Augmented two-step estimating equations with nuisance functionals and complex survey data

PUYING ZHAO[†] AND CHANGBAO WU[‡]

[†] *Yunnan University, Kunming, 650091, China.*
E-mail: pyzhao@live.cn
[‡] *University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, N2L3G1, Canada.*
E-mail: cbwu@uwaterloo.ca

Summary Statistical inference in the presence of nuisance functionals with complex survey data is an important topic in social and economic studies. The Gini index, Lorenz curves and quantile shares are among the commonly encountered examples. The nuisance functionals are usually handled by a plug-in nonparametric estimator and the main inferential procedure can be carried out through a two-step generalized empirical likelihood method. Unfortunately, the resulting inference is not efficient and the nonparametric version of the Wilks' theorem breaks down even under simple random sampling. We propose an augmented estimating equations method with nuisance functionals and complex surveys. The second-step augmented estimating functions obey the Neyman orthogonality condition and automatically handle the impact of the first-step plug-in estimator, and the resulting estimator of the main parameters of interest is invariant to the first step method. More importantly, the generalized empirical likelihood based Wilks' theorem holds for the main parameters of interest under the design-based framework for commonly used survey designs, and the maximum generalized empirical likelihood estimators achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound. Performances of the proposed methods are demonstrated through simulation studies and an application using the dataset from the New York City Social Indicators Survey.

Keywords: *Complex survey design, design-based inference, generalized empirical likelihood, non-smooth estimating functions, semiparametric efficiency bound, semiparametric estimation, Wilks' theorem.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the era of big data, survey sampling remains one of the most important data collection vehicles for many fields of scientific investigations. Population health research, social and economic studies such as inequality measures and other policy related issues focus on a particular finite population, and design-based framework with complex survey data is well suited for the inferential problems. Regression analysis and estimating equations with survey data have become a standard tool for statistical inference (Wu and Thompson, 2020). Empirical likelihood (EL), first proposed by Owen (1988) for independent samples, has been adapted successfully for survey data analysis through the pseudo EL approach (Chen and Sitter, 1999; Wu and Rao, 2006). Zhong and Rao (2000) studied EL inferences on population mean under stratified sampling. Finite population parameters defined through the so-called census estimating equations and the related inferential procedures have been discussed by Chen and Kim (2014) and Zhao et al. (2022) through the sample EL approach as well as the pseudo EL approach (Zhao and Wu,

2019). For parameters defined through U-statistics, jackknife EL can be used to reduce the computational complexities (Chen and Tabri, 2021).

Nuisance parameters of a finite dimension are typically handled through profiling; see, for instance, Berger and Torres (2016), Oguz-Alper and Berger (2016), Zhao *et al.* (2022), among others. Statistical inferences in the presence of nuisance functionals, i.e., nuisance parameters with infinite dimension, are an important problem, especially in social and economic studies. The most commonly used strategy is to use a two-step procedure where a consistent nonparametric estimator for the nuisance functional is constructed first and then used in the second step as a plug-in estimator for inferences on the main parameters of interest. Zhao et al. (2020) is among the first to discuss the design-based two-step EL method and the generalized method of moments (GMM) method for complex survey data in the presence of nuisance functionals. The two-step survey weighted estimating equations (SWEE) approach discussed by Zhao et al. (2020), however, has two major limitations. First, the maximum EL or GMM estimators are sensitive to the plug-in estimator for the nuisance functional and do not achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound. Second, the two-step EL ratio statistic does not lead to the nonparametric version of the Wilks' theorem even for simple random sampling. Applications of the results require tedious evaluation of the limiting distributions and design-based variance estimation and therefore are very difficult. There has been a well developed statistical and econometric literature with non-survey data on semiparametric efficiency bounds and Wilks' theorem for semiparametric models; see, for instance, Newey (1990), Chen et al. (2008), Cattaneo (2010), Ackerberg et al. (2014), Frazier and Renault (2017), Chernozhukov et al. (2018), Bravo et al. (2020), Matsushita and Otsu (2020), Chernozhukov et al. (2022), among others. Unfortunately, these model-based efficient analytical procedures do not apply directly to complex survey data for design-based inference on finite population parameters.

This article presents an augmented two-step survey weighted estimating equations approach with nuisance functionals and complex survey data. The proposed methods are formulated through the generalized empirical likelihood (GEL, Newey and Smith, 2004; Parente and Smith, 2011) and represent a major advance over the usual two-step SWEE approach as discussed in Zhao et al. (2020). The GEL methods cover a large class of estimators as special cases, including the EL estimators (Owen 1988; Qin and Lawless 1994; Chen and Sitter 1999; and Zhao et al., 2022), the continuous updating estimators (CU, Hansen et al., 1996), and the exponential tilting estimators (ET, Kitamura and Stutzer, 1997; and Imbens et al., 1998). Under our proposed methods, the second-step augmented estimating functions obey the Neyman orthogonality condition (Chernozhukov et al., 2018) and automatically handle the impact of the first-step plug-in estimator, and the resulting estimators of the main parameters of interest are invariant to the first step method for the plug-in estimator for the nuisance functional. Our methods are bias-corrected for the main parameters of interest in the sense that the nonparametric Wilks' theorem with standard chi-square limiting distributions holds under commonly used survey designs, and the maximum GEL estimators achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound. Our results are established under the design-based framework for complex survey data, and our setting is very general, allowing the estimation equations system to be over-identified, the estimating functions to be nonsmooth and the plug-in estimator of the nuisance functional to be slower than root-n-consistent. In other words, our results allow the nuisance functional to be estimated through any consistent nonparametric procedures in the first step, including the non-parametric series-based method (Newey,

1994b; Chen, 2007). These features have theoretical and practical importance since the estimating equations under study can be semiparametric and encompass a large class of econometric and statistical models.

Our proposed methods have immediate applications to inequality measures widely used in social and economic studies. Popular income inequality measures, such as the Lorenz curve, income shares and the Gini index, all involve nuisance functionals. The measurement and analysis of income inequality have been well documented in econometric literature; see, for instance, Atkinson (1970), Beach and Davidson (1983), Davidson and Duclos (2000), among others. Income data are usually collected through complex surveys. Design-based approach to estimation and inference for income inequality measures with the focus on a particular finite population has been addressed by several authors; see, for instance, Nygård and Sandström (1989), Zheng (2002), Bhattacharya (2007), Goga and Ruiz-Gazen (2014), Zhao et al. (2020), among others. Our proposed augmented two-step SWEE approach provides a powerful inference tool for this important topic in statistics and econometrics.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first describe basic setup and the conventional two-step method of Zhao et al. (2020), and then present our proposed augmented two-step method with the GEL approach. In Section 3, we examine the theoretical properties of the proposed point estimators and general hypothesis test problems. In Section 4, we discuss general procedures with illustrating examples on the construction of the augmentation terms. Complex survey designs and asymptotic variance estimation are discussed in Section 5. Results from simulation studies are reported in Section 6, and an application to income share using the New York City Social Indicators Survey data is presented in Section 7. Some concluding remarks are given in Section 8. Technical details and proofs of the main theoretical results are presented in Appendices A and B.

2. PROPOSED METHODS

2.1. Preliminaries

Consider a survey population $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{N}} = \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with N labelled units. Let $Z \in \mathsf{R}^{d_z}$ be a d_z-dimensional vector of variables, and let Z_i be the value of Z associated with the ith unit. Denote by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}} = (Z_1, \cdots, Z_{\mathrm{N}})$ the full set of vectors for the finite population. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of n sampled units selected from $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{N}}$ by a probability survey design. For asymptotic development, we assume there is a sequence of finite populations and a sequence of survey samples which allow n and N go to infinity; see Fuller (2009) for further details. The sample size n could be a random number under certain sampling designs. Let $\pi_i = \Pr(i \in \mathcal{S})$ and $\pi_{ij} = \Pr(i, j \in \mathcal{S})$ be the first and second order inclusion probabilities. A detailed discussion on the probability space induced by the survey design is given in Section 4.1.

Let $\Theta \subseteq \mathsf{R}^p$ be the parameter space and assume it is a compact set. Let Ψ be the space for the nuisance functional and assume it is a linear subspace of the space of square integrable functions with respect to Z. Consider a vector of r real-valued functions $g(Z, \theta, \varphi)$ with a known form up to the unknown parameters of interest $\theta \in \Theta$ and the

nuisance functional $\varphi \in \Psi$. The main assumption on $\mathcal{F}_\mathrm{N}$ is that for some $\theta_\mathrm{N} \in \Theta$,

$$U_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N}, \varphi_\mathrm{N}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} g(Z_i, \theta_\mathrm{N}, \varphi_\mathrm{N}) = 0, \qquad (2.1)$$

where $\varphi_\mathrm{N} = \varphi_\mathrm{N}(\cdot, \theta_\mathrm{N}) \in \Psi$ is the true value of the nuisance functional with the given finite population. We assume that the census estimating equations (2.1) may be an over-identified system in the sense that $r \geq p$, and that the estimating functions $g(Z, \theta, \varphi)$ can be non-smooth in θ and/or φ. As in Chen et al. (2003) and Zhao et al. (2020), the nuisance functional $\varphi \in \Psi$ is allowed to depend on the parameters θ and the population data on Z. For ease of presentation, we use the notation $(\theta, \varphi) \equiv (\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta))$, $(\theta, \varphi_\mathrm{N}) \equiv (\theta, \varphi_\mathrm{N}(\cdot, \theta))$, and $(\theta_\mathrm{N}, \varphi_\mathrm{N}) \equiv (\theta_\mathrm{N}, \varphi_\mathrm{N}(\cdot, \theta_\mathrm{N}))$.

The empirical likelihood (EL) of Owen (1988) is a popular tool for effectively combining available auxiliary information and parameters of interest through a system of estimating equations (Qin and Lawless, 1994). Assume that we have at hand a suitable "plug-in" estimator $\hat{\varphi}$ for φ_N. Let $(p_1, \cdots, p_n)$ be the discrete probability measure assigned to the sampled units in $\mathcal{S}$. For any $\theta \in \Theta$ and the given $\hat{\varphi}$, the two-step survey-weighted EL ratio statistic is defined as (Zhao et al., 2020)

$$L_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}) = \sup \left\{ \prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (np_i) \; \middle| \; p_i \geq 0, \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} p_i = 1, \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} p_i \left[\pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi}) \right] = 0 \right\}.$$

Note that the survey weights π_i^{-1} are part of the parameter constraints. Using the standard Lagrange multiplier method, we can rewrite the EL ratio statistic as $L_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \lambda, \hat{\varphi}) = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \{1 + \lambda^\top \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi})\}^{-1}$, where the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda = \lambda(\theta, \hat{\varphi})$ is the solution to $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi}) \{1 + \lambda^\top \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi})\}^{-1} = 0$ with the given θ and $\hat{\varphi}$. The two-step maximum EL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{EL}$ for θ_N is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_{EL} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\lambda \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, g}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} l_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \lambda, \hat{\varphi}),$$

where $l_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \lambda, \varphi) = -\log L_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \lambda, \varphi)$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, g}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}) = \{\lambda : \lambda^\top \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi}) > -1, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$ for the given θ and $\hat{\varphi}$. The estimator $\hat{\theta}_{EL}$ is also called the maximum sample EL estimator by Zhao et al. (2020).

Suppose that Ψ is a vector space of functions endowed with the sup-norm metric $\|\varphi\|_\Psi = \sup_\theta \|\varphi(\cdot, \theta)\|_\infty = \sup_\theta \sup_z |\varphi(z, \theta)|$. Define $\Theta(\delta) = \{\theta : \theta \in \Theta, \|\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N}\| \leq \delta\}$ and $\Psi(\delta) = \{\varphi : \varphi \in \Psi, \|\varphi - \varphi_\mathrm{N}\|_\Psi \leq \delta\}$. Throughout the paper, we denote $E(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathrm{N})$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathrm{N})$ to be the expectation and variance with respect to the design probability space, which will be discussed in detail in Section 4.1. Let $n_B = E(n \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathrm{N})$ be the expected sample size under the sampling design. Let $\|A\| = \{\mathrm{trace}(A^\top A)\}^{1/2}$ and $A^{\otimes 2} = AA^\top$ for any matrix or vector A. We use $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}$ to denote convergence in distribution.

The asymptotic properties of $\hat{\theta}_{EL}$ under the design-based framework were investigated by Zhao et al. (2020) under the regularity conditions presented in Appendix A. In particular, Condition A2 states that there exists vector-valued functions $U(\theta, \varphi)$ such that $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi(\delta_\mathrm{N})} \|U_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \varphi) - U(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$ with $\delta_\mathrm{N} = o(1)$; Condition A4 indicates that for any $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta(\delta) \times \Psi(\delta)$, the ordinary derivative $\Gamma_1(\theta, \varphi)$ in θ of the limiting functions $U(\theta, \varphi)$ exists and satisfies $\Gamma_1(\theta, \varphi)(\bar{\theta} - \theta) = \lim_{t \to 0} [U(\theta + t(\bar{\theta} - \theta), \varphi(\cdot, \theta + t(\bar{\theta} - \theta))) - U(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta))]/t$ for $\bar{\theta} \in \Theta$; and Condition A5 requires that for any $\theta \in \Theta(\delta)$, the limiting function $U(\theta, \varphi)$ is pathwise differentiable at $\varphi \in \Psi(\delta)$ in the direction $[\bar{\varphi} - \varphi]$ in the sense

that the limit $D(\theta, \varphi)[\bar{\varphi} - \varphi] = \lim_{t \to 0}[U(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta) + t(\bar{\varphi}(\cdot, \theta) - \varphi(\cdot, \theta))) - U(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta))]/t$ exists for $\{\varphi + t(\bar{\varphi} - \varphi) : t \in [0, 1]\} \subset \Psi$. Moreover, Condition A6 specifies that the pathwise derivative $D(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_{\text{N}}]$ is of the following form:

$$D(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_{\text{N}}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}), \tag{2.2}$$

where $\Xi(Z, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})$ has finite fourth population moments and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})$ is asymptotically normally distributed with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix at the order $O(n_B^{-1} N^2)$. The following results were established by Zhao et al. (2020).

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Under the regularity conditions A1–A8 specified in Appendix A and as $N \to \infty$,*

(a) *$n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{EL} - \theta_N) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, V_1)$, where $V_1 = \Sigma_1 \Gamma_1^{\top} W_1^{-1} \Omega W_1^{-1} \Gamma_1 \Sigma_1$, $\Sigma_1 = (\Gamma_1^{\top} W_1^{-1} \Gamma_1)^{-1}$, $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_1(\theta_N, \varphi_N)$, $\Omega = (n_B/N^2) \text{Var}\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1}[g(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N) + \Xi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)] \mid \mathcal{F}_N\}$, and $W_1 = (n_B/N^2) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}$.*

(b) *$-2 \log L_N(\theta_N, \hat{\varphi}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \delta_1 \chi_1^2 + \cdots + \delta_r \chi_r^2$, where the χ_j^2's are independent χ^2 random variables with one degree of freedom and the weights δ_j are the eigenvalues of $W_1^{-1} \Omega$.*

Proposition 2.1 shows that for complex survey data the Wilks' theorem breaks down with the two-step EL approach even under simple random sampling. When using the two-step EL ratio statistic $-2 \log L_n(\theta, \hat{\varphi})$ to construct confidence regions or conduct hypothesis tests on θ_{N}, one needs to approximate the distribution of a weighted χ^2 random variable, and finding the weights δ_j requires estimation of the matrix W_1 and the design-based variance-covariance matrix Ω. The last component is especially cumbersome for complex surveys. A bootstrap calibration procedure could be an option but the method is computationally intensive and theoretical justifications are not available for general survey designs. Moreover, inferences based on the two-step EL approach do not use information on the main parameters and on the nuisance functionals simultaneously and therefore are not efficient, which motivates the research presented in the current paper. For an in-depth discussion on weighted chi-squared statistic, see Rao and Scott (1981).

2.2. An augmented survey weighted estimating equations approach

2.2.1. Neyman orthogonal score We first investigate the key condition for restoring Wilks' phenomenon in two-step survey weighted EL inferences. We refer to $\pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)$ defined in (2.2) as the first step survey weighted influence function (FSSWIF). It follows from the arguments of Zhao et al. (2020) that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \hat{\varphi}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \{g(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + \Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})\} + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}). \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore, we conclude from (2.3) and the arguments of Zhao et al. (2020) that the two-step survey weighted EL ratio statistic satisfies a nonparametric version of Wilks' theorem if the FSSWIF at $(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})$ is zero, or equivalently $\Xi(Z, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) = 0$. This motivates us to propose an augmented survey weighted estimating equations approach to mitigate the impact of the plug-in estimator $\hat{\varphi}$ of the nuisance functional in the usual two-step survey weighted estimating equations through an ingenious augmentation term for the main

estimating functions. Motivated by Chernozhukov et al. (2018) and Chernozhukov et al. (2022), we define the augmented estimating functions as,

$$\psi(Z, \theta, \varphi) = g(Z, \theta, \varphi) + \Xi(Z, \theta, \varphi). \tag{2.4}$$

With the given finite population $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}} = (Z_1, \cdots, Z_{\mathrm{N}})$, we define the following augmented population (census) estimating functions

$$\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi). \tag{2.5}$$

It follows from the original population estimating equations given in (2.1) and Condition A3(ii) above that $\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = 0$ has a unique root at $(\theta, \varphi) = (\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$.

We analogously impose some conditions on the augmented population estimating functions: (i) there exists real-valued functions $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ such that $\sup_{(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})} \|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$ for all sequences of positive numbers $\{\delta_{\mathrm{N}}\}$ with $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$; (ii) for any $\theta \in \Theta(\delta)$, the limiting function $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ is pathwise differentiable at $\varphi \in \Psi(\delta)$ in the direction $[\bar{\varphi} - \varphi]$ in the sense that $\mathbb{D}(\theta, \varphi)[\bar{\varphi} - \varphi] = \lim_{t \to 0}[\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta) + t(\bar{\varphi}(\cdot, \theta) - \varphi(\cdot, \theta))) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta))]/t$ exists for $\{\varphi + t(\bar{\varphi} - \varphi) : t \in [0, 1]\} \subset \Psi$. The augmented population estimating functions has the orthogonality property in the sense that

$$\mathbb{D}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})[\varphi - \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}] = 0, \ \text{ for all } \ \varphi \in \Psi. \tag{2.6}$$

Given the set of sampled units $\mathcal{S}$ and the set of survey weights $\{\pi_i^{-1}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$, the augmented survey weighted estimating functions are defined as

$$\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi). \tag{2.7}$$

It is clear that $E\{\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}}\} = \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi)$ for any $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi$. The orthogonality property in (2.6) implies that, modulo some regularity conditions, the following invariance property holds:

$$\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \hat{\varphi}) = \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}). \tag{2.8}$$

In this sense, the augmented estimating functions defined in (2.4) are also referred to as Neyman orthogonal score (Chernozhukov et al., 2018; Chernozhukov et al., 2022).

