noting that:

$$L_{RSBS}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta L_{IBS}(\zeta, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (29)$$

$$L_{RISLL}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta L_{ILL}(\zeta, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (30)$$

$$L_{SNL}(\zeta, t, \delta | \hat{G}_{KM}) = \frac{\delta L_{LL}(\zeta, t)}{\hat{G}_{KM}(t)} \quad (31)$$

where  $L_{IBS} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  is the integrated Brier score,  $L_{ILL} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  is the integrated log-loss, and  $L_{LL} : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  is the log-loss; and all three are strictly proper [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007, Gressmann et al., 2018].  $\square$