

Weighted Likelihood for Semiparametric Models and Two-phase Stratified Samples, with Application to Cox Regression

Norman E. Breslow
Jon A. Wellner

University of Washington, Seattle

March 29, 2022

Abstract

Weighted likelihood, in which one solves Horvitz-Thompson or inverse probability weighted (IPW) versions of the likelihood equations, offers a simple and robust method for fitting models to two phase stratified samples. We consider semiparametric models for which solution of infinite dimensional estimating equations leads to \sqrt{N} consistent and asymptotically Gaussian estimators of both Euclidean and nonparametric parameters. If the phase two sample is selected via Bernoulli (i.i.d.) sampling with known sampling probabilities, standard estimating equation theory shows that the influence function for the weighted likelihood estimator of the Euclidean parameter is the IPW version of the ordinary influence function. By proving weak convergence of the IPW empirical process, and borrowing results on weighted bootstrap empirical processes, we derive a parallel asymptotic expansion for finite population stratified sampling. Whereas the asymptotic variance for Bernoulli sampling involves the within strata second moments of the influence function, for finite population stratified sampling it involves only the within strata variances. The latter asymptotic variance also arises when the observed sampling fractions are used as estimates of those known *a priori*. A general procedure is proposed for fitting semiparametric models with estimated weights to two phase data. Several of our key results have already been derived for the special case of Cox regression with stratified case-cohort studies, other complex survey designs and missing data problems more generally. This paper is intended to help place this previous work in appropriate context and to pave the way for applications to other models.

Key words: case-cohort, estimated weights, failure time, inverse probability weights, missing data

1 Introduction

Two phase stratified sampling, also known as double sampling, was introduced by Neyman (1938) to estimate the population mean of a target variable that is costly or difficult to measure. At phase one a relatively large random sample is drawn and measurements are made on an auxiliary variable that is correlated with the target variable but easier to measure. At phase two measurements on the target variable are made for a subsample drawn randomly, without replacement, from within strata defined by the auxiliary variable. Neyman showed that the optimal, design unbiased linear estimator of the population mean is the Horvitz-Thompson (1952) estimator that weights each observation by the inverse of the probability of its selection into the phase two sample.

Two-phase stratified sampling designs can dramatically reduce the costs of regression modeling when the strata depend on (correlates of) both outcome and explanatory variables. A common method of estimation is “weighted exogenous sampling maximum likelihood”, here simply Weighted Likelihood or WL, in which one maximizes the inverse probability weighted (IPW) sum of log-likelihood contributions from the phase two observations (Manski and Lerman, 1977; Kalbfleisch and Lawless, 1988). Equivalently, one may solve an IPW version of the score equations (Skinner et al., 1989, §3.4). Although easy to implement, WL estimators are sometimes seriously inefficient (Robins et al., 1994). They may still be of interest, however, because even when the model is wrong they consistently estimate the finite population parameters that would be obtained by fitting the model to complete phase one data (Xie and Manski, 1989; Binder, 1992). Fully efficient estimators are available for logistic and other parametric regression models in situations where the phase one data consist only of stratum frequencies. See, for example, Breslow et al. (2003) and the references cited therein.

The asymptotic properties of WL estimators of Euclidean parameters in parametric models follow readily from standard results for M -estimators (van der Vaart, 1998, Chapter 5). WL may also be used for estimation of both Euclidean and infinite dimensional parameters in semiparametric models, for which the paradigm is Cox (1972) proportional hazards regression. Lin (2000) developed asymptotic results for both regression coefficients and baseline cumulative hazard when fitting the Cox model to survey data including those obtained using two phase sampling. Borgan et al. (2000)

obtained the same results for the regression parameters when fitting the Cox model to data from exposure stratified case-cohort studies, in which all subjects who have a failure event (the cases) are sampled at phase two. One purpose of the present paper is to develop a modern theory of WL estimation in semiparametric models that encompasses these previous results, helps to interpret them and paves the way for further applications. We also explore the relationship between results based on finite population stratified sampling at phase two and those based on i.i.d. variable probability sampling with sampling weights estimated using information from phase one.

2 Notation, Assumptions and Problem Statement

Suppose $P_{\theta,\eta}$ denotes a probability distribution in a semiparametric model for a random variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is the Euclidean parameter and η , taking values in some arbitrary space H , is the nonparametric one. Let $P_0 = P_{\theta_0,\eta_0}$ denote the distribution from which X is actually sampled. Following closely §25.12 of van der Vaart (1998), suppose maximum likelihood (ML) estimators $(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta})$ are obtained by solving the system

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{N1}(\theta, \eta) &= \mathbb{P}_N \dot{\ell}_{\theta,\eta} = 0 \\ \Psi_{N2}(\theta, \eta) &= \mathbb{P}_N B_{\theta,\eta} h - P_{\theta,\eta} B_{\theta,\eta} h = 0 \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}.\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

Here $\dot{\ell}_{\theta,\eta}$ is the p -dimensional likelihood score for θ , $B_{\theta,\eta}$ is the score operator (Begun et al., 1983) working on an infinite dimensional class \mathcal{H} of directions h from which paths of one-dimensional submodels for η may approach η_0 , and \mathbb{P}_N is empirical measure based on the i.i.d. sequence X_1, \dots, X_N . Set $\dot{\ell}_0 = \dot{\ell}_{\theta_0,\eta_0}$ and $B_0 = B_{\theta_0,\eta_0}$.

Suppose the following assumptions, which slightly strengthen the hypotheses of van der Vaart (1998, Theorem 25.90), are satisfied so that $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0, \hat{\eta} - \eta_0)$ is asymptotically Gaussian:

A1 for (θ, η) in a δ -neighborhood of (θ_0, η_0) the functions $\dot{\ell}_{\theta,\eta}$ and $\{B_{\theta,\eta} h, h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ are contained in a P_0 -Donsker class \mathcal{F} ;

A2 $P_0 \|\dot{\ell}_{\theta,\eta} - \dot{\ell}_0\|^2$ and $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} P_0 |B_{\theta,\eta} h - B_0 h|^2$ converge to 0 as $(\theta, \eta) \rightarrow (\theta_0, \eta_0)$;

A3 the map $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2) : \Theta \times H \mapsto \mathbb{R}^p \times \ell^\infty(\mathcal{H})$ with components

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_1(\theta, \eta) &= P_0 \dot{\ell}_{\theta, \eta} \\ \Psi_2(\theta, \eta) &= P_0 B_{\theta, \eta} h - P_{\theta, \eta} B_{\theta, \eta} h, \quad h \in \mathcal{H},\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

which is the expectation of the random map $\Psi_N = (\Psi_{N1}, \Psi_{N2})$ in (1), has a Fréchet derivative $\dot{\Psi}_0$ at (θ_0, η_0) that is continuously invertible on its range.

A4 $(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta})$ is consistent for (θ_0, η_0) and satisfies $\Psi_N(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}) = 0$.

Assumption **A3** is typically established by showing that the information operator $B_0^* B_0$ is continuously invertible and thus that η is estimable at a \sqrt{N} rate. This is the most restrictive assumption, but one that leads quickly to our main result.

