

Multiple bias-calibration for adjusting selection bias of non-probability samples using data integration

Z. Wang

S. Yang

J.K. Kim

Abstract

Valid statistical inference is challenging when the sample is subject to unknown selection bias. Data integration can be used to correct for selection bias when we have a parallel probability sample from the same population with some common measurements. How to model and estimate the selection probability or the propensity score (PS) of a non-probability sample using an independent probability sample is the challenging part of the data integration. We approach this difficult problem by employing multiple candidate models for PS combined with empirical likelihood. By incorporating multiple propensity score models into the internal bias calibration constraint in the empirical likelihood setup, the selection bias can be eliminated so long as the multiple candidate models contain a true PS model. The bias calibration constraint under the multiple PS models is called multiple bias calibration. Multiple PS models can include both missing-at-random and missing-not-at-random models. Asymptotic properties are discussed, and some limited simulation studies are presented to compare the proposed method with some existing competitors. Plasmode simulation studies using the Culture & Community in a Time of Crisis dataset demonstrate the practical usage and advantages of the proposed method.

Keywords: Empirical likelihood, multiple robustness, propensity score, variance estimator

1 Introduction

While probability samples serve as the gold standard in social science and related fields to estimate population quantities and monitor policy effects, their acquisition and analysis become challenging due to their high cost and low response rates (Couper, 2013; Miller, 2017; Williams and Brick, 2018; Kalton, 2019). During the past 20 years, non-probability samples, on the other hand, have been increasingly prevailing since they are “wider, deeper, faster, better, cheaper, less burdensome, and more relevant” (Holt, 2007; Citro, 2014). However, non-probability samples suffer from selection bias because of unknown selection probabilities, and it may lead to erroneous inference if such selection bias is overlooked (Couper, 2000; Bethlehem, 2016; Elliott and Valliant, 2017; Meng, 2018). Consequently, addressing selection bias in non-probability samples constitutes a significant research area, and we tackle this challenge through the utilization of a data integration methodology.

Data integration is an emerging area of research that combines multiple data sources in a defensible way. Tam and Clarke (2015) and Pfefffermann (2015) addressed the methodological challenges of big data in the production of official statistics. However, important questions related to data integration for complex surveys remain, as summarized by Rao (2020) and Yang and Kim (2020). In data integration, by utilizing an independent probability sample as a calibration sample, the selection bias in the non-probability sample can be reduced. Valliant and Dever (2011) proposed a rescaled design weight (RDW) model based on a missing-at-random (MAR) assumption, and the associated model parameter is estimated by combining both probability sample and non-probability sample. Based on the estimated selection probabilities for the non-probability sample, Valliant and Dever (2011) used a Hájek estimator (Hájek, 1971) to estimate the parameter of interest. Similarly, Chen et al. (2020) proposed a parametric MAR model for the selection probabilities, but the model parameters are estimated by balancing a smooth function involving them. Wang et al. (2021)

proposed several estimators to correct the selection bias of the non-probability sample based on different logistic regression models. Kim and Tam (2021) proposed an efficient estimator using a regression model to integrate information from a probability sample and a non-probability sample. Parametric models are commonly used by existing methods, but they are sensitive to model misspecification. Rivers (2007) proposed a nearest-neighbor sampling matching approach, which is a non-parametric imputation method for data integration. Semi-parametric imputation is also discussed by Kim et al. (2021). Wang et al. (2022) proposed a non-parametric data integration method based on models from a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. Chen et al. (2022) proposed a data integration method for a non-probability sample by empirical likelihood (Owen, 1991). See also Wu (2022), Beaumont (2020) and the references therein for other data integration methods. Existing methods mainly assumed an MAR condition for the selection probabilities of the non-probability sample, and such an assumption is hard to verify in practice. In addition, violation of the MAR assumption usually leads to biased inference.

In this paper, we propose a maximum empirical likelihood (MEL) estimator to integrate a probability sample, a non-probability sample and fully observed auxiliary information from the population. Differently from most existing work, we accommodate a possible missing-not-at-random (MNAR) model for the selection probability associated with the non-probability sample. Instead of assuming a correctly specified parametric model, we assume that a true response model for the selection probability belongs to a set of candidate models for the selection probability inspired by the multiple robustness framework of Han and Wang (2013). The price we need to pay for the MNAR assumption is that a correctly specified density function is required. The assumption on the density function is less stringent than the MAR one in the sense that the former can be checked or obtained by the probability sample but the latter one cannot. Han and Wang (2013) did not provide a rigorous variance estimator, but under regularity conditions, an asymptotically unbiased variance estimator is

available for the proposed estimator.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The problem setup is introduced in Section 2. We propose the maximum empirical likelihood estimator in Section 3, and its variance estimator is discussed in Section 4. In Section 5, the proposed estimator is compared with the existing ones in a limited simulation study. The application of the proposed estimator to a simulation based on real data using the Culture & Community in a Time of Crisis dataset is presented in Section 6. Concluding remarks are given in Section 7.

