

Cheap Subsampling bootstrap confidence intervals for fast and robust inference in biostatistics

Johan Sebastian Ohlendorff^{1,*}, Anders Munch¹, Kathrine Kold Sørensen²,
and Thomas Alexander Gerds¹

¹Section of Biostatistics, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

²Department of Cardiology, Nordsjællands Hospital, Denmark

Abstract

Bootstrapping is often applied to get confidence limits for semiparametric inference of a target parameter in the presence of nuisance parameters. Bootstrapping with replacement can be computationally expensive and problematic when cross-validation is used in the estimation algorithm due to duplicate observations in the bootstrap samples. We provide a valid, fast, easy-to-implement subsampling bootstrap method for constructing confidence intervals for asymptotically linear estimators and discuss its application to semiparametric causal inference. Our method, inspired by the Cheap Bootstrap (Lam, 2022), leverages the quantiles of a t -distribution and has the desired coverage with few bootstrap replications. We show that the method is asymptotically valid if the subsample size is chosen appropriately as a function of the sample size. We illustrate our method with data from the LEADER trial (Marso et al., 2016), obtaining confidence intervals for a longitudinal targeted minimum loss-based estimator (van der Laan and Gruber, 2012). Through a series of empirical experiments, we also explore the impact of subsample size, sample size, and the number of bootstrap repetitions on the performance of the confidence interval.

Keywords: bootstrap; causal inference; computational efficiency; subsampling; targeted learning.

1 Introduction

Epidemiological studies of observational data are often characterized by large sample sizes and analyzed using statistical algorithms that incorporate machine learning estimators to estimate the nuisance parameters involved in the estimation of a target parameter of interest (Hernán and Robins, 2016, 2020; van der Laan and Rose, 2018). The bootstrap is a standard approach in cases where (asymptotic) formulas for standard errors do not exist or are not implemented. But even if there exists an asymptotic formula for constructing confidence intervals, one may wish to supplement the analysis with bootstrap confidence intervals if the validity of the estimator of the formula-based standard error depends on the correct specification of the nuisance parameter models (Chiu et al., 2023). However, the computational burden of the standard bootstrap algorithms increases with the sample size.

Methods for constructing bootstrap confidence intervals often use empirical quantiles of a bootstrapped statistic. Popular choices include the percentile bootstrap and the bootstrap- t confidence interval (Tibshirani and Efron, 1993). It is recommended these methods be

run with a minimum of 1000 bootstrap replications (Efron, 1987). Others are based on the standard error using the bootstrap samples. According to Efron (1987), performing between 25 and 100 bootstrap replications is sufficient for stability in standard error-based bootstrap confidence intervals.

When bootstrap samples are drawn with replacement, complications can arise if one of the subroutines is sensitive to duplicate observations in the data (Bickel et al., 1997). This is the case, for example, if cross-validation is used to tune hyperparameters of machine learning algorithms for nuisance parameters. Cross-validation is a means of evaluating the performance of a model on unseen data by splitting the data into independent training and test sets. However, if we first apply the bootstrap with replacement and then cross-validation, the same observation may be present in both the training and test sets (see Figure 1). This violates the independence between the training and test sets in the cross-validation procedure, which may lead to a biased estimate of the out-of-sample error.




Figure 1: Illustration of the problem with ties in the data when using bootstrap with replacement and the subsampling bootstrap. First, a bootstrap sample is drawn with and without replacement from the data set. The data set is then split into two folds for the cross-validation procedure. We see that there is one observation present in both folds for the bootstrap sample drawn with replacement. Conversely, the subsample does not have this issue.

In this article, we propose a Cheap Subsampling bootstrap algorithm that samples without replacement to obtain bootstrap data sets that are smaller than the original data set. Our algorithm and formula are based on the Cheap Bootstrap confidence interval (Lam, 2022). Note that (Lam, 2022) also discusses subsampling but with replacement. Their approach may have theoretical advantages over subsampling without replacement (Bickel et al., 1997), but our approach is compatible with cross-validation and other methods that

are sensitive to ties.

