

Optimal Distributed Subsampling for Maximum Quasi-Likelihood Estimators with Massive Data

Jun Yu, HaiYing Wang, Mingyao Ai and Huiming Zhang *

Abstract

Nonuniform subsampling methods are effective to reduce computational burden and maintain estimation efficiency for massive data. Existing methods mostly focus on subsampling with replacement due to its high computational efficiency. If the data volume is so large that nonuniform subsampling probabilities cannot be calculated all at once, then subsampling with replacement is infeasible to implement. This paper solves this problem using Poisson subsampling. We first derive optimal Poisson subsampling probabilities in the context of quasi-likelihood estimation under the A- and L-optimality criteria. For a practically implementable algorithm with approximated optimal subsampling probabilities, we establish the consistency and asymptotic normality of the resultant estimators. To deal with the situation that the full data are stored in different blocks or at multiple locations, we develop a distributed subsampling framework, in which statistics are computed simultaneously on smaller partitions of the full data. Asymptotic properties of the resultant aggregated estimator are investigated. We illustrate and evaluate the proposed strategies through numerical experiments on simulated and real data sets.

Keywords: Big Data, Distributed Subsampling, Poisson Sampling, Quasi-Likelihood

*Jun Yu is an Assistant Professor, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, China (yujunbeta@bit.edu.cn); HaiYing Wang is an Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Mansfield, CT 06269, USA (haiying.wang@uconn.edu); Mingyao Ai is a Professor, LMAM, School of Mathematical Sciences and Center for Statistical Science, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China (myai@math.pku.edu.cn); and Huiming Zhang is a PhD student, School of Mathematical Sciences and Center for Statistical Science, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China (zhanghuiming@pku.edu.cn). Correspondence should be addressed to Mingyao Ai. Yu's work was partially supported by Beijing Institute of Technology research fund program for young scholars. Wang's work was partially supported by NSF grant 1812013. Ai's work was partially supported by NSFC grants 11671019 and LMEQF. The authors are grateful to the co-Editor, the Associate Editor, and three referees for their valuable comments and suggestions.

1 Introduction

Nowadays, the sizes of collected data are ever increasing, and the incredible sizes of big data bring new challenges for data analysis. Although many traditional statistical methods are still valid with big data, it is often computationally infeasible to perform statistical analysis due to relatively limited computing power. In this scenario, the bottleneck for big data analysis is the limited computing resources, and extracting useful information from massive data sets is a primary goal.

In general, there are two computational barriers for big data analysis: the first is that the data set is too large to be held in a computer's memory; and the second is that the computation takes too long to obtain the results. Faced with these two challenges, current research on statistical inference for big data sets can be categorized into two basic approaches. One approach utilizes parallel computing platforms by dividing the whole data set into subsets to compute; the results from subsets are then combined to obtain a final estimator, see Lin and Xi (2011); Duchi et al. (2012); Li et al. (2013); Kleiner et al. (2015); Schifano et al. (2016); Jordan et al. (2019) and the references therein. The other approach uses subsampling to reduce the computational burden by carrying out intended calculations on a subsample drawn from the full data, see Drineas et al. (2011); Dhillon et al. (2013); Ma et al. (2015); Quiroz et al. (2019), among others.

A key tactic of subsampling methods is to specify nonuniform sampling probabilities to include more informative data points with higher probabilities. Typical examples are the leverage score-based subsampling (see Drineas et al., 2011; Mahoney, 2012; Ma et al., 2015) and optimal subsampling method under the A-optimality criterion (Wang et al., 2018). Wang et al. (2019) proposed the information based optimal subdata selection for linear models which selects the subsample deterministically without random sampling.

It is worth mentioning that most of the current subsampling strategies focus on linear regression models and logistic regression models. However, many more complicated models are required in mining massive data because a linear regression model or a logistic regression model may not be sufficient to fit a complicated large data set. For example, the paper citation data set (<https://www.aminer.cn/citation>) contains text information for over four million research papers. Although we can extract numerical fea-

tures from these texts, a linear regression or a logistic regression is clearly not adequate to model the number of citations for these papers. As another example, the airline data set (<http://stat-computing.org/dataexpo/2009/the-data.html>) has more than one hundred million observations, and a primary goal is to model the airline delays, which are right skewed and always positive. A log or power transform may help to alleviate the skewness, but a Gamma regression may give better interpretability. More details about these two data sets will be provided in Section 5. In order to support more statistical models, this paper focuses on the quasi-likelihood estimator which only requires assumptions on the moments of the response variable and the form of the distribution is not specified.

Subsampling with replacement according to unequal probabilities requires accessing subsampling probabilities for the full data all at once. This takes a large memory to implement and may reduce the computational efficiency. To overcome this challenge, we propose an algorithm based on Poisson sampling (Särndal et al., 1992). Compared with subsampling with replacement, Poisson subsampling also has a high estimation efficiency with nonuniform subsampling probabilities. In order to utilize parallel computing facilities, a distributed version of the algorithm is also developed which enables us to select subsamples in parallel or in different locations simultaneously. To the best of our knowledge, theoretical and methodological discussions with statistical guarantees on optimal subsampling from massive data are limited for statistical models beyond linear regression models and logistic regression models. This paper not only develops optimal subsampling method for quasi-likelihood estimators but also solves storage constraints imposed by large scale data sets.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the model setup, present the general Poisson subsampling algorithm, and derive theoretical results for the resultant estimator. Section 3 presents optimal subsampling strategies based on the A- and L-optimality criteria for quasi-likelihood estimators. Some practical issues to approximate and implement the optimal subsampling procedures are also considered with theoretical justifications. Section 4 designs a distributed version of the Poisson subsampling algorithm and presents asymptotic properties of the resultant estimators. Section 5 provides numerical results on simulated and real data sets. All proofs are deferred in the supplementary material.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we first provide a brief overview of quasi-likelihood estimation and then present the general Poisson subsampling algorithm.

2.1 Models and Assumptions

We adopt the notations for quasi-likelihood estimator discussed in Chen et al. (1999). Let $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables with each covariate $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and response $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The conditional expectation of the response y_i given \mathbf{x}_i is

$$E(y_i|\mathbf{x}_i) = \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

for some true regression parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\psi(\cdot)$ is a twice continuously differentiable function such that $\dot{\psi}(t) := d\psi(t)/dt > 0$ for all t . The quasi-likelihood estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ is the solution to the following estimation equation:

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}) := \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\} \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}. \quad (2)$$

The inference procedure based on (2) is very general, and a typical example is the maximum likelihood estimation for generalized linear models (McCullagh and Nelder, 1989). More details can be found in Fahrmeir and Tutz (2001); Chen (2011) and the references therein.

2.2 General Poisson Subsampling Algorithm

Let p_i be the probability to sample the i -th data point for $i = 1, \dots, N$, and let S be a set of subsample observations and the corresponding sampling probabilities. A general Poisson subsampling algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: General Poisson subsampling algorithm

Initialization $S = \emptyset$;

for $i = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

Generate a Bernoulli variable $\delta_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i)$;

if $\delta_i = 1$ **then**

Update $S = S \cup \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, p_i)\}$;

Estimation: Solve the following weighted estimation equation to obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ based on the subsample S ,

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_S \frac{1}{p_i} \{y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\} \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3)$$

An advantage of Poisson subsampling is that the decision of inclusion for each data point (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) is made on the basis of p_i only. We do not need to use all p_i for $i = 1, \dots, N$ together. In Algorithm 1, p_i can be used one-by-one or block-by-block to generate δ_i while scanning through the full data. Therefore, there is no memory constraint problem for massive data.

The subsample size, say r^* , in Algorithm 1 is random such that $E(r^*) = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$. We use $r = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$ to denote the expected subsample size, and further assume $r < N$ throughout this paper, which is natural in the big data setting.

To establish our asymptotic results, we need the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. The regression parameter lies in the l_1 ball $\Lambda = \{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \leq B\}$, with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ being the inner points of Λ , where B is a constant.

Assumption 2. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad E(\|\mathbf{x}_1\|^9) < \infty, & \quad \text{(ii)} \quad E(|y_1|^6) < \infty, \\ \text{(iii)} \quad E\left\{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Lambda} \psi^6(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_1)\right\} < \infty, & \quad \text{(iv)} \quad E\left\{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Lambda} \dot{\psi}^6(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_1)\right\} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 3. Let $\Sigma_\psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\psi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$, and further assume that it satisfies $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Lambda} \lambda_{\min}\{\Sigma_\psi(\boldsymbol{\beta})\} > 0$ with probability approaching one, where $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ means the smallest eigenvalue of matrix A .

Assumption 4. Assume that both $\psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)$ and $\dot{\psi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$ are $m(\mathbf{x}_i)$ -Lipschitz continuous. To be precise, for all $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \in \Lambda$, there exist $m_1(\mathbf{x}_i)$ and $m_2(\mathbf{x}_i)$ such that $\|\psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_1^T \mathbf{x}_i) -$

$\psi(\beta_2^T \mathbf{x}_i)\| \leq m_1(\mathbf{x}_i)\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|$ and $\|\dot{\psi}(\beta_1^T \mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_i^T - \dot{\psi}(\beta_2^T \mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_i^T\|_s \leq m_2(\mathbf{x}_i)\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|$, where $\|A\|_s$ denotes the spectral norm of matrix A . Further assume that both $E\{m_1^3(\mathbf{x}_i)\}$ and $E\{m_2(\mathbf{x}_i)\}$ are finite.

Assumption 5. Assume that $\max_{i=1,\dots,N} (Np_i)^{-1} = O_P(r^{-1})$.

Assumption 1 is required to guarantee consistency and it is commonly used in the literature such as Newey and McFadden (1994). Assumption 2 imposes some moment assumptions, and similar conditions are also assumed in Chen et al. (1999). Conditions (iii) and (iv) in Assumption 2 are satisfied by many examples of generalized linear models such as linear regressions, logistic regressions, and binomial regressions when the covariate distributions are sub-Gaussian. Assumption 3 is mainly to ensure that the quasi-likelihood estimator is unique, since this condition indicates that the quasi log-likelihood function is convex (cf. Tzavelas, 1998; Rao et al., 2007; Chen, 2011). Assumption 4 adds restrictions on smoothness. Similar assumptions are common in statistics (see van der Vaart, 1998, Chapter 5 as an example). Assumption 5 restricts the weights in the estimation equation (3). It is mainly to protect the estimation equation from being dominated by data points with extremely small subsampling probabilities. This assumption is quite common in classic sampling techniques (see Berger and Torres, 2016; Breidt and Opsomer, 2000, as examples). In this paper, we allow the subsampling probability p_i to dependent on the observed data, so we use the O_P notation in Assumption 5.

To facilitate the presentation, denote the full data by $\mathcal{F}_N = \{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^N$. The following theorems establish consistency to the full data QLE and asymptotically normality of $\tilde{\beta}$ from Algorithm 1.

Theorem 1. *If Assumptions 1 – 5 hold, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow \infty$, $\tilde{\beta}$ is consistent to $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$ in conditional probability, given \mathcal{F}_N in probability. Moreover, the rate of convergence is $r^{-1/2}$. That is, with probability approaching one, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finite Δ_ϵ and r_ϵ such that*

$$P(\|\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}\| \geq r^{-1/2}\Delta_\epsilon | \mathcal{F}_N) < \epsilon \quad (4)$$

for all $r > r_\epsilon$.

Theorem 2. *If Assumptions 1 – 5 hold, then as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow \infty$, conditional on \mathcal{F}_N in probability,*

$$V^{-1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \longrightarrow N(0, I) \quad (5)$$

in distribution, where

$$V = \Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V_c \Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \quad (6)$$

and

$$V_c = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T}{p_i} - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T. \quad (7)$$

Remark 1. When $r/N \rightarrow 0$, the second term on the right-hand-side of (7) can be ignored. In this case, the result is the same as that for sampling with replacement in logistic regression (see Wang et al., 2018). However, when $r/N \rightarrow c \in (0, 1]$, Poisson subsampling will lead to a smaller variance.

3 Optimal Poisson Subsampling

In this section, we derive optimal subsampling probabilities to better approximate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$.

3.1 Optimal Subsampling Strategies

The result in Theorem 2 can be used to find optimal subsampling probabilities that minimize the asymptotic mean squared error (MSE) of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in approximating $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$. This is equivalent to minimizing $\text{tr}(V)$, which corresponds to the A-optimality in the language of optimal design (see Pukelsheim, 2006).

