

Mastering Rare Event Analysis: Optimal Subsample Size in Logistic and Cox Regressions

TAL AGASSI, NIR KERET, MALKA GORFINE*

Department of Statistics and Operations Research

Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.

gorfinem@tauex.tau.ac.il

June 21, 2024

Abstract

In the realm of contemporary data analysis, the use of massive datasets has taken on heightened significance, albeit often entailing considerable demands on computational time and memory. While a multitude of existing works offer optimal subsampling methods for conducting analyses on subsamples with minimized efficiency loss, they notably lack tools for judiciously selecting the optimal subsample size. To bridge this gap, our work introduces tools designed for choosing the optimal subsample size. We focus on three settings: the Cox regression model for survival data with rare events and logistic regression for both balanced and imbalanced datasets. Additionally, we present a novel optimal subsampling procedure tailored for logistic regression with imbalanced data. The efficacy of these tools and procedures is demonstrated through an extensive simulation study and meticulous analyses of two sizable datasets. Hypothesis testing; Imbalanced data; Time to event analysis; Relative efficiency;

⁰To whom correspondence should be addressed.

1 Introduction

The escalating demand to analyze massive datasets with millions of observations often leads to considerable computational time and memory requirements, presenting significant challenges in implementing statistical analyses. In response, subsampling has become a widely adopted and effective method for expediting computation, for various regression models. These models encompass least-squares regression models (Dhillon et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2015), logistic regression (Wang et al., 2018, 2021), generalized linear models (Ai et al., 2021), quantile regression (Wang and Ma, 2021), quasi-likelihood estimators (Yu et al., 2020), time-to-event regression under the additive-hazards model (Zuo et al., 2021), semi-competing risks (Gorfine et al., 2021), the Cox proportional-hazards (PH) model (Keret and Gorfine, 2023) and accelerated failure time model (Yang et al., 2024).

In this work, we mainly concentrate on two prominent scenarios associated with rare events: (1) addressing the challenge of highly imbalanced data in logistic regression, where one of the classes is rare, and (2) employing Cox proportional-hazards (PH) regression (Cox, 1972) for survival data characterized by a notably high right-censoring rate.

Wang et al. (2018) introduced an innovative subsampling method optimized for logistic regression, demonstrating high effectiveness for balanced data but acknowledging its limited efficacy for highly imbalanced data. In the context of rare-event data, a natural approach involves subsampling exclusively within the majority group (the common class or censored observations) to prevent the loss of crucial information. Addressing this concern, Wang et al. (2021) focused on logistic regression and proposed an optimal subsampling procedure targeting the rare-event setting, ensuring retention of all events in binary outcome scenarios. However, the underlying assumption is that the proportion of rare events decreases as the sample size increases, a condition that is often considered undesirable.

For survival analysis involving rare events, Gorfine et al. (2021) advocated subsampling solely the observations that have not yet experienced the event (i.e., the censored observations) and implemented a uniform subsampling approach. In a similar vein, Keret and

[Gorfine \(2023\)](#) presented an optimal subsampling strategy for the Cox PH model within the rare-events framework. In this approach, optimal subsampling exclusively targets censored observations, combining all observed events with the subsample set of censored observations. These optimal subsampling techniques have been convincingly demonstrated to significantly reduce computational burden compared to analyzing the entire dataset, with minimal loss of efficiency.

However, a notable aspect left unaddressed in the aforementioned works is the lack of practical guidelines for determining the subsample size. While our primary goal is to reduce computation time, we are equally committed to maintaining the statistical power or efficiency for answering the research questions and avoiding a substantial increase in standard errors. Hence, it is valuable to offer researchers a tool for choosing the subsample size that aligns with their research objectives.

This work offers notable contributions in two key aspects:

1. We introduce tools designed to optimize the process of selecting subsample sizes in the realm of optimal subsampling. These tools are versatile, and applied here to Cox regression models dealing with rare events and logistic regression models, regardless of the presence of rare events.
2. We present optimal subsampling methods specifically tailored for logistic regression models handling rare events. Notably, our approach assumes that the proportion of rare events converges to a positive constant with increasing sample size, a substantial departure from the assumption made by [Wang et al. \(2021\)](#).

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 begins by summarizing the key findings on optimal subsampling from [Keret and Gorfine \(2023\)](#) to ensure the current paper is self-contained. It then introduces new methodologies for determining optimal subsample size. Section 3 proposes a two-step subsampling algorithm specifically designed for logistic regression in scenarios involving rare events, including techniques for selecting the subsample size.

Section 4 focuses on Wang et al.’s (2018) two-step algorithm to nearly balanced datasets and offers strategies for identifying the optimal subsample size. Section 5 summarizes a comprehensive simulation study to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approaches. Sections 6 and 7 focus on analyzing two large-scale datasets, a survival regression model with around 350 million records and a logistic regression model with approximately 28 million observations. The paper concludes with a short discussion in Section 8.

2 Optimal Subsample Size for Cox Regression with Optimal Subsampling

2.1 Notation, Formulation and Reservoir-Sampling (Keret and Gorfine, 2023)

For the sake of clarity, this section presents the model formulation and pertinent findings from Keret and Gorfine (2023). Consider a set of n independent and identically distributed observations. Let V_i represent the failure time for the i th observation, C_i denote the right-censoring time, and T_i signify the observed time, $T_i = \min(V_i, C_i)$. Define $\Delta_i = I(V_i \leq C_i)$, and let \mathbf{X}_i be a vector of potentially time-dependent covariates of size r . The observed dataset is denoted by $\mathcal{D}_n = \{T_i, \Delta_i, \mathbf{X}_i; i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Among the n observations, there are n_e instances where the failure times are observed, termed “events”. It is assumed that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the ratio n_e/n converges to a small positive constant. The count of censored observations is represented by $n_c = n - n_e$, and τ denotes the maximum follow-up time.

In time-to-event data, the predominant source of information comes from events rather than censored observations. This rationale underlies the two-step algorithm introduced by Keret and Gorfine (2023), which utilizes all observed events while sampling a subset of censored observations. Let q_n be the number of censored observations sampled from the full data, where q_n is typically much smaller than n , and it is assumed that q_n/n converges to a

small positive constant as $q_n, n \rightarrow \infty$. Define \mathcal{C} as the index set containing all censored observations in the full data, and \mathcal{Q} as the index set encompassing all observations with observed failure times and all censored observations included in the subsample. Due to computational and theoretical considerations, censored observations are sampled with replacement, implying that a censored observation in the original sample may appear more than once in the subsample.

Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ be a vector of size r of unknown coefficients. Then, under the Cox PH regression, the instantaneous hazard rate of observation i at time t is given by

$$\lambda(t|\mathbf{X}_i) = \lambda_0(t)e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i} \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

where $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ is an unspecified non-negative function and $\Lambda_0(t) = \int_0^t \lambda_0(u)du$ is the cumulative baseline hazard function. The goal is estimating the unknown parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and Λ_0 . Define $\mathbf{S}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i} Y_i(t) \mathbf{X}_i^{\otimes k}, k = 0, 1, 2$, where $\mathbf{X}^{\otimes 0} = 1, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 1} = \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^{\otimes 2} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T$ and $Y_i(t) = I(T_i \geq t)$ is the at-risk process of observation i at time t . Denote $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{PL}$ as the full-sample partial-likelihood (PL) estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ that solves

$$\frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i \left\{ \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{\mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, T_i)}{S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, T_i)} \right\} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Suppose that the data are organized such that the censored observations precede the failure times, namely $\mathcal{C} = \{1, \dots, n_c\}$, and $\mathcal{E} = \{n_c + 1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{n_c})^T$ be a vector of the sampling probabilities for the censored observations, where $\sum_{i=1}^{n_c} p_i = 1$, and set

$$w_i = \begin{cases} (p_i q_n)^{-1} & \text{if } \Delta_i = 0, p_i > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \Delta_i = 1 \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The subsample-based counterpart of $\mathbf{S}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)$ is $\mathbf{S}_w^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} w_i e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i} Y_i(t) \mathbf{X}_i^{\otimes k}, k =$

0, 1, 2. Then, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is defined as the estimator derived from the subsample \mathcal{Q} , by solving

$$\frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \equiv \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} \Delta_i \left\{ \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{\mathbf{S}_w^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, T_i)}{S_w^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, T_i)} \right\} = \mathbf{0} \quad (1)$$

where l^* is the log PL based on the subsample \mathcal{Q} . Finally, for a given vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, define $\hat{\Lambda}_0(t, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i I(T_i \leq t) / S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, T_i)$, and the Breslow estimator (Breslow, 1972) of Λ_0 function is produced by $\hat{\Lambda}_0(t, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{PL})$.

Consistency and asymptotic normality of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_0$ were established by Keret and Gorfine (2023) under some regularity assumptions. Specifically, given the true $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$,

$$\sqrt{n} \mathbb{V}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I})$$

as $n, q_n \rightarrow \infty$, where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{n}{q_n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{\mathbf{a}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{a}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})^T}{p_i} - \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{a}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{a}_j(\boldsymbol{\beta})^T \right\}, \\ \mathbf{a}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \int_0^\tau \left\{ \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{\mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right\} \frac{Y_i(t) e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i}}{S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} dN_{\cdot}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $N_{\cdot}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i I(T_i \leq t)$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{n} \int_0^\tau \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{S}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} - \left(\frac{\mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right)^T \right\} dN_{\cdot}(t).$$

As \mathcal{I} and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ involve the entire dataset, their subsampling-based counterparts, $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$, will be utilized in the variance estimator $\tilde{\mathbb{V}}(\mathbf{p}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. The Exact expressions of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}$ can be found in the Supplementary Material (SM) file Section S1.

The above results laid the foundation for establishing the subsequent optimal subsampling

probabilities. The A-optimal sampling probabilities vector, denoted as \mathbf{p}^A and derived from minimizing the trace of $\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$, is expressed as follows

$$p_m^A = \frac{\|\mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mathbf{a}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\|_2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \|\mathcal{I}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mathbf{a}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\|_2} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathcal{C} \quad (2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the l_2 euclidean norm. The L-optimal sampling probabilities vector, denoted as \mathbf{p}^L and obtained from minimizing the trace of $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$, is given by

$$p_m^L = \frac{\|\mathbf{a}_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\|_2}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \|\mathbf{a}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\|_2} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (3)$$

Evidently, \mathbf{p}^A incorporate \mathcal{I}^{-1} , enabling a more efficient estimation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in contrast to the estimator using probabilities from the L-optimal criterion. Nevertheless, for the same reason, \mathbf{p}^A demands a greater computational time.

As both \mathbf{p}^A and \mathbf{p}^L rely on the true unknown regression vector, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$, the following two-step procedure has been proposed. It commences with a quick and straightforward consistent estimator of the regression vector to estimate the optimal sampling probabilities. The complete implementation of the two-step procedure is outlined below:

Algorithm 1: Cox Regression - Two Step Optimal Subsampling

Step 1: Select q_0 observations uniformly from \mathcal{C} and combine them with the observed events to get \mathcal{Q}_{pilot} . Conduct a weighted Cox regression on \mathcal{Q}_{pilot} and obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$ based on Eq. (1). Compute approximated optimal sampling probabilities by substituting $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$ in Eq. (2) or (3).

Step 2: Select q_n observations from \mathcal{C} based on the sampling probabilities of Step 1. Combine these selected observations with the observed events and get \mathcal{Q} . Perform a weighted Cox regression on \mathcal{Q} , based on Eq. (1), and get the two-step estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$.

The original algorithm employs $q_0 = q_n$. However, here we suggest using a small value of q_0 for the initial uniform sampling of Step 1. Subsequently, the methods outlined in the following subsections focus on determining the value of q_n under various criteria. To maintain computational efficiency, we recommend setting q_0 as $c_0 n_e$, where c_0 is a small scalar (e.g.,

$c_0 < 5$). Our simulation study and real-data analysis indicate that this recommendation is generally sufficient. Furthermore, our findings suggest that when none of the covariates exhibit long-tailed distributions, setting $c_0 = 1$ is often adequate.

The asymptotic properties of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_0(t, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})$ were established (Keret and Gorfine, 2023). Specifically, it was shown that under standard assumptions,

$$\sqrt{n}\mathbb{V}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \xrightarrow{D} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$$

as $q_n, n \rightarrow \infty$, where \mathbf{p}^{opt} is either \mathbf{p}^A or \mathbf{p}^L . Moreover, the asymptotic theory accommodates left truncation, stratified analysis, time-dependent covariates and time-dependent coefficients. However, a practical methodology for selecting the size of q_n was not studied, despite its considerable importance. This motivates us to propose the following frameworks for determining the necessary size of q_n based on specific objectives.

Often, datasets are too voluminous to fit within the RAM limitations of standard computers, a challenge highlighted in the real-data analyses of Section 6. Keret and Gorfine (2023) proposed a speedy and memory-efficient approach for batch-based reservoir sampling, designed to operate on conventional computer systems. Summarizing, the observed-events dataset, \mathcal{E} , is consistently maintained in the RAM. Conversely, the censored observations are split into B batches, labeled as $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_B$. At any given moment, only one batch is in the RAM. In every batch b , $b = 1, \dots, B$, we approximate \mathbf{p}^A or \mathbf{p}^L by considering the dataset comprised of $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{B}_b$. The approximation employs distinct weights, 1 for an event and $n_c/|\mathcal{B}_b|$ for each censored observation. The reservoir-sampling algorithm selects q_n observations with replacement in a single iteration. The key idea involves keeping a sample of q_n observations (referred to as the “reservoir”), where replacements can occur as new batches are loaded. For an in-depth description and proof of the algorithm validity, refer to Section 2.6 in Keret and Gorfine (2023). This reservoir-sampling algorithm can be applied to any scenario of sampling with replacement, independently of the original regression problem. In this work, we employ it for survival regression with approximately 350 million records.

