

Borrowing Information from an Unidentifiable Model: Guaranteed Efficiency Gain with a Dichotomized Outcome in the External Data

Lu Wang ^{*a}, Yanyuan Ma ^{†b}, and Jiwei Zhao ^{‡c,d}

^aDepartment of Mathematics, Western New England University

^bDepartment of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University

^cDepartment of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison

^dDepartment of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, University of
Wisconsin-Madison

January 14, 2025

*e-mail: lu.wang@wne.edu

†e-mail: yzm63@psu.edu

‡e-mail: jiwei.zhao@wisc.edu

Borrowing Information from an Unidentifiable Model: Guaranteed Efficiency Gain with a Dichotomized Outcome in the External Data

Abstract

In the era of big data, the increasing availability of diverse data sources has driven interest in analytical approaches that integrate information across sources to enhance statistical accuracy, efficiency, and scientific insights. Many existing methods assume exchangeability among data sources and often implicitly require that sources measure identical covariates or outcomes, or that the error distribution is correctly specified—assumptions that may not hold in complex real-world scenarios. This paper explores the integration of data from sources with distinct outcome scales, focusing on leveraging external data to improve statistical efficiency. Specifically, we consider a scenario where the primary dataset includes a continuous outcome, and external data provides a dichotomized version of the same outcome. We propose two novel estimators: the first estimator remains asymptotically consistent even when the error distribution is potentially misspecified, while the second estimator guarantees an efficiency gain over weighted least squares estimation that uses the primary study data alone. Theoretical properties of these estimators are rigorously derived, and extensive simulation studies are conducted to highlight their robustness and efficiency gains across various scenarios. Finally, a real-world application using the NHANES dataset demonstrates the practical utility of the proposed methods.

Key Words: Data integration, data fusion, unidentifiable model, model misspecification, efficient score, efficiency gain.

1 Introduction

With the advent of innovative data collection methods, the growing availability of data has sparked increasing interest in analytical approaches that integrate data from multiple sources. When applied effectively, integrating data and information from diverse but relevant sources can enhance statistical accuracy, improve efficiency, support more informed decision-making, and yield deeper scientific insights. In the literature, such methods and approaches are classified as data integration (Lenzerini 2002) or data fusion (Klein 2004). Similarly, meta-analysis (Glass 1976), a key component of systematic reviews, also shares a comparable spirit of combining evidence from multiple studies.

These methods have achieved significant success across a variety of fields. The concept of data fusion traces back to the evolved ability of humans and animals to incorporate information from multiple senses to enhance survival. For instance, combining sight, touch, smell, and taste helps determine whether a substance is edible (Hall & Llinas 1997). In genomics, integrating expression data, gene sequencing data, and network data provides a heterogeneous description of genes and a distinctive view of cellular mechanisms (Lanckriet et al. 2004). In causal inference, researchers have proposed combining data from randomized controlled trials with observational data to evaluate the effects of treatments or interventions on target populations different from the study population (Stuart et al. 2015, Bareinboim & Pearl 2016, Dahabreh et al. 2020, Colnet et al. 2024). In machine learning, similar principles have been applied in the contexts of semi-supervised learning, transfer learning, and distribution shifts (Quinero-Candela et al. 2008).

When combining data from different sources, assumptions are being made about how the distributions of their corresponding populations differ. Many existing approaches require that these populations share a common joint distribution or a portion of it, such as the conditional distribution of the outcome Y given the covariate \mathbf{X} (known as covariate shift) or the conditional distribution of the covariate given the outcome (known as label shift). This concept, known as “exchangeability” across different data sources, enables the transfer or generalization of conclusions across populations, thereby facilitating data integration (Degtiar & Rose 2023).

In these assumptions regarding “exchangeability”, some more nuanced conditions are implicitly assumed. For example, it might be assumed that different sources measure the exactly same set of covariate \mathbf{X} , or, exactly the same outcome Y . In reality, these implicit conditions might be violated thus the assumption regarding the common distribution cannot be justified. Li et al. (2023) studied some data fusion techniques when different sources of data are not perfectly aligned, and investigated the potential efficiency gain by making use of slightly misaligned data sources.

In this paper, we examine a situation where the outcome variables in two data sources are on different scales. Our motivating example involves a study where the primary outcome variable is body mass index (BMI), defined as body mass divided by the square of height (in kg/m^2). BMI is a simple yet widely used numerical measure of a person’s weight status, enabling health professionals to discuss weight-related issues objectively. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), adult BMI classifications are as follows: underweight ($<18.5 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$), normal weight (18.5-24.9), overweight (25-29.9), and obese (≥ 30). BMI provides a clear and practical metric for studying health outcomes. For instance, being

overweight or obese (with BMI ≥ 25) is strongly associated with a variety of health problems, including but not limited to, cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, mental health issues and reduced quality of life. In our study, we incorporate an external dataset that examines the same association between overweight status and a set of covariate variables \mathbf{X} ; however, this dataset only provides an indicator of overweight (whether BMI ≥ 25 or not), the variable Z , rather than the actual BMI value in the primary dataset, the variable Y .

The primary question of interest is how to effectively combine these two specialized data sources to better understand the statistical advantages of incorporating external data. Our initial analysis, as detailed in Section 2.2, reveals that the parameter of interest, β , is not identifiable when relying solely on the external data. Consequently, the approach of separately estimating β from each data source and then combining the results is not viable. This raises a key question: can the external data contribute to improving the estimation of β , and, if so, how?

To address this challenge, we begin by identifying all possible estimating equations derived from the combined data. Specifically, as detailed in Section 3.1, we identify the orthogonal complement of the nuisance tangent space, Λ^\perp , whose elements yield regular and asymptotically linear (RAL) estimators for β . Furthermore, we derive the efficient score function within Λ^\perp , corresponding to the semiparametric efficiency bound for estimating β . To construct an estimator based on this efficient score function, we recognize that knowledge of the error distribution in the target data, $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, is critical. However, estimating this component accurately is nontrivial. As a solution, we propose an estimator $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ that uses a potentially misspecified error distribution, $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, instead. Remarkably, the resulting locally efficient score function retains the mean-zero property, making it a valid estimating equation. The corresponding estimator and its theoretical properties are presented in Section 3.2. A minor limitation of the estimator introduced in Section 3.2 is that, in theory, it may not always be more efficient than a comparable estimator based solely on the target data, literally the weighted least square (WLS) estimator $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$. To explicitly quantify the efficiency gain from incorporating external data, we propose a second estimator $\hat{\beta}^*$ in Section 3.3, which guarantees improved efficiency compared to the target-data-only WLS estimator $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$. Finally, in Sections 4 and 5, we evaluate the numerical performance of the proposed estimators through simulated datasets and a real-world data application.

In summary, this work offers several novel contributions to the broad field of data integration and data fusion. First, in our context, the parameter of interest β is unidentifiable using external data alone; thus, a model that integrates both target and external data is necessary. Second, the two proposed estimators are straightforward to implement. Notably, they require only a potentially misspecified error distribution, $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, rather than a correctly specified and estimated one. This simplicity enhances their practical applicability. The estimators also extend the same principle of the weighted least square estimator using target data alone, $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$. Finally, the second proposed estimator, $\hat{\beta}^*$, guarantees an efficiency gain over $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$. This highlights the ability to effectively borrow information from an otherwise unidentifiable model.

2 Problem Set-up

2.1 Parameter of interest and the target data

In applications, investigators are usually interested in some association between an outcome Y and a set of covariates \mathbf{X} . Here we consider Y on a continuous scale which can be some characteristic of certain disease such as clinical biomarkers and so on. We assume that we observe a random sample with independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) data $(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i), i = 1, \dots, n$, from a target population \mathcal{T} .