With two phase sampling, however, X is not observed for all N subjects. At phase one we observe only a coarsening $\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}(X)$ of X plus auxiliary variables $U \in \mathcal{U}$ that serve to determine the sampling strata. X is fully observed for subjects sampled at phase two. Let $W = (X, U) \in \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$ denote the variables potentially available for everyone, but in fact fully observed only for those in the phase two sample, and $V = (\tilde{X}, U) \in \mathcal{V} = \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathcal{U}$ denote the variables actually observed for everyone. We write \tilde{P}_0 for the distribution of $W = (X, U)$ and denote by $\Sigma_N = \sigma[W_1, \dots, W_N]$ the sigma field of information, also referred to as the complete data, potentially available for the N subjects. A sequence of binary indicators (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N) shows which subjects are selected ($\xi_i = 1$) at phase two for observation of X_i . We consider two probability models for the indicators ξ_i . In the first, known as Bernoulli or Manski-Lerman (1977) sampling, each phase one subject is examined in succession for the value of V_i and the indicator ξ_i is independently generated with $\Pr(\xi_i = 1|W_i) = \Pr(\xi_i = 1|V_i) = \pi_0(V_i)$ where π_0 is a known sampling function. This preserves the i.i.d. structure for the observations $(\xi_i, V_i, \xi_i X_i)$. Note the crucial missing at random (MAR) assumption: π_0 depends only on what is observed at phase one. We write Q_0 for the distribution of (W_i, ξ_i) . If \mathcal{V} is partitioned into J strata $\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{V}_J$, stratified Bernoulli sampling corresponds to the special case where $\pi_0(v) = p_j$ for $v \in \mathcal{V}_j$. We assume that all J strata are sampled with positive probability, or more generally that

$$0 < \sigma \leq \pi_0(v) \leq 1 \quad \text{for } v \in \mathcal{V}.\tag{3}$$

Even though the sampling fractions are known, it is advisable to estimate π_0 in order to increase the efficiency of WL (Robins et al., 1994). We consider estimation of π_0 using a parametric model in §6.

The second sampling model corresponds to Neyman's original design and is usually closer to actual practice. Here we observe the entire phase one sample at once and record the stratum frequencies $N_j = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_j}(V_i)$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$. At phase two samples of size $n_j \leq N_j$ are drawn at random, without replacement, from each of the J finite phase one strata. Using now a doubly subscripted notation where $\xi_{j,i}$ denotes the indicator variable for i^{th} subject in stratum j , the essential features of this design are that, conditionally on Σ_N : (i) for $j = 1, \dots, J$ the random variables $(\xi_{j1}, \dots, \xi_{jN_j})$ are exchangeable with $\Pr(\xi_{j,i} = 1 | \Sigma_N) = n_j/N_j$; and (ii) the J random vectors $(\xi_{j1}, \dots, \xi_{jN_j})$ are independent. Our problem is to estimate (θ, η) using the incomplete observations V_i on everyone and the complete observations X_i on subjects sampled at phase two.

3 Weighted Likelihood Estimator

WL estimates are obtained by solving Horvitz-Thompson (IPW) versions of the likelihood equations. Define the *inverse probability weighted empirical measure* by

$$\mathbb{P}_N^\pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_i} \delta_{X_i}, \quad (4)$$

where δ_{X_i} denotes Dirac measure placing unit mass on X_i and

$$\pi_i = \begin{cases} \pi_0(V_i) & \text{for Bernoulli sampling} \\ \frac{n_j}{N_j} \text{ if } V_i \in \mathcal{V}_j & \text{for finite population stratified sampling.} \end{cases}$$

Then, instead of (1) we solve

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{N1}^\pi(\theta, \eta) &= \mathbb{P}_N^\pi \dot{\ell}_{\theta, \eta} = 0 \\ \Psi_{N2}^\pi(\theta, \eta) &= \mathbb{P}_N^\pi B_{\theta, \eta} h - P_{\theta, \eta} B_{\theta, \eta} h = 0 \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathcal{H}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In view of the MAR assumption, for any integrable function $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and under either Bernoulli or finite population stratified sampling,

$$\mathbb{E} \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_i} f(X_i) = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\pi_i} \middle| \Sigma_N \right) f(X_i) \right] = \mathbb{E} f(X_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

so that $\mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}_N^\pi f = \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}_N f = P_0 f$. Consequently, the random map $\Psi_N^\pi = (\Psi_{N1}^\pi, \Psi_{N2}^\pi)$ defined by (5) has the same expectation as the random map Ψ_N in (1), namely $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$ as in (2). The implication is that the assumptions **A1-A4** made to guarantee the asymptotic normality of the ML estimator based on complete phase one data are also the assumptions needed to guarantee the asymptotic normality of the WL estimator based on two phase data. Indeed, van der Vaart's (1998) Theorem 25.90, or more precisely his Theorem 19.26 of which it is a restatement, applies virtually without change to the Bernoulli sampling setup. The Donsker class \mathcal{F} in **A1** is modified to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \{[\xi/\pi_0(V)]f(X), f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Since under the hypothesis (3) it is the product of a fixed bounded function with the Donsker class \mathcal{F} , the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is Donsker for the joint distribution Q_0 of (W, ξ) follows from van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, example 2.10.10). The random map Ψ_N corresponding to the estimating functions (5) is ordinary empirical measure \mathbb{Q}_N for $\{(W_i, \xi_i), i = 1, \dots, N\}$ applied to the unbiased estimating functions $(\xi/\pi_0)\dot{\ell}_{\theta, \eta}$ and $(\xi/\pi_0)B_{\theta, \eta}h$. **A4** will generally follow from (3) and the arguments used to establish consistency for the complete data ML estimator, together with (5). **A2** and **A3** are unchanged. The more general Theorem 3.3.1 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) is needed, however, to deal with the non i.i.d. data induced by finite population stratified sampling. To verify its hypotheses, we first must establish weak convergence of the empirical process based on \mathbb{P}_N^π .

4 Weak Convergence of the IPW Empirical Process

Two phase stratified sampling resembles the bootstrap in that it involves random sampling from the finite, albeit incompletely observed, population $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$. Here we use results on weighted bootstrap empirical processes from Præstgaard and Wellner (1993, Theorem 2.2), as incorporated in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Theorem 3.6.13), to demonstrate weak convergence of the IPW empirical process $\mathbb{G}_N^\pi = \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N^\pi - P_0)$ for finite population stratified sampling. First note that, with the subscript j, i denoting the i^{th} of N_j observations in stratum j ,

$$\mathbb{P}_N^\pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{N_j}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \xi_{j,i} \delta_{X_{j,i}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{N_j^2}{n_j} \mathbb{P}_{j, N_j}^\xi \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j}^\xi = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \xi_{j,i} \delta_{X_{j,i}}$$

is a *finite sampling empirical measure* for the j^{th} stratum. Similarly one can express the ordinary empirical measure as

$$\mathbb{P}_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^J N_j \mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \delta_{X_i} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_j}(V_i) = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \delta_{X_{j,i}} \quad (8)$$

denotes the empirical measure for the j^{th} stratum. Justification of the second (doubly indexed) form is given in Appendix A.

