
A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING SELECTION BIAS IN REAL-WORLD HEALTHCARE DATA

Ritoban Kundu

PhD Student
Department of Biostatistics
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA.
kundur@umich.edu

Xu Shi

Assistant Professor
Department of Biostatistics
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA.
shixu@umich.edu

Jean Morrison

Assistant Professor
Department of Biostatistics
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA.
jvmorr@umich.edu

Jessica Barrett

MRC Investigator
Biostatistics Unit, Medical Research Council
University of Cambridge, UK.
jessica.barrett@mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk

Bhramar Mukherjee

Professor
Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA.
bhramar@umich.edu

August 21, 2023

Abstract

Using administrative patient-care data such as Electronic Health Records (EHR) and medical/ pharmaceutical claims for population-based scientific research has become increasingly common. With vast sample sizes leading to very small standard errors, researchers need to pay more attention to potential biases in the estimates of association parameters of interest, specifically to biases that do not diminish with increasing sample size. Of these multiple sources of biases, in this paper, we focus on understanding selection bias. We present an analytic framework using directed acyclic graphs for guiding applied researchers to dissect how different sources of selection bias may affect estimates of the association between a binary outcome and an exposure (continuous or categorical) of interest. We consider four easy-to-implement weighting approaches to reduce selection bias with accompanying variance formulae. We demonstrate through a simulation study when they can rescue us in practice with analysis of real world data. We compare these methods using a data example where our goal is to estimate the well-known association of cancer and biological sex, using EHR from a longitudinal biorepository at the University of Michigan Healthcare system. We provide annotated R codes to implement these weighted methods with associated inference.

Keywords: calibration, directed acyclic graphs, inverse probability weighting, non-probability sample, Michigan Genomics Initiative, post-stratification.

1 Introduction

Massive amounts of data are routinely collected in health care clinics for administrative and billing purposes. Longitudinally varying time-stamped observational patient care data such as electronic health records (EHRs) allow researchers from various disciplines to run agnostic queries (Denny et al., 2013; Hoffmann et al., 2017) or validate hypothesis driven questions in large databases (Roberts et al., 2022; Shen et al., 2022). However these observational

studies pose several practical challenges for health research which can negatively impact internal validity and external generalizability of the results (Beesley et al., 2020a). Without properly accounting for potential sources of biases and study design issues, association analysis using these data can result in spurious findings (Madigan et al., 2014) and misguided policies (Wang and Wright, 2020). One major challenge in removing or reducing bias in these studies lies in the fact that there can be several potential causes of bias that may be simultaneously at play in an analysis done with a given real world dataset. With larger datasets at researchers' fingertips, the impact of bias relative to variance becomes even more pronounced. This phenomenon has recently been termed as the "curse of large n" (Kaplan et al., 2014; Bradley et al., 2021). The common sources of biases related to EHR studies do not disappear with increased sample size and thus with increased precision comes the increased possibility of achieving incorrect inference. This is also termed as the "big data paradox" (Meng et al., 2018). In studies with large n, bias often dominates the mean squared error of an estimator and thus we need to update our statistical thinking to focus on strategies for reducing bias as opposed to the classical thinking around reducing variance.

Given a scientific question and access to a potentially large and messy database, we first need to define a target population of inference. A careful investigator then needs to think about the possible sources of bias that are most critical for the underlying question at hand. Selection bias, missing data, clinically informative patient encounter process, confounding, lack of consistent data harmonization across cohorts, true heterogeneity of the studied populations, registration of start time or definition of time zero, and misclassification bias due to imperfect phenotyping are some of the most common sources of bias in EHR. An overview of the different kinds of biases mentioned above with relevant references are given in Table 1.

In this paper, we focus on understanding and tackling one major source of bias, namely selection bias in administrative healthcare data. The selection mechanism underlying the question "Who is in my study sample?" may vary widely across the different sources of real-world data. For example, in using EHRs in the United States, where there is no universal healthcare or nationally integrated clinical data warehouse, one challenge is understanding factors that influence selection into a given study such as health care seeking behavior and insurance coverage (Haneuse and Daniels, 2016; Rexhepi et al., 2021; Heintzman et al., 2015; Heart et al., 2017). Population-based biobanks such as the UK Biobank that are based on invitation to volunteers can lead to specific types of biases such as healthy control bias (Fry et al., 2017; van Alten et al., 2022). Nationally representative studies such as the NIH All of Us often have a purposeful sampling strategy that leads to, say, oversampling certain underrepresented subgroups (All Of Us Research Programs Investigators, 2019). In contrast, medical center and health system based studies attempt to recruit patients meeting specific criteria within the health system, often through multiple disease/treatment clinics. This leads to enrichment of certain diseases in the study sample (Zawistowski et al., 2021; Pendergrass et al., 2011). In addition, there is non-response and consenting bias among those who are approached to participate in the study. Since the process of selection into each study is unique and often unknown, conventional survey sampling techniques to handle probability samples with known sampling/survey weights are not generally applicable for such type of observational data which can be predominantly considered as non probability samples (samples where selection probabilities are unknown) (Beesley and Mukherjee, 2022b; Chen et al., 2020).

If the issue of selection bias is ignored, it can negatively impact downstream inference (Kleinbaum et al., 1981; Christensen et al., 1992). Due to unknown selection weights, naive inference from these non probability samples is generally not directly transportable to the target population. On the other hand, it is important to know when the selection process can be ignored and we can proceed with straightforward naive analysis. A structural framework to study selection bias using Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAG) was introduced in Hernán et al. (2004). We use this approach to study some common scenarios of selection mechanisms and their effects on estimates of association between a binary disease outcome and an exposure of interest (after adjusting for a set of confounders/covariates) specifically for real world data. We consider a logistic regression model as the underlying disease outcome model.

After dissecting the selection mechanism to the best of our ability, we need to think about methods that are available to address/account for selection bias. Some of these methods rely on having individual level data from an external probability-sample. Chen et al. (2020), Wang and Kim (2021) adopted the method of pseudolikelihood based estimating equations to account for selection bias in estimating population mean of a response variable in non probability samples using individual level data from an external probability sample. On the other hand, beta regression generalized linear model (glm) (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004) was used to estimate selection probabilities in Elliot (2009) and Beesley and Mukherjee (2022b). When only summary level information are available on an external probability sample, some methods in survey sampling, such as post stratification, raking and calibration techniques as in Kim and Park (2010); Deville and Särndal (1992); Montanari and Ranalli (2005) can be modified to reduce selection bias in non probability

samples (Beesley and Mukherjee, 2022b,a). We consider simulation settings reflecting common selection mechanisms represented by the DAGs and assess the bias-reduction properties of four of these weighting methods using the general framework of inverse-probability weighted (IPW) logistic regression. The methods differ in how the weights are constructed and what type of external data are required. We also present variance formulae associated with each weighting method.

Using EHR data from a longitudinal biorepository at the University of Michigan Healthcare system, the Michigan Genomics Initiative (MGI) and auxiliary data from a nationally representative probability sample study to define the selection weights, we illustrate how and when the weighted methods enable us to get closer to the truth compared to naive unweighted logistic regression.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2.1, we describe the study setting and four common types of selection DAGs. The expected extent of biases under different selection DAGs in a logistic regression outcome-exposure association model is studied using an analytical expression that relates the parameters of the true association model in overall population to the model restricted to the selected sub-population (without any adjustment for selection). Four variants of weighted logistic regression methods with individual or summary level external data (targeted to reduce selection bias in association parameters of interest) are described in sections 2.3- 2.5. We also present variance formulae for each method in section 2.6. In section 3, we conduct a simulation study comparing the four methods under different selection DAGs. In section 4, we estimate the association between cancer and biological sex in the Michigan Genomics Initiative Data using the four IPW methods discussed in the previous sections with associated confidence intervals. We conclude with a brief discussion in section 5.

2 Methods

2.1 Notation

Our main focus is on the relationship between a binary disease indicator D and a set of covariates \mathbf{Z} in a target population from which the internal non-probability sample is drawn. Selection is denoted by a binary indicator $S = 1$ which is assumed to be driven by a set of covariates and may also depend on D . Figure 1 summarizes the structures of the disease and selection models. \mathbf{Z}_1 is the subset of \mathbf{Z} present only in the disease model, \mathbf{Z}_2 influences the disease indicator D and may influence the selection indicator S . While \mathbf{W} denotes covariates present only in the selection model. The primary disease model of interest is :

$$\text{logit}(P(D = 1|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)) = \theta_0 + \boldsymbol{\theta}_1\mathbf{Z}_1 + \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\mathbf{Z}_2. \quad (1)$$

Selection into the internal sample is driven by a probability mechanism $P(S = 1|\mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W}, D)$ which is allowed to be completely nonparametric.

Our desired target is $D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$ as in equation (1). However, we can only fit $D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1$. As derived in Supplementary section S1.1, if equation (1) holds one can relate the true model parameters and the ones for naively fitted model (conditional on $S = 1$) by the following key relationship:

$$\text{logit}(P(D = 1|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1)) = \theta_0 + \boldsymbol{\theta}_1\mathbf{Z}_1 + \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\mathbf{Z}_2 + \log(r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)). \quad (2)$$

where

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}.$$

describes how disease predictors $\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$ modify the selection mechanism. Unless $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a constant function of $\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$ (like in a population-based case-control study), estimates obtained from the naive unweighted logistic regression model of D on \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 based on just the internal data lead to biased estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2$, or both. A common example of such predictor outcome-dependent selection bias is case control studies where factors like education could influence the likelihood of volunteering as controls (Geneletti et al., 2009; Kleinbaum et al., 1981).

2.2 Selection DAGs

We study the extent of bias introduced by the additional term $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ in equation (2) when we use naive logistic regression on the selected sample, namely $D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1$. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) &= \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)} \\ &= \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We study the bias in the naive approach under some plausible DAGs with increasing levels of complexity in dependencies among $D, S, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$ and \mathbf{W} . We simplify the expression of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ in equation (3) under the different DAGs introduced in Figure 2.

Example DAG 1: unbiased case

Under DAG 1 in Figure 2 the arrows from $(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ to (\mathbf{W}, S) do not exist. In addition, D does not directly affect \mathbf{W} . This implies, none of the disease model predictors \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 affect the selection mechanism; As shown in Supplementary Section S1.2.1, the expression of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ in equation (3) simplifies to a constant denoted by r :

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = r = \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1)}{P(S = 1|D = 0)}.$$

In this case, estimates obtained from an unweighted logistic regression of D on \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 in the selected sample (conditional on $S = 1$) are unbiased for θ_1 and θ_2 even without adjusting for any selection bias. However, the intercept term estimate is biased for θ_0 with the bias being the offset term $\log(r)$. This is equivalent to the results that are well-known for a case-control study (Cornfield et al., 1959).

Example DAG 2: $\mathbf{Z}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ arrow induced bias for coefficient of \mathbf{Z}_1

Under DAG 2 in Figure 2 we observe that there is an additional direct dependence from \mathbf{Z}_1 to \mathbf{W} compared to DAG 1. As shown in Supplementary Section S1.2.2, the expression for $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ under this scenario reduces to,

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}.$$

With the introduction of additional arrow between \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{W} , the function $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ depends on \mathbf{Z}_1 through $P(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)$ but does not depend on \mathbf{Z}_2 . Consequently estimates from a naive logistic regression of $D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1$ leads to biased estimates of θ_1 but not of θ_2 . Similarly if $\mathbf{Z}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ is present and $\mathbf{Z}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ is absent, then using identical arguments, we obtain unbiased estimates for θ_1 and biased for θ_2 .

Example DAG 3: $\mathbf{Z}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_2 \rightarrow S$ induced bias for coefficients of \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2

Under DAG 3 in Figure 2, \mathbf{Z}_2 has a direct causal pathway to S which leads to increase in the strength of dependence between the selection and disease models when compared to DAG 2. As shown in Supplementary section S1.2.3, the expression for $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ in this case is,

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}.$$

Therefore, $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a function of both \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 . The dependence on \mathbf{Z}_1 is through $P(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)$. The dependence on \mathbf{Z}_2 is through $P(S|D, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)$. The naive unweighted logistic regression method fails to provide unbiased estimates of both θ_1 and θ_2 . In case where $\mathbf{Z}_2 \rightarrow S$ exists but there is no arrow $\mathbf{Z}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ then estimates for θ_2 will be biased and unbiased for θ_1 .

Example DAG 4: strong dependence, increased bias for coefficients of \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2

DAG 4 in Figure 2 corresponds to a situation where the dependence between the selection and disease model is the most complex among the four selection DAGs we considered. As shown in Supplementary section S1.2.4, the expression for

$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ in this case is given by,

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, D = 1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, D = 0)}.$$

Here, $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ depends on \mathbf{Z}_2 via $P(S|D, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ and $P(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, D)$. Consequently, the estimated coefficient of \mathbf{Z}_2 from a naive unweighted logistic regression of $D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1$ potentially becomes more biased for θ_2 compared to the other DAGs conditioned on the fact that the strength of associations among the variables remain same across the different DAGs. However, the dependence of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ on \mathbf{Z}_1 is only through $P(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, D)$ potentially leading to less bias in estimate of θ_1 compared to estimate of θ_2 .

Remark: The issue of correcting for selection bias becomes more challenging in our setting due to the joint dependence of S on both the disease indicator D and other covariates $(\mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})$. If in fact there was no arrow $D \rightarrow S$, then conditioned on $(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$, all paths between D and S are blocked leading to d-separation of D and S in DAGs 1, 2 and 3, implying $D \perp\!\!\!\perp S | (\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$. This also implies $P(D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1) = P(D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$. Thus, estimates from fitting the naive unweighted model in equation (2) are consistent for the true parameters, θ_1 and θ_2 . On the other hand for DAG 4, the estimates are biased since conditioned on $(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ the path $D \rightarrow \mathbf{W} \rightarrow S$ is still unblocked.

Now that we have established that fitting a model on the selected sample namely, $D|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, S = 1$ can generally (for example in DAGs 2, 3 and 4) lead to biased estimates of the true model parameters θ_1 and θ_2 in the target population, we consider four easy-to-use weighted logistic regression methods that address selection bias. The methods differ in terms of their construction of weights and the type of external data required.

2.3 Weighted Logistic Regression

In this section, we use the following notation. We assume that we have an internal nonprobability sample with selection indicator S and an external probability sample with selection indicator S_{ext} drawn from the same target population. Figure 3 is a schematic representation of the assumed scenario. The internal and external samples may or may not have overlap ($S_{\text{both}} = 1$ or 0 respectively as in Figure 3).