2 Problem Setup

Let $\mathcal{F}_N = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ be a finite population of size N , where \mathbf{x}_i is a $p \geq 1$ dimensional covariate vector associated with unit i , and y_i is the response of interest. In this paper, we adopt a model-assisted framework (Särndal, 1992) and assume that the finite population \mathcal{F}_N is a random sample from a super-population model $F(\mathbf{x}, y)$. The finite population is treated as fixed once it is generated, and we are interested in estimating the population mean $\theta_N = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$.

Due to the limited budget and time, it is practically impossible to observe $\{y_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Instead, complex sampling is always performed to obtain a probability sample from the finite population \mathcal{F}_N , and the size of the probability sample is usually much smaller compared to N . Thus, we assume that a probability sample $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : i \in A\}$ of size n_A is available, with π_{Ai} being the inclusion probability associated with the unit i and $n_A = o_p(N)$. Other than the probability sample A , we also assume the availability of an independent non-probability sample $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : i \in B\}$ of size n_B as well as the auxiliary information $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Since the response of interest is observable in the probability sample, $\hat{\theta}_A = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in A} \pi_{Ai}^{-1} y_i$ is a design-unbiased estimator of θ_N (Horvitz and Thompson, 1952). Denote $\pi_{Bi} = \Pr(\delta_{Bi} = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ to be the selection probability of the i th unit for the

non-probability sample B . If $\{\pi_{Bi} : i \in B\}$ were fully observed, then we can obtain another design-unbiased estimator $\hat{\theta}_B = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in B} \pi_{Bi}^{-1} y_i$. Due to the independence between the probability sample A and the non-probability sample B , we can construct a more efficient estimator based on $\hat{\theta}_A$ and $\hat{\theta}_B$, and the auxiliary information can be further incorporated. However, the selection probabilities $\{\pi_{Bi} : i \in B\}$ are not available in practice, and they need to be estimated to correct the selection bias associated with the non-probability sample B .

In this paper, we develop methods to combine the information from two samples as well as $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. To address the challenges and utilize all available information in statistically defensible ways, it is important to develop better statistical tools for data integration. Many existing methods (Valliant and Dever, 2011; Chen et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021) are mainly based on the MAR assumption of Rubin (1976), which is a strong assumption and difficult to validate in practice. How to avoid or relax this assumption and develop valid statistical tools for data integration and data fusion is a critically important problem in survey sampling.

3 Maximum empirical likelihood estimator

Consider the following MNAR response model for the non-probability sample:

$$\pi_{Bi} = \pi(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \boldsymbol{\phi}_0), \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\phi}_0$ is the model parameter. Since a non-probability sample usually corresponds to a big data source, it is reasonable to assume $n_B = O_p(N)$. Rather than assuming the availability of the exact parametric form (1) in this paper, we borrow the idea of multiple robustness (Han and Wang, 2013) and assume that the correct response model (1) is contained in K

candidates $\{\pi_k(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\phi}_k) : k = 1, \dots, K\}$, where $\pi_k(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\phi}_k)$ is the k th candidate response model with model parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$. The estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_k$ solves

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{\delta_{Bi}}{\pi_k(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \boldsymbol{\phi}_k)} - 1 \right\} \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0} \quad (2)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. Other estimating equations can be used as long as certain conditions are satisfied; see Beaumont (2005), Kim and Kim (2007), Chen et al. (2020) and Section 7.3 of Kim and Shao (2021) for details.

Based on estimated candidate models $\{\pi_k(\mathbf{x}, y; \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_k) : k = 1, \dots, K\}$, we propose an approach based on empirical likelihood (Owen, 1991) to combine the information from the probability sample A , the nonprobability sample B , and the auxiliary information $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ in the finite population. Specifically, the proposed maximum empirical likelihood (MEL) estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{MEL}$ is obtained by maximizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} \log p_i$$

subject to $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i = 1$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i \pi_k(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_k) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\pi}_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_k) \quad (k = 1, \dots, K), \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i (y_i - \theta) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\pi}_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = E\{\pi_k(\mathbf{X}, Y; \boldsymbol{\phi}) \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}\}$. The right-hand side of (3) is a consistent estimator of the population mean $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_k(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$. Including the propensity score function in the calibration constraint in the empirical likelihood framework has been discussed by Liu and Fan (2023) and Kim and Morikawa (2023). The multiple calibration constraints in (3) for $\{p_i, i \in B\}$ intend to correct the selection bias of the non-probability sample and

thus are referred to as multiple bias-calibration. To obtain an estimator of $\tilde{\pi}_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_k)$, we need to assume a correctly specified conditional density function $f(y | \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ with parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and its estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is obtained by maximizing the pseudo log-likelihood function

$$\sum_{i \in A} \pi_{A_i}^{-1} \log f(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}). \quad (5)$$

Since we do not restrict ourselves to the MAR assumption and do not need to pinpoint which candidate model is the correct one among the K candidate models, we need an additional assumption that $f(y | \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is correct. This condition is weaker than the correct model assumption for (1) for the following reasons. First, the model assumption $f(y | \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is testable using the probability sample A . If a correct parametric model is difficult to specify, we can consider a non-parametric density model and use fractional imputation (Kim and Yang, 2014) to obtain $\tilde{\pi}_k(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$. Second, it is well known that the MNAR assumption (17) is very hard to validate even coupled with the probability sample A under general setups.