Combining (6) and (7), and letting $\mathbb{G}_N = \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N - P_0)$ denote the standard empirical process, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_N^\pi &= \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N^\pi - P_0) \\ &= \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N - P_0) + \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N^\pi - \mathbb{P}_N) \\ &= \mathbb{G}_N + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{N_j^2}{n_j} \right) \left(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j}^\xi - \frac{n_j}{N_j} \mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{G}_N + \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\frac{N_j}{N}} \left(\frac{N_j}{n_j} \right) \mathbb{G}_{j,N_j}^\xi \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\mathbb{G}_{j,N_j}^\xi = \sqrt{N_j} \left(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j}^\xi - \frac{n_j}{N_j} \mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} \right) \quad (10)$$

is the *finite sampling empirical process* for stratum j .

The first term in (9) converges to the P_0 -Brownian bridge process \mathbb{G} indexed by the Donsker class \mathcal{F} mentioned in **A1**. Let $P_{0|j}(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}(\cdot | V \in \mathcal{V}_j)$ denote \tilde{P}_0 conditional on membership in stratum j , *i.e.*, for measurable $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, $P_{0|j}(A) = \tilde{P}_0[A \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_j}(V)] / \nu_j$ with $\nu_j = \tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_j}(V)$, and let \mathbb{G}_j denote the $P_{0|j}$ -Brownian bridge, also indexed by \mathcal{F} . Our goal is to establish the weak convergence of the remaining terms on the RHS of (9). If as $N \rightarrow \infty$ the sampling fractions converge with

$n_j/N_j \rightarrow p_j$, the assumption on the exchangeable “weights” $(\xi_{j,1}, \dots, \xi_{j,N_j})$ in equation (3.6.8) of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) holds trivially with

$$\frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} (\xi_{j,i} - \bar{\xi}_{j\cdot}) \xrightarrow{P} p_j(1 - p_j).$$

Furthermore, with \rightsquigarrow denoting weak convergence in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$, $\sqrt{N_j}(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} - P_{0|j}) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_j$; see Appendix B for the proof. Thus their Theorems 3.6.13 and 1.12.4 imply that, for almost every sequence of complete data, $\mathbb{G}_{j,N_j}^\xi \rightsquigarrow \sqrt{p_j(1-p_j)}\mathbb{G}_j$. Conditionally on Σ_N , the processes \mathbb{G}_{j,N_j}^ξ are mutually independent because of the independence of the $\{\xi_{j,i}\}$ in different strata. Furthermore, by virtue of the fact that they also are (unconditionally) uncorrelated with $\mathbb{G}_N = \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N - P_0)$, which follows along the lines of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Corollary 2.9.3), or that (conditionally) they have the same limiting distributions for almost all sequences of data, the vector of processes $(\mathbb{G}_N, \mathbb{G}_{1,N_1}^\xi, \dots, \mathbb{G}_{J,N_J}^\xi)$ converges weakly to the vector of independent Brownian bridge processes $(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{G}_1, \dots, \mathbb{G}_J)$. Consequently

$$\mathbb{G}_N^\pi \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G} + \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\nu_j} \sqrt{\frac{1-p_j}{p_j}} \mathbb{G}_j. \quad (11)$$

This result formalizes and extends Proposition 1 of Self and Prentice (1988) and the arguments in §4 of Borgan et al. (2000).

5 Asymptotic Distributions of the WL estimator

We apply Theorem 19.26 of van der Vaart (1998) to conclude that, under Bernoulli sampling,

$$\sqrt{N}\dot{\Psi}_0 \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\theta} - \theta_0 \\ \hat{\eta} - \eta_0 \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbb{G}_N \frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\ell}_0 \\ B_0 h \end{pmatrix} + o_p(1). \quad (12)$$

Similarly, using Theorem 3.3.1 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) together with the development of the previous section, we conclude that for finite population stratified sampling

$$\sqrt{N}\dot{\Psi}_0 \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\theta} - \theta_0 \\ \hat{\eta} - \eta_0 \end{pmatrix} = -\mathbb{G}_N^\pi \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\ell}_0 \\ B_0 h \end{pmatrix} + o_p(1). \quad (13)$$

We have already argued that the hypotheses of the first theorem follow from appropriately modified versions of **A1-A4**. Together with the weak convergence of \mathbb{G}_N^π just established, they also suffice

for the second theorem. In particular, the stochastic condition (3.3.2) of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) follows from **A1** and **A2** together with the proof of their Lemma 3.3.5 applied to each of $\mathbb{G}_N, \mathbb{G}_{1,N_1}^\xi, \dots, \mathbb{G}_{1,N_1}^\xi$.

In practice attention is usually focused on inferences for the Euclidean parameter θ . To derive a general expression for the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\theta}$ we further assume

A5 $\dot{\Psi}_0$ admits a partition as in equation (25.91) of van der Vaart (1998) where the information operator $B_0^* B_0$ is continuously invertible.

Following closely the arguments in §25.12 of van der Vaart, we calculate from (12) that under Bernoulli sampling

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \mathbb{G}_N \frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0 + o_p(1) \quad (14)$$

whereas from (13) under finite population stratified sampling

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \mathbb{G}_N^\pi \tilde{\ell}_0 + o_p(1), \quad (15)$$

where in both cases $\tilde{\ell}_0$ denotes the efficient influence function

$$\tilde{\ell}_0 = \tilde{I}_0^{-1} \left(I - B_0 (B_0^* B_0)^{-1} B_0^* \right) \dot{\ell}_0 \quad (16)$$

and

$$\tilde{I}_0 = P_0 \left[\left(I - B_0 (B_0^* B_0)^{-1} B_0^* \right) \dot{\ell}_0 \dot{\ell}_0^T \right] \quad (17)$$

is the efficient information. Since $P_0 \tilde{\ell}_0 = 0$, moreover, both (14) and (15) may be expressed

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \sqrt{N} \mathbb{P}_N^\pi \tilde{\ell}_0 + o_p(1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_i} \tilde{\ell}_0(X_i) + o_p(1), \quad (18)$$

which expansion constitutes the principal result of this paper.

Under Bernoulli sampling with known π_0 the asymptotic variance is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_A \sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) &= \text{Var} \left(\frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0 \right) \\ &= \text{Var} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0 \middle| X \right) + \mathbb{E} \text{Var} \left(\frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0 \middle| X \right) \\ &= \text{Var}(\tilde{\ell}_0) + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\tilde{\ell}_0^{\otimes 2}}{\pi_0^2} \text{Var}(\xi | X) \right] \\ &= \tilde{I}_0^{-1} + \tilde{P}_0 \left(\frac{1 - \pi_0}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0^{\otimes 2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In the special case of stratified Bernoulli sampling, with $\pi_i = \pi_0(V_i) = p_j$ for $V_i \in \mathcal{V}_j$, this becomes

$$\tilde{I}_0^{-1} + \sum_{j=1}^J \nu_j \frac{1-p_j}{p_j} P_{0|j} \left(\tilde{\ell}_0^{\otimes 2} \right). \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, from (11) and (15), the asymptotic variance under finite population stratified sampling is

$$\tilde{I}_0^{-1} + \sum_{j=1}^J \nu_j \frac{1-p_j}{p_j} \text{Var}_j(\tilde{\ell}_0), \quad (21)$$

where $\text{Var}_j(f) = P_{0|j}(f^{\otimes 2}) - P_{0|j}^{\otimes 2}(f)$. Comparing the last two expressions shows the substantial potential gain from keeping track of the stratum frequencies for the phase one data.

