



Henrique Laureano

Wagner Bonat

http://leg.ufpr.br/~henrique|http://leg.ufpr.br/~wagner



» We work on the probability scale, modeling the

Cause-specific cumulative incidence function (CIF)

for a type
$$k$$
 failure, $F_k(t \mid X) = \mathbb{P}[T \le t, K = k \mid X]$
= $\int_0^t f_k(a \mid X) da$, $t > 0$,

where $f_k(t \mid X) = \lambda_k(t \mid X) \times S(t \mid X)$ is the (sub)density for the time to a type k failure



» We work on the probability scale, modeling the

Cause-specific cumulative incidence function (CIF)

for a type
$$k$$
 failure, $F_k(t \mid X) = \mathbb{P}[T \le t, K = k \mid X]$
= $\int_0^t f_k(a \mid X) da$, $t > 0$,

where $f_k(t \mid X) = \lambda_k(t \mid X) \times S(t \mid X)$ is the (sub)density for the time to a type k failure

- » We go beyond the independence supposition, having clusters of subjects with a possible correlation
- » Our latent structure to capture this possible correlation has audacity, allowing for within-cluster dependence of both risk and timing



Considering a competing risks setup of three competing causes. . .



Considering a competing risks setup of three competing causes. . .

... we want to model the CIF in the following specific manner

$$F_{k}(t \mid X, U) = \mathbb{P}[T \leq t, K = k \mid X, U]$$

$$= \underbrace{\pi_{k}(X, u_{1}, u_{2})}_{\text{cluster-specific risk level}} \times \underbrace{\Phi[w_{k}g(t) - X^{\top}\gamma_{k} - \eta_{k}]}_{\text{cluster-specific failure time trajectory}}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

i.e., a product of two functions

- » the first models the absolute risk of a competing cause in the presence of another
- » the second models the failure time distribution,

both varying between clusters



Considering a competing risks setup of three competing causes. . .

... we want to model the CIF in the following specific manner

$$F_{k}(t \mid X, U) = \mathbb{P}[T \leq t, K = k \mid X, U]$$

$$= \underbrace{\pi_{k}(X, u_{1}, u_{2})}_{\text{cluster-specific risk level}} \times \underbrace{\Phi[w_{k}g(t) - X^{\top}\gamma_{k} - \eta_{k}]}_{\text{cluster-specific failure time trajectory}}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

i.e., a product of two functions

- » the first models the absolute risk of a competing cause in the presence of another
- » the second models the failure time distribution,

both varying between clusters

- » The third competing cause is left to accommodate the censorship
- Which probability distribution fits this setup? Multinomial



Scheike works out this idea via a pairwise composite likelihood approach,

```
@article{Scheike.
  author = {L. Cederkvist and K. K. Holst and K. K. Andersen and
             T. H. Scheike}.
 title = {Modeling the cumulative incidence function of
             multivariate competing risks data allowing for
             within-cluster dependence of risk and timing},
        = {2019}.
  year
  journal = {Biostatistics},
 volume = \{20\},
 number = \{2\},
  pages = \{199--217\}.
```

And we? We try a hierarchical approach via a GLMM



Our approach: what we do



Our approach: what we do

For an observed response y_{ijt} of a subject i, with cluster j, in the time t, we have

$$y_{ijt} \mid \{u_{1j}, u_{2j}, \eta_{1j}, \eta_{2j}\} \sim \mathsf{Multinomial}(p_{1ijt}, p_{2ijt}, p_{3ijt}),$$

$$[u_{1i}] \qquad [0] \quad [\sigma^2 \quad o_{ij}, u_{2j}, u_{2j},$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{1j} \\ u_{2j} \\ \eta_{1j} \\ \eta_{2j} \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{u_1}^2 & \varrho_{u_1,u_2} & \varrho_{u_1,\eta_1} & \varrho_{u_1,\eta_2} \\ \sigma_{u_2}^2 & \varrho_{u_2,\eta_1} & \varrho_{u_2,\eta_2} \\ \sigma_{\eta_1}^2 & \varrho_{\eta_1,\eta_2} \\ \sigma_{\eta_2}^2 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.$$



Our approach: what we do

For an observed response y_{ijt} of a subject i, with cluster j, in the time t, we have

$$y_{ijt} \mid \{u_{1j}, u_{2j}, \eta_{1j}, \eta_{2j}\} \sim \mathsf{Multinomial}(p_{1ijt}, p_{2ijt}, p_{3ijt}), \ egin{bmatrix} u_{1j} \ u_{2j} \ \eta_{1j} \ \eta_{2j} \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \end{bmatrix}, egin{bmatrix} \sigma_{u_1}^2 & \varrho_{u_1,u_2} & \varrho_{u_1,\eta_1} & \varrho_{u_1,\eta_2} \ \sigma_{u_2}^2 & \varrho_{u_2,\eta_1} & \varrho_{u_2,\eta_2} \ \sigma_{\eta_1}^2 & \varrho_{\eta_1,\eta_2} \ \sigma_{\eta_2}^2 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This model structure is connected via a link function, i.e., a functional form for the multinomial probabilities.

Here we use the CIF derivative w.r.t. time t,

$$\begin{split} p_{kijt} &= \frac{\exp\{\pmb{x}_{kij}\pmb{\beta}_{ki} + u_{kj}\}}{1 + \sum_{m=1}^{K-1} \exp\{\pmb{x}_{mij}\pmb{\beta}_{mi} + u_{mj}\}} \\ &\times w_{k} \frac{\delta}{2\delta t - 2t^{2}} \phi[w_{k} \mathrm{arctanh}\left(\frac{t - \delta/2}{\delta/2}\right) - \pmb{x}_{kij}\pmb{\gamma}_{ki} - \eta_{kj}]. \end{split}$$

Our approach: how we do



Our approach: how we do

TMB: Template Model Builder

Quickly implement complex random effect models through simple C++ templates. The R package combines

- » CppAD: C++ automatic differentiation
- » Eigen: templated matrix-vector library
- » CHOLMOD: sparse matrix routines available from R

to obtain an efficient implementation of the applied Laplace approximation with exact derivatives.

Also, key features are

- » automatic sparseness detection
- » parallelism through BLAS
- » parallel user templates.



Main application: cancer incidence in twins



Clustered competing risks data

L Clusters? Families

Family studies

Twins data

within-cluster dependence \Rightarrow within-family dependence

within-family dependence may reflect both disease **heritability** and the impact of shared **environmental effects**

