

Visualising and analysing time-toevent data: lifting the veil of censoring

Patrick Royston Cancer Group, MRC Clinical Trials Unit, London



A poet writes about censored observations:

Last night I saw upon the stair A little man who wasn't there He wasn't there again today Oh, how I wish he'd go away!

From Antigonish (1899)

Hughes Mearns (1875-1965)





- Why is censoring of time-to-event data an issue?
- Example in breast cancer
- Visualisation of censored data using model-based imputation
- Multiple imputation and analysis of survival data with missing covariate observations
- Demonstration with Stata



- You can't picture the raw data easily
- Reliance on Kaplan-Meier plots
 - Exaggerates differences between groups
 - Attracts attention to unreliable survival estimates at extreme times
- Data will be analysed using Cox model
 - Still the almost-automatic choice although decent alternatives exist
- Time is "forgotten about" in the Cox model
 - Analysis is based on the ranks of failure times



- Results of Cox regression models are usually expressed as (log) hazard ratios
 - Indirect not dealing directly with time
 - Can be hard to interpret different effect on survival curves at high and low survival probs
 - Particularly difficult for interactions 'ratio of hazard ratios'
- Non-proportional hazards
 - Data with long-term follow-up typically have it
 - Modelling and interpretation may be complex

Example: Primary nodepositive breast cancer



- GBSG trial BMFT-2
- 686 patients, 299 events for recurrencefree survival (RFS)
- Patients assigned to hormonal therapy (TAM) or not
- Visualise the effect of TAM on RFS
- Visualise interaction between TAM and ER (estrogen receptor status)

Traditional visualisation: Kaplan-Meier by TAM group







12th UK Stata Users' meeting, September 2006

How better to visualise survival times?



- To make progress with visualisation, aim to impute the "missing" part of censored times
- Assume a parametric distribution of survival time
- Survival times are sometimes approximately lognormally distributed (Royston 2001a)
 - Can check by using modified Normal Q-Q plot
- If lognormal approximation is not good, can consider Box-Cox transformation of time
 - Or another transformation towards normality

Assessing lognormality: modified Normal Q-Q plot

- MRC Clinical Trials Unit
- Simple transformation of Kaplan-Meier survival curve



Normal Q-Q plot by TAM group



Clinical

Trials

Unit

MRC

Visualisation of censored data using imputation



- Create m (≥ 1) copies of the data with censored survival times imputed
- Need an imputation model to reflect
 - Distribution of times (e.g. lognormal)
 - Effects of covariates (prognostic factors)
- Creating an imputation model:
 - Use mfp with cnreg (censored normal regrn.) to model poss. non-linear effects of covariates
 - E.G. mfp cnreg lnt x1 x2 x3 x4a x4b x5 x6 x7 hormone, censored(c) select(1) dfdefault(2)

Creating the imputed dataset(s)

MRC Clinical Trials Unit

- Can use the ice multiple imputation command to create the imputations
 Royston (2004, 2005a, 2005b) Stata J
- ice varlist using filename[.dta]
 [if exp] [in range] [weight],
 [m(#) cmd(cmdlist) cycles(#)
 boot[(varlist)] seed(#) dryrun
 eq(eqlist) passive(passivelist)
 substitute(sublist) dropmissing
 interval(intlist) other_options]



- gen ll = lnt
- gen ul = cond(_d==1, lnt, ln(50))
 // chose upper limit of 50 years for
 RFS: can use . for +∞
- (generate FP transformations of x1, x5, x6)
- ice x1_1 x2 x3 x4a x4b x5_1 x6_1 x7
 hormone ll ul lnt using imputed.dta,
 interval(lnt:ll ul) m(10)



• Sample randomly from truncated normal distribution (shaded)



Code fragment from uvis.ado

```
`cmd' `yvarlist' `xvars' `wgt',
  `options'
if "`cmd'"=="intreg" {
    tempvar PhiA PhiB
    gen `PhiA` = cond(missing(`ll'), 0,
      norm((`ll'-`xb')/`rmsestar'))
    gen `PhiB` = cond(missing(`ul'), 1,
      norm((`ul'-`xb')/`rmsestar'))
    replace `yimp` = `xb`
      +`rmsestar'*invnorm(`u'*
      (`PhiB'-`PhiA')+`PhiA')
}
```