Theorem 3. *For ease of presentation, define*

$$\tilde{h}_i^{\text{MV}} = |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (8)$$

and let $\tilde{h}_{(1)}^{\text{MV}} \leq \tilde{h}_{(2)}^{\text{MV}} \leq \dots \leq \tilde{h}_{(N)}^{\text{MV}}$ denote the order statistics of $\{\tilde{h}_i^{\text{MV}}\}_{i=1}^N$. For convenience, denote $\tilde{h}_{(N+1)}^{\text{MV}} = +\infty$, and assume that $\tilde{h}_{(N-r)}^{\text{MV}} > 0$. The asymptotic MSE of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\text{tr}(V)$, attains its minimum, if p_i 's in Algorithm 1 are chosen to be

$$p_i^{\text{MV}} = r \frac{\tilde{h}_i^{\text{MV}} \wedge M}{\sum_{j=1}^N (\tilde{h}_j^{\text{MV}} \wedge M)}, \quad (9)$$

where $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$,

$$M = \frac{1}{r-k} \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_{(i)}^{\text{MV}}, \quad (10)$$

and

$$k = \min \left\{ s \mid 0 \leq s \leq r, \quad (r-s)\hbar_{(N-s)}^{\text{MV}} < \sum_{i=1}^{N-s} \hbar_{(i)}^{\text{MV}} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

that is, k satisfies

$$(r-k+1)\hbar_{(N-k+1)}^{\text{MV}} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N-k+1} \hbar_{(i)}^{\text{MV}} \quad \text{and} \quad (r-k)\hbar_{(N-k)}^{\text{MV}} < \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_{(i)}^{\text{MV}}. \quad (12)$$

Remark 2. In (9), if $r\hbar_{(N)}^{\text{MV}}/(\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j^{\text{MV}}) < 1$, then $\hbar_{(N)}^{\text{MV}} < M = r^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j^{\text{MV}}$ and the optimal subsampling probabilities reduce to $p_i^{\text{MV}} = r\hbar_i^{\text{MV}}/(\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j^{\text{MV}})$. In this case, all p_i^{MV} 's are smaller than one and the inclusion of any data point in the subsample is random. If $r\hbar_i^{\text{MV}}/(\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j^{\text{MV}}) \geq 1$ for some i , then some p_i^{MV} 's will be equal to one. For this scenario, k is the number of p_i^{MV} 's that are one and M is the threshold that satisfies

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{r(\hbar_i^{\text{MV}} \wedge M)}{\sum_{j=1}^N (\hbar_j^{\text{MV}} \wedge M)} = 1. \quad (13)$$

From (10) and (12), we see that

$$\hbar_{(N-k)}^{\text{MV}} < M \leq \hbar_{(N-k+1)}^{\text{MV}}. \quad (14)$$

Remark 3. In order to determine the value of k , we need to find and sort at most r largest values of \hbar_i^{MV} 's. Thus, the required time to find the value of k is $O(N+r \log r)$ using partition based partial selection algorithm. The simulation results reveal that when $r/N \rightarrow c > 0$, it also works well if we select M as some quantile of $\{\hbar_i\}_{i=1}^N$.

As observed in (8), the optimal subsampling probability $\mathbf{p}^{\text{MV}} = \{p_i^{\text{MV}}\}_{i=1}^N$ depends on data through both the covariates and the responses directly. For the covariates, the terms $\|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|$ describe the structure information of the covariates and they are similar to statistical leverage scores. The direct effect of the responses on the optimal subsampling probabilities is through $|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|$. Intuitively, including data points with larger values of $|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|$ will improve the robustness of the subsample estimator.

The optimal subsampling strategy derived in the previous section requires the calculation of $\|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, which takes $O(Nd^2)$ time even if $\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})$ is

available. To further reduce the computation time, Wang et al. (2018) proposed to minimize $\text{tr}(V_c)$. This criterion essentially is the linear optimality (L-optimality) criterion in optimal experimental design (see Pukelsheim, 2006), which is to improve the quality of the estimator for some linear combinations of unknown parameters.

The following theorem gives the optimal subsampling probabilities that minimize $\text{tr}(V_c)$.

Theorem 4. *Let*

$$\tilde{h}_i^{\text{MVc}} = |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\|, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (15)$$

and let $\tilde{h}_{(1)}^{\text{MVc}} \leq \tilde{h}_{(2)}^{\text{MVc}} \leq \dots \leq \tilde{h}_{(N)}^{\text{MVc}}$ denote the order statistics of $\{\tilde{h}_i^{\text{MVc}}\}_{i=1}^N$. For convenience, denote $\tilde{h}_{(N+1)}^{\text{MVc}} = +\infty$ and assume that $\tilde{h}_{(N-r)}^{\text{MVc}} > 0$. The trace of V_c defined in (7) attains its minimum if p_i 's in Algorithm 1 are selected as

$$p_i^{\text{MVc}} = r \frac{\tilde{h}_i^{\text{MVc}} \wedge M}{\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{h}_j^{\text{MVc}} \wedge M}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$M = (r - k)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \tilde{h}_{(i)}^{\text{MVc}}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$k = \min \left\{ s \mid 0 \leq s \leq r, \quad (r - s) \tilde{h}_{(N-s)}^{\text{MVc}} < \sum_{i=1}^{N-s} \tilde{h}_{(i)}^{\text{MVc}} \right\}, \quad (18)$$

that is, k satisfies

$$(r - k + 1) \tilde{h}_{(N-k+1)}^{\text{MVc}} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{N-k+1} \tilde{h}_{(i)}^{\text{MVc}} \quad \text{and} \quad (r - k) \tilde{h}_{(N-k)}^{\text{MVc}} < \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \tilde{h}_{(i)}^{\text{MVc}}.$$

The structural results for $\mathbf{p}^{\text{MVc}} = \{p_i^{\text{MVc}}\}_{i=1}^N$ and \mathbf{p}^{MV} are similar. The difference is in the covariate effect: \mathbf{p}^{MV} uses $\|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|$ while \mathbf{p}^{MVc} uses $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|$. The computational benefits is obvious, only $O(Nd)$ time is required to compute \mathbf{p}^{MVc} while $O(Nd^2)$ is needed for \mathbf{p}^{MV} .

3.2 Practical Implementation

For ease of presentation, we use a unified notation p_i^{os} to denote the optimal subsampling probabilities p_i^{MV} or p_i^{MVc} derived in Theorems 3 or 4, respectively. To be precise,

$$p_i^{\text{os}} = r \frac{\tilde{h}_i^{\text{os}} \wedge M}{\sum_{j=1}^N (\tilde{h}_j^{\text{os}} \wedge M)} = r \frac{\tilde{h}_i^{\text{os}} \wedge M}{N\Psi}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (19)$$

where $M = (r - k)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \tilde{h}_{(i)}^{\text{os}}$, $\Psi = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N (\tilde{h}_j^{\text{os}} \wedge M)$, and \tilde{h}_i^{os} is either \tilde{h}_i^{MV} or \tilde{h}_i^{MVc} .

To practically implement the optimal subsampling probabilities, we need to replace the unknown $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$ by a pilot estimator, say $\tilde{\beta}_0$, which can be obtained by taking a uniform subsample. Some other sampling distributions can also be used to obtain the pilot estimator as long as they satisfy Assumption 5 and are computationally feasible to implement. Furthermore, in order to take advantage of Poisson subsampling and determine the inclusion of each data point separately, we use the pilot sample to approximate M and Ψ .

In the setting of subsampling for computational efficiency, it is typical that $r \ll N$ and the number of cases that $\tilde{h}_i^{\text{os}} > M$ is small. Thus, taking $M = \infty$ will not significantly affect the optimal subsampling probabilities. In fact, if $r\tilde{h}_{(N)}^{\text{os}}/(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{h}_j^{\text{os}}) \leq 1$, then taking $M = \infty$ does not affect the optimal subsampling probabilities at all. Simulation results in Section 5 show that taking $M = \infty$ does not reduce the estimation efficiency as long as r/N is small.

Let \tilde{S}_{r_0} be the set of the pilot subsample and

$$\hat{\Psi} = \frac{1}{|\tilde{S}_{r_0}|} \sum_{\tilde{s}_{r_0}} |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| h(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad (20)$$

where $|\tilde{S}_{r_0}|$ is the size of \tilde{S}_{r_0} , and $h(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|$ for MVc or $h(\mathbf{x}) = \|\Sigma_\psi(\tilde{\beta}_0)^{-1} \mathbf{x}\|$ for MV with $\Sigma_\psi(\tilde{\beta}_0)$ calculated as $\Sigma_\psi(\tilde{\beta}_0) = |\tilde{S}_{r_0}|^{-1} \sum_{\tilde{s}_{r_0}} \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i^*) \mathbf{x}_i^* \mathbf{x}_i^{*T}$. Let \tilde{p}_i^{os} be the approximated subsampling probabilities with $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$, M , and Ψ in (19) replaced by the pilot estimator $\tilde{\beta}_0$, $M = \infty$, and $\hat{\Psi}$. The weighted estimator with \tilde{p}_i^{os} inserted in (3) may be sensitive to data points with $y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i) \approx 0$ if they are included in the subsample. To make the estimator more stable and robust, we adopt the idea of shrinkage-based subsampling method proposed in Ma et al. (2015). To be specific, we use the following subsampling probabilities

$$\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} = (1 - \varrho) \frac{r |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| h(\mathbf{x}_i)}{N \hat{\Psi}} + \varrho r N^{-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (21)$$

where $\varrho \in (0, 1)$.

Note that when $\tilde{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\Psi}$ are calculated from the pilot subsample, \tilde{p}_i^{sos} depends on the i -th observation (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) only. Thus, each \tilde{p}_i^{sos} can be calculated when scanning the data from hard drive line-by-line or block-by-block; there is no need to calculate \tilde{p}_i^{sos} 's all at once. Therefore, there is no need to load the full data into memory to calculate all \tilde{p}_i^{sos} 's and this is very computationally beneficial in terms of memory usage.

In (21), $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{sos}} = \{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}}\}_{i=1}^N$ is a convex combination of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{os}} = \{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{os}}\}_{i=1}^N$ and the uniform subsampling probability, and it shares the strengths of both. When ϱ is larger, the corresponding estimator will be more stable since the estimation equation will not be inflated by data points with extremely small values of \tilde{p}_i^{os} . The rankings of \tilde{p}_i^{sos} and \tilde{p}_i^{os} are the same, so the estimator still enjoys the benefits of the optimal subsampling strategy. The shrinkage term not only increases small subsampling probabilities, but also shrinks large subsampling probabilities and thus protects the effects of potential outliers to some extent.

Since we approximate Ψ and take $M = \infty$, some \tilde{p}_i^{sos} may be larger than one. Thus, we need to use inverses of $\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1$'s as weights in the subsample QLE estimator. For transparent presentation, we summarize the practical procedure with approximated quantities in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Practical Algorithm

Pilot Subsampling: Run Algorithm 1 with average subsample size r_0 and $\mathbf{p}^{\text{UNIF}} = \{p_i := r_0/N\}_{i=1}^N$ to take a subsample set \tilde{S}_{r_0} , and use it to obtain an estimate $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ and $\hat{\Psi}$ as in (20).

Initialization: $S_0 = \tilde{S}_{r_0}$;

for $i = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

Generate $\delta_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1, p_i)$ with $p_i = \tilde{p}_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1$, where \tilde{p}_i^{SOS} is defined in (21);

if $\delta_i = 1$ **then**

| Update $S_i = S_{i-1} \cup \{(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i, p_i)\}$

else

| Set $S_i = S_{i-1}$

Estimation: Solve the following weighted estimating equation to obtain the estimate $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ based on the subsample set S_N .

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{S_N} \frac{1}{p_i} [y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)] \mathbf{x}_i = 0.$$

For estimators obtained from Algorithm 2, we derive asymptotic properties as follows.

Theorem 5. *Under Assumptions 1 – 4, if $r_0 r^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$, then for the estimator $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ obtained from Algorithm 2, as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$, with probability approaching one, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist finite Δ_ϵ and r_ϵ such that*

$$P(\|\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\| \geq r^{-1/2} \Delta_\epsilon | \mathcal{F}_N) < \epsilon$$

for all $r > r_\epsilon$.

