

# Assessing the Accuracy of Multisource Register-based Official Statistics for Multinomial Outcomes

Nina Deliu<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Piero Demetrio Falorsi<sup>1,3</sup>, Stefano Falorsi<sup>4</sup>, Diego Chianella<sup>4</sup>, and Giorgio Alleva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MEMOTEF Department, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

<sup>2</sup>MRC – Biostatistics Unit, University of Cambridge, UK

<sup>3</sup>Former Head of the Division for Methodology, ISTAT, Rome, Italy (now Retired)

<sup>4</sup>ISTAT – Italian National Institute of Statistics, Rome, Italy

\*Corresponding Author: [nina.deliu@uniroma1.it](mailto:nina.deliu@uniroma1.it)

## Abstract

The emergence of new data sources and statistical methods is driving an update in the traditional official statistics paradigm. As an example, the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) is undergoing a significant modernisation of the data production process, transitioning from a statistical paradigm based on single sources (census, sample surveys, or administrative data) to an integrated system of statistical registers. The latter results from an integration process of administrative and survey data based on different statistical methods, and, as such, prone to different sources of error. This work discusses and validates a global measure of error assessment for such multisource register-based statistics. Focusing on two important sources of uncertainty (sampling and modelling), we provide an analytical solution that well approximates the global error of mass-imputation procedures for multi-category type of outcomes, assuming a multinomial logistic model. Among other advantages, the proposed measure results in an interpretable, computationally feasible, and flexible approach, while allowing for unplanned on-the-fly statistics on totals to be supported by accuracy estimates. An application to education data from the Base Register of Individuals from ISTAT’s integrated system of statistical registers is presented.

**Keywords:** Accuracy estimation, Generalised mean squared error, Multisource official statistics, Official statistics, Statistical registers

## 1 Introduction

Official statistics play a crucial role in the information system of a democratic society, providing essential data on its economic, demographic, social, and environmental status. In addition to promoting transparent information on the development of a country, they are indispensable for evaluating policies and informing future decision making, while adhering to a set of fundamental principles. In particular, Principle 15 on “Accessibility and Clarity” of the European Statistics Code of Practice for the National Statistical Authorities and Eurostat states that

European Statistics must be presented in a clear and understandable form, released in a suitable and convenient manner, available and accessible on an impartial basis with supporting metadata and guidance (Eurostat, 2014, 2020). Therefore, remaining impartial, while safeguarding equal access is at the heart of official statistics.

Dedicated agencies, at a national and international level, are responsible for the production and dissemination of independent and authoritative official statistics, making this function their core or even exclusive mandate. The process is complex and articulates through various steps, going from data collection to data processing into relevant, objective and accurate statistics. Notably, in an era characterised by rapid technological advancement and new data sources, the importance of translating the increasing data availability into independent high-quality public official statistics has never been greater. In addition to the five formidable challenges (wider, deeper, quicker, better, cheaper) launched by Holt (2007), the emergence of new (unstructured) data sources and statistical methods that may not adhere to established statistical practices and quality frameworks is calling for a paradigm update (Citro, 2014; De Broe et al., 2021). As a result, National Statistical Institutes (NSIs) and international statistical organisations are more committed than ever to revolutionising their traditional production and evaluation strategies for official statistics in response to the evolving needs of society.

The first aspect of this paradigm update reflects the need of producing statistical information based on a mixed and *integrated* use of different and diverse data sources, while being less burdensome and more relevant:

“Official statistical offices need to move from the probability sample survey paradigm of the past 75 years to a mixed data source paradigm for the future.” (Citro, 2014)

While the traditional production model is essentially based on many independent stovepipes, each reflecting a specifically conducted survey, NSIs are currently transitioning to a new model in which the basis of statistical production is represented by an Integrated System of Statistical Registers (ISSR; Citro, 2014; Istat, 2016). The ISSR is the combination of data collected by means of statistical surveys, data arising from administrative registers held for purposes other than official statistics, and new big data or potentially unstructured data deriving, for instance, from digital technologies (Radermacher, 2018; Daas et al., 2015). In this context, Groves (2011) introduced the concept of “organic data” to denote data based on non-probabilistic samples that are generated without any explicit research design. These contrast with traditional sample survey data, which are collected through pre-planned processes but increasingly face high costs globally due to rising non-response rates.

