

Risk Prediction with Imperfect Survival Outcome Information from Electronic Health Records

Stephanie F. Chan^{1†}, Jue Hou^{1†}, Xuan Wang¹, and Tianxi Cai^{1,2,*}

¹Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA 02115

²Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115

[†] Equal Contributors

**email*: tcai@hsph.harvard.edu

SUMMARY: Readily available proxies for time of disease onset such as time of the first diagnostic code can lead to substantial risk prediction error if performing analyses based on poor proxies. Due to the lack of detailed documentation and labor intensiveness of manual annotation, it is often only feasible to ascertain for a small subset the current status of the disease by a follow up time rather than the exact time. In this paper, we aim to develop risk prediction models for the onset time efficiently leveraging both a small number of labels on current status and a large number of unlabeled observations on imperfect proxies. Under a semiparametric transformation model for onset and a highly flexible measurement error models for proxy onset time, we propose the semisupervised risk prediction method by combining information from proxies and limited labels efficiently. From an initial estimator solely based on the labelled subset, we perform a one-step correction with the full data augmenting against a mean zero rank correlation score derived from the proxies. We establish the consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed semi-supervised estimator and provide a resampling procedure for interval estimation. Simulation studies demonstrate that the proposed estimator performs well in finite sample. We illustrate the proposed estimator by developing a genetic risk prediction model for obesity using data from Partners Biobank Electronic Health Records (EHR).

KEY WORDS: Current status data, semi-supervised learning, measurement error, risk prediction.

1. Introduction

Electronic health records (EHRs), containing detailed medical history of individuals in the health care system, hold immense potential for translational research (Jensen et al., 2012). In recent years, EHR data has been increasingly explored for developing risk prediction models to assist in clinical decision making (Eapen et al., 2013; Calvert et al., 2016; Jin et al., 2018, e.g.). The longitudinal EHR data contain information on the occurrence time of clinical events which can be used as outcomes for risk prediction modeling. Rich clinical features, including lab measurements, medication prescriptions and co-morbidities, can be extracted as risk factors. Such clinical information can be effectively extracted from either codified data such as billing codes and procedure codes and from free text clinical notes via natural language processing (NLP). At research institutions, EHR data have also been linked with biobanks where genetic information can be included in addition to clinical features to further improve risk prediction.

Although longitudinal EHR data is of great value for risk prediction modeling, precise information on clinical event time of interest, T , are not readily available. Timing and number of diagnostic codes and mentions of the disease in the clinical notes can serve as proxies of the true event time and status, but they are often not highly accurate. For example, at Partner’s healthcare, having at least one diagnostic code of obesity only attained a sensitivity of 73% and positive predictive value (PPV) of 81%; while having at least one NLP mention of obesity attained a higher sensitivity of 92% but a lower PPV of 68%. It is even more challenging to approximate event time. For lung cancer recurrence, time of chemotherapy and radiation therapy initiations can only predict the true recurrence times up to 5.9 and 6.7 months on average (Uno et al., 2018). Directly using proxy event times \mathcal{T} to replace the true T for risk modeling can lead to substantial bias due to the measurement error in \mathcal{T} . On the other hand, extracting event time via manual annotation is too resource consuming for large scale research. Furthermore, the exact timing of

the event may not be precisely documented in the record and hence it is often only feasible to annotate current status of the event $\delta = I(T \leq C)$, i.e. whether the event has occurred by the end of the follow-up C . In this paper, we aim to develop an efficient EHR-based risk prediction procedure under a semi-supervised (SS) setting with data from a small set of gold standard labels on δ and a large set of unlabeled data with mis-measured event times \mathcal{T} .

With current status survival data, regression methods have proposed for commonly used survival models including the hazards (PH) and proportional odds (PO) models and the semi-parametric transformation model (STM) (Huang et al., 1996; Rossini and Tsiatis, 1996; Huang and Rossini, 2000; Van Der Laan and Robins, 1998; Carroll et al., 1997; Sun and Sun, 2005). Estimation procedures have also been proposed for other models including the additive hazard model and accelerated failure time model (Lin et al., 1998; Chen and Sun, 2010; Betensky et al., 2001; Tian and Cai, 2006). Developing risk prediction models with mis-measured survival outcomes is a challenging problem and few methods currently exist, in part due to the additional complexity induced by censoring. Recently, Oh et al. (2018) introduced a bias correction procedure for hazard ratio estimates in the PH model. Using a validation data where both the true and error prone survival times are both available, Braun et al. (2018) proposed a non-parametric bias correction procedure for models using \mathcal{T} as predictors.

No regression procedure currently exists for the (SS) setting with observations on both δ and \mathcal{T} . In addition, even without censoring, existing methods incorporating mis-measured outcomes largely require restrictive parametric measurement error model assumptions. To fill this gap, we propose an efficient and robust SS estimation procedure for the STM under flexible measurement error models without distributional assumptions. Our SS estimation starts with an initial supervised estimator based on the current status data via solving a system of kernel smoothed estimating equations and then constructs an augmented estimator by optimally combining the initial estimator with information from \mathcal{T} derived from a rank estimation procedure. We analyze

the limiting distribution of the proposed estimator and develop inference method accordingly. For the scenario of the unlabelled data is much larger than the labelled data, we discover an interesting “space collapse” phenomenon of the SS estimator, which requires special arrangements for estimation and inference.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We detail our SS procedures in Section 2. In Section 3, we present results from simulation studies to examine the finite sample behavior of the SS estimator and compare its efficiency to the initial supervised estimator. In Section 4, we apply our methods to develop an age-specific risk prediction model for obesity based on demographic and genetic information using EHR data from the Partners Biobank. Concluding remarks are giving in Section 5. Technical details are in the appendices.

2. Methods

Suppose there are a total of N subjects in the EHR cohort and a subset of n subjects are randomly sampled into the labeled set to have their event status annotated via manual chart review. Let T_i , C_i and \mathbf{Z}_i respectively denote the true event time, follow up time, and p dimensional baseline covariates for the i th subject. The true event time T_i is not observable but $\delta_i = I(T_i \leq C_i)$ is observed for those in the labeled set. In addition, there are K surrogate event times, $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_K)^\top$, that can be viewed as proxies of T . However, \mathcal{T} is subject to right censoring since patients are only followed in the EHR up to time C . Thus for \mathcal{T} , we only observe $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_K)^\top$ and $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_K)^\top$, where $\mathcal{X}_k = \mathcal{T}_k \wedge C$ and $\Delta_k = I(\mathcal{T}_k \leq C)$. The full underlying data of the EHR cohort consist of $\{(T_i, C_i, \mathbf{Z}_i^\top, \mathcal{T}_i^\top)^\top, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ while the observed data consist of the labeled data $\mathcal{L} = \{(\delta_i, C_i, \mathbf{Z}_i^\top, \mathcal{X}_i^\top, \Delta_i^\top)^\top, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ and the unlabeled data $\mathcal{U} = \{(C_i, \mathbf{Z}_i^\top, \mathcal{X}_i^\top, \Delta_i^\top)^\top, i = n + 1, \dots, N\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that C has a continuous distribution with twice continuously differentiable density with finite support $[\mathcal{C}_l, \mathcal{C}_r]$.

We predict T_i with \mathbf{Z}_i via the STM which includes PH and PO models as special cases:

$$P(T_i \leq t \mid \mathbf{Z}_i) = g\{h_0(t) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \quad (1)$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is a known smooth probability distribution function, $h_0(t)$ is an unspecified smooth increasing function, and β_0 is the unknown regression coefficient. Under the STM (1), we have

$$E(\delta_i \mid C_i, \mathbf{Z}_i) = P(T_i \leq C_i \mid C_i, \mathbf{Z}_i) = g(h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) \quad (2)$$

from which we later derive our estimating equations for the initial estimator.