Inverse probability weighted (IPW) regression is a potential remedy to adjust for selection bias and obtain less biased estimates of parameters in the disease model (Beesley and Mukherjee, 2022b; Haneuse and Daniels, 2016). Let N be the size of the target population. Let $\mathbf{X} = (D, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})$ denote the selection model covariates and $\pi(\mathbf{X}) = P(S = 1|\mathbf{X})$ denote probability of selection into internal sample. Therefore the size of the internal non-probability sample is given by $\sum_{i=1}^N S_i$. Let $\mathbf{Z} = (1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ denotes the disease model covariates in equation (1) with parameters denoted by θ . Thus $\dim(\theta) = \dim(\mathbf{Z}_1) + \dim(\mathbf{Z}_2) + 1$. In IPW logistic regression, the estimating equations are given by

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (4)$$

where i corresponds to the i^{th} individual in the target population. The consistency of the estimate $\hat{\theta}$ obtained as a solution to equation (4) is presented in Supplementary Section S1.3.

For non probability samples, the selection probability of individual i , given by $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)$ is unknown. Since there is no information available on participants who are not selected into the internal study ($S = 0$), the estimation of $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ requires some form of external information. Auxiliary external data are typically available in two forms, either individual level data or summary level statistics. Moreover, since the external sample is a probability sample drawn from the target population, we assume that we have access to the known sampling probabilities, say π_{ext} .

In Sections 2.4 and 2.5, we describe four methods to estimate the selection probabilities $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ depending on the nature of available external information. All four methods adopt a two step process: the first step involves obtaining estimates of the selection probabilities, $\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{X})$; the second step is estimation of disease model parameters θ using the weighted score equation (4) with $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ replaced by $\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{X})$. A summary of all the methods including the unweighted and the four weighted ones are given in Table 2.

2.4 Estimation of Weights Using Individual Level External Data

In this subsection, we consider two methods to account for selection bias in the internal sample using individual level data from an external probability sample. The first one is adaptation of a pseudolikelihood based estimating equation approach originally proposed in [Chen et al. \(2020\)](#) for estimation of population mean of a response variable. We modified this technique to our context. The second one is based on simplex regression method ([Barndorff-Nielsen and Jørgensen, 1991](#)), as an improvement over beta regression that has been previously used in this problem ([Elliot, 2009](#); [Beesley and Mukherjee, 2022b](#)).

2.4.1 Pseudolikelihood-based estimating equation (PL)

The selection indicator variable into the internal sample for the i^{th} individual in the population, $S_i|\mathbf{X}_i$ is a bernoulli random variable with success probability $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)$. In this method, we assume a parametric model for $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ indexed by parameters α , specified by $\pi(\mathbf{X}) = \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha) = \frac{e^{\alpha' \mathbf{X}}}{1 + e^{\alpha' \mathbf{X}}}$.

The likelihood function of $S_i|\mathbf{X}_i \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\{S\}_{i=1}^N, \{\mathbf{X}\}_{i=1}^N) = \prod_{i=1}^N \{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)\}^{S_i} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)\}^{1-S_i}. \quad (5)$$

Equivalently, the log likelihood is

$$l(\alpha|\{S\}_{i=1}^N, \{\mathbf{X}\}_{i=1}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \log \left\{ \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)}{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)} \right\} + \sum_{i=1}^N \log \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)\}. \quad (6)$$

The first term of the above equation only involves values of \mathbf{X} from the internal non-probability sample. Ideally, the selection parameters α would have been obtained by maximizing the above log likelihood in equation (6), however the second part of the log likelihood $\sum_{i=1}^N \log(1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha))$ cannot be calculated solely based on the available data from the internal sample. This term require the values of \mathbf{X} from $S = 0$ sample. [Chen et al. \(2020\)](#) provide an approximation to the log likelihood using the following expression,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \log \left\{ \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)}{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)} \right\} + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\left(\frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext},i}} \right) \log \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)\} \right]. \quad (7)$$

Since the exact sampling weights of the external probability sample are known, the second term of equation (7) is an unbiased estimator of the second term in equation (6). Using the logistic form of the internal selection model $\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)$ and differentiating equation (7) with respect to α , we obtain the following estimating equation

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext},i}} \right) \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{0}. \quad (8)$$

Newton-Raphson method is used to estimate α from the above equation. We obtain the estimates of internal selection probabilities, $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)$ by plugging the estimates of α in the logistic functional form of the selection model.

2.4.2 Simplex Regression (SR)

The main idea underlying this method is based on the identity

$$\pi(\mathbf{X}) = P(S = 1|\mathbf{X}) = P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X}) \cdot \left(\frac{p_{11}(\mathbf{X}) + p_{10}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{11}(\mathbf{X}) + p_{01}(\mathbf{X})} \right). \quad (9)$$

where, $p_{jk}(\mathbf{X}) = P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k|\mathbf{X}, S = 1 \text{ or } S_{\text{ext}} = 1)$. The proof of this above identity (9), is provided in Supplementary Section S1.5. From equation (9), we observe that we need to estimate $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X})$ and $p_{11}(\mathbf{X}), p_{10}(\mathbf{X}), p_{01}(\mathbf{X})$ for each internal sample individual to calculate the internal selection probabilities $\pi(\mathbf{X})$. We adopt two separate regression frameworks to model the dependencies of $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X})$ and $p_{jk}(\mathbf{X})$ on \mathbf{X} respectively.

Estimation of $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X})$: We used simplex regression ([Barndorff-Nielsen and Jørgensen, 1991](#)) to model dependence of $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X})$ on \mathbf{X} . Simplex regression is one of the glm regression methods with proportions as the

response. The main idea is to fit the best possible model in the external sample to the known design probabilities π_{ext} as a function \mathbf{X} , say, $\text{logit}(\mathbb{E}(\pi_{\text{ext}}|\mathbf{X})) = \boldsymbol{\delta}'\mathbf{X}$. The parameter $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is estimated by maximizing the following likelihood function based on the external probability sample obtained using the simplex distribution

$$\prod_{i=1}^N S_{\text{ext},i} \cdot [2\pi\sigma^2\{\pi_{\text{ext},i}(1 - \pi_{\text{ext},i})\}^3]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}d(\pi_{\text{ext},i}, \mathbb{E}(\pi_{\text{ext},i}|\mathbf{X}_i))}. \quad (10)$$

with the unit deviance function,

$$d(\pi_{\text{ext},i}, \mathbb{E}(\pi_{\text{ext},i}|\mathbf{X}_i)) = \frac{(\pi_{\text{ext},i} - \mathbb{E}(\pi_{\text{ext},i}|\mathbf{X}_i))^2}{\pi_{\text{ext},i}(1 - \pi_{\text{ext},i})\mathbb{E}(\pi_{\text{ext},i}|\mathbf{X}_i)^2(1 - \mathbb{E}(\pi_{\text{ext},i}|\mathbf{X}_i))^2}.$$

In R, the `simplexreg` package (Zhang et al., 2016) provides estimates of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ by maximizing the likelihood in (10). $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X})$ for individuals in the internal non-probability sample are then estimated by the plug-in estimate $(\exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathbf{X})/1 + \exp(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'\mathbf{X}))$.

Estimation of $p_{jk}(\mathbf{X})$: On the other hand, $p_{jk}(\mathbf{X})$ is estimated based on the combined data (external union internal) sample. We define a nominal categorical variable with three levels corresponding to different values of (j, k) pairs $((j, k) = (1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1))$. An individual with level (1,1) is a member of both samples; (0,1) indicates a member of the exterior sample only, whereas (1,0) corresponds to the internal sample only. The multicategory response is again regressed on the internal selection model variables, \mathbf{X} using a multinomial regression model and we obtain estimates of $p_{jk}(\mathbf{X})$.

Using the estimates of $p_{jk}(\mathbf{X})$ from multinomial regression and $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|\mathbf{X})$ from simplex regression respectively, the selection probabilities for the internal sample, $P(S = 1|\mathbf{X})$, were estimated from equation (9) which serves as $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ in equation (4).

2.5 Estimation of Weights Using Summary Level Statistics

In this section, we discuss two methods to account for selection bias using summary level information that correspond to the target population. These summary information may be obtained directly from the target population (such as from census data) or from summary data that has been made available by applying known survey design weights to an external sample drawn from the target population. We consider two types of summary level statistics namely, joint and marginal probabilities of $\mathbf{X} = (D, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})$. Similar to Beesley and Mukherjee (2022b), we adopt post-stratification methods (Holt and Smith, 1979) when joint probabilities of the selection variables \mathbf{X} are available to us. On the other hand when only marginal probabilities are available, we modify the calibration method used in Wu (2003) originally proposed for obtaining modified sampling probabilities from survey data.

2.5.1 Poststratification (PS)

We assume the joint distribution of the selection variables in the target population, namely $P(\mathbf{X})$ are available to us. In case of continuous selection variables, we can at best expect to have access to joint probabilities of discretized versions of those variables. Beyond this coarsening, obtaining joint probabilities of a large multivariate set of predictors become extremely challenging. In such cases, several conditional independence assumptions will be needed to specify a joint distribution from sub-conditionals.

We consider the scenario where both \mathbf{Z}_2 and \mathbf{W} are continuous variables. Let \mathbf{Z}'_2 and \mathbf{W}' be the discretized versions of \mathbf{Z}_2 and \mathbf{W} respectively. We assume that the joint distributions for $\mathbf{X}' = (D, \mathbf{Z}'_2, \mathbf{W}')$ in the target population are available from external sources. The post stratification method estimates the selection weights (inverse of selection probabilities into the internal sample) for the i^{th} individual belonging to the internal sample by,

$$w_i \propto \frac{P(\mathbf{X}'_i)}{P(\mathbf{X}'_i|S_i = 1)}.$$

The numerator of the above expression is the known population level joint distribution for the discretized selection variables \mathbf{X}'_i obtained from external sources. On the other hand, the denominator, is the same probability empirically estimated from the internal sample. The inverses of the weights, w_i are normalized to obtain estimates of $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)$ in equation (4).

2.5.2 Calibration (CL)

Calibration methods are often used in survey sampling to obtain corrected sampling weights in probability samples (Wu, 2003). We borrowed this idea to estimate internal selection probabilities $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ by a model, $\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ indexed by parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, when marginal population means of the selection variables \mathbf{X} are available from external sources. Using target population size N and the given marginal population means of the selection variables \mathbf{X} , we derive the population totals, namely $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i$. We obtain the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ by solving the following calibration equation,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha})} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i. \quad (11)$$

In this approach, we match the sum of each selection variable in the internal sample (as estimated by inverse probability weighted sum on the LHS in equation (11)) with the available total from the target population (RHS of equation (11)), analogous to the method of estimation by first moment matching. Similar to Section 2.4.1, Newton-Raphson method is used to solve equation (11) to estimate $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and henceforth obtain $\hat{\pi}(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ for each individual in the internal sample. We used a logistic specification of $\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ in our numerical work, but any selection model consistent for $\pi(\mathbf{X})$ will lead to consistent estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ in equation (4).

2.6 Asymptotic Distribution and Variance Estimation

We study the asymptotic distribution of the IPW estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ under each of the four weighting methods. We consider infinite population inference with population size N going to infinity. We assume that all the variables, including S , S_{ext} , \mathbf{Z}_1 and $\mathbf{X} = (D, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})$ are random. This asymptotic setting is intrinsically different than finite population asymptotics, often followed in the survey literature where all the variables other than the selection indicators are considered to be non-random. This asymptotic analysis allows us to derive consistent estimators of the variance of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ to be used in subsequent inference.

PL: For PL, we derive the consistency, asymptotic normality and asymptotic variance estimator of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ in Supplementary Section S1.4. The two-step variance estimation procedure incorporates uncertainty associated with estimates of the selection model parameter $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ that are obtained by solving equation (8).

SR: For SR, due to composite nature of the selection model, we use an approximation of the variance ignoring uncertainty in the estimates of the selection model parameters. The details of this approach are provided in Supplementary Section S1.3.

PS: For PS, the weights are known from summary statistics of the target population and the variance formula is provided in Supplementary Section S1.3.

CL: Similar to PL, for CL we considered the uncertainty associated with estimates of the selection model parameter $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ that are obtained by solving equation (11) while deriving the estimated asymptotic variance of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Supplementary Section S1.6 contains the details.

We compared the average of the variance estimators proposed above across simulated datasets with the empirical Monte Carlo variances of the obtained parameter estimates. In particular, we quantify the potential inconsistency of our variance estimator for the SR method due to omission or ignorance of the uncertainty associated with estimation of the parameters of the selection model.

3 Simulation Study

In this section, we present three simulation scenarios for each of the four DAGs introduced in Figure 2. The three setups differed in the assumption of the functional form of the selection model of the internal sample, namely $\pi(\mathbf{X})$. For all three setups we consider the following generative distributions

- Disease model covariates \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 : The joint distribution of (Z_1, Z_2) is specified as,

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_1 \\ Z_2 \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2 \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

- Disease outcome D : D is simulated from the conditional distribution specified by,

$$D|Z_1, Z_2 \sim \text{Ber} \left(\frac{e^{\theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2}}{1 + e^{\theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2}} \right).$$

where, $\theta_0 = -2$, $\theta_1 = 0.5$ and $\theta_2 = 0.5$.

- Selection model covariate W : W is an univariate random variable simulated from the conditional distribution of $W|Z_1, Z_2, D$, specified by,

$$W|Z_1, Z_2, D \sim \mathcal{N}(\gamma_1 \cdot D + \gamma_2 \cdot Z_1 + \gamma_3 \cdot Z_2, 1).$$

to incorporate the dependencies of W on D , Z_1 and Z_2 respectively. We set $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) = (0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)$ for the four DAGs respectively.

- The internal sample selection models for the three setups are specified as follows.

- **Setup 1:** We set target population size to $N = 50,000$. The functional form of the selection model is given by,

$$\text{logit}(P(S = 1|Z_2, W, D)) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot Z_2 + \alpha_2 \cdot W + \alpha_3 \cdot D. \quad (12)$$

We set $\alpha_0 = -0.8$, $\alpha_1 = 0$ for DAGs 1 and 2 and $\alpha_1 = 0.7$ for DAGs 3 and 4, $\alpha_2 = 0.3$, $\alpha_3 = 1$.

