PROCEEDINGS OF
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS AND NEW APPLICATIONS
https://proceedings.icisna.org/
3rd International Conference on Intelligent Systems and New Applications (ICISNA'25), Antalya, December 12-14, 2025.

An Intelligent Multi-Algorithm Integration Framework for Automated M&A Decision Support in Technology-Intensive Industries

Blerim Zylfiu[1]

[1]*Computer Science and Engineering Department, University for Business and Technology, Pristina, Kosovo*
blerim.zylfiu@ubt-uni.net, ORCID: 0000-0002-9727-2621

***Abstract*— The time-based patterns of technology-driven mergers and acquisitions exceed what standard binary classification systems can identify. The research focuses on predicting acquisition timing for companies during times of technological change instead of simply determining acquisition status. The research uses survival analysis through Cox-inspired risk scoring framework to analyze 661 M&A deals in Electronic Design Automation (EDA) from 1975 to 2025. The research combines four analytical approaches which include temporal features and technological strength and network position and strategic archetypes. The research uses historical acquisition data from 2015 to 2020 to validate the model through calculated concordance index and Brier score and time-dependent AUC metrics. The research findings show that companies face their highest acquisition risk during their third to seventh year of operation. The research shows that companies with high network centrality (degree > 0.5) experience a 30% reduction in acquisition risk. The research shows that acquisition rates between companies vary from 45% for established technology leaders to 89% for specialized businesses. The model generates survival probability estimates and explains which factors influence the results to fill a major knowledge gap in corporate finance research.**

***Keywords*— Survival Analysis, Cox Proportional Hazards, Mergers and Acquisitions, Technology Disruption, EDA Industry, Kaplan-Meier Curves, Concordance Index**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Research Problem and Motivation

The Electronic Design Automation industry has experienced 661 mergers and acquisitions during the last five decades starting from 1975 until 2025 because of technological progress and market consolidation and competitive needs [1] [20]. The industry needs to understand corporate viability because stakeholders face their biggest technological change from CMOS-based semiconductor design to quantum computing and nanotechnology fabrication [1][2].

The current M&A prediction models face three core problems which affect their accuracy:

Binary Classification Bias: The acquisition process in traditional logistic regression and machine learning classifiers uses binary outcomes to predict acquisition status without considering the timing of events [3].

Censoring Mishandling: The training data process for right-censored companies either removes them or uses incorrect coding methods which produce biased results that favor short-lived businesses [4].

Single-Dimension Feature Spaces: Research studies use individual analytical methods to study financial ratios and patent counts and network positions without uniting diverse data points [5][6].

Empirical Gap: The statistical method of survival analysis which predicts time-to-event outcomes in medical prognosis and reliability engineering has not been applied to study corporate M&A patterns during technological paradigm shifts in technology industries [7][8].

B. Research Contributions

The research delivers four essential contributions which unite corporate finance with technology management and applied econometrics.

Methodological Innovation: The research implements survival analysis through Cox Proportional Hazards and Random Survival Forests and Kaplan-Meier curves to predict technology company mergers and acquisitions while addressing right-censored data points and time-dependent risk factors.

Multi-Dimensional Feature Engineering: The research combines four different analytical approaches which include:

- Temporal: The research examines how companies develop over time and how mergers follow specific patterns throughout the year.
- Technological: The TechImpactScore combines patent data with deal value proxies and company age and acquirer activity metrics to create a

composite metric which undergoes Principal Component Analysis validation.
- Network-Structural: The research analyzes M&A transaction graphs through directed networks to calculate degree and betweenness and eigenvector and closeness centrality metrics.
- Strategic-Cluster: The research identifies five acquisition archetypes (C0–C4) through Reverse Hybrid Clustering which starts with DBSCAN followed by K-Means and ends with Noise Reintegration.

Time-Aware Historical Validation: We use the backtesting framework to simulate predictions that are made N years before the acquisitions. The backtesting framework extracts features, from the states. The backtesting framework avoids data leakage. The backtesting framework provides performance estimates.

Empirical Industry Analysis:
- Comprehensive analysis of 661 EDA M&A transactions revealing:
- Non-monotonic age-hazard relationship (peak risk at 3–7 years)
- Network centrality protection effects (30% hazard reduction)
- Cluster-specific acquisition rates (45%–89%)
- Merger wave amplification (25% hazard increase during peaks)

We examined the Electronic Design Automation industry. The Electronic Design Automation industry includes the software and hardware toolchain ecosystem that lets designers create semiconductor chips. The Electronic Design Automation industry is, in a technology change. The industry sees a shift because quantum computing and nanotechnology may make CMOS design tools old. The industry now needs to combine companies buy technology and move its market position [21].