The consistency of subsampling, which we need for the validity of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval, has been derived under the assumption that the asymptotic distribution of the estimator of interest exists (Politis and Romano, 1994). Consistency has also been derived under the assumption that the estimator of interest is asymptotically linear (Wu, 1990). In contrast, non-parametric bootstrapping (drawing a bootstrap sample of size n from the data set with replacement) is known to fail in various theoretical settings (Bickel et al., 1997). Consistency of subsampling requires that the subsample size is chosen correctly as a function of the sample size. The results are asymptotic and do not provide a method for selecting the subsample size in practice. Here we apply the conditions in Wu (1990) to show the asymptotic validity of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval for asymptotically linear estimators (Theorem 1). In addition, we show that the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval converges to a confidence interval based on a delete- d jackknife variance estimator (Shao and Wu, 1989) as the number of bootstrap repetitions increases. In the limit, our confidence interval is valid for any number of bootstrap replications.

We demonstrate the use of our method with an application in causal inference in the LEADER trial (Marso et al., 2016), which investigates the effects of liraglutide on cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. The overall goal is to estimate the causal effect of staying on a treatment which we estimate with a longitudinal targeted minimum loss-based estimator (van der Laan and Gruber, 2012). Bootstrap inference for the longitudinal targeted minimum loss-based estimator is of general interest and in particular useful in cases where estimates of the standard error are not reliable (Tran et al., 2023; van der Laan et al., 2023).

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the Cheap Subsampling algorithm and formulate the conditions for the asymptotic validity of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval and its connection to an asymptotic confidence interval based on the delete- d jackknife variance estimator. In Section 3, we apply the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval to the LEADER trial data. In Section 4, we present a simulation study to investigate the performance of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval.

2 Cheap Subsampling bootstrap

2.1 Notation and framework

We introduce our Cheap Subsampling algorithm in a general framework that includes the applied settings. Let $\mathcal{D}_n = (O_1, \dots, O_n)$ with $O_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a data set of independent and identically distributed random variables sampled from some unknown probability measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Here \mathcal{P} denotes a suitably large set of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d . We denote by $\Psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the statistical functional of interest and by $\hat{\Psi}_n$ an estimator of $\Psi(P)$ based on \mathcal{D}_n . The estimator $\hat{\Psi}_n$ is asymptotically linear (Bickel et al., 1993) if

$$\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_P(O_i) + R_n(P)$$

where $\phi_P : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function with $\mathbb{E}_P[\phi_P(O)] = 0$, $0 < \mathbb{E}_P[\phi_P(O)^2] < \infty$, and the remainder term fulfills $R_n(P) = o_P(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. A subsample $\mathcal{D}_m^* = (O_1^*, \dots, O_m^*)$ is a diminished data set obtained by drawing $m < n$ observations without

replacement from the data set \mathcal{D}_n . We denote by $\hat{\Psi}_m^*$ the estimate based on the subsample \mathcal{D}_m^* .

2.2 Cheap Subsampling confidence interval

We aim to construct confidence intervals for $\Psi(P)$ based on the estimator $\hat{\Psi}_n$ and $B \geq 1$ subsamples of size m . By repeating the subsampling procedure independently $B \geq 1$ times we obtain the estimates based on subsamples $\{\hat{\Psi}_{(m,1)}^*, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_{(m,B)}^*\}$ and define the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval as

$$\mathcal{I}_{(m,n,B)} = \left(\hat{\Psi}_n - t_{B,1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n-m}} S, \hat{\Psi}_n + t_{B,1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n-m}} S \right), \quad (1)$$

where $t_{B,1-\alpha/2}$ is the $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of a t -distribution with B degrees of freedom and $S = \sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2}$.

The asymptotic validity of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval (1) can be shown under the assumption that $\hat{\Psi}_n$ is asymptotically normal and that the subsample size $m(n)$ is chosen appropriately as a function of the sample size n . To ease the notation, we will just write m instead of $m(n)$ in what follows. Sufficient conditions for asymptotic validity are formulated in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Let $\hat{\Psi}_n$ be an asymptotically linear estimator of $\Psi(P)$. If the subsample size m fulfills that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{m}{n} \leq c$ for some $0 < c < 1$, then the coverage probability of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval $\mathcal{I}_{(m,n,B)}$ converges to $1 - \alpha$, that is,*

$$P(\Psi(P) \in \mathcal{I}_{(m,n,B)}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha,$$

as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $B \geq 1$.