- **Setup 2:** The internal selection model in Setup 1 is perturbed by a constant multiplication given by,

$$P(S = 1|Z_2, W, D) = 0.4 \cdot \left(\frac{e^{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot Z_2 + \alpha_2 \cdot W + \alpha_3 \cdot D}}{1 + e^{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot Z_2 + \alpha_2 \cdot W + \alpha_3 \cdot D}} \right).$$

We set the exact same values for $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ as in Setup 1. This perturbation of the selection model leads to a misspecification issue for pseudolikelihood and calibration methods, when we fit the two methods using a logistic form. In order to ensure comparable sample size of internal data for both the simulation scenarios, we increased the target population size to 125,000 which is 2.5 times the previous population size, 50000.

- **Setup 3:** In this setup, we incorporate interaction terms of (D, Z_2) and (D, W) in the selection model. The new selection model is given by,

$$\text{logit}(P(S = 1|Z_2, W, D)) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Z_2 + \alpha_2 W + \alpha_3 D + \alpha_4 D Z_2 + \alpha_5 D W.$$

The values of $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ are identical to Setup 1. We set $(\alpha_4, \alpha_5) = (0, 0.4)$ for DAGs 1 and 2 and $(0.5, 0.4)$ for DAGs 3 and 4. Therefore this setup leads to a misspecification issue in pseudolikelihood, simplex regression and calibration methods when we fit these models without considering the interaction terms.

- **External Selection Model:** For external data, the selection model can take any functional form and the selection probabilities are known to us. In our case, we assumed that the functional form of the external selection model is given by,

$$\text{logit}(P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|Z_2, W, D)) = \nu_0 + \nu_1 \cdot Z_2 + \nu_2 \cdot W + \nu_3 \cdot D.$$

The values of $(\nu_0, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3)$ are given by $(-0.6, 1.2, 0.4, 0.5)$. The probabilities $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1|Z_2, W, D)$ from the above equation were multiplied by a factor of 0.75.

For the PS method, the joint distribution of (D, Z'_2, W') are available from external sources, where both Z'_2 and W' are the coarsened versions of Z_2 and W . The criteria that we used to discretize these variables in the simulations is described in Supplementary Section S1.7. All simulation results are summarized over 1000 replications.

Evaluation Metrics for Comparing Methods

In all the simulation setups, we compared the bias, relative bias and relative mean squared error (RMSE) relative to the unweighted method for both θ_1 and θ_2 across the four different weighted methods introduced in the previous section. The bias and relative bias % in estimation for a parameter θ using $\hat{\theta}$ are given by,

$$\text{Bias}(\theta, \hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R (\hat{\theta}_r - \theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Relative Bias \%}(\theta, \hat{\theta}) = \frac{|\text{Bias}(\theta, \hat{\theta})|}{|\theta|} * 100.$$

where, $\hat{\theta}_r$ is the estimate of θ in the r^{th} simulated dataset, $r = 1, 2, \dots, R$ and $R = 1000$.

RMSE of $\hat{\theta}$ with respect to the unweighted estimator $\hat{\theta}_{\text{naive}}$ is defined as the ratio of the two MSEs given by,

$$\text{RMSE}(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\text{naive}}) = \frac{\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R (\hat{\theta}_r - \theta)^2}{\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R (\hat{\theta}_{\text{naive},r} - \theta)^2}.$$

3.1 Results from the Simulation Study

3.1.1 Example DAG 1: unbiased case

Under DAG 1, as described in Section 2.2, the selection bias-inducing term in the observed disease model ($D|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1$), namely $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ is a constant function in Z_1, Z_2 . We proved in Supplementary Section S1.2.1 that the unweighted method produces unbiased estimates of θ_1 and θ_2 for this DAG. This theoretical result is evident from the simulation results in Table 3 and Figure 4 under all the three setups. All five methods including the unweighted approach estimate both the disease model parameters with high accuracy. The highest relative bias among all the three setups is 0.82%, which implies that all the methods accurately estimate both the disease model parameters. Therefore, the results show that the different specifications of the functional form of the selection model do not affect the performances of any of the models significantly other than minor inflation in variance of the parameter estimates in some cases. The RMSE of all four weighted methods are close to 1.

3.1.2 Example DAG 2: $Z_1 \rightarrow W$ arrow induced bias for coefficient of Z_1

Under DAG 2, we showed in Section 2.2 that $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ is a function of Z_1 only. With introduction of the dependence, ($Z_1 \rightarrow W$), the relative bias in estimation of θ_1 using the unweighted method increases to at least 9.6% compared to 0.30% in DAG 1, under all the three simulation setups. Under setup 1, the selection model for PL and CL are correctly specified. In this setup, PL and CL perform best in terms of both bias and RMSE in estimating θ_1 , whereas SR estimates θ_1 with a higher bias (1.72%). Due to loss of information in discretizing selection variables, the relative bias and RMSE of PS is the highest among all the five methods (20.78% and 2.07 respectively) under setup 1. However under simulation setups 2 and 3, the biases and RMSEs of both PL and CL increase significantly due to misspecification of selection models. For PS, the functional form of the selection model affect neither bias nor RMSE. The estimate of θ_1 using SR under setup 2 is close to the estimate in setup 1 since the estimation procedure of SR do not depend on the logistic form of the selection model. Therefore the effect of perturbation of the selection probabilities by a constant in setup 2 for SR is inconsequential. However, the introduction of interaction term in setup 3 increases the relative bias and RMSE for SR to 25.96% and 6.33 respectively since it assumes no interaction in the estimation method. In Setup 3, the RMSE of all the four unweighted methods are remarkably high (atleast 6) due to severe misspecification.

On the other hand, due to lack of dependence of $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ on Z_2 , all the methods produce accurate estimate of θ_2 in terms of both bias and RMSE under all the three simulation setups.

3.1.3 Example DAG 3: $Z_1 \rightarrow W$ and $Z_2 \rightarrow S$ induced bias for coefficients of Z_1 and Z_2

Under DAG 3, $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ is a function of both Z_1 and Z_2 . Consequently under all the setups, the relative biases in estimation of θ_2 increased to at least 16% using the unweighted logistic method. Due to correct specification of the selection model for PL and CL in Setup 1, we observe that these two methods accurately estimate both θ_1 and θ_2 . However, under both setups 2 and 3, the relative bias of estimates of θ_1 and θ_2 using PL and CL increases by a large amount. The relative bias in estimation of θ_2 using SR increase to 16.74 in DAG 3 % from 0.28% in DAG 2 under setup 1 due to incorrect model specification. The bias in estimation of θ_2 using SR did not change much in Setups 2 and 3 from Setup 1. For θ_1 , we observe a big increase in bias in Setup 3 using SR. On the other hand in terms of RMSE, PL, CL and SR perform better than the unweighted logistic regression except for estimation of θ_1 in Setup 3, where RMSE increased to atleast 15. All the four weighted estimates being highly biased in compared to the naive estimator lead to this abrupt hike in RMSE. In all the other cases, the RMSE of these methods are below 1. The estimate of θ_1 using PS in all the three setups performs poorly with high relative bias (at least 24%) and RMSE (at least 3.61). On the other hand, both relative bias and RMSE in estimation of θ_2 using PS is fairly low (at most 1.95% and 0.09 respectively).

3.1.4 Example DAG 4: strong dependence, increased bias for coefficients of Z_1 and Z_2

Due to increase in dependence of $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ on Z_2 , the bias in estimation of θ_2 is the highest among all the DAGs for the unweighted method. The relative bias in estimation of θ_2 increases to at least 40.34% in all the three setups using

the unweighted method. Similar to the previous DAGs, under Setup 1, PL and CL perform best in terms of both RMSE and bias among all the methods in estimation of the disease parameters due to correct specification of the selection model. Under Setups 2 and 3, these two methods perform poorly in terms of model misspecification. For SR, we observe an increase in relative bias to 29% in estimation of θ_2 compared to DAG 3 in setup 1. The bias in estimation of both θ_1 and θ_2 decrease compared to other DAGs using PS. For all the methods in most scenarios, the RMSE is less than 1, which implies better performance of the weighted methods compared to the unweighted logistic method.

3.1.5 Summary Takeaways

The comparative performances of the different methods under all varying simulation scenarios are summarized in Figure 5.

Setup 1- Correctly Specified Individual Selection Model: As expected PL and CL estimate both the disease model parameters accurately when the selection model is correctly specified under all the four DAGs. They offer better solutions than using the naive logistic regression across all scenarios. It is not fair to compare PS and SR since they use different types of external data. Still, between PS and SR, there is no clear winner. While PS does well in DAG 4, SR has better performance in simpler DAGs. However SR is also always better than naive logistic regression in all simulations. While for PS there could be very large RMSEs as we noticed in DAGs 2 and 3 (Table 1) due to high bias. The loss in information in discretizing the selection variables leads to incorrect selection weights estimation using PS. As a result, we observe that even with help of only marginal means of the selection variables from target population, under correct specification of selection model, PL works better than PS. However in DAG 4 due to high dependence among the different variables, the information contained in the discretized versions become adequate to estimate accurate weights for PS.

Variance Estimation/Uncertainty Quantification: Supplementary Figures S1 and S2 assess the performances of the proposed variance estimators for the weighted methods under all the DAGs in Setup 1. Supplementary Figure S1 shows the deviation of the estimated variance of $\hat{\theta}$ using the variance estimators discussed in Section 2.6 from the Monte Carlo variance under all the four DAGs. We observe that the variance estimators for the four methods estimate accurately the Monte Carlo variance except for SR variance estimator in case of DAG 4. Supplementary Figure S2 shows the coverage probabilities of the 95% confidence intervals constructed using the proposed variance estimators. The coverage probabilities of PL and CL are close to 0.95 for all the four DAGs in Setup 1. The coverage probabilities are conservative for PS in DAGs 1,2 and 3. In DAG 4 the coverage probability is less than 0.5 for PS. The coverage probabilities of SR in DAGs 1 and 2 are comparable to the other methods. On the other hand in DAGs 3 and 4 the coverage probability of SR is close to 0. The main reason behind the low coverage probability is due to high bias of SR in DAGs 3 and 4 observed from subfigure (B) of Figure 4.

Setup 2- Incorrectly Specified Selection Model 1: In Setup 2, our results indicate that all methods performed remarkably well in DAG 1, similar to the previous setup since the bias term $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ is constant in (Z_1, Z_2) . SR and PS did not show major changes from the previous setup and the performance in terms of relative bias % and RMSE are better than PL and CL. In DAG 4, PS estimate both the disease model parameters with low relative bias % and RMSE. On the other hand, in DAGs 3 and 4, we observed highly inaccurate estimates for PL and CL in terms of relative bias (%). Our findings suggest that these models are highly sensitive to selection model misspecification.

Setup 3- Incorrectly Specified Selection Model 2: The key takeaways in this setup are similar to the previous one. However, the RMSE of the all four weighted methods are extremely high in DAGs 2 and 3 in estimation of θ_1 . Due to high degree of selection model misspecification with introduction of interaction among the selection variables, the selection weights estimates of the four unweighted methods are extremely inaccurate which leads to a huge increase in RMSE. However in DAG 4, the performance of the unweighted method degraded by a huge extent and as a result, the RMSEs of the weighted methods are much less compared to DAGs 2 and 3.

4 Data Application: The Michigan Genomics Initiative

4.1 Introduction

The Michigan Genomics Initiative (MGI) is a rolling enrollment health EHR-linked biorepository within the University of Michigan Healthcare System consisting of over 93,000 participants primarily recruited through surgical encounters

at Michigan Medicine. Due to the perioperative recruitment strategy, participants in MGI exhibit a lower overall health status and higher prevalence of cancer compared to the general population (Zawistowski et al., 2021). Time-stamped ICD (International Classification of Disease) diagnosis data are available for each patient. A rich ecosystem of additional information is available, including lifestyle and behavioral risk factors, lab and medication data, geo-coded residential information, socioeconomic metrics, and other patient-level, census tract-level, and provider-level characteristics.

In this section we use the MGI data to study the association between cancer (D) and biological sex (Z_1) in the target US adult population. The direction of association in this case is well known from national SEER (Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results) registry estimates. SEER data indicates lower lifetime cancer risk among women relative to men, with corresponding marginal log-odds ratios of -0.24 (2008-2010), -0.19 (2010-2012), -0.08 (2012-2014), and -0.07 (2014-2016) respectively (seer.cancer.gov). This known target national-level true association presents us with an opportunity to assess and compare the methods when applied to MGI in terms of bias in $\hat{\theta}_1$. In this analysis we investigate the marginal/unadjusted and age (Z_2) adjusted association between cancer and biological sex. For all the methods, we divided age into three categories, namely (18-39) (reference level), (40-59) and (≥ 60). For the selection model we use diabetes, race, smoking currently, BMI (body mass index) and CHD (coronary heart disease) as \mathbf{W} . BMI has four categories, namely (0-18) (reference level), [18.5-25), [25-30) and (≥ 30). For the individual level data methods (PL and SR), we use publicly available NHANES 2017-18 (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey) data to construct IPW weights (cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes). NHANES is a complex multistage probability sampling design used to select participants representative of the civilian, non-institutionalized US population. On the other hand, we use age specific and marginal summary statistics from SEER, the US Census and the US CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) to construct post-stratification and calibration weights respectively.

4.2 Descriptive Summaries

We select adult participants in NHANES since MGI consists of participants with age 18 years or older. After removing observations with incomplete data on the variables of interest, we are left with 80947 and 5153 participants in MGI and NHANES respectively. Table 4 presents a comprehensive summary of the variables of interest in both the MGI and NHANES datasets. The reported statistics for the NHANES dataset in this table are unweighted. As expected, MGI is enriched with cancer patients, with 48.7% participants having a past or current cancer diagnosis (D). The NHANES dataset demonstrates a prevalence of cancer at 10.3%. The two studies differ in terms of the distribution of sex (Z_1), age (Z_2) and other selection covariates (\mathbf{W}).

4.3 Analyses of MGI Data

In this data example in the disease model we consider cancer, sex and age as D , Z_1 and Z_2 respectively. The sex variable is coded as 1 for female participants. We are primarily interested in estimation of the marginal and age adjusted association parameters between cancer and sex, θ_1 , which is defined by the following equation.

$$\text{logit}(P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2)) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 \cdot Z_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \mathbb{I}(40 \leq Z_2 \leq 59) + \theta_3 \cdot \mathbb{I}(60 \leq Z_2 \leq 150).$$

In the marginal association model, we did not adjust for age. The additional terms in the adjusted model are displayed in red. Note that the reference data from SEER corresponds to the marginal association model of cancer on sex without adjusting for age.