Theorem 6. *If Assumptions 1 – 4 hold and $r_0 r^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$, then as $r_0 \rightarrow \infty$, $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_N in probability,*

$$V^{-1/2}(\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \rightarrow N(0, I) \text{ in distribution,}$$

where $V = \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V_c \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1}$ and

$$V_c = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\{1 - (p_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1)\} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T}{p_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1},$$

with

$$p_i^{\text{SOS}} := (1 - \varrho) \frac{r |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|}{\sum_{j=1}^N |y_j - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_j)| \|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j\|} + \varrho \frac{r}{N},$$

for MV criterion and

$$p_i^{\text{sos}} := (1 - \varrho) \frac{r|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|\|\mathbf{x}_i\|}{\sum_{j=1}^N |y_j - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_j)|\|\mathbf{x}_j\|} + \varrho \frac{r}{N},$$

for MVc criterion.

4 Distributed Poisson Subsampling

In this section, we discuss the distributed optimal Poisson subsampling procedure. For large data sets, it is common to analyze them on multiple machines. This motivates us to develop divide-and-conquer subsampling procedures that take advantages of parallel and distributed computational architectures. Although Poisson subsampling can be easily implemented in parallel, pooling the subsample sets from multiple machines together may still result in a subsample set that exceeds the memory limit of a single machine. In addition, transferring data may be time consuming and subject to security issues. Thus this method can only be used when the subsample size on each machine is not that big. We propose to aggregate estimators derived in different machines to approximate the full data quasi-likelihood estimator. Here we assume that the entire data set of size N are stored in K different machines, and let \mathcal{F}_{N_j} ($j = 1, \dots, K$) denote the data stored in the j -th machine. For simplicity, assume that the number of observations in different machines are all equal to n , and denote the observations in \mathcal{F}_{N_j} as $\{(y_{ji}, \mathbf{x}_{ji})\}_{i=1}^n$. We present the distributed optimal Poisson subsampling procedure in Algorithm 3.

Remark 4. The first step in Algorithm 3 can be implemented by sampling the data machine-by-machine and pooling all the subsamples together. Since r_0 is usually small in our setting, the time of communication can be ignored.

The results of consistency and asymptotic normality are presented in the following theorems.

Theorem 7. *Under Assumptions 1 – 4, if the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ based on the first step sample exists, $r_0(Kr)^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$ and the partition number K satisfies $K = O(r^\eta)$ for some η in $[0, 1/3]$, then conditional on \mathcal{F}_N , for the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr}$ obtained from Algorithm 3, as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and*

Algorithm 3: Distributed Optimal Poisson Subsampling

Step 1: Obtain the pilot estimator**for** $i = 1, \dots, N$ **do** | Generate $\delta_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1, p_i)$ with $p_i = r_0/N$; **if** $\delta_i = 1$ **then** | Add (x_i, y_i, p_i) to the subsample set S_{r_0} For the obtained subsample S_{r_0} , calculate the pilot estimator $\tilde{\beta}_0$, $\hat{\Psi}$, and \dot{Q}_0

according to (3), (20) and (23), respectively.

Step 2: Subsampling and Compression**foreach** $\mathcal{F}_{Nj}, j = 1, \dots, K$ **do** **Initialization:** $S_{j0} = \emptyset$; **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do** | Calculate the corresponding subsampling probabilities $\tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{sos}}$ according to (21); | Generate $\delta_{ji} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1, p_{ji})$ with $p_{ji} = \tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1$; **if** $\delta_{ji} = 1$ **then** | Update $S_{ji} = S_{ji-1} \cup \{(y_{ji}, \mathbf{x}_{ji}, p_{ji})\}$. **else** | Set $S_{ji} = S_{ji-1}$. Obtain $\tilde{\beta}_j$ by solving

$$Q_j^*(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{S_{jn}} \frac{1}{p_{ji}} \{y_{ji} - \psi(\beta^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})\} \mathbf{x}_{ji} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (22)$$

and calculate

$$\dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{S_{jn}} \frac{1}{p_{ji}} \psi(\tilde{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T. \quad (23)$$

Step 3: CombinationCombine the K estimators and the pilot estimator by calculating

$$\tilde{\beta}_{Kr} = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j) \tilde{\beta}_j. \quad (24)$$

$n \rightarrow \infty$, with probability approaching one, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist finite Δ_ϵ and r_ϵ such that

$$P(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\| \geq (Kr)^{-1/2} \Delta_\epsilon | \mathcal{F}_N) < \epsilon$$

for all $r > r_\epsilon$.

Theorem 8. Under Assumptions 1 – 4, if $r_0(Kr)^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$ and the partition number K satisfies $K = O(r^\eta)$ for some η in $[0, 1/3]$, then for the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr}$ obtained from Algorithm 3, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_N in probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_0 \rightarrow \infty$,

$$V_{\text{opt}}^{-1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \rightarrow N(0, I) \quad \text{in distribution,}$$

where $V_{\text{opt}} = \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V_{c,\text{opt}} \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1}$,

$$V_{c,\text{opt}} = \frac{1}{KN^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\{1 - (p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1)\} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T}{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1},$$

and p_i^{sos} is defined in Theorem 6.

For statistical inference, we propose to estimate the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr}$ using

$$\tilde{V} = \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \right\}^{-1} \tilde{V}_c \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \right\}^{-1}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_c = \frac{1}{N^2} & \left\{ \sum_{S_{r_0}} \frac{\{y_{0i}^* - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_{0i}^*)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_{0i}^* \mathbf{x}_{0i}^{*T}}{(r_0/N)^2} (1 - r_0/N) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{S_{jn}} \frac{\{y_{ji}^* - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}^*)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_{ji}^* \mathbf{x}_{ji}^{*T}}{(\tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{sos}*})^2} (1 - \tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{sos}*}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This formula enables us to know how well $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr}$ approximates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$. When $Kr = o(N)$, we can also draw inference on the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t$, since uncertainty of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ can be ignored under this assumption. It is worth mentioning that if we want to calculate (25), we also need to have $\sum_{S_{j_n}} (1 - \tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{sos}}) \{y_{ji} - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})\}^2 \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T / (\tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{sos}})^2$ calculated on each machine.

Since the pilot estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ has to be calculated anyway, our method is valuable even for the case $K = 1$ because this avoids iterative calculation on the Step 1 sample twice.

5 Numerical Studies

In this section, we present examples of numerical experiments using the methods developed in Sections 3 and 4. Computations are performed using R (R Core Team, 2018). The performance of a sampling strategy is evaluated by the empirical MSE of the resultant estimator:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\|^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)}$ is the estimate from the t -th subsample with subsampling probability \mathbf{p} and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ is the quasi-likelihood estimator calculated from the whole data set. We set $T = 1000$ throughout this section.

5.1 Simulation Studies

We take Poisson regression as an example to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed methods throughout this section. We also considered logistic regression and Gamma regression models, the results were similar and thus were omitted. Full data of size $N = 500,000$ are generated from a Poisson regression model such that given the covariate \mathbf{x} , the response y follows a Poisson distribution with mean $E(y|\mathbf{x}) = \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})$. Here we set the true value of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ as a 7×1 vector of 0.5. We consider the following four scenarios to generate the covariates $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{i7})^T$.

Case 1 The seven covariates are i.i.d from the standard uniform distribution, namely, $x_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$ for $j = 1, \dots, 7$.

Case 2 The second covariate is $x_{i2} = x_{i1} + \varepsilon_i$ with $x_{i1} \sim U(0, 1)$, $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$, and other covariates are $x_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d}}{\sim} U(0, 1)$ for $j = 1, 3, \dots, 7$. In this scenario, the first two covariates are correlated (≈ 0.5).

Case 3 This scenario is the same as Case 2 except that $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d}}{\sim} U([0, 0.1])$. For this case, the correlation between the first two covariates is close to 0.8.

Case 4 This scenario is the same as Case 2 except that $x_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d}}{\sim} U([-1, 1])$ for $j = 6, 7$. For this case, the supports for different covariates are not all the same.

In the following, we evaluate the performance of Algorithm 3 based on MV and MVc subsampling probabilities with partition number $K = 1$ and $K = 5$. Note that Algorithm 3 with $K = 1$ and Algorithm 2 differ only in the way to incorporate pilot sample information, so their performances are similar. Results of uniform subsampling are also calculated for comparisons.

We fix $r_0 = 200$ and $\varrho = 0.2$, and choose r to be 300, 500, 700, 1000, 1200, 1500, 1700 and 2000. Since the uniform subsampling probability does not depend on unknown parameters and no pilot subsamples are required, it is implemented with subsample size $r + r_0$ for fair comparisons.

Figure 1 gives the simulation results. It is seen that for the four data sets, subsampling methods based on MV and MVc always result in smaller empirical MSEs compared with the uniform subsampling, which agrees with the theoretical results in Section 3. The MSEs for all subsampling methods decrease as r increases, which confirms the theoretical result on consistency of the subsampling methods.




Figure 1: A graph showing the log of MSE with different r and K for different distributions of covariates based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods where $r_0 = 200$ and $\varrho = 0.2$.

Next, we will explore the effect of different ϱ with fixed r_0 and r . The results are given in Figure 2 with $r_0 = 200$, and $r = 1200$ and 1500 . It is clear to see that the subsampling

method outperforms the uniform subsampling method when $\varrho \in [0.01, 0.99]$. When ϱ is close to 1, the performances of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{sos}}$ are similar to that of the uniform subsampling. The two-step approach works the best when ϱ is around 0.25. This implies that the shrinkage estimator effectively protect the weighted estimating equation from data points with $|y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)|$ close to zero. We only present the performance of Case 4 here because results for all other cases are similar.




Figure 2: Log MSEs for Case 4 with different ϱ and a fixed $r_0 = 200$ based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods.

To see the effects of M in \mathbf{p}^{sos} , we compare the choice of $M = \infty$ with another two choices: 1) M is approximated by the $(1 - r/(2n))$ -th quantile of $\{\hat{h}_i^{*\text{MV}}\}_{i=1}^{r_0}$ or $\{\hat{h}_i^{*\text{MVc}}\}_{i=1}^{r_0}$ calculated from pilot subsample set (denote this choice as $M = Q$), and 2) M is calculated according to the formulas in Theorem 3 or 4 except that $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$ is replaced by $\tilde{\beta}_0$ (denote this choice as $M = E$). we consider different values of r/N with choices of 0.01, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5 and 0.7, and report results in Table 1. When $r/N \leq 0.3$, the choice $M = \infty$ has comparable results as the choice $M = E$ (calculating M from the full). When $r/N \geq 0.5$, the choice $M = Q$ (using a quantile from the pilot subsample) still produce satisfactory results. Thus, the MSE is not very sensitive to the choice of M . In the big data subsampling scheme, since it is typical that $r \ll N$, we can simply use $M = \infty$.

Table 1: MSE for different expected size r under varying subsampling strategy with $r_0 = 2000$ and $\varrho = 0.2$ on Case 4. Here Q is the $(1 - r/(2n))$ -th quantile of $\{\tilde{h}_i^{*MV}\}_{i=1}^{r_0}$ or $\{\tilde{h}_i^{*MVc}\}_{i=1}^{r_0}$, and E is calculated according to the formula for M in Theorem 3 or 4 with $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$ replaced by $\tilde{\beta}_0$.

Method	$r/N = 0.01$	$r/N = 0.1$	$r/N = 0.3$	$r/N = 0.5$	$r/N = 0.7$
UNIF	1.75E-03	1.93E-04	5.03E-05	2.14E-05	9.21E-06
MV with $M = \infty$	1.18E-03	1.12E-04	2.35E-05	8.35E-06	3.64E-06
MV with $M = Q$	1.19E-03	1.11E-04	2.54E-05	8.19E-06	1.57E-06
MV with $M = E$	1.21E-03	1.16E-04	2.29E-05	7.55E-06	2.36E-06
MVc with $M = \infty$	1.32E-03	1.22E-04	2.82E-05	1.09E-05	5.26E-06
MVc with $M = Q$	1.28E-03	1.22E-04	2.72E-05	9.65E-06	2.12E-06
MVc with $M = E$	1.35E-03	1.26E-04	2.74E-05	8.76E-06	2.67E-06

To have a closer look at the effect of K , we implement Algorithm 3 with fixed partition number $K = 5$ or $K = 10$ and changing r with choices of 300, 500, 700, 1000, 1200, 1500, 1700, and 2000. We also consider the cases where r and Kr are fixed. The results for Case 4 are reported in Figure 3 with $r_0 = 200$ and $\varrho = 0.2$. For comparisons, the uniform subsampling is also implemented through Algorithm 3 with $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{\text{sos}}$ replaced by \mathbf{p}^{UNIF} . Figure 3 shows that the subsampling method outperforms the uniform subsampling method for both $K = 5$ and $K = 10$. If r is fixed, the aggregate estimator approximates $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$ better when K is larger since more data are involved in each subsample set. However, when Kr is fixed, as K increases, the performance of the aggregate estimator deteriorates.