Our proposal differs from existing work in the following aspects. Existing methods mainly assumed MAR response models for data integration (Elliott and Valliant, 2017; Chen et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021, 2022), but in this article we consider an MNAR response model (1) for data fusion. Although such an MNAR response model is discussed in the literature of missing data analysis (Kim and Shao, 2021), we do not assume a correctly specified parametric form for it. Instead, we consider the case where the correct response model is contained in several candidate models (Han and Wang, 2013). Han and Wang (2013) did not provide a consistent variance estimator, but we propose an asymptotically unbiased variance estimator for our estimator that allows for multiply robust inference; see Section 4 for details.

In addition to the constraint on the selection probabilities (3), an MEL generalized re-

gression (MEL_GREG) estimator can be obtained using the following additional constraint,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i \mathbf{x}_i = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_i. \quad (6)$$

Such marginal information is commonly used to improve the estimation efficiency in survey sampling; see, e.g., Deville and Särndal (1992).

The following estimation procedure is used to obtain the MEL estimator.

[Step 1]. Estimate ϕ_k by solving $\sum_{i=1}^N \{\delta_{Bi} \pi_k^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \phi_k) - 1\} \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$ in (2).

[Step 2]. Posit a conditional density model $f(y | \mathbf{x}; \beta)$ and estimate β by maximizing $\sum_{i \in A} \pi_i^{-1} \log f(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \beta)$ in (5).

[Step 3]. Maximize $\sum_{i \in B} \log p_i$ subject to $\sum_{i \in B} p_i = 1$ and (3)–(4).

We can use the algorithm in Wu (2005) to solve Step 3. To obtain the MEL_GREG estimator, we only need an additional equality constraint (6) in Step 3. Other estimating functions can be used for θ if we are interested in parameters other than the population mean.

4 Variance estimation

Since we have assumed $n_A = o_p(N)$ and $n_B = O_p(N)$, and since the sampling indicators $\{\delta_{Bi} : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ are independently generated for the non-probability sample B , we conclude that the variability of estimating ϕ_k is asymptotically negligible compared to the uncertainty of estimating β under regularity conditions. Therefore, we use ϕ_k to denote its estimator $\hat{\phi}_k$ in this section for the variance estimation of $\hat{\theta}$ as well as $\hat{\beta}$.

The proposed MEL estimator is asymptotically equivalent to the one by maximizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} \log p_i \quad (7)$$

subject to $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i = 1$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i \pi_k(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \phi_k) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\pi}_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \phi_k) \quad (k = 1, \dots, K), \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i (y_i - \theta) = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Ai} \pi_{Ai}^{-1} \frac{1}{f(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} \frac{\partial f(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (10)$$

where (10) corresponds to the pseudo-maximum likelihood estimator in (5). The difference between (3) and (8) is that we use the true parameter ϕ_k for the latter.

Let $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i = (\pi_1(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \phi_1), \dots, \pi_K(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \phi_K))^T$ and

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\tilde{\pi}_1(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \phi_1), \dots, \tilde{\pi}_K(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}, \phi_K))^T.$$

Then, by the Lagrange multiplier, the optimization problem (7)–(10) is equivalent to solving the following equation system

$$\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i \in A} \pi_{Ai}^{-1} \frac{1}{f(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})} \frac{\partial f(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \sum_{i \in B} \frac{1}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T (\boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))} (\boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \\ \sum_{i \in B} \frac{1}{1 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T (\boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))} (y_i - \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (11)$$

Under regularity conditions (Owen, 1990), we can show that the solution to (11), denoted as $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \hat{\theta})$, satisfies

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \hat{\theta}) - (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{0}, \theta_N) = o_p(1). \quad (12)$$

Therefore, linearization can be used to obtain a variance estimator for the solution, which is

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \hat{\theta}) = \hat{\mathbf{I}}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{V}}_g (\hat{\mathbf{I}}^{-1})^T,$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_g$ is the design variance estimator of $\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \theta)$ with $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \theta)$ replaced by its estimator, and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}$ evaluated by $\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \theta) / \partial (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \theta)^T$ with parameters replaced by their estimators.

As we have discussed in the preceding section, we can provide an asymptotically unbiased variance estimator for the proposed estimator, but Han and Wang (2013) cannot unless a true model is available. This merit is achieved based on the assumption $n_A = o_p(n_B)$. Since a parametric density model is assumed for the response of interest y given the covariate \mathbf{x} , based on the consistency result in (12), we can also derive an asymptotic distribution for the parameter of interest using linearization for statistical inference.

5 Simulation

In this section, we compare the performance of the proposed estimator with its competitors numerically. A finite population $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ is generated as follows, where $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2})^T$. For $i = 1, \dots, N$, $x_{ij} \sim N(0, 1)$ for $j = 1, 2$, and $y_i = x_{i1} + x_{i2} + \epsilon_i$ with $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 4)$, where $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ is a normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . The parameter of interest is the population mean $\theta_N = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$. In this section, we consider $N \in \{5\,000, 10\,000\}$.