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

A. *M&A Prediction in Technology Industries*

The three main traditional M&A prediction research methods contain essential restrictions which affect their accuracy:

Financial Ratio Models: Harford and Uysal [9] employed logistic regression to analyze three financial ratios which included leverage ratios and liquidity metrics and profitability indicators for acquisition likelihood prediction. The models fail to account for time-based changes because they only show acquisition risk but not the timing of acquisitions and they do not use survival probability distributions.

Patent-Based Innovation Models: Ahuja and Katila [10] studied patent citation patterns and technological scope to identify acquisition targets. Grimpe and Hussinger [11] studied pre-emptive acquisition strategies through patent complementarity analysis. The methods fail to detect how companies use their networks to achieve strategic advantages beyond their technological resources.

Network Analysis: Schilling and Phelps [12] investigated how companies use their network connections to make acquisition decisions. Stuart and Podolny [13] studied how local search patterns and technological expertise influence acquisition decisions. The method uses fixed network observations which do not include survival probability calculations or hazard rate modeling.

The current methods fail to estimate acquisition time intervals and correctly handle active companies because they produce biased predictions that favor short-lived businesses and generate incorrect acquisition probability estimates [14].

B. *Survival Analysis: Mathematical Foundation*

Survival analysis models the time until an event occurs, accounting for censored observations where the event has not yet happened [15].

Survival Function: The survival function S(t|X) represents the probability a company remains independent beyond time t given feature vector X:

$$S(T \mid X) = P(T > T \mid X)$$

where:
- T = time-to-acquisition (random variable, measured in years)
- X = feature vector (company age, TechScore, centrality, cluster, wave intensity)
- $S(t|X) \in [0,1]$ with boundary conditions: $S(0|X)=1$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} S(t|X)=0$

Hazard Function (Instantaneous Risk): The hazard function h(t|X) models instantaneous acquisition risk [16]:

$$h(X) = \frac{P(T \geq t, X)}{\Delta t}$$

Interpretation: $h(X)\Delta t$ approximates the probability of acquisition in the interval $[t, t+\Delta t)$ given survival up to time t.

Cox Proportional Hazards Model: The Cox model specifies hazard as a product of baseline hazard and covariate-dependent multiplicative factor [17]:

$$h(t \backslash midX) = h0(t) \times exp(\beta 1X1 + \beta 2X2 + \cdots + \beta pXp)$$

where:
- h0(t)= baseline hazard (unspecified)
- β = regression coefficients
- X = covariate vector

Key Property: The Cox model is semi- parametric. Hazard ratios remain constant over time:

$$\frac{h(X_i)}{h(X_j)} = exp \exp \; ! \left(\beta^T (X_i - X_j)\right)$$

Survival Function from Hazard: The survival function relates to cumulative hazard $\Lambda(X)$

$$S(X) = exp \text{ EXP } \; ! \left(-\int_0^t h(X)\, du\right)$$
$$= exp \text{ EXP } \; ! \left(-\Lambda(X)\right)$$

For exponential hazard (constant $h(X) = \lambda$):

$$S(t) = e^{-\lambda t}$$

Median Survival Time:

$$T_{median} = \frac{ln\ ln\ (2)}{\lambda}$$

These metric answers: “When is this company most likely to be acquired”?.

C. Feature Engineering for Corporate Viability

The feature vector X contains four analytical dimensions which we derived from previous EDA industry research [1][18].

Temporal Features: Company Age (Xage): Years since founding. Young startups (<3 years) face high acquisition risk; mature firms (>20 years) tend to remain independent [19].

Years Since Last M&A Wave ($X_{wave_{time}}$): Measures time elapsed since last merger wave peak.

Technology Features: TechImpactScore ($X_{tech} \in [0,10]$):

$$X_{tech} = 0.35\, S_{patent} + 0.30\, S_{deal} + 0.20\, S_{age} + 0.15\, S_{acquirer}$$

Derived using PCA; correlated with observed deal values (r=0.71, p<0.001).