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix A. □

Remark 1. *Other choices of the subsample size may be of interest such as $m/n \rightarrow 1$ and $n - m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (Wu, 1990), but would require conditions on the remainder term R_n that are too restrictive for our purposes.*

Next, we state a result that shows that the endpoints of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval converge to a random limit fully determined by the data \mathcal{D}_n as the number of bootstrap repetitions increases (Theorem 2). Specifically, the theorem has the consequence that the endpoints of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval (1) converge to the endpoints of an (asymptotic) confidence interval based on the delete- $(n - m)$ jackknife variance estimator for the variance as $B \rightarrow \infty$. The delete- $(n - m)$ jackknife variance estimator (Shao and Wu, 1989) is given by

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}_{\text{jack}} = \frac{m}{n - m} \mathbb{E}_P[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n].$$

If the condition of Theorem 2 is fulfilled, we have

$$\hat{\Psi}_n \pm t_{B,1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n-m}} S \xrightarrow{P} \hat{\Psi}_n \pm q_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{Var}}_{\text{jack}}}, \text{ as } B \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $q_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

Theorem 2. Let $\hat{\Psi}_n$ be any estimator. If $\mathbb{E}_P[\hat{\Psi}_n^4] < \infty$, then

$$S^2 = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n \right)^2 \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{E}_P[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n],$$

as $B \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed m and n .

3 Case study: Application to the LEADER data set

For the sole purpose of illustrating our method, we use the data from the LEADER trial (Marso et al., 2016), where we apply the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval to the longitudinal targeted minimum loss-based estimator (LTMLE) (van der Laan and Rose, 2018). We use a subset of the data from the LEADER trial, which includes 8652 patients with type 2 diabetes. The baseline variables selected for analysis were sex, age, use of thiazide, use of statin, hypertension, BMI, and the number of years since diabetes diagnosis. The time-varying data was discretized into 8 intervals of 6 months length each. In each interval, we defined time-varying covariates that represent HbA1c, use of thiazolidinediones, use of sulfonylureas, use of metformin, and use of DPP-4 inhibitors. For each time interval, the LTMLE algorithm estimates nuisance regression models for the outcome, the propensity of treatment, and the censoring probability. Nuisance parameter estimation for the LTMLE was performed using a discrete super learner (van der Laan et al., 2007), including learners based on penalized regression (Tay et al., 2023) and random forests obtained with the `ranger` algorithm (Wright and Ziegler, 2017). The discrete super learner used 2-fold cross-validation to choose the best-fitting model. Throughout, we apply the Cheap Subsampling algorithm to obtain confidence intervals for the causal effect of adhering to the placebo regimen and the absolute 4-year risk of all-cause death. We compare our method with asymptotic confidence intervals that are based on an estimate of the efficient influence function (van der Laan and Gruber, 2012). We investigate the Monte Carlo error (effect of setting the random seed), the impact of the subsample size, and the number of bootstrap repetitions on the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval.

Figure 2 shows the effect of the number of bootstrap repetitions B on the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval. We observe that the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval is comparable to the asymptotic confidence interval and that a higher number of bootstrap repetitions results in a more stable confidence interval. It is seen that the Cheap Subsampling confidence intervals stabilize quickly and do not change significantly after 10 bootstrap replications.

Due to the random nature of the bootstrap, the bootstrap confidence intervals are affected by Monte Carlo error, i.e., they depend on the random seed set by the algorithm. This means that the confidence intervals will change when repeating the whole bootstrap procedure with a new random seed. In Figure 3, we illustrate this seed effect on the upper endpoint of the confidence interval for various subsample sizes and 10 repetitions of the whole Cheap Subsampling bootstrap algorithm. This shows that $B \geq 25$ seems sufficient for the seed effect to be negligible in our data example. We also see that in this example the Cheap Bootstrap confidence interval does not depend on the subsample size with sufficiently many bootstrap repetitions ($B \geq 25$).




Figure 2: Lower and upper endpoints (y-axis) of 95% Cheap Subsampling confidence intervals for the absolute risk of dying within 4 years for the placebo regimen in the LEADER trial using the LTMLE. The x-axis shows the number of bootstrap repetitions $B \in \{1, \dots, 200\}$ for the subsample size $m = \lfloor 0.8 \cdot 8652 \rfloor = 6850$. Additionally, the lower and upper endpoints of the asymptotic confidence interval is the black horizontal lines and the point estimate is the dotted line.