For all the four weighting methods, we first estimated the IPW weights without including cancer (D) as a selection variable (defined as w_0 , inverse of $P(S = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)$). This is due to the small number of cancer cases in NHANES compared to MGI as displayed in Table 4. Then we modified the weights w_0 for the two individual level methods (PL and SR) using the following expression to incorporate cancer into the selection model,

$$w = \frac{1}{P(S = 1|D, \mathbf{W}, Z_2)} = \frac{P(D|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)}{P(D|S = 1, \mathbf{W}, Z_2)} \cdot \frac{1}{P(S = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)} \quad (13)$$

$$= w_0 \cdot \frac{P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)^D \cdot (1 - P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2))^{(1-D)}}{P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2, S = 1)^D \cdot (1 - P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2, S = 1))^{(1-D)}}. \quad (14)$$

where $P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2, S = 1)$ is obtained from fitting a logistic regression model of D on Z_2, \mathbf{W} in MGI. On the other hand, we fit a weighted logistic regression in the NHANES data with the given sampling weights to obtain $P(D = 1|Z_2, \mathbf{W})$. The details of deriving equation (13) is provided in Supplementary Section S1.8. In case of the summary level methods PS and CL, estimation of $P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)$ in equation (14) is not possible due to limited

availability of joint summary statistics from population. Therefore we approximate $P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)$ in equation (14) by $P(D = 1|Z_2)$ using SEER estimate of age specific cancer SEER estimate. Similarly $P(D = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2, S = 1)$ in the denominator is obtained using a logistic regression D on age in MGI. We still need the joint distribution of \mathbf{W}, Z_2 to estimation of w_0 to implement PS. Due to limited availability of joint and conditional summary data on \mathbf{W}, Z_2 from the US target population we made an assumption that given Z_2 all the other selection variables are independent of each other. For all the weighted methods, we winsorized the selection weights by replacing the extreme 2.5% and 97.5% intervals by their respective quantiles to stabilise the methods.

4.4 Results

We present the estimates of marginal and age adjusted association parameters between cancer and sex in Subfigures (A) and (B) of Figure 6 respectively using all the four weighted methods and unweighted logistic regression.

Marginal/Unadjusted Association: We consider the SEER estimates of cancer-sex association to be the target truth (-0.24, -0.07). The estimate using the naive unweighted logistic regression method is -0.05 [95% Confidence Interval (C.I) (-0.08,-0.03)]. The corresponding estimates obtained using the four IPW weighted methods namely PL, SR, PS, CL and without including cancer as a selection variable are 0.08 [95% C.I (0.04,0.12)], 0.12 [95% C.I (0.06,0.18)], 0.19 [95% C.I (0.15,0.23)], 0.22 [95% C.I (0.15,0.23)] respectively, showing that misspecified weights can sway the OR estimates in the wrong direction further away from the truth than the unweighted estimator. On the other hand, the estimates obtained using the four IPW weighted methods namely PL, SR, PS, CL and including cancer as a selection variable are -0.13 [95% C.I (-0.16,-0.09)], -0.11 [95% C.I (-0.17,-0.06)], -0.11 [95% C.I (-0.15,-0.07)], -0.12 [95% C.I (-0.15,-0.08)] respectively. The 95% C.I of θ_1 using all the four weighted methods largely lie within the SEER confidence estimate (-0.24, -0.07).

Age-adjusted Association: The age-adjusted estimate using the unweighted logistic method is 0.10 [95% C.I (0.07,0.13)] which lies in the opposite direction of the SEER confidence estimate. The estimates obtained using the four IPW weighted methods namely PL, SR, PS, CL and without including cancer as a selection variable skew the OR estimates in the opposite direction. In contrast, the estimates obtained using the four IPW weighted methods namely PL, SR, PS, CL and including cancer as a selection variable are -0.07 [95% C.I (-0.10,-0.03)], -0.09 [95% C.I (-0.15,-0.02)], -0.07 [95% C.I (-0.12,-0.02)], -0.05 [95% C.I (-0.15,-0.08)] respectively. We observe that all the four weighted methods have reduced the bias of the estimated association parameter.

4.5 Effects of different sub-sampling strategies within MGI

In this section we carry out an idealized experiment using the MGI data. In real data, we do not know the actual variables \mathbf{W} that are driving the selection mechanism. However, when we subsample data intentionally based on certain variables from MGI, the selection model and variables are known to us. This intentional and known subsampling strategy provide a framework to study the extent of selection bias introduced due to different choices of selection variables and allow us to study the performance of different methods in recovering the truth in a more realistic situation. Let S_{sub} denotes the selection indicator of being included into the subsample of MGI. We incorporate four subsampling strategies using a logistic selection model with varying parameter values. The first one is a random sample, the second depends on only cancer (D), third on cancer (D) and sex (Z) and finally the fourth on cancer (D), sex (Z) and diabetes (W). In this exercise we do not include age in the disease model. The details of the subsampling strategies are given in Supplementary Section S1.9. Using the above four subsamples of the MGI data, we evaluate the performances of the different methods in estimating the association parameter between cancer and biological sex. We consider two scenarios with two target population (MGI and US populations respectively) as we develop the weights. In both the scenarios, we assume that the true subsampling strategy is known.

First Scenario: In the first scenario, we assume that the MGI cohort is the target population. Therefore in this case, the unweighted estimate obtained from MGI [-0.05, 95% C.I (-0.08,-0.03)] is assumed to be the truth and we compare the estimates of the different methods under varying subsamples. The different subsamples serve as the non-probability samples of interest drawn from the target MGI population. For the individual level methods, in this scenario external data and target are same which is MGI and hence $\pi_{\text{ext}} = 1$ for each participant. Therefore it does not make sense to apply SR since the response variable for Simplex Regression step is 1 for all datapoints. For PS and CL, we constructed joint probabilities and marginal means from the MGI data. The performances of three weighted and the unweighted logistic method are presented in subfigure (A) of Figure 7. Under random sampling, all the four methods accurately estimate θ_1 in terms of bias as expected. In case of only cancer affecting subsampling, all the methods including the

unweighted logistic are unbiased. This case is exactly same as DAG 1 which justifies the accurate performances of all the methods. However when sex (Z) and cancer (D) impacts selection, the estimate using the unweighted logistic method is severely biased. The association changes to an entirely wrong direction [0.20, 95% C.I (0.15, 0.25)]. All three weighted methods, namely PL [-0.05, 95% C.I (-0.10, 0)], PS [-0.05, 95% C.I (-0.1, 0)] and CL [-0.05, 95% C.I (-0.10, 0)] estimate the association parameter with negligible bias. We observe similar results in the fourth case where diabetes (W) affects selection along with cancer and sex. In all the cases, we observe that the variances of the methods increase in comparison to the true MGI C.I due to smaller sample size of the subsamples.

Second Scenario: In this scenario, we assume that the US adult population is the target population, not MGI. Therefore in this case, the SEER estimates are assumed to be the truth and we compare the estimates of the different methods under varying subsampling schemes. For each of the three weighted methods, we apply a two stage weighting approach to obtain the final weights for the IPW regression. The first and second step of weights transport the subsample estimates to the MGI and then the US adult population respectively. In the second weighting step we use all the variables in W in Section 4.3 including age. All the three weighted methods have reduced the bias in estimating the association parameter compared to the estimate of the unweighted method. We observe from subfigure (B) of Figure 7 that under the first two subsampling strategies, all the three weighted methods perform well in terms of bias. For the last two subsampling strategies, CL and PL perform have a large overlap with the SEER band. For example when subsampling is based on both cancer and sex, majority portion of the 95% C.I bands of PL [-0.14, 95% C.I (-0.21,-0.08)] and CL [-0.14, 95% C.I (-0.22,-0.07)] are with the SEER band. Compared to PL and CL, PS on the other hand did not perform well since a large portion of PS is outside the SEER band. Again in all the cases, we observe that the variances of the methods increase due to smaller sample size of the subsamples.

Similar to the simulation results obtained in Section 3.1, we observe when either Z or W or both affect selection along with D , the unweighted estimate is highly biased. The IPW methods help in reducing the bias of the parameter of interest.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

Selection bias is a major concern in EHR studies since it is extremely difficult to ascertain the process through which a patient from the target population enters the analytic sample or why a particular observation or lab result appears in the health record of a patient. The mechanism of patients' interactions with the healthcare system may be influenced by a variety of patient characteristics such as age, sex, race, healthcare access and other health related co-morbidities. If the issue of selection bias is overlooked, association analyses are generally biased because unadjusted inference from these non-probability samples from EHR data is generally not transportable to the target population. Therefore, there is a pressing need to understand the structure of selection bias and correct for it when needed, in order to draw valid inferences for the target population.

Hospital-based biobanks are enriched with specific diseases. For example, the dataset we used, MGI, (Zawistowski et al., 2021) recruits patients while they are waiting for surgery. Consequently it is enriched for many diseases including skin cancer (Fritsche et al., 2019). Thus the results from MGI are not directly generalizable to the Michigan or US population which is evident from the results shown in Section 4 on the cancer sex association. On the other hand, population based biobanks such as the UK Biobank, Estonian Genome Center Biobank, and Taiwan Biobank attempt to recruit participants nationally by inviting volunteers. Even these large population-based biobanks like the UK Biobank suffer from healthy control bias (Fry et al., 2017; van Alten et al., 2022). Nationally representative studies such as the NIH All of Us often have a purposeful sampling strategy that leads to, say, oversampling certain underrepresented subgroups (All Of Us Research Programs Investigators, 2019). The problem of selection bias may be magnified when multiple biobanks all over the world are being harmonized together for massive meta-analysis. For example, the Global Biobank Meta-analysis Initiative (GBMI) (Vogan, 2022) has linked 24 biobanks with more than 2.2 million genotyped samples linked with health records. For turning such big data into meaningful knowledge, one needs to characterize the different sampling mechanisms underlying the recruitment strategies of these diverse biobanks. We hope this paper provides a conceptual and analytic framework towards understanding selection bias and a set of the tools that are available to us.

In this work, we introduce a framework to assess selection bias using DAGs in case of estimating association of a binary response variable with other independent variables of interest. We develop four IPW methods and present using a simulation study the extent by which these methods are able to reduce selection bias across a diverse set of simulation

settings. Finally we discuss a data example of estimating the association of biological sex with cancer in a hospital based biobank namely, MGI and compare the results obtained from different methods to the population based SEER estimate.

This work has several limitations. All the methods we consider suffer when the selection probability model is misspecified. We only considered functional misspecification of the selection model in our simulation studies but there will likely be many omitted covariates. It is nearly impossible to measure all the variables driving selection. Gathering more data on a representative sub-sample of the population embedded within EHR may also lead to more substantial reduction of bias. Chart review (Yin et al., 2022), multi-wave sampling (Liu et al., 2022), double sampling approaches (Chen and Chen, 2000) should also be considered as possible avenues. We also ignored selection model uncertainty in the simplex regression method. Bootstrap can offer a potential solution to consistent variance estimation. Finally, as described in Table 1, selection bias occurs not in isolation but in conjunction with several other sources of bias, for example with outcome misclassification (Beesley et al., 2020a). We need sensitivity analysis tools and source of bias diagnostics for EHR data to identify a hierarchy of the different sources of bias for a given problem. In this analysis we did not consider the time stamps of the observations in longitudinal EHR data. The relationships between covariates and outcomes in the DAGs are highly dependent on the relative ordering. Extension of the discussed methods to longitudinal data may address this issue.

Finally, creation of nationally integrated databases, where all health encounters for everyone are recorded in the same data system will enable researchers to harness the full potential of real-world healthcare data for everyone, not just for some selected (often historically privileged) sub-populations. Use of exclusionary cohorts and data disparity is at the heart of fairness in modern machine learning methods (Mhasawade et al., 2021; Parikh et al., 2019). In that sense, equal probability sample selection method (EPSEM) is a tool to ensure equity and fairness in data science. In absence of EPSEM in real world data, thinking about selection bias is at the heart of doing inclusive science with data. Our hope is that our paper will contribute to that important discourse.

6 Acknowledgements

This research is supported by NSF DMS 1712933, NIH/NCI CA267907 and NIH R01GM139926. The authors would like to thank Professor Ruth Keogh and organizers and attendees of the symposium on 50 years of the Cox Model for including this work in the program and providing feedback during the presentation.

7 Competing interests

Nothing to declare.

8 Materials and Correspondence

All correspondence should be directed to Bhramar Mukherjee (bhramar@umich.edu). All codes are available in <https://github.com/Ritoban1/Short-Note-Selection-Bias.git>. Michigan Genomics Initiative Data are available after institutional review board approval to select researchers. See <https://precisionhealth.umich.edu/our-research/michigan-genomics/>.

References

- H. Abbasizanjani, F. Torabi, S. Bedston, T. Bolton, G. Davies, S. Denaxas, R. Griffiths, L. Herbert, S. Hollings, S. Keene, et al. Harmonising electronic health records for reproducible research: challenges, solutions and recommendations from a UK-wide COVID-19 research collaboration. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 23(1):1–15, 2023.
- All Of Us Research Programs Investigators. The “all of us” research program. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 381(7):668–676, 2019.
- J. R. Almeida, L. B. Silva, I. Bos, P. J. Visser, and J. L. Oliveira. A methodology for cohort harmonisation in multicentre clinical research. *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked*, 27:100760, 2021.
- O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and B. Jørgensen. Some parametric models on the simplex. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 39(1):106–116, 1991.

