# PH 716 Applied Survival Analysis

Part VI: Diagnostics of Cox PH Models

Zhiyang Zhou (zhou67@uwm.edu, zhiyanggeezhou.github.io)

2024/Apr/01 18:11:02

## Types of residuals

- Cox-Snell residuals: assessing the overall fit of the final model
- Martingale residuals: determining the functional form of a covariate included in the model
- Deviance residuals: detecting outliers
- Schoenfeld residuals: checking the appropriateness of the PH assumption

## **Cox-Snell** residuals

- Cox-Snell residuals:  $r_{i,CS} = \widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(\widetilde{T}_i)$ 
  - $-\widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(\cdot)$ : estimated  $\Lambda_{T_i}(\cdot)$  given by the Cox PH model
  - (For uncensored subjects)  $r_{i,\rm CS} \stackrel{\rm iid}{\approx} \exp(1)$
  - (For all subjects)  $\widehat{\Lambda}_{H_i, \text{NA}}(\widetilde{t}_i) \approx \widetilde{t}_i$ 
    - \*  $H_i = \widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(T_i)$ 
      - Note that  $r_{i,CS} \neq H_i$  and instead  $r_{i,CS} = \min\{H_i, \widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(C_i)\}$
- \*  $\widehat{\Lambda}_{H_i, \text{NA}}(\cdot)$ : NA estimator of  $\Lambda_{H_i}(\cdot)$  based on right-censored  $\{(r_{i, \text{CS}}, \Delta_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ • Cox-Snell residual plot
  - (For uncensored subjects) compare  $r_{i,CS}$  to exp(1) samples via Q-Q plot
  - (For all subjects) plot  $\Lambda_{H_i, NA}(\tilde{t}_i)$  against  $\tilde{t}_i$
  - Used to diagnose poor model fit
  - No insight into how model assumptions are violated
- Theoretical notes
  - Inverse cdf theorem: arbitrary r.v. X with cdf  $F_X(x) = \Pr(X \le x) \Rightarrow F_X(X) \sim U(0,1)$
  - It follows that  $T_i \stackrel{\text{independent}}{\sim} S_{T_i}(\cdot) \Rightarrow S_{T_i}(T_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} U(0,1) \Rightarrow \Lambda_{T_i}(T_i) = -\ln S_{T_i}(T_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \exp(1)$   $\{(r_{i,\text{CS}}, \Delta_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  is a right-censored dataset
  - - \*  $r_{i,CS} = \min(H_i, \widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(C_i)) \Leftarrow \widetilde{T}_i = \min(T_i, C_i)$  and monotonically ascending  $\widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(\cdot)$  $\cdot \quad H_i = \widehat{\Lambda}_{T_i}(T_i) \approx \Lambda_{T_i}(T_i) \Rightarrow H_i \approx \exp(1) \Rightarrow \Lambda_{H_i}(\widetilde{t}_i) \approx \widetilde{t}_i$

## Ex. 6.1 [KM, Example 11.1]

- This multi-center acute leukemia study consists of 137 patients with acute myelocytic leukemia (AML) or acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) aged 7 to 52 from March 1, 1984 to June 30, 1989 at four institutions.
- The disease-free survival time (t2) on study is defined as time (in days) to relapse or death
- d3 is the disease free survival indicator: 1 Dead or Relapsed, 0 Alive Disease Free.
- Focus on effects of the following 9 covariates on disease-free survival:

```
- z1: Patient age in years.
```