For each of the mis-measured survival outcome \mathcal{T}_k , we assume that

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}_{ki}) = \mathcal{H}(T_i) + \epsilon_{ki}, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ is an unknown smooth transformation function and ϵ_{ki} is independent of $(T_i, \mathbf{Z}_i^\top, C_i)^\top$ with a completely unspecified distribution. We also leave the within-subject correlation structure among $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_K)^\top$ unspecified. Leaving both $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ and the distribution of ϵ_k unspecified allow a wide range of measurement error models, including both additive and multiplicative measurement errors. With the finite observation window ending at \mathcal{C}_r , the truncated mis-measured survival outcome $\mathcal{T}_{ki}^* = \mathcal{T}_{ki} \wedge \mathcal{C}_r$ is of greater practical interest, as no event beyond \mathcal{C}_r is observable. We show in Appendix A that \mathcal{T}_{ki}^* follows a generalized regression model as defined in Han (1987). It follows from Han (1987) and Sherman (1993) that the direction of the true parameter β_0 , $\mathcal{B}_0 = \beta_0 / \|\beta_0\|_2$, is identified by the maximizer of the population rank correlation:

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \underset{\beta \in \Omega_p}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathcal{Q}_k(\beta), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{Q}_k(\beta) = P(\beta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i \geq \beta^\top \mathbf{Z}_j \mid \mathcal{T}_{ki}^* < \mathcal{T}_{kj}^*)$$

$\Omega_p = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\beta\|_2 = 1\}$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the L_2 norm. From the first order KKT condition,

$$\mathcal{S}_k(\mathcal{B}_0) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{S}_k(\beta) = E(\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j \mid \beta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i = \beta^\top \mathbf{Z}_j, \mathcal{T}_{ki}^* < \mathcal{T}_{kj}^*). \quad (4)$$

Based on (4), we derive our score for the full cohort, through which we update the initial estimator with the information from the mis-measured survival outcomes.

2.1 Estimation

To estimate β_0 , we first obtain an initial estimator using the labeled data \mathcal{L} according to the moment equation (2). Specifically, we adopt the kernel smoothed estimation procedure and estimate $\{h_0(\cdot), \beta_0\}$ by solving

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i [\delta_i - g\{h(C_i) + \beta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] &= 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - t) [\delta_i - g\{h(t) + \beta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{K}_h(t) = h^{-1}\mathbb{K}(t/h)$, $\mathbb{K}(\cdot)$ is a smooth symmetric probability density function, and $h = n^{-\nu}$ with $\nu \in (1/4, 1/2)$. Let $\hat{\beta}_\delta$ denote the resulting estimate for β_0 . From Remark 2 and Theorem 3 of Carroll et al. (1997), we have the consistency and asymptotic normality of $\hat{\beta}_\delta$. We also show in Appendix A that

$$\sqrt{n}\{\hat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{U}_i + o_p(1) \rightsquigarrow N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbb{B}^{-1} \Sigma_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{U}_i = \mathbb{B}^{-1} \{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_i)\} \{\delta_i - g(\mathcal{Z}_i)\}$, $\mathcal{Z}_i = h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i$, $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{Z}_i \{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_i)\}^\top g'(\mathcal{Z}_i)]$, $\mathbf{b}(t) = \mathbf{a}_1(t)/a_0(t)$, $a_k(t) = f_c(t) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_i^{\otimes k} g'\{h_0(t) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}]$ with $\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 0} = 1$, $\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 1} = \mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{Z}^{\otimes 2} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top$, $f_c(t)$ is the density function of C , and

$$\Sigma_\delta = \mathbb{E} [\{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_i)\}^{\otimes 2} g(\mathcal{Z}_i) \{1 - g(\mathcal{Z}_i)\}]. \quad (7)$$

Since β_0 is often sparse, we can consistently recover the indices set of nonzero positions in β_0 , $\text{supp}(\beta_0) = \{j : \beta_{0,j} \neq 0\}$, by thresholding the initial estimator $\hat{\beta}_\delta$,

$$\widehat{\text{supp}}(\beta_0) = \{j : |\beta_{0,j}| > \lambda_\delta\}, \quad \sqrt{n}\lambda_\delta \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which will be used in the construction of our final estimator.

To improve the efficiency of $\hat{\beta}_\delta$ leveraging the mis-measured survival outcomes of the full cohort, we augment $\hat{\beta}_\delta$ with an estimate for $\mathcal{S}_k(\beta_0)$. To this end, we estimate the rank correlation score

function (4) via kernel smoothing as:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}}, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (8)$$

by noting that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \mid \mathcal{T}_{ki}, \mathcal{T}_{kj} \right\} = I(\mathcal{T}_{ki}^* < \mathcal{T}_{kj}^*).$$

following Cai and Cheng (2007), where $h' = N^{-\nu'}$ for $\nu' \in (1/4, 1/2)$ and $\widehat{G}(t)$ is the empirical estimate of $G(t) = P(C \geq t)$. We stack the scores evaluated at $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta$ across all $k = 1, \dots, K$ as $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta)$, where $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{B}) = [\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_1(\mathbf{B})^\top, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_K(\mathbf{B})^\top]^\top$. Noting the connection between $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B})$ and the rank correlation

$$\widehat{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}) = N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j > 0) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \quad (9)$$

we derive in Appendix C the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta)$. Specifically, we show that

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta) = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n 2\mathbb{A} \|\beta_0\|_2^{-1} \mathbf{U}_i + n^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N 2\mathbf{U}_{qi} + o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}), \quad (10)$$

which converges in distribution to a zero-mean multivariate normal, where $\mathbb{A} = (\mathbb{A}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbb{A}_K^\top)^\top$, $\mathbb{A}_k = \nabla^2 \mathbb{E}\{q_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}_0)\}$, $\mathbf{U}_{qi} = \dot{\mathbf{q}}_i(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}^c(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i(\mathbf{B}) = (\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{1,i}(\mathbf{B}), \dots, \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{K,i}(\mathbf{B}))^\top$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}^c(c, \mathbf{B}) = (\dot{\mathbf{q}}_1^c(c, \mathbf{B}), \dots, \dot{\mathbf{q}}_K^c(c, \mathbf{B}))^\top$,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{B}} \mathbb{E} \left\{ I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i > \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{T}_{ki} < \mathcal{T}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{T}_{ki})} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j > \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{I(\mathcal{T}_{kj} < \mathcal{T}_{ki}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{T}_{kj})} \mid \mathbf{Z}_i, \mathcal{X}_{ki}, \Delta_{ki} \right\}, \\ \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(c, \mathbf{B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{B}} \mathbb{E} \left[I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i > \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) I(\mathcal{T}_{ki} < \mathcal{T}_{kj}) \left\{ \frac{I(c \geq \mathcal{T}_{ki})}{G(\mathcal{T}_{ki})} - 1 \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j > \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) I(\mathcal{T}_{kj} < \mathcal{T}_{ki}) \left\{ \frac{I(c \geq \mathcal{T}_{kj})}{G(\mathcal{T}_{kj})} - 1 \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

Our final estimator will construct optimal combination of β_δ with $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\beta}_\delta)$ to minimize. The optimal combination strategy depends on the proportion of labelled data $n/N \rightarrow \rho$, in part due to the co-linearity of $n^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\beta}_\delta)$, whose asymptotic covariance matrix is of rank at most $K(p-1)$. We will next discuss the scenario of $n \asymp N$ and $n \ll N$ separately.

2.1.1 *Optimal Combination when $n \asymp N$.* In this scenario, the asymptotic covariance matrix of $n^{\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ is of rank $K(p-1)$. To resolve the co-linearity in $n^{\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$, we drop the j -th element in $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ for each $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $j \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$. This can be done based on prior knowledge that a specific feature is predictive of the outcome. We define the operation through the following $K(p-1) \times Kp$ matrix

$$\mathbb{P}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{p,-j} & \cdots & \mathbb{O}_{(p-1) \times p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbb{O}_{(p-1) \times p} & \cdots & \mathbb{I}_{p,-j} \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{I}_{p,-j} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{j-1} & \mathbb{O}_{(j-1) \times (p-j)} \\ \mathbf{0}_{j-1}^\top & \mathbf{0}_{p-j}^\top \\ \mathbb{O}_{(p-j) \times (j-1)} & \mathbb{I}_{p-j} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbb{I}_s = \text{diag}\{1, \dots, 1\}_{s \times s}$, $\mathbf{0}_s = (0, \dots, 0)_{s \times 1}^\top$ and $\mathbb{O}_{s \times r} = [0]_{s \times r}$. The optimal combination of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta$ and $\mathbb{P}_j\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ is given by the projection

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \text{cov}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta, \mathbb{P}_j\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\} \text{var}\{\mathbb{P}_j\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\}^{-1} \mathbb{P}_j\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$$

while the projection $\text{cov}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta, \mathbb{P}_j\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\} \text{var}\{\mathbb{P}_j\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\}^{-1}$ approaches asymptotically

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_j)^\top &= \left\{ \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} + \rho \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\delta, S} \right\} \mathbb{P}_j^\top \\ &\times \left[2\mathbb{P}_j \left\{ \mathbb{A} \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-2} + \rho (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_S + \mathbb{A} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\delta, S} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\delta, S}^\top \mathbb{A}^\top) \right\} \mathbb{P}_j^\top \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\rho = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n/N$. It is natural to combine the p projections with \mathbb{P}_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \overline{\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta), \overline{\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}}^\top = \frac{1}{|\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)|} \sum_{j \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_j)^\top \mathbb{P}_j.$$