- L. J. Beesley and B. Mukherjee. Case studies in bias reduction and inference for electronic health record data with selection bias and phenotype misclassification. *Statistics in Medicine*, 2022a.
- L. J. Beesley and B. Mukherjee. Statistical inference for association studies using electronic health records: handling both selection bias and outcome misclassification. *Biometrics*, 78(1):214–226, 2022b.
- L. J. Beesley, L. G. Fritsche, and B. Mukherjee. An analytic framework for exploring sampling and observation process biases in genome and phenome-wide association studies using electronic health records. *Statistics in Medicine*, 39(14):1965–1979, 2020a.
- L. J. Beesley, M. Salvatore, L. G. Fritsche, A. Pandit, A. Rao, C. Brummett, C. J. Willer, L. D. Lisabeth, and B. Mukherjee. The emerging landscape of health research based on biobanks linked to electronic health records: Existing resources, statistical challenges, and potential opportunities. *Statistics in medicine*, 39(6):773–800, 2020b.
- V. C. Bradley, S. Kuriwaki, M. Isakov, D. Sejdinovic, X.-L. Meng, and S. Flaxman. Unrepresentative big surveys significantly overestimated US vaccine uptake. *Nature*, 600(7890):695–700, 2021.
- Y. Chen, J. Wang, J. Chubak, and R. A. Hubbard. Inflation of type I error rates due to differential misclassification in EHR-derived outcomes: empirical illustration using breast cancer recurrence. *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, 28(2):264–268, 2019.
- Y. Chen, P. Li, and C. Wu. Doubly robust inference with nonprobability survey samples. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(532):2011–2021, 2020.
- Y.-H. Chen and H. Chen. A unified approach to regression analysis under double-sampling designs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 62(3):449–460, 2000.
- K. Christensen, N. Holm, J. Olsen, K. Kock, and P. Fogh-Andersen. Selection bias in genetic-epidemiological studies of cleft lip and palate. *American journal of human genetics*, 51(3):654, 1992.
- J. Cornfield, W. Haenszel, E. C. Hammond, A. M. Lilienfeld, M. B. Shimkin, and E. L. Wynder. Smoking and lung cancer: recent evidence and a discussion of some questions. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 22(1):173–203, 1959.
- A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):1–22, 1977.
- J. C. Denny, L. Bastarache, M. D. Ritchie, R. J. Carroll, R. Zink, J. D. Mosley, J. R. Field, J. M. Pulley, A. H. Ramirez, E. Bowton, et al. Systematic comparison of phenome-wide association study of electronic medical record data and genome-wide association study data. *Nature biotechnology*, 31(12):1102–1111, 2013.
- J.-C. Deville and C.-E. Särndal. Calibration estimators in survey sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87(418):376–382, 1992.
- L. L. Doove, S. Van Buuren, and E. Dusseldorp. Recursive partitioning for missing data imputation in the presence of interaction effects. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 72:92–104, 2014.
- M. R. Elliot. Combining data from probability and non-probability samples using pseudo-weights. *Survey Practice*, 2(6):2982, 2009.
- S. Ferrari and F. Cribari-Neto. Beta regression for modelling rates and proportions. *Journal of applied statistics*, 31(7):799–815, 2004.
- L. G. Fritsche, L. J. Beesley, P. VandeHaar, R. B. Peng, M. Salvatore, M. Zawistowski, S. A. Gagliano Taliun, S. Das, J. LeFaive, E. O. Kaleba, et al. Exploring various polygenic risk scores for skin cancer in the phenomes of the Michigan genomics initiative and the UK Biobank with a visual catalog: PRSWeb. *PLoS genetics*, 15(6):e1008202, 2019.
- A. Fry, T. J. Littlejohns, C. Sudlow, N. Doherty, L. Adamska, T. Sprosen, R. Collins, and N. E. Allen. Comparison of sociodemographic and health-related characteristics of UK Biobank participants with those of the general population. *American journal of epidemiology*, 186(9):1026–1034, 2017.
- S. Fu, L. Y. Leung, A.-O. Raulli, D. F. Kallmes, K. A. Kinsman, K. B. Nelson, M. S. Clark, P. H. Luetmer, P. R. Kingsbury, D. M. Kent, et al. Assessment of the impact of EHR heterogeneity for clinical research through a case study of silent brain infarction. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, 20(1):1–12, 2020.
- J.-E. Galimard, S. Chevret, C. Protopopescu, and M. Resche-Rigon. A multiple imputation approach for MNAR mechanisms compatible with Heckman’s model. *Statistics in medicine*, 35(17):2907–2920, 2016.
- S. Geneletti, S. Richardson, and N. Best. Adjusting for selection bias in retrospective, case-control studies. *Biostatistics*, 10(1):17–31, 2009.

- E. F. Glynn and M. A. Hoffman. Heterogeneity introduced by EHR system implementation in a de-identified data resource from 100 non-affiliated organizations. *JAMIA open*, 2(4):554–561, 2019.
- S. Haneuse and M. Daniels. A general framework for considering selection bias in EHR-based studies: what data are observed and why? *eGEMs*, 4(1), 2016.
- T. Heart, O. Ben-Assuli, and I. Shabtai. A review of PHR, EMR and EHR integration: A more personalized healthcare and public health policy. *Health Policy and Technology*, 6(1):20–25, 2017.
- J. Heintzman, M. Marino, M. Hoopes, S. R. Bailey, R. Gold, J. O’Malley, H. Angier, C. Nelson, E. Cottrell, and J. Devoe. Supporting health insurance expansion: do electronic health records have valid insurance verification and enrollment data? *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 22(4):909–913, 2015.
- M. A. Hernán, S. Hernández-Díaz, and J. M. Robins. A structural approach to selection bias. *Epidemiology*, pages 615–625, 2004.
- T. J. Hoffmann, G. B. Ehret, P. Nandakumar, D. Ranatunga, C. Schaefer, P.-Y. Kwok, C. Iribarren, A. Chakravarti, and N. Risch. Genome-wide association analyses using electronic health records identify new loci influencing blood pressure variation. *Nature genetics*, 49(1):54–64, 2017.
- D. Holt and T. F. Smith. Post stratification. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (General)*, 142(1):33–46, 1979.
- J. Huang, R. Duan, R. A. Hubbard, Y. Wu, J. H. Moore, H. Xu, and Y. Chen. PIE: A prior knowledge guided integrated likelihood estimation method for bias reduction in association studies using electronic health records data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 25(3):345–352, 2018.
- R. M. Kaplan, D. A. Chambers, and R. E. Glasgow. Big data and large sample size: a cautionary note on the potential for bias. *Clinical and translational science*, 7(4):342–346, 2014.
- J. K. Kim and M. Park. Calibration estimation in survey sampling. *International Statistical Review*, 78(1):21–39, 2010.
- D. G. Kleinbaum, H. Morgenstern, and L. L. Kupper. Selection bias in epidemiologic studies. *American journal of epidemiology*, 113(4):452–463, 1981.
- M. Lipsitch, E. T. Tchetgen, and T. Cohen. Negative controls: a tool for detecting confounding and bias in observational studies. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 21(3):383, 2010.
- R. J. Little. Pattern-mixture models for multivariate incomplete data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88(421):125–134, 1993.
- X. Liu, J. Chubak, R. A. Hubbard, and Y. Chen. SAT: a Surrogate-Assisted Two-wave case boosting sampling method, with application to EHR-based association studies. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 29(5): 918–927, 2022.
- D. Madigan, P. E. Stang, J. A. Berlin, M. Schuemie, J. M. Overhage, M. A. Suchard, B. Dumouchel, A. G. Hartzema, and P. B. Ryan. A systematic statistical approach to evaluating evidence from observational studies. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1:11–39, 2014.
- W. G. Madow, H. Nisselson, I. Olkin, and D. B. Rubin. *Incomplete Data in Sample Surveys: Theory and Bibliographies*, volume 2. Academic Press, 1983.
- G. A. Marcoulides and R. E. Schumacker. *Advanced structural equation modeling: Issues and techniques*. Psychology Press, 2013.
- W. Meng, M. J. Adams, H. L. Hebert, I. J. Deary, A. M. McIntosh, and B. H. Smith. A genome-wide association study finds genetic associations with broadly-defined headache in UK Biobank (n= 223,773). *EBioMedicine*, 28:180–186, 2018.
- V. Mhasawade, Y. Zhao, and R. Chunara. Machine learning and algorithmic fairness in public and population health. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3(8):659–666, 2021.
- G. E. Montanari and M. G. Ranalli. Nonparametric model calibration estimation in survey sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(472):1429–1442, 2005.
- J. M. Neuhaus. Bias and efficiency loss due to misclassified responses in binary regression. *Biometrika*, 86(4):843–855, 1999.
- R. B. Parikh, S. Teeple, and A. S. Navathe. Addressing bias in artificial intelligence in health care. *Jama*, 322(24): 2377–2378, 2019.
- S. Pendergrass, S. M. Dudek, D. M. Roden, D. C. Crawford, and M. D. Ritchie. Visual integration of results from a large DNA biobank (BioVU) using synthesis-view. In *Biocomputing 2011*, pages 265–275. World Scientific, 2011.

- H. Rexhepi, I. Huvila, R.-M. Åhlfeldt, and Å. Cajander. Cancer patients' information seeking behavior related to online electronic healthcare records. *Health Informatics Journal*, 27(3):14604582211024708, 2021.
- E. K. Roberts, T. Gu, B. Mukherjee, and L. G. Fritsche. Estimating COVID-19 vaccination effectiveness using electronic health records of an academic medical center in michigan. *medRxiv*, pages 2022–01, 2022.
- D. B. Rubin. *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*, volume 81. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- S. R. Seaman and S. Vansteelandt. Introduction to double robust methods for incomplete data. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 33(2):184, 2018.
- C. Shen, M. Risk, E. Schiopu, S. S. Hayek, T. Xie, L. Holevinski, C. Akin, G. Freed, and L. Zhao. Efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines in patients taking immunosuppressants. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*, 81(6):875–880, 2022.
- X. Shi, W. Miao, J. C. Nelson, and E. J. T. Tchetgen. Multiply robust causal inference with double-negative control adjustment for categorical unmeasured confounding. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 82(2):521, 2020.
- J. W. Sun, R. Wang, D. Li, and S. Toh. Use of Linked Databases for Improved Confounding Control: Considerations for Potential Selection Bias. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 191(4):711–723, 2022.
- S. Toh, L. A. García Rodríguez, and M. A. Hernán. Confounding adjustment via a semi-automated high-dimensional propensity score algorithm: an application to electronic medical records. *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, 20(8):849–857, 2011.
- J. Tong, J. Huang, J. Chubak, X. Wang, J. H. Moore, R. A. Hubbard, and Y. Chen. An augmented estimation procedure for EHR-based association studies accounting for differential misclassification. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(2):244–253, 2020.
- A. A. Tsiatis. Semiparametric theory and missing data. 2006.
- S. van Alten, B. W. Domingue, T. J. Galama, and A. T. Marees. Reweighting the UK Biobank to reflect its underlying sampling population substantially reduces pervasive selection bias due to volunteering. *medRxiv*, pages 2022–05, 2022.
- K. Vogan. Global biobank meta-analysis. *Nature Genetics*, pages 1–1, 2022.
- E. C.-H. Wang and A. Wright. Characterizing outpatient problem list completeness and duplications in the electronic health record. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 27(8):1190–1197, 2020.
- H. Wang and J. K. Kim. Information projection approach to propensity score estimation for handling selection bias under missing at random. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2104, 2021.
- C. Wu. Optimal calibration estimators in survey sampling. *Biometrika*, 90(4):937–951, 2003.
- Z. Yin, J. Tong, Y. Chen, R. A. Hubbard, and C. Y. Tang. A cost-effective chart review sampling design to account for phenotyping error in electronic health records (EHR) data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 29(1):52–61, 2022.
- M. Zawistowski, L. G. Fritsche, A. Pandit, B. Vanderwerff, S. Patil, E. M. Schmidt, P. VanderHaar, C. M. Brummett, S. Keterpal, X. Zhou, et al. The michigan genomics initiative: a biobank linking genotypes and electronic clinical records in Michigan Medicine patients. *medRxiv*, 2021.
- P. Zhang, Z. Qiu, and C. Shi. simplexreg: An R Package for Regression Analysis of Proportional Data Using the Simplex Distribution. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 71(11):1–21, 2016. doi: 10.18637/jss.v071.i11.







Figure 1: Figure depicting the disease and selection models along with the different variables present in both the models.




(a) DAG 1



(b) DAG 2



(c) DAG 3



(d) DAG 4

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Disease model} & : \text{logit} (P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2)) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2 \\
 \text{Selection model} & : P(S = 1|Z_2, W, D) = f(Z_2, W, D)
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 2: Selection Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) representing some plausible relationships between different variables of interest: D (Disease Indicator), S (Selection Indicator into the internal sample) Z_1 (Predictors in the disease model only (White)), Z_2 (Predictors both in disease and selection models (Mixture of Blue and White)) and W (Predictors in the selection model only (Blue)).




Figure 3: Figure depicting the relationship between the target population, internal non-probability and external probability samples. S and S_{ext} are the selection indicator variables of internal and external samples respectively. S_{both} is the selection indicator variable for a person present in both internal and external samples.




Figure 4: (A) Estimates of θ_1 in, coefficient of Z_1 in the disease model along with 95% C.I using the unweighted and the four weighted methods under the three simulation setups for each of the four DAGs. (B) Estimates of θ_2 in, coefficient of Z_2 in the disease model along with 95% C.I using the unweighted and the four weighted methods under the three simulation setups for each of the four DAGs. Unweighted : unweighted logistic regression, SR : simple regression, PL : pseudolikelihood, PS : poststratification and CL : calibration.




Figure 5: Preferred methods of estimation for including the unadjusted and the four weighted ones in terms of bias of estimation of the disease model parameters under different DAG setups in all the three considered simulation setups. Unweighted : unweighted logistic regression, SR : simplex regression, PL : pseudolikelihood, PS : poststratification and CL : calibration.




Figure 6: (A) Estimates of the marginal association between cancer and sex along with 95% C.I in using all the four weighted methods and the unweighted logistic regression with and without including cancer as a selection variable. (B) Estimates of the age adjusted association between cancer and sex along with 95% C.I in using all the four weighted methods and the unweighted logistic regression with and without including cancer as a selection variable. The grey band represents the true SEER estimates. The red bar corresponds to the unweighted logistic method. The yellow and pink bars correspond to the estimates of the four IPW methods without and with including cancer in the selection model respectively.




Figure 7: (A) Estimates of the association between cancer and sex along with 95% C.I using three weighted methods and the unweighted logistic regression under the four subsampling strategies when MGI is assumed to be the target population. (B) Estimates of the association between cancer and sex along with 95% C.I using three weighted methods and the unweighted logistic regression under the four subsampling strategies when US is assumed to be the target population. The grey band represents the 95% C.I of estimate of θ_1 obtained from MGI using unweighted logistic regression. Unweighted : unweighted logistic regression, PL : pseudolikelihood, PS : poststratification and CL : calibration.