4 Simulation study

In this section, we simulate data to investigate the effects of sample size, subsample size, and the number of bootstrap repetitions on the coverage probability and the width of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval. We consider a survival setting with a binary treatment and a time-to-event outcome and apply the LTMLE algorithm for which we discretize time into 2 time intervals. In the simulation study, the target parameter is the absolute risk of an event within the end of the second time interval under sustained treatment. For details on the data-generating mechanism, the simulation study, and the **R** code, see the supplementary material (Appendix C) and https://github.com/jsohlendorff/cheap_




Figure 3: The upper endpoint of 95% Cheap Subsampling confidence interval based on the LTMLE of the absolute risk of dying within 4 years under the placebo regimen in the LEADER trial. The plot shows the Monte Carlo error (random seed effect) based on 10 runs of the Cheap Subsampling algorithm for each of the subsample sizes $m = \lfloor \eta \cdot 8652 \rfloor$ with $\eta \in \{0.5, 0.632, 0.8, 0.9\}$ and number of bootstrap repetitions $B \in \{5, 20, 100, 200\}$.

subsampling_simulation_study.

In our simulation study, we consider sample sizes $n \in \{250, 500, 1000, 2000, 8000\}$ and vary the subsample size $m = \lfloor \eta \cdot n \rfloor$ with $\eta \in \{0.5, 0.632, 0.8, 0.9\}$ and the number of bootstrap repetitions $B \in \{1, \dots, 500\}$. For each scenario, we repeat the whole procedure in 2000 simulated data sets. For the estimation of the nuisance parameters, we use (correctly specified) logistic regression models.

In each instance, we compute the empirical coverage of the confidence intervals and the average relative width of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval for the LTMLE when compared with the asymptotic confidence interval which is based on an estimate of the efficient influence function van der Laan and Gruber (2012). Additionally, we compare

our Cheap Subsampling confidence interval with the Cheap Bootstrap confidence interval (Lam, 2022). The results are summarized across the 2000 simulated data sets in Table 1 and Figure 4.




Figure 4: Results from the simulation study illustrating the coverage (y-axis) of three 95% confidence intervals for the absolute risk of an event before the end of the second time interval under sustained exposure using the LTMLE for $n = 2000$. The three confidence intervals are the asymptotic confidence interval, the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval ($m = \lfloor 0.632 \cdot 2000 \rfloor = 1264$), and the Cheap Bootstrap confidence interval (Lam, 2022). The x-axis shows the number of bootstrap repetitions $B \in \{1, \dots, 500\}$.

Figure 4 shows that the coverage is close to the nominal level for very low numbers of bootstrap repetitions and fixed subsample size $m = \lfloor 0.632 \cdot 2000 \rfloor = 1264$. This was guaranteed by Theorem 1 only in large samples. When we compare the coverage of the asymptotic confidence interval with the coverage of the Cheap Bootstrap confidence interval (Lam, 2022), we see that the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval has similar coverage, albeit with slightly worse coverage for very low numbers of bootstrap replications B . Table

1 shows no systematic effects on the coverage of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval for different subsample sizes in large sample sizes. However, the coverage appears to depend on the subsample size when the sample size is small.

For the widths in Table 1, we see that the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval is, in general, slightly wider than the asymptotic confidence intervals, but that increasing B results in narrower confidence intervals. A possible explanation for the wider Cheap Subsampling confidence intervals at low B is that the quantiles of the t -distribution are large for low degrees of freedom but quite comparable to the normal distribution for large degrees of freedom ($B \geq 25$). Similar results were obtained in the case study (Section 3) for small values of B . Moreover, the width of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval slightly decreases with increasing subsample size and sample size when compared to the asymptotic confidence interval, but this effect is less noticeable than the effect of the number of bootstrap repetitions.

Table 1: The table shows the coverage and relative widths compared to the asymptotic confidence interval of the 95% Cheap Subsampling confidence interval for the absolute risk of an event before the end of the second time interval under sustained exposure using the LTMLE for different subsample percentages η and sample sizes n and the number of bootstrap repetitions B .