6 Bernoulli Sampling with Estimated Weights

Let \mathcal{V}_0 denote an additional stratum, possibly null, such that $\xi_i = 1$ for $V_i \in \mathcal{V}_0$. Introduction of this special stratum with $p_0 = 1$ does not affect the previous development; in particular, equations (18)-(21) continue to hold. For $V_i \notin \mathcal{V}_0$ suppose

$$\Pr(\xi_i = 1 | X_i, V_i; \alpha) = \Pr(\xi_i = 1 | V_i; \alpha) = \pi_\alpha(V_i) < 1 \quad (22)$$

where $\alpha \in \Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ is a parameter to be estimated by maximum likelihood from the phase one observations $\{V_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ not in \mathcal{V}_0 . We assume sufficient regularity in the model for α , e.g., to satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.21 of van der Vaart (1998), so that the ML estimator $\hat{\alpha}$ is consistent and asymptotically normal with influence function

$$\tilde{\ell}_0^\alpha = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \left(\tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\dot{\pi}_0^{\otimes 2}}{\pi_0(1-\pi_0)} \right)^{-1} \dot{\pi}_0 \frac{\xi - \pi_0}{\pi_0(1-\pi_0)}. \quad (23)$$

Here for $V \in \mathcal{V}_0^c$, the complement of \mathcal{V}_0 , $\pi_0(V) = \pi_{\alpha_0}(V)$ is the true sampling function while $\dot{\pi}_0(V)$ denotes the q -vector of partial derivatives of $\pi_\alpha(V)$ with respect to α evaluated at $\alpha = \alpha_0$. If $\hat{\theta}(\alpha)$ denotes the WL estimator under two phase Bernoulli sampling with “known” sampling function $\pi_\alpha(V)$, then from (23) and (18) we have

$$\sqrt{N} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\theta}(\alpha_0) - \theta_0 \\ \hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0 \end{pmatrix} = \sqrt{N} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{P}_N^\pi \tilde{\ell}_0 \\ \mathbb{Q}_N \tilde{\ell}_0^\alpha \end{pmatrix} + o_p(1). \quad (24)$$

Furthermore, with $\hat{\pi}_i = \pi(V_i; \hat{\alpha})$ for $V_i \in \mathcal{V}_0^c$ otherwise $\hat{\pi}_i = 1$, we show in Appendix C that under some further mild assumptions regarding $\pi_\alpha(V)$

$$\sqrt{N}(\mathbb{P}_N^{\hat{\pi}} - \mathbb{P}_N^{\pi_0})\tilde{\ell}_0 = -\tilde{P}_0 \left(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\tilde{\ell}_0 \dot{\pi}_0^T}{\pi_0} \right) \sqrt{N}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) + o_p(1). \quad (25)$$

The joint asymptotic normality of $(\hat{\theta}(\alpha_0), \hat{\alpha})$ that follows from (24), together with the Taylor expansion (25), are precisely the hypotheses used by Pierce (1982) to deduce that $\sqrt{N}[\hat{\theta}(\hat{\alpha}) - \theta_0] \rightsquigarrow Z$ where $Z \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is mean zero Gaussian with covariance matrix

$$\text{Var}_A \sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta}(\hat{\alpha}) - \theta_0) = \text{Var} \left(\frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0 \right) - \tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\tilde{\ell}_0 \dot{\pi}_0^T}{\pi_0} \left(\tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\dot{\pi}_0^{\otimes 2}}{\pi_0(1 - \pi_0)} \right)^{-1} \tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\dot{\pi}_0 \tilde{\ell}_0^T}{\pi_0}. \quad (26)$$

A matrix calculation shows that, when (26) is evaluated for stratified Bernoulli sampling

$$\pi_\alpha = \pi_\alpha(V) = \begin{cases} 1, & V \in \mathcal{V}_0 \\ \alpha_j, & V \in \mathcal{V}_j, j = 1, \dots, J, \end{cases}$$

the asymptotic variance for the WL estimator $\hat{\theta}$ with *estimated* sampling probabilities $\hat{\alpha}_j = n_j/N_j$ is identical to the finite population sampling variance (21) with $p_j = \alpha_{j,0} = \lim n_j/N_j$.

Two possibilities present themselves for estimation of the terms in (26). Let $\hat{\pi}_i = \pi_{\hat{\alpha}}(V_i)$ for $V_i \in \mathcal{V}_0^c$ else $\hat{\pi}_i = 1$. Then, using (19), we could estimate the first term by

$$\widehat{\text{Var} \left(\frac{\xi}{\pi_0} \tilde{\ell}_0 \right)} = \tilde{I}_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}}^{-1} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\xi_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i)}{\hat{\pi}_i^2} \tilde{\ell}_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}}^{\otimes 2}(X_i),$$

the expression in the middle of the second term by

$$\tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\dot{\pi}_0^{\otimes 2}}{\pi_0(1 - \pi_0)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \frac{\dot{\pi}_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\otimes 2}(V_i)}{\hat{\pi}_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i)}$$

and similarly for $\tilde{P}_0(\tilde{\ell}_0 \dot{\pi}_0^T / \pi_0)$. A more empirical approach, however, would be to use the θ and α

influence function contributions themselves to estimate these terms as in

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\text{Var}}\left(\frac{\xi}{\pi_0}\tilde{\ell}_0\right) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \tilde{\ell}_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}}(X_i) \right)^{\otimes 2}, \\
\widehat{\tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\tilde{\ell}_0 \dot{\pi}_0^T}{\pi_0}} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \frac{\xi_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} \frac{\tilde{\ell}_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}}(X_i)}{\hat{\pi}_i} \dot{\pi}_{\hat{\alpha}}(V_i)^T \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \left(\frac{\xi_i \tilde{\ell}_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}}(X_i)}{\hat{\pi}_i} \right) \left(\frac{\dot{\pi}_{\hat{\alpha}}(V_i)^T (\xi_i - \hat{\pi}_i)}{\hat{\pi}_i (1 - \hat{\pi}_i)} \right) \quad \text{and} \\
\widehat{\tilde{P}_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c} \frac{\dot{\pi}_0^{\otimes 2}}{\pi_0 (1 - \pi_0)}} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \left(\frac{\dot{\pi}_{\hat{\alpha}}(V_i) (\xi_i - \hat{\pi}_i)}{\hat{\pi}_i (1 - \hat{\pi}_i)} \right)^{\otimes 2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The resulting asymptotic variance for $\hat{\theta}$ may be recognized as the comprising the residual sums of squares and of cross products from the least squares regressions of each the p components of the $\hat{\theta}$ influence function contributions $\xi_i \tilde{\ell}_{\hat{\theta}, \hat{\eta}}(X_i)/\hat{\pi}_i$, to which subjects not in the phase two sample contribute 0, on the q components of the estimated $\hat{\alpha}$ influence function contributions (23), to which subjects having $V_i \in \mathcal{V}_0$ contribute 0. See Henmi and Eguchi (2004) for a recent discussion and interpretation. This suggests the following estimation procedure:

1. Estimate α from the phase one data and compute the estimated sampling fractions $\hat{\pi}_i$.
2. Estimate θ and η from the phase two data by WL, using the inverse $\hat{\pi}_i$ as known weights.
3. Regress each component of the influence function contributions for $\hat{\theta}$ on those for $\hat{\alpha}$.
4. Estimate $\text{Var}_A(\hat{\theta})$ as the matrix comprising the residual sums of squares and of cross products from these regressions.