Type of Bias	Definition	Literature	Software
Imperfect Phenotyping	Major bias in EHR studies Misclassification of derived disease phenotypes. Overreporting and underreporting can both occur. Underreporting is the primary source.	Neuhauser (1999) Beesley et al. (2020b) Tong et al. (2020); Chen et al. (2019) Yin et al. (2022); Liu et al. (2022) Huang et al. (2018)	SAMBA
Missing Data	Lack of routine checkup. Loss of follow up reasons.	Hot Deck Madow et al. (1983), Tree based methods Doove et al. (2014) Expectation-Maximization Algorithm Dempster et al. (1977) IPW and AIPW techniques Seaman and Vansteelandt (2018) Full information maximum likelihood Marcoulides and Schumacker (2013) Multiple imputation Rubin (2004), Pattern mixture models Little (1993) Heckman imputation Galimard et al. (2016)	MICE MissForest
Confounding	Direct cause of both exposure and the response. Major challenge caused by unmeasured confounders.	Toh et al. (2011) Sun et al. (2022) Negative and Double Negative Controls Shi et al. (2020); Lipsitch et al. (2010)	
Lack of data harmonization across cohorts	Integrating disparate data of various sources and formats. Different clinics recruit patients using varying selection criteria. Misclassification of phenotypes differs across cohorts.	Almeida et al. (2021); Abbasizanjani et al. (2023) Fu et al. (2020); Glynn and Hoffman (2019); Zawistowski et al. (2021).	meta
Heterogeneity of studied populations	Systematic differences between the population characteristics or sampling mechanisms	Beesley et al. (2020b)	meta

Table 1: Different types of biases in EHR studies other than selection bias along with their description and relevant literature to reduce the corresponding bias.

Class	Method	Reference	Description	Features	Software
Unweighted	Naive		Unweighted logistic regression with D and (Z_1, Z_2) as response and predictors respectively.	Estimates θ_1 and θ_2 unbiasedly only when $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ is free of Z_1 and Z_2 respectively.	glm
	Simplex Regression (SR)	Bamdorff-Nielsen and Jørgensen (1991) , Elliot (2009) , Beesley and Mukherjee (2022b)	Weighted logistic regression with D and (Z_1, Z_2) as response and predictors respectively. Integrating external level individual data, the weights obtained using Simplex and Multinomial Regressions.	Bias in estimation of θ_2 increases with the complexity of DAG. Difference in predictors of the internal and external selection models leads to biased estimates for SR.	simplxreg SAMBA
Individual External Patient Data	Pseudo Likelihood (PL)	Chen et al. (2020)	An weighted logistic regression with D and (Z_1, Z_2) as response and predictors respectively. With external level individual data, the maximum likelihood estimating equations for weights are approximated by the measures from external level data resulting in pseudolikelihood estimating methods.	With correct specification of selection model, the estimates are highly accurate for all setups, However highly sensitive to model misspecification.	nleqslv
	Post Stratification (PS)	Beesley and Mukherjee (2022b)	An weighted logistic regression with D and (Z_1, Z_2) as response and predictors respectively. With external level joint probabilities of (D, Z_2, W') , where Z_2, W' are the discrete versions of Z_2, W , the weights are obtained.	Fails to work for Setup 2 and 3. However the efficiency in terms of bias increases for Setup 4 and is least sensitive to model misspecification.	survey SAMBA
Summary Level Statistics Data	Calibration (CL)	Wu (2003)	Weighted logistic regression with D and (Z_1, Z_2) as response and predictors respectively. With external level marginal probabilities on the selection variables (D, Z_2, W') , the weights are estimated using pseudolikelihood estimating methods similar to the PL method	With correct specification of selection model, the estimates are highly accurate for all setups, However highly sensitive to model misspecification.	survey

Table 2: Short Summary of the five methods including the naive and the four weighted ones.

DAG	Method	Bias(θ_1) (Multiplied by 1000)			Bias(θ_2) (Multiplied by 1000)			RMSE(θ_1)			RMSE(θ_2)		
		Setup 1	Setup 2	Setup 3	Setup 1	Setup 2	Setup 3	Setup 1	Setup 2	Setup 3	Setup 1	Setup 2	Setup 3
DAG 1	Unweighted	-1.48 (0.30%)	-1.48 (0.30%)	-1.48 (0.30%)	1.00 (0.20%)	1.00 (0.20%)	1.00 (0.20%)	1	1	1	1	1	1
	PL	-1.56 (0.32%)	-1.56 (0.32%)	-1.56 (0.32%)	1.21 (0.24%)	1.21 (0.24%)	1.21 (0.24%)	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.07	1.07	1.07
	SR	-1.58 (0.32%)	-1.58 (0.32%)	-1.58 (0.32%)	1.22 (0.24%)	1.22 (0.24%)	1.22 (0.24%)	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.07	1.07	1.07
	PS	0.83 (0.17%)	0.83 (0.17%)	0.83 (0.17%)	-4.10 (0.82%)	-4.10 (0.82%)	-4.10 (0.82%)	1.21	1.21	1.21	0.88	0.88	0.88
DAG 2	CL	0.68 (0.14%)	0.68 (0.14%)	0.68 (0.14%)	-0.61 (0.12%)	-0.61 (0.12%)	-0.61 (0.12%)	1.13	1.13	1.13	1	1	1
	Unweighted	-70.80 (14.16%)	-70.42 (14.08%)	47.61 (9.53%)	1.02 (0.20%)	1.02 (0.20%)	1.69 (0.34%)	1	1	1	1	1	1
	PL	-1.39 (0.28%)	-51.02 (10.20%)	157.33 (31.47%)	1.29 (0.25%)	0.61 (0.12%)	2.11 (0.42%)	0.09	0.57	9.22	1.06	1.05	1.07
	SR	-8.61 (1.72%)	-8.25 (1.65%)	129.80 (25.96%)	1.39 (0.28%)	0.68 (0.14%)	2.34 (0.47%)	0.10	0.12	6.33	1.05	1.06	1.05
DAG 3	PS	103.90 (20.78%)	103.85 (20.77%)	137.93 (27.59%)	10.05 (2.01%)	10.29 (2.06%)	-0.82 (0.16%)	2.07	2.22	7.15	1.14	1.86	0.94
	CL	0.44 (0.09%)	-47.79 (9.56%)	145.26 (29.05%)	-0.67 (0.13%)	-0.13 (0.03%)	0.40 (0.08%)	0.09	0.65	7.89	1.01	1.13	1.00
	Unweighted	-62.83 (12.6%)	-62.28 (12.46%)	9.24 (1.85%)	-143.75 (28.74%)	-143.86 (28.77%)	79.05 (15.81%)	1	1	1	1	1	1
	PL	-0.30 (0.06%)	-48.90 (9.78%)	122.56 (24.51%)	1.27 (0.25%)	-112.28 (22.46%)	147.67 (29.53%)	0.11	0.67	31.01	0.03	0.63	3.33
DAG 4	SR	-13.80 (2.76%)	-13.41 (2.68%)	84.07 (16.81%)	-83.72 (16.74%)	-84.22 (16.84%)	77.48 (15.50%)	0.15	0.15	15.08	0.36	0.36	0.98
	PS	123.44 (24.7%)	124.32 (24.86%)	138.89 (27.78%)	2.15 (0.43%)	2.10 (0.42%)	9.74 (1.95%)	3.61	3.86	39.64	0.02	0.04	0.09
	CL	0.14 (0.03%)	-42.95 (8.59%)	108.11 (21.62%)	-0.62 (-0.12%)	-102.32 (20.46%)	116.77 (23.35%)	0.11	0.74	24.32	0.02	0.56	2.10
	Unweighted	-71.92 (14.38%)	-71.67 (14.33%)	-42.33 (8.47%)	-235.72 (47.14%)	-235.24 (47.05%)	-201.69 (40.34%)	1	1	1	1	1	1
DAG 4	PL	0.07 (0.01%)	-60.53 (12.11%)	82.38 (16.47%)	1.09 (0.22%)	-198.12 (39.62%)	173.74 (34.75%)	0.08	0.75	3.33	0.01	0.72	0.75
	SR	-30.11 (6.02%)	-30.23 (6.05%)	21.63 (4.33%)	-145.59 (29.20%)	-145.58 (29.12%)	-61.17 (12.23%)	0.24	0.24	0.41	0.39	0.39	0.10
	PS	2.96 (0.59%)	-20.03 (4.01%)	12.68 (2.54%)	29.11 (5.82%)	-57.71 (11.54%)	31.38 (6.28%)	0.15	0.52	0.37	0.10	0.40	0.11
	CL	0.45 (0.09%)	-51.03 (10.21%)	68.70 (13.7%)	-0.65 (0.13%)	-174.77 (34.75%)	129.91 (25.98%)	0.08	0.72	2.38	0.01	0.57	0.42

Table 3: Bias and RMSE Comparison between the unweighted and four weighted methods in DAGs 1, 2, 3, 4, under simulation setups 1,2 and 3. The best models in terms of bias and RMSE under each setup have been highlighted in red separately. Unweighted : Unweighted Logistic Regression, SR : Simplex regression, PL : Pseudolikelihood, PS : Post Stratification and CL : Calibration.

Variables	MGI (<i>N</i> = 80947)	NHANES (<i>N</i> = 5153)
Cancer	Yes (48.7%) No (51.2%)	Yes (10.3%) No (89.7%)
Sex	Female (53.8%) Male (46.2%)	Female (51.8%) Male (48.2%)
Age	57.5 (18.1)	51.2 (17.6)
Race	Non-Hispanic White (85.3%) Others (14.7%)	Non-Hispanic White (34.3%) Others (66.7%)
BMI(kg/m²)	29.9 (7.26)	29.8 (7.4)
CHD	Yes : 16.5% No: 83.5%	Yes : 4.6% No : 95.4%
Diabetes	Yes : 33.3% No : 66.7%	Yes : 15.7% No : 84.3%
Current Smoking	Yes : 9.8% No : 90.2%	Yes: 18.2% No: 81.8%

Table 4: Descriptive Summaries of the different variables of interest in both MGI and NHANES data. The statistics for NHANES provided here are unweighted. CHD stands for Coronary heart disease. For continuous variables we reported Mean (Sd).

Supplementary Section

In this section, we present the detailed proofs of the results and theorem stated above.

S1.1 Distribution of $D|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1$

By Bayes Theorem we obtain that,

$$P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1) = \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, Z_1, Z_2)P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2)}{P(S = 1|D = 1, Z_1, Z_2)P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2) + P(S = 1|D = 0, Z_1, Z_2)P(D = 0|Z_1, Z_2)}.$$

From equation (1) in Section 2.1, we know that, $r(Z_1, Z_2) = \frac{P(S=1|D=1, Z_1, Z_2)}{P(S=1|D=0, Z_1, Z_2)}$ and $\text{logit}(P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2)) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2$. Therefore, dividing both the numerator and denominator by $P(S = 1|D = 1, Z_1, Z_2)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1) &= \frac{P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2)}{P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2) + \frac{1}{r(Z_1, Z_2)} \cdot (1 - P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2))} \\ &= \frac{e^{\theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2}}{e^{\theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2} + \frac{1}{r(Z_1, Z_2)}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1)}{1 - P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1)} = e^{\theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2} \cdot r(Z_1, Z_2).$$

Thus we obtain, $\text{logit}(P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1)) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2 + \log(r(Z_1, Z_2))$.

S1.2 Expression of $r(Z_1, Z_2)$ in different Setups

The original disease model in absence of selection bias as in equation (1) in Section 2.1 is :

$$\text{logit}(P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2)) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2.$$

However in presence of selection bias from equation (2), the observed disease model $D|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1$ is :

$$\text{logit}(P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1)) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2 + \log(r(Z_1, Z_2)).$$

S1.2.1 Example DAG 1: unbiased case

Under DAG 1 of Figure 2, we observe that all the paths from Z_1 to S , as well as from Z_2 to S are blocked when we condition on D . Therefore, both Z_1 and S and Z_2 and S are d-separated when we condition on D . Therefore $P(S = 1|D = 1, Z_1, Z_2) = P(S = 1|D = 1)$ and $P(S = 1|D = 0, Z_1, Z_2) = P(S = 1|D = 0)$ and as a result, the simplified $r(Z_1, Z_2) = \frac{P(S=1|D=1)}{P(S=1|D=0)}$ independent of Z_1 and Z_2 or a constant function of (Z_1, Z_2) . As a result, the observed model simplifies to :

$$\text{logit}(P(D = 1|Z_1, Z_2, S = 1)) = (\theta_0 + \log(r)) + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2 = \theta'_0 + \theta_1 Z_1 + \theta_2 Z_2.$$

Therefore, in this case when we perform a logistic regression with D and Z_1, Z_2 as response and predictors, $\widehat{\theta}_1$ and $\widehat{\theta}_2$ consistently estimate the actual disease model parameters θ_1 and θ_2 . But still $\widehat{\theta}'_0$ is biased since it has the extra $\log(r)$ term.

S1.2.2 Example DAG 2: $Z_1 \rightarrow W$ arrow induced bias for coefficient of Z_1

Under DAG 2 of Figure 2, we observe that conditioned on D and Z_1 , all the paths between from Z_2 to S are blocked. Therefore, given Z_1 and D , Z_2 and S are d-separated which implies,

$$r(Z_1, Z_2) = \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, Z_1, Z_2)}{P(S = 1|D = 0, Z_1, Z_2)} = \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, Z_1)}{P(S = 1|D = 0, Z_1)}. \quad (15)$$

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1)}. \quad (16)$$

Under DAG 2, conditioned on \mathbf{W} and D , \mathbf{Z}_1 is independent of S since given \mathbf{W} and D all the paths from \mathbf{Z}_1 to S are blocked, Thus,

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}. \quad (17)$$

Since $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a function of \mathbf{Z}_1 only, using an exactly similar argument as in DAG 1, we conclude that the naive method unbiasedly estimates the coefficient θ_2 of \mathbf{Z}_2 . Equation (17), shows that the dependence $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ on \mathbf{Z}_1 is only through the second term (distribution of $\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1$) of the integral for both the numerator and denominator.

