



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Gámiz Pérez, M. L., Mammen, E., Miranda, M. D. M. and Nielsen, J. P. (2016). Double one-sided cross-validation of local linear hazards. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 78(4), pp. 755-779. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12133

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/12651/>

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12133>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Double one-sided cross-validation of local linear hazards

María Luz Gámiz Pérez

University of Granada, Spain

Enno Mammen

Heidelberg University, Germany and Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

María Dolores Martínez Miranda

University of Granada, Spain

Jens Perch Nielsen

Cass Business School, City University London, U.K.

1. Additional simulation results

Here we include additional details about the simulation studies described in the paper in Section 7.

Figure 1 shows the five simulated hazard functions. Table 1 shows the simulation results in the case of adding left truncation (case 2).

Table 2 reports the percentage of times where the cross-validation score:

$$\hat{Q}_K(b) = n^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^T [\hat{\alpha}_{b,K}(s)]^2 Y_i(s) w(s) ds - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^T \hat{\alpha}_{b,K}^{[i]}(s) w(s) dN_i(s) \right\},$$

for the kernel K (cross-validation) or for the one-sided kernels K_L and K_R (Do-validation), have more than one minima on the considered grid of bandwidths. For simplicity we only show the results for two of the five simulated models. The non-presented models show a similar behaviour. The small number of cases where the Do-validation criterion runs into having several local minima is an indicator for the stability of Do-validation compared to cross-validation.

Table 1. Simulation results for datasets with left-truncation. Measure m_1 in columns 3–6 is the empirical MISE for each bandwidth estimate (multiplied by 100 for models 1 to 4 and by 1000 for model 5). The last column shows the relative error Rel_err that compares Do-validation with standard cross-validation. Measures m_2 and m_3 are the average and the standard deviation of the differences $\hat{b} - \hat{b}_{ISE}$, respectively.

	Criteria	<i>ISE</i>	<i>MISE</i>	<i>CV</i>	<i>DO</i>	<i>Rel_err</i>	
Model 1, $n = 100$	m_1	2.556	2.944	4.590	3.539	2.07	
	m_2		0.024	0.141	0.201		
	m_3		0.274	0.620	0.580		
	$n = 1000$	m_1	0.340	0.398	0.563	0.429	2.51
		m_2		0.000	-0.032	-0.024	
		m_3		0.117	0.179	0.136	
	$n = 10000$	m_1	0.055	0.061	0.077	0.063	2.75
		m_2		-0.009	-0.019	-0.010	
		m_3		0.054	0.082	0.060	
Model 2, $n = 100$	m_1	2.871	3.456	5.459	3.912	2.50	
	m_2		0.010	0.004	0.022		
	m_3		0.152	0.258	0.197		
	$n = 1000$	m_1	0.471	0.542	0.742	0.591	2.25
		m_2		-0.005	-0.017	-0.001	
		m_3		0.068	0.107	0.085	
	$n = 10000$	m_1	0.082	0.089	0.108	0.092	2.66
		m_2		0.001	-0.009	-0.001	
		m_3		0.031	0.050	0.036	
Model 3, $n = 100$	m_1	5.199	5.749	7.980	7.388	1.27	
	m_2		-0.035	0.174	0.278		
	m_3		0.227	0.567	0.585		
	$n = 1000$	m_1	0.909	0.965	1.171	1.033	2.12
		m_2		-0.003	-0.006	0.001	
		m_3		0.045	0.080	0.064	
	$n = 10000$	m_1	0.184	0.190	0.210	0.197	2.00
		m_2		-0.003	-0.002	0.008	
		m_3		0.020	0.035	0.026	
Model 4, $n = 100$	m_1	3.907	4.147	6.591	5.141	2.18	
	m_2		0.566	0.004	0.123		
	m_3		0.531	0.943	0.881		
	$n = 1000$	m_1	0.596	0.653	0.920	0.745	2.17
		m_2		0.104	0.124	0.147	
		m_3		0.327	0.672	0.603	
	$n = 10000$	m_1	0.168	0.182	0.214	0.196	1.64
		m_2		-0.041	-0.003	0.076	
		m_3		0.146	0.214	0.172	
Model 5, $n = 50000$	m_1	0.063	0.070	0.080	0.073	1.71	
	m_2		0.079	0.274	-0.273		
	m_3		1.413	2.088	1.687		
	$n = 75000$	m_1	0.047	0.051	0.057	0.053	1.70
		m_2		-0.165	0.278	-0.196	
		m_3		1.183	1.779	1.431	
	$n = 100000$	m_1	0.036	0.039	0.043	0.041	1.51
		m_2		0.145	0.219	-0.182	
		m_3		1.095	1.638	1.352	




Fig. 1. The simulated models: the true hazard functions. Model 5 is a parametric specification for the mortality dataset in Iceland presented in the paper in Section 6.

Table 2. Percentage of cases where the cross-validation and the Do-validation scores have multiple local minima.

	Without left-truncation		With left-truncation	
	<i>CV</i>	<i>DO</i>	<i>CV</i>	<i>DO</i>
Model 2, $n = 100$	17.2	1.2	21.2	2.4
$n = 1000$	7.2	0.0	12.4	0.0
$n = 10000$	5.6	0.0	8.4	0.0
Model 5, $n = 50000$	18.0	2.4	2.0	0.0
$n = 75000$	11.2	1.6	2.8	0.0
$n = 100000$	12.0	1.2	3.6	0.0