2.2.2. Generalized empirical likelihood   For scenarios where $r = p$, a design-based estimator of θ_{N} may be obtained by solving $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}) = 0$. The resulting estimator for θ_{N} is bias-corrected due to the invariance property (2.8). In other words, the estimation of the nuisance functional has no impact asymptotically on the estimation of the main parameters of interest. Note that the discussions of Binder (1983) and Godambe and Thompson (1986) on survey weighted estimating equations based inferences do not apply to the augmented estimating equations proposed here.

For general cases where $r \geq p$, we consider the generalized empirical likelihood (GEL) approach. GEL has a well-know dual representation that facilitates computations and analysis of higher-order properties (Newey and Smith, 2004). Let $\rho(v)$ be a concave function of the scalar $v \in \mathcal{V}$ (an open interval containing zero); let $\rho_j(v) = \partial^j \rho(v)/\partial v^j$ and $\rho_j = \rho_j(0)$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Following Newey and Smith (2004), we impose a normalization constraint on $\rho(v)$ such that $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = -1$. Define the re-centred GEL

objective function as

$$\hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \varphi) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \rho\left(\eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\right) - \rho_0 \right\},$$

where η is an r-vector of "pseudo parameters" related to the Lagrange multipliers.

Given the first step plug-in estimator $\hat{\varphi}$ for the nuisance functional φ_{N}, a class of augmented design-based two-step GEL estimators for θ_{N} can be defined as the solution to the following saddle-point problem

$$\hat{\theta}_{GEL} = \arg\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N}, \psi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}), \qquad (2.9)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N}, \psi}(\theta, \varphi) = \{\eta : \eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$. For nonsmooth estimating functions, the augmented design-based two-step GEL estimators $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ are no longer required to be defined by (2.9) but satisfy

$$\hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \leq \arg\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N}, \psi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) + o_p(1),$$

where $\hat{\eta}_{GEL} = \eta(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$ and $\eta(\theta, \varphi) = \arg\max_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N}, \psi}(\theta, \varphi)} \hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \varphi)$. Specific choices of the function $\rho(\cdot)$ for the GEL estimators lead to specific types of estimators. The EL estimator is obtained by taking $\rho(v) = \log(1 - v)$ and $\mathcal{V} = (-\infty, 1)$; the ET estimator is constructed by setting $\rho(v) = -\exp(v)$. The CU estimator is defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_{CUE} = \arg\min_{\theta} n_B \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})^\top \left\{ \hat{W}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}) \right\}^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}),$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \varphi)$ is defined in (2.7) and $\hat{W}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = n_B N^{-2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)^{\otimes 2}$. Using the arguments of Newey and Smith (2004), we can show that $\hat{\theta}_{CUE} = \hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ if $\rho(\cdot)$ is quadratic. A dual representation to the augmented design-based two-step GEL estimators is described in detail in supplementary material.

Let $\tilde{\theta}$ be an initial design-consistent estimator for θ_{N}. Then the augmented design-based two-step GMM estimator of θ_{N} is obtained as

$$\hat{\theta}_{GMM} = \arg\min_{\theta} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})^\top \left\{ \hat{W}_{\text{N}}(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\varphi}) \right\}^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}).$$

Detailed discussion on the regular design-based two-step GMM estimator can be found in Zhao et al. (2020).

The maximum GEL-based estimators for the empirical probabilities $(p_1, \cdots, p_n)$ are given by

$$\hat{p}_i = \frac{\rho_1\left(\hat{\eta}_{GEL}^\top \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\right)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_1\left(\hat{\eta}_{GEL}^\top \pi_j^{-1} \psi(Z_j, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\right)}, \quad i \in \mathcal{S}, \qquad (2.10)$$

which satisfy the sample moment condition $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{p}_i \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) = 0$.

The invariance property (2.8), together with some regularity conditions, imply that $n_B^{1/2} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \hat{\varphi}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, \Omega)$, where $\Omega = (n_B/N^2)\text{Var}\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1}[g(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + \Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})] \mid \mathcal{F}_{\text{N}}\}$. Under single-stage PPS sampling with replacement or single-stage PPS sampling without replacement with negligible sampling fractions, we have that $\Omega = W_2$, where $W_2 = (n_B/N^2) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})^{\otimes 2}$. This, coupled with the fact $\|\hat{W}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \hat{\varphi}) - W_2\| = $

$o_p(1)$, intuitively implies that the Wilks' phenomenon is restored in the augmented design-based two-step GEL inferences. More details can be found in Sections 3 and 4.2.

3. MAIN RESULTS

We now present the main results on the proposed methods. We first present theorems regarding the consistency and efficiency of the augmented design-based two-step GEL estimators $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$. We then discuss the construction of confidence regions and general hypothesis testing problems on θ_N based on the GEL ratio statistic. The following regularity conditions are used for the establishment of the main results.

B1. There exists real-valued functions $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ such that $\sup_{(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi(\delta_N)} \|\mathbb{U}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$ for all sequences of positive numbers $\{\delta_N\}$ with $\delta_N = o(1)$, and $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ satisfies the following conditions:

   (i) The ordinary derivative $\Gamma_2(\theta, \varphi)$ of $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ with respect to θ exists for $\theta \in \Theta(\delta)$, and is continuous at $\theta = \theta_N$; the matrix $\Gamma_2(\theta, \varphi)$ has full column rank p;
   (ii) There exists a unique $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ such that $\mathbb{U}(\theta_0, \varphi_0) = 0$, where $\varphi_0 = \varphi_0(\cdot, \theta_0) \in \Psi$;
   (iii) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ is continuous (with respect to the metric $\|\cdot\|_\Psi$) in φ at $\varphi = \varphi_0$.

B2. The augmented estimating functions $\psi(Z, \theta, \varphi)$ defined in (2.4) satisfy the following conditions:

   (i) $\max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi} \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(n_B^{1/\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 2$;
   (ii) For any sequence $c_N = O(N^{-\kappa})$ with $\kappa \in (1/4, 1/2]$,

$$\sup_{(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi) - \psi(Z_i, \theta + c_N, \varphi + c_N)\| = O(|c_N|).$$

B3. (i) For any sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_N\}$ with $\delta_N = o(1)$,

$$\sup_{(\theta, \varphi), (\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta_N) \times \Psi(\delta_N)} \|\mathbb{U}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi) - [\mathbb{U}_N(\theta', \varphi') - \mathbb{U}(\theta', \varphi')]\| = o(N^{-1/2});$$

   (ii) For all $\delta > 0$ and some positive constant c,

$$\sup_{(\theta, \varphi), (\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta) \times \Psi(\delta)} \mathrm{Var}\left\{ [\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta', \varphi')] \mid \mathcal{F}_N \right\} \leq c n_B^{-1} |\delta|.$$

B4. For all $(\theta, \varphi), (\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta_N) \times \Psi(\delta_N)$ with $\delta_N = o(1)$, $\|\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi')\| \leq c\|\varphi - \varphi'\|_\Psi^2$ for some constant $c \geq 0$.

Condition B1 states that the limiting function of the augmented population estimating equations $\mathbb{U}_N(\theta, \varphi)$ defined in (2.5) exists with certain smoothness properties. Condition B2(i) is commonly adopted in the literature on EL inference with estimating equations, while condition B2(ii) gives a bound on the variation of the estimating functions. Condition B3(i) restricts the class of moment functions under study by requiring that the empirical process $\{\mathbb{U}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi) : \theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi\}$ is asymptotically stochastically equicontinuous, which can easily be verified under the model-based framework. Condition B3(ii) is on the correlation between two Horvitz-Thompson estimators at two close points of (θ, φ). As discussed in the proof of Theorem 3.2 below, Condition B4 is key to guaranteeing the invariance property (2.8). Moreover, if the orthogonality equation (2.6) holds,

then $\|\mathbb{U}(\theta_N, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi_N) - \mathbb{D}(\theta_N, \varphi_N)[\varphi - \varphi_N]\| = \|\mathbb{U}(\theta_N, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_N, \varphi_N)\| \leq c\|\varphi - \varphi'\|_\Psi^2$, which is a commonly used condition in the literatures of two-step semiparametric inferences, see, e.g., Chen et al. (2003) and Chen (2007). Condition B4, together with condition A6 presented in Appendix A, imply that the first step plug-in estimator $\hat{\varphi}$ can attain rate of convergence that are faster than $n_B^{-1/4}$.

3.1. Consistency and efficiency

We first study the design consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed augmented design-based two-step GEL estimators. The main results are presented in the following two theorems. Regularity conditions A1–A8 were used by Zhao et al. (2020) and are listed in Appendix A.

THEOREM 3.1. *Suppose that $\hat{\varphi} = \varphi_N + o_p(1)$, and that conditions A1, A7–A8, B1–B2 hold. Then the proposed augmented design-based two-step GEL estimator is design-consistent for θ_N in the sense that $\lim_{N\to\infty} \Pr\{\|\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_N\| > \epsilon \mid \mathcal{F}_N\} = 0$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.*

THEOREM 3.2. *Suppose that conditions A1, A6–A8, B1 and B3–B4 hold, and that $\hat{\theta}_{GEL} = \theta_N + o_p(1)$. Then, as $N \to \infty$,*

$$n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_N) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, V_2),$$

where $V_2 = \Sigma_2 \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Omega W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2 \Sigma_2$, $\Sigma_2 = (\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2)^{-1}$, $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_2(\theta_N, \varphi_N)$, $W_2 = (n_B/N^2) \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}$, with Ω defined in Proposition 2.1.

COROLLARY 3.1. *Suppose that the assumptions for Theorem 3.2 hold. Under single-stage PPS sampling with replacement or single-stage PPS sampling without replacement with negligible sampling fractions, the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix $V_2 = \Sigma_2$.*

REMARK 3.1. *One important observation from the results presented in Theorem 3.2 is that the limiting distribution of our proposed estimator of θ_N based on the augmented estimating equations is invariant to the first-step estimator of the nuisance functional. This leads to the earlier statement that the proposed augmented two-step GEL estimators are less sensitive to the estimation of nuisance functionals. By combining the results from Corollary 3.1 with the arguments of Ackerberg et al. (2014, Lemma 1), we conclude that the proposed estimators also achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound under the survey designs specified in Corollary 3.1. As discussed further in Section 5, the estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ together with its standard errors can be used as bases for statistical inferences. Note that if the nuisance functional φ_N does not depend on the parameter of interest θ_N and the estimating equations (2.1) is just-identified (i.e., $r = p$), then the proposed augmented two-step GEL estimators have the same limit distribution as the two step EL estimator proposed in Zhao et al. (2020). However, Zhao et al.'s (2020) estimator does not satisfy invariance property similar to that stated in (2.8).*

3.2. Hypothesis testing

We next consider the GEL ratio based confidence regions and hypothesis tests on θ_{N}. The GEL ratio statistic for θ_{N} is defined as

$$\text{T}_{\text{N}}(\theta) = -2\{[\hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta_\theta, \hat{\varphi})\}$$

for the given θ, where $\hat{\eta}_{GEL} = \eta(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$ and $\eta_\theta = \eta(\theta, \hat{\varphi})$. The asymptotic distribution of $\text{T}_{\text{N}}(\theta)$ at $\theta = \theta_{\text{N}}$ is given in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.3. *Suppose that the assumptions for Theorem 3.2 hold. Then, as $N \to \infty$,*

$$\text{T}_N(\theta_N) \;\overset{\mathcal{L}}{\to}\; Q^\top \Delta Q,$$

where $Q \sim N(0, I_r)$, $\Delta = \Omega^{1/2} W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2 (\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2)^{-1} \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Omega^{1/2}$, and I_r is the $r \times r$ identity matrix.

COROLLARY 3.2. *Suppose that the assumptions for Theorem 3.3 hold. Under single-stage PPS sampling with replacement or single-stage PPS sampling without replacement with negligible sampling fractions, we have $\text{T}_N(\theta_N) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{\to} \chi_p^2$ as $N \to \infty$.*

REMARK 3.2. *Theorem 3.3 indicates that, under general unequal probability sampling designs, the proposed augmented design-based two-step GEL ratio statistic converges in distribution to a weighted chi-square random variable, with the weights independent of the first-step estimation of the nuisance functions. More importantly, Corollary 3.2 shows that the proposed GEL ratio statistics satisfy a nonparametric version of the Wilks' Theorem under commonly used single-stage unequal probability sampling designs. Note that the Wilks' theorem breaks down in the two-step survey weighted EL approach proposed in Zhao et al. (2020) even under simple random sampling.*

The standard Wilks phenomenon with the proposed two-step survey weighted GEL provides a convenient way to construct confidence regions for θ_{N} defined via the population estimating equations (2.1) or test the hypothesis $H_0\colon \theta_{\text{N}} = \theta_0$ with a pre-specified θ_0. The $(1 - \alpha)100\%$ confidence region for θ_{N} can be constructed as

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \left\{ \theta \mid -2\Big[\hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{P}_{\text{N}}\Big(\theta, \eta(\theta, \hat{\varphi}), \hat{\varphi}\Big)\Big] \le \chi_{p,\alpha}^2 \right\},$$

where $\chi_{p,\alpha}^2$ satisfies $\Pr(\chi_p^2 \ge \chi_{p,\alpha}^2) = \alpha$. The empirical results from simulation studies presented in section 6 provide strong evidence that the standard Wilks' Theorem is also a good approximation for stratified sampling and cluster sampling.

Auxiliary population information is often available for different sources. Including the information for survey data analysis often leads to efficiency gains in estimation and hypothesis testing problems. Auxiliary information can often be formed through a set of population estimating equations as

$$\mathfrak{U}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} q(Z_i, \theta_{\text{N}}) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where $q(Z, \theta)$ is a known s-vector of estimating functions. Under the proposed GEL framework, the side information in the form of (3.1) can easily be incorporated into the inferential problems.

A general hypothesis test problem on the unknown parameters θ_{N} can often be imposed as $H_0 \colon R(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$, where $R(\theta)$ is a $k \times 1$ vector of functions, with $k \leq p$. We are interested in developing tests for the general parametric hypotheses in the form of $R(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$ under the proposed GEL inferential framework.

Let $\Theta^R = \{\theta \mid \theta \in \Theta \text{ and } R(\theta) = 0\}$ be the restricted parameter space under H_0. Write the combined estimating functions as $\phi(Z, \theta, \varphi) = (\psi(Z, \theta, \varphi)^\top, q(Z, \theta)^\top)^\top$. We define the "restricted" maximum GEL estimator as

$$\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R = \arg \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^R} \sup_{\nu \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \phi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \hat{\varphi}), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \varphi) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (\rho(\eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} \phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)) - \rho_0)$, ν is an $(r + s)$-vector of auxiliary parameters and $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \phi}(\theta, \varphi) = \{\nu : \nu^\top \pi_i^{-1} \phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$. The GEL ratio statistic for testing $H_0 \colon R(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$ is given by

$$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta) = -2\{\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\varphi})\}, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R = \nu^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\varphi})$ and $\nu^R(\theta, \varphi) = \arg\max_{\nu \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \phi}(\theta, \varphi)} \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \varphi)$.

Let $\mathscr{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)/N$, $\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} q(Z_i, \theta)/N$, and $\Phi(\theta) = \partial R(\theta)/\partial \theta^\top$. The following additional regularity conditions are used to investigate the asymptotic properties of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ defined in (3.2) and the test statistic $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta)$ defined in (3.3).

B5. The finite population parameter vector $\theta_{\mathrm{N}} \in \Theta$ is the unique solution to $\mathscr{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$.

B6. (i) There exists a function $\mathfrak{U}(\theta)$ such that $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta) - \mathfrak{U}(\theta)\| = o(1)$; (ii) for all $\theta \in \Theta$, the ordinary derivative of $\mathfrak{U}(\theta)$ with respect to θ, denoted as $H(\theta)$, exists and has full column rank p.

B7. (i) $\max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|q(Z_i, \theta)\| = o_p(n_B^{1/\alpha})$, where α is as defined in condition B2(i);
(ii) For any sequence $c_{\mathrm{N}} = O(N^{-\kappa})$ with $\kappa \in (1/4, 1/2]$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|q(Z_i, \theta) - q(Z_i, \theta + c_{\mathrm{N}})\| = O(|c_{\mathrm{N}}|);$$

(iii) For any sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_{\mathrm{N}}\}$ with $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$,

$$\sup_{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})} \|\mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta) - \mathfrak{U}(\theta) - [\mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta') - \mathfrak{U}(\theta')]\| = o(N^{-1/2});$$

(iv) For all $\delta > 0$ and some positive constant c,

$$\sup_{\theta, \theta' \in \Theta(\delta)} \mathrm{Var}\Big\{[\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathfrak{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta')] \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}}\Big\} \leq c n_B^{-1} |\delta|.$$

THEOREM 3.4. *Suppose that the assumptions for Theorem 3.3 and the conditions B5-B7 hold. Then, as $N \to \infty$,*

$$n_B^{1/2} (\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, V^R),$$

where $V^R = \mathscr{C}^R \Pi^\top \mathscr{W}^{-1} \Omega^R \mathscr{W}^{-1} \Pi \mathscr{C}^R$, *with* $\mathscr{C}^R = \Sigma^R - \Sigma^R \Phi^\top (\Phi \Sigma^R \Phi^\top)^{-1} \Phi \Sigma^R$, $\Sigma^R = [\Pi^\top \mathscr{W}^{-1} \Pi]^{-1}$, $\Pi = (\Gamma_2^\top, H^\top)^\top$, Γ_2 *is given in Theorem 3.2,* $H = H(\theta_N)$, $\Phi = \Phi(\theta_N)$, $\mathscr{W} = (n_B/N^2) \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i^{-1} \phi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}$, *and* $\Omega^R = n_B N^{-2} \mathrm{Var}\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \phi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N) \mid \mathcal{F}_N\}$.