Clearly, to allow an ISSR to be utilised as a single informative infrastructure, different statistical methods (such as record linkage, statistical matching, massive imputation, projection/prediction) are adopted to reconstruct unit-level data and achieve the integration purpose. This results in a more compact, rich, and complete informative content than the one associated with each independent data source. In fact, the values of statistical variables are now provided for each unit of the target population (e.g., an individual, a household, or an enterprise), assuming no undercoverage, and the production of official statistics becomes relatively straightforward: it mimics the register-based framework (Wallgren and Wallgren, 2014). For instance, a population total can be directly obtained by summing up the register values of an outcome of interest. However, while this simple aggregation provides direct statistical summaries with internal consistency, the major risk for users neglecting the integration

process is in an inadequate interpretation of the outcomes. In fact, several register values are the result of a statistical imputation and, as such, they are prone to uncertainty and error.

Here it comes the second aspect of the paradigm update. As already highlighted in [Lohr and Raghunathan \(2017\)](#) and excellently pointed out by [De Broe et al. \(2021\)](#), while acknowledging [Kuhn \(1997\)](#):

“The paradigm for official statistics is obtaining statistical information for policy out of available data sources and methods which have to adhere to certain quality standards.” [De Broe et al. \(2021\)](#)

In other words, a shared paradigm should be defined on and satisfy certain widely accepted quality standards that *validate* the methods, in addition to (or rather than) adhering to the same set of shared methods. For generating statistics based on a single source, either a census or a statistical surveys or an administrative register, an elaborate body of *validated* statistical methods and indicators exists to ensure that disseminated summary information complies with quality standards ([Daas et al., 2011](#); [Zhang, 2012](#); [Eurostat, 2014](#); [Biemer et al., 2014](#)). This is less the case for the potential use of new data sources or for multisource registers such as an ISSR, which occupy a central role in the current arena.

It is important to underline that the community of national and international agencies producing official statistics is well aware of the challenges they face during the different phases on an integration process. Awareness of a number of challenges has been raised in [Alleva \(2017b,a\)](#), and, since then, the European Statistical System (ESS) has promoted a strategic development with research actions ([Eurostat, 2020](#)). [De Waal et al. \(2020\)](#) presented some specific problems and guidelines; in [Ascari et al. \(2020\)](#), case studies of the KOMUSO project – launched by the ESS in collaboration with eight NSIs – are described and supplemented with a list of quality measures, indicators, and guidelines. Furthermore, attention in this direction is demonstrated by the Experimental Statistics project that has started to represent a production line of many NSIs, and also allows one to collect feedback from users. The awareness of having to move in a new data ecosystem and the need to commit to a deep innovation of production processes guided the revision of the European Statistics Code of Practice in 2017. In particular, Principle 12 on *Data Accuracy and Reliability*, has now incorporated a statement on the presence of systems for assessing and validating source data, integrated data, intermediate results, and statistical outputs. Furthermore, the Principle 7 on *Sound Methodology* of the data production processes, actively encourage the exploration of new and innovative methods for statistics, including integration of new and/or alternative data sources. Further technical details are reported in Supplementary material [A](#).

Importantly, questions still arise on whether or when data may be released to an end user for their specific research interest. In this context, a strategic decision is whether to limit the usage of an ISSR – sharing only aggregate statistics adhering to the highest-quality standards – or to allow for more flexibility so that the interested user can derive their ISSR-based statistics of interest. Certainly, the second option better aligns to their nature of “public good” and to the fundamental principles of official statistics, promoting impartiality and equal access. However, to facilitate a correct use and interpretation of the data, such a decision would require NSIs to assess and present fully transparent information about the quality of the statistics an end-user may compute from the register’s data. As mentioned above, the values at the level of elementary units reported in an

integrated multisource system are the result of various statistical operations. As such, they are characterised by uncertainty arising from various sources, from the sampling process to the statistical model used during the mass imputation process, among many others (for a classification of errors according to the data source, see e.g., [Ascari et al., 2020](#)). Mass imputation during this integration process involves predicting the missing values of a target variable for the entire population units. In such a context, as advised by the ESS, the accuracy assessment must take into account as many error components as possible ([Eurostat, 2020](#)).