B	n	Coverage (%)				Relative width (%)			
		Subsample proportion (η)				Subsample proportion (η)			
		50%	63.2%	80%	90%	50%	63.2%	80%	90%
5	250	94.8	93.2	92.9	93.7	131.0	127.5	127.5	127.2
	500	94.2	93.8	95.0	94.5	126.3	126.0	126.9	125.8
	1000	94.0	95.0	94.2	94.7	125.1	125.8	124.9	125.3
	2000	94.8	95.1	95.0	94.5	125.6	126.2	123.5	124.8
	8000	95.3	95.8	94.5	95.3	125.8	127.1	124.8	124.0
25	250	93.6	92.5	93.2	92.2	107.9	106.0	106.1	106.3
	500	94.2	93.8	94.3	95.1	105.8	104.9	104.8	104.1
	1000	94.5	95.2	94.2	94.3	104.3	104.8	104.5	104.1
	2000	94.2	95.0	95.3	95.0	104.9	105.2	104.2	104.3
	8000	94.7	95.3	95.3	94.5	104.2	104.8	104.0	103.6
100	250	93.8	92.7	93.2	92.5	104.8	103.5	103.2	103.0
	500	94.2	93.8	94.9	95.0	102.5	102.2	101.8	101.7
	1000	94.9	94.8	94.6	93.8	101.5	101.5	101.4	101.1
	2000	94.2	94.6	94.8	95.0	101.5	101.3	101.0	101.1
	8000	94.5	95.2	95.0	95.4	101.0	101.3	100.7	101.0
500	250	93.9	92.8	93.0	92.7	103.9	102.8	102.2	102.1
	500	93.8	93.8	94.7	95.1	101.7	101.3	101.1	101.0
	1000	94.8	94.8	94.5	94.0	100.8	100.7	100.6	100.5
	2000	94.0	94.5	94.8	95.0	100.6	100.5	100.3	100.3
	8000	94.6	94.9	95.0	94.7	100.2	100.3	100.2	100.2

5 Discussion

The Cheap Subsampling confidence interval is a valuable tool for applied research where computational efficiency is needed. We have shown that it provides asymptotically valid confidence intervals and investigated the real world and small sample performance for a target parameter in a semiparametric causal inference setting. The Cheap Subsampling confidence interval is easy to implement and can be applied to any asymptotically linear estimator. Theoretically, the method can be applied already with very few bootstrap repetitions. But, in our case study, the Monte Carlo error may not be regarded as negligible for $B < 25$. This is similar to the suggestion given by Efron (1987). This is likely due to $\frac{mn}{n-m}S^2$ being a Monte Carlo bootstrap estimator of the asymptotic variance.

Our empirical study shows that the coverage of the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval is more sensitive to the subsample sizes in small data sets. In these situations, we need to choose the subsample size carefully to ensure correct coverage. Politis et al. (1999) and Bickel and Sakov (2008) provide methods for adaptively selecting the subsample size. For example, one may want to conduct a Monte Carlo experiment by selecting from a list of subsample sizes m_1, \dots, m_K the one that gives the best apparent coverage. The most notable issue with these approaches is the computational burden. In future work, we will investigate the possibility of adapting these methods to choosing the subsample size in practice.

With large data sets, such as those found in electronic health records, there is also the possibility of using the Bag of Little Bootstraps (Kleiner et al., 2012) or the Cheap Bag of Little Bootstraps (Lam, 2022). The idea behind these methods is to avoid the tuning of the subsample size but to retain computational feasibility by estimating on smaller data sets. Another advantage over the Cheap Subsampling confidence interval is that the confidence intervals based on the Bag of Little Bootstraps are second-order accurate, likely resulting in narrower confidence intervals. Lam (2022) showed that the Cheap Bootstrap based on resampling yields confidence intervals that are second-order accurate. In future work, we will investigate if the Cheap Subsampling bootstrap confidence interval can be made second-order accurate, e.g., by using interpolation (Bertail, 1997) and extrapolation (Bertail and Politis, 2001). On the other hand, the Bag of Little Bootstraps sample with replacement and hence these methods suffer from the problem illustrated in Figure 1.

In our application of the Cheap Subsampling confidence intervals, we chose to study the finite-sample properties with the TMLE, but there are also other choices given by Tran et al. (2023); Coyle and van der Laan (2018). Both of these approaches provide valid confidence intervals for the TMLE that adequately deal with the issue with cross-validation. The method in Tran et al. (2023) also reduces the computation time for bootstrapping by only needing to estimate the nuisance parameters once in the entire sample. However, these approaches are specifically designed for the TMLE and may not be applicable to other estimators.