A simple random sampling without replacement is performed to generate a probability sample $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : i \in A\}$ of size n_A , and the associated inclusion probability is $\pi_{A,i} = n_A N^{-1}$ for $i \in A$. The inclusion probability is similar to the selection probability, but is used for the probability sample. We consider $n_A \in \{100, 400\}$. To generate a non-probability sample $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : i \in B\}$, we use $\delta_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi_{B,i}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i))$ to generate the corresponding response

indicators, where $\text{Bernoulli}(p)$ is a Bernoulli distribution with success probability $p \in (0, 1)$.

We consider the following three scenarios for the response model (17):

S1. $\text{logit}(\pi_{Bi}) = -0.5 + 0.5x_{i1} + 0.5x_{i2}$, where $\text{logit}(p) = \log p - \log(1 - p)$ for $p \in (0, 1)$.

S2. $\text{logit}(\pi_{Bi}) = -0.5 + 0.5x_{i1} + 0.5x_{i2} + 0.2y_i$.

S3. $\text{logit}(\pi_{Bi}) = -0.5 + 0.5x_{i1} + (0.5x_{i2} + 0.2y_i)I(y_i < 0) + 0.3y_iI(y_i \geq 0)$.

For the three scenarios, the average response rates are about 0.4. Scenarios S1 and S2 correspond to the MAR assumption and the MNAR assumption, respectively. Additionally, scenario S3 is also an MNAR response model, but it cannot be correctly estimated using a traditional logistic regression model $\text{logit}(\pi_{Bi}) = \phi_0 + \phi_1x_{i1} + \phi_2x_{i2} + \phi_3y_i$.

We consider the following methods to estimate θ_N .

1. The HT estimator $\hat{\theta}_{HT} = n_A^{-1} \sum_{i \in A} y_i$ only by the probability sample A .
2. The Generalized regression (GREG) estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GREG} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\gamma}$ incorporating information from the probability sample A as well as auxiliary information $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i = 1, \dots, N\}$, where $\hat{\gamma} = (\sum_{i \in A} \pi_{Ai}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T)^{-1} \sum_{i \in A} \pi_{Ai}^{-1} y_i \mathbf{x}_i$.
3. The RDW estimator (Valliant and Dever, 2011). Assume a logistic regression model for the selection probability associated with the non-probability sample $\pi_{Bi} = \pi_{Bi}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$:

$$\log \left\{ \frac{\pi_{Bi}(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{1 - \pi_{Bi}(\boldsymbol{\phi})} \right\} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \boldsymbol{\phi}, \quad (13)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is the model parameter to be estimated and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T = (1, \mathbf{x}_i^T)$ is a vector of covariates augmented with an intercept term. Parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is estimated by maximizing

$$l_{RDW}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{i \in B} w_i^* \log \pi_{Bi}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \sum_{i \in A} \log \{1 - \pi_{Bi}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\}, \quad (14)$$

where $w_i^* = 1$ for $i \in B$, $w_i^* = \pi_{A,i}^{-1}(\hat{N} - n_B)/\hat{N}$ for $i \in A$, and $\hat{N} = \sum_{i \in S_p} \pi_{A,i}^{-1}$ is the estimated population size. Denote $\hat{\phi}$ as the one maximizing (14), and let $w_i^{(RDW)} = \{\pi_{Bi}(\hat{\phi})\}^{-1}$. Then, the RDW estimator is

$$\hat{\theta}_{RDW} = \left(\sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(RDW)} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(RDW)} y_i.$$

4. The Chen-Li-Wu (CLW) estimator (Chen et al., 2020). Consider (13), but the model parameter ϕ is estimated by maximizing

$$l_{CLW}(\phi) = \sum_{i \in B} \log \left\{ \frac{\pi_{Bi}(\phi)}{1 - \pi_{Bi}(\phi)} \right\} + \sum_{i \in A} \pi_{A,i}^{-1} \log\{1 - \pi_{Bi}(\phi)\}. \quad (15)$$

Once the estimator $\hat{\phi}$ is obtained, a similar estimator to the RDW one can be used to estimate θ_N .

5. The adjusted logistic propensity weighting (ALP) estimator (Wang et al., 2021). Denote $p_i = \pi_{Bi}(1 - \pi_{Bi})^{-1}$, and consider a logistic regression model for $p_i = p_i(\phi)$,

$$\log \left\{ \frac{p_i(\phi)}{1 - p_i(\phi)} \right\} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \phi. \quad (16)$$

The parameter ϕ is estimated by maximizing

$$l_{ALP}(\phi) = \sum_{i \in B} \log p_i(\phi) + \sum_{i \in A} \pi_{A,i}^{-1} \log\{1 - p_i(\phi)\}.$$

Once an estimator $\hat{\phi}$ is obtained, the ALP estimator is

$$\hat{\theta}_{ALP} = \left(\sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(ALP)} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(ALP)} y_i,$$

where $w_i^{(ALP)} = \{1 - p_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}})\}/p_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}})$.