Figure 3: Log MSEs for different combination of r and K with $r_0 = 200$ and $\varrho = 0.2$ based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods.

Now we evaluate the performance of the proposed subsampling method for statistical inference under different values of r and K . As an example, we take β_2 as the parameter of interest and construct 95% confidence intervals for it. The estimator given in (25) is used to estimate the variance-covariance matrices based on selected subsamples. Table 2 reports empirical coverage probabilities and average lengths over the four synthetic data sets with $r_0 = 200$ and $\varrho = 0.2$. It is clear that MV and MVc based subsampling methods have similar performances and they are uniformly better than the uniform subsampling method. As r or K increases, lengths of confidence intervals decrease. The 95% confidence intervals in Case 3 are longer than those in other cases with the same subsample sizes. This coincides with the aforementioned results.

Table 2: Empirical coverage probabilities and average lengths of 95% confidence intervals for β_2 with $r_0 = 200$ and $\varrho = 0.2$.

		r	MV		MVc		UNIF	
			coverage	length	coverage	length	coverage	length
case1	k=1	1000	0.950	0.1867	0.949	0.1880	0.944	0.1932
		1500	0.949	0.1829	0.946	0.1837	0.945	0.1871
	k=5	1000	0.947	0.1774	0.944	0.1776	0.931	0.1783
		1500	0.951	0.1766	0.946	0.1767	0.935	0.1771
case2	k=1	1000	0.935	0.1619	0.944	0.1638	0.927	0.1680
		1500	0.940	0.1587	0.937	0.1600	0.934	0.1627
	k=5	1000	0.945	0.1542	0.934	0.1546	0.936	0.1550
		1500	0.938	0.1536	0.938	0.1538	0.932	0.1539
case3	k=1	1000	0.957	1.8103	0.956	1.8504	0.947	1.8961
		1500	0.954	1.7788	0.956	1.8058	0.941	1.8368
	k=5	1000	0.956	1.7344	0.951	1.7418	0.936	1.7503
		1500	0.951	1.7280	0.951	1.7325	0.945	1.7374
case4	k=1	1000	0.935	0.1949	0.928	0.1977	0.935	0.2034
		1500	0.927	0.1913	0.933	0.1932	0.936	0.1970
	k=5	1000	0.928	0.1862	0.928	0.1865	0.949	0.1877
		1500	0.930	0.1854	0.927	0.1856	0.946	0.1864

Additional simulation results on both estimation efficiency and computational efficiency with larger full data sizes and higher dimensions are available in the supplementary material.

5.2 Citation Number Data Set

The number of citations is an important factor about the quality of a research paper, and it is of interest to most of the researchers in every field. As a result, study of paper citations itself has become an interesting research topic. In this example, we applied the proposed method to a real data set about over four million papers associated with abstract, authors, year, venue, title, type and citation numbers (Tang et al. (2008)). The data set is available

at <https://www.aminer.cn/citation>, and our goal is to model the number of citations using features extracted from the text information about the articles.

The original data set is in text format, and we extract the following numerical features to characterize each article. First, the number of years between the year the paper was published and the year of 2018 (x_1). This feature describes the time effect since the citation numbers are nondecreasing in x_1 . We categorize the length of the abstract of each paper into detail/brief/non-present status, and bring two indicator variables to denote them. Specifically, $x_2 = 1$ if the paper has an abstract with more than 100 words and $x_2 = 0$ otherwise; and $x_3 = 1$ if the paper has an abstract with less than 100 words and $x_3 = 0$ otherwise. Similarly, we characterize the length of the title for each paper by defining $x_4 = 1$ if the title contains more than 10 words and $x_4 = 0$ otherwise. We also consider the publication type, and use $x_5 = 1$ to denote journal papers and $x_5 = 0$ for the rest of papers. To measure the influence of the journal or publisher, we use the newest SJR score (x_6) provided by <https://www.scimagojr.com>. We also consider the SJR ranking and let $x_7 = 1$ for journals or publishers that are marked with “Q1” and let $x_7 = 0$ otherwise. The author information of each paper is also taken into account. We define x_8 as the average number of author publications for each paper, which is calculated by dividing the total number of publications from the author(s) of the paper before 2018 by the total number of author(s) in the paper. We remove all the incomplete cases in the data set, and there are $n = 2,803,027$ data points after the data cleaning.

To describe the relationship between the number of citations and the aforementioned features, a Poisson regression is used. The estimated mean model from the quasi-likelihood estimator based on the full data set is given as below:

$$E(Y|X) = \exp(1.32 + 0.39x_1 + 1.44x_2 + 1.09x_3 - 0.26x_4 + 0.03x_5 + 0.20x_6 + 0.55x_7 + 0.21x_8).$$

From the fitted model, we have the following findings. 1) A detailed abstract helps to attract more citations while a detailed title may not be popular among scholars. This may be because follow-up papers often have longer titles compared with the original paper, but they usually gain less attentions. 2) The publication type is not critical to receive high number of citations comparing with other factors. 3) SJR ranking is critical to receive higher number of citations. This is because the paper published in high quality publishers

Table 3: Average estimates for the Citation number data set from the proposed methods with $\varrho = 0.2$, $r_0 = 800$, and $r = 4400$. In the table β_1, \dots, β_8 are the regression coefficients for x_1, \dots, x_8 respectively, and β_0 is the intercept coefficient. The numbers in the parentheses are the empirical standard errors.

	K=1			K=5		
	UNIF	MV	MVc	UNIF	MV	MVc
β_0	1.29 (0.339)	1.35 (0.183)	1.35 (0.213)	1.47 (0.221)	1.44 (0.153)	1.44 (0.159)
β_1	0.41 (0.054)	0.39 (0.027)	0.39 (0.023)	0.38 (0.039)	0.38 (0.027)	0.38 (0.026)
β_2	1.46 (0.333)	1.42 (0.182)	1.42 (0.208)	1.37 (0.218)	1.40 (0.145)	1.40 (0.149)
β_3	1.11 (0.365)	1.07 (0.190)	1.07 (0.218)	1.02 (0.240)	1.05 (0.160)	1.05 (0.162)
β_4	-0.25 (0.139)	-0.26 (0.100)	-0.26 (0.083)	-0.25 (0.094)	-0.25 (0.071)	-0.25 (0.069)
β_5	0.03 (0.159)	0.03 (0.103)	0.03 (0.099)	0.04 (0.103)	0.04 (0.073)	0.04 (0.073)
β_6	0.21 (0.051)	0.21 (0.022)	0.20 (0.017)	0.21 (0.035)	0.21 (0.020)	0.21 (0.019)
β_7	0.54 (0.185)	0.55 (0.114)	0.55 (0.111)	0.54 (0.117)	0.55 (0.093)	0.55 (0.094)
β_8	0.22 (0.044)	0.21 (0.023)	0.21 (0.017)	0.21 (0.027)	0.21 (0.017)	0.21 (0.016)

usually receive more attentions. 4) More productive authors gain more citations since they may have more influences.

To assess the performance of the proposed method in approximating the full data estimates, we apply them on the citation data for 1000 times and report the averages of parameter estimates along with the empirical standard errors in Table 3. The uniform subsampling method is also implemented for comparison. In this table, $\varrho = 0.2$, $r_0 = 800$, and $r = 4400$. It is seen that all subsampling methods produce average estimates that are close to the full data estimates. However, the proposed methods have significantly smaller empirical standard errors.

Similar to the simulation studies, we also compare our methods with the uniform subsampling method with various sampling budget r varying from 2000 to 4400 and r_0 being fixed at 800. Figure 4 shows the results on the empirical MSE. We see that MV and MVc perform similarly and they both dominate the uniform sampling method. This pattern is similar to that in the simulation studies.




Figure 4: A graph showing the log of MSEs for the citation number data set with $r_0 = 400$ and different r and partition number K based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods.

5.3 Airline On-time and Delay Data Set

To track the on-time performance of domestic flights operated by large air carriers, information about on-time, delayed, canceled, and diverted flights have been collected since October 1987. The full data set contains 123,534,969 records (~ 11 GB) which is available on <http://stat-computing.org/dataexpo/2009/the-data.html>. One purpose for analyzing this data set is to build a model for airlines delays. We first plot the histogram of actual arrive delays based on the pilot sample and notice a very large discrepancy from normality. The distribution of actual delays are extremely skewed and heavy-tailed (see Figure 5a).

In order to extract useful information about arrive delays, we use linear regression, log-linear regression, and Gamma regression to model the relationship between arrive delays and other covariate variables: x_1 , the distance between airports; x_2 , day/night status (binary; 1 if departure between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., 0 otherwise); x_3 , weekend/weekday status (binary; 1 if departure occurred during the weekend, 0 otherwise); and x_4 , departure delay status (binary; 1 if the delay is 15 Minutes or More, 0 otherwise). Note that both log linear and Gamma regression models are defined for non-negative responses. Thus we switch the locations of all the responses, i.e., add 1440 to all the responses. Based on the pilot sample, the Bayesian information criterion values are 7312.672, -4407.750, and -4415.854 for linear regression, log-linear regression, and Gamma regression, respectively, which implies that the posterior probability for Gamma regression model is around 0.98 in the view of Bayesian

model averaging (see Neath and Cavanaugh, 2012). Thus we use Gamma regression for this case. In addition, we drop the NA values in the dataset. After data cleaning, we have $n = 119,793,199$ data points. Similar to the simulation studies, we also compare our method with the uniform subsampling method, and report the results under various sampling budget r varying from 2000 to 4400 with r_0 fixed at 800 in Figure 6. As expected, MV and MVc perform similarly and they both outperform the uniform sampling method.




Figure 5: Distribution of Actual Delays and Log-transformed Actual Delays based on the pilot samples ($r_0 = 800$).




Figure 6: A graph showing the log of MSEs for the airline on-time and delay data set with $r_0 = 800$, $\rho = 0.2$ and different r and partition number K based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have derived the optimal Poisson subsampling probabilities for quasi-likelihood estimation, and developed a distributed optimal subsampling method. We have

investigated the theoretical properties of the proposed methods and carried out extensive numerical experiments on simulated and real data sets to evaluate their practical performance. Both theoretical results and numerical results demonstrate the great potential of the proposed method in extracting useful information from massive data sets.

Supplementary material for “Optimal Distributed Subsampling for Maximum Quasi-Likelihood Estimators with Massive Data”

In this supplementary material we prove the theorems in the paper and present additional simulation results to evaluate the proposed methods.

S.1 Proofs

Recall that we use $Q(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ to denote the estimating equation on full data set. For the subsamples, the weighted estimation equation (3) can be written as

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} [y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)] \mathbf{x}_i,$$

where δ_i is the indicator variable that signifies whether (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) is included in the subsample. Denote the first derivative of $Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ as $\dot{Q}^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \partial Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}$.

S.1.1 Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2

To prove Theorems 1 and 2, we start from proving the following lemmas.

Lemma S.1. *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 5, conditional on \mathcal{F}_N , as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{1}{N} V_c^{-1/2} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \rightarrow N(\mathbf{0}, I),$$

in distribution, where

$$V_c = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T.$$

Proof. Direct calculation shows that

$$E \left\{ \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right\} = \frac{1}{N} Q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{var} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\text{var}(\delta_i | \mathcal{F}_N)}{p_i^2} \{y_i \mathbf{x}_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i\} \{y_i \mathbf{x}_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i\}^T \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T}{p_i} - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we check the Lindeberg-Feller condition under the conditional distribution. Denote $\eta_i = \delta_i \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\} \mathbf{x}_i / (N p_i)$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^N E\{\|\eta_i\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\|\eta_i\| > \varepsilon} \mid \mathcal{F}_N\} &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N E(\|\eta_i\|^3 \mid \mathcal{F}_N) \\
&= \frac{1}{N^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{p_i^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\{ \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{(N p_i)^2} \right\} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N},
\end{aligned} \tag{S.26}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function.