To study the association between Y and \mathbf{X} , one may simply adopt the linear regression model

$$Y = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X} + \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where $E(\epsilon | \mathbf{X}) = 0$. We let the first element of \mathbf{X} to be one, so the first element of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the intercept. We assume the conditional distribution of ϵ given \mathbf{x} follows $\epsilon \sim f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, where $f(\cdot)$ is an unknown generic conditional probability density function satisfying $\int t f(t, \mathbf{x}) dt = 0$. We assume that the marginal distribution of \mathbf{X} follows $f_t(\cdot)$. We also denote $v(\mathbf{x}) \equiv E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})$ and assume that $0 < v(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$.

Based on model (1), the simplest approach for obtaining an estimator for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the ordinary least square (OLS) estimation, that corresponds to solving the empirical version of the estimating equation $E\{(Y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}\} = \mathbf{0}$. The OLS estimation does not need a model specification for the heteroscedastic error distribution $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ or its conditional variance $v(\mathbf{x})$.

One can cast model (1) as a semiparametric model regarding both $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ and $f_t(\mathbf{x})$ as nonparametric nuisance; see Section 4.5 of Tsiatis (2006). Accordingly, the efficient score for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is $\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}} = v(\mathbf{x})^{-1}(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}$. Thus, one can obtain the corresponding estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}$ by solving

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-1}(y_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0},$$

if $v(\mathbf{x})$, or in general $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, were known or could be well estimated. In practice, estimating $v(\mathbf{x})$ or $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ might not be straightforward. Nevertheless, with a working model $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ and thus $v^*(\mathbf{x})$, one can still obtain the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$ by solving

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v^*(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-1}(y_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}. \quad (2)$$

Note that this estimator corresponds to the locally efficient score

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}}^* = v^*(\mathbf{x})^{-1}(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}, \quad (3)$$

and we usually refer it as the weighted least square (WLS) estimator.

The WLS estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$ indicates that, one is still able to obtain an asymptotically consistent estimator even if the error distribution is misspecified. In this paper, we are interested in estimating the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ bearing in mind that the error distribution $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ generally cannot be correctly specified. We focus on the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$ but also care about the property of the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}$ when $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ is correctly specified.

Lemma 1. Consider model (1) but with a possibly misspecified heteroscedastic error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$. Assume $\mathbf{A}_0 = E(\partial \mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}}^* / \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top)$ is invertible with \mathbf{S}_{ls}^* defined in (3). Then, the target data only estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$ that solves (2) satisfies

$$n^{1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \rightarrow N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}_0^{-1} \mathbf{B}_0 \mathbf{A}_0^{-1\top}),$$

where $\mathbf{B}_0 = E(\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}}^{*\otimes 2})$.

This is the standard result about WLS estimator hence we omit the proof.

2.2 External data with a dichotomized outcome

In practice, similar data sets for the same disease exist. In this paper, other than the target population \mathcal{T} introduced in Section 2.1, we also consider a data set with i.i.d. random samples from an external population \mathcal{E} . However, it is more common that in such a data set, the outcome variable is not Y introduced above but a dichotomous version of Y , the disease status. In particular, we consider that the external population contains a random sample $(z_i, \mathbf{x}_i), i = 1, \dots, m$, where $z_i = 1$ if $Y_i \leq c$ and $z_i = 0$ if $y_i > c$. Thus,

$$\text{pr}(Z = 1 \mid \mathbf{X}) = \text{pr}(Y \leq c \mid \mathbf{X}) = \text{pr}(\epsilon \leq c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{X}) = F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}), \quad (4)$$

where $F(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of $f(\cdot)$ and the cutoff value c is known. We assume in the external population the marginal distribution of \mathbf{X} follows $f_e(\cdot)$, which is allowed to be different from $f_t(\cdot)$.

Model (4) is semiparametric with both $F(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ unknown. It is interesting to note that, this model is not identifiable. We state this result below in Proposition 1 with its proof given in Supplement S.1.

Proposition 1. *Based on external data alone, the parameter of interest $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in (4) is not identifiable.*

Proposition 1 is critical. It indicates that no estimator for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ exists by using the external data alone. Thus, it is infeasible to estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ separately from the two data sources and then conducting meta analysis. Nevertheless, the research goal of this paper is still to investigate the potential benefits for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, more specifically the guaranteed efficiency gain, by incorporating this specific external data set.

2.3 Research goal of this paper

For a smoother technical presentation, we pool the data from two difference sources \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{E} together, and create a binary indicator R in that $R = 1$ if the corresponding subject is from the target population \mathcal{T} and $R = 0$ if from \mathcal{E} . Table 1 illustrates the data structure after the combination. In this combined population $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{E}$, we define $\text{pr}(R = 1) = \pi = n/N$ with $N = n + m$. We also define $p(\mathbf{x}) \equiv E(R \mid \mathbf{X}) = f_t(\mathbf{x})\pi / \{f_t(\mathbf{x})\pi + f_e(\mathbf{x})(1 - \pi)\}$.

Recall that with the target data only, as explained in Section 2.1, one can estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ via the locally efficient score \mathbf{S}_{ls}^* , with the OLS as a special case (misspecifying the conditional

Table 1: Data structure after combining two different data sources.

		R	Y	Z	\mathbf{X}
Target Data \mathcal{T}	1	1	✓		✓
	2	1	✓		✓
	\vdots	1	✓		✓
	n	1	✓		✓
External Data \mathcal{E}	$n + 1$	0		✓	✓
	\vdots	0		✓	✓
	$n + m \equiv N$	0		✓	✓

variance as a constant). For later use, we rewrite the efficient score \mathbf{S}_{ls} and the locally efficient score \mathbf{S}_{ls}^* as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}} = rv(\mathbf{x})^{-1}(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}, \text{ and} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}}^* = rv^*(\mathbf{x})^{-1}(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}, \quad (6)$$

respectively. Note that the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$ studied in Lemma 1 serves as the benchmark throughout this paper.

Thus, the research goal of this paper is to investigate the wise use of the external data. Compared to the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$ that relies on a misspecified error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, what can external data bring us and what is the benefit? More specifically, can external data enhance the estimation efficiency, compared to $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$?

The answer is yes. The information for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ can be seen from the likelihood function. Note that, while the conditional density of Y given \mathbf{X} in the target population is $f(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$, the conditional density of Z given \mathbf{X} in the external population is $\{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}^z \{1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}^{1-z}$. More rigorously, if we spell out the likelihood function of one generic subject from the population $(R, RY, (1 - R)Z, \mathbf{X})$, which is

$$f(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})^r [\{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}^z \{1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}^{1-z}]^{1-r} f_t(\mathbf{x})^r f_e(\mathbf{x})^{1-r} \pi^r (1 - \pi)^{1-r}, \quad (7)$$

it is clear that the external data indeed bring additional information about $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

3 Proposed Estimators

The key of our proposal stems from the careful investigation of model (7) that integrates both sources of data together. Even though the parameter of interest $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is not identifiable from the external data only model (4), it is from model (7).

In Section 3.1 we present the motivation for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ with the integrated data, where we first characterize all of the possible mean zero estimating equations then derive the efficient score function \mathbf{S}_{eff} (Bickel et al. 1993, Tsiatis 2006) for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in model (7). In Section 3.2 and 3.3 respectively, we proposed two different estimators for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. The first proposal more closely relies on the locally efficient score function $\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*$, the same format as \mathbf{S}_{eff} but with the same misspecified error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ as in the estimator $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{ls}}^*$.