2.2 Subsample Size Based on Relative Efficiency

What is the optimal size of q_n that maintains a small efficiency loss? Here, we introduce a tool that enables us to evaluate the efficiency loss resulting from the subsampling approach. We begin by defining an estimator of the relative efficiency (RE) of the two-step estimator compared to the full PL estimator by

$$RE(q_n) = \frac{\|n^{-1}\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) + q_n^{-1}\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\|_F}{\|n^{-1}\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{PL})\|_F} \quad (4)$$

where $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} |a_{i,j}|^2}$. The lower limit of Eq. (4) is close to 1.

If interest lies in the effect of a particular covariate, e.g., the p -th covariate, then we may utilize

$$RE_p(q_n) = \frac{\left[n^{-1}\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) + q_n^{-1}\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \right]_{pp}}{\left[n^{-1}\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{PL}) \right]_{pp}} \quad (5)$$

where $[A]_{pp}$ is the pp element of the matrix A . Adjusted optimal sampling probabilities to target a subset of covariates, while retaining the rest in the model to control for confounders, are available in [Keret and Gorfine \(2023\)](#) (see, Equations 7 and 8).

The equations above pose practical challenges: firstly, they include $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{PL}$ —whose calculations we aim to avoid; secondly, they involve $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$, which can be computed *after* determining the subsample size, q_n . However, leveraging the consistent estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$ from Step 1 resolves it by substituting $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{PL}$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$. An additional challenge arises as $\mathbf{I}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ involve the full data. Alternatively, their subsampling-based counterparts, $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$, can be used. However, it is advisable to refrain from using $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ based on the uniform subsample of Step 1, since uniform sampling allows the selection of observations with extremely small optimal probabilities \mathbf{p}^{opt} . Consequently, dividing by these probabilities often renders Eq. (4) or (5) numerically unstable. Our proposed approach involves sampling an additional small subsample of size q_0 , but this time using the approximated optimal probabilities obtained by substituting $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$, in Eq.s (2) and

(3), with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$. Let $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$ be the index set containing all observations whose failure time was observed, along with the censored observations included in this new subsample of size q_0 . We denote the counterparts of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}^{-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ for this subsample as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ (see the SM, Section S1, for details).

Hence, the proposed RE estimator is given by

$$\widehat{RE}(q_n) = \frac{\|n^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) + q_n^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\|_F}{\|n^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\|_F} \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}$ is the estimated optimal-probabilities vector calculated in Step 1. To save computational time, we utilize $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$ from Step 1 instead of re-estimating the optimal probabilities and the coefficient vector based on $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$. The computational time for this additional step is very short, since q_0 is very small compared to n . Lastly, by calculating $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ only once, a plot of $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ as a function of q_n can be generated quickly and effortlessly. This additional step can be added easily in the above two-step Algorithm 1, between Steps 1 and 2, as follows:

Step 1.5: Sample q_0 observation from \mathcal{C} using the optimal sampling probabilities computed at Step 1. Combine these observations with the observed failure times to form $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$ and compute $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$. Plot $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ as a function of q_n . Choose the minimal q_n that provides the required RE.

In practice, with a large n , the curve of $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ is anticipated to show a rapid decrease followed by a gradual decline, resembling an ‘elbow’ shape. A sensible selection for q_n would be in the region where the decline becomes moderate, as the incremental efficiency gain from further increasing q_n is likely to be minimal. Comprehensive examples from simulations and real data analysis are presented in Sections 5–7 for further insights.

2.3 Subsample Size Based on Hypothesis Testing

Let β_p^o be the p^{th} element of β^o . Suppose we aim to test the hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_p^o = 0$ against $H_1 : \beta_p^o \neq 0$ at a significance level of α with a power of γ . Our current objective is to determine the necessary subsample size, given that $\beta_p^o = \beta_p^*$, where β_p^* is specified by the researcher. Since the minimal n should satisfy

$$n = \left\lceil (Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_\gamma)^2 \left\{ \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\beta^o) + \frac{n}{q_n} \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\beta^o) \varphi(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \beta^o) \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\beta^o) \right\}_{pp} \beta_p^{*-2} \right\rceil,$$

where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the ceiling function, the required q_n is obtained by solving for q_n and using estimated quantities, namely by

$$\tilde{q}_n = \left\lceil \frac{\left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{Q_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\beta}_U) \tilde{\varphi}_{Q_{1.5}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^{opt}, \tilde{\beta}_U) \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{Q_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\beta}_U) \right\}_{pp} (Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_\gamma)^2}{\left(\beta_p^{*2} - n^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{Q_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\beta}_U)_{pp} \right) (Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_\gamma)^2} \right\rceil. \quad (7)$$

This formula is convenient and practically valuable because, upon completing Steps 1 and 1.5, we can straightforwardly plot \tilde{q}_n as a function of γ . A negative value of \tilde{q}_n indicates that the required power cannot be achieved even with the entire sample n . Our simulation study demonstrates that in scenarios where the required power is attainable, typically only a small fraction of the censored observations is necessary.

We summarize the additional step for a single-covariate hypothesis testing by adding the following mid-step to the original two-step Algorithm 1:

Step 1.5*: Sample q_0 observations from \mathcal{C} using the optimal sampling probabilities computed in Step 1. Combine these observations with the observed events to create $Q_{1.5}$. Compute $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{Q_{1.5}}^{-1}(\tilde{\beta}_U)$, $\tilde{\varphi}_{Q_{1.5}}(\mathbf{p}^{opt}, \tilde{\beta}_U)$, and \tilde{q}_n , with the desired values of α and γ . If $\tilde{q}_n < 0$, achieving the required power is not feasible even with the entire sample. Otherwise, set $q_n = \tilde{q}_n$.

3 Logistic Regression with Rare Events

3.1 Two-Step Algorithm

While Wang et al. (2018) introduced a two-stage optimal subsampling algorithm for logistic regression, it was observed that their asymptotic variance may not perform well in cases of highly imbalanced data (i.e., when the rate of cases is below 15%). Section 4 presents a method for choosing a subsample size for their optimal subsampling algorithm, and our simulation results indeed indicate its effectiveness primarily when the event is not rare.

In the realm of subsampling for imbalanced binary data, various methods have been explored and developed (Wang, 2020; Wang et al., 2021). However, their results were derived under the assumption that the intercept approaches zero as the sample size goes to infinity, and the other coefficients are fixed, leading to the probability of experiencing an event decreasing to zero as the sample size goes to infinity. Our current work, akin to Wang et al. (2021), is based on subsampling only among non-cases observations while retaining all cases. Notably, our approach does not necessitate the undesired assumption that the event probability approaches zero as the sample size increases. Furthermore, our method yields a simpler formula for the asymptotic variance, enabling evaluation of the required subsample size in a practically efficient manner.

Let $D_i \in \{0, 1\}$ be the response of individual i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. In order to include an intercept term, we extend the vector of covariates of each individual from r to $r + 1$ to include the value of 1 in its first element, and for simplicity of presentation we continue using the notation \mathbf{X}_i . Let $\mathcal{N} = \{i; D_i = 0\}$ and $n_0 = |\mathcal{N}|$. The logistic regression model is of the form

$$\Pr(D_i = 1 | \mathbf{X}_i) = \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = e^{\mathbf{X}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)^{-1} \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

and the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) is given by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^n [D_i \log \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + (1 - D_i) \log\{1 - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})\}].$$

As before, let q_n be the size of the subsample from \mathcal{N} , π_i the sampling probability of individual i , $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i = 1$, and \mathcal{Q} is the index set containing of all the observed cases (i.e., $D_i = 1$) and the subsampled non-cases ($D_i = 0$). Finally, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, set

$$w_i = \begin{cases} (\pi_i q_n)^{-1}, & \text{if } D_i = 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } D_i = 1 \end{cases}$$

as the sampling weights. Then, the estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ that is based on \mathcal{Q} is obtained by maximizing the pseudo log-likelihood function

$$l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} w_i [D_i \log \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + (1 - D_i) \log\{1 - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})\}]. \quad (8)$$

The following theorem provides the asymptotic distribution of a general subsampling-based estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, for any vector of sampling probabilities, given standard assumptions (see the SM, Section S2). Based on the asymptotic distribution, the optimal sampling probabilities will be derived. Since the optimal sampling probabilities will be shown to involve the true unknown $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$, we describe the two-step algorithm for logistic regression, which uses approximation of the optimal probabilities.

Theorem 1 *If Assumptions A.1-A.4 hold, then as $q_n, n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{n} \mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I})$$

where

$$\mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{n}{q_n} \mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}),$$

$$\mathbf{M}_X(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \{1 - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})\} \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T,$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T}{\pi_i} - \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mu_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_j^T \right\}.$$

We now turn to derive optimal sampling probabilities while considering the A-optimal and L-optimal criteria, as before.

Theorem 2 *The respective A-optimal and L-optimal sampling probability vectors, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{R,A}$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{R,L}$, which minimize the trace of $\mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ and $\mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, respectively, are given by*

$$\pi_m^{R,A} = \frac{\mu_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_m\|_2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_j\|_2} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathcal{N} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\pi_m^{R,L} = \frac{\mu_m(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{X}_m\|_2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2} \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (10)$$

Notably, the optimal probabilities expressed in (9) and (10) bear a resemblance to those derived for the subsampling approach in Wang et al. (2018) applied to a balanced design. The discrepancy between these optimal probabilities and their counterparts in Wang et al. (2018) stems from the fact that, here, the summation in the denominators is restricted to the set \mathcal{N} rather than the entire sample. Since $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{R,A}$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{R,L}$ involve the unknown $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$, we suggest the following two-step algorithm, in the spirit of the previous section and Wang et al. (2018):

Consistency and asymptotic normality of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$ can be shown by following the main steps of Wang et al. (2018) and Keret and Gorfine (2023), as detailed in the SM, Section S2. As for the Cox regression, the value of q_0 is recommended to be $c_0(n - n_0)$ with small values of c_0 . Once $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$ is calculated, inference can be executed by using the subsample counterparts of $\mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})$ and $\mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})$, namely

$$\tilde{\mathbb{H}}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) + \frac{n}{q_n} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \tilde{\mathbf{K}}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \quad (11)$$

Algorithm 2: Logistic Regression with Rare Events - Two Step Optimal Subsampling

Step 1: Sample q_0 observations uniformly from \mathcal{N} and combine them with all the observed events to create \mathcal{Q}_{pilot} . Perform a weighted logistic regression on \mathcal{Q}_{pilot} , based on Eq. (8), and obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$. Utilize this estimator to derive approximated optimal sampling probabilities by substituting $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U$ in Eq. (9) or (10).

Step 2: Sample q_n observations from \mathcal{N} using the sampling probabilities computed in Step 1. Combine these observations with the observed events to create \mathcal{Q} and conduct a weighted logistic regression on \mathcal{Q} , based on Eq. (8), to obtain the two-step estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$.

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{q_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})^2 \mathbf{X}_i (\mathbf{X}_i)^T}{\pi_i^2} - \frac{1}{q_n^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi_i} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi_i} \right)^T \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \{i : D_i = 1\}$ and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} w_i \mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \{1 - \mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\} \mathbf{X}_i (\mathbf{X}_i)^T.$$

3.2 Choosing Subsample Size by Relative Efficiency or Hypothesis Testing

In the spirit of Section 2.2, we can estimate the RE of the two-step estimator relative to the estimator based on the entire dataset, in order to assess the required subsample size of Step 2. To this end, define

$$\check{\mathbb{H}}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) = \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) + \frac{n}{q_0} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbf{K}}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \quad (12)$$

where

$$\check{\mathbf{M}}_X(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_{1.5}} \check{w}_i \mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \{1 - \mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\} \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T, \quad (13)$$

$$\check{w}_i = \begin{cases} (\pi_i^{opt} q_0)^{-1}, & \text{if } D_i = 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } D_i = 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\check{\mathbf{K}}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) = \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{q_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_{1.5} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \mathbf{X}_i (\mathbf{X}_i)^T}{\pi_i^2} - \frac{1}{q_0^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_{1.5} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi_i} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_{1.5} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \mathbf{X}_i}{\pi_i} \right)^T \right\}.$$

Finally, we define the RE estimators as

$$\widehat{RE}(q_n) = \frac{\|n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) + q_n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbb{H}}^R(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\|_F}{\|n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)\|_F} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\widehat{RE}_p(q_n) = \frac{[n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) + q_n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbb{H}}^R(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)]_{pp}}{[n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)]_{pp}}. \quad (15)$$

The procedure can be easily incorporated within the two-step Algorithm 2 by the following additional step:

Step 1.5: Sample q_0 observations from \mathcal{N} using the optimal sampling probabilities from Step 1. Combine the sampled observations with \mathcal{E} to create $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$. Calculate $\check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\check{\mathbb{H}}^R(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$. Plot $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ or $\widehat{RE}_p(q_n)$ as a function of q_n and select the minimum q_n that satisfies the required relative efficiency.

The minimal subsample size for testing $H_0 : \beta_p^o = 0$ against a two-sided alternative, given $\beta_p^o = \beta_p^*$, a significance level α and a power γ , is given by

$$\tilde{q}_n = \left\lceil \frac{\left\{ \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbf{K}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U) \right\}_{pp} (Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_\gamma)^2}{\beta_p^{*2} - n^{-1} \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)_{pp} (Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_\gamma)^2} \right\rceil. \quad (16)$$

A plot of \tilde{q}_n as a function of γ can be easily generated. The algorithm for a single covariate hypothesis testing is defined by adding the following mid-step to the two-step Algorithm 2:

Step 1.5*: Sample q_0 observations from \mathcal{N} using the optimal sampling probabilities of

Step 1. Combine these sampled observations with \mathcal{E} to form $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$. Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$ and $\check{\mathbb{H}}^R(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{opt}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_U)$. Plot \tilde{q}_n against γ . If $\tilde{q}_n < 0$, achieving the required power is unattainable even with the entire dataset n . Otherwise, set $q_n = \tilde{q}_n$.