THEOREM 3.5. *Suppose that the assumptions for Theorem 3.4 hold. Then, as $N \to \infty$,*

$$\mathrm{T}_N^R(\theta_N) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{\to} \mathcal{Q}^\top \Delta^R \mathcal{Q},$$

where $\mathcal{Q} \sim N(0, I_{r+s})$, $\Delta^R = (\Omega^R)^{1/2}[\mathscr{P}^R - \mathscr{S}_\psi \mathscr{P} \mathscr{S}_\psi^\top](\Omega^R)^{1/2}$, $\mathscr{S}_\psi = (I_r, 0)^\top$ is an $(r+s) \times r$ matrix, $\mathscr{P}^R = \mathscr{W}^{-1} - \mathscr{W}^{-1} \Pi \mathscr{C}^R \Pi^\top \mathscr{W}^{-1}$, and $\mathscr{P} = W_2^{-1} - W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2 \Sigma_2 \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}$.

COROLLARY 3.3. *Suppose that the assumptions for Theorem 3.5 hold. Under single-stage PPS sampling with replacement or single-stage PPS sampling without replacement with negligible sampling fractions, we have $V^R = \mathscr{C}^R$ and $\mathrm{T}_N^R(\theta_N) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{\to} \chi_{s+k}^2$ as $N \to \infty$.*

The standard chi-square limiting distribution presented in Corollary 3.3 under the commonly used survey designs provides a convenient tool for conducting general hypothesis tests and the construction of confidence regions for a subvector, say θ_{1N}, of θ_N consisting of k elements. Let $\theta = (\theta_1^\top, \theta_2^\top)^\top$ be the partition of θ_N with the first k components corresponding to θ_{1N}. A $(1 - \alpha)$-level confidence region for θ_{1N} using the proposed GEL ratio statistic is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha^R = \left\{ \theta_1 \mid -2\left[\hat{P}_N(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{P}_N\left(\tilde{\theta}(\theta_1), \eta(\tilde{\theta}(\theta_1), \hat{\varphi}), \hat{\varphi} \right) \right] \le \chi_{k,\alpha}^2 \right\},$$

where $\tilde{\theta}(\theta_1) = (\theta_1^\top, \hat{\theta}_2(\theta_1)^\top)^\top$ and $\hat{\theta}_2(\theta_1) = \arg\inf_{\theta_2} \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}((\theta_1,\theta_2),\hat{\varphi})} \hat{P}_N((\theta_1, \theta_2), \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ for the given θ_1.

4. DERIVATIONS OF AUGMENTATION TERMS

The augmentation term Ξ specified in (2.4) plays the most crucial role in the proposed methods and needs to be derived for the particular nuisance functionals involved. In this section, we first discuss general procedures for identifying Ξ, and then illustrate the methods using three examples related to income inequality measures widely used in economic studies.

4.1. The general identification condition

We first discuss the general identification condition of Ξ using a superpopulation-based approach. To facilitate the technical arguments, we introduce the notion of probability spaces associated with the sampling design and the superpopulation model. We assume that the vectors $\mathcal{F}_N = (Z_1, \cdots, Z_N) \in \mathsf{R}^{d_z \times N}$ are an independent and identically distributed sample from a superpopulation model over a probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_m)$, as well as from a distribution function F_0. The values Z_i can be viewed as a mapping $\Omega \mapsto \mathsf{R}^{d_z}$, and we can write Z_i as $Z_i(\omega)$ with $\omega \in \Omega$. Denote a d_x-dimensional component of Z_i as X_i with $X_i \in \mathsf{R}_+^{d_x}$ and $1 \le d_x \le d_z$. Suppose that $\mathbf{X}^N = (X_1, \cdots, X_N) \in \mathsf{R}_+^{d_x \times N}$ contains all the variables used for the sampling design. With the given sampling design, denote by $\mathbf{S}_N = \{\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}_N\}$ the set of all possible samples. The smallest σ-algebra containing all the sets of $\mathbf{S}_N$ is denoted as C_N and is called the sigma-algebra generated by $\mathbf{S}_N$. Following Rubin-Bleuer and Schiopu-Kratina (2005), the sampling design is characterized by a function $P: \mathsf{C}_N \times \mathsf{R}_+^{d_x \times N} \to [0, 1]$ such that (i) for all $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathbf{S}_N$, $P(\mathcal{S}, \cdot)$ is Borel-measurable in $\mathsf{R}_+^{d_x}$; (ii) for $\mathbf{X}^N \in \mathsf{R}_+^{d_x \times N}$, $P(\cdot, \mathbf{X}^N)$ is a probability measure on C_N. For each $\omega \in \Omega$ and $B \subset \mathbf{S}_N$, define $\mathbb{P}_d(B, \omega) = \sum_{s \in B} P(s, \mathbf{X}^N(\omega))$. We call the triple

$(\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{N}}, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{N}}, \mathbb{P}_d)$ a design probability space. The product probability space that includes the super-population and the design space is defined as $(\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \Omega, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_{d,m})$, in which the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{m,d}$ defined on rectangles $\{s\} \times A \in \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \mathscr{A}$ has the value

$$\mathbb{P}_{m,d}(\{s\} \times A) = \int_A P(s, \mathbf{X}^N(\omega)) \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_m(\omega) = \int_A \mathbb{P}_d(\{s\}, \mathbf{X}^N(\omega)) \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_m(\omega).$$

In what follows, we use $\mathbb{E}_m\{\cdot\}$ to denote the expectation with respect to the probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_m)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{d,m}\{\cdot\}$ to represent the expectation with respect to the product probability space $(\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \Omega, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_{d,m})$. For any $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{d,m}\Big\{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\Big\} = \mathbb{E}_m\{g(Z, \theta, \varphi)\},$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{d,m}\Big\{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\Big\} = \mathbb{E}_m\{\Xi(Z, \theta, \varphi)\}.$$

Let $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ and $\varphi_0 \in \Psi$ be the superpopulation version of the parameter of interest θ_{N} and the nuisance functions φ_{N}, respectively. Then, in terms of probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_m)$, we have $\theta_{\mathrm{N}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_m} \theta_0$ and $\varphi_{\mathrm{N}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_m} \varphi_0$. Here " $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_m}$ " denotes convergence in probability with respect to probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_m)$. By the identification of the super-population model, we further have that $\mathbb{E}_m\{g(Z, \theta_0, \varphi_0)\} = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_m\{\Xi(Z, \theta_0, \varphi_0)\} = 0$.

Let $\mathscr{F} = \{F\}$ be a general family of distribution of Z and $\varphi(\cdot)$ be a mapping $\mathscr{F} \mapsto \mathsf{R}^{\dim(\varphi)}$. Suppose that $\hat{\varphi} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{d,m}} \varphi(F)$ if the distribution of Z is $F \in \mathscr{F}$, where " $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{d,m}}$ " denotes convergence in probability with respect to the product probability space $(\mathbf{S}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \Omega, \mathsf{C}_{\mathrm{N}} \times \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_{d,m})$. Let $\{F_\alpha : F_\alpha \in \mathscr{F}\}$ be a one-dimensional subfamily of $\mathscr{F}$. Following Newey (1994), the path $\{F_\alpha : \alpha \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \subset \mathsf{R}, \varepsilon > 0, F_\alpha \in \mathscr{F}\}$ is assumed to be regular and satisfies the following mean-squared differentiability condition

$$\lim_{\alpha \to 0} \int \left[\alpha^{-1}(dF_\alpha^{1/2} - dF_0^{1/2}) - \frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{F}(z)dF_0^{1/2}\right]^2 dz = 0,$$

where dF_α is the density of F_α, and $\mathfrak{F}(z) = \partial \ln(F_\alpha)/\partial \alpha$ is the corresponding score function satisfying $\mathbb{E}_m\{\mathfrak{F}(Z)\} = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_m\{\mathfrak{F}(Z)^2\} < \infty$. Define the functional

$$\mu(F) = \mathbb{E}_m\{g(Z, \theta_0, \varphi(F))\}.$$

We assume that $\mu : \mathscr{F} \mapsto \mathsf{R}^r$ is differentiable at F_0 in the sense of Van der Vaart (1991). Then under certain regularity conditions the function $\Xi(Z, \theta_0, \varphi(F_0))$ to be used as the augmentation term is uniquely determined by

$$\left.\frac{\partial \mu(F_\alpha)}{\partial \alpha}\right|_{\alpha=0} = \mathbb{E}_m\{\Xi(Z, \theta_0, \varphi(F_0))\mathfrak{F}(Z)\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Equation (4.1) is useful for deriving the expression for the function Ξ when $\varphi_{\mathrm{N}} = \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}(\cdot, \theta_{\mathrm{N}})$ is the finite population version of a regression function or a density.

The function $\Xi(Z, \theta_0, \varphi(F_0))$ is called influence function of $\mu(F_0)$. In the model-based context, the explicit or numerical computation of the influence function has been discussed extensively in the literature, see, for example, Bickel et al. (1993), Newey (1994a, 1994b), Chen et al. (2003), Chen (2007), Ichimura and Newey (2022), Bravo et al. (2020), Chernozhukov et al. (2022) and references therein. It follows from above that these model-based approaches can be readily extended to the problem of complex survey data.

4.2. Census estimating equation based approach

We next consider cases where the nuisance functional φ_{N} can be explicitly defined via the following census estimating equations

$$\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{N}}(\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{T}(Z_i, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

We assume that the equation system (4.2) for defining the function φ_{N} is possibly over-identified, i.e., $\dim(\mathfrak{T}) \geq \dim(\varphi)$. Given the set of sampled units $\mathcal{S}$ and survey weights $\{\pi_i^{-1}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$, the design-based GEL estimator for φ_{N} can be obtained as

$$\hat{\varphi}_{GEL} = \arg\inf_{\varphi \in \Psi} \sup_{\lambda \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \mathfrak{T}}(\varphi)} \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}(\varphi, \vartheta),$$

where $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}(\varphi, \vartheta) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \{\rho(\vartheta^\top \pi_i^{-1} \mathfrak{T}(Z_i, \varphi)) - \rho_0\}$, and $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \mathfrak{T}}(\varphi) = \{\vartheta : \vartheta^\top \pi_i^{-1} \mathfrak{T}(Z_i, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$. By applying Theorem 3.2, we have that

$$\hat{\varphi}_{GEL} - \varphi_{\mathrm{N}} = -\mathbb{K}(\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\mathbb{H}(\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^\top \mathbb{W}(\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^{-1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \mathfrak{T}(Z_i, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}),$$

where $\mathbb{K}(\varphi) = [\mathbb{H}(\varphi)^\top \mathbb{W}(\varphi)^{-1} \mathbb{H}(\varphi)]^{-1}$, $\mathbb{H}(\varphi) = \partial \mathscr{T}(\varphi)/\partial \varphi^\top$ with $\mathscr{T}(\varphi)$ satisfying

$$\sup_{\varphi \in \Psi} \|\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{N}}(\varphi) - \mathscr{T}(\varphi)\| = o(1),$$

and $\mathbb{W}(\varphi) = (n_B/N^2) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1} \mathfrak{T}(Z_i, \varphi)^{\otimes 2}$. The augmentation term is therefore given by

$$\Xi(Z, \theta, \varphi) = -D(\theta, \varphi)\mathbb{K}(\varphi)\mathbb{H}(\varphi)^\top \mathbb{W}(\varphi)^{-1} \mathfrak{T}(Z, \varphi),$$

where the derivative $D(\theta, \varphi)$ is defined in Condition A5 presented in Appendix A. When φ_{N} is just-identified by (4.2), i.e., $\dim(\mathfrak{T}) = \dim(\varphi)$, the result is simplified to $\Xi(Z, \theta, \varphi) = -D(\theta, \varphi)\mathbb{H}(\varphi)^{-1} \mathfrak{T}(Z, \varphi)$. It is straightforward to show that the augmented estimating functions $\psi(Z, \theta, \varphi) = g(Z, \theta, \varphi) + \Xi(Z, \theta, \varphi)$ satisfy the following invariance property:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \hat{\varphi}_{GEL}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}).$$

This observation intuitively justifies the standard chi-square limiting distributions of augmented two-step GEL ratio statistics presented in the paper under commonly used survey designs.

4.3. Illustrative examples

We now apply the general results to three examples: the Gini coefficient, Lorenz curves and quantile shares, all involving a nuisance functional. These three examples have important implications to the theory and practice in economics on inequality measures. The Gini coefficient, also called the Gini index, measures the degree of the inequality in income distributions, the Lorenz curve depicts concentration and inequality in distribution of resources and in size distributions, while the quantile share is used to detect perturbations at different levels of a distribution (Beach and Davidson, 1983). If the variable under study represents income, then the quantile shares are also called income shares.

Example 1 (Gini Coefficient). Let $Z \in \mathsf{R}$ be a nonnegative random variable on

a probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{A}, \mathbb{P}_m)$. The cumulative distribution function of Z is $F_0(z) = \mathbb{P}_m(Z \leq z)$. The general family of Gini coefficients (Nygård and Sandström, 1989) is defined as

$$\theta_0 = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \int_0^\infty \psi\{F_0(z)\} z dF_0(z),$$

where $\mu_0 = \mathbb{E}_m[Z]$, ψ is a bounded and continuous function. Here, $\mathbb{E}_m[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation taken with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_m$. For the original Gini coefficient, $\psi\{u\} = 2u - 1$. The nuisance functional in this case is the cumulative distribution function $F_0(z)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}} = (Z_1, \cdots, Z_N) \in \mathsf{R}^N$ be a finite population from $\mathbb{P}_m$. The finite population distribution function is given by $F_{\mathrm{N}}(z) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N I(Z_i \leq z)$, where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, and the finite population mean is $\mu_{\mathrm{N}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i$. Then, the finite population Gini coefficient is defined as $\theta_{\mathrm{N}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_{\mathrm{N}}^{-1} \psi\{F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z_i)\} Z_i$, which satisfies

$$U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, F_{\mathrm{N}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z_i)) = 0,$$

where $g(Z, \theta, F) = \psi\{F\} Z - \theta Z$.

Denote $U(\theta, F) = \mathbb{E}_m[\psi\{F\} Z - \theta Z]$. Standard empirical process methods can be used to show that $U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, F)$ converges uniformly in (θ, F) to $U(\theta, F)$. The pathwise derivative of $U(\theta, F_{\mathrm{N}})$ in the direction $F - F_{\mathrm{N}}$ has the form $D(\theta, F_{\mathrm{N}})[F - F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)] = \mathbb{E}_m[\psi'\{F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)\} Z \{F - F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)\}]$, where $\psi'\{u\} = \partial \psi\{u\} / \partial u$. Given the set of sampled units $\mathcal{S}$ and first order inclusion probabilities π_i, the survey weighted estimator of $F_{\mathrm{N}}(z)$ is obtained by $\hat{F}_{\mathrm{N}}(z) = \hat{N}^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} I(Z_i \leq z)$, where $\hat{N} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1}$. It can be shown that

$$D(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, F_{\mathrm{N}})[\hat{F}_{\mathrm{N}}(Z) - F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, F_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}),$$

where $\Xi(Z_i, F_{\mathrm{N}}) = \mathbb{E}_m[Z \psi'\{F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)\} \{I(Z \geq Z_i) - F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)\}]$, which is used to construct the augmentation term. For the original Gini coefficient, we have $\Xi(Z_i, F_{\mathrm{N}}) = 2\mathbb{E}_m[Z \{I(Z \geq Z_i) - F_{\mathrm{N}}(Z)\}]$.

Example 2 (Lorenz Curves). Assume that $F(z)$ is differentiable and $f(z)$ is its density function. For a given $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the Lorenz curve of $\mathbb{P}_m$ is defined as

$$\theta_0(\tau) = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \int_0^{\xi_0(\tau)} z dF(z),$$

where $\xi_0(\tau) = F_0^{-1}(\tau) = \inf\{z : F_0(z) \geq \tau\}$, which is a nuisance functional. The finite population Lorenz curve is defined as $\theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_{\mathrm{N}}^{-1} Z_i I\{Z_i \leq \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)\}$, where $\xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau) = F_{\mathrm{N}}^{-1}(\tau) = \inf\{z : F_{\mathrm{N}}(z) \geq \tau\}$, the τth finite population quantile. Note that $\theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)$ is the solution to

$$U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(Z_i, \theta, \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)) = 0,$$

where $g(Z, \theta, \xi) = Z\{I(Z \leq \xi) - \theta\}$.

Denote $U(\theta, \xi) = \mathbb{E}_m[Z\{I(Z \leq \xi) - \theta\}]$. It can be shown that $U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \xi)$ converges uniformly in (θ, ξ) to $U(\theta, \xi)$, and that the pathwise derivative of $U(\theta, \xi_{\mathrm{N}})$ in direction $\xi - \xi_{\mathrm{N}}$ is of the form $D(\theta, \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau))[\xi - \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)] = \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau) f(\xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau))[\xi - \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)]$. The survey weighted

estimator of $\xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)$ is given by $\hat{\xi}(\tau) = \hat{F}_{\mathrm{N}}^{-1}(\tau) = \inf\{z : \hat{F}_{\mathrm{N}}(z) \geq \tau\}$. Using the Bahadur representation established in Chen and Wu (2002), we obtain

$$D(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau))[\hat{\xi}(\tau) - \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}),$$

where $\Xi(Z, \xi) = -\xi\{I(Z \leq \xi) - \tau\}$. The GEL-based estimation and inference for $\theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau)$ can consequently be conducted using the augmented estimating function $\psi(Z, \theta, \xi) = g(Z, \theta, \xi) + \Xi(Z, \theta, \xi)$.

Example 3 (Quantile Shares). For two fixed quantile levels $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, 1]$ with $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, the quantile share of $\mathbb{P}_m$ is defined as

$$\theta_0(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \theta_0(\tau_2) - \theta_0(\tau_1),$$

where $\theta_0(\tau)$ is defined in Example 2. If Z is an income variable, the income share $\theta_0(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ is the percentage of total income shared by the population allocated to the income interval $[\xi_0(\tau_1), \ \xi_0(\tau_2)]$. The finite population quantile share is defined as $\theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) = N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu_{\mathrm{N}}^{-1} Z_i I\{\xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_1) < Z_i \leq \xi_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_2)\}$, which is obtained by solving the census estimating equation

$$U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} g(Z_i, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = 0,$$

with $g(Z, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = Z\{I(\xi_1 < Z \leq \xi_2) - \theta\}$. Using the same arguments given in Example 2 for the Lorenz curve, we obtain the following augmented estimating function $\psi(Z, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = g(Z, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) + \Xi(Z, \xi_1, \xi_2)$, where $\Xi(Z, \xi_1, \xi_2) = -\xi_2\{I(Z \leq \xi_2) - \tau_2\} + \xi_1\{I(Z \leq \xi_1) - \tau_1\}$.