Now we show that $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3 = O_P(1)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} + 3 \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^2 \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\
&\quad + 3 \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i| \psi^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\psi^3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S.27}$$

From (i) and (ii) in Assumption 2, we have $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^6 = O_P(1)$ and $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i^6 = O_P(1)$ from the law of large numbers. Thus, from Holder's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^6}{N}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^6}{N}} = O_P(1). \tag{S.28}$$

Similarly, under Assumption 2, it can be shown that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\psi^3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} = O_P(1), \tag{S.29}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^2 \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} = O_P(1), \tag{S.30}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i| \psi^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} = O_P(1). \tag{S.31}$$

Here, the last two equalities come from the generalized Holder inequality (See Schilling, 2017, Page 133),

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i b_i c_i| \leq \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i^3| \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |b_i^3| \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |c_i^3| \right)^{1/3}. \quad (\text{S.32})$$

To be specific, the results come from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^2 \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^6}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi^3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} \right)^{1/3} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^6}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\psi^6(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)}{N} \right)^{1/6} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} \right)^{1/3} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i| \psi^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i|^3}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\psi^6(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} \right)^{1/3}.$$

Combining (S.27), (S.28), (S.29), (S.30) and (S.31), we have

$$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3 = O_P(1). \quad (\text{S.33})$$

From (S.26), (S.33), and Assumption 5, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^N E\{\|\eta_i\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\|\eta_i\| > \varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_N\} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} O_P(r^{-2}) \cdot O_P(1) = o_P(1).$$

Thus, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_N , the desired result holds by the Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem (Proposition 2.27 of van der Vaart, 1998). \square

Lemma S.2. *Under Assumptions 1 – 5, as $N, r \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\mathbf{s}_r \rightarrow 0$ in probability,*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \dot{\psi}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} + \mathbf{s}_r)^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1). \quad (\text{S.34})$$

Proof. Direct calculation shows that conditionally on \mathcal{F}_N ,

$$E \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T.$$

Let $\Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i p_i^{-1} \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$, for any component $\Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{j_1 j_2}$ of $\Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})$ where $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\{ \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{j_1 j_2} - \Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{j_1 j_2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right\}^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i(1-p_i)}{p_i^2} \left\{ \frac{\dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{ij_1} x_{ij_2}}{N} \right\}^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i} \left\{ \frac{\dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{ij_1} x_{ij_2}}{N} \right\}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{\dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{ij_1} x_{ij_2}}{N} \right\}^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i} \left\{ \frac{\dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{ij_1} x_{ij_2}}{N} \right\}^2 \\
&\leq \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{N p_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\dot{\psi}^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) (x_{ij_1} x_{ij_2})^2}{N}, \\
&\leq \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{N p_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\dot{\psi}^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^4}{N},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is because $(x_{ij_1} x_{ij_2})^2 \leq x_{ij_1}^4 + x_{ij_2}^4 \leq \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^4$. Utilizing (i), (iii) and (iv) in Assumption 2, it can be shown that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\dot{\psi}^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^4}{N} = O_P(1),$$

by arguments similar to those used for Lemma S.1. Thus we have

$$E \left(\Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{j_1 j_2} - \Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{j_1 j_2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right)^2 = O_P(r^{-1})$$

from Assumption 5. Note that $\Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{j_1 j_2} = O_P(1)$ under Assumption 3. It is proved that

$$\Upsilon_I := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1),$$

from Chebyshev's inequality.

It remains to show that

$$\Upsilon_{II} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \{ \dot{\psi}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} + \mathbf{s}_r)^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1).$$

According to Wely's theorem (Horn and Johnson, 2013, Theorem 4.3.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Upsilon_{II}\|_s &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \|\dot{\psi}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} + \mathbf{s}_r)^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T\|_s \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\{\dot{\psi}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} + \mathbf{s}_r)^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T\|_s \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} m_2(\mathbf{x}_i) \|\mathbf{s}_r\| = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

under Assumption 4. Thus the result follows from the fact that $\|\Upsilon_{II}\|_s \geq 0$.

□

Now we are ready to prove Theorems 1 and 2.

Proof. The estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the solution of

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \{y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\} \mathbf{x}_i.$$

Note that

$$E \left\{ \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right\} = \frac{1}{N} Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \tag{S.35}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{var} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_N \right\} &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T}{p_i} - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \\
&\leq \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T}{p_i} = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S.36}$$

by using the similar arguments in Lemma S.1 under Assumptions 1, 2 and 5.

Therefore, as $r \rightarrow \infty$, $N^{-1}Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - N^{-1}Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rightarrow 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Lambda$ in conditional probability given \mathcal{F}_N . Note that the parameter space is compact and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ is the unique solution of $N^{-1}Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{0}$ under Assumption 3 (cf. Tzavelas, 1998). Thus, from Theorem 5.9 and its remark of van der Vaart (1998), we have

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\| = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1), \tag{S.37}$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty, r \rightarrow \infty$, conditionally on \mathcal{F}_N in probability.

By Taylor's expansion,

$$Q^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(1)}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{i1} \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(d)}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{id} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}), \quad (\text{S.38})$$

where all $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(d)}$ lie between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

From (S.37), for each $j = 1, \dots, d$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(j)}$ can be written as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} + \mathbf{s}_{(j)}$ for some $\mathbf{s}_{(j)} = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1)$. Thus, from Lemma S.2,

$$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(j)}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T - N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1),$$

which implies that for every j ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \begin{pmatrix} \vdots \\ \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(j)}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{ij} \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \begin{pmatrix} \vdots \\ \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{ij} \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{p_i} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(1)}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{i1} \\ \vdots \\ \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(d)}^T \mathbf{x}_i) x_{id} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_i^T = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1).$$

By the definition of the quasi-likelihood estimator, the left-hand-side of (S.38) is zero. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} &= -\Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\|) \\ &= -\Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V_c^{1/2} V_c^{-1/2} \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\|) \\ &= O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2}) + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.39})$$

since $\Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1)$ under Assumption 3, $V_c^{1/2} = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2})$ from (S.36) and $V_c^{-1/2} \frac{1}{N} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1)$ from Lemma 1. Therefore, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\|) = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2})$, which implies that

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2}).$$

For Theorem 2, applying (S.39), as $r \rightarrow \infty$, conditional on \mathcal{F}_N , it holds that

$$V^{-1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) = -V^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V_c^{1/2} V_c^{-1/2} N^{-1} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1).$$

Thus, the result follows from Lemma S.1 and Slutsky's theorem. \square

S.1.2 Proofs of Theorems 3 and 4

Proof. If some elements of $\{\hbar_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are equal to zero, we can set the corresponding subsampling probabilities as zero and then consider the subsampling probabilities among the rest. Thus, without loss of generality, we assume all $\hbar_i > 0$.

In order to minimize the asymptotic mean square error, $\text{tr}(V)$ in (6), it is sufficient to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \tilde{H} = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{p_i} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^N p_i = r, \quad 0 \leq p_i \leq 1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.40})$$

For brevity, we denote $\hbar_i^{\text{MV}} := |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|$ as \hbar_i for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Without loss of generality, we further assume that $\hbar_1 \leq \hbar_2 \leq \dots \leq \hbar_N$.

From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{1}{p_i} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{r} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N p_j \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^N [p_i^{-1} \hbar_i^2] \right) \geq \frac{1}{r} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \hbar_i \right]^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality in it holds if and only if $p_i \propto \hbar_i$. Therefore, when $p_i = r\hbar_i / (\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j)$ satisfies that $p_i \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, p_i 's give the optimal solution.

Otherwise, we can easily see that $p_N = 1$ when $r\hbar_N / (\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j) > 1$. Thus, the original problem (S.40) turns into finding p_1, \dots, p_{N-1} which solve the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{p_i} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} p_i = r - 1, \quad 0 \leq p_i \leq 1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, this is a typical recursion problem, and the optimal solution is $\min \tilde{H} = \sum_{i=N-k+1}^N \hbar_i^2 + (r-k)^{-1} (\sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_i)^2$, for some k satisfying

$$\frac{(r-k+1)\hbar_{N-k+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N-k+1} \hbar_i} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(r-k)\hbar_{N-k}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_i} < 1.$$

Suppose that M exists such that

$$\max_{i=1,\dots,N} \frac{\hbar_i \wedge M}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j \wedge M} = \frac{1}{r},$$

and $\hbar_{N-k} < M \leq \hbar_{N-k+1}$. It follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_i = (r-k)M$. Therefore $\min \tilde{V} = \sum_{i=N-k+1}^N \hbar_i^2 + (r-k)M^2$.

Substituting $p_i^{\text{MV}} = (\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j \wedge M)^{-1} r (\hbar_i \wedge M)$ into (S.40), the following equation holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= \sum_{i=N-k+1}^N \hbar_i^2 + \frac{1}{r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_i \right)^2 + \frac{1}{r} \left(\sum_{i=N-k+1}^N M \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=N-k+1}^N \hbar_i^2 + \frac{1}{r} (r-k)^2 M^2 + \frac{1}{r} (r-k) k M^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=N-k}^N \hbar_i^2 + (r-k) M^2 = \min \tilde{H}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, p_i^{MV} is the optimal solution of (S.40).

Now we will show that M exists and satisfying $\hbar_{N-k} < M \leq \hbar_{N-k+1}$. Note that k satisfies

$$\frac{(r-k+1)\hbar_{N-k+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N-k+1} \hbar_i} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(r-k)\hbar_{N-k}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N-k} \hbar_i} < 1.$$

The following inequality holds by fetching $M = \hbar_{N-k+1}$,

$$\frac{(r-k+1)\hbar_{N-k+1} + (k-1)M}{\sum_{i=1}^{N-k+1} \hbar_i + (k-1)M} \geq 1.$$

This implies $(\hbar_N \wedge M) / (\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j \wedge M) \geq 1/r$. Similarly, we know $(\hbar_N \wedge M) / (\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j \wedge M) < 1/r$ by fetching $M = \hbar_{N-k}$. Thus the assertion M exists and satisfying $\hbar_{N-k} < M \leq \hbar_{N-k+1}$ follows by the facts that $\max_{i=1,\dots,N} \hbar_i \wedge M / (\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j \wedge M)$ is a continuous function on M conditioning on \hbar_1, \dots, \hbar_N .

Also note that for any $\hbar_N \geq M' > M$, $M' \wedge \hbar_N \geq M \wedge \hbar_N$ and $(M'/M) \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar_i \wedge M \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar_i \wedge M'$. Thus $\hbar_N \wedge M / (\sum_{i=1}^N \hbar_i \wedge M)$ is nondecreasing on $M \in (\hbar_1, \hbar_N)$. Therefore

$$\max_{i=1,\dots,N} \frac{\hbar_i \wedge M}{\sum_{j=1}^N \hbar_j \wedge M} = \frac{1}{r},$$

indicates that $\hbar_{N-k} < M \leq \hbar_{N-k+1}$.

The proof for Theorem 4 is similar, so we omit the details. \square

S.1.3 Proofs of Theorems 5 and 6

Since $\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \geq \varrho r/N$, we have $\max_{i=1, \dots, N} (Np_i)^{-1} = O_P(r^{-1})$. Theorem 1 indicates Theorem 5. Thus it remains to show that Theorem 6 holds.

Proof. Note that $r_0 r^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$, the contribution of the first step subsample to the estimation equation is $o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2})$. Thus, we can focus on the subsamples drawn in the second step only. Here we reuse the notation of $Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ to represent the corresponding estimation equation. To be precise,

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} [y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)] \mathbf{x}_i,$$

where \tilde{p}_i^{sos} is defined in (21) and $\delta_i = 1$ if and only if the corresponding data point is selected in the subsample set in second step.

From Lemma S.1, conditionally on $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0, \mathcal{F}_N$, it holds that

$$N^{-1} \tilde{V}_c^{-1/2} Q^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}) \rightarrow N(\mathbf{0}, I),$$

in distribution, where

$$\tilde{V}_c = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T,$$

since $\hat{\Psi}$ is a consistency estimator of $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| h(\mathbf{x}_i)$.