6. The full design weight (FDW) estimator (Wang et al., 2021). Consider the ALP estimator, but use $p_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}})$ to approximate π_{Bi} . That is, the FDW estimator is

$$\hat{\theta}_{FDW} = \left(\sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(FDW)} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(FDW)} y_i,$$

where $w_i^{(FDW)} = 1/p_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}})$.

7. The scaled ALP (ALP_s) estimator (Wang et al., 2021). Consider (16) but scale the sampling weights by a factor $\lambda = n_B/(\sum_{i \in A} \pi_{A,i}^{-1})$. That is, the parameter in (16) is estimated by maximizing

$$l_{ALP-s}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{i \in B} \log p_i(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \lambda \sum_{i \in A} \pi_{A,i}^{-1} \log\{1 - p_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})\}.$$

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^\top = (\hat{\phi}_{0,\lambda}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{1,\lambda}^\top)$, and denote $w_i^{(ALP-s)} = \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{1,\lambda})$. Then, the ALP_s estimator is

$$\hat{\theta}_{ALP-s} = \left(\sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(ALP-s)} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in B} w_i^{(ALP-s)} y_i.$$

8. The traditional EL (EL₀) estimator, and it is obtained by maximizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} \log p_i$$

subject to $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i \mathbf{x}_i = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_i$, and $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Bi} p_i (y_i - \theta) = 0$.

9. The EL₁ estimator. First, estimate the density model parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by maximizing (5). Then consider the following response model $\text{logit } \pi_1(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\phi}_1) = \phi_{10} + \phi_{11}x_1 + \phi_{12}x_2$, where $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 = (\phi_{10}, \phi_{11}, \phi_{12})'$, and it is estimated by solving (2). Then, maximize

$\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i \log p_i$ subject to $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i p_i = 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i p_i \pi_1(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_1) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\pi}_1(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_1)$, and $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i p_i (y_i - \theta) = 0$, where $\tilde{\pi}_1(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\phi}) = E\{\pi_1(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i; \boldsymbol{\phi}; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\}$.

10. The EL₂ estimator, which is similar to EL₁ estimator, but we consider the following response model logit $\pi_2(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\phi}_2) = \phi_{20} + \phi_{21}x_1 + \phi_{22}y$, where $\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 = (\phi_{20}, \phi_{21}, \phi_{22})'$.
11. The EL₃ estimator, which is similar to EL₁ estimator, but we consider the following response model logit $\pi_3(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\phi}_3) = \phi_{30} + \phi_{31}x_2 + \phi_{32}y$, where $\boldsymbol{\phi}_3 = (\phi_{30}, \phi_{31}, \phi_{32})'$.
12. The proposed MEL estimator based on the estimated parameters $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_1$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_2$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_3$ associated with the above EL₁, EL₂ and EL₃ estimators.
13. The proposed MEL-GREG estimator with an additional constraint $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i p_i \mathbf{x}_i = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_i$.

The HT estimator and the GREG estimator are commonly used in practice. Other existing estimators, including the RDW estimator, CLW estimator, ALP estimator, FDW estimator, ALP_s estimator, are based on the MAR assumption for the response model. In this section, we consider three candidate models by collecting those for EL₁ to EL₃ estimators. For Scenario S1, one of the candidate response models is correctly specified, but all three are wrong for the other two scenarios. Thus, Scenarios S2–S3 can be used to check the robustness of the proposed MEL and MEL-GREG estimators.

Based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations, Figure 1 shows the comparison of different estimators for the three different scenarios under the setup $N = 5\,000$ and $n_A = 100$. When the response model satisfies the MAR assumption, the RDW estimator and the FDW estimator are slightly biased and all remaining ones are consistent. Among the consistent estimators, the CLW estimator is not as stable as others, since its variability is greater. The EL₁ estimator with correctly specified response model outperforms others in terms of variability. The EL₀ estimator performs similarly as the EL₁ estimator but with slightly more variability.




Figure 1: Comparison of different estimators under the setup $N = 5000$ and $n_A = 100$.

However, when the MAR assumption fails for Scenarios S2–S3, most existing estimators are biased, except for the HT estimator, the GREG estimator, the EL estimators, and the two proposed MEL estimators. The same observation holds for different setups with different population and sample sizes. To simplify the discussion, we compare only the HT estimator, the GREG estimator, the three EL estimators, and the two proposed estimators in the following analysis.

Table 1 shows the summary statistics for different estimators under different setups based on 1000 Monte Carlo simulations. It is obvious that the HT estimator is less efficient than the GREG estimator, since the latter incorporates auxiliary information. Other than the conclusions about EL₁ estimator from Figure 1, EL₂ estimator and EL₃ estimator perform poorly under Scenarios S2–S3, regardless of the sizes for the finite population and the probability sample. The proposed MEL and MEL_GREG estimator is more efficient than the GREG estimator in general, and the MEL_GREG estimator is slightly more efficient than the MEL estimator, since additional auxiliary information is incorporated. If the sample size n_A remains unchanged, the bias, variance, and MSE are comparable for different population

sizes, and such an observation is guaranteed by the theoretical assumption $n_A = o_p(N)$.