5. SURVEY DESIGNS AND VARIANCE ESTIMATION

We give detailed illustrations of how our results can be readily applied to a class of complex survey designs, along with discussions on design-based variance estimation of the proposed efficient GEL estimators. It follows from Theorem 3.2 that the point estimators $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ and its estimated standard errors can be used to construct Wald-type confidence regions. However, estimation of the asymptotic design-based variance-covariance matrix V_2 of $n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_{\mathrm{N}})$ is not straightforward for a general unequal probability survey design. We consider three commonly used survey designs: single-stage unequal probability sampling single-stage survey designs, stratified sampling and cluster sampling. General discussions on variance estimation for complex survey designs can be found in Wu and Thompson (2020).

5.1. Single-stage unequal probability sampling

If the survey design is single-stage PPS sampling with replacement or single-stage PPS sampling without replacement with negligible sampling fractions, we have the following approximation formula for the variance-covariance matrix Ω:

$$\Omega = \frac{n_B}{N^2}\mathrm{Var}\Big\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}}\Big\} = \frac{n_B}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^{\otimes 2} + o(1).$$

Consequently, a design-based consistent estimator of Ω in the survey designs mentioned above can be obtained by

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{n}{N^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - Nn^{-1}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \right]^{\otimes 2},$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)$.

However, for general survey designs, estimating Ω requires second order inclusion probabilities $\pi_{ij} = \Pr(i, j \in \mathcal{S})$, which may not be available. Approximate variance formulas not involving the π_{ij} are often used in practice; see Haziza *et al.* (2008) for further discussion. For single-stage PPS sampling with non-negligible sampling fractions, we can estimate Ω by the Hájek variance estimator

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{n}{N^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c_i \left[\pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathscr{B}} \right]^{\otimes 2},$$

where

$$\hat{\mathscr{B}} = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c_i \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \right\} / \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c_i \quad \text{and} \quad c_i = \{n(1 - \pi_i)\}/(n - 1).$$

Simulation results reported in Haziza *et al.* (2008) showed that the approximate variance estimator has good finite sample performances for commonly used single-stage survey designs.

We now discuss design consistent estimators of the weight matrix W_2 and the derivative Γ_2 under a general single-stage sampling design. The weight matrix W_2 can be consistently estimated by

$$\hat{W}_{\mathrm{N}} = \frac{n}{N^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})^{\otimes 2}.$$

If the function $\psi(Z, \theta, \varphi)$ is differentiable in θ, it is easily to see that

$$\hat{\Gamma}_2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \frac{\partial \psi(Z, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})}{\partial \theta^\top}$$

is a design consistent estimator for Γ_2. For non-smooth functions, we employ the method of random perturbation proposed in Chen and Liao (2015). Denote by $\mathscr{V}$ a large enough compact set in R^p and define

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) = \sqrt{N}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} + N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V}, \hat{\varphi}) - \sqrt{N}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}).$$

Under the conditions presented in Appendix, $\{\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi), N = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous. This, together with the differentiability of the limiting function $\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)$ with respect to θ, implies that

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) = \Gamma_2(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\mathscr{V} + o_p(1). \tag{5.1}$$

where $\tilde{\theta}$ is on the line segment between $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{GEL} + N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V}$. Motivated by the expression (5.1), we propose the following resampling procedure based on the least squares.

1. Generate independent and identically distributed random samples, $\{\mathscr{V}_b : b = 1, \cdots, B\}$, from some known multivariate distribution with mean zero and variance I_p.
2. Compute $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V}_b, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$ for $b = 1, \cdots, B$.

3. Calculate

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{2,j} = \left(\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \mathscr{V}_b \mathscr{V}_b^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \mathcal{D}_{j\text{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V}_b, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \mathscr{V}_b, \tag{5.2}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, r$, where $\mathcal{D}_{j\text{N},\theta}$ denotes the jth coordinate of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{N},\theta}$. The value of Γ_2 is then estimated by $\hat{\Gamma}_2$ with $\hat{\Gamma}_2 = (\hat{\Gamma}_{2,1}, \cdots, \hat{\Gamma}_{2,r})^\top$.

Note that $\hat{\Gamma}_{2,j}$ in (5.2) is the least squares estimate from regressing $\mathcal{D}_{j\text{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$ over $\mathscr{V}$ based on (5.1). Denote by $E_{\mathscr{V}}[\cdot]$ the expectation with respect to $\mathscr{V}$. The following theorem presents the consistency of the resampling estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_2$.

THEOREM 5.1. *Suppose that (i) $\mathscr{V}$ is a random vector with mean zero and variance I_d, independent of the survey sample $\mathcal{S}$; (ii) for all sequences $\delta_N = o(1)$,*

$$\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta(\delta_N)\times\Psi(\delta_N)} \|\Gamma_2(\theta,\varphi) - \Gamma_2(\theta_N,\varphi_N)\| = o(1)$$

and

$$\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta(\delta_N)\times\Psi(\delta_N)} \|E_{\mathscr{V}}[\mathfrak{D}_{N,\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V}, \theta + N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V}, \varphi)]\| = o_p(N^{-1/2}),$$

where $\mathfrak{D}_{N,\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V}, \theta, \varphi) = [\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)]\mathscr{V}^\top$. Then $\hat{\Gamma}_2 \overset{p}{\to} \Gamma_2$.

Consequently, the variance-covariance matrix of $n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_N)$ can be consistently estimated by $\hat{V}_2 = (\hat{\Gamma}_2^\top \hat{W}_N^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2)^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2^\top \hat{W}_N^{-1} \hat{\Omega} \hat{W}_N^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2 (\hat{\Gamma}_2^\top \hat{W}_N^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2)^{-1}$.

5.2. Stratified sampling

Suppose that the finite population $\mathcal{U}_\text{N}$ is divided into H strata indexed by $h = 1, \cdots, H$. Let $N = \sum_{h=1}^{H} N_h$ be the overall population size where N_h is the population size of the hth stratum. Let (hi) be the index for unit i in stratum h. The parameter of interest θ_N is defined through the following stratified population estimating equations

$$U_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i=1}^{N_H} g(Z_{hi}, \theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Assume that the stratum sample $\mathcal{S}_h$ of size n_h is selected with first order inclusion probabilities $\{\pi_{hi}, i \in \mathcal{S}_h\}$, $h = 1, \cdots, H$, independent across different strata. Let $n = \sum_{h=1}^{H} n_h$ be the overall size of the stratified sample. Assume that a design consistent estimator for φ_N, denoted by $\hat{\varphi}$, can be obtained in advance by using the stratified samples. The following two regularity conditions are imposed on the population estimating functions defined in (5.3) and the first-step estimator $\hat{\varphi}$:

C1. There exists a function $U(\theta, \varphi)$ such that $\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta\times\Psi} \|U_\text{N}(\theta,\varphi) - U(\theta,\varphi)\| = o(1)$, and $U(\theta, \varphi)$ satisfies conditions A4 and A5 presented in Appendix A.
C2. The pathwise derivative $D(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_\text{N}]$ of $U(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})$ is of the following form:

$$D(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_\text{N}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_h} \pi_{hi}^{-1} \Xi(Z_{hi}, \theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}),$$

where $\Xi(\cdot)$ satisfies the following conditions: (i) $\Xi(Z_{hi}, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$ has finite fourth population moments; and (ii) $\sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} \pi_{hi}^{-1} \Xi(Z_{hi}, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$ is asymptotically normally distributed with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix at the order $O(n_B^{-1} N^2)$.

Under stratified sampling designs, the efficient two-step GEL estimator for θ_{N} satisfying (5.3) is defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_{GEL} = \arg \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \psi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}), \tag{5.4}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta, \varphi) = \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} \{\rho(\eta^{\top} \pi_{hi}^{-1} \psi(Z_{hi}, \theta, \hat{\varphi})) - \rho_0\}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \psi}(\theta, \varphi) = \{\eta : \eta^{\top} \pi_{hi}^{-1} \psi(Z_{hi}, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}, i \in \mathcal{S}_h, h = 1, \cdots, H\}$. We call $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ under stratified sampling the pooled GEL estimator. It follows from Theorem 3.2 that the pooled GEL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ defined in (5.4) is asymptotically normally distributed with mean θ_{N} and variance-covariance matrix $n_B^{-1} V_2$, where V_2 has the same form given in Theorem 3.2 with the matrices W_2 and Ω replaced respectively by $W_2 = n_B N^{-2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i=1}^{N_H} g(Z_{hi}, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^{\otimes 2}$ and

$$\Omega = \frac{n_B}{N^2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \mathrm{Var}\Big\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} \pi_{hi}^{-1} [\psi(Z_{hi}, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})] \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}} \Big\}.$$

If the stratum samples $\mathcal{S}_h$ are selected by a PPS sampling design with small sampling fractions, we can estimate Ω by

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{n}{N^2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} \Big[\pi_{hi}^{-1} \psi(Z_{hi}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{U}_h(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \Big]^{\otimes 2},$$

where $\hat{U}_h(\theta, \varphi) = n_h^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} \pi_{hi}^{-1} \psi(Z_{hi}, \theta, \varphi)$. In cases where the sampling fractions are not negligible, using arguments similar to those presented in Section 5 of the main paper, we can estimate Ω by

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{n}{N^2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} c_{ih} \big[\pi_{ih}^{-1} \psi(Z_{ih}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathscr{B}}_h \big]^{\otimes 2},$$

where $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_h = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} c_{ih} \pi_{ih}^{-1} \psi(Z_{ih}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) / \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h} c_{ih}$ and $c_{ih} = \{n_h(1 - \pi_{ih})\} / \{n_h - 1\}$.

Under stratified sampling designs, the weight matrix W_2 and the derivative Γ_2 can be consistently estimated by using the same estimators for single-stage sampling designs, with Z_i, π_i and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ respectively replaced by Z_{hi}, π_{ih} and $\sum_{h=1}^{H} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_h}$.

5.3. Cluster sampling

We now consider cluster sampling. Suppose that the population is divided into K clusters and that the ith cluster has M_i elements. The overall population size is $N = \sum_{i=1}^{K} M_i$. Let $Z_{(ij)}$ be the value of Z for the jth element in the ith cluster. Then, the true parameter θ_{N} satisfies

$$U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} g(Z_{(ij)}, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0. \tag{5.5}$$

We consider two-stage cluster sampling designs where the first stage sample $\mathcal{S}_c$ is a set of k clusters selected from the population with inclusion probabilities $\pi_{1i} = \mathrm{Pr}(i \in \mathcal{S}_c)$,

and the second stage sample $\mathcal{S}_i$ is a set of m_i ($\leq M_i$) units drawn from cluster $i \in \mathcal{S}_c$ with second-stage inclusion probabilities $\pi_{j|i} = \Pr(j \in \mathcal{S}_i \mid i \in \mathcal{S}_c)$. The final first order inclusion probability for selecting unit (ij) is given by $\pi_{(ij)} = \Pr(i \in \mathcal{S}_c, j \in \mathcal{S}_i) = \pi_{1i}\pi_{j|i}$. A popular two-stage sampling design is the so-called self-weighting design for which $\pi_{1i} = kM_i/N$ and $\pi_{j|i} = m/M_i$ such that the final first order inclusion probabilities are the same for all units.

We assume that under two-stage cluster sampling the population estimating functions defined in (5.5) and the first-step estimator $\hat{\varphi}$ satisfy the following two regularity conditions:

D1. There exists a function $U(\theta, \varphi)$ such that $\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta\times\Psi} \|U_{\text{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - U(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$, and $U(\theta, \varphi)$ satisfies conditions A4 and A5 presented in Appendix A.

D2. The pathwise derivative $D(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_{\text{N}}]$ is of the following form:

$$D(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_{\text{N}}] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_c}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}_i}\pi_{(ij)}^{-1}\Xi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}),$$

where $\Xi(\cdot)$ satisfies the following conditions: (i) $\Xi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})$ has finite fourth population moments; and (ii) $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_c}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}_i}\pi_{(ij)}^{-1}\Xi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})$ is asymptotically normally distributed with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix at the order $O(n_B^{-1}N^2)$.

Under two-stage cluster sampling, the parameter θ_{N} is defined by (5.5). The efficient two-step GEL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ is defined as in (5.4) but replaces $\hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ by

$$\hat{P}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_c}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}_i}\{\rho(\eta^\top\pi_{(ij)}^{-1}\psi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta, \hat{\varphi})) - \rho_0\},$$

where $\psi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta, \varphi) = g(Z_{(ij)}, \theta, \varphi) + \Xi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta, \varphi)$. We can show that $n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_{\text{N}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, V_2)$, where $V_2 = \Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}\Omega W_2^{-1}\Gamma_2\Sigma_2$, $\Sigma_2 = (\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}\Gamma_2)^{-1}$, $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_2(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})$, $\Gamma_2(\theta, \varphi)$ is the ordinary derivate of $U(\theta, \varphi)$ with respect to θ,

$$W_2 = \frac{n_B}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\sum_{j=1}^{M_i}\pi_{(ij)}^{-1}\psi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}})^{\otimes2},$$

and

$$\Omega = \frac{n_B}{N^2}\text{Var}\Big\{\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_c}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}_i}\pi_{(ij)}^{-1}\psi(Z_{(ij)}, \theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\text{N}}\Big\}.$$

For self-weighting two-stage sampling designs, we can estimate Ω directly by

$$\hat{\Omega} = \frac{1}{k(k-1)}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_c}\left(\bar{G}_i - \bar{G}\right)^{\otimes2},$$

where $\bar{G}_i = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}_i}\psi(Z_{(ij)}, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})/m$ and $\bar{G} = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}_c}\bar{G}_i/k$. Design consistent estimators of weight matrix W_2 and derivative Γ_2 can be easily obtained under general two-stage cluster sampling with suitable changes in notation.

The results described in Sections 5.1 for single-stage unequal probability sampling and those for stratified sampling and cluster sampling can be combined for variance estimation under the more general stratified multi-stage sampling designs.

6. SIMULATION STUDIES

In this section, we report results from a simulation study on the finite sample performances of our proposed augmented two-step GEL estimators and the GEL ratio confidence intervals when the sample data are selected from a finite population by a probability sampling method. The finite population $\mathcal{F}_N = (Z_1, \cdots, Z_N)$ of size N is generated from the model

$$Z_i = X_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N,$$

where $X_i \sim 0.25 + \text{Weibull}(2, 2)$ and ε_i follows the χ^2 distribution with 3 degrees of freedom. The parameter of interest is the finite population quantile share $\theta_N(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ of the population $\mathcal{F}_N$ as discussed in Section 4. We consider four scenarios for the quantile levels: $(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (0, 0.25), (0.25, 0.5), (0.5, 0.75), (0.75, 1)$.

The finite population, once generated, is held fixed and repeated simulation samples are selected from the finite population using the following four sampling methods:

(A) Single-stage randomized systematic PPS sampling without replacement with small sampling fractions. The finite population size and the sample size are taken to be $(N, n) = (20000, 300)$. The sampling fraction is $n/N = 1.5\%$, which can be viewed as negligible.

(B) Single-stage Rao-Sampford PPS sampling without replacement with large sampling fractions. The finite population size and the sample size are chosen as $(N, n) = (3000, 300)$. The sampling fraction is 10%, which is non-negligible.

(C) Stratified Rao-Sampford PPS sampling. The finite population is divided into $H = 3$ strata with stratum sizes $(N_1, N_2, N_3) = (4000, 6000, 10000)$. Stratum samples of size n_h are selected by the randomized systematic PPS sampling, for $h = 1, 2, 3$. The stratum sample sizes are chosen as $(n_1, n_2, n_3) = (50, 100, 150)$. The total sample size is $n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3$.

(D) Two-stage cluster sampling. The finite population is split into 1350 clusters, with 200 clusters having equal cluster size $M_j = 30$, 250 clusters having size $M_j = 20$, and 900 clusters having size $M_j = 10$. In the first stage sampling $k = n/5$ clusters are selected by the randomized systematic PPS sampling, and in the second stage sampling $m = 5$ units are selected within each selected cluster, independent among different clusters, by simple random sampling without replacement. The overall sample size is taken to be $n = 300$.

For each of the four sampling methods, a total of 1000 simulation samples are selected from the finite population. For each selected sample, we calculate the survey weighted point estimator, and use the following six different methods to construct the 95% confidence intervals for the quantile share $\theta_N(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ at each quantile levels (τ_1, τ_2): the GEL ratio confidence intervals using the standard chi-square limiting distributions for each of EL, ET, CU and GMM; the normal approximation confidence interval using the estimating equation based point estimator and a bootstrap estimate of the standard error (BC_n); and the bootstrap percentile interval with the estimating equation based point estimator (BC_p). In all simulations, the proposed method (Augmented SWEE) is compared with the method of Zhao et al. (2020) (Conventional SWEE) under an assumed standard chi-square limiting distribution for the GEL ratio statistic. The latter is based on $g(Z, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = Z\{I(\xi_1 < Z \le \xi_2) - \theta\}$ without the augmentation term, where ξ_1 and ξ_1 are the nuisance parameters with true values being the τ_1th and τ_2th population quantile of $\mathcal{F}_N$, respectively. Our proposed augmented SWEE method is based on $\psi(Z, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) = g(Z, \theta, \xi_1, \xi_2) - \xi_2\{I(Z \le \xi_2) - \tau_2\} + \xi_1\{I(Z \le \xi_1) - \tau_1\}$.

Point estimation. Tables 1 presents the Monte Carlo biases, standard deviation (SD) and standard error (SE) of the survey weighted estimator of $\theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ at four different values of (τ_1, τ_2) for each of the four sampling methods. Here, the SD is the square root of the simulated true variance of the point estimator and the SE is the square root of the bootstrap variance estimator. From Table 1, we have the following observations. (i) Under all the settings, the proposed augmented survey weighted estimators have negligible biases, and the values of SE are all close to the corresponding values of SD; (ii) The proposed estimator has values of SD similar to the conventional estimator without the augmentation term.