Let \tilde{h}_i^{os} have the same expression as h^{os} defined in (19) except that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}$ is replaced by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$. For clarity, we consider the MVc case first. Recall $\|A\|_s$ denotes the spectral norm of matrix A . The distance between \tilde{V}_c and V_c can be quantified as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{V}_c - V_c\|_s &= \left\| \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \left(\frac{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right) \right\|_s \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} \left| \frac{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\max_{i=1, \dots, N} \frac{1}{N p_i^{\text{sos}}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \left| \frac{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \\ &\leq (\varrho r)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \left| \frac{p_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{sos}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{S.41}$$

Simple calculation yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{p_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right| \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{N} \\
\leq & \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} |\tilde{h}_i - h_i| + \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \tilde{h}_i \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \\
= & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\tilde{h}_i - h_i| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{N \varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} + \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N \varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \\
\leq & \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \frac{1}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\
+ & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \frac{1}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the facts

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{p_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right| & \leq \left| \frac{(1 - \varrho) \frac{r h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i} + \varrho \frac{r}{N} - (1 - \varrho) \frac{r \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - \varrho \frac{r}{N}}{[(1 - \varrho) \frac{r h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i} + \varrho \frac{r}{N}] \wedge 1} \right| \\
& \leq (1 - \varrho) \left| \frac{\frac{\tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}}{\varrho N^{-1}} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \frac{\left| \frac{\tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - \frac{h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i} \right| + \left| \frac{h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i} - \frac{h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i} \right|}{\varrho N^{-1}} \right| \\
& = \frac{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} |\tilde{h}_i - h_i| + \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| (\tilde{h}_i)}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}. \tag{S.42}
\end{aligned}$$

To well exam the distance between \tilde{V}_c and V_c , we will show the following equalities hold:

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N h_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \frac{1}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} = o_P(1), \tag{S.43}$$

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \frac{1}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} = o_P(1). \tag{S.44}$$

Now we begin with showing (S.43). For the sake of clarity, we first consider the case that

\tilde{h}_i^{os} and \tilde{h}_i^{os} are selected as \tilde{h}_i^{MVC} and \tilde{h}_i^{MVC} respectively. According to the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| - |y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \right| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2} \\
& \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N m_1^2(\mathbf{x}_i) \|\tilde{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}\|^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2} = o_P(1), \tag{S.45}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds due to Assumptions 2, 4 by using the holder inequality and the fact that $\|\tilde{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}\| = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1) = o_P(1)$ (see Xiong and Li, 2008, Theorem 3.3). Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i + o_P(1). \tag{S.46}$$

Similarly it also can be shown

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| = o_P(1),$$

by noting that $\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}$ is a consistent estimator of β_t . Thus,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + o_P(1).$$

By the law of large number, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| = E|y_1 - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_1)| \|\mathbf{x}_1\| + o_P(1).$$

Obviously, $E|y_1 - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_1)| \|\mathbf{x}_1\|$ is a positive constant under the model setting. Hence,

$$\left(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i \right)^{-1} = O_P(1). \tag{S.47}$$

Following the facts we have derived in (S.46) and (S.47), it holds that

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| = o_P(1), \quad (\text{S.48})$$

$$\left(\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i \right)^{-1} = O_P(1). \quad (\text{S.49})$$

Combining the results (S.33), (S.48) and (S.49), we have (S.43). Thus it remains to show (S.44). Using the Holder's inequality (S.32), it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| y_i^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| |y_i| |\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| |\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\ \leq & \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^6}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} \right)^{1/3} \\ & + 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i|^3 |\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} \right)^{1/3} \\ & + \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)^6}{N} \right)^{1/3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} \right)^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in order to obtain (S.44), it is sufficient to show the following equalities hold:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3}{N} = o_P(1), \quad (\text{S.50})$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{y_i^6}{N} = O_P(1), \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^9}{N} = O_P(1), \quad \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)^6}{N} = O_P(1), \quad (\text{S.51})$$

since $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i|^3 |\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \leq (N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i|^6)^{1/2} (N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^6)^{1/2}$. From Assumption 2, (S.51) holds due to Markov's inequality. Now we check (S.50). Under Assumption 4, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 & \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N m_1^3(\mathbf{x}_i) \|\tilde{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}\|^3 \\ & = \|\tilde{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}\|^3 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N m_1^3(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ & = o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds due to the fact that $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\| = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(1) = o_P(1)$. The results (S.50) and (S.51) implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} = o_P(1) \quad (\text{S.52})$$

Therefore, (S.44) holds by noting the results in (S.49) and (S.48).

Now let us consider the case that \tilde{h}_i^{os} and \tilde{h}_i^{os} are selected as \tilde{h}_i^{MV} and \tilde{h}_i^{MV} respectively. For brevity, let $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ denote $\Sigma_\psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0)$ and $\Sigma_\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}})$ respectively. From Assumption 3, Lemma S.2, (S.45) in this case turns into

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\| - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\| \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\| + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|(\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}) \mathbf{x}_i\| \\ & \leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1})}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + o_P(1) \\ & = o_P(1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.53})$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality, and the last equality holds due to the same reason as (S.45). Using the similar arguments, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i\| \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1})}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + o_P(1).$$

Hence, $(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i)^{-1} = O_P(1)$. Combing this result with (S.53), it is obviously that (S.48) and (S.49) also hold for this case.

Combing (S.33), (S.48), (S.49), (S.52), and Assumption 3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{p_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1}{\tilde{p}_i^{\text{SOS}} \wedge 1} - 1 \right| \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{N} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} |\tilde{h}_i - \tilde{h}_i| + \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \tilde{h}_i}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \frac{\{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{N} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\tilde{h}_i - \tilde{h}_i| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{N \varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1})}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i \lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}) + \lambda_{\max}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1})}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i \varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_0^T \mathbf{x}_i)| \{y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1})}{\varrho N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}_i} - 1 \right| \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|y_i - \psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}}^T \mathbf{x}_i)|^3 \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3}{N} \\
&= o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by noting that $\lambda_{\max}(\hat{\Sigma}^{-1})$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1})$ are $O_P(1)$.

Combing (S.41), (S.43), and (S.44), it follows that $\|\tilde{V}_c - V_c\|_s = o_P(r^{-1})$. Therefore, the desired results follow by Lemma S.1 and Slutsky's theorem by noting

$$\begin{aligned}
&V^{-1/2} \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} (\tilde{V}_c)^{1/2} \{V^{-1/2} \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} (\tilde{V}_c)^{1/2}\}^T \\
&= V^{-1/2} \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} (\tilde{V}_c) \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V^{-1/2} \\
&= V^{-1/2} \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} (V_c) \Sigma_\psi(\hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}})^{-1} V^{-1/2} + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2}) \\
&= I + o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}(r^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by the definition of V_c . □

S.1.4 Proofs of Theorems 7 and 8

To prove Theorem 7, we first establish some lemmas on the estimator $\tilde{\beta}_j$ which is calculated on a single machine \mathcal{F}_{Nj} . For simplicity, let p_{ji} denote $\tilde{p}_{ji}^{\text{SOS}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, K$, and $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Lemma S.3. *If Assumptions 1 – 4 hold, then conditional on subset \mathcal{F}_{Nj} , as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with probability approaching one, the subsample QLE $\tilde{\beta}_j$ based on subsamples in \mathcal{F}_{Nj} satisfies*

$$\text{pr}(r^\alpha \|\tilde{\beta}_j - \beta_t\| > \Delta) = O(r^{2\alpha-1}) \quad (\text{S.54})$$

for any $\Delta > 0$ and $\alpha \in (1/4, 1/2)$, where β_t is the true value of β .

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $j = 1$. Recall that the estimator $\tilde{\beta}_1$ is the solution of the estimation equation $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{1i} p_{1i}^{-1} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\beta^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} = \mathbf{0}$. From Wedderburn (1974), it is clear to see that, under Assumption 3, $\tilde{\beta}_1$ achieves the minimum of the following quasi-likelihood function:

$$U_S(\beta) := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \int_{y_{1i}}^{\psi(\beta^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})} \frac{t - y_{1i}}{\dot{\psi}(\psi^{-1}(t))} dt, \quad (\text{S.55})$$

with $\partial U_S / \partial \beta = -n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} [y_{1i} - \psi(\beta^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})] \mathbf{x}_{1i}$, where $\psi^{-1}(t)$ denotes the inverse function of $\psi(t)$. Note that $\dot{\psi}(t) > 0$ in our model setting which indicates the existence of $\psi^{-1}(t)$. By Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} U_S(\tilde{\beta}_1) &= U_S(\beta_t) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i}^T (\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t)^T \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \dot{\psi}(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) \mathbf{x}_{1i} \mathbf{x}_{1i}^T \right\} (\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t), \\ &\geq U_S(\beta_t) - \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} [y_{1i} - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})] \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\| \|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\psi, S}(\hat{\beta})) \|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.56})$$

where $\hat{\beta}$ lies between β_t and $\tilde{\beta}_1$ and $\Sigma_{\psi, n}(\hat{\beta}) := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\psi}(\hat{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) \mathbf{x}_{1i} \mathbf{x}_{1i}^T$.

Simple calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\| \|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\| \\ &\geq U_S(\beta_t) - U_S(\tilde{\beta}_1) + 2^{-1} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\psi, S}(\hat{\beta})) \|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\|^2 \\ &\geq 2^{-1} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\psi, S}(\hat{\beta})) \|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.57})$$

by noting $U_S(\tilde{\beta}_1) \leq U_S(\beta_t)$. Thus based on the following event

$$\Xi_{1, \lambda} = \{0.5C_\psi \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\psi, S}(\hat{\beta}))\},$$

it follows that

$$\|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\| \leq \frac{4}{C_\psi} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\beta_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\|,$$

which implies

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_t\|^2 \leq \frac{16}{C_\psi^2} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\|^2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_t\| \geq \Delta, \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happens}) &= E \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_t\| \geq \Delta, \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happens}\}} \\ &\leq E \left\{ \frac{16}{C_\psi^2 \Delta^2} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\|^2 \times \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_t\| \geq \Delta, \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happens}\}} \right\} \\ &\leq E \left\{ \frac{16}{C_\psi^2 \Delta^2} \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.58})$$

To deal with (S.58), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left\{ \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \mathbf{x}_{1i} \right\|^2 \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ E \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{1i}}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} x_{1ik} \right]^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{N1}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 \right) \right\} \\ &= E \left[\sum_{k=1}^d \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_{1i}} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\}^2 x_{1ik}^2 \right] \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^d E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i \neq j} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\} \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1j})\} x_{1ik} x_{1jk} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varrho r} E \left[\sum_{k=1}^d \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{y_{1i} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})\}^2 x_{1ik}^2 \right] \leq \frac{d}{\varrho r} E[\{y_1 - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{11})\}^2 \|\mathbf{x}_{11}\|^2] \\ &\leq \frac{d}{\varrho r} \sqrt{E[\{y_1 - \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_{11})\}^4] E\{\|\mathbf{x}_{11}\|^4\}} \leq \frac{d\mathfrak{C}_1}{\varrho r}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.59})$$

where \mathfrak{C}_1 denotes for some positive constant, the second last inequality is from Holder inequality, and the last inequality comes from Assumption 2.

Combining (S.58) and (S.59), it yields

$$\text{pr}(r^\alpha \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_t\| > \Delta, \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happens}) \leq \frac{16r^{2\alpha-1}d\mathfrak{C}_1}{C_\psi^2 \Delta^2 \varrho}. \quad (\text{S.60})$$

Now we evaluate the probability that $\Xi_{1,\lambda}$ happens.

From (S.39), it holds that $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}}\| = O_P(r^{-1/2})$. And also note $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{QLE}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_t\| = O_P(n^{-1/2})$ under Assumptions 1 – 3 (see Newey and McFadden, 1994, Chapter 36 Theorem

3.1). Thus it is clear to see that $\|\tilde{\beta}_1 - \beta_t\| = O_P(r^{-1/2})$. As $r \rightarrow \infty$, with probability approaching one, we have $E\{E_{\beta}(\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})|\dot{\beta}, \mathcal{F}_{N1})\} \geq E \inf_{\beta \in \Lambda}(\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})|\mathcal{F}_{N1})$ where E_{β} means the expectation is taken with respect to $\dot{\beta}$ conditional on \mathcal{F}_{N1} . Thus from Assumption 3, it holds that $E(\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})) \geq E(E \inf_{\beta \in \Lambda}(\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})|\mathcal{F}_{N1})) \geq C_{\psi}I_d$ for some constant C_{ψ} by taking expectation on both sides of the inequality. Therefore, let $\Xi_{2,\lambda} := \{\lambda_{\max}(E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta}) - \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\dot{\beta})) \leq 0.5C_{\psi}\}$, it holds that $\Xi_{2,\lambda} \subseteq \Xi_{1,\lambda}$ according to the facts that $\lambda_{\min}(E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta}) + \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\dot{\beta}) - E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})) \geq \lambda_{\min}(E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})) + \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\psi,S}(\dot{\beta}) - E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})) = \lambda_{\min}(E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})) - \lambda_{\max}(E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta}) - \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\dot{\beta}))$, where the last equality due to the fact $\lambda_{\min}(A) = -\lambda_{\max}(-A)$. Let $\Xi_{3,\lambda} := \{\|\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta}) - \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\dot{\beta})\|_s \leq 4^{-1}C_{\psi}\}$, and $\Xi_{4,\lambda} := \{\|\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta}) - E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\dot{\beta})\|_s \leq 4^{-1}C_{\psi}\}$. It follows easily that $\Xi_{3,\lambda} \cap \Xi_{4,\lambda} \subseteq \Xi_{2,\lambda}$ which implies $\text{pr}(\Xi_{1,\lambda}^c) \leq \text{pr}(\Xi_{2,\lambda}^c) \leq \text{pr}(\Xi_{3,\lambda}^c) + \text{pr}(\Xi_{4,\lambda}^c)$. Thus, in order to get the desired result, it is sufficient to evaluate the probabilities that $\Xi_{3,\lambda}$ and $\Xi_{4,\lambda}$ happens respectively.