Realizing that the first proposal does not always lead to efficiency gain over the benchmark $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$, we propose the second estimator in Section 3.3 that guarantees the efficiency gain thus guarantees the statistical benefits by incorporating the external data \mathcal{E} .

3.1 Motivation for estimating β with the integrated data

With the target data only, the set that contains all the influence functions, each corresponds to a regular and asymptotically linear (RAL) estimator for β (Tsiatis 2006), is contained in the space

$$\{r(y - \beta^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x})\},$$

with \mathbf{S}_{ls} in (5) and \mathbf{S}_{ls}^* in (6) as special elements. On the other hand, with the external data only, in model (4), if $F(\cdot)$ were known, the score function for estimating β is

$$(1 - r)\{z - F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}_1(\mathbf{x}), \quad (8)$$

with $\mathbf{b}_1(\mathbf{x}) = F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})^{-1}\{1 - F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}^{-1}f(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}$. Generally, for an arbitrary $\mathbf{b}_1(\mathbf{x})$, the score function (8) still maintains mean zero. Though the score function (8) by itself does not work in our setting, its format provides us some indication of how the external data can contribute to the influence function in the integrated data model (7). Specifically, we expect that, with the integrated data, the influence function for estimating β , when $r = 1$, would look like

$$(y - \beta^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) + \{z - F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{x}),$$

where the first component is the contribution of the target data itself while the second component is the contribution of the external data provided that both $F(\cdot)$ and β were identifiable. When $r = 0$, it would look like

$$\{z - F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x}).$$

By combining these two pieces together, it is reasonable to reach the following set

$$[r(y - \beta^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) + \{r - p(\mathbf{x})\}\{z - F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})].$$

Below, we will rigorously show that, this is indeed the orthogonal complement of the nuisance tangent space Λ^\perp for estimating β in the integrated data model (7). That means, this set characterizes all the possible influence functions, each corresponds to a RAL estimator for β .

Proposition 2. *The nuisance tangent space orthogonal complement Λ^\perp for estimating β in the integrated data model (7) is*

$$\Lambda^\perp = \{r(y - \beta^T \mathbf{x})\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) + \{r - p(\mathbf{x})\}\{z - F(c - \beta^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) : \forall \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}), \forall \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

The proof of this result can be found in Supplement S.2. The structure of Λ^\perp is important to us, since any element in it can lead to a RAL estimator for the parameter of interest β . However, it does not provide us guidance on how to choose the functions $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})$. In the following, we further derive one special element in Λ^\perp , the efficient score function \mathbf{S}_{eff} , which is the projection of the score vector \mathbf{S}_β onto the space Λ^\perp . It will give us more insights on what estimators can be proposed, especially with a misspecified error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$.

Proposition 3. *The efficient score for estimating β , \mathbf{S}_{eff} , is*

$$\frac{r(y - \beta^\top \mathbf{x})\{F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\}F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) + \{r - p(\mathbf{x})\}\{z - F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\{F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\}v(\mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}.$$

The proof of this result can be found in Supplement S.3. One can verify that, \mathbf{S}_{eff} can be written as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}} = \kappa(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}} + \{1 - \kappa(\mathbf{x})\} \frac{r - p(\mathbf{x})}{1 - p(\mathbf{x})} \frac{z - F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x},$$

where

$$\kappa(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \frac{F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\{F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\}v(\mathbf{x})}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\{F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\}v(\mathbf{x})},$$

and \mathbf{S}_{ls} has been defined in (5). Clearly, the efficient score \mathbf{S}_{eff} is a weighted average between the efficient score \mathbf{S}_{ls} of model (1) and

$$\frac{r - p(\mathbf{x})}{1 - p(\mathbf{x})} \frac{z - F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}, \quad (9)$$

which summarizes the information in model (4). Note that (9) is even not the efficient score function (8) when $F(\cdot)$ were known. This difference reflects the difference, between an unidentifiable model and an identifiable model, of the contributions to the efficient score function in the integrated data model (7).

3.2 Proposed estimator according to the efficient score \mathbf{S}_{eff}

Our next step is to proposed estimators for β based on the efficient score \mathbf{S}_{eff} , especially with a misspecified error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$.

In order to present our ideas more clearly, we first consider the situation that $f_t(\mathbf{x}) = f_e(\mathbf{x})$; i.e., $p(\mathbf{x}) = \pi$, a constant. This is a technically simpler situation. In reality, it is also intuitive that, it is of primary interest to first consider the situation that both sources of subjects are from the same population. If the statistical benefits brought by the external data are clear or convincing in this simpler case, then we further consider a more general situation that $f_t(\mathbf{x}) \neq f_e(\mathbf{x})$.

When $p(\mathbf{x}) = \pi$, the efficient score can be simplified as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}} = \kappa(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}} + \{1 - \kappa(\mathbf{x})\} \frac{r - \pi}{1 - \pi} \frac{z - F(c - \beta^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}. \quad (10)$$

With a possibly misspecified error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, and subsequently $F^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, $E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})$, $v^*(\mathbf{x})$ and $\kappa^*(\mathbf{x})$, one can obtain

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* = \kappa^*(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}}^* + \{1 - \kappa^*(\mathbf{x})\} \frac{r - \pi}{1 - \pi} \frac{z - F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x},$$

with

$$\kappa^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\} v^*(\mathbf{x})}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2 \{1 - \pi\} + F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\} v^*(\mathbf{x})},$$

and \mathbf{S}_{ls}^* has been defined in (6). Clearly $\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*$ preserves the mean zero property, so a corresponding RAL estimator can be proposed, with details studied later.

Further, when $p(\mathbf{x})$ is not a constant, we assume the truth of $p(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as $p(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0)$ with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$ the true value of the parameter, and we assume that we are able to estimate $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that

$$N^{1/2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\phi}(r_i, \mathbf{x}_i, p(\cdot), \boldsymbol{\alpha}) + o_p(\pi^{1/2}).$$

Then, with a possibly misspecified error distribution $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{eff}}^* \equiv \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*(r, ry, z, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{p}) = \kappa^*(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{S}_{\text{ls}}^* + \{1 - \kappa^*(\mathbf{x})\} \frac{r - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x})}{1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{z - F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}, \quad (11)$$

as the local efficient score to construct estimating equations, where $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$, and

$$\kappa^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\} v^*(\mathbf{x})}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2 \{1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x})\} + F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - 1\} v^*(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Clearly, similar to \mathbf{S}_{eff} , $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{eff}}^*$ is also a weighted average between the local efficient score \mathbf{S}_{ls}^* of model (1) and

$$\frac{r - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x})}{1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x})} \frac{z - F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})} \mathbf{x}. \quad (12)$$

As we have shown in Proposition 1, when one models F as, say, F^* , model (4) becomes identifiable and the corresponding efficient score will be

$$\frac{z - F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) \{1 - F^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}} f^*(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}),$$

which, however, is still different from (12). Similar to the discussion in the end of Section 3.1, this difference reflects the difference, between a posited and an unknown $F(\cdot)$ model, of the contributions to the locally efficient score function in the integrated data model (7).