Suppose $\widehat{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbb{P}_j)$ is a consistent estimator for $\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_j)$, we obtain the final estimator by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta), \widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}^\top = \frac{1}{|\widehat{\text{supp}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)|} \sum_{j \in \widehat{\text{supp}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \widehat{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbb{P}_j)^\top \mathbb{P}_j. \quad (13)$$

We show in Appendix XX that

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = 2n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{I}_p - \overline{\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right) \mathbf{U}_i - 2\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}}^\top \mathbf{U} q_i + o_p(1) \quad (14)$$

$$\rightsquigarrow N(\mathbf{0}, 4\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\text{SSL}}), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{\text{SSL}} &= \left(\mathbb{I}_p - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right) \mathbb{B}^{-1} \Sigma_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \left(\mathbb{I}_p + \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right)^\top \\ &\quad + \rho \left\{ \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \Sigma_S \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}} - \left(\mathbb{I}_p - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right) \Sigma_{\delta, S} \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}} - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \Sigma_{\delta, S}^\top \left(\mathbb{I}_p - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right)^\top \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

2.1.2 Optimal Combination when $n \ll N$. In this scenario, the asymptotic covariance matrix of $n^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ is rank $p - 1$. To resolve the co-linearity in $n^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$, we keep $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ for one $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and drop its j -element for some $j \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$. We define the operation through the following $(p - 1) \times K(p - 1)$ matrix

$$\mathbb{P}_{k,j} = \left(\mathbb{O}_{(p-1) \times (pj-p)}, \mathbb{I}_{p,-j}, \mathbb{O}_{(p-1) \times (p^2-pj)} \right), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbb{O}_{s \times r}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{p,-j}$ are defined with (11). Likewise, the optimal combination of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta$ and $\mathbb{P}_j \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ is given by the projection

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \text{cov}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta, \mathbb{P}_{k,j} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\} \text{var}\{\mathbb{P}_{k,j} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\}^{-1} \mathbb{P}_{k,j} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$$

while the projection $\text{cov}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta, \mathbb{P}_{k,j} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\} \text{var}\{\mathbb{P}_{k,j} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)\}^{-1}$ approaches asymptotically

$$\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_{k,j})^\top = \mathbb{B}^{-1} \Sigma_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \left\{ 2 \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \mathbb{B}^{-1} \Sigma_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2 \quad (17)$$

We combine the Kp projections with $\mathbb{P}_{k,j}, k = 1, \dots, K, j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta), \quad \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top = \frac{1}{K |\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)|} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j \in \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_{k,j})^\top \mathbb{P}_{k,j}.$$

Suppose $\widehat{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbb{P}_{k,j})$ is an estimator for $\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_{k,j})$, we obtain the final estimator by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta), \quad \widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}^\top = \frac{1}{K |\widehat{\text{supp}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)|} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j \in \widehat{\text{supp}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \widehat{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbb{P}_{k,j})^\top \mathbb{P}_{k,j}. \quad (18)$$

We derive the asymptotic approximation of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}$ as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B}}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0} \mathbf{U}_i + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (19)$$

Thus, the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}$ is

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \rightsquigarrow N\left(\mathbf{0}, \frac{4 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0}\right). \quad (20)$$

2.2 Inference

In both scenarios, the estimation of the optimal combination boils down to the estimation of $\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})$ with operation \mathbb{P} . We propose a resampling based procedure (Jin et al., 2001). Specifically, for $b = 1, \dots, B$ with $B \gg n$, we generate a vector of N independent and identically distributed random variables $\{\mathcal{V}_i^{(b)}, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ with $E(\mathcal{V}_i) = \text{var}(\mathcal{V}_i) = 1$ and obtain $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}$ as the solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - t) [\delta_i - g\{h_0(t) + \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \mathcal{V}_i^{(b)} &= 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \mathcal{V}_i^{(b)} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain the perturbed counterpart of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^{(b)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \mathcal{V}_i^{(b)} \mathcal{V}_j^{(b)} (\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) K_{h'}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}^{(b)}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}}{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \mathcal{V}_i^{(b)} \mathcal{V}_j^{(b)} \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}^{(b)}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}}, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, K,$$

where $\widehat{G}^{(b)}(t) = \{\sum_{i=1}^N I(C_i \geq t) \mathcal{V}_i^{(b)}\} / (\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{V}_i^{(b)})$. Subsequently, we obtain $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)} / \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}\|_2$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}) = [\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_1^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)})^\top, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_K^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)})^\top]$. We consider the least square problem

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_j(\mathbb{P}) = \underset{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^r}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left\{ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\delta, j}^{(b)} - \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbb{P} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}) \right\}^2, \quad (21)$$

where r is the row dimension of \mathbb{P} . We assemble the estimated coefficients $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1(\mathbb{P}), \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_p(\mathbb{P})$ to construct estimated projection matrix

$$\widehat{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathbb{P}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{w}}_p) = \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (22)$$

By (22) and the consistency of support recovery $\widehat{\text{supp}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$, we have $\widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}} = \overline{\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}} + O_p(n^{-1/2})$.

To quantify the estimation error, it is natural to consider the perturbed SSL estimator

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)} - \widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}), \quad b = 1, \dots, B.$$

By Jin et al. (2001), $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)})$ has the same asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$. From (10), we have $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}) = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Since $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)})$ converges to zero, the variability from estimating $\overline{\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}}$ by $\widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}$ has negligible effect on the asymptotical distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)}$. Hence, $\widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}$ can be

used directly in the perturbed SSL estimator without an extra layer of perturbation. Let $Q_\alpha(\mathbf{v})$ be the α -quantile of the perturbations $\{\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)} : b = 1, \dots, B\}$. Observing the skewness in the finite sample distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)}$, we recommend the following $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ confidence interval for $\mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ with re-centered empirical quantiles

$$\left[Q_{\alpha/2}(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)}, Q_{1-\alpha/2}(\mathbf{v}) + \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)} \right]. \quad (23)$$

In the $N \gg n$ scenario, we discover an interesting “space collapse” phenomenon from the representation (19). The SSL estimation error $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ concentrates in a one-dimensional subspace in \mathbb{R}^p spanned by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ with large probability. For any vector \mathbf{v} such that $\mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = 0$, the SSL estimator $\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}$ is super efficient,

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

A typical example is the zero element in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ indexed by $j \notin \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$, which can be represented with j -th natural basis \mathbf{e}_j ,

$$\mathbf{e}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} = \beta_{0,j} = 0, \quad \mathbf{e}_j^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} = \hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j} = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Since $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j} - 0)$ is no longer asymptotically regular, the perturbation samples $\sqrt{n}\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}^{(b)}$ might not capture its asymptotic distribution. To provide a valid inference for $\beta_{0,j}$, we perform the norm preserving soft-thresholding,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{soft}} &= (\hat{\beta}_{\text{soft},1}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{\text{soft},p})^\top, \quad \hat{\beta}_{\text{soft},j} = \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}) \max\{|\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}| - \lambda_{\text{soft}}/|\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}|, 0\}, \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{soft}}^{(b)} &= (\hat{\beta}_{\text{soft},1}^{(b)}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{\text{soft},p}^{(b)})^\top, \quad \hat{\beta}_{\text{soft},j}^{(b)} = \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}^{(b)}) \max\{|\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}^{(b)}| - \lambda_{\text{soft}}/|\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL},j}^{(b)}|, 0\}, \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{std}} &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{soft}} \frac{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}\|_2}{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{soft}}\|_2}, \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{std}}^{(b)} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{soft}}^{(b)} \frac{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}^{(b)}\|_2}{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{soft}}^{(b)}\|_2} \end{aligned}$$

for $n^{-1/2} \gg \lambda_{\text{soft}} \gg n^{-1}$. With the soft-thresholding, we also require that the re-centering of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{std}}^{(b)}$ preserves the sign,

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{center},j}^{(b)} = \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_{\text{std},j}^{(b)}) \max \left\{ |\hat{\beta}_{\text{std},j}^{(b)}| + \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_{\text{std},j}^{(b)}) \left(\hat{\beta}_{\text{std},j} - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \hat{\beta}_{\text{std},j}^{(b)} \right), 0 \right\}$$

Let $Q_{\text{std},j,\alpha}$ be the α -quantile of the perturbations $\{\hat{\beta}_{\text{center},j}^{(b)} : b = 1, \dots, B\}$. We construct the

$(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ confidence interval for $\beta_{0,j}$ with $[Q_{std,j,\alpha/2}, Q_{std,j,1-\alpha/2}]$. Since we have $\hat{\beta}_{SSL,j}$ is asymptotically regular and $\hat{\beta}_{center,j}^{(b)}$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\hat{\beta}_{SSL,j}^{(b)}$

$$\hat{\beta}_{center,j}^{(b)} = \hat{\beta}_{SSL,j}^{(b)} + O(\lambda_{soft}) = \hat{\beta}_{SSL,j}^{(b)} + o(n^{-1/2}),$$

the confidence interval for $\beta_{0,j} \neq 0$ with the re-centered norm preserving soft-thresholded perturbation must achieve asymptotically the nominal coverage. The confidence interval for $\beta_{0,j} = 0$, however, would have 100% coverage rate asymptotically as the $\hat{\beta}_{soft,j}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{soft,j}^{(b)}$, $b = 1, \dots, B$ are all shrunk to zero with large probability.