Therneau and Grambsch (2000, p. 166), who cited earlier work by Pugh et al. (1992), suggested this procedure for the special case of Cox regression, to which we now direct our attention.

7 Application to the Cox Proportional Hazards Model

Our development of the Cox model follows closely that of van der Vaart (1998, §25.12) where $X = (\Delta, T, Z)$ with $T = \min(\tilde{T}, C)$ a censored failure time, $\Delta = \mathbf{1}_{[\tilde{T} \leq C]}$ the failure indicator and

$Z \in \mathbb{R}^p$ a vector of covariates. The Euclidean parameter is the p -vector of regression coefficients β in the linear predictor $z\beta$. The nonparametric parameter $\eta = (\Lambda, G, G_Z)$ has three infinite dimensional components: $\Lambda(\cdot) = \int_0^\cdot \lambda(s)ds$ the baseline cumulative hazard function, assumed differentiable; $G(t|z) = \Pr(C \leq t|Z = z)$ the conditional distribution of the censoring time; and G_Z , the marginal distribution of the covariates. We introduce the usual notation for the “at risk” process $Y(t) = \mathbf{1}_{[T \geq t]}$ and the event counting process $N(t) = \Delta \mathbf{1}_{[T \leq t]}$ and we make the standard assumptions: (i) that the true failure time \tilde{T} and C are independent given Z ; and (ii) that there is a finite maximum censoring time τ such that $\Pr[Y(\tau) = 1] > 0$. van der Vaart (1998) makes some further “partly unnecessary” assumptions to simplify his development, namely that the covariates Z are bounded, that G and G_Z have densities as indicated and especially that $\Pr(C \geq \tau) = \Pr(C = \tau) > 0$ (see discussion in §8). Writing the density for $x = (\delta, t, z)$, with z a row vector, as

$$e^{-e^{z\beta}\Lambda(t)} \left[e^{z\beta} \lambda(t) (1 - G(t - |z)) \right]^\delta [g(t|z)]^{1-\delta} g_Z(z), \quad (27)$$

and noting that G and G_Z factor out of the complete data likelihood, van der Vaart (1998) considers ML estimation for (β, Λ) only. With \mathcal{H} denoting various subsets of the space $BV[0, \tau]$ of bounded functions of bounded variation, he develops the following explicit expressions for the β score vector, the Λ score operator that maps functions $h \in \mathcal{H}$ to functions of the data, its adjoint (but only evaluated for the β scores) and the information operator that maps \mathcal{H} onto itself:

$$\dot{\ell}_{\beta, \Lambda}(x) = \delta z - z e^{z\beta} \Lambda(t) \quad (28)$$

$$B_{\beta, \Lambda} h(x) = \delta h(t) - e^{z\beta} \int_0^t h d\Lambda \quad (29)$$

$$B_{\beta, \Lambda}^* \dot{\ell}_{\beta, \Lambda}(t) = P_{\beta, \Lambda} Y(t) Z e^{Z\beta}$$

$$B_{\beta, \Lambda}^* B_{\beta, \Lambda} h(t) = h(t) P_{\beta, \Lambda} Y(t) e^{Z\beta}.$$

These are used to calculate the efficient scores

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\beta, \Lambda}^*(x) &= \dot{\ell}_{\beta, \Lambda} - B_{\beta, \Lambda} (B_{\beta, \Lambda}^* B_{\beta, \Lambda})^{-1} B_{\beta, \Lambda}^* \dot{\ell}_{\beta, \Lambda} \\ &= \delta [z - m(t; \beta)] - e^{z\beta} \int_0^t [z - m(s; \beta)] d\Lambda(s) \end{aligned}$$

and efficient information

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{I}_0 &= I_0 - P_0 B_0 (B_0^* B_0)^{-1} B_0^* \dot{\ell}_0 \\ &= P_0 \left(e^{Z\beta_0} \int_0^\tau [Z - m(t; \beta_0)]^{\otimes 2} \Pr(T \geq t|Z) d\Lambda_0(t) \right),\end{aligned}$$

respectively, where $I_0 = P_0 \dot{\ell}_0 \dot{\ell}_0^T$ and $m(t; \beta) = S^{(1)}(t; \beta) / S^{(0)}(t; \beta)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}S^{(0)}(t; \beta) &= P_0 e^{Z\beta} Y(t) \\ S^{(1)}(t; \beta) &= P_0 Z e^{Z\beta} Y(t).\end{aligned}$$

To fit the Cox model by WL to two phase stratified samples, first define IPW estimators of the two quantities just considered by $\hat{S}^{(0)}(t; \beta) = \mathbb{P}_N^\pi e^{Z\beta} Y(t)$ and $S^{(1)}(t; \beta) = \mathbb{P}_N^\pi Z e^{Z\beta} Y(t)$. By definition the WL estimators solve

$$\Psi_{N1}^\pi(\beta, \Lambda) = \mathbb{P}_N^\pi \dot{\ell}_{\beta, \Lambda} = 0 \quad (30)$$

$$\Psi_{N2}^\pi(\beta, \Lambda)h = \mathbb{P}_N^\pi B_{\beta, \Lambda} h = 0 \quad \text{for all } h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (31)$$

where we have used the fact that $P_{\beta, \Lambda} B_{\beta, \Lambda} h = 0$. Substituting

$$h_t(s) = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[s \leq t]}}{\hat{S}^{(0)}(s, \beta)}$$

for h in (31) and solving using (29) shows that, for fixed β , the cumulative hazard function that partially maximizes the weighted likelihood and, as is easily checked, satisfies $\mathbb{P}_N^\pi B_{\beta, \hat{\Lambda}_\beta} h = 0$ for all h , is

$$\hat{\Lambda}_\beta(t) = \mathbb{P}_N^\pi \frac{\Delta \mathbf{1}[T \leq t]}{\hat{S}^{(0)}(T; \beta)} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_i} \frac{dN_i(s)}{\hat{S}^{(0)}(s; \beta)}. \quad (32)$$

This may be recognized as an IPW version of the so called Breslow (1974) estimator. Inserting this expression into (30) and evaluating using (28) yields

$$\Psi_{N1}^\pi(\beta, \hat{\Lambda}_\beta) = \mathbb{P}_N^\pi \Delta [Z - \hat{m}(T; \beta)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_i} \Delta_i \left[Z_i - \frac{\hat{S}^{(1)}(T_i; \beta)}{\hat{S}^{(0)}(T_i; \beta)} \right] = 0,$$

which is the IPW Cox “partial score” equation. Its solution, together with (32), are the estimators proposed for Cox regression by Binder (1992), Pugh et al. (1992), Borgan et al. (2000, Estimator

II), Lin (2000) and others for a variety of complex sampling and missing data problems. Using the results of this paper, the large sample properties of $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\Lambda}_{\hat{\beta}})$ follow from those already developed for the ML estimators with complete data, which are given by the same equations with $\xi_i = \pi_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, N$.