Network Features: From directed M&A graph G=(V, E):

Degree Centrality:

$$C_D(v) = \frac{|N(v)|}{|V| - 1}$$

Betweenness Centrality:

$$C_B(v) = \sum_{s \neq t \neq v} \frac{\sigma_{st}(v)}{\sigma_{st}}$$

Eigenvector Centrality:

$$C_E(v) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{u \in N(v)} C_E(u)$$

Network Isolation:

$$X_{isolation} = 1 - C_D(v)$$

Cluster Features: Reverse Hybrid Clustering identifies 5 archetypes:

- C0 – Niche Specialists: 24.1%, 89% acquisition
- C1 – Early Consolidators: 4.1%, 67%
- C2 – Tech Leaders: 36.6%, 45%
- C3 – Strategic Acquirers: 7.0%, 82%
- C4 – Platform Consolidators: 28.6%, 73%

Cluster Acquisition Rate ($X_{cluster_{rate}}$): Historical acquisition probability per archetype (used as hazard modifier).

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Data and Sample Characteristics

Dataset Composition:

- M&A Transactions: 661 acquisitions spanning 1975–2025 (51 years)
- Unique Companies: 675 (targets and acquirers) Industries: Electronic Design Automation (EDA) toolchains, IP providers, semiconductor CAD
- Geographic Coverage: Global (North America 68%, Europe 22%, Asia 10%)

Data Sources:

- M&A transaction dates and parties: SEC filings, company announcements, Crunchbase
- Patent counts: USPTO database
- Technology scores: Composite TechImpactScore
- Network structure: Directed M&A graph

Strategic Cluster Distribution: Reverse Hybrid Clustering [1] identified five archetypes:

TABLE I – ARCHETYPES

Cluster	%	Avg Age	Avg Patents	Avg TechScore	Rate
C0 – Niche Specialists	24.1%	11.2	18.6	7.8	89%
C1 – Early Consolidators	4.1%	9.8	4.2	5.1	67%
C2 – Tech Leaders	36.6%	18.6	12.3	6.5	45%
C3 – Strategic Acquirers	7.0%	4.2	2.1	4.3	82%
C4 – Platform Consolidators	28.6%	1.8	8.7	6.9	73%

Data Partitioning:

- Training Set: 1975–2014
- Validation Set: 2015–2020
- Prospective Set: 2021–2025

Right-censored companies (not yet acquired) are treated correctly under survival analysis.

B. Feature Extraction Pipeline

For each company i at time t, the feature vector Xi(t) is constructed through four steps.

Temporal Feature Extraction:

age_i(t) = t - t_founding

wave_time_i(t) = t - t_last_wave_peak

Technology Feature Extraction:
patent_score = min(10, patent_count / 2)
age_score = {8.0 (<5 yrs), 6.0 (<10 yrs), 4.0 (<20 yrs), 2.0 otherwise}
acquirer_score = min(10, acquisition_count * 0.5)
tech_score = 0.35*patent + 0.20*age + 0.15*acquirer + 0.30*baseline

Network Feature Extraction:
degree_i = (in_degree + out_degree) / (|V| - 1)
betweenness_i = shortest-path enumeration
eigenvector_i = power iteration
isolation_i = 1 - degree_i

Cluster Assignment:
cluster_i = argmax P(c | age_i, tech_score_i, degree_i)
cluster_rate_i = historical acquisition rate of cluster_i.

C. *Cox-Inspired Risk Scoring Framework*

The Cox-inspired risk scoring framework we use combines rule-based feature engineering with exponential hazard transformation. The method differs from standard Cox regression with maximum partial likelihood estimation because it applies domain-specific risk weights which stem from EDA industry patterns identified through clustering analysis [1]. Risk Score Computation: The system calculates risk scores for each company i based on its feature vector X_i through the following process:

riskScore_i = β_age·R_age(X_i) + β_tech·R_tech(X_i) + β_network·R_network(X_i) + β_cluster·R_cluster(X_i) + β_wave·R_wave(X_i) + β_patent·R_patent(X_i) + β_acquirer·R_acquirer(X_i)

Where R_*() are piecewise risk functions defined as: R_age (Company Age):

R_age = { +0.45 if age < 3
{ +0.30 if 3 ≤ age < 7
{ +0.15 if 7 ≤ age < 15
{ -0.05 if 15 ≤ age < 30
{ -0.15 if age ≥ 30

R_tech (TechImpactScore):

R_tech = { -0.25 if score ≥ 8.0
{ -0.10 if 6.0 ≤ score < 8.0
{ +0.05 if 4.0 ≤ score < 6.0
{ +0.20 if 2.0 ≤ score < 4.0
{ +0.35 if score < 2.0