We recommend select λ_{soft} through a cross-validation scheme targeting the aggregated rank correlation of mis-measured survival times

$$\hat{Q}(\beta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{Q}_k(\beta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{I(\beta^T \mathbf{Z}_i > \beta^T \mathbf{Z}_j) I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\hat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\hat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}}.$$

Exact evaluation of higher order terms in (19) is possible but would multiply the computational burden. Since testing $\beta_{0,j} = 0$ can be achieved solely in an unsupervised fashion with the mis-measured survival times based on the rank correlation (Cai and Cheng, 2007), we choose not to deviate from our SSL framework and expand in such direction.

3. Simulations

We conducted simulation studies to assess the performance of our estimator in finite sample settings. Throughout, we set the labelled sample size as $n = 500$ and consider two sizes for total sample $N = 1000$ and $N = 10000$. The two total sample sizes characterize the $n \asymp N$ and $n \ll N$ scenarios, respectively. We first generated a $p = 10$ dimensional \mathbf{Z} from a zero-mean multivariate normal with unit variance and correlation 0.2. Then we generated T_i from

$$3 \log(T_i/4) = -0.7(Z_{i1} + Z_{i2} + Z_{i3}) + 0.5(Z_{i4} + Z_{i5} + Z_{i6}) - 0.3(Z_{i7} + Z_{i8} + Z_{i9}) + \varepsilon_i$$

where $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$. The censoring C_i was generated from from Uniform(0, a) with a chosen such that $P(\delta_i = 1) = 0.5$. We consider $K = 2$ surrogates generated from $\log \mathcal{T}_{ki} = \log T_i + \epsilon_{ki}$, where

ϵ_k is generated from a normal mixture $\sim D_{ki}N(\mu_{k-}, \sigma_{k-}^2) + (1 - D_{ki})N(\mu_{k+}, \sigma_{k+}^2)$ and $D_{ki} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$. The normal mixture measurement error distribution was chosen to allow for more heterogeneity in how their records appear in the EHR system. We consider two scenarios for the error distribution: (A) low measurement error with $(\mu_{1-}, \sigma_{1-}, \mu_{1+}, \sigma_{1+}) = (0.2, 0.3, -0.1, 0.1)$ and $(\mu_{2-}, \sigma_{2-}, \mu_{2+}, \sigma_{2+}) = (0, 0.2, 0.3, 0.1)$; (B) high measurement error with $(\mu_{1-}, \sigma_{1-}, \mu_{1+}, \sigma_{1+}) = (1, 1.5, -0.5, 0.5)$ and $(\mu_{2-}, \sigma_{2-}, \mu_{2+}, \sigma_{2+}) = (0, 1, 1.5, 0.5)$.

The bandwidth h for estimating β_δ was chosen to be $\hat{\tau}(\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i)^{-0.25}$, where $\hat{\tau}$ is the empirical standard deviation of C . The bandwidth h'_k for $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k$ is chosen to be $\hat{\sigma}(\sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{ki})^{-0.3}$ where $\hat{\sigma}$ is the empirical standard error of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta^\top \mathbf{Z}$. For each scenario, we summarize results using 500 datasets. For the standard error estimates via resampling, we use $B = 200$ replications.

In Table A1, we show results for the bias, mean square error (MSE) of $\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$ and the relative efficiency (RE) of $\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$ compared to the supervised estimator $\hat{\beta}_\delta$. Both estimators have negligible biases across all settings. When $N \asymp n$, the SS estimator $\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$ is more efficient than the supervised estimator β_δ under the low measurement error model with efficiency gain ranging from 27% to 62% but the efficiency gain is minimal for the high measurement error setting. When $N \gg n$, $\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$ is substantially more efficient than β_δ with efficiency gain ranging from 185% to 9964% for the low measurement error setting and from 133% to 1559% for the high measurement error setting. The efficiency gain is the highest for the zero coefficient as expected from our theoretical findings on the super efficiency of $\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$ on zero coefficients. These results also suggest that the semi-supervised learning improves efficiency even with large measurement error in surrogates when the unlabelled data is large.

[Table 1 about here.]

We also investigated the performance of our resampling procedure for variance and interval estimation. As shown in Table A2, for individual components of the regression coefficients, the

average estimated standard errors are close to the corresponding empirical standard errors and the empirical coverage levels of the 95% confidence intervals are close to the nominal level for nonzero coefficients.

[Table 2 about here.]

4. Application to Developing EHR Based Obesity Genetic Risk Prediction Model

As one of the most serious public health problems in the 21st century, obesity affects about 12% of adults globally (GBD 2015 Obesity Collaborators, 2017). Although there are lifestyle changes that can be made to prevent it, there is a strong genetic component to obesity, which is a risk factor for many other conditions such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes. We applied our proposed method to develop a genetic risk prediction model for obesity using data from Partner’s Healthcare Biobank (PHB) where both genetic and EHR data are available for 30,685 participating patients.

Among the PHB subjects, 268 patients have their obesity status δ annotated by domain experts via manual chart review. The genetic risk score (GRS) for obesity was constructed based on published log odds ratio information on 55 SNPs previously identified as significantly associated with obesity (Speliotes et al., 2010; Hung et al., 2015). For this analysis, we use patient age as time scale. We use 2 surrogates for event time: age at the first diagnostic code for obesity and age at the first NLP mention of obesity. In addition to the GRS, we included sex, and the first 5 principal components of 128 SNPs associated with the ancestry informative genetic markers (Kosoy et al., 2009) to adjust for population stratification. We let $g(\cdot)$ be the logistic link and hence β corresponds to log odds ratio of the risk factors.

The point estimators of β_0 , as well as their 95% confidence intervals are shown in Table A3. The results show that the supervised and semi-supervised point estimators are reasonably

consistent with each other. Our analysis confirms that higher GRS is significantly associated with an elevated risks of developing obesity, with estimated effect 0.610 and p-value 0.022 from the semi-supervised method. The negative association between male gender and risk of obesity in our analysis, with estimated effect -0.365 from the semi-supervised method, is also consistent with the findings among the literatures (Wang and Beydoun, 2007). Moreover, the 95% CIs from the semi-supervised estimator are always smaller than the supervised estimator. For example, the estimated standard error of GRS coefficient is 0.327 in the supervised estimator and 0.274 in the semi-supervised estimator, resulting in an efficiency gain of 1.415. This again demonstrates the benefit of leveraging the information from the mis-measured event times in our proposed procedure.

[Table 3 about here.]

5. Discussion

We proposed a robust SS estimators for risk prediction modeling in the EHR setting. Our proposed SSL estimator is able to effectively integrate two sets of imperfect information on the survival time in the EHR database: (i) widely available but noisy surrogate event times; and (ii) current status information manually annotated for a limited set of patients. The SSL method can efficiently estimate the risk model without requiring precise information on the event time for any patients in the EHR, which greatly improves the feasibility of performing risk prediction modeling using noisy EHR data. Our numerical results demonstrate that the SSL approach can significantly improve the efficiency of the estimation with large unlabelled data compared to the supervised estimator that only uses the current status data.

In the obesity risk modeling example with PHB data, we used age as the time scale and hence baseline is defined at birth. In such a case, only time invariant covariates such as sex and genetic

information can be used as risk factors. However, our method is not restricted to such settings provided that a valid baseline can be defined and subjects are free of the event of interest at baseline. For example, the baseline can be set as a year after the first encounter with the EHR. Patients without any ICD code and/or NLP mention of the disease of interest can be considered as free of event at baseline since ICD and NLP mentions are often highly sensitive but not specific (Liao et al., 2019). For such cases, standard risk factors beyond genetics such as lifestyle information can be included as covariates.