8 Discussion

The two phase stratified sampling designs considered here are quite flexible in that the phase one strata may be formed using all available information and sampled with arbitrary positive probabilities. This is in the spirit of Binder (1992) and Lin (2000), who considered even more general complex sample survey designs. Others (Borgan et al., 2000; Kulich and Lin, 2004) have restricted their attention to covariate stratified versions of the case-cohort design, whereby all subjects who fail are sampled at phase two for complete covariate ascertainment. Although this may well be an efficient design when the failure rate is low, the assumption that $\xi = 1$ whenever $\Delta = 1$ is often unnecessary and may sometimes be unduly restrictive. Not only does it limit application when the phase one population has large numbers of both failures and non-failures, it also does so when the sampling has been carried out for one failure type but it is of interest to evaluate another. When following patients enrolled in a clinical trial, for example, all deaths may be sampled as “cases” but it may later be decided to analyze the data also in terms of “event-free survival”. In other contexts, biological samples may turn out to be non-informative so that data are still missing for substantial numbers of subjects, including failed cases, who are sampled at phase two. Provided one is willing to make the standard MAR assumptions, WL methods as described herein may still be used by determining the stratum frequencies for subjects having complete data at phase two and using them to estimate the sampling weights.

The major drawback of WL estimation is its lack of statistical efficiency. Efforts to address this deficiency with Cox regression have been made by several authors including Robins et al. (1994), Kulich and Lin (2004), Nan et al. (2004), Nan (2004) and Scheike and Martinussen (2004). Most of these methods are relatively recent and involve sufficiently complex calculations, or sufficiently restrictive assumptions, that none have yet seen widespread use. These limitations are certain to decline with advances in computing hardware and software, making more efficient estimation

methods more widely available. In the meantime, the WL estimation procedure outlined at the end of §6 offers a relatively simple and robust alternative. It is likely to remain the method of choice for many survey statisticians for the reasons mentioned in the introduction, namely, their interest in finite population parameters defined as solutions to ML estimating equations. As emphasized by Robins et al. (1994), in view of the interpretation of (26) as a residual sum of squares, inclusion of additional variables in the model (22) for π can only enhance the efficiency of θ estimation. When the sampling probabilities vary, as in finite population stratified sampling, inclusion of the stratum factors in the model is essential to avoid bias. Finer stratification, or the inclusion of auxiliary variables in the model for π , serves the cause of efficiency. Equation (21) suggests that such additional variables would be most valuable if they could somehow be chosen to be highly correlated with the efficient scores. The doubly weighted estimator developed by Kulich and Lin (2004) for exposure stratified case-cohort studies is intriguing in that it uses a separate set of (time-dependent) weights for each covariate. A preliminary analysis is conducted to estimate quantities that resemble within stratum conditional expectations of partial score contributions given the phase one data, and these are used to form the weights. An extension of their approach to more general two phase stratified sampling designs would be of considerable interest.

This paper is limited in application to semiparametric models that satisfy the rather stringent assumptions **A1-A4** of §2. Even in the case of Cox regression, these have been established only under the “partly unnecessary” conditions imposed by van der Vaart (1998, §25.12.1). His assumption that everyone still “on-study” is censored at the common time τ would apply to situations in which time t referred to calendar time, everyone was entered on study at $t = 0$ and there was a common closing date at $t = \tau$. It would not apply, however, if subjects were entered on study at various calendar times but withdrawn on a common closing date, and t was taken to be “time-on-study”. Nor would it apply if t was “age” and subjects both entered and exited the study at various ages. We look forward to further work that relaxes these assumptions, in particular to a determination as to whether or not the general approach extends to Cox regression with time-dependent covariates and repeated failure events under standard assumptions (Andersen and Gill, 1982).

In his Appendix Lin (2000) remarks

“To our knowledge, there does not exist a general theory on the conditions required for the tightness and weak convergence of Horvitz-Thompson processes. However, the results of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, §§2.9, 3.6, 3.7) can be applied to possibly stratified simple random sampling and can potentially be extended to other survey designs.”

One purpose of this paper has been to carry out in detail the program mentioned for stratified random sampling. We conjecture that our fundamental equation (18) applies to Horvitz-Thompson estimators for other complex sampling designs, and work is in progress to explore these extensions.

Acknowledgements

The second author owes thanks to Galen Shorack for a helpful discussion concerning the representation in Appendix A. Supported in part by grants 5-R01-CA40644 and 2-R01-AI291968 from the U.S. National Institutes of Health and by grant DMS-0503822 from the U.S. National Science Foundation.

References

- ANDERSEN, P. K. and GILL, R. D. (1982). Cox’s regression model for counting processes: A large sample study. *Annals of Statistics* **10** 1100–1120.
- BEGUN, J. M., HALL, W. J., HUANG, W.-M. and WELLNER, J. A. (1983). Information and asymptotic efficiency in parametric- nonparametric models. *Annals of Statistics* **11** 432–452.
- BINDER, D. A. (1992). Fitting Cox proportional hazards models from survey data. *Biometrika* **79** 139–147.
- BORGAN, O., LANGHOLZ, B., SAMUELSEN, S. O., GOLDSTEIN, L. and POGODA, J. (2000). Exposure stratified case-cohort designs. *Lifetime Data Analysis* **6** 39–58.
- BRESLOW, N. (1974). Covariance analysis of censored survival data. *Biometrics* **30** 89–99.

- BRESLOW, N., MCNENEY, B. and WELLNER, J. A. (2003). Large sample theory for semiparametric regression models with two-phase, outcome dependent sampling. *Annals of Statistics* **31** 1110–1139.
- COX, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (Series B)* **34** 187–220.
- HENMI, M. and EGUCHI, S. (2004). A paradox concerning nuisance parameters and projected estimating functions. *Biometrika* **91** 929–941.
- HORVITZ, D. G. and THOMPSON, D. J. (1952). A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **47** 663–685.
- KALBFLEISCH, J. D. and LAWLESS, J. F. (1988). Likelihood analysis of multi-state models for disease incidence and mortality. *Statistics in Medicine* **7** 149–160.
- KULICH, M. and LIN, D. Y. (2004). Improving the efficiency of relative-risk estimation in case-cohort studies. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **99** 832–844.
- LIN, D. Y. (2000). On fitting Cox’s proportional hazards models to survey data. *Biometrika* **87** 37–47.
- MANSKI, C. F. and LERMAN, S. R. (1977). The estimation of choice probabilities from choice based samples. *Econometrica* **45** 1977–1988.
- NAN, B. (2004). Efficient estimation for case-cohort studies. *Canadian Journal of Statistics-Revue Canadienne de Statistique* **32** 403–419.
- NAN, B., EMOND, M. and WELLNER, J. A. (2004). Information bounds for Cox regression models with missing data. *Annals of Statistics* **32** 723–753.
- NEYMAN, J. (1938). Contribution to the theory of sampling human populations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **33** 101–116.
- PIERCE, D. A. (1982). The asymptotic effect of substituting estimators for parameters in certain types of statistics. *Annals of Statistics* **10** 475–478.