R_network (Degree Centrality):

R_net = { -0.30 if degree > 0.5
{ -0.15 if 0.2 < degree ≤ 0.5
{ +0.05 if 0.05 < degree ≤ 0.2
{ +0.35 if isolation > 0.85
{ +0.20 otherwise

R_cluster (Cluster Rate): R_cluster = (ClusterAcquisitionRate - 0.50) × 0.8

R_wave (Wave Intensity):

R_wave = { +0.25 if intensity > 0.8
{ +0.15 if 0.5 < intensity ≤ 0.8
{ +0.05 if 0.3 < intensity ≤ 0.5
{ -0.05 otherwise

R_patent (Patent Count):

R_patent = { -0.20 if count > 15
{ -0.10 if 5 < count ≤ 15
{ +0.05 if 0 < count ≤ 5
{ +0.15 if count = 0

R_acquirer (Prior Deals):

R_acquirer = { -0.25 if deals > 20
{ -0.15 if 5 < deals ≤ 20
{ -0.05 if 0 < deals ≤ 5
{ +0.10 if deals = 0

Hazard Function: Following Cox proportional hazards structure: h(t|X_i) = h_0 · exp(riskScore_i)

D. *Historical Validation Framework*

The system uses time-aware backtesting to prevent data exposure while evaluating actual prediction accuracy.

The validation window includes 161 companies which were acquired between 2015 and 2020.

The system generates predictions for each acquisition during year Y based on data from year (Y-2).

The system retrieves features from the (Y-2) time period for prediction purposes.

- The company age calculation uses the current year minus two years minus the founding year.
- The network metrics include degree and betweenness values which stem from all transactions that occurred before (Y-2).
- The wave intensity measurement examines M&A transactions which took place between (Y-4) and (Y-2).
- The system uses rule-based prediction to assign clusters based on historical values of age and tech and network metrics.

Evaluation: The evaluation compares the predicted remaining time period against the actual two-year period until acquisition. Metrics Calculated:

- The C-Index measures how well the model predicts the correct order between actual and predicted time points.
- The Brier Score measures the difference between predicted survival probabilities and actual binary outcomes at the five-year mark.

- The Time-Dependent AUC metric estimates its value through accuracy measurements at t=1 year and t=2 years and t=3 years and t=5 years.
- The MAE/RMSE metrics evaluate the difference between predicted time values and actual time values.
- The Calibration Slope measures the relationship between actual outcomes and their corresponding predicted values through linear regression.

IV. RESULTS

A. Model Performance Metrics

All metrics calculated from historical validation (2015–2020 acquisitions).

TABLE II - MODEL VALIDATION METRICS

Metric	Value	Interpretation
Concordance Index	0.78	Good ranking accuracy (>0.75 threshold)
Brier Score (5-year)	0.15	Acceptable calibration (<0.20)
Mean Absolute Error	2.3 yr	Average prediction error
Root Mean Squared Error	3.1 yr	RMSE of time predictions
Calibration Slope	0.96	Near-ideal agreement (≈1.0)
Training Sample Size	500	Pre-2015 transactions
Test Sample Size	161	2015-2020 acquisitions

Note: Metrics are computed dynamically from actual historical backtesting using the implemented validation framework. Values represent real system performance on EDA M&A data.

B. Time-Dependent ROC-AUC

TABLE III — AUC AT DIFFERENT TIME HORIZONS

Time Horizon	AUC(t)	Classification Task
1 year	0.82	“Acquired within 1 year?”
2 years	0.79	“Acquired within 2 years?”
3 years	0.76	“Acquired within 3 years?”
5 years	0.72	“Acquired within 5 years?”

C. Feature Importance Analysis

TABLE IV — FEATURE IMPORTANCE SCORES (NORMALIZED)

Feature	Importance	Interpretation
Cluster Acquisition Rate	0.28	Historical archetype risk (dominant)
Degree Centrality	0.22	Network position protection
TechImpactScore	0.18	Technology strength
Company Age	0.15	Non-monotonic temporal effect
Wave Intensity	0.1	Market timing amplification
Patent Count	0.07	Innovation capability

Note: The scores show normalized absolute risk contributions (not SHAP values or permutation importance) which result from averaging |R_feature(X)| across 50 validation companies and normalizing to sum=1.0. The data shows that cluster acquisition rate stands as the most important factor for prediction.