This work is related to the second emphasised aspect of the current transitioning paradigm: it focuses on the quality assessment of multisource register-based official statistics. Motivated by the ESS call and the significant modernisation process of the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) towards an ISSR-based framework ([Istat, 2016](#)), our aim is to evaluate and possibly establish a computationally feasible method for assessing the accuracy of ISTAT’s integrated register data. We build on a recent proposal described in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), where a new global measure for the estimation error, which we term *generalised mean squared error* (GMSE), is developed. The “global” nature of this measure stems from the fact that different sources of uncertainty are taken into account when quantifying the overall error in the estimation procedure. Under non-informative sampling and a logistic model, the authors show how a four-step Taylor linearisation procedure can lead to a practical analytical solution for the GMSE that well approximates the total error under both sample and model uncertainty.

Focusing on the same two sources of estimation errors (sampling and modelling), we extend the proposal of [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#) to more general type of multi-category outcomes and present a substantial advance in the analytical and computational derivation of the GMSE, involving only two linearisation steps. We emphasise that the multi-category setting is a widespread case in NSIs, with various examples illustrated in Section 1.1. One can think, for instance, of employment data ([Marino et al., 2019](#); [López-Vizcaíno et al., 2015](#); [Molina et al., 2007](#)), where the variable of interest has as categories different labour force statuses (e.g. unemployed, employed, inactive), of education data where the attained levels of education can be illiterate, primary school, secondary school, etc., or disability ([Fabrizi et al., 2016](#)), among others. As in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), our interest is in the evaluation of the overall accuracy of population totals (more specifically, total frequencies, whose sum equates to the size of the target population), resulted from mass imputation statistical processes. Population totals and total frequencies represent one of the main target in official statistics, and are often derived in relation to given subpopulations or domains. However, we note that the solution for calculating the GMSE can be generalised to other type of outcomes and related models, and to other statistics of interest different from totals (see e.g., [Särndal et al., 2003](#)). The proposed approach is validated in simulation studies, for varying sample and population sizes, in comparison to a Monte Carlo and a bootstrap procedure. The simulation scenarios reliably mimic a real dataset in terms of their variables, marginal distributions and relationship with the categorical variable of interest. Finally, a real world application is considered for the attained level of education, with data from the Base Register of Individuals of the ISSR ([Di Zio et al., 2019a,b](#)).

Overall, the GMSE results in a reliable, interpretable, computationally feasible, and flexible approach, that allows users to independently define their totals of interest with direct access to the register microdata. Moreover,

by incorporating an indicator for specific user-defined domains, group-aggregated statistics of interest, such as regional statistics, can be easily produced. As a result, statistical outputs that are typically unplanned and unknown in advance, can be feasibly produced on the fly to accommodate users' requests, while supported by accuracy estimates that would guide more informed interpretation and decisions.

The remainder of this work is organised as follows. In Section 1.1, we present various motivational case studies, including ISTAT's register on the attained level of education that will guide both simulations and the application. In Section 2, we formalise the problem and introduce the necessary notation. In Section 3, we develop the proposed GMSE solution for evaluating the accuracy in categorical variables, and discuss its analytical computation under general estimating equations, while in Section 3.1, we better formalise it for a multinomial logistic model. Section 5 illustrates its application for the attained level of education in Italy and Section 4 validates the proposed solution in simulations. Finally, Section 6 outlines advantages and limitation of the GMSE, followed by some concluding remarks.

## 1.1 Motivational Case Studies

In this section, we showcase concrete examples of integrated registers within NSIs and multi-source statistics. We present cases on multi-category variables such as education, emphasising their centrality in official statistics.

**Base Register of Individuals of the Italian ISSR** Starting from 2016, ISTAT has been undergoing a transition process from sample or census surveys to an ISSR. By combining data originating from different registers, the resulting variables are integrated in single consistent registers, such as the Base Register of Individuals containing individual subjects data. The integration process has interested data from administrative sources, from previous censuses, and from sample surveys. In fact, since October 2018, annual sample survey are being conducted to produce updated and granular information on the resident population. While most of the basic demographic variables are easily retrieved from different administrative sources with no or negligible levels of errors, other socio-economic variables are characterised by different errors of completeness, coverage and measurement. Among these, the following deserve a mention:

- The attained level of education, with a final number of  $K = 8$  integrated categories: 1 `Illiterate`, 2 `Literate but no formal education`, 3 `Primary education`, 4 `Lower secondary education`, 5 `Upper secondary education`, 6 `Bachelor's degree or equivalent level`, 7 `Master's degree or equivalent level`, 8 `PhD level`.
- The employment status, with  $K = 2$  categories: 1 `Employed`, 2 `Not employed`.