We denote the corresponding estimators based on \mathbf{S}_{eff} and $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\text{eff}}^*$ as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^*$, respectively. More specifically, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^*$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*(r_i, r_i y_i, z_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^*, \hat{p}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (13)$$

For $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^*$, with the proof in Supplement S.4, we have the following result:

Theorem 1. The estimator $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ satisfies

$$n^{1/2}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \beta) \rightarrow N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}^{-1\text{T}}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= E[\pi^{-1}\partial\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*\{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \beta, p(\mathbf{X})\}/\partial\beta^{\text{T}}] \\ &= E\left\{\frac{p(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}}{\pi}E\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta^{\text{T}}}\left[\frac{\epsilon(F^* - 1)F^*}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})\}^2 + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{X})}\right] \mid \mathbf{X}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B} &= E\left\{\frac{1}{\pi}(\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*\{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \beta, p(\mathbf{X})\}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ E\left[\frac{(F^* - F)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}p'_{\alpha}(\mathbf{X}, \alpha)^{\text{T}}}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\} + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})}\right]\phi(R, \mathbf{X}, p(\cdot), \alpha)\right)^{\otimes 2}\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Remark 1 (Discussion when $N \gg n$). Sometimes, the external population data may have a much larger sample size than the target population, we thus consider the case of $N \gg n$ next. Interestingly, the much larger external data size does not help to reduce the convergence rate of β , i.e., the convergence rate of $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ remains to be $n^{-1/2}$. The intuition behind this conclusion is that the external data itself does not suffice to identify β , as we described before. To capture the $N \gg n$ situation, instead of $\pi, p(\mathbf{x})$, we write $\pi_n = n/N, p_n(\mathbf{x}) = f_t(\mathbf{x})\pi_n/\{f_t(\mathbf{x})\pi_n + (1 - \pi_n)f_e(\mathbf{x})\}$, and note that $\pi_n \rightarrow 0, p_n(\mathbf{x})/\pi_n \rightarrow f_t(\mathbf{x})/f_e(\mathbf{x})$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. All the results above hold with π replaced by π_n . In this case, although we still have the form $N^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha) = N^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^N\phi(R_i, \mathbf{X}_i, p_n(\cdot), \alpha) + o_p(\pi_n^{1/2})$, we note that $\text{var}\{\phi(R, \mathbf{X}, p_n(\cdot), \alpha)^{\otimes 2}\}\pi_n = \text{var}(n^{1/2}\hat{\alpha}) = O(1)$, i.e., $\text{var}\{\phi(R, \mathbf{X}, p_n(\cdot), \alpha)^{\otimes 2}\} = O(\pi_n^{-1})$.

Remark 2 (Discussion on model misspecification). In this section, we advocate the modeling of $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ and $p(\mathbf{x})$ differently. The correct specification of the error distribution $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ will result in the correct specification of the conditional distribution of Y given \mathbf{X} in the target data, which is a demanding ultimate goal. Given the situation that the model $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ is heavily involved in implementing the efficient score function, we pursue the direction with an arbitrary working model $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$. On the contrary, even though it also involves the same covariate \mathbf{x} , modeling $p(\mathbf{x})$ is a standard procedure for estimating a density ratio function, or, equivalently, a classification task. Thus, any method, either parametric or semiparametric or nonparametric, can be adopted. We choose a parametric approach for simplicity. In reality, if sufficient data are available, one may use black-box machine learning methods for estimating both $\hat{f}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ and $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x})$ that satisfy the $o_p(n^{-1/4})$ convergence rate in terms of the supnorm. In such a situation, we can engage the estimated functions in the construction of \mathbf{S}_{eff} to achieve optimal efficiency for estimating β .

3.3 Proposed estimator that has guaranteed efficiency gain

While obviously $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$ is more efficient than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}$, we cannot conclude $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ is also always more efficient than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$. The relative performance depends on π and the working model $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$.

This is the limitation of the proposed estimator $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$. Our proposed estimator $\hat{\beta}^*$, presented in this section, however, is guaranteed to be more efficient than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$. This indicates, even with an arbitrary working model $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, the leverage of external data is always beneficial.

We propose a new estimator

$$\hat{\beta}^* = \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^* + \mathbf{W}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{W} = -\{\text{cov}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*, \tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\}\{\text{var}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\}^{-1}$. The estimator $\hat{\beta}^*$ is guaranteed to be always more efficient than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$ in that

$$\text{var}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*) - \text{var}(\hat{\beta}^*) = \{\text{cov}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*, \tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\}\{\text{var}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\}^{-1}\{\text{cov}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*, \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\},$$

which is positive definite. Obviously, the estimator $\hat{\beta}^*$ is also asymptotically consistent, and it guarantees the safe use of the external data. Of course, the estimator is also always more efficient than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ in that we also have

$$\text{var}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*) - \text{var}(\hat{\beta}^*) = \{\text{cov}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*, \tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\}\{\text{var}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*)\}^{-1}\{\text{cov}(\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^* - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*, \tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*)\},$$

which is also positive definite.

Additionally, if the working model $f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ is fortunately chosen as the correct model, then the matrix \mathbf{W} becomes the identity matrix, and the estimator $\hat{\beta}^*$ (now written as $\hat{\beta}$) becomes $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$, the semiparametrically efficient estimator based on the efficient score \mathbf{S}_{eff} . Hence, the estimator $\hat{\beta}^*$ also guarantees the efficient use of the external data.

4 Simulation Studies

We conduct comprehensive simulation studies to examine the numerical performance of the proposed estimators and the comparison with the benchmark.

We consider two simulations. In the first, we generate data under the assumption that $f_t(\mathbf{x}) = f_e(\mathbf{x})$ so that $p(\mathbf{x}) = \pi$ is a constant. In the second, we generate data with $f_t(\mathbf{x}) \neq f_e(\mathbf{x})$ so that we need to estimate $p(\mathbf{x})$ for implementing the proposed estimators. In each simulation, we consider three scenarios where the error distribution $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$ is correctly specified in scenario I but misspecified differently in scenarios II and III. The two proposed estimators are $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ in (11) and $\hat{\beta}^*$ in (16), respectively, and the benchmark estimator is $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$ in (6). Under correct specification, they become $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$, $\hat{\beta}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}$, respectively.

In the first simulation, 1000 data sets with sample size $n = 500$ were generated from the regression model

$$Y = \beta_0 + X_1\beta_1 + X_2\beta_2 + \epsilon,$$

where X_1 is a Bernoulli(0.5) random variable and X_2 is a $N(0, 1)$ random variable, representing discrete and continuous covariates, respectively. The zero mean error term ϵ has a mixture of normal distribution with pdf

$$f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) = 0.4\phi\{(\epsilon - 8)/2\} + 0.2\phi(\epsilon + 2).$$

The true values of β_0 , β_1 and β_2 are 0, 1 and -1 , respectively. In each data set, the proportion of observations from the target population is fixed at $\pi = 0.5$. For each observation in the external population, a binary response Z is created following $Z = 1$ if $Y \leq c$ and $Z = 0$ if $Y > c$ with the cutoff value c fixed at 0. This setting leads to around 60% of observations in the external population to have $Z = 1$.

In the first scenario, the error distribution is correctly specified, i.e. $f^* = f$. This leads to the efficient estimators $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$ and $\hat{\beta}$. In the second scenario, we misspecify the distribution of the error as standard normal, i.e. the working model is

$$f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-\epsilon^2/2}.$$

In the third scenario, we misspecify the error distribution as the standard logistic distribution, i.e.

$$f^*(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) = e^{-\epsilon}/(1 + e^{-\epsilon})^2.$$

To address the computational challenges associated with obtaining the covariance matrix, a weighted bootstrap approach (Jin et al. 2001) has been adopted in the simulation study. This resampling method allocates independent, identically distributed positive random weights to each data point. Subsequently, the covariance matrix is estimated by calculating the empirical covariance of the weighted estimates generated across multiple bootstrap samples. In each of the simulation scenarios, the random weights are generated from an exponential distribution with mean of 1, and the number of bootstrap samples is fixed at 1,000.