4 Logistic Regression with Nearly Balanced Data

4.1 The Two-Step Optimal Subsampling Algorithm (Wang et al., 2018)

While Wang et al. (2018) presented an optimal two-step subsampling algorithm for logistic regression in the context of nearly balanced data and laid the theoretical asymptotic foundations for this approach, they did not offer a method for selecting the subsample size. This section aims to remedy this gap. To enhance clarity, we begin by providing a summary of their optimal two-step subsampling algorithm.

In the rare event setting, sampling is performed exclusively from the majority class, whereas in the nearly balanced binary outcome scenario, sampling is conducted from the entire sample. Hence, now we redefine \mathcal{Q} as the index set of all the observations included in the subsample with sampling weights $w_i = (\pi_i q_n)^{-1}, i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ that is based on \mathcal{Q} is obtained by maximizing the pseudo log-likelihood function (8).

Under some regularity assumptions (Wang et al., 2018), they showed that given $\mathcal{F}_n = \{D_i, \mathbf{X}_i, 1, \dots, n\}$, the asymptotic distribution of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is

$$\sqrt{n}\mathbb{H}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})^{-1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I}) \quad (17)$$

as $n, q_n \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\mathbb{H}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{K}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \{D_i - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})\}^2 \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T.$$

Then, the A-optimal and L-optimal subsampling probabilities are given by

$$\pi_i^{B,A} = \frac{|D_i - \mu_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})| \|\mathbf{M}_X^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i\|}{\sum_{j=1}^n |D_j - \mu_j(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})| \|\mathbf{M}_X^{-1} \mathbf{X}_j\|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (18)$$

and

$$\pi_i^{B,L} = \frac{|D_i - \mu_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})| \|\mathbf{X}_i\|}{\sum_{j=1}^n |D_j - \mu_j(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})| \|\mathbf{X}_j\|}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (19)$$

Since we wish to avoid evaluating the full-data estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}$, the following two-step algorithm is given by [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#):

Algorithm 3: Logistic Regression with Nearly Balanced Data - Two Step Optimal Subsampling

Step 1: Sample q_0 observations using the following probabilities

$$\pi_i^{prop} = \begin{cases} (2n_0)^{-1} & \text{if } D_i = 0 \\ (2n_1)^{-1} & \text{if } D_i = 1 \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (20)$$

where $n_1 = n - n_0$. Conduct a weighted logistic regression with the subsample, based on Eq. (8), and get $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop}$. Derive the approximated optimal sampling probabilities by substituting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}$ with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop}$ in (18) or (19).

Step 2: Sample q_n observations from the entire sample using the probabilities of Step 1 and get \mathcal{Q} . Conduct a weighted logistic regression on \mathcal{Q} , based on Eq. (8), and obtain the two-step estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$.

Once $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$ is calculated, inference can be carried out by using the variance estimator $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{K}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}) \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})^{-1}$, where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} w_i^2 \{D_i - \mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\}^2 \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T.$$

Certainly, we can utilize the concepts discussed earlier to determine the desired values of q_n . However, the asymptotic properties outlined in [Wang et al. \(2018\)](#) are confined to the conditional space, conditioning on the entire observed data, \mathcal{F}_n . In contrast, our approach

for the optimal q_n necessitates the consideration of the asymptotic distribution under the unconditional space. The subsequent theorem presents this result, and the proof is available in the SM, Section S2.

Theorem 3 *Given Assumptions A.1-A.3 (see SM, Section S2) and as $q_n, n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{n}\mathbb{H}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I}).$$

4.2 Choosing Subsample Size by Relative Efficiency or Hypothesis Testing

An estimator of the RE of the two-step estimator relative to the estimator based on the entire dataset is given by

$$RE(q_n) = \frac{\|\mathbb{H}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\|_F}{\|n^{-1}\mathbf{M}_X(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})\|_F},$$

and the respective estimator that focuses on the p^{th} covariate is given by

$$RE_p(q_n) = \frac{\left[\mathbb{H}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS})\right]_{pp}}{\left[n^{-1}\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE})\right]_{pp}}.$$

Once again, we substitute $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}$ with the consistent estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop}$ from Step 1. To ensure numerical stability in approximating $\mathbb{H}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})$ and $\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})$, we recommend utilizing the estimated optimal probabilities of Step 1 to sample an additional set of size q_0 , denoted as $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$. Let

$$\check{\mathbb{H}}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\check{\mathbf{K}}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

where

$$\check{\mathbf{K}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_{1.5}} \dot{w}_i^2 \left\{ D_i - \mu_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\}^2 \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T,$$

and $\check{w}_i = (q_0\pi_i)^{-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Finally,

$$\widehat{RE}(q_n) = \frac{\|q_0q_n^{-1}\check{\mathbb{H}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})\|}{\|n^{-1}\check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})\|}. \quad (21)$$

Unlike the RE estimator in the rare event setting, Eq. (21) approaches zero as $q_n \rightarrow \infty$ while keeping q_0 and n fixed. Consequently, only practical sizes for q_n should be taken into account. In other words, values of q_n that are close to n should not be considered in the plot of $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ as a function of q_n . This procedure can be seamlessly integrated into the two-step Algorithm 3 with minimal additional computation time, as outlined below:

Step 1.5: Draw a sample of q_0 observations from the entire dataset using the optimal sampling probabilities obtained in Step 1 to create $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$. Compute $\check{\mathbb{H}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})$ and $\check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})$. Generate a plot of $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ against q_n and select the smallest q_n that meets the desired RE.

Similarly, the minimal subsample size for testing $H_0 : \beta_p^o = 0$ against a two-sided alternative, given $\beta_p^o = \beta_p^*$, a significance level α and power γ , is given by

$$\tilde{q}_n = \left\lceil \frac{q_0(Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_\gamma)^2 [\check{\mathbb{H}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})]_{pp}}{\beta_p^{*2}} \right\rceil. \quad (22)$$

A plot of \tilde{q}_n as a function of γ can be easily generated. The values derived from Eq. (22) might exceed the sample size n . Nevertheless, exceeding the sample size may not yield any additional information beyond what is already captured by the full-data MLE, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}$. Despite this, a value surpassing n remains informative, indicating that the desired statistical power cannot be attained. In conclusion, the algorithm for a single covariate hypothesis testing is provided by adding the following mid-step to the two-step Algorithm 3:

Step 1.5*: Draw a sample of q_0 observations from the entire dataset using the optimal sampling probabilities obtained in Step 1 to create $\mathcal{Q}_{1.5}$. Compute $\check{\mathbb{H}}^B(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})$ and $\check{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{prop})$. Generate a plot of $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$ against γ and select the smallest q_n that meets the desired power.

5 Simulation Study

5.1 Cox Regression

5.1.1 Data Generation

The sampling designs are similar to that of [Keret and Gorfine \(2023\)](#). For each of the settings described below, 500 samples were drawn, $n = 15,000$ with $\beta^o = (0.3, -0.5, 0.1, -0.1, 0.1, -0.3)^T$. Censoring times were generated from an exponential distribution with rate 0.2, independently of failure times. The instantaneous baseline hazard rate was set to be $\lambda_0(t) = 0.001I(t < 6) + c_{\lambda_0}I(t \geq 6)$. The distributions of the covariates and the parameter c_{λ_0} of each setting, I, II, III, were as follows:

1. **Setting I:** $X_j \sim Unif(0, 4)$, $j = 1, \dots, 6$ and $c_{\lambda_0} = 0.075$. This is a setting of equal variances and no correlation between the covariates.
2. **Setting II:** $X_j \sim Unif(0, \theta_j)$, $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6) = (1, 6, 2, 2, 1, 6)$ and $c_{\lambda_0} = 0.15$. This is a setting of unequal variances and no correlation between covariates.
3. **Setting III:** X_1, X_2 and X_3 are independently sampled from $Unif(0, 4)$, $X_4 = 0.5X_1 + 0.5X_2 + \varepsilon_1$, $X_5 = X_1 + \varepsilon_2$, $X_6 = X_1 + \varepsilon_3$ and $c_{\lambda_0} = 0.05$, where $\varepsilon_1 \sim N(0, 0.1)$, $\varepsilon_2 \sim N(0, 1)$, $\varepsilon_3 \sim N(1, 1.5)$, and the ε 's are independent. The strongest correlation between two covariates is about 0.75.

5.1.2 Results

Eq. (6) and (7) become practically valuable only when the approximations made in Step 1.5 and Step 1.5* of Sections 2.2 and 2.3, respectively, closely align with their true values. In Fig. S1 of the SM, we compare the Frobenius norm of three covariance matrices: (i) The covariance matrix of the two-step estimator, $\tilde{\beta}_{TS}$. (ii) The approximated covariance matrix utilized in Step 1.5. (iii) The empirical covariance matrix of $\tilde{\beta}_{TS}$. The results are obtained with $q_n = 5n_e$ and $q_0 = c_0n_e$, where c_0 ranges from 1 to 5. Clearly, the Frobenius norm of

Step 1.5 is remarkably close to the covariance matrix of the two-step estimator, and both are in close agreement with the empirical variance, even for small values of c_0 such as $c_0 = 1$.

A comparison between the RE as defined by Eq. (4) and its approximation in Eq. (6) is summarized in Fig. 1, where $q_0 = 2n_e$, $q_n = cn_e$, and $c = 1, \dots, 9$. The results indicate that the approximated RE of Step 1.5, (i.e., Eq. (6)) closely mirrors Eq. (4). The presence of an ‘elbow’ shape around $c = 3$ with RE fairly close to 1 suggests that $q_n = 3n_e$ is sufficiently large under these specific settings. Clearly, the two optimal sampling strategies substantially outperform uniform sampling in terms of RE.

To assess the effectiveness of \tilde{q}_n as defined in Eq. (7), we conducted a comparison of the empirical and nominal power of the test for $H_0 : \beta_5 = 0$ against a two-sided alternative using \tilde{q}_n based on the proposed three-step estimation algorithm, comprising Steps 1, 1.5*, and 2. The tests were performed with $\alpha = 0.05$. Here, we increased the sample size to $n = 150,000$, and for Setting I $c_{\lambda_0} = 0.005$, while for Settings II and III $c_{\lambda_0} = 0.05$. Consequently, the respective event rates were 0.65%, 1.3% and 3%.

The results are outlined in Table 1 with $q_0 = 2n_e$. Clearly, \tilde{q}_n achieves the intended nominal power. When considering the mean and standard deviation (SD) of \tilde{q}_n , we observe that both optimality criteria exhibit similar performance under Settings I and II, while A surpasses L in Setting III. These results further validate our assertion that in extensive datasets with rare events, only a small fraction of the censored data is practically necessary. For instance, in Setting III, it is demonstrate that subsampling approximately 6000 censored observations from about 145,550 censored observations is sufficient to achieve a power of 0.95.

5.2 Logistic Regression with Rare Events

5.2.1 Data Generation

The sampling designs are similar to that of Wang et al. (2018) with some modification to represent settings of rare events. 500 samples were drawn for each setting, each dataset is of size $n = 100,000$. The following covariates’ distributions were considered:

1. **mzNormal**. \mathbf{X} follows a multivariate normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where $\Sigma_{ij} = 0.5^{I(i \neq j)}$.
2. **mixNormal**. \mathbf{X} is a mixture of two multivariate normal distribution, $\mathbf{X} \sim 0.5N(\mathbf{1}, \Sigma) + 0.5N(-\mathbf{1}, \Sigma)$ so the distribution of \mathbf{X} is bimodal.
3. **T3**. \mathbf{X} follows a multivariate t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom, $\mathbf{X} \sim t_3(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)/10$. Hence, the distribution of \mathbf{X} has heavy tails.
4. **EXP**. Components of \mathbf{X} are independent and each has an exponential distribution with a rate parameter of 2. The distribution of \mathbf{X} is skewed and has a heavier tail on the right.

We set $q_0 = 1,000$ and explored various values for q_n , ranging from 1,000 to 10,000 in increments of 1,000. We set $\beta_i = 0.5$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$, and employed distinct values for the intercept β_0 to regulate the event rate. Specifically, $\beta_0 = -6$ for mzNormal (yielding an event rate of 2%), $\beta_0 = -5$ for mixNormal (event rate of 2.1%), $\beta_0 = -5$ for T3 (event rate of 1.5%), and $\beta_0 = -11$ for EXP (event rate of 1.3%).

5.2.2 Results

The comparison among different estimators involved assessing the empirical root mean squared errors (RMSEs) with respect to β^o and $\hat{\beta}_{PL}$. Namely, $B^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^B \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^6 (\hat{\beta}_i^{(j)} - \beta_i^o)^2}$ and $B^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^B \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^6 (\hat{\beta}_i^{(j)} - \hat{\beta}_{PL,i}^{(j)})^2}$, where $\hat{\beta}$ represents the relevant estimator, the superscript (j) denotes the j 'th sample, and $B = 500$ signifies the number of repetitions. Fig. 2 shows the RMSEs of the two-step estimators of Algorithm 2 with \mathbf{p}^A and \mathbf{p}^L , the full-data MLE, and a one-step estimator with uniform subsampling from the non-cases data. Clearly, the optimal subsampling methods outperform uniform subsampling in terms of RMSE, with A-optimal yielding slightly superior results compared to L-optimal, as anticipated. Table 2 presents a comparison of the running times. Evidently, the optimal subsampling methods are substantially faster than $\hat{\beta}_{PL}$ while still maintaining low RMSE.

Fig. S2 of the SM demonstrate the validity of the variance estimator (11), and the effectiveness of optimal subsampling over uniform subsampling. In Figure 3(a) it is demonstrated that Eq. (14) provides a good approximation of the RE based on the actual two-step estimator, thereby endorsing the validity of the proposed three-step estimator that includes steps 1, 1.5 and 2.