Confidence intervals. The finite sample performances of the six confidence intervals are evaluated using the following criteria: the average lengths (AL), the coverage probabilities (CP), the lower tail error (LE) and the upper tail error (UE), which are respectively computed as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{AL} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left\{ P_{\mathrm{U}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) - P_{\mathrm{L}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right\}, \\
\mathrm{CP} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} I\left\{ P_{\mathrm{L}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) < \theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) < P_{\mathrm{U}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right\}, \\
\mathrm{LE} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} I\left\{ \theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \leq P_{\mathrm{L}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right\}, \\
\mathrm{UE} &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} I\left\{ \theta_{\mathrm{N}}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \geq P_{\mathrm{U}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2) \right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $P_{\mathrm{L}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ and $P_{\mathrm{U}}^{(m)}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ are respectively the lower and upper boundaries of the 95% confidence interval computed from the mth simulation sample, and M is the number of simulation runs.

Tables 2–5 report the simulation results computed from $M = 1000$ simulation runs. Using the proposed augmented estimating functions, the GEL and GMM confidence intervals have excellent performance in terms of all the criteria listed above. Both have better coverage accuracy than the normal approximation and bootstrap based confidence intervals. The proposed GEL and GMM confidence intervals have coverage probabilities which are closer to the nominal level, and have shorter lengths than those of normal approximation and bootstrap methods. Without using the augmentation term, the GEL and GMM approaches under an assumed standard chi-square limiting distributions give invalid results as coverage probabilities are completely off the target nominal value.

7. AN APPLICATION

The proposed methods are further illustrated with an application to the New York City Social Indicators Survey (NYSIS). The NYSIS was a biennial survey of New York City residents conducted by the Columbia University School of Social Work. The core survey is designed to demonstrate the use of several social indicators to answer questions about inequality and wellbeing. The survey also measures the sources and extent of external supports from government, family and friends, community and religious programs, and employers. We use data from the 2002 NYSIS survey (Teitler et al., 2004), which examined the period between March and June, 2002. The original data were collected from 1501 adults through telephone interviews and census individual weight was assigned to each survey respondent.

In this example we are interested in making statistical inference for quintile shares on the respondent's earnings in 2002. We consider a subset of the 2002 survey sample consisting of $n = 956$ respondents who have positive earnings. For analytical purposes, we re-scale the survey weights by $w_i = n\tilde{w}/\sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{w}_j$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i = n$, where $\tilde{w}_i$ is the original weight for ith survey respondent. Four different quantile shares are considered: $\theta_{\text{N}}(0, 0.25)$, $\theta_{\text{N}}(0.25, 0.5)$, $\theta_{\text{N}}(0.5, 0.75)$ and $\theta_{\text{N}}(0.75, 1)$. The point estimator and their standard errors are computed in the same way as the simulation study described in Section 6. In line with the simulation study, we also use the same six methods to construct 95% confidence intervals for quantile shares: EL, ET, CU, GMM, BC_n and BC_p. We include both the augmented and the conventional SWEE methods for all the cases considered.

The analysis results are reported in Tables 6–7. In terms of point estimators, the two approaches produce very similar values. However, the 95% confidence intervals from the the conventional SWEE analysis are much wider than those from the augmented SWEE analysis. This is consistent with the theoretical results as well as results from the simulation studies.

8. DISCUSSION

Semiparametric modeling techniques using estimating equations combine the flexibility and robustness of nonparametric models and the interpretability of parametric models, and provide a powerful general framework for analytical use of complex survey data. In the presence of nuisance functions, however, the conventional two-step semiparametric estimation approach with simple plug-in estimators for the nuisance function is not only inefficient but also sensitive to the plug-in estimator. Moreover, the conventional approach lacks the asymptotic pivotalness and is difficult to use in practice. Our proposed augmented estimating functions tackle the weaknesses of the conventional approach in dealing with nuisance functions and complex survey data, and lead to more efficient estimation of the main parameters of interest and more desirable features on confidence intervals and hypothesis tests. We show that the augmented two-step GEL ratio statistic is asymptotically pivotal under some commonly used survey designs, and the resulting maximum GEL estimators achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound. The inferential framework developed in this paper for design-based inferences using survey data is generally applicable to parameters defined through estimating equations in the presence of nuisance functions. The proposed methods do not follow from any work in the existing literature and are especially attractive to problems in economic studies on inequality measures.

Applications of machine learning methods to the semiparametric estimation problems have received considerable attention in recent years. Under the model-based framework with independent samples, Chernozhukov et al. (2018) proposed double/debiased machine learning estimators for treatment and structural parameters; Chernozhukov et al. (2022) considered debiased and robust semiparametric GMM estimation for plug-in semiparametric estimating equations; Chang (2020) developed double/debiased machine learning estimators for difference-in-differences models. In the survey context, Dagdoug et al. (2021) proposed using random forests to construct a new class of model-assisted estimators for finite population parameters. In this paper, we show that the limiting distribution of the point estimator of the main parameters of interest is invariant to the first step plug-in estimator for the nuisance parameters under our proposed augmented

approach. It is a challenge research question on how to deal with scenarios where machine learning methods are used in the first-step estimation under the current setting. The development of appropriate machine learning methods for general semiparametric models with survey data requires future investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Ackerberg, D., Chen, X., Hahn, J. and Liao, Z. (2014). Asymptotic Efficiency of Semiparametric Two-step GMM. *Review of Economic Studies 81*, 919–943.

Atkinson, A. B. (1970). On the Measurement of Inequality. *Journal of Economic Theory 2*, 244–263.

Beach, C. M. and Davidson, R. (1983). Distribution-Free Statistical Inference with Lorenz Curves and Income Shares. *Review of Economic Studies 50*, 723–734.

Berger, Y. G. and De La Riva Torres, O. (2016). Empirical Likelihood Confidence Intervals for Complex Sampling Designs. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* Series B *78*, 319–341.

Bhattacharya, D. (2007). Inference on Inequality from Household Survey Data. *Journal of Econometrics 137*, 674–707.

Bickel, P. J., Klaassen, C. A., Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y. A., Klaassen, J., Wellner, J. A., and Ritov, Y. A. (1993). *Efficient and adaptive estimation for semiparametric models.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Binder, D. A. (1983). On the Variances of Asymptotically Normal Estimators from Complex Surveys. *International Statistical Review 51*, 279–292.

Bravo, F., Escanciano, J. C. and Van Keilegom, I. (2020). Two-Step Semiparametric Empirical Likelihood Inference. *The Annals of Statistics 48*, 1–26.

Cattaneo, M. D. (2010). Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of Multi-Valued Treatment Effects Under Ignorability. *Journal of Econometrics 155*, 138–154.

Chang, N. C. (2020). Double/Debiased Machine Learning for Difference-in-Differences Models. *The Econometrics Journal 23(2)*, 177–191.

Chen, J. and Sitter, R. R. (1999). A Pseudo Empirical Likelihood Approach to the Effective Use of Auxiliary Information in Complex Surveys. *Statistica Sinica 9*, 385–406.

Chen, J. and Wu, C. (2002). Estimation of Distribution Function and Quantiles Using the Model-Calibrated Pseudo Empirical Likelihood Method. *Statistica Sinica 12*, 1223–1239.

Chen, R. and Tabri, R. V. (2021). Jackknife Empirical Likelihood for Inequality Constraints on Regular Functionals. *Journal of Econometrics 221*, 68–77.

Chen, S. and Kim, J. K. (2014). Population Empirical Likelihood for Nonparametric Inference in Survey Sampling. *Statistica Sinica 24*, 335–355.

Chen, X. (2007). *Large Sample Sieve Estimation of Semi-Nonparametric Models*. In: Heckman, J., Leamer, E. (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics, vol. VI*. Elsevier Science B.V, pp. 5549–5632.

Chen X. and Liao, Z. (2015). Sieve Semiparametric Two-Step GMM Under Weak Dependence. *Journal of Econometrics 189*, 163–186.

Chen, X., Hong, H. and Tarozzi, A. (2008). Semiparametric Efficiency in GMM Models With Auxiliary Data. *The Annals of Statistics 36*, 808–843.

Chen, X., Linton, O. B. and Van Keilegom, I. (2003). Estimation of Semiparametric Models When the Criterion Function is not Smooth. *Econometrica 71*, 1591–1608.

Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W. and Robins, J. (2018). Double/Debiased Machine Learning for Treatment and Structural Parameters. *The Econometrics Journal 21*, C1–C68.

Chernozhukov, V., Escanciano, J. C., Ichimura, H., Newey, W. K., and Robins, J. M. (2022). Locally robust semiparametric estimation. *Econometrica 90(4)*, 1501–1535.

Corcoran, S. (1998). Bartlett Adjustment of Empirical Discrepancy Statistics. *Biometrika 85*, 965–972.

Cressie, N. and T. Read. (1984). Multinomial Goodness-of-Fit Tests. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* Series B *46*, 440–464.

Davidson, R. and Duclos, J. (2000). Statistical Inference for Stochastic Dominance and for the Measurement of Poverty and Inequality. *Econometrica 68*, 1435–1464.

Dagdoug, M., Goga, C. and Haziza, D. (2021). Model-Assisted Estimation Through Random Forests in Finite Population Sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. DOI: 10.1080/01621459.2021.1987250

Frazier, D. T. and Renault, E. (2017). Efficient Two-Step Estimation via Targeting. *Journal of Econometrics 201*, 212–227.

Fuller, W. A. (2009). *Sampling Statistics*. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey.

Godambe, V. P. and Thompson, M. E. (1986). Parameters of Superpopulation and Survey Population: Their Relationships and Estimation. *International Statistical Review 54*, 127–138.

Goga, C. and Ruiz-Gazen, A. (2014). Efficient Estimation of Nonlinear Finite Population Parameters by Using Non-parametrics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* Series B *76*, 113–140.

Hansen, L., Heaton, J. and Yaron, A. (1996). Finite-Sample Properties of Some Alternative GMM Estimators. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics 14*, 262–280.

Haziza, D., Mecatti, F. and Rao, J. N. K. (2008). Evaluation of Some Approximate Variance Estimators under the Rao-Sampford Unequal Probability Sampling Design. *Metron 66*, 91–108.

Ichimura, H., and Newey, W. K. (2022). The influence function of semiparametric estimators. *Quantitative Economics 13(1)*, 29–61.

Imbens, G., Spady, R. and Johnson, P. (1998). Information Theoretic Approaches to Inference in Moment Condition Models. *Econometrica 66*, 333–357.

Kitamura, Y. and Stutzer, M. (1997). An Information-Theoretic Alternative to Generalized Method of Moments Estimation. *Econometrica 65*, 861–874.

Matsushita, Y. and Otsu, T. (2020). Likelihood Inference on Semiparametric Models with Generated Regressors. *Econometric Theory 36*, 626–657.

Newey, W. (1990). Semiparametric Efficiency Bounds. *Journal of Applied Econometrics 5*, 99–135.

Newey, W. (1994a). Kernel estimation of partial means and a general variance estimator. *Econometric Theory 10*, 233–253.

26

Newey, W. (1994b). The Asymptotic Variance of Semiparametric Estimators. *Econometrica 62*, 1349–1382.

Newey, W. and Smith, R. J. (2004). Higher-Order Properties of GMM and Generalized Empirical Likelihood Estimators. *Econometrica 72*, 219–255.

Nygård, F. and Sandström, A. (1989). Income Inequality Measures Based on Sample Surveys. *Journal of Econometrics 42*, 81–95.

Oguz-Alper, M. and Berger, Y. G. (2016). Modelling Complex Survey Data with Population Level information: An Empirical Likelihood Approach. *Biometrika 103*, 447–459.

Owen, A. B. (1988). Empirical Likelihood Ratio Confidence Intervals for a Single Functional. *Biometrika 75*, 237–249.

Parente, P. M. and Smith, R. J. (2011). GEL Methods for Nonsmooth Moment Indicators. *Econometric Theory 27*, 74–113.

Qin, J. and Lawless, J. (1994). Empirical Likelihood and General Estimating Equations. *The Annals of Statistics 22*, 300–325.

Rao, J. N. K., and Scott, A. J. (1981). The Analysis of Categorical Data From Complex Sample Surveys: Chi-Squared Tests for Goodness of Fit and Independence in Two-Way Tables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 76*, 221–230.

Rao, J. N., and Wu, C. F. J. (1988). Resampling inference with complex survey data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 83(401)*, 231–241.

Rao, J. N. K., Wu, C. F. J., and Yue, K. (1992). Some recent work on resampling methods for complex surveys. *Survey Methodology 18(2)*, 209–217.

Rao, C. R. and Mitra, S. K. (1971). *Generalized Inverse of Matrices and Its Applications*. Wiley.

Rubin-Bleuer, S. and Schiopu Kratina, I. (2005). On the Two-Phase Framework for Joint Model and Design-Based Inference. *The Annals of Statistics 33*, 2789–2810.

Teitler, J., Garfinkel, I., Garcia, S. and Kenney, S. (2004). *New York Social Indicators 2001: Growing Prosperity, Lingering Inequality. Social Indicators Survey Center*. Columbia University.

Van der Vaart, A. W. (1991). On Differentiable Functionals. *The Annals of Statistics 19*, 178–204.

Wu, C. and Rao, J. N. K. (2006). Pseudo Empirical Likelihood Ratio Confidence Intervals for Complex Surveys. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics 34*, 359–375.

Wu, C. and Thompson, M. E. (2020). *Sampling Theory and Practice*. Springer, Cham.

Zhao, P. and Wu, C. (2019). Some Theoretical and Practical Issues with Empirical Likelihood Methods for Complex Surveys. *International Statistical Review 87*, S239–256.

Zhao, P., Haziza, D. and Wu, C. (2020). Survey Weighted Estimating Equation Inference With Nuisance Functionals. *Journal of Econometrics 216*, 516–536.

Zhao, P., Haziza, D. and Wu, C. (2022). Sample Empirical Likelihood and the Design-Based Oracle Variable Selection Theory. *Statistica Sinica 32*, 435–457.

Zheng, B. (2002). Testing Lorenz Curves with Non-Simple Random Samples. *Econometrica 70*, 1235–1243.

Zhong, C.X.B. and Rao, J. N. K. (2000). Empirical likelihood inference under stratified sampling using auxiliary population information. *Biometrika 87*, 929–938.

Table 1. Point Estimates of Quantile Shares

Design	(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE			Conventional SWEE		
		Bias	SD	SE	Bias	SD	SE
A	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.000	0.006	0.006
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	-0.001	0.005	0.005	0.000	0.005	0.006
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	-0.002	0.005	0.006	0.000	0.005	0.006
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	-0.002	0.010	0.010	-0.002	0.010	0.010
B	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.000	0.005	0.005
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	-0.005	0.004	0.006	-0.001	0.004	0.006
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	-0.007	0.005	0.007	0.000	0.005	0.006
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	-0.007	0.009	0.010	-0.001	0.009	0.010
C	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.000	0.006	0.006	0.000	0.006	0.006
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	-0.001	0.004	0.005	0.000	0.004	0.005
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	-0.002	0.004	0.005	0.000	0.004	0.005
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	-0.003	0.009	0.009	-0.001	0.009	0.009
D	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.000	0.004	0.004
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.000	0.004	0.004	0.000	0.004	0.005
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.000	0.004	0.005	0.000	0.004	0.006
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	-0.001	0.009	0.009	-0.001	0.009	0.009

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Regularity Conditions for Proposition 2.1

The asymptotic properties of the conventional survey weighted two-step empirical likelihood estimator presented in Zhao et al. (2020) are established under the following regularity conditions.

A1. (i) The finite population parameter vector $\theta_\mathrm{N} \in \Theta$ is the unique solution to $U_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N}, \varphi_\mathrm{N}) = 0$; (ii) The parameter space Θ is a compact set in the p-dimensional Euclidean space; (iii) The $\varphi_\mathrm{N} \in \Psi$ is a nuisance parameter and Ψ is a vector space of functions.

A2. There exists a function $U(\theta, \varphi)$ such that as $N \to \infty$, $\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta\times\Psi(\delta_\mathrm{N})} \|U_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \varphi) - U(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$ for all sequences of positive numbers $\{\delta_\mathrm{N}\}$ with $\delta_\mathrm{N} = o(1)$. The limiting function $U(\theta, \varphi)$ also satisfies the following conditions:

   (i) There exists unique $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ satisfying $U(\theta_0, \varphi_0) = 0$, where $\varphi_0 = \varphi_0(\cdot, \theta_0) \in \Psi$;
   (ii) Uniformly for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $U(\theta, \varphi)$ is continuous (with respect to the metric $\|\cdot\|_\Psi$) in φ at $\varphi = \varphi_0$.

A3. (i) $\max_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi} \|g(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(n_B^{1/2})$; (ii) For any sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_\mathrm{N}\}$ with $\delta_\mathrm{N} = o(1)$,

$$\sup_{(\theta,\varphi),(\theta',\varphi')\in\Theta(\delta_\mathrm{N})\times\Psi(\delta_\mathrm{N})} \|U_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \varphi) - U(\theta, \varphi) - [U_\mathrm{N}(\theta', \varphi') - U(\theta', \varphi')]\| = o(N^{-1/2});$$

   (iii) For all $\delta > 0$ and some positive constant c,

$$\sup_{(\theta,\varphi),(\theta',\varphi')\in\Theta(\delta)\times\Psi(\delta)} \mathrm{Var}\Big\{[\hat{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta, \varphi) - \hat{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta', \varphi')] \mid \mathcal{F}_\mathrm{N}\Big\} \le cn_B^{-1}|\delta|,$$

Table 2. 95% Confidence Intervals of Quantile Shares Under the Survey Design A

Methods	(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE				Conventional SWEE			
		LE	CP	UE	AL	LE	CP	UE	AL
EL	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.037	0.940	0.023	0.024	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.068
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.031	0.947	0.022	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.091
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.032	0.940	0.028	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.111
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.017	0.944	0.039	0.040	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.137
ET	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.051	0.932	0.017	0.023	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.068
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.033	0.944	0.023	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.091
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.031	0.940	0.029	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.111
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.013	0.943	0.044	0.039	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.138
CU	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.057	0.932	0.011	0.023	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.068
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.031	0.948	0.021	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.091
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.031	0.942	0.027	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.112
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.009	0.944	0.047	0.040	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.139
GMM	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.059	0.929	0.012	0.023	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.068
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.033	0.944	0.023	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.091
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.031	0.940	0.029	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.111
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.010	0.942	0.048	0.039	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.138
BC_n	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.059	0.928	0.013	0.023	0.057	0.930	0.013	0.023
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.014	0.969	0.017	0.021	0.021	0.966	0.013	0.021
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.008	0.966	0.026	0.023	0.022	0.958	0.020	0.023
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.008	0.945	0.047	0.041	0.011	0.951	0.038	0.041
BC_p	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.060	0.926	0.014	0.022	0.045	0.945	0.010	0.024
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.010	0.972	0.018	0.021	0.012	0.981	0.007	0.024
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.007	0.965	0.028	0.023	0.004	0.992	0.004	0.026
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.007	0.936	0.057	0.041	0.009	0.949	0.042	0.041

where $\hat{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} g(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)$, the commonly used survey weighted estimating equations.