S1.2.3 Example DAG 3: $Z_1 \rightarrow W$ and $Z_2 \rightarrow S$ induced bias for coefficients of Z_1 and Z_2

Under DAG 3 of Figure 2, \mathbf{Z}_2 is a direct parent of the selection indicator. Therefore, under this setup, $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a function of both the disease model predictors ($\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$). The expression of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) &= \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)} \\ &= \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Under DAG 3, conditioned on $(\mathbf{W}, D, \mathbf{Z}_2)$, \mathbf{Z}_1 is independent of S since given $(\mathbf{W}, D, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ all paths from \mathbf{Z}_1 to S are blocked. Thus,

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1)}. \quad (18)$$

Since $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a function of both \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 , the naive method fails to produce unbiased estimates for both the disease parameters. Equation (18) also shows that the dependence $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ on \mathbf{Z}_1 is only through the second term (distribution of $\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1$) of the integral for both the numerator and denominator. On the other hand the first term in the integral, namely distribution of $(S|D, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ for both numerator and denominator summarizes the dependence of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ on \mathbf{Z}_2 .

S1.2.4 Example DAG 4: strong dependence, increased bias for coefficients of Z_1 and Z_2

The additional arrows $Z_2 \rightarrow W$ and $D \rightarrow W$ lead to increase in dependence between the selection and disease models. Similar to DAG 3, $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a function of both the disease model predictors ($\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2$). The expression of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) &= \frac{P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)} \\ &= \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 1, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W})dP(\mathbf{W}|D = 0, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Under DAG 4, conditioned on $(\mathbf{W}, D, \mathbf{Z}_2)$, \mathbf{Z}_1 is independent of S since given $(\mathbf{W}, D, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ all the paths from \mathbf{Z}_1 to S are blocked. Thus,

$$r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) = \frac{\int P(S = 1|D = 1, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, D = 1)}{\int P(S = 1|D = 0, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}_2)dP(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2, D = 0)}. \quad (19)$$

Since $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ is a function of both \mathbf{Z}_1 and \mathbf{Z}_2 , the naive method fails to produce unbiased estimates for both the disease parameters. Step 3 also shows that the dependence $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ on \mathbf{Z}_1 is only through the second term (distribution of $\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{Z}_1$) of the integral for both the numerator and denominator. On the other hand both terms in the integral depends on \mathbf{Z}_2 . Therefore, the dependence of $r(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ on \mathbf{Z}_2 is extremely high in this scenario.

S1.3 One Step IPW regression

Assumptions

A1. $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \in \Theta$, where Θ is compact.

A2. We did not consider finite population inference here unlike most survey sampling literature. For all the asymptotic results we let $N \rightarrow \infty$. A3. All the variables, including the selection indicator S , $\mathbf{X} = (D, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ are considered to be random which are generally considered fixed in finite population literature.

Theorem 1. *Under assumptions A1, A2 and A3 if the true selection weights are known, then estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2)$ from equation (4) is consistent for $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_0^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^*)$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ is the true value of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ satisfying equation (1).*

Proof. Let

$$\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\}.$$

From Tsiatis (2006), under assumptions A1, A2 and A3 it is enough to show that $\mathbb{E}(\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)) = 0$, in order to prove that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \xrightarrow{P} \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$, where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is obtained from solving $\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{0}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{1i}} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \left(D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right) \middle| \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{1i} \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{1i}} \left[\left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \mathbb{E}(S_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{1i}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $S \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{X}$ therefore $\mathbb{E}(S_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{1i}) = \mathbb{E}(S_i | \mathbf{X}_i) = \pi(\mathbf{X}_i)$. Using this result and equation (1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)] &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{1i}} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{D_i, \mathbf{Z}_i} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}_i} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right) \middle| \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

The last step is obtained from the relation between D and $(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2)$ given by equation (1). □

Theorem 2. *Under assumptions of Theorem 1 when the selection weights are known and we do not take into consideration estimation of selection model parameter, the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is given by*

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V &= (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{g}'] \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})' \quad G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \\ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) &= \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \left\{ D \mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#)'s arguments for a Z-estimation problem under assumptions of [Theorem 1](#) we obtain

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

where

$$V = (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{g}'] \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})' \quad G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right\} \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$$

$$\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\}.$$

This proof just requires the calculation of $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$.

Calculation for $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \right] \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} \\ &= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\}.$$

□

Next we derive a consistent estimator of asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ when the selection probabilities are known. We use this variance estimator for SR and PS. Apart from assumptions A1, A2 and A3, we make an additional assumption to derive a consistent estimator of asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$.

A4. $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})'\}] < \infty$.

Theorem 3. Under assumptions A1, A2, A3 and A4, $\frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1})'$ is a consistent estimator of the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ where

$$\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\}.$$

$$\widehat{E} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \right\}^2 \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i'.$$

Proof. First we prove that as $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\}.$$

Using assumptions A1, A2, A3 and A4 and Uniform Law of Large Numbers (ULLN), we obtain

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\| \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{0}. \quad (20)$$

Since this above expression holds for any $\theta \in \Theta$, therefore it is true for $\hat{\theta}$. This implies

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{0}. \quad (21)$$

Using Triangle Inequality we obtain

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\| \leq \quad (22)$$

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}} + \quad (23)$$

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Since we proved that $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{p} \theta^*$ in Theorem 1, therefore by Continuous Mapping Theorem

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right\| \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{0}. \quad (25)$$

Using equations (21), (22), (23), (24) and (25) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\hat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\}.$$

Therefore we obtain

$$-\widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}} \xrightarrow{p} -G_{\theta^*} \quad \text{which implies} \quad \widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}} \xrightarrow{p} G_{\theta^*}.$$

Using the exact same set of arguments we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{E} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} \right\}^2 \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\hat{\theta}' \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\hat{\theta}' \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[g(\theta^*) \cdot g(\theta^*)'] = \mathbb{E} \left[S \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X})} \right\}^2 \cdot \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining together the consistency of $\widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}}$ and \widehat{E} we obtain

$$\widehat{V} = \widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1})' \xrightarrow{p} V = (G_{\theta^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(\theta^*) \cdot g(\theta^*)'] \cdot (G_{\theta^*}^{-1})'.$$

$$\text{From Theorem 2 } \sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\{0, (G_{\theta^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(\theta^*) \cdot g(\theta^*)'] \cdot (G_{\theta^*}^{-1})'\}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\{\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)\} &= (G_{\theta^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(\theta^*) \cdot g(\theta^*)'] \cdot (G_{\theta^*}^{-1})' + O_p(1) \\ N \cdot \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) &= (G_{\theta^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(\theta^*) \cdot g(\theta^*)'] \cdot (G_{\theta^*}^{-1})' + O_p(1) \\ \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{N} \cdot (G_{\theta^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[g(\theta^*) \cdot g(\theta^*)'] \cdot (G_{\theta^*}^{-1})' + O_p\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ \text{Var}(\widehat{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1})' + o_p(1) = \frac{\widehat{V}}{N} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\frac{\widehat{V}}{N}$ is a consistent estimator of asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\theta}$. \square

S1.4 Asymptotic Distribution and Variance Estimation of PL

For the following theorem apart from assumptions A1 and A2 we make the following assumptions

A5. The selection model parameter $\alpha \in \Theta_\alpha$ where Θ_α is compact.

A6. All the variables, including the selection indicators $S, S_{\text{ext}}, \mathbf{X} = (D, \mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{W}), \mathbf{Z}_1$ are considered to be random which are generally considered fixed in finite population literature.

A7. The known external selection probability is dependent on some variables \mathbf{M} and external selection indicators S_{ext} are independent Bernoulli random variables where $P(S_{\text{ext}} = 1 | \mathbf{M}) = \pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})$. \mathbf{M} can be set of any variables even overlap with \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}_1 .

Theorem 4. *Under assumptions A1, A2 A5, A6 and A7 and assuming the selection model is correctly specified, that is, $\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*) = P(S = 1 | \mathbf{X}) = \pi(\mathbf{X})$ where α^* is the true value of α , then $\hat{\theta}$ estimated using PL is consistent for θ^* as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. In this case, the estimating equation consists of both selection model and disease model parameter estimation. The two step estimating equation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n(\alpha) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext},i}} \right) \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \\ \phi_n(\theta, \hat{\alpha}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\alpha})} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#) to show $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta^*$ in a two step estimation procedure, we need to prove both $\mathbb{E}(\delta_N(\alpha^*)) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbb{E}(\phi_N(\theta^*, \alpha^*)) = \mathbf{0}$. First we show that $\mathbb{E}(\delta_N(\alpha^*)) = \mathbf{0}$.

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \mathbf{X}_i \right) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}(S_i \mathbf{X}_i) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \{ \mathbb{E}(S_i \mathbf{X}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i) \}$$

Since S_i is independent of \mathbf{M}_i given \mathbf{X}_i we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \{ \mathbb{E}(S_i \mathbf{X}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i) \} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} (\mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbb{E}(S_i | \mathbf{X}_i)) \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \{ \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha^*) \}. \quad (27)$$

Next we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext},i}} \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha^*) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha_0) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i \right\} \right] \quad (28)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha^*) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \mid \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i \right\} \right] \quad (29)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \left[\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha^*) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S_{\text{ext},i}}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \mid \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i \right\} \right] \quad (30)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{M}_i} \{ \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha^*) \}. \quad (31)$$

Using equations (27) and (31) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\delta_N(\alpha^*)) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (32)$$

The proof to show that $\mathbb{E}(\phi_N(\theta^*, \alpha^*)) = \mathbf{0}$ is exactly as [Theorem 1](#) except we use $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha^*)$ instead of $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)$. Therefore we obtain $\hat{\theta}$ is a consistent estimator of θ^* . \square

Theorem 5. Under assumptions of Theorem 4 and consistency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ using PL is given by

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, V). \quad (33)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V &= (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\}'] \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})' \\ G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \\ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \left\{ D \mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \\ G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{X}' \right] \\ \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(M)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' \right]^{-1} \cdot \left\{ S \mathbf{X} - \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(M)} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) = \left\{ S \mathbf{X} - S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(M)} \cdot \mathbf{X} \right\}$. By Tsiatis (2006)'s arguments on a two step Z-estimation problem, under assumptions of Theorem 4 and consistency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, we obtain that

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\}'] \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})').$$

We derive the expression of each of the terms in the above expression.

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right\} \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} & G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right\} \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \\ H &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right\} \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} & \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= -H^{-1} \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*). \end{aligned}$$

First we calculate $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$.

Calculation for $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \left\{ D \mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \right] \Bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} \\ &= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}'. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right].$$

Next we calculate $G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*}$.

Calculation for G_{α^*}

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{\partial g(\theta^*, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} &= \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \right] \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} \\
&= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)^2} \cdot \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \cdot \left. \frac{\partial \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} \\
&= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{X}'.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$G_{\alpha^*} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{X}' \right].$$

Next we calculate $\Psi(\alpha^*)$.

Calculation for $\Psi(\alpha^*)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{\partial h(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} &= \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left\{ S\mathbf{X} - S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \mathbf{X} \right\} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} = -\frac{\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha) \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*}}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \\
&= -\frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{X}'
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$H = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{X}' \right].$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\Psi(\alpha^*) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' \right]^{-1} \cdot \left\{ S\mathbf{X} - \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \mathbf{X} \right\}.$$

This gives the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}$ for PL. □

Next we derive a consistent estimator of asymptotic variance of $\hat{\theta}$. Apart from assumptions of Theorem 4 and 5 we make the following additional assumption.

Let $\eta = (\theta, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N} = \Theta \times \Theta_{\alpha}$.

A8. Each of the following expectations are finite.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} (G_{\theta})] < \infty \quad \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} (G_{\alpha})] < \infty \quad \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\alpha \in \Theta_{\alpha}} (H)] < \infty \\
&\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} \left[S \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} \right\}^2 \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right] \right) < \infty \\
&\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} \left[\frac{S\mathbf{X}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} \cdot \left\{ D\mathbf{Z}' - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}' \right\} - \frac{SS_{\text{ext}}\mathbf{X}}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \left\{ D\mathbf{Z}' - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \right] \right) < \infty \\
&\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \Theta_{\alpha}} \left[S \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' - 2SS_{\text{ext}} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' + S_{\text{ext}} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' \right] \right) < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6. Under all the assumptions of Theorems 4, 5 and A8, $\frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_\theta^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_\theta^{-1})'$ is a consistent estimator of the variance of $\widehat{\theta}$ for PL where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G}_\theta &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
\widehat{H} &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_{ext,i} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})}{\pi_{ext}(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \\
\widehat{G}_\alpha &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{\{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\} \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{X}_i' \\
\widehat{E}_1 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \right\}^2 \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
\widehat{E}_2 = \widehat{E}_3 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \widehat{G}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i' - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot S_{ext,i} \cdot \widehat{G}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\pi_{ext}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i' - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} \\
\widehat{E}_4 &= \frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' - 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot S_{ext,i} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})}{\pi_{ext}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{i=1}^N S_{ext,i} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})}{\pi_{ext}(\mathbf{M})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \right] \cdot (\widehat{H}^{-1})' \cdot (\widehat{G}_\alpha)' \\
\widehat{E} &= \widehat{E}_1 - \widehat{E}_2 - \widehat{E}_3 + \widehat{E}_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Under all the assumptions of Theorems 4, 5 and A8 and using ULLN and Continuous Mapping Theorem, the proof of consistency for each of the following sample quantities are exactly same as the approach in Theorem 3. Using the exact same steps on the joint parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (as in Theorem 3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G}_\theta &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} G_{\theta^*} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G}_\alpha &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{\{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\} \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{X}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} G_\alpha = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{X}' \right]. \\
\widehat{H} &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_{ext,i} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})}{\pi_{ext}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} H = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\pi_e(\mathbf{M})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \cdot S_{ext} \cdot \mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{X}' \right].
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{E}_1 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \right\}^2 \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \left[S \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \right\}^2 \cdot \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right]. \\
\widehat{E}_2 = \widehat{E}_3 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \cdot \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i' - \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot S_{\text{ext},i} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i' - \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i' \right\} \\
&\xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \{ G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot H^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)' \}. \\
\widehat{E}_4 &= \frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' - 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot S_{\text{ext},i} \cdot \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{i=1}^N S_{\text{ext},i} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})}{\pi_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{M}_i)} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \right] \cdot (\widehat{H}^{-1})' \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \{ G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} H^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \cdot \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)' \cdot (H^{-1})' \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*})' \}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\widehat{E} = \widehat{E}_1 - \widehat{E}_2 - \widehat{E}_3 + \widehat{E}_4 \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \{ \{ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \} \{ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \}' \}.$$

Using all the above results we obtain $\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1})'$

$$\xrightarrow{p} (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E} \{ \{ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \} \{ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \}' \} \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})'.$$

From Theorem 5 using the same approach used in the last step of Theorem 3, we obtain that $\frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1})'$ is a consistent estimator of the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. \square