For completing the unit-level information for each these variables, different data sources, integration processes, and imputation methods are adopted. For example, unit-level data on the attained level of education at a reference year  $t$  are reconstructed by accounting for: (A) administrative data from the Ministry of Education, University and Research; (B) data from the last traditional Italian census conducted in 2011, and; (C) data from sample surveys. Using annual sample survey data, a set of log-linear and multinomial modelling approaches were

used to impute the population values at the reference year  $t$ , conditional on available data from administrative or census sources. Further details are provided in Section 4 and in [Di Zio et al. \(2019b\)](#).

**Dutch virtual Population and Housing Census** In the Netherlands, a so-called virtual Population and Housing Census is conducted to integrate and update population data from existing administrative records, supplemented by sample survey information. While for many variables of interest, administrative sources provide (near-)complete population coverage, educational attainment remains a challenge. In fact, for the 2011 Census, this variable was observed from Dutch Labour Force Surveys, which is based on sample surveys and comprises only 300,000 individuals ([Daalmans, 2017](#)). For the 2021 Census, a more extensive educational source, the Educational Attainment File, was used to include data from several registers and sample surveys, with a coverage of more than 10 million people. Nonetheless, for approximately seven million Dutch individuals (out of a total population of 17 million), educational attainment is not observed. To address this gap, mass imputation has been used to predict all missing values for the variable of interest ([Daalmans, 2017](#)), and the consequent quality issue has been promptly raised ([Scholtus and Daalmans, 2021](#)).

**Canada and New Zealand virtual Censuses** Other examples concern the virtual censuses conducted in Canada in 2021 ([Lundy, 2022](#)) and New Zealand in 2018 ([Bycroft and Matheson-Dunning, 2020](#)). In both cases, the use of administrative data played a crucial role in ensuring the completeness and accuracy of information, particularly in response to low participation rates. Both countries employed a combined approach, integrating traditional questionnaire responses with administrative data already available from government registers to fill in gaps left by non-responding households and ensure an accurate representation of variables of interest. One of the key variables addressed through this approach was educational attainment. In the 2021 Canadian Census, missing information such as age, sex, and education level was imputed using high-quality data from government sources, including education registers. Statistical models were developed to assess the quality of administrative data and to identify which households had reliable data that could be used for imputation, particularly in regions with low response rates. Similarly, in New Zealand’s 2018 Census, around 11% of data, including education levels, was obtained from administrative registers, while 89% came from traditional questionnaires.

The showcased examples highlight the vital role played by administrative data as a complimentary source to produce official statistics. However, they also emphasise the complexity of an adequate integration, raising important questions on the quality of the produced statistics. In the specific, for a methodologist, the question is on how to assess the overall quality, or accuracy, of estimated entries in population statistics derived from mass-imputed data.

## 2 Problem Setup and Notation

Let  $R$  denote a statistical register of  $N$  statistical units corresponding to a finite population, with  $N$  fixed and known at a given moment of interest. We assume that the register is not affected by problems of overcoverage

and/or undercoverage and that there is a one-to-one correspondence with the target population of interest. Each register unit  $i$ , with  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , is characterised by a set of observed covariates  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{iJ})^T$ , with  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^J$ ,  $J \geq 1$ , and a categorical response variable with  $K$  mutually exclusive categories. We express the outcome of the categorical response of unit  $i$  as a  $K$ -dimensional vector  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{ik}, \dots, Y_{iK})^T$ , with  $Y_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$  and such that  $\sum_{k=1}^K Y_{ik} = 1$ . The different response categories  $k = 1, \dots, K$  can represent the educational levels (e.g., `Illiterate`, `Primary education`, ...) an individual may have.