The summary of the simulation 1 results is contained in Table 2. In scenario I, all three methods have small biases, indicating that all the methods are consistent. Further, in this scenario, $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ have comparable performance in terms of estimation variability, and both methods outperform $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}$. Indeed, in this case, $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$ is actually efficient so $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are asymptotically equal. Of course, because both $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ use information from both target population and external population, they are more efficient than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}$, which uses only information from the target population. Finally, all the methods have sample standard deviation (SSD) close to their corresponding average estimated standard error (ESE), and the 95% coverage rates of all the proposed methods are around the nominal level. This indicates that the estimated standard errors in the proposed methods are sufficiently precise. In scenario II, $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ is no longer guaranteed to be efficient, although it is still consistent. The results demonstrated in the middle three columns of Table 2 are in consonance with our expectation. Even though the distribution of the error term is misspecified, the proposed robust estimators still have small biases indicating that they remain consistent. Further, $\hat{\beta}^*$ shows an advantage in estimation variability as it tends to have smaller SSD than $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$. Conclusions from scenario III are similar. All three estimators show small biases, while $\hat{\beta}^*$ tends to have the smallest SSD among all three estimators. The SSDs are close to ESEs, and the confidence intervals have coverage rates near 95%. In general, this simulation study suggests that all three methods demonstrate consistency in estimating the regression coefficients regardless the working model is misspecified or not. It is worth noting that generally $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ outperforms $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$, and when the working model is misspecified, the weighting strategy can further improve the performance of $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$.

Table 2: Simulation 1. Error distribution is correctly specified (Scenario I), mis-specified as standard normal (Scenario II), and mis-specified as standard logistic (Scenario III). Results include the bias (Bias), the sample standard deviation (SSD), the average estimated standard error (ESE), and the coverage rate of 95% confidence intervals (CR95) for the 1000 estimates.

		Scenario I			Scenario II			Scenario III		
		$\tilde{\beta}_{ls}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{eff}$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{ls}^*$	$\tilde{\beta}_{eff}^*$	$\hat{\beta}^*$	$\tilde{\beta}_{ls}^*$	$\tilde{\beta}_{eff}^*$	$\hat{\beta}^*$
β_0	Bias	-0.004	0.002	0.014	0.007	0.006	0.012	-0.004	-0.006	-0.004
	SSD	0.413	0.365	0.362	0.397	0.366	0.349	0.413	0.366	0.343
	ESE	0.390	0.351	0.347	0.390	0.363	0.339	0.390	0.348	0.328
	CR95	0.932	0.941	0.941	0.941	0.939	0.932	0.932	0.935	0.931
β_1	Bias	0.019	0.020	0.023	-0.010	-0.004	0.018	0.019	0.023	0.030
	SSD	0.575	0.524	0.528	0.579	0.537	0.519	0.575	0.515	0.495
	ESE	0.552	0.502	0.496	0.553	0.514	0.487	0.552	0.494	0.474
	CR95	0.938	0.933	0.927	0.940	0.936	0.937	0.938	0.936	0.933
β_2	Bias	0.026	0.026	0.013	0.007	0.003	-0.031	0.026	0.017	0.005
	SSD	0.276	0.257	0.261	0.284	0.260	0.259	0.276	0.248	0.242
	ESE	0.276	0.253	0.248	0.274	0.255	0.243	0.276	0.248	0.238
	CR95	0.949	0.943	0.933	0.932	0.934	0.914	0.949	0.946	0.945

In the second simulation, the data generation procedure is largely the same as in Simulation 1, except that we generate the covariates (X_1, X_2) from different distributions in the target and external populations. In the target population, X_{1t} is a Bernoulli(0.5) random variable and X_{2t} is a $N(0, 1)$ random variable, while in the external population X_{1e} is a Bernoulli(0.3) random variable and X_{2e} is a $U(-2, 2)$ random variable. Overall, we have 50% of observations from the external population. Under this more complicated setting, the error term ϵ is generated from a mixture distribution with pdf $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) = 0.9/1.1\phi\{(\epsilon - 0.2)/1.1\} + 0.1\phi(\epsilon + 1.8)$.

The proposed methods are assessed in the same three scenarios as mentioned in Simulation 1. Different from Simulation 1, here, $p(\mathbf{x})$ is estimated parametrically in all three scenarios. Specifically, we use $\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}_t(\mathbf{x})\pi / \{\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{x})\pi + \hat{f}_e(\mathbf{x})(1 - \pi)\}$, where $\hat{f}_t(\mathbf{x}) = s_{x_{2t}}^{-1}\phi\{(x_2 - \bar{x}_{2t})/s_{x_{2t}}\}(\bar{x}_{1t})^{x_1}(1 - \bar{x}_{1t})^{(1-x_1)}$ and $\hat{f}_e(\mathbf{x}) = [1/\{\max(x_{2e}) - \min(x_{2e})\}](\bar{x}_{1e})^{x_1}(1 - \bar{x}_{1e})^{(1-x_1)}$. Here, \bar{x}_{1e} , \bar{x}_{1t} , \bar{x}_{2t} , and $s_{x_{2t}}$ are respectively the sample means of x_1 in the external population, in the target population, and the sample mean and sample standard deviation of x_2 in the target population. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Briefly, the conclusions from Simulation 2 are the same as Simulation 1. It is clear that when covariates in target population and external population have different distributions, the proposed methods are all asymptotically unbiased. Meanwhile, most of the time $\tilde{\beta}_{eff}^*$ is more precise than $\tilde{\beta}_{ls}^*$, and $\hat{\beta}^*$ consistently maintains higher precision than $\tilde{\beta}_{ls}^*$, aligning with our theory.

Table 3: Simulation 2. Error distribution is correctly specified (Scenario I), mis-specified as standard normal (Scenario II), and mis-specified as standard logistic (Scenario III). Results include the bias (Bias), the sample standard deviation (SSD), the average estimated standard error (ESE), and the coverage rate of 95% confidence intervals (CR95) for the 1000 estimates.

		Scenario I			Scenario II			Scenario III		
		$\tilde{\beta}_{ls}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{eff}$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{ls}^*$	$\tilde{\beta}_{eff}^*$	$\hat{\beta}^*$	$\tilde{\beta}_{ls}^*$	$\tilde{\beta}_{eff}^*$	$\hat{\beta}^*$
β_0	Bias	-0.003	-0.004	-0.003	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.003	-0.001	-0.002
	SSD	0.114	0.099	0.099	0.110	0.092	0.092	0.114	0.097	0.095
	ESE	0.110	0.096	0.092	0.111	0.093	0.093	0.110	0.096	0.092
	CR95	0.941	0.936	0.928	0.953	0.950	0.948	0.934	0.944	0.937
β_1	Bias	-0.003	-0.004	-0.006	0.008	0.007	0.002	0.000	0.001	-0.003
	SSD	0.156	0.139	0.138	0.158	0.138	0.139	0.160	0.141	0.140
	ESE	0.156	0.141	0.137	0.157	0.138	0.137	0.156	0.140	0.136
	CR95	0.950	0.950	0.945	0.948	0.951	0.952	0.942	0.947	0.940
β_2	Bias	0.000	-0.002	0.005	-0.003	-0.003	-0.000	-0.002	-0.001	0.001
	SSD	0.081	0.080	0.078	0.077	0.071	0.071	0.079	0.074	0.074
	ESE	0.078	0.077	0.072	0.078	0.072	0.072	0.077	0.073	0.071
	CR95	0.930	0.933	0.921	0.946	0.944	0.944	0.940	0.936	0.931

5 Real Data Application

The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) is a program designed by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), a division of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The NHANES collects extensive health and nutritional information from a diverse U.S. population and aims to assess the health and nutritional status of adults and children in the United States. NHANES began conducting health and nutrition surveys in the 1960s and became a continuous program in 1999. Annually, around 5,000 individuals of various ages are interviewed in their homes and undergo health examinations. The comprehensive data combines survey interviews with physical examinations and laboratory tests. It offers valuable insights contributing significantly to public health in the United States.