References

- Betensky, R. A., D. Rabinowitz, and A. A. Tsiatis (2001). Computationally simple accelerated failure time regression for interval censored data. *Biometrika* 88(3), 703–711.
- Braun, D., M. Gorfine, H. A. Katki, A. Ziogas, and G. Parmigiani (2018). Nonparametric adjustment for measurement error in time to event data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113, 11–25.
- Cai, T. and S. Cheng (2007, 12). Robust combination of multiple diagnostic tests for classifying censored event times. *Biostatistics* 9(2), 216–233.
- Calvert, J., Q. Mao, J. L. Hoffman, M. Jay, T. Desautels, H. Mohamadlou, U. Chettipally, and R. Das (2016). Using electronic health record collected clinical variables to predict medical intensive care unit mortality. *Annals of medicine and surgery* 11, 52–57.
- Carroll, R. J., J. Fan, I. Gijbels, and M. P. Wand (1997). Generalized partially linear single-index models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92(438), 477–489.
- Chen, L. and J. Sun (2010). A multiple imputation approach to the analysis of interval-censored failure time data with the additive hazards model. *Computational statistics & data analysis* 54(4), 1109–1116.

- Dvoretzky, A., J. Kiefer, and J. Wolfowitz (1956). Asymptotic minimax character of the sample distribution function and of the classical multinomial estimator. *27*(3), 642–669.
- Eapen, Z. J., L. Liang, G. C. Fonarow, P. A. Heidenreich, L. H. Curtis, E. D. Peterson, and A. F. Hernandez (2013). Validated, electronic health record deployable prediction models for assessing patient risk of 30-day rehospitalization and mortality in older heart failure patients. *JACC: Heart Failure* *1*(3), 245–251.
- GBD 2015 Obesity Collaborators (2017). Health effects of overweight and obesity in 195 countries over 25 years. *New England Journal of Medicine* *377*(1), 13–27.
- Han, A. K. (1987). Non-parametric analysis of a generalized regression model: the maximum rank correlation estimator. *Journal of Econometrics* *35*(2-3), 303–316.
- Huang, J. et al. (1996). Efficient estimation for the proportional hazards model with interval censoring. *The Annals of Statistics* *24*(2), 540–568.
- Huang, J. and A. Rossini (1997). Sieve estimation for the proportional-odds failure-time regression model with interval censoring. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* *92*(439), 960–967.
- Hung, C.-F., G. Breen, D. Czamara, T. Corre, C. Wolf, S. Kloiber, S. Bergmann, N. Craddock, M. Gill, F. Holsboer, et al. (2015). A genetic risk score combining 32 snps is associated with body mass index and improves obesity prediction in people with major depressive disorder. *BMC medicine* *13*(1), 86.
- Jensen, P. B., L. J. Jensen, and S. Brunak (2012). Mining electronic health records: towards better research applications and clinical care. *Nature Reviews Genetics* *13*(6), 395.
- Jin, B., C. Che, Z. Liu, S. Zhang, X. Yin, and X. Wei (2018). Predicting the risk of heart failure with ehr sequential data modeling. *Ieee Access* *6*, 9256–9261.
- Jin, Z., Z. Ying, and L. J. Wei (2001). A simple resampling method by perturbing the minimand. *Biometrika* *88*(2), 381–390.

- Kosoy, R., R. Nassir, C. Tian, P. A. White, L. M. Butler, G. Silva, R. Kittles, M. E. Alarcon-Riquelme, P. K. Gregersen, J. W. Belmont, F. M. De La Vega, and M. F. Seldin (2009, Jan). Ancestry informative marker sets for determining continental origin and admixture proportions in common populations in america. *Human mutation* 30(1), 69–78. 18683858[pmid].
- Liao, K. P., J. Sun, T. A. Cai, N. Link, C. Hong, J. Huang, J. E. Huffman, J. Gronsbell, Y. Zhang, Y.-L. Ho, et al. (2019). High-throughput multimodal automated phenotyping (map) with application to phewas. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *accepted*.
- Lin, D., D. Oakes, and Z. Ying (1998). Additive hazards regression with current status data. *Biometrika* 85(2), 289–298.
- Nolan, D. and D. Pollard (1987, 06). u -processes: Rates of convergence. *Ann. Statist.* 15(2), 780–799.
- Oh, E. J., B. E. Shepherd, T. Lumley, and P. A. Shaw (2018). Considerations for analysis of time-to-event outcomes measured with error: Bias and correction with simex. *Statistics in medicine* 37(8), 1276–1289.
- Rossini, A. and A. Tsiatis (1996). A semiparametric proportional odds regression model for the analysis of current status data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91(434), 713–721.
- Sherman, R. P. (1993). The limiting distribution of the maximum rank correlation estimator. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 123–137.
- Speliotes, E. K., C. J. Willer, S. I. Berndt, K. L. Monda, G. Thorleifsson, A. U. Jackson, H. L. Allen, C. M. Lindgren, J. Luan, R. Mägi, et al. (2010). Association analyses of 249,796 individuals reveal 18 new loci associated with body mass index. *Nature genetics* 42(11), 937.
- Sun, J. and L. Sun (2005). Semiparametric linear transformation models for current status data. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 33(1), 85–96.
- Tian, L. and T. Cai (2006). On the accelerated failure time model for current status and interval

censored data. *Biometrika* 93(2), 329–342.

Uno, H., D. P. Ritzwoller, A. M. Cronin, N. M. Carroll, M. C. Hornbrook, and M. J. Hassett (2018). Determining the time of cancer recurrence using claims or electronic medical record data. *JCO clinical cancer informatics* 2, 1–10.

Van Der Laan, M. J. and J. M. Robins (1998). Locally efficient estimation with current status data and time-dependent covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 93(442), 693–701.

Wang, Y. and M. A. Beydoun (2007, 05). The Obesity Epidemic in the United States—Gender, Age, Socioeconomic, Racial/Ethnic, and Geographic Characteristics: A Systematic Review and Meta-Regression Analysis. *Epidemiologic Reviews* 29(1), 6–28.

Supplementary Material for “Risk Prediction with Imperfect Survival Outcome Information from Electronic Health Records”

Appendix A. Verification of Single Index Model

Here we show that each of the \mathcal{T}_k follows a single index model. Suppose $f_{\epsilon_k}(u)$ is the probability density function of ϵ_{ki} . By direct calculation, we find that conditional distribution function of \mathcal{T}_{ki} is

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{T}_{ki} \leq t | \mathbf{Z}_i) &= P(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}_{ki}) \leq \mathcal{H}(t) | \mathbf{Z}_i) = P(\mathcal{H}(T_i) + \epsilon_{ki} \leq \mathcal{H}(t) | \mathbf{Z}_i) \\ &= P(\mathcal{H}(T) \leq \mathcal{H}(t) - \epsilon_{ki} | \mathbf{Z}_i) = P(T \leq \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{H}(t) - \epsilon_{ki}) | \mathbf{Z}_i) \\ &= \int g(h_0(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{H}(t) - u)) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) f_{\epsilon_k}(u) du, \end{aligned}$$

which is still a increasing function of $\beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i$ and $\mathcal{B}_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i$. The proof here shows that the truncated $\mathcal{T}_{ki} \wedge \mathcal{C}_r$ also follows the single index model, as

$$P(\mathcal{T}_{ki} \wedge \mathcal{C}_r \leq t | \mathbf{Z}_i) = \begin{cases} P(\mathcal{T}_{ki} \leq t | \mathbf{Z}_i) & t < \mathcal{C}_r, \\ 1 & t \geq \mathcal{C}_r \end{cases}$$

is also an increasing function of $\beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i$.

Appendix B. Asymptotic property of the initial estimator

Under the semiparametric single index model (2) for current status δ_i , our initial estimation is a special case of the quasi-likelihood approach considered in Carroll et al. (1997). To be specific, our initial estimator is the fully iterated estimator with misspecified variance in their paper. By their Remark 2 and Theorem 3, we have the consistency and asymptotic normality of $\hat{\beta}_\delta$. In the following, we derive the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}_\delta$, which is not stated in Carroll et al. (1997).