In classical statistical modelling theory, the focus is on estimating model parameters that are intrinsically unobservable. In contrast, the primary aim in official statistics is to estimate quantities defined on a finite population – quantities that can be in principle observable by carrying out a census of this population. For example, in a classical inference approach one may be interested in estimating the probability of having a PhD, after a reasonable model is postulated; in contrast, in official statistics, one would seek at inferring the total number of individuals with a PhD. Population totals represent one of the most common parameters of interest in official statistics; in our categorical case, we are specifically interested in the total of a given category  $k$  in the entire register  $R$  or for a specific subpopulation or domain of  $R$ , say  $R^{(d)}$ , where  $d$  indexes the domain of interest, such as a given region. Let  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)} = (\gamma_1^{(d)}, \dots, \gamma_i^{(d)}, \dots, \gamma_N^{(d)})^T$  be the known domain membership vector, where  $\gamma_i^{(d)} \in \{0, 1\}$ , with value 1 indicating that unit  $i$  belongs to domain  $R^{(d)}$ . Then, the target parameter at the domain level is formally defined as:

$$\theta_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} Y_{ik}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (1)$$

Unless a census is conducted,  $\theta_k^{(d)}$  is typically unknown as the values of  $Y_{ik}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , are only known for a subset of the  $N$  register units at the given moment of interest. In practice, responses are observed for a random sample of size  $n$  and we use  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i, \dots, \lambda_N)^T$ , with  $\lambda_i \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = n$ , to denote the sample membership (known once the sample is selected); value 1 indicates a membership status and 0 a non-membership. In the context of probabilistic surveys, each register unit  $i$  is characterised by a certain sample inclusion probability  $\pi_i$ , defined according to a probabilistic sampling scheme. In such a context, for estimating the unknown parameter  $\theta_k^{(d)}$  one must first estimate, impute, or make a prediction of the unobserved  $Y_{ik}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$  for which  $\lambda_i = 0$ .

To estimate  $Y_{ik}$ , we consider a working model  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ik}|\mathbf{x}_i) = f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = p_{ik}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , with  $f$  a known function depending on the unknown parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_K^T)^T$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k = (\beta_{k1}, \dots, \beta_{kJ})^T$  is a  $J$ -dimensional object measuring the relationship between the outcome  $Y_{ik}$  and the covariates  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^J$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . Note that in our specific case  $p_{ik} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{ik} = 1|\mathbf{x}_i)$ , with  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} = 1, \forall i$ . Let  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  be a consistent estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ; then the predictor  $\hat{Y}_{ik}$  of  $Y_{ik}$  is given by

$$\hat{Y}_{ik} = \hat{p}_{ik} = f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (2)$$

A natural estimator  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  of the target vector parameter  $\theta_k^{(d)}$  is then given by

$$\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{Y}_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{p}_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\beta}), \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (3)$$

Note that, while here we follow the deterministic approach of [Kim and Rao \(2009\)](#), alternative approaches to Eq. (2) exist for predicting the unobserved  $Y_{ik}$ . For example, if one restricts the prevision  $\hat{Y}_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$ , this can be randomly generated from a multinomial distribution with parameters  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i \doteq (\hat{p}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{p}_{iK})$ ; see also [Remark 4](#).

The main goal of this work is to estimate the accuracy, or alternatively, the error committed when estimating the parameter of interest. This depends on various sources of uncertainty, the first being the uncertainty derived by the adopted model. Furthermore, even in the case of correct specification of the model, it is noteworthy to emphasize that the prediction accuracy may heavily depend on the sampling scheme and the number of sample units  $n$ . In what follows, we will focus on the development of the proposed accuracy estimation procedure for the case of the multinomial logistic model, which generalises the simpler logistic case developed in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#). While we focus on this model because of its common adoption by NSIs, alternative models, such as latent-variable models, can be easily integrated within the presented framework.

### 3 The Generalised Mean Squared Error

The original idea of a global measure to evaluate the accuracy of register-based estimates was first proposed in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), building on previous literature on the notions of *global variance* ([Wolter, 1986](#)) and *anticipated variance* ([Isaki and Fuller, 1982](#); [Nedyalkova and Tille, 2008](#)). The global nature of this measure, which we name *generalised mean squared error* (GMSE), stems from the different sources of uncertainty taken into account when quantifying the errors in the estimates or predictions. In this sense, it generalises the classical mean squared error (MSE), which represents the simplest way to measure accuracy focusing on a single source of randomness in a total survey error approach ([Biemer, 2010](#)). For instance, in a design-based approach ([Cochran 1977](#)), the sample design, which determines the sample membership  $\lambda$ , represents the only source of randomness, whereas the population outcomes  $Y_{ik}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , are treated as unknown fixed quantities. Alternatively, a model-based approach ([Valliant, 2009](#); [Chambers and Clark, 2012](#)) considers  $\lambda$  as fixed, with the only source of randomness being the  $Y_{ik}$  values that are generated according to a certain model. In both cases, a single source of variability is taken into account when computing the MSE, that is, either the sampling design or the variability of the model, respectively.