- z2: Donor age in years.
- z3: Patient sex: 1 Male, 0 Female.
- z4: Doner sex: 1 Male, 0 Female.
- z5: Patient Cytomegalovirus (CMV) status: 1 CMV positive, 0 CMV negative.
- z6: Donor CMV status: 1 CMV positive, 0 CMV negative.
- z7: Waiting time to transplant in days.
- z8: French-American-British classification (FAB): 1 FAB Grade 4 or 5 and AML, 0 otherwise.
- z10: Methotrexate (MTX): used as a Graft-Versus-Host-Prophylactic 1 Yes, 0 No.

```
options(digits=4)
library(survival)
# model fitting
data.ex55 = read.csv("bmt.csv")
fit.ex55 <- coxph(Surv(t2,d3) ~ z1+z2+z3+z4+z5+z6+z7+z8+z10, data=data.ex55)
# Cox-Snell residual
r.cs = data.ex55$d3-residuals(fit.ex55, type='martingale') # Cox-Snell
# Cox-Snell residual plot
set.seed(2024)
exp.rnd = rexp(10000)
qqplot(
 x = exp.rnd, y = r.cs[as.logical(data.ex55$d3)],
  xlab = "Theoretical Quantiles", ylab = "Sample Quantiles"
)
qqline(r.cs[as.logical(data.ex55$d3)], distribution = qexp)
# Or
cum.haz.r.cs <- basehaz(coxph(Surv(r.cs, d3)~1, data=data.ex55), centered = FALSE)</pre>
plot(
  x=cum.haz.r.cs[,2], y=cum.haz.r.cs[,1],
  xlab='t', ylab='Cumulative hazard of r.cs'
)
abline(a=0,b=1,col='red')
```

# Martingale residuals

- Martingale residuals:  $r_{i,M} = \Delta_i r_{i,CS}$
- To explore the proper functional form of the  $j_0$ th covariate, say  $f_{j_0}(\cdot)$ 
  - 1. Fit a Cox PH model without the *j*th covariate  $\lambda_{T_i}(t) = \lambda_0(t) \exp\{\sum_{j \neq j_0} f_j(x_{ij})\beta_j\}$ -  $f_j(\cdot)$ : known proper functional form of the *j*th covariate
  - 2. Compute martingale residuals  $r_{i,M}$  for the above model
  - 3. Scatterplot of  $r_{i,M}$  against  $x_{ij_0}$  with a fitted locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (loess) curve  $-f_{j_0}(\cdot)$  (approximately) proportional to the loess curve
  - 4. Update the model by adding  $f_{j_0}(x_{ij_0})$  and check the scatterplot of updated  $r_{i,M}$  against  $x_{ij_0}$  with a fitted loess line
    - No further transformation needed If the new loess curve lies at the x-axis
- Theoretical notes:
  - loess: to predict  $f(x_0)$  by an weighted average  $\hat{f}(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i y_i$ , where  $w_i$  relies on the distance between  $x_i$  and  $x_0$ ; a closer  $x_i$  enjoys a higher  $w_i$ .
  - Why is the residual bearing such a name?
    - \* Martingale: a stochastic process M(t) such that  $E\{M(t)\} = 0$  and  $E\{M(t) \mid M(s)\} = M(s)$

for all s < t

- \*  $r_{i,M}$  obtained by evaluating a martingale at  $t_i$
- Why would the martingale residuals reveal the correct functional forms of covariates?
  - \* With  $r_{i,M}$  obtained from the Cox PH model excluding the  $j_0$ th covariate,  $E(r_{i,M}) \approx (n_D/n) \{ f_{j_0}(x_{ij_0}) \text{constant} \}$  [KM, pp. 362]
    - $\cdot n_D/n$ : the ratio of total number of events to total number of subjects
- Zero-sum of martingale residuals:  $\sum_{i} r_{i,M} = 0$ 
  - \* Specific for Cox PH model with the Breslow estimator for the baseline cumulative hazard
  - \* Proof:  $\sum_{i} r_{i,\text{CS}} = \sum_{i} \sum_{k:t_k \leq \tilde{t}_i} \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{ij}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)} = \sum_k \frac{d_k \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(t_k)} \exp(\sum_j x_{\ell j}\hat{\beta}_j$