- PRÆSTGAARD, J. and WELLNER, J. A. (1993). Exchangeably weighted bootstraps of the general empirical process. *Annals of Probability* **21** 2053–2086.
- PUGH, M., ROBINS, J., LIPSITZ, S. and HARRINGTON, D. (1992). Inference in the Cox proportional hazards model with missing covariates. Tech. Rep. 758Z, Department of Biostatistics, Harvard School of Public Health.
- ROBINS, J. M., ROTNITZKY, A. and ZHAO, L. P. (1994). Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **89** 846–866.
- SCHEIKE, T. H. and MARTINUSSEN, T. (2004). Maximum likelihood estimation for cox’s regression model under case-cohort sampling. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **31** 283–293.
- SELF, S. G. and PRENTICE, R. L. (1988). Asymptotic distribution theory and efficiency results for case-cohort studies. *Annals of Statistics* **16** 64–81.
- SKINNER, C. J., HOLT, D. and SMITH, T. M. F. (eds.) (1989). *Analysis of Complex Surveys*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- THERNEAU, T. M. and GRAMBSCH, P. M. (2000). *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and WELLNER, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes with Applications in Statistics*. Springer, New York.
- XIE, Y. and MANSKI, C. F. (1989). The logit model and response-based samples. *Sociological Methods and Research* **17** 283–302.

9 Appendices

In Appendices A and B we establish two results slightly more general than needed for the development in Section 4. (See the end of Appendix B for the special case required.) The notation

in these two appendices should be understood to be independent of the that in the body of the paper.

Appendix A. A Representation of Stratified Sampling.

Suppose that (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) is a probability space and $W : (\Omega, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$. Write P^W for the measure induced by W on $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$; in the notation of section 2, $P^W = \tilde{P}_0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \mathcal{W}_J$ is a (measurable) partition of \mathcal{W} :

- (a) $\mathcal{W}_j \in \mathcal{B}$, $j = 1, \dots, J$;
- (b) $\mathcal{W}_j \cap \mathcal{W}_{j'} = \emptyset$ for $j \neq j'$; and
- (c) $\cup_{j=1}^J \mathcal{W}_j = \mathcal{W}$.

We will assume that $P(W \in \mathcal{W}_j) \equiv p_j > 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$.

Now consider a new probability space $(\Omega^\dagger, \mathcal{A}^\dagger, P^\dagger)$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^\dagger &= \Omega_0^\dagger \times \Omega_1^\dagger \times \dots \times \Omega_J^\dagger, \\ \mathcal{A}^\dagger &= \mathcal{A}_0^\dagger \times \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_J^\dagger, \\ P^\dagger &= P_0^\dagger \cdot P_1^\dagger \dots P_J^\dagger,\end{aligned}$$

and random variables $\Delta = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_J)$, $W_1^\dagger, \dots, W_J^\dagger$ defined thereon as follows: for $\omega^\dagger = (\omega_0^\dagger, \omega_1^\dagger, \dots, \omega_J^\dagger) \in \Omega^\dagger$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\omega^\dagger) &= \Delta(\omega_0^\dagger) \sim \text{Multinomial}_J(1, (p_1, \dots, p_J)) \\ W_j^\dagger(\omega^\dagger) &= W_j^\dagger(\omega_j^\dagger) \sim P_j^\dagger\end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, J$ where $p_j = P(W \in \mathcal{W}_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, and P_j^\dagger is defined by

$$P_j^\dagger(W_j \in B) = \frac{P(W \in B \cap \mathcal{W}_j)}{P(W \in \mathcal{W}_j)} = \frac{P^W(B \cap \mathcal{W}_j)}{P^W(\mathcal{W}_j)}, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (33)$$

Now define a random variable $W^\dagger : (\Omega^\dagger, \mathcal{A}^\dagger) \rightarrow (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$ by

$$W^\dagger(\omega^\dagger) = \Delta_1(\omega_0^\dagger)W_1^\dagger(\omega_1^\dagger) + \dots + \Delta_J(\omega_0^\dagger)W_J^\dagger(\omega_J^\dagger).$$

Note that Δ , $W_1^\dagger, \dots, W_J^\dagger$ are independent by construction.

Proposition A.1 $W^\dagger \stackrel{d}{=} W$ on $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$. That is, $P^{W^\dagger} = P^W$ as measures on $(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B})$.

Proof. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} P^\dagger(W^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_j) &= P^\dagger(W_j^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_j, \Delta_j = 1) \\ &= P^\dagger(W_j^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_j)P^\dagger(\Delta_j = 1) = 1 \cdot p_j = p_j \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

using independence of Δ and W_j^\dagger , the fact that W_j^\dagger takes values in \mathcal{W}_j with P^\dagger -probability 1, and $P^\dagger(\Delta_j = 1) = p_j$ by the definition of P^\dagger .

Now let $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Then since $p_j > 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^\dagger(W^\dagger \in B) &= \sum_{j=1}^J P^\dagger(W^\dagger \in B \cap \mathcal{W}_j) = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{P^\dagger(W^\dagger \in B \cap \mathcal{W}_j)}{P^\dagger(W^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_j)} P^\dagger(W^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{P^\dagger(W_j^\dagger \in B)}{P^\dagger(W_j^\dagger \in \mathcal{W}_j)} p_j \quad \text{by (34)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{P^W(B \cap \mathcal{W}_j)/P^W(\mathcal{W}_j)}{1} \cdot p_j \quad \text{by (33)} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J P^W(B \cap \mathcal{W}_j) = P^W(B) = P(W \in B). \end{aligned}$$

□

If W_1, \dots, W_N are i.i.d. P^W , then we can represent the W_i 's in terms of $(\Delta_i, W_{1,i}^\dagger, \dots, W_{J,i}^\dagger)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, i.i.d. as $(\Delta, W_1^\dagger, \dots, W_J^\dagger)$ as described in proposition A.1. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} &= \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{W_i} 1_{\mathcal{W}_j}(W_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{j'=1}^J \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{j',i} \delta_{W_{j',i}^\dagger} 1_{\mathcal{W}_j}(W_{j,i}^\dagger) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \delta_{W_{j,i}} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

by relabelling the $W_{j,i}^\dagger$'s and where $N_j = \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{j,i}$ on the right side is independent of the $W_{j,i}^\dagger$'s. This yields the promised doubly indexed form of the stratum - specific empirical measure in terms of independent $W_{j,i}$'s distributed according to $P_{0|j}$ where, for $B \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$P_{0|j}(B) = \frac{P_0(B 1_{\mathcal{W}_j})}{P_0(1_{\mathcal{W}_j})}.$$

Appendix B. Proof of weak convergence of the stratum-specific empirical process

Let \mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} be as defined in (35)

$$\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{W_i} 1_{\mathcal{W}_j}(W_i)$$

where

$$N^{-1}N_j = \mathbb{P}_N(1_{\mathcal{W}_j}) \rightarrow_{a.s.} P_0(\mathcal{W}_j) \equiv \nu_j > 0.$$

Proposition B.1. If \mathcal{F} is P_0 -Donsker and $\nu_j > 0$, then \mathcal{F} is $P_{0|j}$ -Donsker on stratum \mathcal{W}_j in the sense that

$$\mathbb{G}_{j,N_j} \equiv \sqrt{N_j}(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} - P_{0|j}) \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_j \quad \text{in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}) \quad (36)$$

where \mathbb{G}_j , defined by

$$\mathbb{G}_j(f) = \nu_j^{-1/2} \mathbb{G}_{P_0}((f - P_{0|j}(f))1_{\mathcal{W}_j}), \quad f \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}), \quad (37)$$

is a $P_{0|j}$ -Brownian bridge process.