Table 1: Summary statistics for different estimators under different scenarios based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations. The unit for “Bias” is 10^{-2} , and it is 10^{-4} for “Var” and “MSE”, where “Var” stands for variance, and “MSE” for mean squared error.

N	n_A	Method	Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3		
			Bias	Var	MSE	Bias	Var	MSE	Bias	Var	MSE
5000	100	HT	-1	611	612	0	658	658	1	581	581
		GREG	0	397	397	1	424	424	0	426	426
		EL_1	0	17	17	47	20	2183	59	17	3488
		EL_2	2	389	392	9	506	595	2	493	498
		EL_3	0	391	391	8	539	597	10	543	641
		MEL	-1	383	383	3	377	384	1	386	388
		MEL_GREG	0	383	383	3	373	381	2	382	385
	400	HT	0	138	138	0	138	138	0	137	137
		GREG	0	86	86	0	92	92	0	94	94
		EL_1	0	18	18	46	21	2156	59	18	3503
		EL_2	2	91	94	8	217	287	2	162	165
		EL_3	0	87	87	7	244	295	9	191	272
		MEL	0	88	88	2	85	88	1	89	91
		MEL_GREG	0	85	85	2	83	87	2	87	90
10000	100	HT	0	602	602	1	513	513	-1	566	567
		GREG	1	396	396	1	361	362	0	387	387
		EL_1	0	8	8	47	11	2187	60	9	3584
		EL_2	2	379	384	11	595	719	3	570	581
		EL_3	2	379	384	8	398	469	9	417	496
		MEL	1	377	378	4	318	333	2	359	362
		MEL_GREG	1	375	376	4	315	333	2	357	360
	400	HT	0	145	145	0	145	145	0	144	144
		GREG	0	97	98	0	94	94	0	97	97
		EL_1	0	8	8	47	10	2184	60	9	3607
		EL_2	2	97	100	11	354	471	4	327	346
		EL_3	2	95	98	8	138	195	9	139	218
		MEL	0	93	93	3	82	91	2	88	92
		MEL_GREG	1	93	93	3	93	105	2	88	92

Table 2 shows the relative bias of the variance estimator under different setups based on

1 000 Monte Carlo simulations, and it is calculated as $(\bar{V} - V)/V$, where V is the variance of a certain estimator, $\bar{V} = 1000^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{1000} \hat{V}_m$, \hat{V}_m is the variance estimator of this estimator for the m th simulation study. We use the Monte Carlo variance to approximate V . When the population size is $N = 5\,000$, the relative bias of the variance estimator is satisfactory under Scenario S1, since its absolute values are less than 0.05 regardless of the values of n_A . However, the relative biases are large for both Scenarios S2–S3. In addition, the variance estimator underestimates the variance for most setups, and one possible reason is that the finite population size is not so large that the variability due to the non-probability sample is not negligible. As the finite population size increases to $N = 10\,000$, the performance of the variance estimator improves in general.

Table 2: Relative bias of the variance estimator under different setups based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations.

N	n_A	Scenario S1		Scenario S2		Scenario S3	
		MEL	MEL_GREG	MEL	MEL_GREG	MEL	MEL_GREG
5000	100	-0.019	-0.028	-0.113	-0.105	-0.092	-0.090
	400	-0.009	0.026	-0.084	-0.057	-0.081	-0.070
10000	100	-0.002	-0.001	0.064	0.072	-0.014	-0.009
	400	-0.024	-0.020	-0.020	-0.017	-0.035	-0.036

Table 3 shows the coverage rates of a Wald two-sided 95% confidence interval under different configurations based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations. When the finite population size is $N = 5\,000$, the coverage rates are smaller than its nominal truth of 0.95 for Scenarios S2–S3, since the true variance is underestimated. However, as the finite population size increases to $N = 10\,000$, the coverage rates are close to 0.95, showing the satisfactory performance of the confidence intervals.

Table 3: Coverage rates under different setups based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations.

N	n_A	Scenario S1		Scenario S2		Scenario S3	
		MEL	MEL_GREG	MEL	MEL_GREG	MEL	MEL_GREG
5000	100	0.950	0.952	0.931	0.936	0.932	0.931
	400	0.947	0.946	0.944	0.950	0.941	0.941
10000	100	0.956	0.959	0.949	0.949	0.949	0.950
	400	0.950	0.949	0.938	0.939	0.951	0.950

6 Culture & Community in a Time of Crisis

In this section, we compare various estimators using data from a real 2020 study, Culture and Community in a Time of Crisis (CCTC), which surveyed more than 120,000 Americans online and collected information on hundreds of behavioral and attitudinal variables related to arts and culture before and during the pandemic (Benoit-Bryan and Mulrow, 2021). Due to its large sample size, the CCTC dataset can be used to compare the performance of different data integration methods.