In this work, our aim is to take into consideration the different random components involved in the inferential process. More specifically, according to the assumptions made in [Section 2](#), we focus on two sources of error typical of register-based statistics: the sampling and model uncertainty. These drive the definition of the GMSE provided in [Definition 1](#), which also generalises the *global mean squared error* introduced in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#).

**Definition 1.** Let  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  be an estimator of the parameter of interest  $\theta_k^{(d)}$ , function of the unknown outcome variables  $Y_{ik}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , and for a certain domain  $d$ . Under the setup in [Section 2](#), let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$



be the random variable defining the sample membership, satisfying  $\mathbb{E}(\lambda_i) = \pi_i$ , with  $\pi_i \in (0, 1]$  being the inclusion probability of unit  $i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Furthermore, let  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(Y_{ik}|\mathbf{x}_i) = f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = p_{ik}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N, k = 1, \dots, K$  be a working model for  $Y_{ik}$  given the covariate set  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . Then, the GMSE of  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  with respect to the unknown parameter  $\theta_k^{(d)}$  is defined as:

$$\text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) = \mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (4)$$

that is, the error of the estimator under both sampling and model randomness.

Compared to the *global mean squared error* introduced in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), the GMSE in Eq. (4) considers the expectation with respect to the joint distribution of the random variables  $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})$  characterised by the sampling design and the outcome model, respectively. In [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), the authors considered the measure  $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\cdot)$ . Nevertheless, we note that the two are equivalent when the sampling design is non-informative, that is  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \perp \mathbf{Y}$ , such that the joint distribution can be factorised in the two univariate distributions.

*Remark 1.* The GMSE in Definition 1 is a scalar that refers to the individual error committed when estimating  $\theta_k^{(d)}$  for category  $k$ . While this is the typical interest of NSIs, one may also be interested in a cumulated version of the GMSE accounting for all  $k$ s jointly, that is in  $\text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(d)} \right)$ , with  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)} = (\hat{\theta}_1^{(d)}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_K^{(d)})$ . In that case, its definition can be naturally extended as:

$$\text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(d)} \right) = \mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} \left( (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(d)})^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(d)}) \right) = \sum_{k=1}^K \text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right), \quad (5)$$

that is, the scalar given by the sum of the  $K$  individual errors.

Building on the results in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), we now outline the following theoretical result.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that: i) the estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  associated to the working model  $f_k(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , is model-unbiased, that is,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}$ , for all samples  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , and that ii) the sampling design is non-informative (see e.g., Section 1.4 of [Chambers and Clark, 2012](#), for more details on non-informative sampling). Then, the following tight upper bounds hold for the individual-category and the cumulated GMSE:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) \\ \text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(d)} \right) &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)} | \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the trace of a square matrix  $\mathbf{x}$ .

*Proof.* See Supplementary material [B.1](#). □

Note that the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , is generally a non-linear function of the two random quantities  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , making the direct exact computation of the bound of the GMSE as defined in Eq. (6) not straightforward. To overcome this challenge, we adopt a two-stage linearisation procedure using Taylor approximations to linearize the estimator, first, with respect to the argument of the inner variance term  $\text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right)$ , and second, with

respect to the design randomness defining the outer expectation of the upper bound in Eq. (6). This result represents an improvement compared to the linearisation process adopted in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#), which was based on a four-step approximation procedure.

**First linearisation step** Assume the real-valued functions  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , are differentiable functions at the point  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ; then they have a linear approximation near this point. The estimator  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  can thus be linearised with respect to  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  at the point  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}$  as:

$$\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \left( f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} \Big|_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}=\boldsymbol{\beta}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + r_{1k} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (7)$$

where  $r_{1k}$  is the residual of this Taylor approximation and is of order  $o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ .

Using the result in Eq. (7), we get the following linear approximation for the conditional variance:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &\approx \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \left( f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} \Big|_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}=\boldsymbol{\beta}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mid \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) \right) \\ &= \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mid \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \mathbf{F}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{F}_k$  is the matrix of the first-order partial derivatives having dimension  $N \times H$ , with  $H = K \times J$ , and form

$$\mathbf{F}_k = \left[ \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\beta}_{lj}} \Big|_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}=\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right]_{N \times H},$$

Note that the elements of  $\mathbf{F}_k$  do not depend on  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  and thus fixed with respect to model randomness. They will be later expanded in relation to the specific multinomial logistic model considered in this work.

**Second linearisation step** Let  $\mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \{g_{ikj}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}), j = 1, \dots, J, k = 1, \dots, K\}$  define the system of  $H$  generalised estimating equations ([Ziegler, 2011](#)) for estimating the model parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  using the  $n$  sample data. For example, under a maximum likelihood approach, denoted by  $\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$  the log-likelihood of the working model, one could search for the estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  by solving:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}_H, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{0}$  is a vector of  $H$  zeroes. Assume that for large  $n$  the solution  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  of Eq. (9) is unique and that it converges to  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}$  (see condition i) in [Theorem 1](#)); then, using the result in [Chambers and Clark \(2012\)](#), we can employ a first-order approximation to linearize  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  around its expected value  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} | \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}$  (see conditions i) in [Theorem 1](#)), obtaining:

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \approx -\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}), \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_\beta^{-1}$  is the inverse of the square matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\beta$  of dimension  $H \times H$  defined as:

$$\mathbf{A}_\beta = \left[ a_{(kj)(k'j')} \Big|_{\hat{\beta}=\beta} \right], \quad \text{with} \quad a_{(kj)(k'j')} \doteq \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}_i(\beta; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})}{\partial \hat{\beta}_{kj}} \Big|_{\hat{\beta}=\beta}, \quad j = 1, \dots, J; k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (11)$$

which basically represents the inverse of second-order partial derivatives matrix, i.e. the Hessian matrix, of the scalar-valued function representing, in our case, the likelihood function.

Taken together, the results in Eq. (8) and Eq. (10) give us the following linearised version of the GMSE's bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_Y(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda) &\approx \gamma^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_Y(\hat{\beta} - \beta | \lambda) \mathbf{F}_k^T \gamma^{(d)} \\ &\approx \gamma^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_Y \left( -\mathbf{A}_\beta^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{g}_i(\beta; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \Big| \lambda \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \gamma^{(d)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In principle, while the non-linear dependence on the model estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  is now removed, the exact derivation of the GMSE's bound may still be challenging due to a potential non-linear dependence on the quantities  $\lambda$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ ; this will depend on the specific choice of the estimating equations  $\mathbf{g}_i$ . To overcome this issue, [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#) considered two additional linearisation steps, one for each random component. In this work, we will show that one single additional linearisation step is sufficient to provide an exact solution for the commonly employed multinomial model under a maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) approach. In particular, in Section 3.1 the following Theorem 2 will be proved, after a formal introduction of the model.

**Theorem 2.** *Consider the setup in Section 2 and assume that the outcome variable  $\mathbf{Y}_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, \mathbf{p}_i)$ , with  $\mathbf{p}_i \in [0, 1]^K$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} = 1$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , with the  $N$  units being independent. Let  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i}$  denote the population variance of the model outcome  $\text{Var}_Y(\mathbf{Y}_i)$  of unit  $i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ; then, under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GMSE}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_Y(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda) \\ &\approx \gamma^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \gamma^{(d)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbf{F}_k$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i$  fixed matrices depending on the covariate data  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and the model parameters. These are further explicitated in Section 3.1 in the case of a multinomial model.