In this section, we apply the proposed methods in a subset of the NHANES database previously analyzed in Dinh et al. (2019). This dataset contains 2,278 observations and 9 variables: age group (senior/non-senior), age, gender, engagement in moderate or vigorous-intensity sports, fitness, or recreational activities during a typical week (PAQ605), body mass index (BMXBMI), blood glucose after fasting (LBXGLU), diabetes status (DIQ010), oral glucose tolerance test (LBXGLT), and blood insulin levels (LBXIN).

The primary objective of this analysis is to investigate the impact of various predictors (Age, Gender, PAQ605, LBXGLU, LBXGLT, LBXIN) on Body Mass Index (BMXBMI). One observation with erroneous values for PAQ605 and the 13 observations with extreme covariate values (i.e. at least one of the covariates is more than 4 standard deviations away from the mean), have been excluded from the analysis. This resulting in a dataset containing 2,264 observations. The target population consists of 574 randomly selected individuals, whereas

Table 4: Summary of the analytical results for the NHANES dataset using standard logistic error distribution: $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$, $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$, and $\hat{\beta}^*$. The table displays the estimates (Est), estimated standard errors (ESE), and the upper and lower bounds of 95% confidence intervals (CI95) for six regression coefficients.

		Intercept	Age	Gender	PAQ605	LBXGLU	LBXGLT	LBXIN
$\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$	Est	28.083	1.949	0.897	-1.107	-0.349	-0.118	4.012
	ESE	0.496	0.242	0.469	0.567	0.343	0.273	0.269
	LowerCI95	27.111	1.474	-0.023	-2.219	-1.020	-0.653	3.485
	UpperCI95	29.056	2.424	1.817	0.004	0.323	0.418	4.539
$\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$	Est	26.414	1.341	0.558	-1.158	-0.433	-0.086	2.920
	ESE	0.405	0.190	0.373	0.474	0.285	0.229	0.234
	LowerCI95	25.619	0.969	-0.172	-2.087	-0.992	-0.535	2.461
	UpperCI95	27.208	1.713	1.288	-0.230	0.126	0.363	3.378
$\hat{\beta}^*$	Est	26.722	1.520	0.059	-1.704	-0.513	-0.123	2.177
	ESE	0.402	0.187	0.368	0.468	0.284	0.228	0.225
	LowerCI95	25.936	1.153	-0.662	-2.621	-1.071	-0.569	1.736
	UpperCI95	27.509	1.886	0.780	-0.787	0.044	0.324	2.617

the remaining 1,690 individuals form the external population. As previously described, the dataset structure ensures that observations within the target population contain precise BMI values. In contrast, for the external group, BMI is categorized into overweight status: a BMI below 25 is classified as 1 (not overweight), and a BMI of 25 or higher is classified as 0 (overweight).

Prior to model fitting, all numerical predictors have been logarithmized, centered, and scaled. The error term in the working model is assumed to follow a standard logistic distribution and then a standard normal distribution for comparison purposes. The weighted bootstrap approach, as mentioned in the simulation study, has been adopted to facilitate the statistical inference, with the number of bootstrap sample set at 1,000. The results from assuming logistic error and the normal error are summarized in Table 4 and Table 5, respectively.

The results in Table 4 and Table 5 are consistent, implying that the proposed methods have reliable performance across different working models. It is also worth noting that $\hat{\beta}^*$ consistently be more efficient compared to the other methods, as evidenced by its lower estimated standard errors. The analysis indicates a positive association between Age and BMI across all methods, suggesting an increase in BMI with age. Gender is found to be a non-significant predictor showing a negligible effect. Physical activity (PAQ605) demonstrates a consistent negative relationship with BMI, indicating that higher activity levels are associated with lower BMI values. This relationship is not significant in the WLS estimate using data solely from the target population, but is identified as significant after incorporating external data. Biochemical markers glucose (LBXGLU) and oral glucose tolerance test (LBXGLT) exhibit non-significant associations with BMI. Notably, insulin levels (LBXIN) are positively associated with BMI across all models, highlighting a potential link between

Table 5: Summary of the analytical results for the NHANES dataset using standard normal error distribution: $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$, $\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$, and $\hat{\beta}^*$. The table displays the estimates (Est), estimated standard errors (ESE), and the upper and lower bounds of 95% confidence intervals (CI95) for six regression coefficients.

		Intercept	Age	Gender	PAQ605	LBXGLU	LBXGLT	LBXIN
$\tilde{\beta}_{\text{ls}}^*$	Est	28.083	1.949	0.897	-1.107	-0.349	-0.118	4.012
	ESE	0.496	0.242	0.469	0.567	0.343	0.273	0.269
	LowerCI95	27.111	1.474	-0.023	-2.219	-1.020	-0.653	3.485
	UpperCI95	29.056	2.424	1.817	0.004	0.323	0.418	4.539
$\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$	Est	26.793	1.385	0.558	-1.141	-0.372	-0.136	2.931
	ESE	0.401	0.183	0.365	0.475	0.272	0.216	0.241
	LowerCI95	26.007	1.027	-0.158	-2.072	-0.905	-0.559	2.460
	UpperCI95	27.579	1.743	1.274	-0.211	0.162	0.286	3.403
$\hat{\beta}^*$	Est	26.918	1.415	0.021	-1.612	-0.427	-0.202	2.132
	ESE	0.397	0.175	0.354	0.471	0.269	0.211	0.221
	LowerCI95	26.140	1.071	-0.672	-2.534	-0.954	-0.616	1.699
	UpperCI95	27.696	1.758	0.715	-0.689	0.101	0.211	2.566

insulin resistance and increased body mass.

References

- Bareinboim, E. & Pearl, J. (2016), ‘Causal inference and the data-fusion problem’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**(27), 7345–7352.
- Bickel, P. J., Klaassen, C. A., Ritov, Y. & Wellner, J. A. (1993), *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*, Vol. 4, Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore.
- Colnet, B., Mayer, I., Chen, G., Dieng, A., Li, R., Varoquaux, G., Vert, J.-P., Josse, J. & Yang, S. (2024), ‘Causal inference methods for combining randomized trials and observational studies: a review’, *Statistical Science* **39**(1), 165–191.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Robertson, S. E., Steingrimsson, J. A., Stuart, E. A. & Hernan, M. A. (2020), ‘Extending inferences from a randomized trial to a new target population’, *Statistics in Medicine* **39**(14), 1999–2014.
- Degtiar, I. & Rose, S. (2023), ‘A review of generalizability and transportability’, *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **10**(1), 501–524.
- Dinh, A., Miertschin, S., Young, A. & Mohanty, S. D. (2019), ‘A data-driven approach to predicting diabetes and cardiovascular disease with machine learning’, *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* **19**(1), 1–15.
- Glass, G. V. (1976), ‘Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research’, *Educational Researcher* **5**(10), 3–8.