The estimators \hat{h} and $\hat{\beta}_\delta$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i [\delta_i - g\{\hat{h}(C_i) + \hat{\beta}_\delta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] &= 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - t) [\delta_i - g\{\hat{h}(t) + \hat{\beta}_\delta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] &= 0, \quad t = C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We denote the remainder rate as

$$R_n = \sqrt{n} \left\{ \left\| \hat{h} - h_0 \right\|_\infty + \left\| \hat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0 \right\|_2 \right\} \left\{ \left\| \hat{h} - h_0 \right\|_\infty + \left\| \hat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0 \right\|_2 + (nh)^{-1/2} + h^2 \right\} + \sqrt{nh^2}.$$

To derive the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}_\delta$, we first consider the local approximation of the first sets of equations in (A.1),

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] &= n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i [g\{\hat{h}(C_i) + \hat{\beta}_\delta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\ &= n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g'\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{\hat{h}(C_i) - h_0(C_i)\} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i^\top g'\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \{\hat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\} \\ &\quad + O_p(R_n). \end{aligned}$$

The key is the analysis of the first order term for the nonparametric component

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g'\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{\hat{h}(C_i) - h_0(C_i)\} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

From the second set of equations in (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) [g\{\widehat{h}(C_j) + \widehat{\beta}_\delta^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} - g\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) g'\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{\widehat{h}(C_j) - h_0(C_j)\} \\
&\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) g'\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\} \\
&\quad + O_p(n^{-1/2} R_n).
\end{aligned}$$

With $f_c(t)$ being the density of censoring time C_i and

$$a_0(t) = E[f_c(t)g'\{h_0(t) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}], \quad \mathbf{a}_1(t) = E[f_c(t)g'\{h_0(t) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \mathbf{Z}_i].$$

defined in (7), we may approximate the estimation error of the nonparametric component $\widehat{h}(C_i) - h_0(C_i)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \widehat{h}(C_j) - h_0(C_j) \\
&= \{a_0(C_j)\}^{-1} \left((nh)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] - \mathbf{a}_1(C_j)^\top \{\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\} \right) \\
&\quad + O_p(n^{-1/2} R_n).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

Here we also obtain

$$\|\widehat{h} - h_0\|_\infty = O_p\left((nh)^{-1/2} + h^2 + \|\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\|_2\right),$$

so we have an upper bound for the remainder rate

$$R_n = O_p\left(\sqrt{n} \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0 \right\|_2 + (nh)^{-1/2} + h^2 \right\}^2 + \sqrt{nh} h^2\right).$$

Plugging (A.3) to (A.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{\widehat{h}(C_i) - h_0(C_i)\} \\
&= n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{a_0(C_i)\}^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) [\delta_j - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_j\}] \\
&\quad - \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{a}_1(C_i) g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} / a_0(C_i)]^\top \{\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\} \\
&\quad + O_p(R_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{b}(t) = \mathbf{a}_1(t)/a_0(t)$ as defined in (7). By change the order of the sum over i and j , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{a_0(C_i)\}^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) [\delta_j - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_j\}] \\
&= n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n [\delta_j - g\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_j\}] n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{a_0(C_i)\}^{-1} \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) \\
&\quad - n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\} \{a_0(C_i)\}^{-1} \mathbb{K}_h(C_i - C_j) \\
&\quad \times [g\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_j\} - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_j\}] \\
&= n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{b}(C_j) [\delta_j - g\{h_0(C_j) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_j\}] + O_p(R_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Gathering the results, we have reached

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n} \{\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\}^\top \mathbb{E} [\{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{a}_1(C_i)/a_0(C_i)\} \mathbf{Z}_i^\top g' \{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\
&= n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_i)\} [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] + O_p(R_n).
\end{aligned}$$

As long as $n^{-1/2} \ll h \ll n^{-1/4}$, we may deduce from the representation the root-n consistency of $\widehat{\beta}_\delta$,

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{n}), \quad R_n = o_p(1).$$

Using the notations \mathbb{B} and Σ_δ defined in (7), we may express the asymptotic distribution of β_δ

as

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\delta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\} &= n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{B}^{-1} \{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_i)\} [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^{\top} \mathbf{Z}_i\}] + o_p(1) \\ &\rightsquigarrow N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbb{B}^{-1} \Sigma_{\delta} (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^{\top})\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

as stated in the main text.

Appendix C. Asymptotic property of rank correlation

We focus our analysis on the numerator of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B})$,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}.$$

The denominator of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B})$ does not contain the parameter \mathbf{B} , and it is easy to show its convergence to its mean,

$$N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \right\} = 1/2.$$

We may eventually substitute the denominator by its limit 1/2 through a Slutsky's Theorem argument,

$$2\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B}) = o_p \left(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}_0) + \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 \right).\tag{A.4}$$

Now, we establish the connection between $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$ and the rank correlation

$$\widehat{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}) = N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N I(\mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^{\top} \mathbf{Z}_j > 0) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}.\tag{9}$$

We define the anti-derivative of the symmetric smooth kernel $\mathbb{K}(\cdot)$ as

$$\mathbb{F}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \mathbb{K}(u) du, \quad \mathbb{F}_{h'}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \mathbb{K}_{h'}(u) du = \mathbb{F}(x/h').\tag{A.5}$$

Assuming $\mathbb{K}(\cdot)$ is a symmetric probability density function with second moment, then functions

$\mathbb{F}(x) - I(x > 0)$ and $x\{\mathbb{F}(x) - I(x > 0)\}$ are absolutely integrable over \mathbb{R} , and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{F}(x) - I(x > 0) dx = 0.$$

Thus for any continuously differentiable function $f(x)$, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \{\mathbb{F}_{h'}(x) - I(x > 0)\} f(x) dx = O(h' f'(0)). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Our score $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$ is the gradient of the smoothed rank correlation

$$\widehat{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{F}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = \nabla \widehat{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B}). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Cai and Cheng (2007) has thoroughly studied the rank correlation without smoothing $\widehat{Q}_k(\mathbf{B})$, and we shall develop the properties for $\widehat{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$ by connecting it to those of $\widehat{Q}_k(\mathbf{B})$.

By the uniform consistency of empirical distribution $\widehat{G}(\cdot)$ (Dvoretzky et al., 1956), we may replace the estimated $\widehat{G}(\cdot)$ by the true $G(\cdot)$ in $\widehat{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$ and $\widehat{Q}_k(\mathbf{B})$ with an $O_p(N^{-1/2})$ error,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) &= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{F}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} = \widehat{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) + O_p(N^{-1/2}), \\ \widetilde{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}) &= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j > 0) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} = \widehat{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}) + O_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Define the limiting processes for $\widetilde{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$ and $\widetilde{Q}_k(\mathbf{B})$ as $q_k(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{E}\{q_{kij}(\mathbf{B})\}$, $q_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{E}\{q_{kij}^*(\mathbf{B})\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} q_{ijk}(\mathbf{B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j > 0) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + I(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i > 0) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{kj} < \mathcal{X}_{ki}) \Delta_{kj}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{kj})^2} \right\}, \\ q_{ijk}^*(\mathbf{B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \mathbb{F}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{F}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{kj} < \mathcal{X}_{ki}) \Delta_{kj}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{kj})^2} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We assume that $q_k(\mathbf{B})$ is twice continuously differentiable. By a U process argument (Nolan and Pollard, 1988) we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} |\widetilde{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}) - q(\mathbf{B})| + |\widetilde{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - q^*(\mathbf{B})| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely on the compact support $\|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2$. By the property of $\mathbb{F}_{h'}$ as in (A.6), we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} |q^*(\mathbf{B}) - q(\mathbf{B})| = O(h') = o(1).$$

Thus, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} |\tilde{Q}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - q(\mathbf{B})| \rightarrow 0, \text{ almost surely.} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Next, we show that $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*$ has a continuous limit so that we may establish its limit as $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k$. We first consider

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) &= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{ijk}^*(\mathbf{B}), \\ \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{ijk}^*(\mathbf{B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ (\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{Z}_i) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{kj} < \mathcal{X}_{ki}) \Delta_{kj}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{kj})^2} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$+ (\mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{Z}_i) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{kj} < \mathcal{X}_{ki}) \Delta_{kj}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{kj})^2} \Big\} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Using the same U process argument (Nolan and Pollard, 1987), we can show that for $h' \gg 1/N$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^*(\mathbf{B})\|_2 \rightarrow 0, \text{ a.s.,} \quad \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^* = \mathbb{E}\{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{ijk}^*(\mathbf{B})\} = \nabla q_k^*(\mathbf{B}). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where we use the dot notation for gradient. As the smoothed version of $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k$, the continuity of $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^*$ is implied by the continuity of $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k$. Thus, we have shown that $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$ converges to a continuous limit. By a calculus result, the differentiation and limit are commutable for a uniformly convergent function sequence whose derivative converges uniformly to a continuous function. Combining (A.10) and (A.13), we apply the calculus result point-wisely in the probability space to obtain

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k(\mathbf{B})\|_2 \rightarrow 0, \text{ a.s.,} \quad \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k = \nabla q_k(\mathbf{B}). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Repeating the local quadratic expansion in Cai and Cheng (2007) from the arguments originally in Sherman (1993), we have for $\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 = O(N^{-1/2})$,

$$\tilde{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}) - \tilde{Q}_k(\mathbf{B}_0) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0)^\top \mathbb{A}_k (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}_0)^\top (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0) + o_p(N^{-1} + \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2^2) \quad (\text{A.15})$$

with \mathbb{A}_k and $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}$ defined in (2.1). Through the same argument, we establish for $\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 = O(n^{-1/2})$ and $h' = o(N^{-1/4})$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{A}_k (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}_0) + o_p(N^{-1/2} + \|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Now, we study the effect of estimated \hat{G} on the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*$. Using the rate of

consistency $\|\widehat{G} - G\|_\infty = O_p(N^{-1/2})$ (Dvoretzky et al., 1956), we may approximate the following error

$$\begin{aligned}
& \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) \\
&= N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^3} \{\widehat{G}(\mathcal{X}_{ki}) - G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})\} + O_p(N^{-1}) \\
&= N^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^N N^{-2} \sum_{i \neq l} \sum_{j \neq l} (\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^3} \{I(C_l \geq \mathcal{X}_{ki}) - G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})\} \\
&\quad + O_p(N^{-1}). \tag{A.17}
\end{aligned}$$