To evaluate the utility of \tilde{q}_n derived from Eq. (16), a comparison was made between the empirical and nominal power of testing $H_0 : \beta_5 = 0$ against a two-sided alternative and $\alpha = 0.05$, using \tilde{q}_n and the three-step estimation algorithm of Section 3.1 with steps 1, 1.5* and 2. Due to impractical subsample sizes for some higher values of γ , meaning the required power could not be attained even with the entire sample, the coefficient vector β^o was modified:

1. **mzNormal.** $\beta_0 = -3.5$ and $\beta_j = 0.1, i = 1, \dots, 6$, with an event rate of 3.2%.
2. **mixNormal.** $\beta_0 = -4.5$ and $\beta_j = 0.2, i = 1, \dots, 6$, with an event rate of 1.3%.
3. **T3.** $\beta_0 = -3$ and $\beta_j = 0.15, j = 1, \dots, 6$, with an event rate of 5%.
4. **EXP.** $\beta_0 = -4$ and $\beta_j = 0.15, j = 1, \dots, 6$, with an event rate of 2.8%.

The results are summarized in Table 3 employing $q_0 = 1,000$ with 5,000 repetitions for each γ value. Our conclusion is that \tilde{q}_n yields power close to the nominal level across all scenarios. Regarding the mean and standard deviation of \tilde{q}_n , the A-optimal approach consistently outperforms L-optimal.

5.3 Logistic Regression with Nearly Balanced Data

The configurations examined correspond to those outlined in Wang et al. (2018) (Section 5.1): mzNormal, nzNormal, mixNormal, T3, and EXP. The setting mzNormal is not balanced, and with event rate of 0.73. For each specified scenario, we generated 500 samples, each consisting of 100,000 observations and q_0 was set to 5,000. The results, succinctly illustrated in Fig.

3(b), demonstrate a strong agreement between the proposed RE estimator (21) and the RE based on the actual two-step Algorithm 3.

Table 4 provides a summary of the comparison between empirical and nominal power of testing $H_0 : \beta_6 = 0$ against a two-sided alternative and $\alpha = 0.05$, utilizing \tilde{q}_n and the proposed three-step estimation algorithm outlined in Section 4.2. These results are derived from 5,000 repetitions for each configuration, employing a smaller subsample size for steps 1 and 1.5*, with q_0 set to 1,000. Evidently, \tilde{q}_n provides the desired nominal power, which supports the use of Eq. (22). In terms of the mean and standard deviation of \tilde{q}_n , A-optimal outperforms L-optimal.

The optimal approach of Wang et al. (2018) involves subsampling from both cases and controls, exhibiting strong performance when dealing with balanced data. The sensitivity of the optimal subsample size, as defined by Eq. (22), to imbalanced data is illustrated in Fig. 4. The setting mzNormal is explored with varying sample sizes $n = a \times 100,000$, $a = 1, \dots, 5$, and diverse values of $\beta_0^o = -5, -4, \dots, -1$, corresponding to event rates of 0.8%, 2%, 5%, 13%, and 28%, respectively. Evidently, Eq. (22) fails to deliver the required power as the event rate decreases, regardless of the sample size. These findings underscore the imperative need for a distinct consideration of the imbalanced setting, as addressed in this work.

6 Survival Analysis of UKBiobank Colorectal Cancer

We conducted an analysis complementing the one presented in Keret and Gorfine (2023) and studied the required subsample size based on RE. The event time is defined as the age at colorectal cancer (CRC) diagnosis, while the censoring time is specified as the age at death before CRC diagnosis or the current age without CRC. The analysis encompasses established environmental CRC risk factors, including body mass index (BMI), smoking status (no/yes), family history of CRC (no/yes), physical activity (no/yes), sex (female/male), alcohol consumption (non or occasional/light frequent drinker/very frequent drinker), edu-

cation (lower than high school/high school/higher vocational education/college or university graduate/prefer not to answer), NSAIDs drug use (none/Aspirin or Ibuprofen), and postmenopausal hormones (no/yes). Additionally, 139 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) associated with CRC through GWAS (Jeon et al., 2018) were included along with six principal components to account for population substructure. The SNPs were standardized to have a mean of zero and unit variance.

Building on the analysis in Keret and Gorfine (2023), a time-dependent effect $\beta(t)$ is essential for sex, due to violation of the proportional hazard assumption. In total, 180 regression coefficients were considered for the model, with 5,342 observed events and 479,343 censored observations. However, the introduction of time-dependent coefficients results in the partitioning of each observation into several distinct time-fixed “dummy-observations”, each having an “entrance” and “exit” time (Therneau et al., 2017). This creates non-overlapping intervals that reconstruct the original time interval and inflating the dataset to approximately 350 million rows and $n_e = 5,342$. Subsampling is then performed from the censored dummy-observations using the reservoir-sampling approach.

We set $c_0 = 15$ and investigated the RE based on Step 1.5. The results are summarized in Fig. 5 (a) and Table 5. Notably, $c = 100$ with the L-optimal subsampling approach (i.e., approximately 500K “dummy-observations” instead of nearly 350 million) proves sufficient. However, in subsequent analyses, we also applied our proposed algorithms for $c = 40$ and 160, for comparison purposes. Table 6 presents the RMSE of the estimators with respect to the full-data PL estimator, the Frobenius norm of the covariance matrices of the estimators, and their running times. Clearly, the optimal methods outperform uniform subsampling regarding both RMSE and Frobenius norm, with the A-optimal method consistently exhibiting somewhat better values than the L-optimal method, as expected. While the running time required for the full dataset is 14.5 hours, the time required for the L-optimal method with $c = 100$ is reduced to 3.287 hours, with minimal loss in terms of efficiency, as demonstrated in Figures 5 (b) and (c). In summary, this analysis, incorporating Step 1.5, highlights the

effectiveness of selecting the optimal q_n according to the RE criterion.

7 Linked Birth and Infant Death Data - Logistic Regression

The birth and infant death data sets, sourced from the National Bureau of Economic Research’s public-use data archives, combine information from death certificates with corresponding birth certificates for infants under one year old who pass away in the United States, Puerto Rico, The Virgin Islands, and Guam. This linkage aims to leverage the additional information available in birth certificates, such as age, parents’ race, birth weight, period of gestation, plurality, prenatal care usage, maternal education, live birth order, marital status, and maternal smoking, to enable more comprehensive analyses of infant mortality patterns.

The data from years 2007 to 2013 were amalgamated into a single extensive dataset comprising $n = 28,586,919$ rows. From the raw data, a set of features was derived, resulting in a covariate matrix with 103 columns, encompassing 18 interaction terms with sex and 23 interaction terms with birth year. The covariates in the model are summarized in Tables S1–S3 of the SM. The primary outcome of interest is whether an infant passed away before reaching one year of age. Exactly 176,400 deaths were observed, constituting about 0.6% of event rate, justifying the use of a subsampling algorithm for rare events. The results are summarized in Fig. 6.

In Fig. 6(a), the RE based on Step 1.5 is displayed. Notably, the RE exhibits a distinct ‘elbow’ around $q_n = 1,500,000$, where the RE is also close to 1. We opted for a slightly higher value, $q_n = 1,7640,000$, with $c = 10$, indicating that 10 controls were sampled for each event. To offer a more comprehensive assessment of the algorithm’s performance, we include results of analyses with $c = 5$ and 25. The approximated RE, varying with c , is presented in Table 7. As anticipated, the A-optimal outperforms the L-optimal in terms of RE.

In Fig. 6(b), the running time of various methods is illustrated as a function of c . The effectiveness of optimal subsampling becomes apparent when compared to the full-data MLE. With our chosen $c = 10$, the running times for A and L criteria are 1700 seconds and 628 seconds, respectively, whereas the full-data MLE estimator takes 6484 seconds. It is evident that the additional computational time required for optimal subsampling, as opposed to uniform subsampling, is relatively short, especially for the L method. This outcome reinforces the efficacy of the proposed procedure.

In Fig. 6(c), the RMSE relative to $\hat{\beta}_{MLE}$ is depicted. The findings validate the judicious selection of q_n since increasing c from 5 to 10 substantially reduces the RMSE. However, a further increment to $c = 25$ incurs a longer computational time and yields a comparatively modest improvement. Additionally, it is evident that optimal subsampling yields results substantially superior to those obtained through uniform subsampling.

The effectiveness of optimal subsampling methods over uniform subsampling is also evident in Figs 6(d) and 6(e). In Figure 6(d), the estimated coefficients of each subsampling method are compared to their $\hat{\beta}_{MLE}$ counterparts. Optimal subsampling yields results much closer to the full-data estimator than uniform subsampling. Figure 6(e) displays the standard errors of $\hat{\beta}_{MLE}$ versus the standard errors of their subsampling counterparts. Uniform subsampling produces notably larger standard errors.

We completed the analysis by conducting hypothesis testing, $H_0 : \beta_i = 0$ versus $H_1 : \beta_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, 103$ with FDR adjustment for multiplicity (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995). This process was iterated for $c = 5, 10$ and 25. In Figure 6(f), the total number of rejected hypotheses under each c is presented, contrasting with the number of rejections based on the full-data analysis. Notably, the A-optimal and L-optimal sampling methods outperforms uniform sampling. Even with a relatively small subsample size, the optimal sampling estimator yields results highly similar to those of the full data, surpassing the number of rejections achieved with uniform subsampling. For our chosen $c = 10$, both A-optimal and L-optimal methods result in rejecting 56 hypotheses, almost matching the

full-data analysis of 57 rejections. In contrast, uniform subsampling at $c = 10$ only leads to 37 rejected hypotheses, underscoring the effectiveness of the optimal subsampling.

This dataset possesses a noteworthy characteristic—many of its features consist of rare binary variables. Examples include newborns with congenital anomalies like anencephaly, spina bifida, omphalocele, and Down’s syndrome, alongside rare features related to the mother and delivery. Additionally, these features exhibit significant correlations with the outcome of interest, namely, death within the first year of life. The optimal subsampling procedures offer a notable advantage over uniform subsampling by ensuring that observations with rare features associated with the outcome have larger sampling probabilities. Consequently, they are more likely to be included in the subsample, leading to lower variance. In Table 8, the 20 rarest features in the data are presented, along with their corresponding proportions in both the full dataset and subsampling procedures for $c = 10$. The results affirm that optimal subsamples better capture observations with rare indicators. These insights shed light on the efficiency of our proposed estimators, elucidating their superiority over uniform subsampling.

Regarding the findings derived from the analysis, Tables S4–S6 of the SM present the estimated coefficients for each method, with $c = 10$. While the results are organized into three tables for clarity, it is essential to note that the FDR procedure was executed once, encompassing all coefficients collectively.

Among the significant results, both the mother’s age and the squared mother’s age emerged as noteworthy, corroborating established findings on the impact of maternal age on infant mortality (MacDorman et al., 1997; Standfast et al., 1980). This suggests heightened risks associated with motherhood at either a young or advanced age compared to medium age.

Other variables demonstrating significance in our analysis, consistent with prior literature, include lower risk as a function of number of prenatal visits (Carter et al., 2016), gestational weight gain (Naeve, 1979; Thorsdottir et al., 2002), five-minute Apgar score (Li et al., 2013), and plurality (Ahrens et al., 2017). Conversely, factors known as increasing

risk in the literature and affirmed in this study include live birth order (MacDorman et al., 1997; Modin, 2002), eclampsia (Duley, 2009), and certain congenital malformations linked to infant mortality, such as Spina Bifida (Pace et al., 2019), Omphalocele (Marshall et al., 2015), cleft lip (Carlson et al., 2013), and Down’s syndrome (Sadetzki et al., 1999).

Birth year, confined to the years 2007-2013, did not yield a significant effect. Similarly, no distinctions were observed among different months of the year. Treating Sunday as the baseline, negative impacts were noted for all days of the week except Saturday, indicating a significant difference between workdays and weekends. Concerning parental racial attributes, negative significant effects were identified for native-American ancestry in both parents and for African ancestry from the father’s side. Additionally, an unknown father’s race exhibited statistical significance with a negative effect. In contrast to some prior studies (Holmes Jr et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2015), our findings indicate a lower risk of infant mortality among Caesarean section. Regarding interaction terms, five sex-interaction terms (weight gain, 5 minutes Apgar score, pre-pregnancy-associated hypertension, induction of labor, and cleft lip) and five birth year-interaction terms (African ancestry for the mother, induction of labor, tocolysis, Anencephaly, and Down’s syndrome) were found to be statistically significant.

8 Discussion

This study makes significant enhancements to the efficient two-step algorithms proposed by Wang et al. (2018) and Keret and Gorfine (2023). We introduced practical tools for selecting optimal subsample sizes, illustrating their effectiveness through simulations and real-world data. Additionally, we proposed a new subsampling algorithm designed for logistic regression with rare events. This algorithm, which exclusively subsamples among non-cases, demonstrated speed and efficiency compared to full-data maximum-likelihood estimation. Its superiority over uniform subsampling was established in both simulated and real data, as evidenced by lower RMSE and variance. Furthermore, we demonstrated the algorithm’s nearly

equivalent performance to the full-data estimator in hypothesis testing while significantly reducing computational time.

Similar approaches to those proposed in this study can be extended to other two-step subsampling methods, including algorithms for generalized linear models (Ai et al., 2018), quantile regression (Ai et al., 2021; Fan et al., 2021), and quasi-likelihood regression (Yu et al., 2020).

Datasets with rare events often pose challenges for classification algorithms primarily oriented toward prediction rather than inference. The subsampling-based algorithm proposed for logistic regression with rare events in this study could serve as a practical tool for sampling probabilities in computationally-intensive methods. Notably, it may be worth exploring its application in methods like random forests (Breiman, 2001) and gradient boosting (Friedman, 2001), among others.

9 Software

R codes for the data analysis and reported simulation results along with a complete documentation are available at Github site <https://github.com/tal-agassi/optimal-subsampling>.

10 Supplementary Material

Supplementary material is available online at <http://biostatistics.oxfordjournals.org>.

Acknowledgments

The work was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (ISF) grant number 767/21 and by a grant from the Tel Aviv University Center for AI and Data Science (TAD).