### Revisit Ex. 6.1

```
options(digits=4)
library(survival)
# [DM, pp. 208] a function to add the smooth curve and confidence limits
smoothSEcurve <- function(yy, xx) {</pre>
  # use after a call to "plot"
  # fit a lowess curve and 95% confidence interval curve
  # make list of x values
  xx.list <- min(xx) + ((0:100)/100)*(max(xx) - min(xx))
  # Then fit loess function through the points (xx, yy)
  # at the listed values
  yy.xx <- predict(loess(yy ~ xx, span = 1), se=T, newdata=data.frame(xx=xx.list))</pre>
  lines(yy.xx$fit ~ xx.list, lwd=2)
  lines(yy.xx$fit -
  qt(0.975, yy.xx$df)*yy.xx$se.fit ~ xx.list, lty=2)
  lines(yy.xx$fit +
  qt(0.975, yy.xx$df)*yy.xx$se.fit ~ xx.list, lty=2)
}
# model fitting without z1
data.ex55 = read.csv("bmt.csv")
fit.ex55 <- coxph(Surv(t2,d3) ~ z2+z3+z4+z5+z6+z7+z8+z10, data=data.ex55, ties = 'exact')
# Martingale residual plot (for the model without z1) vs. z1
r.m = residuals(fit.ex55, type='martingale')
sum(r.m)
plot(
  x=data.ex55$z1, y=r.m,
  main = 'Martingale residuals n (for the model without z1) n versus z1')
smoothSEcurve(r.m, data.ex55$z1) # indicating a cubic function?
# model fitting with a cubic function of z1
fit.ex55.1 <- coxph(Surv(t2,d3) ~ z1+I(z1^2)+I(z1^3)+z2+z3+z4+z5+z6+z7+z8+z10, data=data.ex55)
# Martingale residual plot (for the model with a cubic function of z1) vs. z1
r.m.1 = residuals(fit.ex55.1, type='martingale')
plot(
  x=data.ex55$z1, y=r.m.1,
  main = 'Martingale residual n (for the model with a cubic function of z1) n versus z1')
smoothSEcurve(r.m.1, data.ex55$z1)
```

## **Deviance** residuals

- Outlier: an observation for which the outcome is not sufficiently well predicted by the fitted model
- Deviance residuals:  $r_{i,D} = \operatorname{sign}(r_{i,M}) \sqrt{-2\{r_{i,M} + \delta_i \ln(\delta_i r_{i,M})\}}$ 
  - Symmetrically distributed with expected value 0 (if the fitted model is correct); deskewed/transformed martingale residuals
    - \*  $r_{i,\mathrm{D}} = 0 \Leftrightarrow r_{i,M} = 0$
    - \* Inflating  $r_{i,D}$  when  $r_{i,M}$  is close to 1
    - \* Shrinking large negative  $r_{i,M}$
  - Analogous to the deviance in GLMs
- Detecting outliers: plotting  $r_{i,D}$  against  $\sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{ij} \hat{\beta}_j$  (called linear predictors or risk scores)
  - With moderate (or less) censoring, this plot should look like randomly-distributed noise without discernible pattern
  - Large absolute values of deviance residuals indicating observations that are poorly explained by the model, potentially pointing to outliers or influential points
    - \* 95% of absolute deviance residuals  $\leq 2$
    - \* 99.7% of absolute deviance residuals  $\leq 3$