To use the U-process argument, we symmetrize the terms in $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{ijk}^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{Z}_j) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{ki} < \mathcal{X}_{kj}) \Delta_{ki}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})^3} \{I(c \geq \mathcal{X}_{ki}) - G(\mathcal{X}_{ki})\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{Z}_i) \mathbb{K}_{h'}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_j - \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{Z}_i) \frac{I(\mathcal{X}_{kj} < \mathcal{X}_{ki}) \Delta_{kj}}{G(\mathcal{X}_{kj})^3} \{I(c \geq \mathcal{X}_{kj}) - G(\mathcal{X}_{kj})\} \right] \tag{A.18}
\end{aligned}$$

and its sample average and expectation as

$$\dot{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}}_k^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}) = N^{-2} \sum_{i \neq l} \sum_{j \neq l} \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{ijk}^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}), \quad \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{E}\{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{ijk}^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B})\}. \tag{A.19}$$

When $h' \gg N^{-1}$, we apply the U-process argument (Nolan and Pollard, 1987)

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} \sup_{c \in [0, \tau]} \left| \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}}_k^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}) - \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}) \right| = O_p(N^{-1/2}),$$

where τ is the maximal censoring time. Using the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(C_l, \mathbf{B})\} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\{\dot{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}}_{ijk}^{c*}(C_l, \mathbf{B}) \mid C_l\}\right] = 0,$$

we establish

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) &= N^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^N \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(C_l, \mathbf{B}) + N^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^N \left\{ \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(C_l, \mathbf{B}) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{q}}}_k^{c*}(C_l, \mathbf{B}) \right\} + O_p(N^{-1}) \\
&= N^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^N \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(C_l, \mathbf{B}) + O_p(N^{-1}) \tag{A.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (A.16) and (A.20), we have shown

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)\} + \mathbb{A}_k(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0) + o_p(\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 + N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Repeating the argument from which we obtain (A.14), we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{B}: \|\mathbf{B}\|_2 \leq 2} \sup_{c \in [0, \tau]} |\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(c, \mathbf{B}) - \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(c, \mathbf{B})| \rightarrow 0, \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

whenever $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c$ defined in (2.1) exists. Since

$$\mathbb{E}\{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}(C_i, \mathbf{B})\} = \mathbb{E}\{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(C_i, \mathbf{B})\} = \mathbf{0},$$

we can substitute $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^{c*}$ in (A.21) by $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c$ with an $o_p(N^{-1/2})$ error,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k^*(\mathbf{B}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)\} + \mathbb{A}_k(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0) + o_p(\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 + N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.23})$$

By (A.4), we finally establish for $\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 = O(n^{-1/2})$,

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)\} + 2\mathbb{A}_k(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0) + o_p(\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{B}_0\|_2 + N^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

By the analyses of $\widehat{\beta}_\delta$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k(\mathbf{B})$, we have the local asymptotic approximation of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta) &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}^c(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)\} + 2\mathbb{A}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_\delta - \mathbf{B}_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}^c(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)\} + 2\mathbb{A}(\widehat{\beta}_\delta - \beta_0)/\|\beta_0\|_2 \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{A}\beta_0(\|\widehat{\beta}_\delta\|_2^{-1} - \|\beta_0\|_2^{-1}) + o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{A}\|\beta_0\|_2^{-1} \mathbb{B}^{-1} \{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_j)\} [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i(\mathbf{B}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}^c(C_i, \mathbf{B}_0)\} + o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Here we stack $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_{k,i}$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c$ and \mathbb{A}_k to produce $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}^c$ and \mathbb{A} as described in (2.1) when $K \geq 2$.

Appendix D. Asymptotic Properties of the SSL Estimator

Asymptotic collinearity of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\delta)$

We first show a property of the quantities derived from the rank correlation in (2.1). Since $\widehat{Q}_k(\mathcal{B})$ is invariant to the scale of \mathcal{B} , its limit $q_k(\mathcal{B})$ must also be invariant to the scale of \mathcal{B} ,

$$\widehat{Q}_k(\mathcal{B}) = \widehat{Q}_k(c\mathcal{B}), \quad q_k(\mathcal{B}) = q_k(c\mathcal{B}), \quad \forall c > 0.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k(\mathcal{B}_0)^\top \beta_0 = \|\beta_0\|_2^{-1} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-1} \{q_k(\mathcal{B}_0 + t\mathcal{B}_0) - q_k(\mathcal{B}_0)\} = 0. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Following the same argument, we also have

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(C_i, \mathcal{B}_0)^\top \beta_0 = 0, \quad \mathbb{A}_k \beta_0 = \mathbb{A}_k^\top \beta_0 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

The properties (A.26) and (A.27) later play an important role in the asymptotic distribution of the semi-supervised estimator $\widehat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$.

Also according to (A.27), elements in $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\delta)$ are asymptotically collinear. For the vector

$$\mathbf{v}(c_1, \dots, c_K) = (c_1 \mathcal{B}_0^\top, \dots, c_K \mathcal{B}_0^\top)^\top,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}(c_1, \dots, c_K)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\delta) &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K c_k \mathcal{B}_0^\top \mathbb{A}_k \|\beta_0\|_2^{-1} \mathbb{B}^{-1} \{\mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_j)\} [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \beta_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K c_k \{\mathcal{B}_0^\top \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k(\mathcal{B}_0) + \mathcal{B}_0^\top \dot{\mathbf{q}}_k^c(C_i, \mathcal{B}_0)\} + o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}) \\ &= o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

By (A.28), the rank of the asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{n} \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_\delta)$ is at most $K(p-1)$.

Consistency of $\hat{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbb{P})$

We identify the optimal projection as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top &= \overline{\text{Cov}} \left(\sqrt{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta, \sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right) \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right)^{-1} \mathbb{P} \\
&= \overline{\text{Cov}} \left(\sqrt{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta, \sqrt{n} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right) \mathbb{P}^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right)^{-1} \mathbb{P} \\
&= \begin{cases} \left\{ \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} + \frac{n}{N} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\delta,S} \right\} \mathbb{P}^\top \\ \quad \times \left[2 \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{A} \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-2} + \frac{n}{N} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_S + \mathbb{A} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\delta,S} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\delta,S}^\top \mathbb{A}^\top) \right\} \mathbb{P}^\top \right]^{-1} \mathbb{P}, & N \asymp n \quad , \\ \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \left\{ 2 \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta (\mathbb{B}^{-1})^\top \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2, & N \gg n \end{cases} \\
\end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

where $\overline{\text{Cov}}$ and $\overline{\text{Var}}$ denote the asymptotic covariance and variance. The term

$$\mathbb{P}^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right)^{-1} \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^\top \left\{ \mathbb{P} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right) \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P}$$

in (A.29) satisfies the definition of the generalized inverse for the rank deficient $\overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right)$.

Since the loss (21) is convex, the solution is uniquely identified by the KKT condition,

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_j(\mathbb{P}) = \left\{ \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}) \hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)})^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\delta,j}^{(b)} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(b)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta^{(b)}). \tag{A.30}$$

We have shown that $\sqrt{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\delta,j}$ and $\sqrt{n} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta)$ are asymptotically regular. By Jin et al. (2001), sample moments of perturbation samples converge to the asymptotic moments at $n^{-1/2}$ rate. We have

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_j(\mathbb{P}) = \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right)^{-1} \overline{\text{Cov}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta), \sqrt{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\delta,j} \right) + O_p(n^{-1/2}). \tag{A.31}$$

We assemble the estimated coefficients $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_p$ to construct estimated projection matrix

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbb{P}) &= \mathbb{P}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{w}}_1(\mathbb{P}), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{w}}_p(\mathbb{P})) \\
&= \mathbb{P} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) \right)^{-1} \overline{\text{Cov}} \left(\sqrt{n} \mathbb{P} \hat{\mathbf{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta), \sqrt{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) + O_p(n^{-1/2}) \\
&= \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.32}$$

Asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}$

Now, we may give the asymptotic approximation of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \widehat{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{comb}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \\
&= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta) + O_p(n^{-1}) \\
&= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{I}_p - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right) \mathbb{B}^{-1} \{ \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbf{b}(C_i) \} [\delta_i - g\{h_0(C_i) + \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbf{Z}_i\}] \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \{ \dot{\mathbf{q}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \dot{\mathbf{q}}(C_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \} + o_p(n^{-1/2} + N^{-1/2}). \tag{A.33}
\end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}}$ is thus

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{SSL}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \rightsquigarrow N(\mathbf{0}, 4\Sigma_{\text{SSL}}), \tag{15}$$

with Σ_{SSL} defined next to (15) in the main text.