Conflict of Interest: None declared.

References

- Ahrens, K. A., M. E. Thoma, L. M. Rossen, M. Warner, and A. E. Simon (2017). Plurality of birth and infant mortality due to external causes in the united states, 2000–2010. *American journal of epidemiology* 185(5), 335–344.
- Ai, M., F. Wang, J. Yu, and H. Zhang (2021). Optimal subsampling for large-scale quantile regression. *Journal of Complexity* 62, 101512.
- Ai, M., J. Yu, H. Zhang, and H. Wang (2018). Optimal subsampling algorithms for big data generalized linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.06761*.
- Benjamini, Y. and Y. Hochberg (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)* 57(1), 289–300.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine learning* 45(1), 5–32.
- Breslow, N. E. (1972). Contribution to discussion of paper by dr cox. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc., Ser. B* 34, 216–217.
- Carlson, L., K. W. Hatcher, and R. Vander Burg (2013). Elevated infant mortality rates among oral cleft and isolated oral cleft cases: a meta-analysis of studies from 1943 to 2010. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal* 50(1), 2–12.
- Carter, E. B., M. G. Tuuli, A. B. Caughey, A. O. Odibo, G. A. Macones, and A. G. Cahill (2016). Number of prenatal visits and pregnancy outcomes in low-risk women. *Journal of perinatology* 36(3), 178–181.
- Cox, D. R. (1972). Regression models and life-tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 34(2), 187–202.
- Dhillon, P., Y. Lu, D. P. Foster, and L. Ungar (2013). New subsampling algorithms for fast least squares regression. pp. 360–368.

- Duley, L. (2009). The global impact of pre-eclampsia and eclampsia. In *Seminars in perinatology*, Volume 33, pp. 130–137. Elsevier.
- Fan, Y., Y. Liu, and L. Zhu (2021). Optimal subsampling for linear quantile regression models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*.
- Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Annals of statistics*, 1189–1232.
- Gorfine, M., N. Keret, A. Ben Arie, D. Zucker, and L. Hsu (2021). Marginalized frailty-based illness-death model: application to the uk-biobank survival data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 116(535), 1155–1167.
- Holmes Jr, L., L. O’Neill, H. Elmi, C. Chinacherem, C. Comeaux, L. Pelaez, K. W. Dabney, O. Akinola, and M. Enwere (2020). Implication of vaginal and cesarean section delivery method in black–white differentials in infant mortality in the united states: Linked birth/infant death records, 2007–2016. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17(9), 3146.
- Jeon, J., M. Du, R. E. Schoen, M. Hoffmeister, P. A. Newcomb, S. I. Berndt, B. Caan, P. T. Campbell, A. T. Chan, J. Chang-Claude, et al. (2018). Determining risk of colorectal cancer and starting age of screening based on lifestyle, environmental, and genetic factors. *Gastroenterology* 154(8), 2152–2164.
- Keret, N. and M. Gorfine (2023). Analyzing big ehr data—optimal cox regression subsampling procedure with rare events. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118(544), 2262–2275.
- Li, F., T. Wu, X. Lei, H. Zhang, M. Mao, and J. Zhang (2013). The apgar score and infant mortality. *PloS one* 8(7), e69072.
- Ma, P., M. W. Mahoney, and B. Yu (2015). A statistical perspective on algorithmic leveraging. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 16(1), 861–911.

- MacDorman, M. F., S. Cnattingius, H. J. Hoffman, M. S. Kramer, and B. Haglund (1997). Sudden infant death syndrome and smoking in the united states and sweden. *American journal of epidemiology* 146(3), 249–257.
- Marshall, J., J. L. Salemi, J. P. Tanner, R. Ramakrishnan, M. L. Feldkamp, L. K. Marengo, R. E. Meyer, C. M. Druschel, R. Rickard, R. S. Kirby, et al. (2015). Prevalence, correlates, and outcomes of omphalocele in the united states, 1995–2005. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 126(2), 284–293.
- Modin, B. (2002). Birth order and mortality: a life-long follow-up of 14,200 boys and girls born in early 20th century sweden. *Social science & medicine* 54(7), 1051–1064.
- Naeve, R. L. (1979). Weight gain and the outcome of pregnancy. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology* 135(1), 3–9.
- Pace, N. D., A. M. Siega-Riz, A. F. Olshan, N. C. Chescheir, S. R. Cole, T. A. Desrosiers, S. C. Tinker, A. T. Hoyt, M. A. Canfield, S. L. Carmichael, et al. (2019). Survival of infants with spina bifida and the role of maternal prepregnancy body mass index. *Birth defects research* 111(16), 1205–1216.
- Sadetzki, S., A. Chetrit, E. Akstein, O. Luxenburg, L. Keinan, I. Litvak, and B. Modan (1999). Risk factors for infant mortality in down’s syndrome: a nationwide study. *Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology* 13(4), 442–451.
- Standfast, S. J., S. Jereb, and D. T. Janerich (1980). The epidemiology of sudden infant death in upstate new york: Ii: birth characteristics. *American Journal of Public Health* 70(10), 1061–1067.
- Therneau, T., C. Crowson, and E. Atkinson (2017). Using time dependent covariates and time dependent coefficients in the cox model. *Survival Vignettes* 2(3), 1–25.

- Thorsdottir, I., J. E. Torfadottir, B. E. Birgisdottir, and R. T. Geirsson (2002). Weight gain in women of normal weight before pregnancy: complications in pregnancy or delivery and birth outcome. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 99(5), 799–806.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*, Volume 3. Cambridge university press.
- Wang, H. (2020). Logistic regression for massive data with rare events. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9829–9836. PMLR.
- Wang, H. and Y. Ma (2021). Optimal subsampling for quantile regression in big data. *Biometrika* 108(1), 99–112.
- Wang, H., A. Zhang, and C. Wang (2021). Nonuniform negative sampling and log odds correction with rare events data. In *Thirty-Fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Wang, H., R. Zhu, and P. Ma (2018). Optimal subsampling for large sample logistic regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113(522), 829–844.
- Xie, R.-h., L. Gaudet, D. Krewski, I. D. Graham, M. C. Walker, and S. W. Wen (2015). Higher cesarean delivery rates are associated with higher infant mortality rates in industrialized countries. *Birth* 42(1), 62–69.
- Yang, Z., H. Wang, and J. Yan (2024). Subsampling approach for least squares fitting of semi-parametric accelerated failure time models to massive survival data. *Statistics and Computing* 34(2), 1–11.
- Yu, J., H. Wang, M. Ai, and H. Zhang (2020). Optimal distributed subsampling for maximum quasi-likelihood estimators with massive data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–12.
- Zuo, L., H. Zhang, H. Wang, and L. Liu (2021). Sampling-based estimation for massive survival data with additive hazards model. *Statistics in Medicine* 40(2), 441–450.

Setting	Nominal Power	Empirical Power		Mean (SD) of \tilde{q}_n	
		A	L	A	L
I	0.80	0.812	0.794	857 (45)	843 (37)
	0.83	0.818	0.814	1027 (61)	1007 (55)
	0.85	0.852	0.842	1175 (76)	1154 (69)
	0.87	0.882	0.882	1381 (97)	1342 (95)
	0.90	0.896	0.874	1856 (179)	1814 (164)
	0.91	0.920	0.890	2098 (212)	2064 (199)
	0.93	0.936	0.934	2901 (425)	2866 (379)
	0.95	0.952	0.960	5179 (1550)	4922 (1074)
II	0.80	0.774	0.794	1112 (36)	1407 (48)
	0.83	0.804	0.812	1301 (50)	1652 (63)
	0.85	0.834	0.854	1470 (57)	1862 (74)
	0.87	0.882	0.844	1681 (74)	2122 (92)
	0.90	0.892	0.906	2155 (112)	2714 (142)
	0.91	0.916	0.902	2369 (122)	2997 (163)
	0.93	0.932	0.908	3046 (208)	3849 (247)
	0.95	0.940	0.930	4361 (418)	5533 (496)
III	0.80	0.774	0.782	1640 (49)	2677 (81)
	0.83	0.824	0.784	1911 (62)	3132 (108)
	0.85	0.844	0.804	2148 (74)	3516 (123)
	0.87	0.858	0.860	2449 (94)	3999 (156)
	0.90	0.894	0.876	3105 (135)	5103 (216)
	0.91	0.886	0.874	3420 (168)	5603 (253)
	0.93	0.894	0.934	4289 (234)	7071 (375)
	0.95	0.942	0.930	6078 (412)	9872 (675)

Table 1: Simulation results of Cox regression model: nominal versus empirical power based on \tilde{q}_n of Eq. (7) and the proposed three-step estimator of Section 2.3.

Setting	MLE	L	A	Uniform
mzNormal	0.815 (0.243)	0.112 (0.058)	0.116 (0.055)	0.047 (0.030)
mixNormal	0.779 (0.123)	0.101 (0.045)	0.111 (0.052)	0.041 (0.029)
T3	0.740 (0.133)	0.102 (0.042)	0.113 (0.047)	0.040 (0.029)
EXP	1.084 (0.303)	0.120 (0.036)	0.130 (0.052)	0.048 (0.026)

Table 2: Simulation results of logistic regression with rare events: running times (in hours) with $n = 100,000$, $q_0 = 1,000$, $q_n = 10,000$.

Setting	Nominal Power	Empirical Power		Mean (SD) of \tilde{q}_n	
		A	L	A	L
mzNormal	0.80	0.804	0.799	1495 (91)	1648 (107)
	0.83	0.833	0.824	1715 (113)	1893 (129)
	0.85	0.843	0.849	1900 (127)	2093 (149)
	0.87	0.857	0.861	2122 (148)	2345 (175)
	0.90	0.900	0.887	2591 (196)	2865 (230)
	0.93	0.921	0.931	3369 (296)	3718 (352)
	0.95	0.948	0.941	4317 (442)	4758 (524)
mixNormal	0.80	0.792	0.786	821 (58)	911 (69)
	0.83	0.827	0.815	958 (74)	1061 (85)
	0.85	0.844	0.846	1074 (88)	1191 (102)
	0.87	0.863	0.864	1223 (108)	1353 (128)
	0.90	0.899	0.900	1542 (156)	1711 (183)
	0.93	0.930	0.935	2123 (265)	2364 (322)
	0.95	0.947	0.946	2957 (473)	3289 (585)
T3	0.80	0.797	0.798	1175 (168)	1347 (214)
	0.83	0.819	0.821	1334 (193)	1536 (247)
	0.85	0.842	0.843	1467 (221)	1686 (284)
	0.87	0.853	0.850	1625 (250)	1865 (318)
	0.90	0.890	0.891	1947 (319)	2243 (404)
	0.93	0.926	0.918	2449 (421)	2820 (548)
	0.95	0.947	0.951	3021 (558)	3475 (725)
EXP	0.80	0.794	0.791	1263 (225)	1264 (214)
	0.83	0.828	0.831	1449 (259)	1458 (256)
	0.85	0.843	0.841	1613 (301)	1624 (296)
	0.87	0.863	0.857	1812 (346)	1826 (351)
	0.90	0.892	0.891	2225 (477)	2249 (481)
	0.93	0.925	0.920	2913 (742)	2924 (727)
	0.95	0.943	0.955	3814 (1162)	3826 (1182)

Table 3: Simulation results of logistic regression with rare events: nominal versus the empirical power based on \tilde{q}_n of Eq. (16) and the proposed three-step estimator of Section 3.1.

Setting	Nominal Power	Empirical Power		Mean (SD) of \tilde{q}_n	
		A	L	A	L
mzNormal	0.80	0.806	0.820	4126 (230)	4402 (241)
	0.83	0.854	0.818	4513 (253)	4811 (269)
	0.85	0.840	0.822	4831 (266)	5111 (285)
	0.87	0.872	0.860	5114 (271)	5461 (292)
	0.89	0.880	0.872	5506 (307)	5883 (330)
	0.91	0.900	0.924	5952 (324)	6339 (352)
	0.93	0.928	0.922	6502 (353)	6945 (376)
	0.95	0.958	0.940	7219 (415)	7690 (404)
nzNormal	0.80	0.784	0.752	4169 (263)	4921 (292)
	0.83	0.820	0.856	4604 (297)	5392 (353)
	0.85	0.866	0.852	4855 (319)	5706 (348)
	0.87	0.874	0.880	5208 (326)	6094 (382)
	0.89	0.904	0.880	5582 (368)	6591 (410)
	0.91	0.910	0.890	6049 (398)	7092 (415)
	0.93	0.920	0.920	6597 (420)	7727 (477)
	0.95	0.952	0.942	7360 (472)	8587 (535)
mixNormal	0.80	0.842	0.812	8682 (467)	9160 (443)
	0.83	0.810	0.836	9514 (481)	9952 (534)
	0.85	0.864	0.828	10120 (548)	10575 (554)
	0.87	0.856	0.864	10866 (608)	11367 (595)
	0.89	0.874	0.900	11623 (603)	12181 (608)
	0.91	0.926	0.912	12565 (624)	13219 (710)
	0.93	0.930	0.932	13777 (665)	14396 (753)
	0.95	0.956	0.918	15286 (787)	16076 (857)
T3	0.80	0.816	0.780	11900 (1534)	12899 (1668)
	0.83	0.822	0.804	12966 (1659)	14200 (1843)
	0.85	0.838	0.838	13940 (1741)	15171 (2158)
	0.87	0.854	0.850	14698 (1917)	16340 (2112)
	0.89	0.880	0.874	16012 (1959)	17557 (2326)
	0.91	0.912	0.922	17265 (2199)	19050 (2485)
	0.93	0.928	0.916	18837 (2371)	20551 (2805)
	0.95	0.928	0.924	20634 (2660)	23076 (3047)
exp	0.80	0.804	0.808	7526 (832)	7661 (832)
	0.83	0.834	0.800	8200 (829)	8396 (918)
	0.85	0.850	0.856	8652 (940)	8957 (1010)
	0.87	0.872	0.858	9281 (997)	9463 (1089)
	0.89	0.906	0.902	9938 (1057)	10190 (1102)
	0.91	0.890	0.912	10725 (1162)	11027 (1206)
	0.93	0.932	0.910	11786 (1217)	12009 (1230)
	0.95	0.946	0.950	13195 (1380)	13385 (1369)