In this section, we treat the 113,549 respondents as a finite population, and there are 293 variables with high response rates. Among those, we are interested in estimating the average response to the question “Before Covid-19, how important or unimportant were arts & culture organizations to you”. There are five scales to this question and 1–5 represent “Very Unimportant”, “Unimportant”, “Neither”, “Important” and “Very Important”, respectively. There are no non-responses for this question, and its population mean is 4.438. In addition to the population average, we are also interested in estimating the average response to this question among different age groups, and the domain means are 4.420, 4.406, 4.434, and 4.460 for age groups 1–4, respectively, where age groups 1–4 represent those aged 18–34, 35–49, 50–64 and older than 64. In addition to the variable of interest, we consider two regional variables as covariates.

We consider a simulation based on real data, and simple stratified random sampling

without replacement is performed to obtain a probability sample of size 1 000, where the sample size is proportional to the stratum size with a minimum number of 40; see Benoit-Bryan and Mulrow (2021) for more details. The following is used to generate the response indicators for a non-probability sample:

$$\text{logit}(\pi_{Bi}) = -2 + 0.2x_{i2} + 0.3y_i, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2})$ are the two regional covariates, and $y_i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ is the response of interest associated with the i th person in the finite population. The average response rate is 0.375. Since the response of interest contains only five levels, we consider a multinomial distribution with linear effect for $f(y \mid \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$. We compare those estimators in Section 5 based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations.

6.1 Population average estimation

Figure 2 shows the comparison of different estimators for the average attitude of the population toward art and cultural organizations. First, existing estimators, including CLW estimator, ALP estimator, FDW estimator and ALP_s estimator, are biased since the response model is MNAR. The EL_1 estimator is also biased due to the fact that it assumes an MAR model as other existing estimators. The EL_2 and EL_3 estimators are approximately unbiased, but, interestingly, the EL_2 estimator performs better. Please note that the response model for the EL_3 estimator is correctly specified, but the response model for the EL_2 estimator is wrong. One possible reason for this consequence may be that x_{i2} only has two different levels, that is, $x_{i2} \in \{0, 1\}$, but there are five different levels for the response of interest, that is, $y_i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Furthermore, the coefficient for x_{i2} is lower than that for the response of interest. Therefore, compared to y_i , x_{i2} plays a far less important role in (17). We checked the two singular values of the design matrix and the first is much larger




Figure 2: Comparison of different estimators based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations using the CCTC dataset.

than the second one, indicating that there exists a certain collinearity between the two covariates. Furthermore, $x_{i1} \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, so it is more informative than x_{i2} . The proposed MEL and MEL_GREG estimators are almost as efficient as the HT and GREG estimators when estimating the population average.

6.2 Domain average estimation

Other than population average, we are also interested in estimating the domain averages. In this subsection, we are interested in estimating the average attitude toward art and cultural organizations among different age groups.

Figure 3 shows the Monte Carlo errors of different estimators associated with age group 18–34. Existing estimators as well as the EL_1 estimator are biased, since they do not adjust the selection bias. Although the proposed MEL and MEL_GREG estimators perform similarly to the HT and GREG estimators when estimating the population average, they are more efficient. We can draw the same conclusion for the other three age groups. This




Figure 3: Comparison of different estimators based on 1 000 Monte Carlo simulations using the CCTC dataset for age group 18–34.

observation is not theoretically justified, but it would be an interesting research topic in the future.

7 Conclusion

We propose an MEL estimator and an MEL_GREG estimator to integrate information from a probability sample, a non-probability sample and auxiliary information from the finite population, and the associated variance estimators are also discussed. The proposed estimators allow for MNAR response models, but a correct conditional outcome density model given the auxiliary information should be specified. The simulation study shows the good performance of the proposed estimators, and an additional plasmode simulation study based on real data illustrates that the proposed estimators outperform the existing ones, especially in terms of domain estimation.

It is possible to relax the requirement of a correct conditional outcome density model para-

metrically by resorting to flexible semi-parametric or nonparametric models. However, this will change the asymptotic properties and variance estimators of the MEL and MEL_GREG estimators. We will pursue this topic as a future research.

References

- Beaumont, J.-F. (2005). Calibrated imputation in surveys under a quasi-model-assisted approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 67(3), 445–458. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2005.00511.x>.
- Beaumont, J.-F. (2020). Are probability surveys bound to disappear for the production of official statistics. *Survey Methodology* 46(1), 1–28.
- Benoit-Bryan, J. and E. Mulrow (2021). Exploring nonprobability methods with simulations from a common data source: culture and community in a time of crisis. In *To appear: Joint Statistical Meetings 2021 Proceedings*.
- Bethlehem, J. (2016). Solving the nonresponse problem with sample matching? *Social Science Computer Review* 34, 59–77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439315573926>.
- Chen, Y., P. Li, J. N. K. Rao, and C. Wu (2022). Pseudo empirical likelihood inference for nonprobability survey samples. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 50(4), 1166–1185. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjs.11708>.
- Chen, Y., P. Li, and C. Wu (2020). Doubly robust inference with nonprobability survey samples. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115(532), 2011–2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2019.1677241>.
- Citro, C. F. (2014). From multiple modes for surveys to multiple data sources for estimates. *Survey Methodology* 40(2), 137–162.