S1.5 Identity of Simplex Regression

In this section, we prove the identity in equation (9). Let $S_{\text{comb}} = (S = 1 \text{ or } S_{\text{ext}} = 1)$. For any (j, k) in $(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k | \mathbf{X}, S_{\text{comb}} = 1) &= \frac{P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k, \mathbf{X} | S_{\text{comb}} = 1)}{P(\mathbf{X} | S_{\text{comb}} = 1)} \\
&= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} | S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k, S_{\text{comb}} = 1) \cdot P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k | S_{\text{comb}} = 1)}{\sum_{(a,b) \in (10,01,11)} P(\mathbf{X} | S = a, S_{\text{ext}} = b, S_{\text{comb}} = 1) \cdot P(S = a, S_{\text{ext}} = b | S_{\text{comb}} = 1)} \\
&= \frac{P(\mathbf{X} | S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k) \cdot P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k)}{\sum_{(a,b) \in (10,01,11)} P(\mathbf{X} | S = a, S_{\text{ext}} = b) \cdot P(S = a, S_{\text{ext}} = b)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We define three quantities,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{jk} &= P(\mathbf{X} | S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k) \\
\alpha_{jk} &= P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k) \\
p_{jk} &= P(S = j, S_{\text{ext}} = k | \mathbf{X}, S_{\text{comb}} = 1).
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we obtain that,

$$p_{jk} = \frac{\mu_{jk} \alpha_{jk}}{\mu_{11} \alpha_{11} + \mu_{01} \alpha_{01} + \mu_{10} \alpha_{10}}.$$

Therefore, we obtain that,

$$\frac{\mu_{11}\alpha_{11}}{p_{11}} = \frac{\mu_{10}\alpha_{10}}{p_{10}} = \frac{\mu_{01}\alpha_{01}}{p_{01}}.$$

Now, we also obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{X}|S=1) &= \sum_b P(\mathbf{X}|S=1, S_{\text{ext}}=b)P(S_{\text{ext}}=b|S=1) \\ &= \frac{\mu_{11}\alpha_{11} + \mu_{10}\alpha_{10}}{P(S=1)} = \frac{\mu_{11}\alpha_{11} + \mu_{11}\alpha_{11}\frac{p_{10}}{p_{11}}}{P(S=1)} \\ P(\mathbf{X}|S_{\text{ext}}=1) &= \sum_b P(\mathbf{X}|S=a, S_{\text{ext}}=1)P(S=a|S_{\text{ext}}=1) \\ &= \frac{\mu_{11}\alpha_{11} + \mu_{10}\alpha_{10}}{P(S_{\text{ext}}=1)} = \frac{\mu_{11}\alpha_{11} + \mu_{11}\alpha_{11}\frac{p_{10}}{p_{11}}}{P(S_{\text{ext}}=1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of conditional probability

$$\begin{aligned} P(S=1|\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X}|S=1)P(S=1)}{P(\mathbf{X})} \\ P(S_{\text{ext}}=1|\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{P(\mathbf{X}|S_{\text{ext}}=1)P(S_{\text{ext}}=1)}{P(\mathbf{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$P(S=1|\mathbf{X}) = P(S_{\text{ext}}=1|\mathbf{X}) \frac{P(\mathbf{X}|S=1)P(S=1)}{P(\mathbf{X}|S_{\text{ext}}=1)P(S_{\text{ext}}=1)}.$$

Using above expressions of $P(\mathbf{X}|S=1)$, $P(\mathbf{X}|S_{\text{ext}}=1)$ and $P(S=1|\mathbf{X})$, we obtain that,

$$P(S=1|\mathbf{X}) = P(S_{\text{ext}}=1|\mathbf{X}) \cdot \frac{p_{11} + p_{10}}{p_{11} + p_{01}}.$$

This proves equation (9).

S1.6 Asymptotic Distribution and Variance Estimation of CL

Theorem 7. Under assumptions A1, A2 A3, A5 and assuming the selection model is correctly specified, that is, $\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*) = P(S=1|\mathbf{X}) = \pi(\mathbf{X})$ where α^* is the true value of α , then $\hat{\theta}$ estimated using CL is consistent for θ^* as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. In this case, the estimating equation consists of both selection model and disease model parameter estimation. The two step estimating equation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_N(\alpha) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \alpha)} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i \\ \phi_N(\theta, \hat{\alpha}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\alpha})} \left\{ D_i \mathbf{Z}_i - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#) to show $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \xrightarrow{p} \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ in a two step estimation procedure, we need to proof both $\mathbb{E}(\delta_N(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbb{E}(\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)) = \mathbf{0}$. At first we show that $\mathbb{E}(\delta_N(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)) = \mathbf{0}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \right\} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S_i \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{S_i \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \middle| \mathbf{X}_i \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\frac{\mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \mathbb{E}(S_i | \mathbf{X}_i) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\frac{\mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_i}(\mathbf{X}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Using this above expression we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}(\delta_N(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i \right\} = \mathbf{0}.$$

The proof to show that $\mathbb{E}(\phi_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)) = \mathbf{0}$ is exactly as [Theorem 1](#) except we use $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)$ instead of $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)$. Therefore we obtain $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is a consistent estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$. \square

Theorem 8. *Under assumptions of [Theorem 7](#) and consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ using CL is given by*

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, V). \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V &= (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\}'] \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})' \\ G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\} \\ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \left\{ D \mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \\ G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{X}' \right] \\ \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' \right]^{-1} \cdot \left\{ \frac{S \mathbf{X}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} - \mathbf{X} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) = \left\{ \frac{S \mathbf{X}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} - \mathbf{X} \right\}$. From [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#) under assumptions of [Theorem 7](#) and consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ for a two step Z-estimation problem, we obtain that

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*})^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\}'] \cdot (G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}^{-1})').$$

We will derive the expression of each of the terms in the above expression.

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right\} \bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} & G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right\} \bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \\ H &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right\} \bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} & \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= -H^{-1} \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*). \end{aligned}$$

First we calculate $G_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}$.

Calculation for G_{θ}

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial g(\theta, \alpha^*)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta^*} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \right] \Big|_{\theta=\theta^*} \\ &= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' \implies G_{\theta^*} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}' \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next we calculate G_{α^*} .

Calculation for G_{α^*}

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial g(\theta^*, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \right] \Big|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} \\ &= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)^2} \cdot \left\{ D\mathbf{Z} - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \right\} \cdot \left. \frac{\partial \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} \\ &= -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{X}' \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$G_{\alpha^*} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*\prime} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{X}' \right].$$

Next we calculate $\Psi(\alpha^*)$.

Calculation for $\Psi(\alpha^*)$

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial h(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} \left\{ \frac{S\mathbf{X}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} - \mathbf{X} \right\} \Big|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} = -\frac{S\mathbf{X}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)^2} \cdot \left. \frac{\partial \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=\alpha^*} \\ &= -\frac{S\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)^2} \cdot \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*) \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$H = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \right].$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\Psi(\alpha^*) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{S\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}'}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \right]^{-1} \cdot \left\{ \frac{S\mathbf{X}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} - \mathbf{X} \right\}.$$

This gives the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}$ for PL. □

Next we derive a consistent estimator of asymptotic variance of $\hat{\theta}$. Apart from assumptions of Theorem 7 and 8 we make the following additional assumption to derive a consistent estimator of asymptotic variance of $\hat{\theta}$.

Let $\eta = (\theta, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N} = \Theta \times \Theta_{\alpha}$.

A9. Each of the following expectations are finite.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} (G_\theta)] < \infty \quad \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} (G_\alpha)] < \infty \quad \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\alpha \in \Theta_\alpha} (H)] < \infty \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} \left[S \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} \right\}^2 \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right] \right) < \infty \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{N}} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} \cdot \left\{ \frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)} - 1 \right\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta' \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{Z}' \right] \right) < \infty \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \Theta_\alpha} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)^2} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)\} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' \right] \right) < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 9. Under all the assumptions of Theorems 7, 8 and A9, $\frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_\theta^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_\theta^{-1})'$ is a consistent estimator of the variance of $\widehat{\theta}$ for CL where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G}_\theta &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
\widehat{H} &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \\
\widehat{G}_\alpha &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{\{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{X}_i' \\
\widehat{E}_1 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \right\}^2 \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
\widehat{E}_2 = \widehat{E}_3 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \widehat{G}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\} \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
\widehat{E}_4 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{G}_\alpha \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \left[\frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})^2} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\} \right] \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \cdot (\widehat{H}^{-1})' \cdot (\widehat{G}_\alpha)' \\
\widehat{E} &= \widehat{E}_1 - \widehat{E}_2 - \widehat{E}_3 + \widehat{E}_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Under all the assumptions of Theorems 7, 8 and A9 using ULLN and Continuous Mapping Theorem, the proof of consistency for each of the following sample quantities are exactly same as the approach in Theorem 3. Using the exact same steps on the joint parameters η instead of θ (as in Theorem 3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G}_\theta &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} G_\theta = \mathbb{E} \left\{ -\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \cdot \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{G}_\alpha &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \frac{\{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})\}}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\alpha})} \cdot \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\theta}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{X}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} G_\alpha = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)} \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \alpha^*)\} \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\theta^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{X}' \right].
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{H} &= -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})\} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} H = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{S}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \cdot \mathbf{X} \mathbf{X}' \right]. \\
\widehat{E}_1 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \right\}^2 \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E} \left[S \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)} \right\}^2 \cdot \left\{ D - \frac{e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}}}{(1 + e^{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{*'} \mathbf{Z}})} \right\}^2 \cdot \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}' \right]. \\
\widehat{E}_2 = \widehat{E}_3 &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \left\{ \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} - 1 \right\} \left\{ D_i - \frac{e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i}}{(1 + e^{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}' \mathbf{Z}_i})} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{Z}_i' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}\{G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot H^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)'\}. \\
\widehat{E}_4 &= \frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})^2} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' + \frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \right] \cdot (\widehat{H}^{-1})' \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})' \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \left[\frac{S_i}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})^2} \cdot \{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})\} \right] \cdot \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i' \cdot (\widehat{H}^{-1})' \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})' \\
&\xrightarrow{p} E_4 = \mathbb{E}\{\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \widehat{H}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \cdot \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)' \cdot (\widehat{H}^{-1})' \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*})'\}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\widehat{E} = \widehat{E}_1 - \widehat{E}_2 - \widehat{E}_3 + \widehat{E}_4 \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) + G_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)\}'].$$

From Theorem 8 using the same approach used in the last step of Theorem 3, we obtain that $\frac{1}{N} \cdot \widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1} \cdot \widehat{E} \cdot (\widehat{G}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1})'$ is a consistent estimator of the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ using CL. \square

S1.7 Criteria for coarsening variables for PS method

For PS method, the selection probability of (D, Z'_2, W') are available where both Z'_2 and W' are the coarsened versions of Z_2 and W . For any continuous random variable say, L , a coarsened version L' is defined as,

$$L' = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } L < \text{Cutoff}_1 \\ 1 & \text{if } < \text{Cutoff}_1 \leq L \leq \text{Cutoff}_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ K-1 & \text{if } L > \text{Cutoff}_K \end{cases}$$

In this simulation for both Z_2 and W , we chose $K = 2$ and $\text{Cutoff}_1 = \epsilon_{0.15}$, $\text{Cutoff}_2 = \epsilon_{0.85}$, where $\epsilon_{0.15}$ and $\epsilon_{0.85}$ are the 15 and 85 percentile quartiles for both the continuous random variables respectively.

S1.8 Real Data Cancer Weights

As described in Section 4, we first estimated the weights for PL and SR without using cancer w_o as a selection variable. Then we used equation (14) to modify the weights. The proof of equation (14) is presented in this section. At first we

note that $1/w_0 = P(S = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)$. Using Bayes theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(S = 1|D, \mathbf{W}, Z_2) &= \frac{P(D|S = 1, \mathbf{W}, Z_2)P(\mathbf{W}, Z_2, S = 1)}{P(D|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)P(\mathbf{W}, Z_2)} \\
 &= \frac{P(D|S = 1, \mathbf{W}, Z_2)P(S = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)P(\mathbf{W}, Z_2)}{P(D|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)P(\mathbf{W}, Z_2)} \\
 &= \frac{P(D|S = 1, \mathbf{W}, Z_2)}{P(D|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)} \cdot P(S = 1|\mathbf{W}, Z_2) \\
 &= \frac{P(D|S = 1, \mathbf{W}, Z_2)}{P(D|\mathbf{W}, Z_2)} \cdot \frac{1}{w_0}.
 \end{aligned}$$

S1.9 Details of different subsampling strategies

$$\text{logit}(P(S_{\text{sub}} = 1|\text{cancer, sex, diabetes})) = \mu_0 + \mu_1 \cdot \text{cancer} + \mu_2 \cdot \text{diabetes} + \mu_3 \cdot \text{sex}.$$

We selected diabetes to represent a part of \mathbf{W} which has a significant association with cancer. The four different subsampling strategies are given by

- **Random Sampling:** S_{sub} does not depend on any variables. In this case $\mu_0 = -0.5$, $\mu_1 = 0$, $\mu_2 = 0$ and $\mu_3 = 0$.
- **Only cancer:** S_{sub} only depend on cancer. In this case $\mu_0 = -1$, $\mu_1 = 1$, $\mu_2 = 0$ and $\mu_3 = 0$.
- **Cancer and sex:** S_{sub} depends on cancer and sex. In this case $\mu_0 = -0.5$, $\mu_1 = 1$, $\mu_2 = 0$ and $\mu_3 = -1$.
- **Cancer, sex and diabetes:** S_{sub} depends on cancer, sex and diabetes. In this case $\mu_0 = -1$, $\mu_1 = 1$, $\mu_2 = 1$ and $\mu_3 = -1$.

Supplementary Figures




Figure S1: Comparison between empirical monte carlo variance and proposed variance estimators of $\hat{\theta}_2$ using the four weighted methods under the four DAGs in Setup 1. The colored bars denote the empirical variances and the dots represent the estimated ones. SR : Simplex regression, PL : Pseudolikelihood, PS : Post Stratification and CL : Calibration.




Figure S2: The coverage probabilities for the four weighted methods using the proposed variance estimators of $\hat{\theta}_2$ under the four DAGs in Setup 1. SR : Simplex regression, PL : Pseudolikelihood, PS : Post Stratification and CL : Calibration.