Clinical

Trials

Unit

MRC



- Response variable in time-to-event studies
- Impute when a covariate is sometimes partly observed, sometimes complete
 - Some observations recorded exactly
 - Others known to be below or above a cutoff
 - E.g. D-dimer in DVT, PgR/ER in breast cancer
- Interval censored covariates
 - Income in surveys recorded as ranges only

Clinical

Trials Unit

Breast cancer data: visualisation of time to recurrence



Clinical Trials

Unit

MRC

Visualisation: some plots using the first imputed sample





Visualisation: treatment by covariate interaction







- Imputed times to event are helpful for visualisation, but less so for analysis
 - Effectively, such imputations are extrapolations into the future
 - We don't know the future distribution
 - Estimates of means, SD's, regression coeffs etc. are heavily dependent on the distributional assumptions
 - Potential for bias if assumed distr'n is wrong
- Imputed times may be unrealistic
 - E.g. survival time 150 years!



- A reasonably large literature exists
- Buckley-James estimation (Buckley & James 1979)
 - Estimates the mean of the censored part
 - Not so good for visualisation
- Wei & Tanner (1991)
 - Two algorithms which give multiple imputations of the censored part
 - Relaxes the normality assumption samples taken from the distribution of the residuals
- stpm (Royston 2001b, Royston & Parmar 2002)
 - More flexible distributions of survival time available

Imputation of survival data with missing covariate observations



- So far, have assumed covariates have complete data
- If covariates have **missing data**, need a suitable algorithm for multiple imputation of all missing values
 - e.g. MICE (ice)
- To reduce bias, must include the response (time-to-event) in the imputation model
 - How?
- "Standard" approach is to include (censored) log time and the censoring indicator in the imputation model
 - No theoretical justification
- May be better to
 - Include covariates as usual
 - Impute right-censored times using ice with interval() option
- Can also use imputed data for visualisation

Analysis of survival data with missing covariate observations



- Disregard the imputed times in the MI dataset
 - Except for visualisation purposes
- Use original time and censoring indicator
- Can analyse the MI dataset using
 - stcox (Cox regression)
 - streg (several models available)
 - stpm (flexible parametric survival models)
- micombine supports such models



- Use of familiar graphical tools with imputed times to event can give greater insight into censored survival data
 - Scatter plots, smoothers, etc
- Treatment or prognostic effects may be depressingly small when displayed as scatter plots of times
 - Much overlap between groups
 - Weak regression relationships
- Imputation of times may be helpful in multiple imputation with missing covariate values

- Buckley J, James I (1979) Linear regression with censored data. *Biometrika* 66: 429-436
- Faucett CL, Schenker N, Taylor JMG (2002) Survival analysis using auxiliary variables via multiple imputation, with application to AIDS clinical trial data. *Biometrics* **58**: 37-47.
- Ma SG (2006) Multiple augmentation with partial missing regressors. *Biometrical Journal* **48**: 83-92
- Pan W (2000) A multiple imputation approach to Cox regression with interval-censored data. *Biometrics* **56**: 199-203
- Royston P (2001a) The lognormal distribution as a model for survival time in cancer, with an emphasis on prognostic factors. *Statistica Neerlandica* **55**: 89-104
- Royston P (2001b) Flexible alternatives to the Cox model, and more. *The Stata Journal* **1**:1-28.
- Royston P, Parmar MKB (2002) Flexible proportional-hazards and proportional-odds models for censored survival data, with application to prognostic modelling and estimation of treatment effects. *Statistics in Medicine* **21**: 2175-2197
- Royston P (2004) Multiple imputation of missing values. *Stata Journal* **4**: 227-241
- Royston P (2005a) Multiple imputation of missing values: update. *Stata Journal* **5**: 188-201
- Royston P. (2005b) Multiple imputation of missing values: update of ice. *Stata Journal* **5**: 527-536
- Tanner MA, Wing HW (1987) The calculation of posterior distributions by data augmentation. JASA 82: 528-540. [Cited 642 times, WoS 10.9.2006]
- Wei GCG, Tanner MA (1990) Posterior computations for censored regression data. JASA 85: 829-39
- Wei GCG, Tanner MA (1991) Application of multiple imputation to the analysis of censored regression data. *Biometrics* **47**: 1297-1309