Table 4: Simulation results of logistic regression with (nearly) balanced data: nominal versus the empirical power based on \tilde{q}_n of Eq. (22) and the proposed three-step estimator of Section 4.2.

c	q_n	A	L	Uniform
40	213,680	1.0076	1.0316	1.1091
60	320,520	1.0051	1.0206	1.0725
80	427,360	1.0038	1.0154	1.0543
100	534,200	1.0031	1.0123	1.0434
120	641,040	1.0025	1.0103	1.0361
140	747,880	1.0022	1.0088	1.0309
160	854,720	1.0019	1.0077	1.0271
180	961,560	1.0017	1.0068	1.0240
200	1,068,400	1.0015	1.0062	1.0216

Table 5: UKB CRC survival analysis: RE of Step 1.5.

c	RMSE with respect to $\hat{\beta}_{PL} (\times 100)$			Frobenius norm of covariance matrix ($\times 100$)			Computation Time in hours		
	A	L	Uniform	A	L	Uniform	A	L	Uniform
40	6.308	7.627	11.186	2.387	2.457	2.649	5.927	2.911	0.306
100	3.033	4.356	5.690	2.343	2.374	2.447	5.870	3.287	0.387
160	2.528	3.225	7.201	2.338	2.354	2.398	5.847	3.254	0.428

Table 6: UKB CRC survival analysis. The Frobenius norm of the covariance matrix of the entire-data PL estimator, $\hat{\beta}_{PL} (\times 100)$, is 2.325, and its running time is 14.5 hours.

c	q_n	A	L
5	882,000	1.023	1.180
10	1,764,000	1.013	1.090
25	4,410,000	1.005	1.036

Table 7: Linked birth and infant death data: RE of Step 1.5.

Coefficient	Full-sample Proportion	Subsample Proportion		Ratio	
		A	L	A	L
Anencephaly = no	0.00011	0.03529	0.00416	309.41689	36.52090
Spina Bifida = no	0.00016	0.03385	0.00227	206.53149	13.85638
Omphalocele = no	0.00038	0.04523	0.00497	118.48022	13.02339
Downs syndrome = no	0.00048	0.03536	0.00710	73.33574	14.73338
Cleft lip = no	0.00072	0.04208	0.00908	58.72595	12.66362
Residence status = 4	0.00190	0.00927	0.00118	4.88057	0.62083
Eclampsia = no	0.00253	0.04124	0.00754	16.28528	2.97785
Attendant = other midwife	0.00638	0.01121	0.00387	1.75569	0.60659
Attendant = other	0.00654	0.02102	0.01575	3.21212	2.40667
Forceps delivery = no	0.00663	0.03397	0.00433	5.12472	0.65301
Father's race = american indian	0.00870	0.02241	0.01109	2.57516	1.27423
Mother's race = american indian	0.01165	0.03025	0.01596	2.59707	1.37015
Birth place = not in hospital	0.01205	0.02719	0.01835	2.25730	1.52346
Tocolysis = no	0.01211	0.05251	0.03946	4.33686	3.25930
Cronic hypertension = no	0.01325	0.04522	0.03319	3.41423	2.50554
Residence status = 3	0.02119	0.04346	0.03647	2.05113	1.72109
Precipitous labor = no	0.02471	0.04615	0.03853	1.86780	1.55949
Vacuum delivery = no	0.03009	0.03916	0.01360	1.30158	0.45214
Prepregnacny associated hypertension = no	0.04275	0.06545	0.05763	1.53100	1.34794
Meconium = no	0.04736	0.05964	0.04199	1.25928	0.88652

Table 8: Linked birth and infant death data: the proportion of the 20 least common binary variables are compared between the entire dataset and the A-optimal and L-optimal subsamples, with $c = 10$.






Figure 1: Simulation results of Cox regression model: RE with and without the approximation of Step 1.5 and the RE of a one-step estimator based on a uniform subsampling from the censored data. The curves of the true and approximated relative efficiency coincide. The dashed red line is $y = 1$.




(a) RMSE with respect to β^o




(b) RMSE with respect to $\hat{\beta}_{MLE}$

Figure 2: Simulation results of logistic regression with rare events: RMSE of the two-step estimators with sampling methods A-optimal, L-optimal, full-data MLE, and a one-step estimator with uniform sampling from the non-cases data.



(a) Logistic regression - rare event



(b) Logistic regression - nearly balanced

Figure 3: Simulation results of logistic regression: RE with and without the approximation of Step 1.5. The curves of the true and approximated RE tend to coincide. The dashed red line is $y = 1$.







Figure 4: Simulation results of logistic regression setting $mzNormal$ with imbalanced data: nominal versus empirical power based on \tilde{q}_n of Eq. (22) as a function of β_0^o and n . The black line is $x = y$.



(a) RE based on Step 1.5




(b) Comparison of Estimates




(c) Comparison of Standard Errors


Figure 5: UKB CRC survival analysis: results of Cox regression analysis.




(a) RE based on Step 1.5




(b) Running time as a function of subsample size




(c) RMSE with respect to full-data MLE



(d) Comparison of Estimates



(e) Comparison of Standard Errors



(f) Number of significant coefficients

Figure 6: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: results of logistic regression analysis

Supplementary Material

S1 Additional Technical Details

The following functions are required for $\widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}(\mathbf{p}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{n} \int_0^\tau \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{S}_w^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_w^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} - \left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_w^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_w^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_w^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_w^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right)^T \right\} dN.(t)$$

and

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})^T}{p_i^2} - \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{p_i} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{p_i} \right)^T \right\}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \int_0^\tau \left\{ \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{\mathbf{S}_w^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_w^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right\} \frac{Y_i(t) e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i}}{S_w^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} dN.(t).$$

The following functions are required for $\widehat{RE}(q_n)$:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}_{Q_{1.5}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{n} \int_0^\tau \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{S}_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} - \left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right)^T \right\} dN.(t)$$

and

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{Q_{1.5}}(\mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in Q_{1.5} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})^T}{p_i^2} - \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{i \in Q_{1.5} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{p_i} \left(\sum_{i \in Q_{1.5} \setminus \mathcal{E}} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{p_i} \right)^T \right\}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \int_0^\tau \left\{ \mathbf{X}_i - \frac{\mathbf{S}_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)}{S_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} \right\} \frac{Y_i(t) e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i}}{S_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t)} dN.(t),$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{w, Q_{1.5}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, t) = \sum_{i \in Q_{1.5}} w_i e^{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}_i} Y_i(t) \mathbf{X}_i^{\otimes k} \quad k = 0, 1, 2,$$

and

$$w_i = \begin{cases} (p_i q_0)^{-1} & \text{if } \Delta_i = 0, p_i > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \Delta_i = 1 \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

S2 Logistic Regression - Assumptions and Proofs

The \mathbf{X}_i 's are assumed to be independent and identically distributed and the following additional assumptions are required for the asymptotic results:

A.1 As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{X}_i\|^3 = O_P(1)$ and $\mathbf{M}_X(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ goes in probability to a positive-definite matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$, where

$$\mathbf{M}_X(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})(1 - p_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T.$$

A.2 $n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i^{-1} \|\mathbf{X}_i\|^k = O_P(1)$ for $k = 2, 4$.

A.3 There exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $n^{-2+\delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i^{-1-\delta} \|\mathbf{X}_i\|^{2+\delta} = O_P(1)$.

A.4 q_n/n and $(n - n_0)/n$ converge to small positive constants as $q_n, n \rightarrow \infty$.

The first three assumptions are essentially general moment conditions (Wang et al., 2018). In Assumption A.4 it is assumed that the sampled event rate goes to a positive constant as n goes to infinity.

S2.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

This proof follows derivation similar to that of Keret and Gorfine (2023). Wang et al. (2018) have already shown that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is consistent to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}$ in the conditional space, given \mathcal{F}_n . We begin by expanding this result and show that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is consistent to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$ in the unconditional space. Based on Theorem 1 of Wang et al. (2018), for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 > \epsilon | \mathcal{F}_n) = 0.$$

In the unconditional probability space, $\Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 > \epsilon | \mathcal{F}_n)$ itself is a random variable. Hence, denote it by ζ_{n, q_n} and it follows that

$$\Pr\left(\lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{n, q_n} = 0\right) = 1,$$

in the sense that $\zeta_{n,q_n} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ as $q_n, n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 > \epsilon) = \lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} E(\zeta_{n,q_n}) = E\left(\lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{n,q_n}\right) = 0 \quad (\text{S.23})$$

where the interchange of expectation and limit is allowed due to the dominated convergence theorem, since ζ_{n,q_n} is trivially bounded by 1. Next, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon) &= \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon) \\ &\leq \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon) \\ &\leq \Pr(\{\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 > \epsilon/2\} \cup \{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon/2\}) \\ &\leq \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 > \epsilon/2) + \Pr(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon/2). \end{aligned}$$

Taking limits on both sides, yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon) \\ &\leq \lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}\|_2 > \epsilon/2) + \lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon/2) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the first addend is 0 due to Equation (S.23) and the second addend is 0 based on the well-known properties of logistic regression MLE. Then, we conclude that

$$\lim_{q_n, n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2 > \epsilon) = 0.$$

Similarly to Eq. (S.12) in Wang et al. (2018), a Taylor expansion for the subsample-based pseudo-score function evaluated at $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ around $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$ instead of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{MLE}$ gives

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o = -\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T)} + o_P(\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|) \right\} \quad (\text{S.24})$$

where the consistency of $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_X(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ to $\mathbf{M}_X(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ is derived in a similar manner to the proof of the consistency of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ to $\boldsymbol{\beta}^o$ and based on Eq. (S.1) in Wang et al. Wang et al. (2018).

Denote by R_i the number of times observation i appears in the subsample. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{Q}} w_i^* (D_i^* - \mu_i^*(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} w_i (1 - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i - \sum_{i \in \{\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}} w_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} (1 - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i - \sum_{i \in \{\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}} w_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} (1 - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i - \sum_{i \in \{\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}} w_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i - \sum_{i \in \{\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}} w_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} R_i w_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i - \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})) \mathbf{X}_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \\
&= \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i. \tag{S.25}
\end{aligned}$$

Based on Eq.s (S.24) and (S.25), we conclude that

$$\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) = -\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} - \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i + o_P(\sqrt{n} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^o\|_2). \tag{S.26}$$

Now it will be shown that $n^{-1/2} \partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) / \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T$ and $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i$ are asymptotically independent and each one of them is asymptotically normal. From the asymptotic theory of standard logistic regression,

$$-\mathbf{M}_X^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I}),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)). \tag{S.27}$$

Also, $\sqrt{q_n}/n \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} w_i R_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i$ can be alternatively expressed as a sum of independent iden-

tically distributed observations in the conditional space, namely

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sqrt{q_n}}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} w_i R_i \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i &= \frac{\sqrt{q_n}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} w_i^* \mu_i^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i^* \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{q_n}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \frac{\mu_i^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i^*}{\pi_i^* q_n} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \frac{\mu_i^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i^*}{n \pi_i^*} \\
&\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \boldsymbol{\omega}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ changes as a function of n and q_n , the Lindeberg-Feller condition (Van der Vaart, 2000, proposition 2.27) should be established as it covers the setting of triangular arrays. First, let us denote $\mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \equiv \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\omega}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) | \mathcal{F}_n)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= E(\boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \boldsymbol{\omega}^T(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) | \mathcal{F}_n) - E(\boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) | \mathcal{F}_n) E(\boldsymbol{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) | \mathcal{F}_n)^T \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T}{\pi_i} - \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mu_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_j \right\} = O_{|\mathcal{F}_n}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is due to Assumptions A.1 and A.2.

Now, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and some $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{q_n} E\{ \|q_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\omega}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\|_2^2 I(q_n^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\omega}_i(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) > \varepsilon) | \mathcal{F}_n \}. \\
&\leq \frac{1}{q_n^{1+\delta/2} \varepsilon^\delta} \sum_{i=1}^q E\left\{ \left\| \frac{\mu_i^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i^*}{n \pi_i^*} \right\|_2^{2+\delta} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{q_n^{\delta/2} \varepsilon^\delta n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\{\mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})\}^2 \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2^{2+\delta}}{\pi_i^{\delta+1}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{q_n^{\delta/2} \varepsilon^\delta n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2^{2+\delta}}{\pi_i^{\delta+1}} = o_{P|\mathcal{F}_n}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to Van der Vaart (Van der Vaart, 2000, p. 21) and the last equality is due to Assumption A.3. Since $E(1 - w_i R_i | \mathcal{F}_n) = 0$, it holds that $q_n^{1/2} n^{-1} K(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i$ converges conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n to a standard

multivariate distribution. Put differently, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$,

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{q_n}}{n} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \leq \mathbf{u} | \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \rightarrow \Phi(\mathbf{u}). \quad (\text{S.28})$$

where Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard multivariate normal distribution. Since the conditional probability is a random variable in the unconditional space, then due to Eq. (S.28) it converges almost surely to $\Phi(\mathbf{u})$. Being additionally bounded, then due to the dominated convergence theorem, it follows that for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$,

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{q_n}}{n} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} \rightarrow \Phi(\mathbf{u}). \quad (\text{S.29})$$

Suppose that $\mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \xrightarrow{P} \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ where $\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ is a positive-definite matrix. Denote θ as the limit of q_n/n , which we assumed its existence earlier. Then, from Eq. (S.29)

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \theta \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)). \quad (\text{S.30})$$

In the following, it will be shown that the two addends are asymptotically independent. Write

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n, q_n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \leq \mathbf{u}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) p_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \leq \mathbf{v} \right) \\ &= \lim_{n, q_n \rightarrow \infty} E \left(I \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) p_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \leq \mathbf{v} | \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \right) \\ &= E \left(\lim_{n, q_n \rightarrow \infty} I \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} \lim_{n, q \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (1 - w_i R_i) p_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \leq \mathbf{v} | \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \right) \\ &= E \left(\lim_{n, q_n \rightarrow \infty} I \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} \Phi(\theta^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n, q_n \rightarrow \infty} E \left(I \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} \Phi(\theta^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n, q_n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \leq \mathbf{u} \right) \Phi(\theta^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \Phi(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} \mathbf{u}) \Phi(\theta^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Psi}(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S.31})$$

and we have used the dominated convergence theorem.