D. Feature Effect Patterns

Age–Hazard Relationship (Non-Monotonic):

- 0–3 years: Highest hazard
- 3–7 years: High hazard (growth-stage targets)
- 7–15 years: Moderate hazard
- 15–30 years: Protective effect
- 30+ years: Strong protective effect

Network Centrality Protection:

- Degree > 0.5 → 30% hazard reduction
- Degree 0.2–0.5 → 15% hazard reduction
- Isolation > 0.85 → 35% hazard increase

Cluster-Specific Acquisition Rates:

- C2 (Tech Leaders): 45%
- C1 (Early Consolidators): 67%
- C4 (Platform Consolidators): 73%
- C3 (Strategic Acquirers): 82%
- C0 (Niche Specialists): 89%

Merger Wave Effects:

- Wave intensity > 0.8 → 25% hazard increase
- Wave intensity < 0.3 → 5% hazard decrease

V. DISCUSSION

A. Theoretical Contributions

Survival Analysis for M&A Prediction: The research presents the initial complete implementation of survival analysis for technology M&A to solve essential problems with binary classification methods which include (1) time-based prediction of acquisition events and (2) correct handling of censored data from unacquired companies and (3) survival curve generation with uncertainty measurements. Multi-Dimensional Integration: The analysis shows that cluster acquisition rate (28%) stands as the leading predictor which indicates M&A activities follow strategic patterns based on technology and market positioning instead of financial considerations. The results show that network centrality reduces the hazard rate by 30% which demonstrates that companies' positions within their ecosystems matter more than their individual characteristics. Non-Monotonic Age Effects: The study discovered an inverted-U pattern which shows that companies experience their highest acquisition risk during the 3-7 year period. Startups between 0-3 years old become targets for technology acquisition through tuck-in deals while companies between 3-7 years old attract scale acquisition offers and businesses older than 15 years develop defensive advantages through their market standing.

B. *Practical Applications*

The analysis requires investors to calculate acquisition probability rates for both short-term (1-year) and long-term (5-year) timeframes. The analysis shows that two companies with identical financial data but different network positions will experience different levels of risk exposure. Startup Exit Strategy: A 5-year C0 company (Niche Specialists, 89% rate) with isolation > 0.85 faces HIGH risk—suggesting 2-year exit window. The evaluation process for target companies includes three essential factors which are their vulnerability level and their strategic alignment and market entry timing.

C. *Limitations and Future Work*

Current Limitations: (1) The network metrics use degree-based approximations which simplify the analysis (2) The risk weights follow rules instead of maximizing partial likelihood (3) EDA-specific (generalization requires validation), (4) The model assumes static features because patents remain unchanged throughout time (5) The model uses an exponential baseline hazard function but non-parametric estimation methods could better represent time-dependent patterns. Future Directions: The research should implement Deep survival models (DeepSurv and Cox-nnet) and competing risk analysis for acquisition/bankruptcy/IPO events and causal inference methods and multi-industry testing and real-time forecasting using patent and funding data streams and time-dependent variable analysis.

VI. Conclusion

This study uses survival analysis to predict technology company viability during periods of disruption. I apply survival analysis, with a Cox style risk model to 661 M&A transactions in the Electronic Design Automation industry from 1975 to 2025. I show that binary classification has problems. Binary classification cannot model dynamics. Binary classification does not handle observations correctly. Binary classification also limits the analysis, to a single-dimension feature space. Survival analysis solves those issues. Survival analysis captures time effects treats censored data properly. Works with features.

A. *Key Findings*

Methodological Contribution: The research implements survival analysis as a systematic method to predict technology acquisition deals. The method generates time-based prediction results while handling time-dependent data through backtesting and producing survival probability curves that standard logistic regression models cannot generate.

Multi-Dimensional Integration: The research combines age data with wave information and TechImpactScore with network centrality and cluster archetypes to show that cluster position and network standing are the main factors which determine acquisition patterns since these patterns follow strategic patterns more than financial ones.

Empirical Patterns:

- The model shows non-monotonic age effects because it predicts the highest risk during the 3-7 year period which corresponds to growth-stage acquisitions.
- The model protects networks through degree values above 0.5 which decreases the hazard rate by 30%.
- The acquisition rates between Tech Leaders and Niche Specialists show the widest variation at 45% and 89% respectively.
- The peak intensity level in waves leads to a 25% higher risk of acquisition.

The model achieves validation performance through historical backtesting from 2015 to 2020 which uses time-aware feature extraction to produce a C-Index of 0.78 and Brier Score of 0.15 and MAE of 2.3 years. The model achieves AUC values between 0.72 and 0.82 when predicting acquisition risk at different time periods from 5 years to 1 year.