A4. For any $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta(\delta) \times \Psi(\delta)$, the ordinary derivative $\Gamma_1(\theta, \varphi)$ in θ of the limiting functions $U(\theta, \varphi)$ exists and satisfies

$$\Gamma_1(\theta, \varphi)(\bar{\theta} - \theta) = \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{t}[U(\theta + t(\bar{\theta} - \theta), \varphi(\cdot, \theta + t(\bar{\theta} - \theta))) - U(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta))]$$

for $\bar{\theta} \in \Theta$; the derivative $\Gamma_1(\theta, \varphi)$ is continuous at $\theta = \theta_{\mathrm{N}}$; and the matrix $\Gamma_1(\theta, \varphi)$ has full column rank p.

A5. For any $\theta \in \Theta(\delta)$, the limiting function $U(\theta, \varphi)$ is pathwise differentiable at $\varphi \in \Psi(\delta)$ in the direction $[\bar{\varphi} - \varphi]$ in the sense that the limit

$$D(\theta, \varphi)[\bar{\varphi} - \varphi] = \lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{t}[U(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta) + t(\bar{\varphi}(\cdot, \theta) - \varphi(\cdot, \theta))) - U(\theta, \varphi(\cdot, \theta))]$$

exists for $\{\varphi + t(\bar{\varphi} - \varphi) : t \in [0, 1]\} \subset \Psi$; for all $\theta \in \Theta(\delta)$ and $(\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta) \times \Psi(\delta)$, the pathwise derivative $D(\theta, \varphi')[\varphi - \varphi']$ exists in all directions $[\varphi - \varphi'] \in \Psi$; and for all $(\theta, \varphi), (\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}}) \times \Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})$ with a positive sequence $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$: (i) $\|U(\theta, \varphi) - U(\theta, \varphi') - D(\theta, \varphi')[\varphi - \varphi']\| \leq c\|\varphi - \varphi'\|_{\Psi}^2$ for some constant $c \geq 0$; (ii) $\|D(\theta, \varphi')[\varphi - \varphi'] - D(\theta', \varphi')[\varphi - \varphi']\| = o(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})$.

Table 3. 95% Confidence Intervals of Quantile Shares Under the Survey Design B

Methods	(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE				Conventional SWEE			
		LE	CP	UE	AL	LE	CP	UE	AL
EL	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.039	0.933	0.028	0.023	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.067
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.022	0.963	0.015	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.090
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.026	0.952	0.022	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.112
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.015	0.956	0.029	0.038	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.136
ET	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.044	0.932	0.024	0.022	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.066
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.022	0.963	0.015	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.090
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.025	0.953	0.022	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.112
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.012	0.956	0.032	0.038	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.136
CU	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.048	0.940	0.012	0.022	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.067
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.022	0.964	0.014	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.091
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.022	0.959	0.019	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.113
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.010	0.957	0.033	0.038	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.138
GMM	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.046	0.942	0.012	0.022	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.066
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.023	0.962	0.015	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.090
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.022	0.958	0.020	0.020	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.112
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.011	0.956	0.033	0.038	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.137
BC_n	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.050	0.936	0.014	0.021	0.054	0.934	0.012	0.021
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.000	0.953	0.047	0.025	0.007	0.987	0.006	0.025
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.000	0.931	0.069	0.028	0.004	0.991	0.005	0.028
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.001	0.932	0.067	0.042	0.009	0.966	0.025	0.042
BC_p	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.057	0.927	0.016	0.021	0.044	0.946	0.010	0.023
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.000	0.958	0.042	0.025	0.007	0.984	0.009	0.024
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.000	0.932	0.068	0.028	0.004	0.994	0.002	0.026
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.001	0.921	0.078	0.042	0.010	0.956	0.034	0.040

A6. The estimator $\hat{\varphi}$ satisfies the following conditions: (i) $\|\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}\|_\Psi = o_p(n_B^{-1/4})$; (ii) $D(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})[\hat{\varphi} - \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}] = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, where $\Xi(Z, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$ has finite fourth population moments (ie., $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\|^4 < \infty$) and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \Xi(Z_i, \theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$ is asymptotically normally distributed with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix at the order $O(n_B^{-1} N^2)$.

A7. The sampling design along with the expected sample size n_B satisfies (i) $n_B = O(N^\beta)$ for some β such that $1/2 < \beta \le 1$; and (ii) $c_1 < \pi_i N n_B^{-1} < c_2$, $i \in \mathcal{S}$ for some positive constants c_1 and c_2.

A8. Let $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathrm{N}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Z}_i$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathrm{N}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \mathcal{Z}_i$. (i) For any vector $\mathcal{Z}$ satisfying $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\mathcal{Z}_i\|^{2+\sigma} < \infty$ (i.e., finite $2 + \sigma$ population monents) with some small $\sigma > 0$, $\mathrm{Var}(\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathrm{N}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}}) \le c_0 n_B^{-1} (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\mathcal{Z}_i - \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathrm{N}})(\mathcal{Z}_i - \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathrm{N}})^\top$ for some constant c_0; (ii) For any $\mathcal{Z}$ with finite fourth population moment, $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathrm{N}} - \mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{N}}$ is asymptotically normally distributed with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix at the order $O(n_B^{-1})$.

Discussions and interpretations of these regularity conditions can be found in Zhao et al. (2020).

Table 4. 95% Confidence Intervals of Quantile Shares Under the Survey Design C

Methods	(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE				Conventional SWEE			
		LE	CP	UE	AL	LE	CP	UE	AL
EL	(0.00, 0.25)	0.049	0.916	0.035	0.026	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.070
	(0.25, 0.50)	0.033	0.946	0.021	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.087
	(0.50, 0.75)	0.026	0.942	0.032	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.101
	(0.75, 1.00)	0.028	0.939	0.033	0.036	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.117
ET	(0.00, 0.25)	0.068	0.912	0.020	0.025	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.070
	(0.25, 0.50)	0.033	0.947	0.020	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.087
	(0.50, 0.75)	0.025	0.943	0.032	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.101
	(0.75, 1.00)	0.025	0.941	0.034	0.035	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.117
CU	(0.00, 0.25)	0.078	0.915	0.007	0.025	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.070
	(0.25, 0.50)	0.034	0.946	0.020	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.088
	(0.50, 0.75)	0.025	0.943	0.032	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.102
	(0.75, 1.00)	0.019	0.944	0.037	0.036	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.118
GMM	(0.00, 0.25)	0.079	0.913	0.008	0.025	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.070
	(0.25, 0.50)	0.034	0.946	0.020	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.087
	(0.50, 0.75)	0.025	0.941	0.034	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.101
	(0.75, 1.00)	0.020	0.943	0.037	0.035	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.118
BC_n	(0.00, 0.25)	0.083	0.901	0.016	0.024	0.081	0.905	0.014	0.024
	(0.25, 0.50)	0.008	0.975	0.017	0.020	0.017	0.971	0.012	0.020
	(0.50, 0.75)	0.005	0.952	0.043	0.020	0.017	0.961	0.022	0.020
	(0.75, 1.00)	0.011	0.926	0.063	0.037	0.024	0.943	0.033	0.037
BC_p	(0.00, 0.25)	0.084	0.900	0.016	0.024	0.066	0.923	0.011	0.026
	(0.25, 0.50)	0.003	0.978	0.019	0.020	0.006	0.990	0.004	0.022
	(0.50, 0.75)	0.001	0.954	0.045	0.020	0.006	0.989	0.005	0.022
	(0.75, 1.00)	0.011	0.933	0.056	0.036	0.022	0.946	0.032	0.036

Appendix B. Technical Details and Proofs

Let $f_{\mathrm{N}} = n_B/N$ and define the following alternative design-based GEL criterion function

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta, \varphi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} [\rho(\eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_{\mathrm{N}} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)) - \rho_0]. \quad (A.1)$$

As discussed in the Section 2.3 of the main paper, the proposed two-step GEL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ can be equivalently defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_{GEL} = \arg \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \psi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}), \quad (A.2)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \psi}(\theta, \varphi) = \{\eta : \eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_{\mathrm{N}} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$. In addition, we define $\hat{\eta}_{GEL} = \arg \max_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \psi}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$.

Recall that $\phi(Z, \theta, \varphi) = (\psi(Z, \theta, \varphi)^\top, q(Z, \theta)^\top)^\top$. Define the following alternative design-based GEL criterion function

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \varphi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (\rho(\nu^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_{\mathrm{N}} \phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)) - \rho_0). \quad (A.3)$$

The duality results in section 2.3 of the main paper shows that the restricted two-step

Table 5. 95% Confidence Intervals of Quantile Shares Under the Survey Design D

Methods	(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE				Conventional SWEE			
		LE	CP	UE	AL	LE	CP	UE	AL
EL	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.022	0.962	0.016	0.017	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.056
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.024	0.954	0.022	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.083
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.030	0.951	0.019	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.106
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.019	0.945	0.036	0.037	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.132
ET	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.026	0.960	0.014	0.017	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.056
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.025	0.954	0.021	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.083
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.031	0.952	0.017	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.106
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.019	0.940	0.041	0.036	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.132
CU	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.032	0.955	0.013	0.017	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.057
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.026	0.956	0.018	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.084
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.031	0.953	0.016	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.107
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.016	0.941	0.043	0.036	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.134
GMM	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.031	0.955	0.014	0.017	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.056
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.025	0.956	0.019	0.018	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.083
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.031	0.952	0.017	0.019	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.106
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.016	0.941	0.043	0.036	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.132
BC_n	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.033	0.952	0.015	0.017	0.033	0.952	0.015	0.017
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.015	0.970	0.015	0.019	0.015	0.970	0.015	0.019
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.025	0.963	0.012	0.021	0.025	0.963	0.012	0.021
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.014	0.951	0.035	0.038	0.014	0.951	0.035	0.038
BC_p	$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.038	0.950	0.012	0.017	0.029	0.961	0.010	0.018
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.018	0.966	0.016	0.019	0.013	0.976	0.011	0.020
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.025	0.964	0.011	0.021	0.017	0.979	0.004	0.023
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.015	0.947	0.038	0.038	0.013	0.949	0.038	0.037

Table 6. NYSIS Study: Point Estimates of Quantile Shares on Earnings

(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE		Conventional SWEE	
	Estimate	Standard Error	Estimate	Standard Error
$(0.00, 0.25)$	0.037	0.003	0.036	0.004
$(0.25, 0.50)$	0.107	0.010	0.118	0.009
$(0.50, 0.75)$	0.198	0.020	0.215	0.017
$(0.75, 1.00)$	0.615	0.034	0.628	0.026

GEL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ can be also equivalently defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R = \arg \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^R} \sup_{\nu \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\phi,\mathrm{N}}(\theta,\hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \hat{\varphi}), \qquad (A.4)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N},\phi}(\theta,\varphi) = \{\nu : \nu^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_{\mathrm{N}} \phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Also define

$$\hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R = \arg \max_{\nu \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N},\phi}(\theta,\hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \nu, \hat{\varphi}).$$

To facilitates the usual asymptotic orders in the context of complex surveys, we focus on GEL criteria and GEL estimator as in (A.1)–(A.4) to establish the large sample results

Table 7. NYSIS Study: 95% Confidence Intervals of Quantile Shares on Earnings

Methods	(τ_1, τ_2)	Augmented SWEE		Conventional SWEE	
		Confidence Interval	Length	Confidence Interval	Length
EL	$(0.00, 0.25)$	$(0.028, 0.043)$	0.015	$(0.027, 0.046)$	0.019
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	$(0.093, 0.131)$	0.038	$(0.091, 0.145)$	0.054
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	$(0.178, 0.240)$	0.062	$(0.167, 0.258)$	0.091
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	$(0.588, 0.696)$	0.108	$(0.569, 0.705)$	0.136
ET	$(0.00, 0.25)$	$(0.029, 0.044)$	0.015	$(0.028, 0.046)$	0.018
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	$(0.097, 0.133)$	0.036	$(0.094, 0.146)$	0.052
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	$(0.186, 0.243)$	0.057	$(0.173, 0.260)$	0.087
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	$(0.584, 0.683)$	0.099	$(0.564, 0.693)$	0.129
CU	$(0.00, 0.25)$	$(0.030, 0.045)$	0.015	$(0.028, 0.047)$	0.019
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	$(0.099, 0.137)$	0.038	$(0.095, 0.149)$	0.054
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	$(0.191, 0.253)$	0.062	$(0.175, 0.266)$	0.091
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	$(0.567, 0.675)$	0.108	$(0.550, 0.687)$	0.137
GMM	$(0.00, 0.25)$	$(0.029, 0.044)$	0.015	$(0.027, 0.045)$	0.018
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	$(0.098, 0.133)$	0.035	$(0.092, 0.145)$	0.053
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	$(0.190, 0.246)$	0.056	$(0.171, 0.260)$	0.089
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	$(0.573, 0.682)$	0.109	$(0.562, 0.695)$	0.133
BC_n	$(0.00, 0.25)$	$(0.031, 0.042)$	0.011	$(0.028, 0.043)$	0.015
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	$(0.087, 0.126)$	0.039	$(0.100, 0.135)$	0.035
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	$(0.158, 0.237)$	0.079	$(0.181, 0.248)$	0.067
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	$(0.548, 0.681)$	0.133	$(0.577, 0.678)$	0.101
BC_p	$(0.00, 0.25)$	$(0.030, 0.045)$	0.015	$(0.030, 0.045)$	0.015
	$(0.25, 0.50)$	$(0.086, 0.128)$	0.042	$(0.094, 0.132)$	0.038
	$(0.50, 0.75)$	$(0.159, 0.238)$	0.079	$(0.181, 0.247)$	0.066
	$(0.75, 1.00)$	$(0.555, 0.683)$	0.128	$(0.584, 0.688)$	0.104

of the paper. Let "w.p.a.1" denote "with probability approaching 1". Let C denote a generic positive constant which may vary depending on the context.

To facilitate the theoretical proofs, we provide four useful lemmas.

LEMMA A1. *Suppose that conditions A7 and B2(i) hold. Then for any δ with $1/\alpha < \delta < 1/2$ and $\hat{\Lambda}_N = \{\eta : \|\eta\| \le n_B^{-\delta}\}$, $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi, \eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_N, i \in \mathcal{S}} |\eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_N \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)| = o_p(1)$ and w.p.a.1, $\hat{\Lambda}_N \subseteq \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\varphi}(\theta, \varphi)$ for all $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi$.*

PROOF. It follows from Condition A7 that $1/c_2 < \pi_i^{-1} f_N < 1/c_1$ uniformly in i. Combining this with condition B2(i) yields $\max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi} \|\pi_i^{-1} f_N \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(n_B^{1/\alpha})$ for some $\alpha > 2$. Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi, \lambda \in \hat{\Lambda}_N, i \in \mathcal{S}} |\eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_N \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)| \le \|\eta\| \max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi} \|\pi_i^{-1} f_N \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|$$

$$= O_p(n_B^{-\delta + 1/\alpha}) \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

provided $-\delta + 1/\alpha < 0$. This further implies that w.p.a.1, $\eta^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_N \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathcal{V}$ for all $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Psi$ and $\|\eta\| \le n_B^{-\delta}$. $\square$

LEMMA A2. *Suppose that conditions A7 and B2(i) hold, $\bar{\theta} \in \Theta$, $\bar{\theta} \xrightarrow{p} \theta_N$ and $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Then, w.p.a.1, $\bar{\eta} = \arg\sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\bar{\theta},\hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ exists, $\bar{\eta} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, and $\sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\bar{\theta},\hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) \le O_p(n_B^{-1})$.*

PROOF. Let $\hat{W}_N(\theta, \varphi) = n_B^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} f_N^2 \psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)^{\otimes 2}$. It is easy to show that $\|\hat{W}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi}) - W_2\| = o_p(1)$, where $W_2 = n_B N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}$. Recall that $\hat{\Lambda}_N = \{\eta : \|\eta\| \le n_B^{-\delta}\}$, where δ is as defined in Lemma A1. It follows from the nonsingularity of the matrix W_2 that the smallest eigenvalue of $W_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})$ is bounded away from zero w.p.a.1. This, coupled with the twice continuous differentiability of $\rho(v)$ in a neighborhood of zero and the results of Lemma A1, shows that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ admits a second order Taylor expansion on $\hat{\Lambda}_N$ with nonsingular second derivative matrix. Then, $\tilde{\eta} = \arg\sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_N} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ exists w.p.a.1. Now using a second order Taylor's expansion for $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi})$ around $\tilde{\eta} = 0$, we obtain

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi}) = -\tilde{\eta}^\top \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi}) + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\eta}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_2\left(\dot{\eta}^\top f_N \psi(Z_i, \bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\right) \pi_i^{-2} f_N^2 \psi(Z_i, \bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})^{\otimes 2} \right] \tilde{\eta},$$

where $\dot{\eta}$ is on the line segment between $\tilde{\eta}$ and 0. It follows from Lemma A1 and the fact $\rho_2(0) = -1$ that $\max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_2(\dot{\eta}^\top f_N \psi(Z_i, \bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})) < -1/2$ w.p.a.1. Combining this with the above expansion, we obtain that