Since $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{X}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ is a consistent estimator of $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{X}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$, its consistency to $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$ could be

easily shown. Then, from Slutsky's theorem and Eq.s (S.27), (S.30) and (S.31) it follows that Eq. (S.26) converges in distribution to a multivariate normal distribution with zero mean and a covariance matrix asymptotically equivalent to $\mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$. The two variance components correspond to two orthogonal sources of variance, the variance of the original full-data MLE, and the additional variance generated by the subsampling procedure.

S2.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

A-optimal criterion is equivalent to minimizing the asymptotic MSE of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{TS}$, which is the trace of $\mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$. However,

$$Tr(\mathbb{H}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)) = Tr\left(\frac{n}{q_n}\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mathbb{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\right) + d$$

where d is a constant that does not involve $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & Tr\left(\frac{n}{q_n}\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mathbb{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\right) \\ &= Tr\left(\frac{1}{nq_n}\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\left\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\pi_i} \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T - \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\mu_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_j^T\right\}\mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\right). \end{aligned}$$

By removing the part that does not involve $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and the factor $(nq_n)^{-1}$ which does not alter the optimization process, we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} Tr\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\pi_i} \mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{M}_X^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\right) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\pi_i} Tr(\mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{M}_X^{-2}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \mathbf{X}_i) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\pi_i} \|\mathbf{M}_X^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Define the following Lagrangian function, with multiplier α ,

$$g(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\pi_i} \|\mathbf{M}_x^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2 + \alpha \left(1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i\right).$$

Differentiating $g(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ with respect to π_i for any $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and setting the derivative to 0, gives

$$\frac{\partial g(\boldsymbol{\pi})}{\partial \pi_i} = -\frac{\mu_i^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{M}_x^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i\|_2^2}{\pi_i^2} - \alpha \equiv 0,$$

and

$$\pi_i = \frac{\mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{M}_x^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i\|_2}{\sqrt{-\alpha}}.$$

Since $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \pi_i = 1$,

$$\sqrt{-\alpha} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o) \|\mathbf{M}_x^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i\|_2,$$

which yields Eq. (3.9) in the main text. The proof of Eq. (3.10) of the main text follows similarly.

S2.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Following the main steps of the proof of Theorem 2 in Wang et al. (2018), it is straightforward to show that given \mathcal{F}_n ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{1/2} \frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^o} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_n}} \{Var(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i | \mathcal{F}_n)\}^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I})$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \equiv \frac{\{D_i^* - \mu_i^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)\} \mathbf{X}_i^*}{n\pi_i^*}, \quad i = 1, \dots, q_n$$

are independent and identically distributed with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and variance $q_n \mathbf{K}^B(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)$. In other words, for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$,

$$\Pr \left\{ n^{-1} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{1/2} \frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^o} \leq \mathbf{u} | \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \xrightarrow{P} \Phi(\mathbf{u}). \quad (\text{S.32})$$

The conditional probability in Eq. (S.32) is a bounded random variable, thus convergence in probability to a constant implies convergence in the mean. Therefore,

$$\Pr \left\{ n^{-1} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{1/2} \frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^o} \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} = E \left\{ \Pr \left\{ n^{-1} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{1/2} \frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^o} \leq \mathbf{u} \right\} | \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \rightarrow \Phi(\mathbf{u}),$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{K}^R(\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^o)^{1/2} \frac{\partial l^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^o)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^o} \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \mathbf{I})$$

in the unconditional space. The rest of the proof follows directly from Wang et al. (2018).

S3 Additional Simulation Results

In Fig. S1, we compare the Frobenius norm of three covariance matrices: (i) The covariance matrix of the two-step estimator, $\tilde{\beta}_{TS}$. (ii) The approximated covariance matrix utilized in Step 1.5. (iii) The empirical covariance matrix of $\tilde{\beta}_{TS}$. Fig. S2 demonstrates the validity of the variance estimator (3.11), and the effectiveness of optimal subsampling over uniform subsampling.




Figure S1: Simulation results of Cox regression model: Frobenius norm of (i) the estimated covariance matrix of the two-stage estimator; (ii) the empirical covariance matrices of the two-stage estimator; and (iii) the covariance matrix approximation used in Step 1.5, for various values of c_0 where $q_0 = c_0 \times n_e$.




Figure S2: Simulation results for the two-step algorithm for logistic regression with rare events: trace of the variance estimator of the two-step estimators versus the trace of the empirical covariance, with subsampling methods A, L and Uniform along with the gold standard estimator based on the full data, denoted by MLE.

S4 Linked Birth and Infant Death Data - Additional Results

The covariates in the model are summarized in Tables S1–S3. Tables S4–S6 present the estimated coefficients for each method, with $c = 10$. While the results are organized into three tables for clarity, it is essential to note that the FDR procedure was executed once, encompassing all coefficients collectively.

	Non-events	Events
	(N=28410519)	(N=176400)
Mother's age (limited 12-50)		
Mean (SD)	27.71 (6.09)	26.9 (6.5)
Median [Min, Max]	28 [12, 15]	26 [12, 50]
Live Birth Order		
Mean (SD)	2.08 (1.24)	2.19 (1.4)
Median [Min, Max]	2 [1, 8]	2 [1, 8]
Number of Prenatal Visits		
Mean (SD)	11.26 (3.94)	8.21 (5.11)
Median [Min, Max]	12 [0, 49]	8 [0,49]
Weight Gain (limited to 99 pounds)		
Mean (SD)	30.51 (14.32)	22.95 (15.04)
Median [Min, Max]	30 [0, 98]	22 [0, 98]
Five Minute APGAR Score		
Mean (SD)	8.84 [0.71]	5.19 (3.44)
Median [Min, Max]	9 [0,10]	6 [0, 10]
Plurality (limited to 5)		
Mean (SD)	1.04 (0.19)	1.65 (0.42)
Median [Min, Max]	1 [1, 5]	1 [1, 5]
Gestation weeks		
Mean (SD)	38.65 (2.37)	30.21 (7.68)
Median [Min, Max]	39 [17, 47]	30 [17,47]
Years after 2007		
Mean (SD)	2.93 (2.01)	2.85 (2.01)
Median [Min, Max]	3 [0, 6]	3 [0, 6]
Birth month		
January	8.19%	8.36%
February	7.63%	7.72%
March	8.31%	8.35%
April	7.98%	8.19%
May	8.33%	8.56%
June	8.32%	8.32%
July	8.80%	8.66%
August	8.93%	8.79%
September	8.66%	8.42%
October	8.50%	8.52%
November	8.02%	7.97%
December	8.33%	8.14%
Birth weekday		
Sunday	9.31%	11.36%
Monday	15.18%	14.73%
Tuesday	16.59%	15.51%
Wednesday	16.27%	15.38%
Thursday	16.21%	15.57%
Friday	15.84%	15.25%
Saturday	10.60%	12.20%
Birth place		
In hospital	98.80%	98.53%
Not in hospital	1.20%	1.47%
Residence status		
Resident	72.97%	65.82%
Interstate nonresident (type 1)	24.73%	30.26%
Interstate nonresident (type 2)	2.11%	3.83%
Foreign resident	0.19%	0.09%

Table S1: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: variables summary.

	Non-events	Events
	(N=28410519)	(N=176400)
Mother's race		
White	76.72%	64.51%
Black	15.81%	29.58%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1.16%	1.55%
Asian / Pacific Islander	6.31%	4.36%
Mother's marital status		
Married	59.52%	45.56%
Not Married	40.48%	54.44%
Father's race		
White	63.37%	47.25%
Black	11.58%	17.65%
American Indian / Alaskan Native	0.87%	1.01%
Asian / Pacific Islander	5.25%	3.24%
Unknown	18.93%	30.85%
Diabetes		
Yes	5.14%	4.65%
No	94.86%	95.35%
Chronic Hypertension		
Yes	1.32%	2.65%
No	98.68%	97.35%
Prepregnancy Associated Hypertension		
Yes	4.27%	4.82%
No	95.73%	95.18%
Eclampsia		
Yes	0.25%	0.58%
No	99.75%	99.42%
Induction of Labor		
Yes	23.01%	13.01%
No	76.99%	86.99%
Tocolysis		
Yes	1.19%	4.30%
No	98.81%	95.70%
Meconium		
Yes	4.74%	3.71%
No	95.26%	96.29%
Precipitous Labor		
Yes	2.46%	4.46%
No	97.54%	95.54%
Breech		
Yes	5.36%	20.60%
No	94.64%	79.40%
Forceps delivery		
Yes	0.66%	0.38%
No	99.34%	99.62%
Vacuum delivery		
Yes	3.02%	1.08%
No	96.98%	98.92%
Delivery method		
Vaginal	67.54%	60.98%
C-Section	32.46%	39.02%

Table S2: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: variables summary - continued.

	Non-events	Events
	(N=28410519)	(N=176400)
Attendant		
Doctor of Medicine (MD)	85.40%	90.00%
Doctor of Osteopathy (DO)	5.56%	4.96%
Certified Nurse Midwife (CNM)	7.75%	3.12%
Other Midwife	0.64%	0.27%
Other	0.65%	1.65%
Sex		
Female	48.86%	44.17%
Male	51.14%	55.83%
Birth Weight		
227- 1499 grams	1.15%	53.28%
1500 – 2499 grams	6.62%	14.70%
2500 - 8165 grams	92.23%	32.02%
Anencephalus		
Yes	0.01%	1.01%
No	99.99%	98.99%
Spina Bifida		
Yes	0.01%	0.25%
No	99.99%	99.75%
Omphalocele		
Yes	0.03%	0.68%
No	99.97%	99.32%
Cleft Lip		
Yes	0.07%	1.08%
No	99.93%	98.92%
Downs Syndrome		
Yes	0.05%	0.55%
No	99.95%	99.45%

Table S3: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: variables summary - continued.