From Assumption 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left\{ \Sigma_{\psi,S}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\}^2 &= E \left[E \left\{ \Sigma_{\psi,S}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{N_1}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^2 \right] \\
&= E \left(E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i(1-p_i)}{p_i^2} \left\{ \frac{\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) x_{1ij_1} x_{1ij_2}}{n} \right\}^2 \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right] \right) \\
&\leq E \left(E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_i} \left\{ \frac{\psi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) \|\mathbf{x}_{1i}\|^2}{n} \right\}^2 \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right] \right) \\
&\leq E \left[E \left(\max_i \frac{1}{np_i} \right) \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\psi^2(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) \|\mathbf{x}_{1i}\|^4}{n} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\} \right] \\
&\leq E \left[\left(\frac{1}{\varrho r} \right) E \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\psi^4(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})}{n}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_{1i}\|^8}{n}} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\} \right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{\varrho r} \right) E \left[\sqrt{E \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\psi^4(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})}{n} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}} \sqrt{E \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_{1i}\|^8}{n} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)} \right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{\varrho r} \right) \left(\sqrt{E \left[E \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\psi^4(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i})}{n} \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\} \right]} \sqrt{E \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_{1i}\|^8}{n}} \right) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\varrho r} \right) \left(\sqrt{E \left[E \left\{ \psi^4(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{11}) \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\} \right]} \sqrt{E \|\mathbf{x}_{11}\|^8} \right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{\varrho r} \right) \left\{ \sqrt{E \left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Lambda} \psi^4(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{11}) \right)} \sqrt{E \|\mathbf{x}_{11}\|^8} \right\} = O(r^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{pr}(\Xi_{3,\lambda}^c) &\leq \text{pr}(\|\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|_F \geq 4^{-1} C_\psi) \\
&\leq \frac{16E \|\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \Sigma_{\psi,S}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|_F^2}{C_\psi^2} = O(r^{-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S.61}$$

where $\|A\|_F^2 := \text{tr}(A^T A)$ denotes the Frobenius norm of matrix A .

Similarly, for $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq p$, let $\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^{j_1 j_2}$ and $E \Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^{j_1 j_2}$ denote for the (j_1, j_2) -th

component of $\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, respectively. From Assumption 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\{ \Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - E\Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\}^2 = E \left[E \left\{ \Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - E\Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \middle| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^2 \right] \\
& = E \left[E \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) x_{1i j_1} x_{1i j_2}}{n} \right)^2 \middle| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\} \right] - E[E\{\Sigma_{\psi,n}^{j_1 j_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \mid \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}^2] \\
& \leq E \left[E \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\dot{\psi}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{x}_{1i}) \|\mathbf{x}_{1i}\|^2}{n} \right)^2 \middle| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{E \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Lambda} \{\psi^4(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{11})\} E\{\|\mathbf{x}_{11}\|^8\}} = O(n^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it can be shown

$$\text{pr}(\Xi_{4,\lambda}^c) \leq \text{pr}(\|\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - E\Sigma_{\psi,n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|_F \geq 4^{-1}C_\Psi) = O(n^{-1}). \quad (\text{S.62})$$

Combining (S.61) and (S.62), it follows

$$\text{pr}(\Xi_{1,\lambda}^c) \leq \text{pr}(\Xi_{2,\lambda}^c) \leq \text{pr}(\Xi_{3,\lambda}^c) + \text{pr}(\Xi_{4,\lambda}^c) = O(r^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{S.63})$$

Therefore, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the desired result holds, with probability approaching one, from the fact

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{pr}(\text{equation (S.60) holds}) = \text{pr}(\text{equation (S.60) holds, } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happens}) \\
& \quad + \text{pr}(\text{equation (S.60) holds, } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ not happens}) \\
& \leq \text{pr}(\text{equation (S.60) holds, } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happens}) + \text{pr}(\Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ not happens}) \\
& = O(r^{2\alpha-1}) + O(r^{-1/2}) \\
& = O(r^{2\alpha-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Recall that $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr}$ denote the estimator obtained from Algorithm 3 and $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ denote the QLE obtained from the pooling subsamples. The difference between $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr}$ and $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma S.4. *If Assumptions 1 – 4 hold, the estimate $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ based on the first step sample exists, $r_0(Kr)^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ and the partition number K satisfies $K = O(r^\eta)$ for some η in $[0, \min(1 -$*

$2\alpha, 4\alpha - 1$) where $\alpha \in (1/4, 1/2)$, then as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$, with probability approaching one, it holds that

$$\sqrt{Kr} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr} - \check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| = o_P(1).$$

Proof. Since $r_0(Kr)^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$, the contribution of the first step subsample to the estimation equation is $o_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}((Kr)^{-1/2})$. Thus we can focus on the second step only. Recall that

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{Kr} := \left(\sum_{j=1}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j, \quad (\text{S.64})$$

and $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is solution of

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) := \sum_{j=1}^K Q_j^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = 0, \quad (\text{S.65})$$

where $Q_j^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})$'s are defined in Algorithm 3.

Under Assumption 3, it is clear that (24) is well defined as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By Taylor expansion,

$$Q_j^*(\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = Q_j^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) + \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)(\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) + R_j^*, \quad (\text{S.66})$$

where R_j^* is the Remainder with the form

$$R_j^* = \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T \right] (\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j),$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) = \text{diag}(\psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(1)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}), \dots, \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(d)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}))$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{(d)}$ lies between $\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j$. Here $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ represents a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(1)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}), \dots, \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(d)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})$.

From Assumption 4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{\partial \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(k)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})}{\partial \beta_k} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T - \frac{\partial \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})}{\partial \beta_k} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T \right\|_s \leq \left\| \psi(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(k)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T - \psi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T \right\|_s \\ & \leq m_2(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(k)} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j\| \leq m_2(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) \|\check{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j\|, \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, d$, where the last inequality is due to the facts that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{(d)}$ lies between

$\check{\beta}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_j$. It follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \tilde{\psi}(\check{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \psi(\tilde{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T \right\|_s \\
& \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \left\| \tilde{\psi}(\check{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T \right\|_s \\
& \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \left\| \tilde{\psi}(\check{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T - \psi(\tilde{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji}) \mathbf{x}_{ji} \mathbf{x}_{ji}^T \right\|_F \\
& = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d \left\| \frac{\partial \psi(\check{\beta}_{(k)}^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})}{\partial \beta_k} \mathbf{x}_{ji} - \frac{\partial \psi(\tilde{\beta}_j^T \mathbf{x}_{ji})}{\partial \beta_k} \mathbf{x}_{ji} \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq n^{-1} \sqrt{d} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} m_2(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_j\|.
\end{aligned}$$

If the following events happens

$$\Xi_{6,m} = \left\{ n^{-1} \sqrt{d} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} m_2(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_j\| \leq 2U \right\}.$$

We have $\|R_j\| \leq 2U \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_j\|$. Using the fact $Q^*(\check{\beta}) = 0$ and $Q_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j) = 0$, it holds that $\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr} = (\sum_{j=1}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^K R_j^*$ by taking the summation on both side of (S.66) and definition of $\tilde{\beta}_{Kr}$. Thus for all $\omega \in \Phi_{N,K,\Delta}$, if $\Xi_{1,\lambda}$ defined in Lemma S.3 and $\Xi_{6,m}$ happen on all machine \mathcal{F}_{N_j} 's ($j = 1, \dots, K$), the following inequalities hold,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| & \leq \left\| \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j) \right)^{-1} \right\|_s \left\| \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K R_j^* \right\| \\
& \leq \frac{4U}{KC_\psi} \sum_{j=1}^K \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_j\| \leq C_1 r^{-2\alpha} \Delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{S.67}$$

where $C_1 := 4U/C_\psi$ and the second last inequality due to the facts $K^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^K \dot{Q}_j^*(\tilde{\beta}_j) \geq 0.5C_\psi I_d$ if $\Xi_{1,\lambda}$ defined in Lemma S.3 happens on all machines, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Define $\Xi_{5,n,j,\Delta} = \{r^\alpha \|\tilde{\beta}_j - \beta_t\| \leq \Delta\}$, $\Xi_{5,N,\Delta} = \{(Kr)^\alpha \|\check{\beta} - \beta_t\| \leq \Delta\}$ and $\Phi_{N,K,\Delta} = \cap_{j=1}^K \Xi_{5,n,j,\Delta} \cap \Xi_{5,N,\Delta}$. Then for any $K = O(r^\eta)$ with $\eta < \min(1 - 2\alpha, 4\alpha - 1)$, we have $\Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \subset \{\sqrt{Kr} \|\tilde{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| \leq \Delta_1\}$ for any $\Delta_1 := C_1 \Delta$, when $\Xi_{1,\lambda}$ happens and r is large enough, since $\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| \leq \sqrt{Kr} r^{-2\alpha} \Delta_1 = O(r^{(1+\eta-4\alpha)/2}) \Delta_1$.

Recall that for $\omega \in \Phi_{N,K,\Delta}$, $\|\tilde{\beta}_j - \beta_t\| \leq r^{-1/2} \Delta$ and $\|\check{\beta} - \beta_t\| \leq (Kr)^{-1/2} \Delta$. Thus

$\|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_j\| \leq r^{-1/2}\Delta + (Kr)^{-1/2}\Delta$. Combine the above results, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{pr}(\Xi_{6,m}^c \cap \Phi_{N,K,\Delta}) = E \mathbb{1}_{\{\Xi_{6,m}^c \text{ and } \Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happen}\}} \\
& \leq (2U)^{-1} E \left\{ \left| n^{-1} \sqrt{d} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} m_2(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_j\| \right| \mathbb{1}_{\Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens}} \right\} \\
& \leq (2U)^{-1} E \left\{ \left(\frac{\Delta}{r^{1/2}} + \frac{\Delta}{(Kr)^{1/2}} \right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_{ji}}{p_{ji}} m_2(\mathbf{x}_{ji}) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens}\}} \right\} \tag{S.68} \\
& \leq (2U)^{-1} \sqrt{d} C_m \left(\frac{\Delta}{r^{1/2}} + \frac{\Delta}{(Kr)^{1/2}} \right) = O(r^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

By (S.67), (S.68) and the results in Lemma S.3, as $r \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\Delta_1 > 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{pr}(\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| > \Delta_1) \\
& = \text{pr}(\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| > \Delta_1, \Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens, } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ and } \Xi_{6,m} \text{ happen on all Machines}) \\
& + \text{pr}(\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| > \Delta_1, \Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens, all } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ happen and some } \Xi_{6,m} \text{ not happen}) \\
& + \text{pr}(\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| > \Delta_1, \Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ not happens or some } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ not happen}) \\
& \leq \text{pr}(\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| > \Delta_1, \Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens, } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ and } \Xi_{6,m} \text{ happen on all Machines}) \\
& + \text{pr}(\Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens, } \Xi_{6,m} \text{ not happen on some of the Machines}) \\
& + \text{pr}(\Phi_{N,K,\Delta}^c) + P(\Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ not happen on some of the Machines}) \\
& \leq \text{pr}(\sqrt{Kr} \|\check{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}_{Kr}\| > \Delta_1, \Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens, } \Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ and } \Xi_{6,m} \text{ happen on all Machines}) \\
& + \text{pr}(\Phi_{N,K,\Delta} \text{ happens, } \Xi_{6,m} \text{ not happen on some of the Machines}) + \text{pr}(\Phi_{N,K,\Delta}^c) \\
& + \text{pr}(\Xi_{1,\lambda} \text{ not happen on some of the Machines}) \\
& = \sqrt{K} O(r^{1/2-2\alpha}) + K O(r^{-1}) + O((Kr)^{2\alpha-1}) + K O(r^{2\alpha-1}) + K O(r^{-1/2}) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we prove Theorem 7.