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi}) \le -\tilde{\eta}^\top \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi}) - \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\eta}^\top \hat{W}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\tilde{\eta} \le \|\tilde{\eta}\|\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\| - C\|\tilde{\eta}\|^2.$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\eta}$, we have that $0 = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, 0, \hat{\varphi}) \le \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi})$. This leads to $0 \le \|\tilde{\eta}\|\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\| - C\|\tilde{\eta}\|^2$, and thus $C\|\tilde{\eta}\| \le \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\|$, w.p.a.1. It follows from the assumption $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi}) = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ that $\|\tilde{\eta}\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2}) = o_p(n_B^{-\delta})$. Therefore, w.p.a.1. $\tilde{\eta} \in \text{int}(\hat{\Lambda}_N)$ and hence the maximum $\tilde{\eta}$ also satisfies the first order conditions $\partial \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi})/\partial \eta = 0$. Using the results of Lemma A1, it can be further conclude that $\tilde{\eta} \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})$. This, together with the concavity of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ and convexity of $\hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})$, implies that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi}) = \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\bar{\theta},\hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ and hence $\bar{\eta} = \tilde{\eta}$. This yields the conclusions that w.p.a.1, $\bar{\eta} = \arg\sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\bar{\theta},\hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ exists and $\bar{\eta} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Since $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\|\tilde{\eta}\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, together with the above inequality, it is easy to show that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\eta}, \hat{\varphi}) \le \|\bar{\eta}\|\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\bar{\theta}, \hat{\varphi})\| - C\|\bar{\eta}\|^2 = O_p(n_B^{-1})$. $\square$

LEMMA A3. *Suppose that conditions A7 and B2(i) hold. Then $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$.*

PROOF. Let $\tilde{\eta} = -n_B^{-\delta} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})/\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|$, where δ is as defined in Lemma A1. It then follows from Lemma A1 that $\max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |\tilde{\eta}^\top \pi_i^{-1} f_N \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})| \xrightarrow{p} 0$, and thus $\tilde{\eta} \in \hat{\Lambda}_{N,\psi}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$. Then, we have that for any $\dot{\eta}$ on the line segment between $\tilde{\eta}$ and 0, w.p.a.1 $\rho_2(\dot{\eta}^\top \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})) \ge -C$ uniformly in i. By condition B6,

$$\frac{n_B}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i^{-1} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi} \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|^2 = O(1).$$

Moreover, we can show the following uniform convergence property

$$\frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} f_{\text{N}}^2 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi} \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|^2 = \frac{n_B}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi} \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|^2 + o_p(1).$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} f_{\text{N}}^2 \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})^{\otimes 2} \leq \frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} f_{\text{N}}^2 \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Psi} \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|^2 I_q \xrightarrow{p} C I_q,$$

where I_q is the $q \times q$ identity matrix. Using a second order Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi}) &= -\tilde{\eta}^\top \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\eta}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_2 \left(\dot{\eta}^\top f_{\text{N}} \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) \right) \pi_i^{-2} f_{\text{N}}^2 \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})^{\otimes 2} \right] \tilde{\eta} \\
&\geq n_B^{-\delta} \|\psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| - \frac{C}{2} \tilde{\eta}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-2} f_{\text{N}}^2 \psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})^{\otimes 2} \right] \tilde{\eta} \\
&\geq n_B^{-\delta} \|\psi(Z_i, \hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| - C n_B^{-2\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

This, combined with Lemma A2 and the fact the $(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL})$ is a saddle point, shows that

$$n_B^{-\delta} \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| - C n_B^{-2\delta} \leq \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \tilde{\eta}, \hat{\varphi}) \leq \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$$
$$\leq \sup_{\eta \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N}, \psi}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) \leq O_p(n_B^{-1}).$$

Solving above equation for $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|$ then gives $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| \leq O_p(n_B^{\delta-1}) + C n_B^{-\delta} \leq O_p(n_B^{-\delta})$. Now we consider $\bar{\eta} = \varepsilon_n \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})$ with any $\varepsilon_n \to 0$. Obviously, $\bar{\eta} = o_p(n_B^{-\delta})$, and thus $\bar{\eta} \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N}}$ w.p.a.1. Similarly, we have that

$$-\bar{\eta}^\top \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - C \|\bar{\eta}\|^2 = \varepsilon_n \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|^2 - C \varepsilon_n^2 \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|^2 \leq O_p(n_B^{-1}).$$

It can be shown that $\varepsilon_n \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|^2 = O_p(n_B^{-1})$ by noting that $1 - C\varepsilon_n > 0$ for n large enough. Then we can show $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. $\qquad \square$

LEMMA A4. *Suppose that conditions A1, A6–A8, B1 and B3–B4 hold. Then, uniformly in θ and η, for $\theta - \theta_{\text{N}} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\eta = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, we have*

$$|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta)| = o_p(n_B^{-1}),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta) = [-\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) - \Gamma_2(\theta - \theta_{\text{N}})]^\top \eta - \frac{1}{2} \eta^\top W_2 \eta.$

PROOF. Using a second-order Taylor series expansion for $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi})$ around $\eta = 0$, we obtain that, for $\theta - \theta_{\text{N}} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\eta = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$,

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) = -\eta^\top \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \hat{\varphi}) + \frac{1}{2} \eta^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_B} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \rho_2 \left(\dot{\eta}^\top f_{\text{N}} \psi(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi}) \right) \pi_i^{-2} f_{\text{N}}^2 \psi(Z_i, \theta, \hat{\varphi})^{\otimes 2} \right] \eta,$$

where $\dot\eta$ is on the line segment between η and 0. By the triangle inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\eta,\hat\varphi) &- \mathcal{L}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\eta)| \\
&\leq |-[\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})(\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N})]^\top\eta| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\left|\eta^\top\left(\frac{1}{n_B}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}}\rho_2(\dot\eta^\top f_\mathrm{N}\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi))\pi_i^{-2}f_\mathrm{N}^2\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi)^{\otimes 2} + W_2\right)\eta\right| \\
&=: R_\mathrm{N1} + R_\mathrm{N2}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

For R_N1, we have that $R_\mathrm{N1} \leq \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N})\|\|\eta\|$. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) &- \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N})\| \\
&\leq \|[\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\hat\varphi)] - [\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})]\| \\
&\quad + \|\mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N})\| + \|\mathbb{U}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi_\mathrm{N})\|.
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term on the right of above inequality can be rewritten as $\|[\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\hat\varphi)] - [\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})]\| = \|\mathcal{J}_1(\theta,\hat\varphi,\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) + \mathcal{J}_2(\theta,\hat\varphi,\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})\|$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_1(\theta,\hat\varphi,\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) &= \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) + \mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}), \\
\mathcal{J}_2(\theta,\hat\varphi,\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) &= \mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\hat\varphi) + \mathbb{U}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Condition B3, we can show that both $\{\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\varphi) - \mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\varphi), N = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ and $\{\mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi), N = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ are stochastically equicontinuous. Therefore, we obtain that $\|\mathcal{J}_j(\theta,\hat\varphi,\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})\| = o(n_B^{-1/2})$, $j = 1, 2$, uniformly in θ for $\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Then, by triangle inequality, $\|[\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\hat\varphi)] - [\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N})]\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. With assumption $\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and the differentiability of $\mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi)$ with respect to θ, we have $\|\mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N})\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. It follows from conditions A6 and B4 that $\|\mathbb{U}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi_\mathrm{N})\| \leq C\|\hat\varphi - \varphi_\mathrm{N}\|_\Psi^2 = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Combining above arguments, we obtain that $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\hat\varphi) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_\mathrm{N},\varphi_\mathrm{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N})\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. This, together with assumption $\eta = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, immediately implies that $R_\mathrm{N1} = o_p(n_B^{-1})$.

Next we consider R_N2. It is easy to show that uniformly in θ for $\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$,

$$
\left\|\frac{1}{n_B}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}}\pi_i^{-2}f_\mathrm{N}^2\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi)^{\otimes 2} - W_2\right\| = o_p(1).
$$

This combined with Lemma A1 and the assumption $\eta = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, shows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\eta^\top\left(\frac{1}{n_B}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}}\rho_2(\dot\eta^\top f_\mathrm{N}\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi))\pi_i^{-2}f_\mathrm{N}^2\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi)^{\otimes 2} + W_2\right)\eta\right| \\
\leq \|\eta\|^2\left\|\frac{1}{n_B}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}}\rho_2(\dot\eta^\top f_\mathrm{N}\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi))\pi_i^{-2}f_\mathrm{N}^2\psi(Z_i,\theta,\hat\varphi)^{\otimes 2} + W_2\right\| \\
= O_p(n_B^{-1})o_p(1) = o_p(n_B^{-1}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we have $|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\eta,\hat\varphi) - \mathcal{L}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\eta)| = o_p(n_B^{-1})$, uniformly for $\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\eta = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.1: Note that $\Theta = \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N}\| \geq \epsilon\} \cup \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N}\| < \epsilon\}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Obviously, $\{\theta : \|\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N}\| < \epsilon\}$ is also a compact subset of Θ. Thus, there exists $\theta_1 \in \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta_\mathrm{N}\| \geq \epsilon\}$ such that

$$
\inf_{\theta:\|\theta-\theta_\mathrm{N}\|\geq\epsilon}\|\mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta,\varphi_\mathrm{N})\| = \|\mathbb{U}_\mathrm{N}(\theta_1,\varphi_\mathrm{N})\|.
$$

By the identification of θ_{N}, we conclude that $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_1, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| > 0$ for any $\theta_1 \neq \theta_{\mathrm{N}}$. This combined with the above equality, implies that $\inf_{\theta:\|\theta-\theta_{\mathrm{N}}\|\geq\epsilon} \|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| > 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. It follows that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a number $c(\epsilon) > 0$ such that $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \geq c(\epsilon) > 0$ for every θ with $\|\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| > \epsilon$. Thus, the event $\{\|\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| > \epsilon\}$ is contained in the event $\{\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \geq c(\epsilon) > 0\}$, and $\Pr(\|\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| > \epsilon \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}}) \leq \Pr(\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \geq c(\epsilon) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}})$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, to establish the consistency for the proposed GEL estimators $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$, it suffices to show that $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| = o_p(1)$. Using the triangle inequality, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \leq\ & \|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| \\
& + \|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| + \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the first term on the right of above inequality, we have the following inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| \leq\ & \|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \\
& + \|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| + \|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\|.
\end{aligned}
$$

By assumption B3(i), it can be shown that $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| = o_p(1)$ and $\|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = o_p(1)$. Using assumption B2(ii), we can establish the following uniform convergence results

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})} \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(1)\ \text{ and} \\
\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})} \|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(1),
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.5}
$$

for all positive sequences $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$. Combined this with assumption A6, implies that $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = o_p(1)$. It follows that by assumption B1 and $\hat{\varphi} = \varphi_{\mathrm{N}} + o_p(1)$, $\|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = o_p(1)$. Then $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = o_p(1)$. It follows from Lemma A3 that $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = o_p(1)$. Combining above arguments, we have that $\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| = o_p(1)$, which is equivalent to $\Pr(\|\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \geq c(\epsilon) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{N}}) \to 0$ for all $c(\epsilon) > 0$. Now the design-based consistency of $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ follows. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.2: To establish the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$, we first show that $\|\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| = O(n_B^{-1/2})$. By assumption B1, there exists a constant C such that $\|\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| \leq C\|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\|$ w.p.a.1. As discussed in the proof of Lemma A4, both $\{\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi), N = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ and $\{\mathbb{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi), N = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ are stochastically equicontinuous. Then we have $\|[\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})] - [\mathbb{U}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})]\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. By assumption B4, $\|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. By Lemma A3, $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. By condition A8, $\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Combining these facts with the triangle inequality, implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \leq\ & \|[\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})] - [\mathbb{U}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})]\| \\
& + \|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| + \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi})\| + \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently, $\|\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| \leq C\|\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathbb{U}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}})\| \leq O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$.

Recall that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta) = [-\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \Gamma_2(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{N}})]^\top \eta - \frac{1}{2}\eta^\top W_2 \eta$. By Lemma A4, $|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta)| = o_p(n_B^{-1})$ uniformly in θ and η, for $\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{N}} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\eta = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. We now consider the optimization problem $\inf_{\theta\in\Theta} \sup_{\eta\in\mathsf{R}^r} \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \eta)$. It

is clear that $\mathcal{L}_N(\theta, \eta)$ is concave in η. This combined with the fact that Θ is compact, implies that the first-order conditions for an interior global maximum are satisfied at $(\tilde{\theta}^\top, \tilde{\eta}^\top)^\top$ and are given by

$$-\Gamma_2^\top \tilde{\eta} = 0, \quad -\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N) - \Gamma_2[\tilde{\theta} - \theta_N] - W_2\tilde{\eta} = 0. \tag{A.6}$$

The two systems of equations can be combined and rewritten as

$$-\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Gamma_2^\top \\ \Gamma_2 & W_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\theta} - \theta_N \\ \tilde{\eta} - 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the result on the inverse of a block matrix, we obtain that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\theta} - \theta_N \\ \tilde{\eta} - 0 \end{pmatrix} = -\begin{pmatrix} \Sigma & H \\ H^\top & \mathscr{P} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N) \end{pmatrix}.$$

where $\Sigma_2 = (\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2)^{-1}$, $H = \Sigma_2 \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}$ and $\mathscr{P} = W_2^{-1} - W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2 \Sigma_2 \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}$. This immediately shows that $\tilde{\theta} - \theta_N = -\Sigma_2 \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N)$ and $\tilde{\eta} = -\mathscr{P} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N)$. A little more work gives that $\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \tilde{\theta} = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\eta_{GEL} - \tilde{\eta} = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Combining this with condition B6 implies that $n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_N) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, V_2)$, where $V_2 = \Sigma_2 \Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Omega W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2 \Sigma_2$, with $\Omega = n_B N^{-2} \text{Var}\{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N) \mid \mathcal{F}_N\}$. $\qquad \square$

Proof of Corollary 3.1: Denote by $X \in \mathsf{R}_+^{d_x}$ the size variable that contains information for the sampling design. Under single stage PPS sampling with replacement, each unit i in $\mathcal{S}$ is selected from $\{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ with the given probabilities $p_i = X_i$ and the first-order inclusion probabilities of unit i can be written as $\pi_i = nX_i$. This combined with the arguments of Wu and Thompson (2020), implies that the augmented survey weighted estimating equations $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N)$ could be rewritten as

$$\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N) = \frac{1}{Nn} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} X_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N) = \frac{1}{Nn} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i.$$

where $R_1, \cdots, R_n$ are independent and identically distributed random variables, with the common distribution of the random variable R given by

$$\Pr\left(R = X_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)\right) = X_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N.$$

Now, simple algebraic manipulations show that $E(R) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)X_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N) = 0$, and

$$\text{Var}(R) = E(R^2) = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}.$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\text{Var}\left\{\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N) \mid \mathcal{F}_N\right\} = \frac{1}{n}\text{Var}(R) = \frac{1}{N^2 n}\sum_{i=1}^N X_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}$$

$$= \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i^{-1}\psi(Z_i, \theta_N, \varphi_N)^{\otimes 2}.$$

Therefore, under single stage PPS sampling with replacement,

$$\Omega = n_B \text{Var}\left\{ \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) \mid \mathcal{F}_\text{N} \right\} = \frac{n_B}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^{\otimes 2} = W_2,$$

and the covariance matrix V_2 reduce to $(\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2)^{-1} = \Sigma_2$. Using the arguments of Zhao et al. (2022), we can show that the result is also valid for single-stage PPS sampling without replacement with negligible sampling.

Denote by I_i the indicator variable for unit i, and denote by A_i the event "if unit i is in the sample". Then $I_i = \mathbf{I}(A_i)$, where $\mathbf{I}(A)$ is the indicator function of event A. One special PPS sampling without replacement is the Poisson sampling, under which $I_1, \cdots, I_\text{N}$ are independent Bernoulli random variables with success probabilities $\pi_1, \cdots, \pi_\text{N}$, and thus

$$\text{Var}\left\{ \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) \mid \mathcal{F}_\text{N} \right\} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_i^{-1} \psi(Z_i, \theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^{\otimes 2} - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi(Z_i, \theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^{\otimes 2}.$$

If the sampling rate is negligible, i.e., $n_B/N = o(1)$, then we have that

$$\frac{n_B}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \psi(Z_i, \theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^{\otimes 2} = o(1),$$

which implies that $\Omega = n_B \text{Var}\{ \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) \mid \mathcal{F}_\text{N} \} = W_2 + o(1)$. Therefore, under Poisson sampling with negligible sampling fractions, $n_B^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \theta_\text{N}) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{\to} N(0, V_2)$, where $V_2 = (\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} \Gamma_2)^{-1}$. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.3: It follows from the duality results presented in Section 2.3 of the main paper that the GEL ratio statistic $\text{T}_\text{N}(\theta)$ can be equivalently defined as

$$\text{T}_\text{N}(\theta) \quad = \quad -2n_B\{[\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\theta, \eta_\theta, \hat{\varphi})\}.$$

Combining the $n_B^{1/2}$-consistence of $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}$ with the conclusion of Lemma A4, we have that

$$2n_B|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL})| = o_p(1),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\text{N}(\theta, \eta) = [-\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) - \Gamma_2(\theta - \theta_\text{N})]^\top \eta - \frac{1}{2}\eta^\top W_2 \eta$. This, together with the facts that $\hat{\theta}_{GEL} - \tilde{\theta} = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\eta_{GEL} - \tilde{\eta} = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, as discussed in the proof of Theorem 3.2, implies that $2n_B\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) = 2n_B\mathcal{L}_\text{N}(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\eta}) + o_p(1)$. By the first-order condition (A.6), we obtain that $2n_B\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) = n_B\tilde{\eta}^\top W_2 \tilde{\eta} + o_p(1)$. Since $\tilde{\eta} = -\mathscr{P}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})$ from the proof of Theorem 3.3 and $\mathscr{P}W_2\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{P}$,

$$2n_B\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) = n_B\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^\top \mathscr{P}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) + o_p(1). \qquad (A.7)$$

Furthermore, it follows from Lemma A3 that $2n_B\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) = 2n_B\mathcal{L}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \eta) + o_p(1)$, where $\mathcal{L}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \eta) = -\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^\top \eta - \frac{1}{2}\eta^\top W_2 \eta$. The first order conditions with respect to $\eta = \eta(\theta_\text{N}, \hat{\varphi})$ is given by $-\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^\top - W_2 \eta = 0$. Then, we have

$$2n_B\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \eta, \hat{\varphi}) = n_B\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^\top W_2^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) + o_p(1). \qquad (A.8)$$

Combining (A.7) with (A.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{T}_\text{N}(\theta) &= -2n_B\{[\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathcal{P}}_\text{N}(\theta, \eta_\theta, \hat{\varphi})\} \\ &= n_B^{1/2}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N})^\top W_2^{-1}\Gamma_2\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1} n_B^{1/2}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_\text{N}(\theta_\text{N}, \varphi_\text{N}) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