- Couper, M. P. (2000). Review: Web surveys: A review of issues and approaches. *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(4), 464–494. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/318641>.
- Couper, M. P. (2013). Is the sky falling? new technology, changing media, and the future of surveys. In *Survey Research Methods*, Volume 7, pp. 145–156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2013.v7i3.5751>.
- Deville, J.-C. and C.-E. Särndal (1992). Calibration estimators in survey sampling. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 87(418), 376–382. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2290268>.
- Elliott, M. and R. Valliant (2017). Inference for nonprobability samples. *Statistical Science* 32(2), 249–264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1214/16-STS598>.
- Hájek, J. (1971). Comment on “an essay on the logical foundations of survey sampling, part one”. *The Foundations of Survey Sampling* 236.
- Han, P. and L. Wang (2013). Estimation with missing data: Beyond double robustness. *Biometrika* 100, 417–430. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/ass087>.
- Holt, D. T. (2007). The official statistics olympic challenge: Wider, deeper, quicker, better, cheaper. *The American Statistician* 61(1), 1–8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1198/000313007X168173>.
- Horvitz, D. G. and D. J. Thompson (1952). A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 42, 663–685.
- Kalton, G. (2019). Developments in survey research over the past 60 years: A personal perspective. *International Statistical Review* 87, S10–S30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/insr.12287>.

- Kim, J. K. and J. J. Kim (2007). Nonresponse weighting adjustment using estimated response probability. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* 35(4), 501–514. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjs.5550350403>.
- Kim, J. K. and K. Morikawa (2023). An empirical likelihood approach to reduce selection bias in voluntary samples. Available at [arXiv.2211.02998](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.02998).
- Kim, J. K., S. Park, Y. Chen, and C. Wu (2021). Combining non-probability and probability survey samples through mass imputation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 184(3), 941–963. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12696>.
- Kim, J. K. and J. Shao (2021). *Statistical Methods for Handling Incomplete Data* (2nd ed.). CRC press.
- Kim, J.-K. and S.-M. Tam (2021). Data integration by combining big data and survey sample data for finite population inference. *International Statistical Review* 89(2), 382–401. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/insr.12434>.
- Kim, J. K. and S. Yang (2014). Fractional hot deck imputation for robust inference under item nonresponse in survey sampling. *Survey Methodology* 40, 211–230.
- Liu, Y. and Y. Fan (2023). Biased-sample empirical likelihood weighting for missing data problems: an alternative to inverse probability weighting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 85, 67–83.
- Meng, X.-L. (2018). Statistical paradises and paradoxes in big data (i) law of large populations, big data paradox, and the 2016 US presidential election. *Annals of Applied Statistics* 12(2), 685–726. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOAS1161SF>.
- Miller, P. V. (2017). Is there a future for surveys? *Public Opinion Quarterly* 81(S1), 205–212. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfx008>.

- Owen, A. (1990). Empirical likelihood ratio confidence regions. *Annals of Statistics* 18(1), 90–120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347494>.
- Owen, A. (1991). Empirical likelihood for linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1725–1747. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176348368>.
- Pfeffermann, D. (2015). Methodological issues and challenges in the production of official statistics: 24th Annual Morris Hansen Lecture. *Journal of the Survey Statistics and Methodology* 3, 425–483. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smv035>.
- Rao, J. N. K. (2020). On making valid inferences by integrating data from surveys and other sources. *Sankhya B*. Accepted (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13571-020-00227-w>).
- Rivers, D. (2007). Sampling for web surveys. In *Joint Statistical Meetings*, Volume 4. American Statistical Association Alexandria, VA.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika* 63(3), 581–592. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/63.3.581>.
- Särndal, C. E. (1992). Methods for estimating the precision of survey estimates when imputation is used. *Survey Methodology* 18, 241–252.
- Tam, S.-M. and F. Clarke (2015). Big data, official statistics and some initiatives by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. *International Statistical Review* 83, 436–448. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/insr.12105>.
- Valliant, R. and J. A. Dever (2011). Estimating propensity adjustments for volunteer web surveys. *Sociological Methods & Research* 40(1), 105–137. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124110392533>.

- Wang, L., R. Valliant, and Y. Li (2021). Adjusted logistic propensity weighting methods for population inference using nonprobability volunteer-based epidemiologic cohorts. *Statistics in Medicine* 40(24), 5237–5250. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.9122>.
- Wang, Z., X. Mao, and J. K. Kim (2022). Functional calibration under non-probability survey sampling. Available at arXiv:2204.09193.
- Williams, D. and J. M. Brick (2018). Trends in us face-to-face household survey nonresponse and level of effort. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 6, 186–211. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smx019>.
- Wu, C. (2005). Algorithms and r codes for the pseudo empirical likelihood method in survey sampling. *Survey Methodology* 31(2), 239.
- Wu, C. (2022). Statistical inference with non-probability survey samples. *Survey Methodology* 48(2), 283–311.
- Yang, S. and J. Kim (2020). Statistical data integration in survey sampling: A review. *Japanese Journal of Statistics and Data Science* 3, 625–650.