- Hall, D. L. & Llinas, J. (1997), ‘An introduction to multisensor data fusion’, *Proceedings of the IEEE* **85**(1), 6–23.
- Jin, Z., Ying, Z. & Wei, L. (2001), ‘A simple resampling method by perturbing the mini-*mand*’, *Biometrika* **88**(2), 381–390.
- Klein, L. A. (2004), *Sensor and data fusion: a tool for information assessment and decision making*, Vol. 138, SPIE press.
- Lanckriet, G. R., De Bie, T., Cristianini, N., Jordan, M. I. & Noble, W. S. (2004), ‘A statistical framework for genomic data fusion’, *Bioinformatics* **20**(16), 2626–2635.
- Lenzerini, M. (2002), Data integration: A theoretical perspective, *in* ‘Proceedings of the twenty-first ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems’, pp. 233–246.
- Li, S., Gilbert, P. B. & Luedtke, A. (2023), ‘Data fusion using weakly aligned sources’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14836* .
- Quinonero-Candela, J., Sugiyama, M., Schwaighofer, A. & Lawrence, N. D. (2008), *Dataset shift in machine learning*, Mit Press.
- Stuart, E. A., Bradshaw, C. P. & Leaf, P. J. (2015), ‘Assessing the generalizability of randomized trial results to target populations’, *Prevention Science* **16**, 475–485.
- Tsiatis, A. A. (2006), *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*, New York: Springer.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

S.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Let $F(t, \mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\beta}$ denote the true function and parameter that describe the data generation process for Z, \mathbf{x} . Let

$$s(\mathbf{x}) = I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{x} \neq c) \frac{\Phi^{-1}\{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}}{c - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{x}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \neq \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal distribution function. Let $G(t, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi\{ts(\mathbf{x})\}$. The $G(t, \mathbf{x})$ is valid distribution function with mean zero, and

$$G(c - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \Phi\{(c - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{x})s(\mathbf{x})\} = F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}).$$

Thus, $G(t, \mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ would describe the same data generation process hence the model is not identifiable. \square

S.2 Proof of Proposition 2

The likelihood function of model (7) for the combined population is semiparametric. Besides the parameter of interest $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, there are three nonparametric nuisance components $f_t(\mathbf{x}), f_e(\mathbf{x})$ and $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, and another nuisance π .

According to the semiparametric theory (Bickel et al. 1993, Tsiatis 2006), influence functions belong to the linear space orthogonal to the nuisance tangent space Λ , denoted as Λ^\perp throughout. Here, the nuisance tangent space Λ is defined as the mean squared closure of nuisance tangent spaces associated with all parametric submodels.

Below, we show the mutually orthogonal decomposition of the space \mathcal{H} that contains all the p -dimensional mean zero measurable functions of the observed data with finite variance. It is

$$\mathcal{H} = \Lambda_\pi \oplus \Lambda_t \oplus \Lambda_e \oplus \Lambda_f \oplus \Lambda^\perp,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\pi &= \left\{ \mathbf{a} \left(\frac{r}{\pi} - \frac{1-r}{1-\pi} \right) \right\}, \\ \Lambda_t &= \{r\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) : E_t(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{0}\}, \\ \Lambda_e &= \{(1-r)\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) : E_e(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{0}\}, \\ \Lambda_f &= \left\{ r\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-r) \frac{E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}\} z - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) 1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} : E(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, E(\epsilon\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

are the nuisance tangent spaces with respect to $\pi, f_t(\mathbf{x}), f_e(\mathbf{x})$, and $f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})$, respectively, where the notation \oplus represents the direct sum of two spaces that are orthogonal to each other.

The loglikelihood of (7) is

$$\begin{aligned} &r \log f(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) + (1-r)[z \log F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) + (1-z) \log\{1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}] \\ &+ r \log f_t(\mathbf{x}) + (1-r) \log f_e(\mathbf{x}) + r \log \pi + (1-r) \log(1 - \pi), \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon = Y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_\pi &= \left\{ \mathbf{a} \left(\frac{r}{\pi} - \frac{1-r}{1-\pi} \right) \right\}, \\
\Lambda_t &= \{ r\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) : E_t(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{0} \}, \\
\Lambda_e &= \{ (1-r)\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}) : E_e(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{0} \}, \\
\Lambda_f &= \left\{ r\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-r)z \frac{E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}\}}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} - (1-r)(1-z) \frac{E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}\}}{1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} : \right. \\
&\quad \left. E(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, E(\epsilon \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0} \right\} \\
&= \left\{ r\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-r) \frac{E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}\} z - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) 1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} : E(\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, E(\epsilon \mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\Lambda = \Lambda_\pi \oplus \Lambda_t \oplus \Lambda_e \oplus \Lambda_f$.

For Λ^\perp , we consider $r\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-r)\{z\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{x}) + (1-z)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x})\}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
E[R\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) + (1-R)\{Z\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-Z)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\}] &= 0, \\
E[R\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X})/\pi - (1-R)\{Z\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-Z)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\}/(1-\pi)] &= 0, \\
E\{R\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) \mid \mathbf{X}\} &= \mathbf{c}_1, \\
E[(1-R)\{Z\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-Z)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\} \mid \mathbf{X}] &= \mathbf{c}_2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left([R\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) + (1-R)\{Z\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-Z)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\}]^T \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times [R\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-R) \frac{E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{X}\} z - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x}) 1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})}] \right) \\
&= E[R\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-R)\{Z\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-Z)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\}^T \\
&\quad \times \frac{E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{X}\} Z - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x}) 1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{x})}] \\
&= E[p(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X})^T \mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) + (1-p(\mathbf{x}))\{\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\}^T E\{Z\mathbf{a}(\epsilon, \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{X}\}] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Writing $F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$ as F , $f(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$ as f , this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi E_t\{\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X})\} + (1-\pi)E_e[\{F\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-F)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\}] &= \mathbf{0}, \\
\mathbf{c}_1/\pi - \mathbf{c}_2/(1-\pi) &= \mathbf{0}, \\
p(\mathbf{x})E\{\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) \mid \mathbf{X}\} &= \mathbf{c}_1, \\
\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\}\{F\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) + (1-F)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\} &= \mathbf{c}_2, \\
p(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) + \{1-p(\mathbf{x})\}Z\{\mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{X})\} &= \mathbf{c}_3(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{c}_4(\mathbf{x})\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

This is further equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_1/\pi - \mathbf{c}_2/(1 - \pi) &= 0, \\ \mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\mathbf{c}_2 - \{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x})}{\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\}F} + \mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) &= (F - Z) \left[\frac{\mathbf{c}_2 - \{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathbf{x})F} \right] + \frac{\mathbf{c}_4(\mathbf{x})\epsilon - \mathbf{c}_2}{p(\mathbf{x})}, \\ \mathbf{c}_1 &= -\mathbf{c}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{c}_2 = \mathbf{0}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{(F - 1)\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x})}{F}, \\ \mathbf{b}_1(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}) &= \frac{\mathbf{c}_4(\mathbf{x})\epsilon}{p(\mathbf{x})} - (F - Z) \frac{\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathbf{x})F}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^\perp &= \left(r \left[\frac{\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x})\epsilon}{p(\mathbf{x})} - \frac{(F - z)\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathbf{x})F} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - r) \left\{ z \frac{(F - 1)\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})}{F} + (1 - z)\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \right\} : \forall \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, this space can be even further simplified as

$$\Lambda^\perp = \{r(y - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x})\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}) + \{r - p(\mathbf{x})\}\{z - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})\}\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) : \forall \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})\},$$

which completes the proof.