The limiting distribution of statistic $T_N(\theta)$ can be consequently obtained by using the Slutsky's theorem and the asymptotic normality of $n_B^{1/2}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta_N, \varphi_N)$. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Corollary 3.2: It follows from the proof of Corollary 3.1 that $\Omega = W_2$ under the given sampling designs, which leads to

$$\Omega^{1/2}W_2^{-1}\Gamma_2\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}\Omega_2^{1/2} = W_2^{-1/2}\Gamma_2\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1/2}.$$

Simple algebraic manipulations show that

$$\text{trace}\{W_2^{-1/2}\Gamma_2\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1/2}\} = \text{trace}\{\Gamma_2\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}\} = \text{trace}\{\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}\Gamma_2\} = p.$$

Therefore, using Theorem 9.2.1 of Rao and Mitra (1971), $T_N(\theta_N) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \chi_p^2$, under the given sampling designs. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.4: Recall that $\mathscr{U}_N(\theta, \varphi) = \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)/N$. Let $\hat{\mathscr{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \pi_i^{-1}\phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)/N$, and let $\mathscr{U}(\theta, \varphi) = (\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi)^\top, \mathfrak{U}(\theta, \varphi)^\top)^\top$. We first show that the restricted GEL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ defined in (A.4) is design consistent for θ_N. By the same kinds of arguments we used in the proof of Theorem 3.1, all we need to verify now are the following results: (i) $\max_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi} \|\phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(n_B^{1/2})$; (ii) $\hat{\mathscr{U}}_N(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\varphi}) = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$; (iii) for any $\delta_N = o(1)$, $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_N)} \|\hat{\mathscr{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathscr{U}_N(\theta, \varphi)\| = o_p(1)$ and $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_N)} \|\mathscr{U}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathscr{U}(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$. Following the same arguments as used in the proof of Lemma A3, we can conclude (i). Note that $\|\phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\| = \{\|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|^2 + \|q(Z_i, \theta)\|^2\}^{1/2}$. This, together with conditions B2(i) and B7(i), implies that

$$\max_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi} \|\phi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\| \leq \Big\{(\max_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi} \|\psi(Z_i, \theta, \varphi)\|)^2$$
$$+ (\max_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|q(Z_i, \theta)\|)^2\Big\}^{1/2} = o_p(n_B^{1/2}).$$

By recycling arguments we have used in proof of Lemma A3, we can readily establish (ii). Using condition B7(ii), we can show that

$$\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_N(\theta) - \mathfrak{U}_N(\theta)\| = o_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\mathfrak{U}_N(\theta) - \mathfrak{U}(\theta)\| = o(1).$$

Combined this with results (A.5), implies that

$$\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_N)} \|\hat{\mathscr{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathscr{U}_N(\theta, \varphi)\| = \sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_N)} \Big\{\|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}_N(\theta, \varphi)\|^2$$
$$+ \|\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathfrak{U}_N(\theta, \varphi)\|^2\Big\}^{1/2}$$
$$\leq \Big\{\Big(\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_N)} \|\hat{\mathbb{U}}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}_N(\theta, \varphi)\|\Big)^2$$
$$+ \Big(\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_N(\theta) - \mathfrak{U}_N(\theta)\|\Big)^2\Big\}^{1/2} = o_p(1).$$

Similarly, we can verify that $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta, \varphi\in\Psi(\delta_N)} \|\mathscr{U}_N(\theta, \varphi) - \mathscr{U}(\theta, \varphi)\| = o(1)$. The design consistency of restricted GEL estimator $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ is then established.

We now turn to investigate asymptotic normality of the restricted estimators $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$. By

condition B7(iv), $\|\hat{\mathfrak{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta) - \hat{\mathfrak{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta') - \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta) + \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta')\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ uniformly in $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})$ with $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$. Previous arguments can be recycled to established that $\|\hat{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) - \hat{U}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta', \varphi') - U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta, \varphi) + U_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta', \varphi')\| = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, uniformly in $(\theta, \varphi), (\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}}) \times \Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})$ with $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$. Furthermore, by condition B4, we can readily show that, for all $(\theta, \varphi), (\theta', \varphi') \in \Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}}) \times \Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})$ with $\delta_{\mathrm{N}} = o(1)$,

$$\|\mathscr{U}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathscr{U}(\theta, \varphi')\| = \|\mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta, \varphi')\| \le c\|\varphi - \varphi'\|_{\Psi}^2, \text{ for some constant } c \ge 0.$$

Define $\hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R = \arg\max_{\nu \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{N}, \phi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \nu, \hat{\varphi})$. Note that $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ defined in (A.2) and $\hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R$ can be also viewed as the optimizers of

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta^R} \sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{r+s}} \{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \hat{\varphi}) + \Upsilon^{\top} R(\theta)\},$$

where Υ is a $k \times 1$ vector of Lagrange multipliers. Define $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu) = [-\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \Pi(\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{N}})]^{\top} \nu - \frac{1}{2} \nu^{\top} \mathscr{W} \nu$. Using similar arguments to the proof of Lemma A4, we can show that

$$|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu)| = o_p(n_B^{-1}),$$

uniformly in θ and ν, for $\theta - \theta_{\mathrm{N}} = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\nu = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Let $\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R$ be the optimizers of

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta^R} \sup_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{r+s}} \{\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}^R(\theta, \nu) + \Upsilon^{\top} R(\theta)\}.$$

The first-order conditions for an interior global maximum are given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\Pi^{\top} \tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R + \Phi(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R)^{\top} \tilde{\Upsilon}^R &= 0, \\ -\Pi(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}) - \hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathscr{W} \tilde{\lambda}_{GEL}^R &= 0, \\ R(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi(\theta) = \partial R(\theta) / \partial \theta$. Following the same arguments as used in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can show that $\|\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}\| = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. This, together with the condition $R(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$, implies that $R(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R) = \Phi(\theta_{\mathrm{N}})(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Furthermore, we have $\Phi(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R) = \Phi(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) + O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. It follows from $\tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ that $\tilde{\Upsilon}^R = O_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. The above first-order conditions can be further written as

$$\begin{aligned} -\Pi^{\top} \tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R + \Phi^{\top} \tilde{\Upsilon}^R &= o_p(n_B^{-1/2}), \\ -\Pi(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}) - \hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}, \varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathscr{W} \tilde{\lambda}_{GEL}^R &= 0, \\ \Phi(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}) &= o_p(n_B^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

In matrix form, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\mathscr{W} & -\Pi & 0 \\ -\Pi^{\top} & 0 & \Phi^{\top} \\ 0 & \Phi & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R \\ \tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\mathrm{N}} \\ \tilde{\Upsilon}^R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}).$$

Let

$$\mathfrak{M} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathscr{W} & -\Pi & 0 \\ -\Pi^{\top} & 0 & \Phi^{\top} \\ 0 & \Phi & 0 \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_{11} & \mathfrak{M}_{12} \\ \mathfrak{M}_{21} & \mathfrak{M}_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\mathfrak{M}_{11} = -\mathscr{W}$, $\mathfrak{M}_{12} = (-\Pi, 0)$, $\mathfrak{M}_{21} = \mathfrak{M}_{12}^{\top}$ and

$$\mathfrak{M}_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Phi^{\top} \\ \Phi & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the matrix algebra we that

$$\mathfrak{M}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} -\mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathfrak{M}_{12} \\ I \end{pmatrix} \mathscr{D}^{-1} \left(-\mathfrak{M}_{21}\mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1} \quad I \right),$$

where

$$\mathscr{D} = \mathfrak{M}_{22} - \mathfrak{M}_{21}\mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathfrak{M}_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} (\Sigma^R)^{-1} & \Phi^{\top} \\ \Phi & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\mathscr{D}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^R - \Sigma^R\Phi^{\top}(\Phi\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top})^{-1}\Phi\Sigma^R & -\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top}(\Phi\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top})^{-1} \\ -(\Phi\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top})^{-1}\Phi\Sigma^R & (\Phi\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently, we obtain that $\tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R = [\mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1} + \mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathfrak{M}_{12}\mathscr{D}^{-1}\mathfrak{M}_{21}\mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1}]\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\text{N}} \\ \tilde{\Upsilon}^R \end{pmatrix} = -\mathscr{D}^{-1}\mathfrak{M}_{21}\mathfrak{M}_{11}^{-1}\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2}).$$

Let $\mathscr{C}^R = \Sigma^R - \Sigma^R\Phi^{\top}(\Phi\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top})^{-1}\Phi\Sigma^R$ and $\mathscr{P}^R = \mathscr{W}^{-1} - \mathscr{W}^{-1}\Pi\mathscr{C}^R\Pi^{\top}\mathscr{W}^{-1}$. Simple algebraic manipulations show that $\tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R = -\mathscr{P}^R\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, $\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\text{N}} = -\mathscr{C}^R\Pi^{\top}\mathscr{W}^{-1}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, and $\tilde{\Upsilon}^R = (\Phi\Sigma^R\Phi^{\top})^{-1}\Phi\Sigma^R\Pi^{\top}\mathscr{W}^{-1}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\text{N}}(\theta_{\text{N}}, \varphi_{\text{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. Therefore,

$$n_B^{1/2}(\tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \theta_{\text{N}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, V^R),$$

where $V^R = \mathscr{C}^R\Pi^{\top}\mathscr{W}^{-1}\Omega^R\mathscr{W}^{-1}\Pi\mathscr{C}^R$. A little more work gives that $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R - \tilde{\theta}_{GEL}^R = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\nu_{GEL}^R - \tilde{\nu}_{GEL}^R = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$. The desired conclusion of Theorem 3.4 then follows directly. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.5: The duality results presented in section 2.3 of the main paper motivates us to consider the following alternative GEL ratio statistic

$$\text{T}_{\text{N}}^R(\theta_{\text{N}}) = -2n_B\{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\varphi})\},$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}^R(\theta, \nu, \varphi)$ is defined in (A.3), $\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R$ is defined in (A.2), and

$$\hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R = \arg\max_{\nu \in \hat{\Lambda}_{\text{N},\phi}(\theta, \hat{\varphi})} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \nu, \hat{\varphi}).$$

By recycling previous arguments, we have that $2n_B|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL})| = o_p(1)$ and $2n_B|\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R)| = o_p(1)$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\theta, \eta)$ is defined in Lemma A4 and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}^R(\theta, \nu)$ is defined in the proof of Theorem 3.4. Then, for $\text{T}_{\text{N}}^R(\theta)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{T}_{\text{N}}^R(\theta_{\text{N}}) = &-2n_B\{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL})\} \\ &-2n_B\{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\varphi}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R)\} \\ &-2n_B\{\mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R)\} \\ = &-2n_B\{\mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}, \hat{\eta}_{GEL}) - \mathcal{L}_{\text{N}}^R(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}^R, \hat{\nu}_{GEL}^R)\} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\tilde{\theta}^R_{GEL}$ and $\tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL}$ are the optimizers of $\min_{\theta\in\Theta^R}\sup_{\nu\in\mathsf{R}^{r+s}}\mathcal{L}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta,\nu)$. Since $\hat{\theta}^R_{GEL} - \tilde{\theta}^R_{GEL} = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ and $\nu^R_{GEL} - \tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL} = o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$ as discussed in the proof of Theorem 3.4, $2n_B\mathcal{L}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}^R_{GEL},\hat{\nu}^R_{GEL}) = 2n_B\mathcal{L}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\tilde{\theta}^R_{GEL},\tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL}) + o_p(1)$. In the proof of Theorem 3.4, we have already showed that $-\Pi(\tilde{\theta}^R_{GEL} - \theta_{\mathrm{N}}) - \hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) - \mathscr{W}\tilde{\lambda}^R_{GEL} = 0$ and $\tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL} = -\mathscr{P}^R\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(n_B^{-1/2})$, where $\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta,\varphi) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}}\pi_i^{-1}\phi(Z_i,\theta,\varphi)/N$. This, together with the fact $\mathscr{P}^R\mathscr{W}\mathscr{P}^R = \mathscr{P}^R$, implies that

$$2n_B\mathcal{L}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\tilde{\theta}^R_{GEL},\tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL}) = n_B(\tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL})^\top\mathscr{W}\tilde{\nu}^R_{GEL}$$
$$= n_B\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^\top\mathscr{P}^R\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(1)\,.$$

Using the same arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3.3, we can show that

$$2n_B\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\eta}_{GEL}) = n_B\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^\top\mathscr{P}\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(1)\,,$$

where $\mathscr{P} = W_2^{-1} - W_2^{-1}\Gamma_2\Sigma_2\Gamma_2^\top W_2^{-1}$. Now, define the $(r+s)\times r$ selection matrix $\mathscr{S}_\psi = (I_r,0)^\top$. Then, we have that $\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) = \mathscr{S}_\psi^\top\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$, $\Omega = \mathscr{S}_\psi^\top\Omega^R\mathscr{S}_\psi$ and $\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top\Pi = \Gamma_2$. Thus,

$$2n_B\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{N}}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\eta}_{GEL}) = n_B\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^\top\mathscr{S}_\psi\mathscr{P}\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(1)\,.$$

Consequently, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{T}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) = n_B\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})^\top[\mathscr{P}^R - \mathscr{S}_\psi\mathscr{P}\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top]\hat{\mathscr{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}}) + o_p(1).$$

Therefore, $\mathrm{T}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{Q}^\top\Delta^R\mathcal{Q}$, where $\mathcal{Q}\sim N(0,I_{r+s})$ and $\Delta^R = (\Omega^R)^{1/2}[\mathscr{P}^R - \mathscr{S}_\psi\mathscr{P}\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top](\Omega^R)^{1/2}$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 3.3: Using the same arguments as used in the proof of Corollary 3.1, we can show that $\Omega^R = \mathscr{W}$ under the given sampling designs, which leads to $V^R = \mathscr{C}^R(\Sigma^R)^{-1}\mathscr{C}^R = \mathscr{C}^R$ and

$$\Omega^R[\mathscr{P}^R - \mathscr{S}_\psi\mathscr{P}\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top] = I_{r+s} - \Pi\mathscr{C}^R\Pi^\top\mathscr{W}^{-1} - \mathscr{W}\mathscr{S}_\psi\mathscr{P}\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top\,.$$

Simple algebraic manipulations show that

$$\mathrm{trace}(\Pi\mathscr{C}^R\Pi^\top\mathscr{W}^{-1}) = \mathrm{trace}\{\mathscr{C}^R(\Sigma^R)^{-1}\} = p - k.$$

It follows by the fact $\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top\mathscr{W}\mathscr{S}_\psi = W_2$ that $\mathrm{trace}(\mathscr{W}\mathscr{S}_\psi\mathscr{P}\mathscr{S}_\psi^\top) = \mathrm{trace}(W_2\mathscr{P}) = r - p$. Therefore, we have that

$$\mathrm{trace}(\Delta^R) = r + s - (p - k) - (r - p) = s + k.$$

Consequently, applying Theorem 9.2.1 of Rao and Mitra (1971), we can conclude that $\mathrm{T}^R_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta_{\mathrm{N}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \chi^2_{s+k}$ under the given sampling designs. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1: To establish the consistency of the least-squares-based resampling estimate, it suffices to show that $E_\mathscr{V}[\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^\top] = I_p$ and $E_\mathscr{V}[\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V},\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\mathscr{V}^\top] \xrightarrow{p} \Gamma_2$. The former is obvious. In what follows, we verify the latter statement.

Recall that $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{N},\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V},\theta,\varphi) = [\hat{\mathbb{U}}_{\mathrm{N}}(\theta,\varphi) - \mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi)]\mathscr{V}^\top$. By definition, we have that

$$E_\mathscr{V}[\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V},\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\mathscr{V}^\top] - E_\mathscr{V}[\Gamma_2\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^\top]$$
$$= E_\mathscr{V}\left[N^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{N},\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V},\hat{\theta}_{GEL} + N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V},\hat{\varphi}) - N^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{N},\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V},\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\right]$$
$$+ E_\mathscr{V}\left[N^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL} + N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V},\hat{\varphi}) - \mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\right)\mathscr{V}^\top - \Gamma_2\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^\top\right].$$

By the definition of $\mathscr{V}$ and the second part of assumption (ii) of Theorem 5.1, we have

$$
\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})\times\Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})}\left\|E_{\mathscr{V}}\left[N^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{N},\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V},\theta+N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V},\varphi)-N^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{N},\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V},\theta,\varphi)\right]\right\|
$$
$$
=\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})\times\Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})}\|N^{\frac{1}{2}}E_{\mathscr{V}}[\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{N},\mathscr{V}}(\mathscr{V},\theta+N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V},\varphi)]\|=o_{p}(1). \tag{A.9}
$$

By the differentiability of $\mathbb{U}(\theta,\varphi)$ in the local neighborhood of $(\theta_{\mathrm{N}},\varphi_{\mathrm{N}})$ and the first part of assumption (ii) of Theorem 5.1, we have that

$$
\left\|E_{\mathscr{V}}\left[N^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL}+N^{-1/2}\mathscr{V},\hat{\varphi})-\mathbb{U}(\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\right)\mathscr{V}^{\top}-\Gamma_{2}\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^{\top}\right]\right\|
$$
$$
\leq E_{\mathscr{V}}\left[\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})\times\Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})}\left\|[\Gamma_{2}(\theta,\varphi)-\Gamma_{2}]\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^{\top}\right\|\right] \tag{A.10}
$$
$$
\leq E_{\mathscr{V}}\|\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^{\top}\|\sup_{(\theta,\varphi)\in\Theta(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})\times\Psi(\delta_{\mathrm{N}})}\|\Gamma_{2}(\theta,\varphi)-\Gamma_{2}\|=o(1).
$$

Combining (A.9) and (A.10), we can conclude $E_{\mathscr{V}}[\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V},\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\mathscr{V}^{\top}]-E_{\mathscr{V}}[\Gamma_{2}\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^{\top}]=o(1)$. This, together with the fact that $E_{\mathscr{V}}[\Gamma_{2}\mathscr{V}\mathscr{V}^{\top}]=\Gamma_{2}$, implies that

$$
E_{\mathscr{V}}[\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{N},\theta}(\mathscr{V},\hat{\theta}_{GEL},\hat{\varphi})\mathscr{V}^{\top}]\xrightarrow{p}\Gamma_{2}.
$$

This completes the proof Theorem 5.1. $\qquad\square$