5.1 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Novo Nordisk for providing the data from the LEADER trial.

5.2 Funding

Partially funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Health and Digital Executive Agency (HADEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This work has received funding from the UK research and Innovation under contract number 101095556.

5.3 Conflicts of interest

None declared.

5.4 Data availability

Data sharing cannot be provided due to the proprietary nature of the data.

References

- Bertail, P. (1997). Second-order properties of an extrapolated bootstrap without replacement under weak assumptions. *Bernoulli* 3(2), 149 – 179.
- Bertail, P. and D. N. Politis (2001). Extrapolation of subsampling distribution estimators: The i.i.d. and strong mixing cases. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics / La Revue Canadienne de Statistique* 29(4), 667–680.
- Bickel, P. J., F. Götze, and W. R. van Zwet (1997). Resampling Fewer Than n Observations: Gains, Losses, and Remedies for Losses. *Statistica Sinica* 7(1), 1–31.
- Bickel, P. J., C. A. Klaassen, P. J. Bickel, Y. Ritov, J. Klaassen, J. A. Wellner, and Y. Ritov (1993). *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models*, Volume 4. Springer.
- Bickel, P. J. and A. Sakov (2008). On the choice of m in the m out of n bootstrap and confidence bounds for extrema. *Statistica Sinica*, 967–985.
- Chiu, Y.-H., L. Wen, S. McGrath, R. Logan, I. J. Dahabreh, and M. A. Hernán (2023). Evaluating model specification when using the parametric g -formula in the presence of censoring. *American journal of epidemiology* 192(11), 1887–1895.
- Coyle, J. and M. J. van der Laan (2018). *Targeted Bootstrap*, pp. 523–539. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Efron, B. (1987). Better bootstrap confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 82(397), 171–185.
- Hernán, M. A. and J. M. Robins (2016). Using big data to emulate a target trial when a randomized trial is not available. *American journal of epidemiology* 183(8), 758–764.
- Hernán, M. A. and J. M. Robins (2020). *Causal inference: What if*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC, FL.
- Kleiner, A., A. Talwalkar, P. Sarkar, and M. I. Jordan (2012). A scalable bootstrap for massive data.

- Lam, H. (2022, January). A Cheap Bootstrap Method for Fast Inference. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.00090v1>.
- Marso, S. P., G. H. Daniels, K. Brown-Frandsen, P. Kristensen, J. F. Mann, M. A. Nauck, S. E. Nissen, S. Pocock, N. R. Poulter, L. S. Ravn, W. M. Steinberg, M. Stockner, B. Zinman, R. M. Bergenstal, and J. B. Buse (2016). Liraglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine* 375(4), 311–322.
- Politis, D. N. and J. P. Romano (1994). Large Sample Confidence Regions Based on Subsamples under Minimal Assumptions. *The Annals of Statistics* 22(4), 2031 – 2050.
- Politis, D. N., J. P. Romano, and M. Wolf (1999). *Subsampling*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer.
- Shao, J. and C. F. J. Wu (1989). A General Theory for Jackknife Variance Estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 17(3), 1176 – 1197.
- Tay, J. K., B. Narasimhan, and T. Hastie (2023). Elastic net regularization paths for all generalized linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software* 106(1), 1–31.
- Tibshirani, R. J. and B. Efron (1993). An introduction to the bootstrap. *Monographs on statistics and applied probability* 57(1).
- Tran, L., M. Petersen, J. Schwab, and M. J. van der Laan (2023, January). Robust variance estimation and inference for causal effect estimation. *Journal of Causal Inference* 11(1).
- van der Laan, M. J., D. Benkeser, and W. Cai (2023). Efficient estimation of pathwise differentiable target parameters with the undersmoothed highly adaptive lasso. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* 19(1), 261–289.
- van der Laan, M. J. and S. Gruber (2012, May). Targeted Minimum Loss Based Estimation of Causal Effects of Multiple Time Point Interventions. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* 8(1).
- van der Laan, M. J., E. C. Polley, and A. E. Hubbard (2007). Super learner. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology* 6(1).
- van der Laan, M. J. and S. Rose (2018). *Targeted Learning in Data Science: Causal Inference for Complex Longitudinal Studies*. Springer Series in Statistics. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Wright, M. N. and A. Ziegler (2017). ranger: A fast implementation of random forests for high dimensional data in C++ and R. *Journal of Statistical Software* 77(1), 1–17.
- Wu, C. F. J. (1990). On the Asymptotic Properties of the Jackknife Histogram. *The Annals of Statistics* 18(3), 1438 – 1452.