Proof. From the definition of $\check{\beta}$ in Lemma S.4 and Theorem 3.3 in Xiong and Li (2008), it can be shown that

$$\check{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_{\text{QLE}} = O_{P|\mathcal{F}_N}((Kr)^{-1/2}).$$

Combining this result with Lemma S.4, the desired result holds by fetching $\alpha = 1/3$.

□

Based on Lemma S.4 and Theorem 6, the proof of Theorem 8 is in the following.

Proof. From the definition of $\tilde{\beta}_{Kr}$, we know that $\tilde{\beta}_{Kr} - \check{\beta} = o_P((Kr)^{-1})$, where $\check{\beta}$ is calculated from Algorithm 2 by using the pooling subsamples. Combine this result with Theorem 6, the desired result follows immediately from the Slutsky's Theorem.

□

S.2 Additional Simulation Results

To further evaluate our proposed methods, we consider the following additional cases with a larger $N = 5,000,000$.

Case S1: The true value of β is a $d \times 1$ vector of 0.5 with $d = 7$, and \mathbf{x} follows a multivariate normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0.15}, I_d)$, where I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix.

Case S2: The true value of β is a $d \times 1$ vector of 0.5 with $d = 7$, and \mathbf{x} follows a multivariate normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0.15}, \Sigma)$, where Σ is the $d \times d$ matrix with the (i, j) -th entry being $0.5^{|i-j|}$.

Case S3: The true value of β is a $d \times 1$ vector of 0.5 with $d = 7$, and \mathbf{x} follows a multivariate t distribution with degrees of freedom 9, $\mathbf{x} \sim t_9(\mathbf{0.15}, I_d)/10$, where the I_d is defined in Case S1. For this set up, only part of the Assumptions in Sections 2.2, 3.2 and 4 are satisfied.

Case S4: The true value of β is a $d \times 1$ vector with $d = 35$, whose first ten elements are 0.5, the last five elements are -0.1, and the rest are 0.2. In this case, \mathbf{x} follows a multivariate normal distribution with $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, I_d)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is a 35×1 vector whose first seven elements are 0.15 and rest are zeros.

To be aligned with the the settings described in Section 5 of the main paper, we also demonstrate our methods on Poisson distribution with mean $E(y|\mathbf{x}) = \exp(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})$. It is worth mentioning that in Cases S1, S2, and S4, all the Assumptions 1–4 are fully satisfied. However, in Case S3, the conditions in (iii) and (iv) of Assumption 2 are not satisfied.

Here, we fix $r_0 = 400$ and $\varrho = 0.2$. We choose the sample size r to be 500, 700, 1000, 1200, 1500, 1700 and 2000. Since we will consider a case where the full data QLE cannot be calculated, we use the true value of β to calculate the MSE in this section, i.e., we calculate the MSE from

$$\text{MSE} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\beta_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)} - \beta\|^2,$$

where $\beta_{\mathbf{p}}^{(t)}$ is the estimate from the t -th subsample with subsampling probability \mathbf{p} and β is the true parameter. The results are reported in Figure 7.

In Figure 7, the relative patterns among different methods are similar to Cases 1–4 in the main paper for all the five additional datasets. Furthermore, the results in Case S3 indicate that our methods have higher estimation efficiency than the uniform subsampling method even when some regularity assumptions required in the theoretical investigations are not satisfied.

Now we evaluate the computational efficiency of the subsampling strategies. We implemented all methods using the R programming language and recorded the computing times of the three subsampling strategies (uniform, MV, MVc) using `Sys.time()` function. To simulate the distributed computing environments, we used the `foreach` and `doSNOW` packages in R. Computations were carried out on a desktop computer with Window 10 platform and an Intel I7 processor. Each subsampling strategy was repeated for 50 times. Figure 8 shows the results for the four cases listed above with different r and k , and a fixed $r_0 = 400$. The computing time for using the full data is also given for comparisons.

Figure 8 reveals that the computation time is not very sensitive to the subsample size. All the subsampling algorithms take significantly less computing time compared with the full data QLE. This agrees with the fact that the computational complexity for the full data QLE with Newton-Raphson method is $O(\zeta Nd^2)$ while subsampling methods do not need to perform iterative calculations on the full data. Here ζ stands for the number of iterations in the Newton-Raphson method. In most cases, the MVc method requires significantly less computational time compared with the MV method, especially for the last case. This is because the MV method requires $O(Nd^2 + \zeta rd^2)$ time and the MVc methods requires $O(Nd + \zeta rd^2)$. If $N > \zeta rd$, then these time complexities are $O(Nd^2)$ and $O(Nd)$, for the MV and MVc methods, respectively. The uniform sampling always takes the least




Figure 7: A graph showing the log of MSE with different r and K for different distributions of covariates based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods where $r_0 = 400$ and $\varrho = 0.2$.




Figure 8: A graph showing the computational time (in seconds) with different r and K for different distributions of covariates based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods where $r_0 = 400$ and $\varrho = 0.2$. The black solid line in the picture stands for the computing time for the full sample QLE.

computation time, since it does not involve the computation of the sampling probability. Its time complexities is $O(N + \zeta rd^2)$, which reduces to $O(N)$ if $N > \zeta rd^2$.

To further investigate the case that full data QLE are infeasible to calculate due to limited RAM, we consider the scenario that the data is loaded into the RAM block-by-block. For this, we consider the following Case S5 with $N = 5,000,000$ and $d = 140$. This is also a case with higher dimension.

Case S5: The true value of β is a $d \times 1$ vector with $d = 140$ whose first 35 elements are the same as β in Case S4 and rest are zeros. Here, \mathbf{x} follows a multivariate normal distribution with $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, I_d)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is a 140×1 vector whose first seven elements are 0.15 and rest are zeros.

In this case, we generate and store the full data in five files, with each file about ~ 2.4 GB containing 1,000,000 observations. In this setup, we obtain the pilot estimators for each block independently and combine the five pilot estimators with the five optimal estimators using (24). The results about MSE and computing time are in Figures S3(a) and S3(b), respectively.




Figure 9: A graph showing the log MSE and computational time (in seconds) with different r for Case S5 based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods where $r_0 = 400$ and $\varrho = 0.2$.

From Figure 9, it is clear to see that the relative performance among the three methods are the same as in Figures 7 and 8. In Figure S3(b), the times for loading all data files are also recorded. Note that communication between CPU and hard drive is much slower than communication between CPU and RAM. Thus the computational time in Figure S3(b) are

significantly longer than those observed in Figure 8. We also see that MVc is much faster than MV in this case as the dimension d is larger.

In order to show the trade-off more intuitively between estimation efficiency and computation cost, we plot the log MSEs against the used CPU times for Case S5. The results are presented in Figure 10.




Figure 10: A graph showing the computational time (in seconds) and log MSE with different r for Case S5 based on MV (red circle), MVc (green triangle) and uniform subsampling (blue square) methods where $r_0 = 400$, $K = 5$ and $\varrho = 0.2$.

From Figure 10, the MVc approach produce a smaller MSE compared with the uniform subsampling method with the same CPU time, and this advantage becomes more evident with the increase of the used CPU time. For the MV approach, although it produces a smaller MSE compared with the uniform subsampling method and the MVc approach with the same subsample size, it requires a longer time to achieve the same level of accuracy. Note that this does not mean the MVc approach is always better than the MV approach. For example, if the available memory only allow the analysis of a subsample of size r while the computational time is relatively cheap, then the MV approach may be preferable as it often results in more informative subsamples.

To evaluate the asymptotic normality visually, we create histograms for parameter estimates from the $T = 1000$ repetitions of the simulation. Figure 11 reports the results for parameter β_1 in Case S1 when $r = 2000$. The red curves are the normal density functions

with the same means and standard deviations for the 1000 subsample estimates. From Figure 11, we see that the distribution of the subsampling estimators are very close to normal distributions. The results for other parameters and other cases and thus are omitted.




Figure 11: Empirical distribution of β_1 for Case S1 with $r = 2000$, $r_0 = 400$ and $\varrho = 0.2$ based on MV, MVc and uniform subsampling methods. The red curve is the estimated normal density through the method of moments.

References

- Berger, Y. G. and Torres, O. D. L. r. (2016), ‘Empirical likelihood confidence intervals for complex sampling designs’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **78**, 319–314.
- Breidt, F. J. and Opsomer, J. D. (2000), ‘Local polynomial regression estimators in survey sampling’, *The Annals of Statistics* **28**, 1026–1053.
- Chen, K., Hu, I. and Ying, Z. (1999), ‘Strong consistency of maximum quasi-likelihood estimators in generalized linear models with fixed and adaptive designs’, *The Annals of Statistics* **27**, 1155–1163.
- Chen, X. (2011), *Quasi Likelihood Method for Generalized Linear Model (in Chinese)*, Press of University of Science and Technology of China.
- Dhillon, P. S., Lu, Y., Foster, D. and Ungar, L. (2013), New subsampling algorithms for fast least squares regression, *in* ‘International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems’, pp. 360–368.

- Drineas, P., Mahoney, M. W., Muthukrishnan, S. and Sarlós, T. (2011), ‘Faster least squares approximation’, *Numerische Mathematik* **117**, 219–249.
- Duchi, J. C., Agarwal, A. and Wainwright, M. J. (2012), ‘Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling’, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **57**, 592–606.
- Fahrmeir, L. and Tutz, G. (2001), *Multivariate statistical modelling based on generalized linear models*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Horn, R. A. and Johnson, C. R. (2013), *Matrix Analysis*, 2nd edn, Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, M. I., Lee, J. D. and Yang, Y. (2019), ‘Communication-efficient distributed statistical inference’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114**, 668–681.
- Kleiner, A., Talwalkar, A., Sarkar, P. and Jordan, M. I. (2015), ‘A scalable bootstrap for massive data’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **76**, 795–816.
- Li, R., Lin, D. K. and Li, B. (2013), ‘Statistical inference in massive data sets’, *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry* **29**, 399–409.
- Lin, N. and Xi, R. (2011), ‘Aggregated estimating equation estimation’, *Statistics & Its Interface* **1**, 73–83.
- Ma, P., Mahoney, M. W. and Yu, B. (2015), ‘A statistical perspective on algorithmic leveraging’, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **16**, 861–919.
- Mahoney, M. W. (2012), ‘Randomized algorithms for matrices and data’, *Foundations & Trends in Machine Learning* **3**, 647–672.
- Mccullagh, P. and Nelder, J. A. (1989), *Generalized Linear Models. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability 37*, London, U.K.: Chapman & Hall.
- Neath, A. A. and Cavanaugh, J. E. (2012), ‘The bayesian information criterion: background, derivation, and applications’, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics* **4**, 199–203.

- Newey, W. K. and McFadden, D. (1994), Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing, Vol. 4 of *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, pp. 2111 – 2245.
- Pukelsheim, F. (2006), *Optimal design of experiments*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Quiroz, M., Kohn, R., Villani, M. and Tran, M.-N. (2019), ‘Speeding up MCMC by efficient data subsampling’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114**, 831–843.
- R Core Team (2018), *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rao, C. R., Toutenburg, H., Shalabh and Heumann, C. (2007), *Linear Models and Generalizations: Least Squares and Alternatives*, 3rd edn, Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated.
- Särndal, C. E., Swensson, B. and Wretman, J. (1992), *Model assisted survey sampling.*, Springer, New York.
- Schifano, E. D., Wu, J., Wang, C., Yan, J. and Chen, M.-H. (2016), ‘Online updating of statistical inference in the big data setting’, *Technometrics* **58**, 393–403.
- Schilling, R. L. (2017), *Measures, integrals and martingales*, Cambridge University Press.
- Tang, J., Zhang, J., Yao, L., Li, J., Zhang, L. and Su, Z. (2008), Arnetminer: Extraction and mining of academic social networks, *in* ‘KDD’08’, pp. 990–998.
- Tzavelas, G. (1998), ‘A note on the uniqueness of the quasi-likelihood estimator’, *Statistics & Probability Letters* **38**, 125 – 130.
- van der Vaart, A. (1998), *Asymptotic statistics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, H. Y., Yang, M. and Stufken, J. (2019), ‘Information-based optimal subdata selection for big data linear regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114**, 393–405.

- Wang, H., Zhu, R. and Ma, P. (2018), ‘Optimal subsampling for large sample logistic regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**, 829–844.
- Wedderburn, R. W. M. (1974), ‘Quasi-likelihood functions, generalized linear models, and the gauss-newton method’, *Biometrika* **61**, 439–447.
- Xiong, S. and Li, G. (2008), ‘Some results on the convergence of conditional distributions’, *Statistics & Probability Letters* **78**, 3249–3253.