S.3 Proof of Proposition 3

The score vector is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_\beta &= -\mathbf{x} \left\{ r \frac{f'(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})}{f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})} + (1 - r)z \frac{f(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} - (1 - r)(1 - z) \frac{f(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} \right\} \\ &= -\mathbf{x} \left[r \frac{f'(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})}{f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})} + (1 - r) \frac{f(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} \frac{z - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}{1 - F(c - \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})} \right] \\ &= -\mathbf{x} \left[r \frac{f'(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})}{f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})} + (1 - r) \frac{f}{F} \frac{z - F}{1 - F} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{[r\epsilon(F - 1)F - r(F - z)\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\}E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x}) + p(\mathbf{x})(1 - r)(F - z)E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})]\mathbf{x}}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(F - 1)E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{[r\epsilon(F - 1)F + \{p(\mathbf{x}) - r\}(F - z)E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})]\mathbf{x}}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(F - 1)E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})}, \end{aligned} \tag{S.1}$$

corresponding to $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{c}_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{(F-1)\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x})}{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})}, \\ \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{FE(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(F-1)E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})}\end{aligned}$$

in Λ^\perp , and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{S}_\beta - \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{-r\mathbf{x}f'(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})}{f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})} - \frac{(1-r)(z-F)f\mathbf{x}}{F(1-F)} \\ &\quad - \frac{[r\epsilon(F-1)F + \{p(\mathbf{x})-r\}(F-z)E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})]\mathbf{x}}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(F-1)E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})} \\ &= -r\mathbf{x} \left[\frac{f'(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})}{f(\epsilon, \mathbf{x})} + \frac{\epsilon(F-1)F - (F-z)\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\}E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(F-1)E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})} \right] \\ &\quad - (1-r)\mathbf{x} \left[f - \frac{p(\mathbf{x})F(1-F)E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})}{\{E(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F(F-1)E(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})} \right] \frac{z-F}{F(1-F)} \in \Lambda_f.\end{aligned}$$

S.4 Proof of Theorem 1

To simplify notation, we denote $\tilde{\epsilon}_i^* = y_i - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^{*\text{T}}\mathbf{x}_i$, $\tilde{c}_i^* = c - \tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^{*\text{T}}\mathbf{x}_i$, $\epsilon_i^* = y_i - \beta^{*\text{T}}\mathbf{x}_i$, $c_i^* = c - \beta^{*\text{T}}\mathbf{x}_i$, $c_i = c - \beta^{\text{T}}\mathbf{x}_i$, where $\beta^* = \lambda\beta + (1-\lambda)\tilde{\beta}_{\text{eff}}^*$ for some $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Let $\mathbf{p}'_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \alpha) = \partial p(\mathbf{x}, \alpha)/\partial \alpha$. We first have

$$\begin{aligned}& E \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* \{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{x}, \beta, p(\mathbf{x})\}}{\partial p(\mathbf{x})} \mid \mathbf{x} \right] \\ &= \frac{\{F^* - E(Z | \mathbf{x})\}E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F^*(F^*-1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{[E(R | \mathbf{x})E(\epsilon | \mathbf{x})(F^*-1)F^* + \{p(\mathbf{x}) - E(R | \mathbf{x})\}\{F^* - E(Z | \mathbf{x})\}E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})]\mathbf{x}}{[\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F^*(F^*-1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})]^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{(F^* - F)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1-p(\mathbf{x})\} + F^*(F^*-1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})}.\end{aligned}\tag{S.2}$$

Next, because $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^*$ solves the estimating equation formed by the summation of the local efficient scores in (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{0} &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{[r_i \tilde{\epsilon}_i^* \{F^*(\tilde{c}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) - 1\} F^*(\tilde{c}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) + \{\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}_i) - r_i\} \{F^*(\tilde{c}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) - z_i\} E^*(Z_i \tilde{\epsilon}_i^* | \mathbf{x}_i)] \mathbf{x}_i}{\{E^*(Z_i \tilde{\epsilon}_i^* | \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \{1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)\} + F^*(\tilde{c}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) \{F^*(\tilde{c}_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) - 1\} E^*(\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{*2} | \mathbf{x}_i)} \\
&= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{[r_i \epsilon_i \{F^*(c_i, \mathbf{x}_i) - 1\} F^*(c_i, \mathbf{x}_i) + \{\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}_i) - r_i\} \{F^*(c_i, \mathbf{x}_i) - z_i\} E^*(Z_i \epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}_i)] \mathbf{x}_i}{\{E^*(Z_i \epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \{1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)\} + F^*(c_i, \mathbf{x}_i) \{F^*(c_i, \mathbf{x}_i) - 1\} E^*(\epsilon_i^2 | \mathbf{x}_i)} \\
&\quad + \left(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \frac{[r_i \epsilon_i^* \{F^*(c_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) - 1\} F^*(c_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) + \{\hat{p}(\mathbf{x}_i) - r_i\} \{F^*(c_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) - z_i\} E^*(Z_i \epsilon_i^* | \mathbf{x}_i)] \mathbf{x}_i}{\{E^*(Z_i \epsilon_i^* | \mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 \{1 - \hat{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)\} + F^*(c_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) \{F^*(c_i^*, \mathbf{x}_i) - 1\} E^*(\epsilon_i^{*2} | \mathbf{x}_i)} \right) \\
&\quad \times N^{1/2} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
&= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* \{r_i, r_i y_i, z_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{x}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})\} \\
&\quad + \left[E \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*(R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \right\} + o_p(\pi) \right] N^{1/2} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
&= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* \{r_i, r_i y_i, z_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{x}_i)\} \\
&\quad + N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* \{r_i, r_i y_i, z_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\alpha})\}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}) + o_p(1) \\
&\quad + \left[E \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*(R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} \right\} + o_p(\pi) \right] N^{1/2} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
&= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* \{r_i, r_i y_i, z_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{x}_i)\} \\
&\quad + \left(E \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^* \{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{X})\}}{\partial p(\mathbf{X})} \mathbf{p}'_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})^T \right] + o_p(\pi) \right) \\
&\quad \times \left\{ N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(r_i, \mathbf{x}_i, p(\cdot), \boldsymbol{\alpha}) + o_p(\pi^{1/2}) \right\} + \{\pi \mathbf{A} + o_p(\pi)\} N^{1/2} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}),
\end{aligned}$$

therefore $n^{1/2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{eff}}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}^{-1\text{T}})$ in distribution when $n \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A} &= E(\pi^{-1}\partial\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*/\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{T}}) \\
&= E\left(\frac{R\mathbf{X}}{\pi}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{T}}}\left[\frac{\epsilon(F^* - 1)F^* - (F^* - Z)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{X})\} + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{X})}\right]\right) \\
&\quad + E\left(\frac{p(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}}{\pi}\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{T}}}\left[\frac{(F^* - Z)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{X})\} + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{X})}\right]\right) \\
&= E\left\{\frac{p(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}}{\pi}E\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{T}}}\left[\frac{\epsilon(F^* - 1)F^* - (F^* - Z)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})\}^2 + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{X})}\right] \mid \mathbf{X}\right)\right\} \\
&\quad + E\left\{\frac{p(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}}{\pi}E\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{T}}}\left[\frac{(F^* - Z)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})\}^2 + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{X})}\right] \mid \mathbf{X}\right)\right\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{p(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{X}}{\pi}E\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text{T}}}\left[\frac{\epsilon(F^* - 1)F^*}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{X})\}^2 + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{X})}\right] \mid \mathbf{X}\right)\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{B} &= E\left\{\frac{1}{\pi}(\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*\{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{X})\}\right. \\
&\quad \left.+ E\left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*\{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{X})\}}{\partial p(\mathbf{X})}\mathbf{p}'_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})^{\text{T}}\right]\phi(R, \mathbf{X}, p(\cdot), \boldsymbol{\alpha})\right)^{\otimes 2}\Big\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{1}{\pi}(\mathbf{S}_{\text{eff}}^*\{R, RY, Z, \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, p(\mathbf{X})\}\right. \\
&\quad \left.+ E\left[\frac{(F^* - F)E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}\mathbf{p}'_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})^{\text{T}}}{\{E^*(Z\epsilon | \mathbf{x})\}^2\{1 - p(\mathbf{x})\} + F^*(F^* - 1)E^*(\epsilon^2 | \mathbf{x})}\right]\phi(R, \mathbf{X}, p(\cdot), \boldsymbol{\alpha})\right)^{\otimes 2}\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□