6 Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 1

To prove the theorem, we use the notation and framework of Section 2.1. Since the estimator $\hat{\Psi}_n$ is asymptotically linear, Slutsky's theorem and the central limit theorem yield

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)) \xrightarrow{d} Z \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

where $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}_P[\phi_P(O)^2] > 0$. Theorem 2 (iii) of Wu (1990) gives that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| P \left(\sqrt{\frac{mn}{n-m}} (\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \leq x | \mathcal{D}_n \right) - \Phi_{\sigma^2}(x) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

if $\frac{n-m}{n} > \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By our assumption on the subsample size, we have $\frac{m}{n} \leq c$ for some $0 < c < 1$, and thus $\frac{n-m}{n} = 1 - \frac{m}{n} \geq \lambda := 1 - c > 0$. This implies

$$P \left(\sqrt{\frac{mn}{n-m}} (\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \leq x | \mathcal{D}_n \right) \xrightarrow{P} \Phi_{\sigma^2}(x),$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, where Φ_{σ^2} is the cumulative distribution function of a Normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . The remainder of the proof follows along the steps of the proof of Theorem 1 in Lam (2022). Let $k_{(m,n)} = \frac{mn}{n-m}$. We want to show that

$$(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)), \sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,1)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n), \dots, \sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,B)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)) \xrightarrow{d} (Z_0, \dots, Z_B), \quad (2)$$

where Z_0, \dots, Z_B are independent and identically distributed with $Z_b \stackrel{d}{=} Z$. By conditioning on \mathcal{D}_n and using conditional independence of $\sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)$, $b = 1, \dots, B$ (bootstrap samples are drawn independently given the data), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P \left(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)) \leq z_0, \sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,1)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \leq z_1, \dots, \sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,B)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \leq z_B \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \prod_{b=0}^B \Phi_{\sigma^2}(z_b) \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[I \left(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)) \leq z_0 \right) \left| \prod_{b=1}^B P \left(\sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \leq z_b | \mathcal{D}_n \right) - \prod_{b=1}^B \Phi_{\sigma^2}(z_b) \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$+ \left| \prod_{b=1}^B \Phi_{\sigma^2}(z_b) \left[P \left(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)) \leq z_0 \right) - \Phi_{\sigma^2}(z_0) \right] \right|, \quad (4)$$

for any $z = (z_0, \dots, z_B) \in \mathbb{R}^{B+1}$. Since, by assumption, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)) \xrightarrow{d} Z$, the term in equation (4) converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since also $P(\sqrt{k_{(m,n)}}(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \leq z_b | \mathcal{D}_n) \xrightarrow{P} \Phi_{\sigma^2}(z_b)$ for $b = 1, \dots, B$ and all $z \in \mathbb{R}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that the integrand of the term (3) converges to zero in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since the integrand in the term (3) is bounded by 1, it follows from dominated convergence that (3) tends to zero. Thus (2) holds. From

this result, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{(m,n)} &= \frac{\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P)}{\sqrt{\frac{m}{n-m}}S} = \frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P))}{\sqrt{k(m,n)}S} = \frac{\frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Psi}_n - \Psi(P))}{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left(\frac{\sqrt{k(m,n)}}{\sigma} (\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n) \right)^2}} \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \frac{\tilde{Z}_0}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \tilde{Z}_b^2}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{Z}_b = Z_b/\sigma \stackrel{d}{=} N(0, 1)$. Note that by the independence of the \tilde{Z}_b 's and the fact that $\tilde{Z}_b \stackrel{d}{=} N(0, 1)$, we have that $\frac{\tilde{Z}_0}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \tilde{Z}_b^2}}$ has a t -distribution with B degrees of freedom. This shows that $T_{(m,n)}$ converges in distribution to a t -distribution with B degrees of freedom, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we have

$$P(\Psi(P) \in \mathcal{I}_{(m,n,B)}) = P(-t_{B,1-\alpha/2} < T_{(m,n)} < t_{B,1-\alpha/2}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

7 Appendix B: Proof of Theorem 2

To prove the theorem, we shall argue that $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^4] < \infty$. An application of Chebyshev's inequality for conditional expectations then provides the means to show the statement of the theorem.