Remark 1. Note that

$$\text{Var}(\mathbb{G}_j(f)) = \nu_j^{-1} P_0[(f - P_{0|j}(f))^2 1_{\mathcal{W}_j}] = \text{Var}_j(f) \equiv \text{Var}(f(W)|W \in \mathcal{W}_j).$$

Remark 2. The proposition implies that the process $\sqrt{N_j}(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} - P_{0|j})$ behaves asymptotically the same as that of a sample of fixed size drawn from the conditional distribution $P_{0|j}$.

Proof of the proposition. First proof. By the discussion at the beginning of section 2.10.4, page 200, van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), $\mathcal{F}_j \equiv \{f 1_{\mathcal{W}_j} : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is P_0 -Donsker, and hence the

collection $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j \equiv \{f1_{\mathcal{W}_j} : f \in \mathcal{F} \cup \{1\}\}$ is also P_0 -Donsker. Now we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{N_j}(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j}f - P_{0|j}f) &= \sqrt{N_j} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(W_i)1_{\mathcal{W}_j}(W_i)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N 1_{\mathcal{W}_j}(W_i)} - \frac{P_0(f1_{\mathcal{W}_j})}{P_0(1_{\mathcal{W}_j})} \right) \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{N_j}{N}} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{G}_N(f1_{\mathcal{W}_j})}{N_j/N} - \frac{\mathbb{G}_N(1_{\mathcal{W}_j})P_0(f1_{\mathcal{W}_j})}{(N_j/N)P_0(\mathcal{W}_j)} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_j/N}} \{ \mathbb{G}_N(f1_{\mathcal{W}_j}) - \mathbb{G}_N(1_{\mathcal{W}_j})P_{0|j}(f) \} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_j/N}} \mathbb{G}_N((f - P_{0|j}(f))1_{\mathcal{W}_j}) \\
&\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_j}} \mathbb{G}_{P_0}((f - P_{0|j}(f))1_{\mathcal{W}_j}) \equiv \mathbb{G}_{P_{0|j}}(f),
\end{aligned}$$

and, in fact,

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu_j}} \mathbb{G}_{P_0}((f - P_{0|j}(f))1_{\mathcal{W}_j}) : f \in \mathcal{F} \right\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{ \mathbb{G}_{P_{0|j}}(f) : f \in \mathcal{F} \}.$$

Second proof. By the second representation of the stratum-specific empirical measure \mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} as $\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} = N_j^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \delta_{W_{j,i}}$ where the $W_{j,i}$'s are i.i.d. $P_{0|j}$, it follows that the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_{j,N_j} = \sqrt{N_j}(\mathbb{P}_{j,N_j} - P_{0|j})$ is just the empirical process of i.i.d. $W_{j,i}$'s, but with a random sample size N_j independent of the $W_{j,i}$'s. Since $N_j/N \rightarrow \nu_j > 0$, it follows from theorem 3.5.1, page 339, van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), that $\mathbb{G}_{j,N_j} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_j$ in $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F})$ where \mathbb{G}_j is a $P_{0|j}$ -Brownian bridge process as before. \square

In the application of the results of Appendices A and B in section 4 we take $\mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \mathcal{W}_J$ to be the measurable partition of \mathcal{W} induced by the partition $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_J$ of \mathcal{V} (i.e. $\mathcal{W}_j = V^{-1}(\mathcal{V}_j)$) for $j = 1, \dots, J$ where $V(W) \equiv (\tilde{X}(X), U)$. Moreover, the Donsker class \mathcal{F} in Proposition B.1 is taken to be a Donsker class of functions of X only rather than functions of $W = (X, U)$. This is exactly what is needed for the development in section 4.

Appendix C. Proof of equation (25). Besides the consistency and asymptotic linearity (23) for $\hat{\alpha}$ assumed in §6, we further assume that $0 < \sigma \leq \pi_\alpha(v)$ as in (3) and that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\pi_\alpha(v)} - \frac{1}{\pi_{\alpha_0}(v)} - \frac{-\dot{\pi}_0^T(v)}{\pi_0^2(v)}(\alpha - \alpha_0) \right| \leq \psi(v)|\alpha - \alpha_0|^{1+\zeta} \quad (38)$$

for α in a neighborhood of α_0 where $\zeta > 0$ and ψ satisfies $E\psi^2(V) < \infty$. The second assumption will typically follow from the first provided that π_α has a continuous second derivative. For

example, suppose that π_α is given by a logistic regression model with linear predictor $\tilde{v}^T \alpha$ where $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(v) \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Then Taylor's formula with remainder shows that the LHS of (38) equals $\left| \frac{1}{2} e^{-\tilde{v}^T \alpha^*} (\alpha - \alpha_0)^T \tilde{v} \tilde{v}^T (\alpha - \alpha_0) \right|$ with α^* on the line segment between α and α_0 . Thus the condition holds with $\zeta = 1$ provided $e^{\tilde{v}^T \alpha} = \pi_\alpha(v)/[1 - \pi_\alpha(v)]$ is bounded away from 0 and \tilde{V} has finite fourth moment. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{P}_N^{\hat{\pi}} - \mathbb{P}_N^{\pi_0}) \tilde{\ell}_0 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\hat{\pi}_i} - \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_0} \right) \tilde{\ell}_0(X_i) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \xi_i \tilde{\ell}_0(X_i) \left[\frac{1}{\pi_{\hat{\alpha}}(V_i)} - \frac{1}{\pi_{\alpha_0}(V_i)} - \frac{-\dot{\pi}_0^T(V_i)}{\pi_0^2(V_i)} (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \xi_i \tilde{\ell}_0(X_i) \left[\frac{-\dot{\pi}_0^T(V_i)}{\pi_0^2(V_i)} \right] (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \\
&\equiv R_N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \frac{\xi_i}{\pi_0(V_i)} \tilde{\ell}_0(X_i) \left[\frac{\dot{\pi}_0^T(V_i)}{\pi_0(V_i)} \right] (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

where by (3), the similar assumption for π_α and (38),

$$\begin{aligned}
|R_N| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}_0^c}(V_i) \xi_i \tilde{\ell}_0(X_i) \left[\frac{1}{\pi_{\hat{\alpha}}(V_i)} - \frac{1}{\pi_{\alpha_0}(V_i)} - \frac{-\dot{\pi}_0^T(V_i)}{\pi_0^2(V_i)} (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi(V_i) |\tilde{\ell}_0(X_i)| \cdot |\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0|^{1+\zeta} \\
&= O_p(1) |\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0| |\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0|^\zeta \\
&= O_p(1) O_p(N^{-1/2}) o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying through (39) by \sqrt{N} , we conclude that (25) holds by virtue of $\sqrt{N} \tilde{R}_N = o_p(1)$ and the strong law of large numbers.