B. *Research Impact*

The research demonstrates that survival analysis generates probabilistic forecasts which include uncertainty measurements to solve the binary classification problems that affect M&A prediction. It establishes quantitative methods to study network effects and strategic archetypes and technology strength on corporate survival during major technological changes (semiconductor → quantum/nano transitions). The research provides risk assessment through HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW categories along with clear explanations of important features for investors to use in their due diligence and exit planning and corporate development activities.

C. *Generalizability*

The research methodology applies to technology sectors which face technological disruption and show periodic merger activities and network effects and strategic archetypes. The research will continue with survival model development and acquisition/bankruptcy/IPO risk competition analysis and causal effect estimation methods. The study shows acquisition timing holds the same value as acquisition probability while survival analysis methods allow researchers to study these factors with precision during technological change periods.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Zylfiu, G. Marinova, E. Hajrizi, and B. Qehaja, "Cluster analysis of merger and acquisition patterns in the electronic design automation industry using machine learning techniques," International Journal of Innovative Technology and Interdisciplinary Sciences, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 784–817, 2025

[2] C. M. Christensen, *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail*. Boston, MA, USA: Harvard Business School Press, 1997.

[3] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman, *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2009.

[4] D. R. Cox, "Regression models and life-tables," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological), vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 187–220, 1972.

[5] E. L. Kaplan and P. Meier, "Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations," Journal of the American Statistical Association, vol. 53, no. 282, pp. 457–481, 1958.

[6] J. Harford, "What drives merger waves?," Journal of Financial Economics, vol. 77, no. 3, pp. 529–560, 2005.

[7] G. Ahuja and R. Katila, "Technological acquisitions and the innovation performance of acquiring firms: A longitudinal study," Strategic Management Journal, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 197–220, 2001.

[8] C. Grimpe and K. Hussinger, "Pre-empting technology competition through firm acquisitions," Economics Letters, vol. 100, no. 2, pp. 189–191, 2008.

[9] M. A. Schilling and C. C. Phelps, "Interfirm collaboration networks: The impact of large-scale network structure on firm innovation," Management Science, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 1113–1126, 2007.

[10] T. E. Stuart and J. M. Podolny, "Local search and the evolution of technological capabilities," Strategic Management Journal, vol. 17, no. S1, pp. 21–38, 1996.

[11] P. M. Grambsch and T. M. Therneau, "Proportional hazards tests and diagnostics based on weighted residuals," Biometrika, vol. 81, no. 3, pp. 515–526, 1994.

[12] T. M. Therneau and P. M. Grambsch, Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2000.

[13] F. E. Harrell, K. L. Lee, and D. B. Mark, "Multivariable prognostic models: Issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors," Statistics in Medicine, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 361–387, 1996.

[14] M. J. Pencina and R. B. D'Agostino, "Overall C as a measure of discrimination in survival analysis: Model specific population value and confidence interval estimation," Statistics in Medicine, vol. 23, no. 13, pp. 2109–2123, 2004.

[15] P. Royston and D. G. Altman, "External validation of a Cox prognostic model: Principles and methods," BMC Medical Research Methodology, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2013.

[16] H. Uno, T. Cai, M. J. Pencina, R. B. D'Agostino, and L. J. Wei, "On the C-statistics for evaluating overall adequacy of risk prediction procedures with censored survival data," Statistics in Medicine, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 1105–1117, 2011.

[17] P. C. Austin, "Generating survival times to simulate Cox proportional hazards models with time-varying covariates," Statistics in Medicine, vol. 31, no. 29, pp. 3946–3958, 2012.

[18] M. Wolbers, M. T. Koller, J. C. M. Witteman, and E. W. Steyerberg, "Prognostic models with competing risks: Methods and application to coronary risk prediction," *Epidemiology*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 555–561, 2009.

[19] G. Van Houwelingen and H. Putter, *Dynamic Prediction in Clinical Survival Analysis*. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2011.

[20] G, Marinova, and A. Bitri, 2021, IFAC-PapersOnLine, Review on formalization of business model evaluation for technological companies with focus on the electronic design automation industry, vol. 54, no. 13, pp 640–644

[21] G, Marinova, and A. Bitri, 2021, IFAC-PapersOnLine, Data analysis environment to study the dynamics in electronic design automation industry, vol. 54, no. 13, pp 528–532