	Estimate				Standard Deviation				Adjusted P-value			
	MLE	A	L	uniform	MLE	A	L	uniform	MLE	A	L	uniform
Intercept	18.5035	18.4739	18.4791	19.0026	0.2762	0.2782	0.2892	0.6643	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Mother Age	-0.0938	-0.0947	-0.0919	-0.0944	0.0036	0.0038	0.0038	0.0069	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Live birth order	0.1109	0.1120	0.1111	0.1080	0.0023	0.0024	0.0024	0.0046	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Number of prenatal visits	-0.0134	-0.0132	-0.0134	-0.0151	0.0007	0.0007	0.0007	0.0013	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Weight gain	-0.0029	-0.0029	-0.0030	-0.0030	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0006	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Five minute APGAR score	-0.5183	-0.5182	-0.5180	-0.5140	0.0019	0.0019	0.0019	0.0044	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Plurality	-0.0872	-0.0846	-0.0811	-0.0553	0.0122	0.0128	0.0127	0.0250	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0691
Gestation weeks	-0.1307	-0.1308	-0.1300	-0.1282	0.0012	0.0013	0.0013	0.0025	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Year	0.0126	0.0260	0.0215	-0.0901	0.0657	0.0662	0.0690	0.1523	0.8913	0.7523	0.8268	0.7115
Squared mother age	0.0012	0.0012	0.0012	0.0013	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Birth place = not in hospital	0.6151	0.6252	0.6098	0.6420	0.0317	0.0325	0.0331	0.0643	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Diabetes = no	-0.0148	0.0001	-0.0172	-0.0110	0.0285	0.0293	0.0294	0.0511	0.6896	0.9975	0.6611	0.9378
Chronic hypertension = no	0.1177	0.1152	0.0952	0.0178	0.0402	0.0409	0.0415	0.0768	0.0072	0.0101	0.0418	0.9339
Prepregnacy hypertension = no	0.3343	0.3450	0.3208	0.3400	0.0271	0.0280	0.0282	0.0474	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Eclampsia = no	0.4996	0.4983	0.5299	0.2907	0.0770	0.0774	0.0796	0.1371	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0823
Induction of labor = no	0.0054	0.0029	0.0020	-0.0083	0.0176	0.0184	0.0183	0.0246	0.8081	0.9082	0.9134	0.8705
Tocolysis = no	0.0992	0.1073	0.1005	-0.0120	0.0313	0.0321	0.0327	0.0640	0.0034	0.0019	0.0047	0.9418
Meconium = no	-0.1216	-0.1277	-0.1117	-0.0889	0.0262	0.0272	0.0275	0.0475	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.1242
Precipitous labor = no	0.0361	0.0351	0.0248	-0.0213	0.0286	0.0294	0.0298	0.0622	0.2721	0.3129	0.5080	0.8705
Breech = no	-0.1003	-0.0980	-0.1055	-0.1011	0.0147	0.0155	0.0153	0.0330	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0066
Forceps delivery = no	0.1253	0.1161	0.1195	0.1464	0.0898	0.0902	0.0937	0.1282	0.2293	0.2778	0.2840	0.4185
Vacuum delivery = no	0.2982	0.3145	0.3024	0.2598	0.0508	0.0514	0.0529	0.0568	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Delivery method = C-Section	-0.0401	-0.0432	-0.0377	-0.0368	0.0098	0.0103	0.0102	0.0186	0.0001	0.0001	0.0005	0.1008
Sex = male	-0.7590	-0.7601	-0.7388	-0.9213	0.2665	0.2686	0.2796	0.6448	0.0090	0.0099	0.0168	0.2792
Anencephaly = no	-4.1255	-4.1271	-4.1709	-4.0831	0.1118	0.1120	0.1172	0.3471	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Spina Bifida = no	-2.1350	-2.1323	-2.1315	-2.0956	0.1488	0.1487	0.1559	0.3737	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Omphalocele = no	-1.7259	-1.7286	-1.7383	-1.8822	0.0829	0.0831	0.0876	0.2115	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cleft lip = no	-2.8745	-2.8681	-2.8451	-2.9524	0.0656	0.0660	0.0685	0.1456	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Downs syndrome = no	-2.3438	-2.3402	-2.3462	-2.4419	0.0863	0.0868	0.0886	0.1639	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Birth month vs. January												
Birth month = February	0.0103	0.0119	0.0123	0.0592	0.0145	0.0153	0.0152	0.0268	0.5611	0.5133	0.5178	0.0691
Birth month = March	-0.0305	-0.0312	-0.0278	0.0051	0.0143	0.0151	0.0149	0.0265	0.0571	0.0703	0.1064	0.9418
Birth month = April	-0.0294	-0.0275	-0.0268	-0.0121	0.0144	0.0152	0.0150	0.0269	0.0711	0.1193	0.1184	0.8082
Birth month = May	-0.0434	-0.0441	-0.0402	-0.0014	0.0143	0.0150	0.0149	0.0272	0.0051	0.0073	0.0145	0.9683
Birth month = June	-0.0344	-0.0296	-0.0294	0.0006	0.0143	0.0151	0.0149	0.0268	0.0299	0.0883	0.0870	0.9829
Birth month = July	-0.0301	-0.0259	-0.0271	0.0163	0.0141	0.0149	0.0147	0.0265	0.0571	0.1339	0.1064	0.7080
Birth month = August	-0.0213	-0.0185	-0.0241	0.0174	0.0141	0.0148	0.0147	0.0264	0.2002	0.2945	0.1514	0.6974
Birth month = September	-0.0180	-0.0165	-0.0150	0.0418	0.0142	0.0150	0.0148	0.0263	0.2721	0.3511	0.4116	0.2134
Birth month = October	-0.0287	-0.0275	-0.0273	0.0314	0.0142	0.0150	0.0148	0.0262	0.0731	0.1136	0.1064	0.3872
Birth month = November	-0.0311	-0.0414	-0.0302	0.0029	0.0144	0.0152	0.0150	0.0271	0.0561	0.0129	0.0808	0.9524
Birth month = December	-0.0409	-0.0377	-0.0422	-0.0248	0.0143	0.0151	0.0149	0.0274	0.0090	0.0240	0.0100	0.5444
Birth weekday vs. Sunday												
Birth weekday = Monday	0.0907	0.0910	0.0978	0.1239	0.0118	0.0125	0.0123	0.0228	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Birth weekday = Tuesday	0.0981	0.1037	0.1045	0.1035	0.0116	0.0123	0.0122	0.0227	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Birth weekday = Wednesday	0.0941	0.0971	0.0999	0.0781	0.0117	0.0123	0.0122	0.0226	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0018
Birth weekday = Thursday	0.0902	0.0903	0.0974	0.1145	0.0117	0.0123	0.0122	0.0224	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Birth weekday = Friday	0.0755	0.0726	0.0783	0.0711	0.0117	0.0124	0.0122	0.0229	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0060
Birth weekday = Saturday	0.0208	0.0199	0.0205	0.0302	0.0124	0.0131	0.0130	0.0245	0.1504	0.2010	0.1687	0.3731
Residence status vs. 1												
Residence status = 2	0.1156	0.1123	0.1118	0.1159	0.0066	0.0069	0.0068	0.0124	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Residence status = 3	0.2355	0.2306	0.2443	0.2717	0.0162	0.0169	0.0168	0.0338	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Residence status = 4	-0.4333	-0.4285	-0.4366	-0.1390	0.0873	0.0876	0.0897	0.0931	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.2513
Mother's race vs. white												
Mother's race = black	-0.0156	-0.0196	-0.0136	-0.0678	0.0165	0.0174	0.0174	0.0338	0.4331	0.3441	0.5295	0.0980
Mother's race = american indian	0.2387	0.2444	0.2206	0.0930	0.0460	0.0467	0.0482	0.0990	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5240
Mother's race = asian	0.0121	0.0207	0.0099	0.0364	0.0362	0.0368	0.0375	0.0575	0.7989	0.6485	0.8578	0.7075
Paternity acknowledged = no	0.0991	0.1022	0.0988	0.0945	0.0074	0.0078	0.0076	0.0136	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Father's race vs. white												
Father's race = black	0.1357	0.1409	0.1389	0.2239	0.0199	0.0209	0.0209	0.0387	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Father's race = american indian	0.2200	0.2230	0.2323	0.2298	0.0562	0.0569	0.0591	0.1122	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0895
Father's race = asian	-0.0198	-0.0329	-0.0227	-0.0100	0.0413	0.0421	0.0426	0.0661	0.7066	0.5132	0.6948	0.9481
Father's race = unknown	0.1746	0.1724	0.1732	0.2093	0.0141	0.0148	0.0147	0.0265	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Attendant vs. MD												
Attendant = DO	-0.0444	-0.0513	-0.0462	-0.0537	0.0134	0.0140	0.0139	0.0239	0.0020	0.0006	0.0021	0.0656
Attendant = CNM	-0.2782	-0.2861	-0.2786	-0.3119	0.0157	0.0165	0.0164	0.0241	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Attendant = other midwife	-0.2361	-0.2453	-0.2209	-0.3163	0.0542	0.0549	0.0563	0.0901	0.0000	0.0000	0.0002	0.0015
Attendant = other	0.1822	0.1765	0.1797	0.2198	0.0311	0.0318	0.0325	0.0617	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0013
Birth weight recode vs. 1												
Birth weight recode = 2	-0.7391	-0.7430	-0.7353	-0.7328	0.0116	0.0122	0.0121	0.0220	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Birth weight recode = 3	-1.6916	-1.6899	-1.6930	-1.6808	0.0141	0.0149	0.0147	0.0265	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table S4: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: results of logistic regression with $c = 10$ for non-interaction terms. P-values are adjusted by FDR.

	Estimate				Standard Deviation				Adjusted P-value			
	MLE	A	L	uniform	MLE	A	L	uniform	MLE	A	L	uniform
Weight gain	-0.0012	-0.0012	-0.0010	-0.0013	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0008	0.0127	0.0155	0.0418	0.1586
Apgar	0.0315	0.0312	0.0302	0.0307	0.0025	0.0026	0.0026	0.0059	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Plurality	0.0180	0.0165	0.0075	-0.0103	0.0163	0.0172	0.0169	0.0340	0.3447	0.4207	0.7435	0.8911
Gestation week	-0.0016	-0.0014	-0.0022	-0.0055	0.0012	0.0013	0.0013	0.0025	0.2518	0.3507	0.1257	0.0701
Diabetes = no	0.0388	0.0253	0.0418	0.0964	0.0266	0.0277	0.0275	0.0470	0.2147	0.4457	0.1877	0.0895
Chronic hypertension = no	-0.0586	-0.0510	-0.0428	0.0197	0.0376	0.0386	0.0388	0.0761	0.1846	0.2645	0.3600	0.9196
Prepregnacy hypertension = no	-0.0692	-0.0634	-0.0620	-0.0421	0.0260	0.0272	0.0271	0.0478	0.0152	0.0373	0.0418	0.5539
Eclampsia = no	-0.0270	-0.0385	-0.0374	-0.0806	0.0740	0.0745	0.0771	0.1286	0.7827	0.6763	0.7254	0.7075
Induction of labor = no	0.0409	0.0411	0.0469	0.0427	0.0173	0.0182	0.0180	0.0246	0.0328	0.0440	0.0183	0.1586
Tocolysis = no	-0.0056	-0.0120	-0.0076	0.0724	0.0312	0.0323	0.0326	0.0676	0.8921	0.7620	0.8655	0.4548
Forceps delivery = no	0.0692	0.0866	0.1151	0.0757	0.0875	0.0879	0.0917	0.1252	0.5132	0.4116	0.2903	0.7088
Vacuum delivery = no	-0.0215	-0.0308	-0.0060	-0.0080	0.0495	0.0502	0.0518	0.0557	0.7347	0.6169	0.9134	0.9481
Delivery method = C-Section	-0.0217	-0.0212	-0.0242	-0.0183	0.0126	0.0133	0.0131	0.0241	0.1380	0.1824	0.1064	0.6312
Anencephaly = no	0.1447	0.1466	0.1047	0.7030	0.1095	0.1096	0.1141	0.3429	0.2518	0.2616	0.4612	0.0895
Spina Bifida = no	0.2920	0.2926	0.2826	-0.1952	0.1514	0.1517	0.1594	0.3568	0.0889	0.0946	0.1202	0.7321
Omphalocele = no	-0.0071	-0.0054	-0.0096	-0.1927	0.0799	0.0804	0.0846	0.2031	0.9473	0.9647	0.9134	0.5240
Cleft lip = no	0.3197	0.3159	0.2768	0.4703	0.0644	0.0649	0.0672	0.1370	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001	0.0019
Downs syndrome = no	0.0677	0.0748	0.1029	0.1770	0.0852	0.0857	0.0880	0.1879	0.5132	0.4630	0.3274	0.5240

Table S5: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: results of logistic regression with $c = 10$ for interaction terms with sex (male). P-values are adjusted by FDR.

	Coefficient				Coefficient sd				P-value			
	MLE	A	L	uniform	MLE	A	L	uniform	MLE	A	L	uniform
Father's race = black	-0.0079	-0.0084	-0.0078	-0.0265	0.0057	0.0060	0.0059	0.0112	0.2293	0.2400	0.2751	0.0498
Father's race = american indian	-0.0267	-0.0250	-0.0322	-0.0249	0.0161	0.0163	0.0168	0.0305	0.1522	0.1969	0.0986	0.5991
Father's race = asian	-0.0128	-0.0105	-0.0114	-0.0257	0.0116	0.0119	0.0120	0.0187	0.3447	0.4625	0.4449	0.2938
Father's race = unknown	-0.0029	-0.0028	-0.0019	-0.0129	0.0039	0.0041	0.0041	0.0073	0.5362	0.5733	0.7345	0.1541
Mother's race = black	-0.0174	-0.0169	-0.0169	-0.0012	0.0047	0.0050	0.0050	0.0098	0.0006	0.0016	0.0016	0.9489
Mother's race = american indian	-0.0188	-0.0196	-0.0103	0.0091	0.0132	0.0134	0.0138	0.0270	0.2228	0.2193	0.5481	0.8705
Mother's race = asian	-0.0049	-0.0032	-0.0034	-0.0028	0.0102	0.0104	0.0105	0.0163	0.7066	0.8068	0.8237	0.9448
Diabetes = no	-0.0058	-0.0082	-0.0045	-0.0162	0.0066	0.0068	0.0068	0.0118	0.4589	0.3129	0.6081	0.2938
Chronic hypertension = no	-0.0028	-0.0047	0.0019	0.0066	0.0094	0.0096	0.0096	0.0185	0.8081	0.6930	0.8772	0.8705
Prepregnacy hypertension = no	0.0162	0.0116	0.0198	0.0127	0.0064	0.0066	0.0066	0.0115	0.0208	0.1339	0.0062	0.4381
Eclampsia = no	-0.0232	-0.0204	-0.0319	0.0234	0.0186	0.0187	0.0192	0.0330	0.2758	0.3535	0.1484	0.6627
Induction of labor = no	-0.0157	-0.0150	-0.0147	-0.0125	0.0042	0.0044	0.0043	0.0060	0.0004	0.0015	0.0016	0.0861
Tocolysis = no	0.0277	0.0239	0.0259	0.0440	0.0077	0.0079	0.0080	0.0160	0.0007	0.0056	0.0028	0.0182
Meconium = no	-0.0008	-0.0004	-0.0033	-0.0074	0.0072	0.0075	0.0076	0.0129	0.9445	0.9658	0.7450	0.7177
Precipitous labor = no	-0.0106	-0.0109	-0.0071	-0.0009	0.0077	0.0080	0.0081	0.0165	0.2367	0.2543	0.4840	0.9683
Breech = no	-0.0002	-0.0011	0.0010	-0.0012	0.0040	0.0043	0.0042	0.0092	0.9685	0.8443	0.8655	0.9481
Forceps delivery = no	-0.0199	-0.0184	-0.0264	-0.0241	0.0215	0.0216	0.0225	0.0304	0.4390	0.4727	0.3274	0.6090
Vacuum delivery = no	-0.0176	-0.0187	-0.0234	-0.0137	0.0120	0.0121	0.0125	0.0135	0.2109	0.1968	0.1064	0.4905
Anencephaly = no	-0.1061	-0.1052	-0.0938	-0.2437	0.0271	0.0272	0.0284	0.0899	0.0002	0.0003	0.0022	0.0194
Spina Bifida = no	0.0532	0.0520	0.0503	0.1032	0.0373	0.0374	0.0393	0.0749	0.2228	0.2449	0.2840	0.2938
Omphalocele = no	-0.0008	-0.0014	0.0043	0.1153	0.0200	0.0200	0.0212	0.0496	0.9685	0.9647	0.8772	0.0549
Cleft lip = no	0.0085	0.0071	0.0022	-0.0026	0.0159	0.0160	0.0166	0.0349	0.6826	0.7202	0.9134	0.9675
Downs syndrome = no	0.0559	0.0533	0.0492	0.0827	0.0211	0.0212	0.0218	0.0428	0.0152	0.0235	0.0443	0.1105

Table S6: Linked birth and infant death cohort data: results of logistic regression with $c = 10$ for interaction terms with birth year. P-values are adjusted by FDR.