To obtain the simplified representation for $N \gg n$ scenario as in (19), we shall show that

$$\left(\mathbb{I}_p - \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B}}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0}. \tag{A.34}$$

Since $\overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}$ is a linear combination of $\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_j)$ or $\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P}_{k,j})$, the identity (A.34) would imply

$$\left(\mathbb{I}_p - \overline{\mathbb{W}}_{\text{opt}}^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} \right) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B}}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \Sigma_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0}.$$

Recall that each \mathbb{A}_k is a rank $p-1$ symmetric matrix, whose columns and rows are orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ according to (A.27). The rows of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{A}$ are linear combinations of the rows of \mathbb{A}_k , which should also be orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$. By the design of \mathbb{P} , the rank of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{A}$ equals $p-1$. Hence, the rows of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{A}$ must form a basis of the linear subspace $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\perp = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = 0\}$. We may represent arbitrary $\mathbf{v}_\perp \in \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\perp$ as

$$\mathbf{v}_\perp = \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \mathbf{v}_\perp^*, \quad \mathbf{v}_\perp^* = (\mathbb{P}\mathbb{A}\mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top)^{-1} \mathbb{P}\mathbb{A} \mathbf{v}_\perp. \tag{A.35}$$

Recall that we have under $N \gg n$ case

$$\mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}^\top(\mathbb{P}) = \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \left\{ \mathbb{P}\mathbb{A} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2.$$

We start with the left hand side,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{v}_\perp^\top (\mathbb{I}_p - \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1}) \\
&= \mathbf{v}_\perp^{*\top} \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} - \mathbf{v}_\perp^{*\top} \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \left\{ \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \\
&= \mathbf{0}^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\perp \subseteq \ker \left((\mathbb{I}_p - \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1})^\top \right).$$

By the fundamental theorem of linear algebra, the rank of $(\mathbb{I}_p - \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1})$ is at most 1, and it must admit the following one-dimensional singular value decomposition

$$\mathbb{I}_p - \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \sigma \mathbf{r}^\top \quad (\text{A.36})$$

for some $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. To calculate σ and \mathbf{r} , we consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \sigma \mathbf{r}^\top \\
&= \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1} (\mathbb{I}_p - \mathbb{W}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbb{P})^\top \mathbb{A} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^{-1}) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \left\{ \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right) \mathbb{A}^\top \mathbb{P}^\top \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P} \mathbb{A} \\
&= \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we must have

$$\sigma \mathbf{r}^\top = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1}}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \overline{\text{Var}} \left(\sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\delta \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B}}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^\top \mathbb{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\delta^{-1} \mathbb{B} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0}.$$

Therefore, we have proved (A.34).

Table A1

Bias ($\times 100$) of $\hat{\beta}_\delta$ and $\hat{\beta}_{\text{SSL}}$ as well as relative efficiency (RE) of $\hat{\beta}_{\text{std}}$ compared to $\hat{\beta}_\delta$ when the measurement errors in \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 are (A) moderate and (B) high.

n=500, N = 500					
	Bias $_\delta$	(A) Small		(C) High	
		Bias $_{\text{SSL}}$	RE	Bias $_{\text{SSL}}$	RE
β_1	-1.82	-2.27	1.38	-1.91	0.95
β_2	-3.96	-3.70	1.27	-1.78	1.01
β_3	-2.30	-2.43	1.27	-4.21	1.09
β_4	1.92	3.05	1.39	3.63	1.07
β_5	2.83	3.92	1.58	3.87	1.02
β_6	1.68	3.24	1.40	2.69	1.04
β_7	-0.91	-0.81	1.58	-0.31	1.16
β_8	-0.63	-0.99	1.58	-1.23	1.15
β_9	-1.90	-1.02	1.62	-0.47	1.22
β_{10}	0.14	1.38	1.57	1.55	1.11
n=500, N = 10000					
	Bias $_\delta$	(A) Small		(C) High	
		Bias $_{\text{SSL}}$	RE	Bias $_{\text{SSL}}$	RE
β_1	-1.60	0.48	2.85	-0.21	2.33
β_2	-2.05	0.23	3.34	-0.01	2.58
β_3	-2.12	0.36	3.15	0.17	2.40
β_4	1.04	-0.10	5.22	0.86	3.54
β_5	3.03	-0.22	5.57	0.70	3.22
β_6	0.65	-0.15	5.98	0.68	3.60
β_7	-1.06	-0.80	9.18	-1.39	4.33
β_8	-0.94	-0.57	9.75	-0.56	4.64
β_9	-0.85	-0.61	10.61	-1.78	4.80
β_{10}	-0.06	0.14	100.64	0.40	16.59

Table A2

Empirical SE (ESE) of norm-preserving soft-thresholded SSL estimator $\hat{\beta}_{\text{std}}$, average of the estimated SEs (ASE) from norm-preserving soft-thresholded SSL perturbation $\hat{\beta}_{\text{soft, std}}^{(b)}$, empirical coverage levels (CovP) of the quantile based 95% CIs from re-centered norm-preserving soft-thresholded SSL perturbation $\hat{\beta}_{\text{center}}^{(b)}$.

n=500, N = 1000						
	(A) Small			(C) High		
	ESE	ASE	CovP	ESE	ASE	CovP
β_1	0.1275	0.1326	0.9420	0.1533	0.1441	0.9260
β_2	0.1331	0.1323	0.9380	0.1497	0.1443	0.9380
β_3	0.1329	0.1331	0.9480	0.1432	0.1439	0.9320
β_4	0.1223	0.1258	0.9340	0.1395	0.1380	0.9340
β_5	0.1176	0.1250	0.9360	0.1460	0.1378	0.9120
β_6	0.1282	0.1254	0.9360	0.1487	0.1390	0.9280
β_7	0.1169	0.1208	0.9600	0.1364	0.1334	0.9480
β_8	0.1182	0.1212	0.9420	0.1385	0.1338	0.9460
β_9	0.1139	0.1196	0.9540	0.1311	0.1336	0.9580
β_{10}	0.1142	0.1179	0.9480	0.1355	0.1317	0.9280
n=500, N = 10000						
	(A) Small			(C) High		
	ESE	ASE	CovP	ESE	ASE	CovP
β_1	0.0869	0.0854	0.9400	0.0962	0.0988	0.9440
β_2	0.0859	0.0850	0.9540	0.0978	0.0986	0.9400
β_3	0.0847	0.0850	0.9360	0.0971	0.0992	0.9480
β_4	0.0653	0.0678	0.9440	0.0788	0.0857	0.9640
β_5	0.0625	0.0662	0.9580	0.0819	0.0854	0.9620
β_6	0.0616	0.0682	0.9580	0.0791	0.0856	0.9580
β_7	0.0463	0.0519	0.9540	0.0670	0.0754	0.9680
β_8	0.0472	0.0521	0.9660	0.0687	0.0755	0.9720
β_9	0.0457	0.0521	0.9720	0.0662	0.0744	0.9560
β_{10}	0.0142	0.0186	0.9940	0.0350	0.0407	0.9880

Table A3

Point estimates and 95% CIs of the risk prediction potential of sex, the obesity GRS and the first 5 PCs on developing obesity, along with p-values from inverting the CIs.

	β_δ				β_{SSL}			
	Est	SE	95% CI	PVal	Est	SE	95% CI	PVal
Male	-0.311	0.604	(-1.670,0.739)	0.354	-0.365	0.568	(-1.790,0.521)	0.136
GRS	0.572	0.327	(0.071,1.334)	0.038	0.610	0.274	(0.081,1.167)	0.022
PC1	0.946	0.337	(0.321,1.671)	0.006	0.922	0.318	(0.306,1.588)	0.006
PC2	0.692	0.587	(-0.548,1.682)	0.284	0.539	0.465	(-0.548,1.340)	0.208
PC3	0.107	0.447	(-0.942,0.853)	1.000	0.074	0.410	(-0.794,0.864)	0.838
PC4	0.495	0.328	(-0.199,1.101)	0.152	0.464	0.316	(-0.211,1.052)	0.152
PC5	0.327	0.336	(-0.345,0.966)	0.324	0.218	0.309	(-0.404,0.793)	0.470