### Revisit Ex. 6.1

```
options(digits=4)
library(survival)
# [DM, pp. 208] a function to add the smooth curve and confidence limits
smoothSEcurve <- function(yy, xx) {</pre>
  # use after a call to "plot"
  # fit a lowess curve and 95% confidence interval curve
  # make list of x values
  xx.list <- min(xx) + ((0:100)/100)*(max(xx) - min(xx))</pre>
  # Then fit loess function through the points (xx, yy)
  # at the listed values
  yy.xx <- predict(loess(yy ~ xx, span = 1), se=T, newdata=data.frame(xx=xx.list))</pre>
  lines(yy.xx$fit ~ xx.list, lwd=2)
  lines(yy.xx$fit -
  qt(0.975, yy.xx$df)*yy.xx$se.fit ~ xx.list, lty=2)
  lines(yy.xx$fit +
  qt(0.975, yy.xx$df)*yy.xx$se.fit ~ xx.list, lty=2)
}
# model fitting
fit.ex55.1 <- coxph(</pre>
  Surv(t2,d3) \sim z1+I(z1^2)+I(z1^3)+z2+z3+z4+z5+z6+z7+z8+z10,
  data=data.ex55,
  x = T
)
# Two ways to calculate linear predictors
risk.score.1 = fit.ex55.1$x %*% coef(fit.ex55.1) # reliable
risk.score.2 = fit.ex55.1$linear.predictors # Unreliable due to the default centering
sum((risk.score.1-risk.score.2)^2) # typically different
# Deviance residual plot vs. risk scores
r.d = residuals(fit.ex55.1, type='deviance')
```

```
plot(
  x=risk.score.1, y=r.d,
  main = 'Deviance residuals \n versus risk scores')
smoothSEcurve(yy=r.d, xx=risk.score.1)
abline(a=2,b=0,col='red')
abline(a=-2,b=0,col='red')
abline(a=3,b=0,col='red')
abline(a=-3,b=0,col='red')
(1:nrow(data.ex55))[abs(r.d) > 2] # Potential outliers
sum(abs(r.d) > 2)/nrow(data.ex55) # percent of r.d over 2
sum(abs(r.d) > 3)/nrow(data.ex55) # percent of r.d over 3
```

## Schoenfeld residuals

• Schoenfeld residuals: for UNCENSORED subject *i* and the *j*th covariate,

$$r_{ij,\mathrm{S}} = x_{ij} - \bar{x}.$$

- $\bar{x}_{\cdot j} = \sum_{k \in \text{uncensored subjects}} w_{kj} z_{kj} \text{ with weights } w_{kj} = \frac{\exp(\sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{kj} \beta_j)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{R}(\bar{t}_k)} \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{\ell j} \beta_j)}$  $[DM, Sec. 7.2.2] \text{ Schoenfeld residuals are components of the score function } \sum_{i \in \text{uncensored subjects}} r_{ij,S} = \sum_{i \in \text{uncensored subjects}} r_{ij,S}$
- 0 for each j
- Scaled Schoenfeld residuals

$$r_{ij,\mathrm{S}}^* = d \cdot r_{ij,\mathrm{S}} \cdot \operatorname{var}(\hat{\beta}_j)$$

- -d: total number of events
- If the hazard ratio is constant over time, then  $E(r_{ij,S}^*) + \beta_j$  is time-invariant
- Investigating the PH assumption
  - Plotting  $r_{ij,S}$  versus the covariate  $x_{ij}$  for the *j* covariate
    - \* Points centered at zero if the PH assumption holds
    - \* Inconvenient to be implemented in R
  - Instead, checking the plot of  $r_{ij,S}^* + \hat{\beta}_j$  vs. t
    - \* Points without a time tendency if the PH assumption holds
  - Score test (survival::cox.zph)

```
Revisit Ex. 6.1
```

```
options(digits=4)
library(survival)
# model fitting
fit.ex55.1 <- coxph(</pre>
  Surv(t2,d3) ~ z1+I(z1^2)+I(z1^3)+z2+z3+z4+z5+z6+z7+z8+z10,
  data=data.ex55,
  x=T
)
# (unscaled) Schoenfeld residuals
r.s.unscaled = residuals(fit.ex55.1, type='schoenfeld')
# (scaled) Schoenfeld residual plot
plot(cox.zph(fit.ex55.1, transform="identity", terms=F, global=F))
```

# Score test
cox.zph(fit.ex55.1, transform="identity", terms=F, global=F)