Since $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Psi}_n^4] < \infty$, the binomial theorem gives

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^4] = \sum_{i=0}^4 \binom{4}{i} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Psi}_n^{4-i} (\hat{\Psi}_m^*)^i].$$

Applying Hölder's inequality with $p = 4/i$ and $q = 4/(4-i)$, we have $|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Psi}_n^{4-i} \hat{\Psi}_m^{*,i}]| \leq (\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Psi}_n^4])^{1/p} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^*)^4]^{1/q} = (\mathbb{E}[\hat{\Psi}_n^4])^{1/p} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^*)^4]^{1/q}$, where the latter equality follows from the fact that the subsample has marginally the same distribution as a full sample of m observations. Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n] = \operatorname{argmin}_g \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 - g(\mathcal{D}_n)]^2$, where the minimum is taken over all \mathcal{D}_n -measurable functions g , we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left((\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n] \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^4 \right] < \infty. \quad (5)$$

By using that conditionally on \mathcal{D}_n , the random variables $\hat{\Psi}_{(m,1)}^*, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_{(m,B)}^*$ are independent, we have by Chebyshev's inequality for conditional expectations, for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, that

$$P \left(\left| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n] \right| \geq \varepsilon \middle| \mathcal{D}_n \right) \leq \frac{1}{B^2 \varepsilon^2} \sum_{b=1}^B \operatorname{Var}[(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)}^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n].$$

Taking the expectation on both sides of the previous display, we have

$$P \left(\left| \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)} - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n] \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{B\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E}[\text{Var}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n]] \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{1}{B\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left((\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n] \right)^2 \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right] \right] = \frac{1}{B\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2 | \mathcal{D}_n] \right)^2 \right] \quad (7)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{B\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{\Psi}_m^* - \hat{\Psi}_n)^4 \right]. \quad (8)$$

where (6) follows since $(\hat{\Psi}_{(m,b)} - \hat{\Psi}_n)^2, b = 1, \dots, B$ are identically distributed and expectations are linear, (7) follows from the tower property of conditional expectations, and (8) follows by (5). Taking the limit as $B \rightarrow \infty$ concludes the proof.

8 Appendix C: Data-generating mechanism

In this section, we describe the data-generating mechanism for our simulation study (Section 4). See https://github.com/jsohlendorff/cheap_subsampling_simulation_study for the **R** code. We denote by Y_t the outcome, where $Y_t = 1$ if an event has occurred at time t and $Y_t = 0$ otherwise. We also denote the treatment by A_t (1 is treated and 0 is untreated), the time-varying confounders by W_t (continuous), and the censoring indicators by C_t (1 is uncensored and 0 is censored). We generate the data at baseline ($t = 0$) and at two time points ($t = 1$ and $t = 2$) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ A_0 &\sim \text{Bern}(\text{expit}(-0.2 + 0.4W_0)), \\ C_1 &\sim \text{Bern}(\text{expit}(3.5 + W_0)), \\ Y_1 &\sim \begin{cases} \text{Bern}(\text{expit}(-1.4 + 0.1W_0 - 1.5A_0)), & \text{if } C_1 = 1 \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } C_1 = 0, \end{cases} \\ W_1 &\sim \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(0.5W_0 + 0.2A_0, 1), & \text{if } C_1 = 1 \text{ and } Y_1 = 0 \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ A_1 &\sim \begin{cases} \text{Bern}(\text{expit}(-0.4W_0 + 0.8A_0)), & \text{if } C_1 = 1 \text{ and } Y_1 = 0 \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ C_2 &\sim \begin{cases} \text{Bern}(\text{expit}(3.5 + W_1)), & \text{if } C_1 = 1 \text{ and } Y_1 = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } C_1 = 0 \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ Y_2 &\sim \begin{cases} \text{Bern}(\text{expit}(-1.4 + 0.1W_1 - 1.5A_1)), & \text{if } C_2 = 1 \text{ and } Y_1 = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } C_2 = 1 \text{ and } Y_1 = 1 \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } C_2 = 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{expit}(x) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(-x)}$ is the logistic function, $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ is the normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 , $\text{Bern}(p)$ is the Bernoulli distribution with probability p , and \emptyset is the missingness indicator.