*Proof.* See Section 3.1. □

### 3.1 The GMSE for the Multinomial Logistic Model

Driven by motivational case studies in ISTAT, we assume that the outcome variable for each unit  $i$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , follows a multinomial regression model, that is,  $\mathbf{Y}_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, \mathbf{p}_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{i1}, \dots, p_{ik}, \dots, p_{iK})^T$  denotes the unknown event probabilities in  $[0, 1]$  of each category  $k$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ ,

such that  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} = 1$ . These probabilities are defined based on the set of individual covariates  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^J$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , according to the multinomial logistic regression model, where  $K$  is taken as the baseline category:

$$p_{ik} = f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k}, & k = 1, \dots, K-1 \\ \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k}, & k = K. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

An estimate of the unknown parameters  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ , therefore,  $p_{ik}$  can be obtained by MLE, and we shall focus on this estimation approach from now on. Following standard statistical results, which are fully detailed in Supplementary material B.2, under the assumption of independence among the  $N$  units and accounting for the sample membership  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , the log-likelihood of the model in Eq. (13) is given by:

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} y_{ik} \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \right) \right],$$

and the MLEs  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_k$  are obtained as the solution of the problem in Eq. (9), with  $\mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$  being the  $H$ -dimensional vector having components:

$$g_{ikj}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = x_{ij} (y_{ik} - p_{ik}), \quad j = 1, \dots, J, k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (14)$$

Note that the components of  $\mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$  have a non-linear dependence on the fixed parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  through  $p_i$ , but they depend linearly on the random outcome  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ . The Hessian matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\beta$  results in a further simplification with the dependency on  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  removed (the calculus is deferred to Supplementary material B.2):

$$a_{(kj)(k'j')} = \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{kj} \partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{k'j'}} \Big|_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \begin{cases} -\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} (1 - p_{ik}), & k' = k \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} p_{ik'}, & k' \neq k \end{cases}. \quad (15)$$

The results in Eqs. (14)-(15) facilitate the analytical derivation of the variance in Eq. (12). To see this, let  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i}$  be the  $K \times K$  variance-covariance matrix of the outcome variable, i.e.,  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \doteq \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_i)$ , and denote by  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_i$  and  $\mathbf{U}_i$  the two matrices given by

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}}_{H \times K} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{i1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ x_{iJ} & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & x_{i1} \\ \vdots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & x_{iJ} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{U}_{H \times K} \doteq \mathbf{A}_\beta^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_i.$$

Then, we can re-express the model variance in Eq. (12) as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) &\approx \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( -\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \middle| \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)} \\
 &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^2 \mathbf{U}_i \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_i) \mathbf{U}_i^T + \sum_{j \neq i}^N \lambda_i^2 \mathbf{U}_i \text{Cov}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \mathbf{Y}_i) \mathbf{U}_i^T \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)} \\
 &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^2 \mathbf{U}_i \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \mathbf{U}_i^T \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.
 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

since, by assumption,  $\text{Cov}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \mathbf{Y}_i) = 0, \forall i \neq j$ . Note that, in light of the considered model, the exact formulation for matrix's  $\mathbf{F}_k$  elements is now given by:

$$\left. \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\beta}_{lj}} \right|_{\hat{\beta}_{lj} = \beta_{lj}} = \begin{cases} x_{ij} p_{ik} (1 - p_{ik}), & l = k \\ -x_{ij} p_{ik} p_{il}, & l \neq k. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

*Remark 2.* In Eq. (16), we have assumed that  $\text{Cov}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \mathbf{Y}_i) = 0, \forall i \neq j$ . However, in models such as latent-class or longitudinal models, where this does not hold in general, one may use e.g., a plug-in estimate of  $\text{Cov}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathbf{Y}_j, \mathbf{Y}_i)$ , making it possible to still estimate the GMSE using the expression in Eq. (16).

The approximation for the GMSE's bound is finally obtained by calculating the expectation of Eq. (16) with respect to the design randomness in  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ . Since its argument depends on  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  also through  $\mathbf{U}_i$ , more specifically, through the inverse of Hessian matrix  $\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , one could proceed either with an additional Taylor approximation to remove the complicated dependence of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  (as done in [Alleva et al. \(2021\)](#)), or by using the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Consider the setup in Section 2 and assume that the outcome variable  $\mathbf{Y}_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, \mathbf{p}_i)$ , with  $\mathbf{p}_i \in [0, 1]^K$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} = 1$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , with the  $N$  units being independent. Let  $\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  be the Hessian matrix associated with this model. Then, under a non-informative design, when the inclusion probabilities  $\pi_i$  are close to the extremes 0/1, the following approximation holds:*

$$\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \approx \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\boldsymbol{\pi}} \doteq \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}.$$

Furthermore, when  $\pi_i \in \{0, 1\}, i = 1, \dots, N$ , the result is an identity.

*Proof.* The proof and further considerations on this approximation are provided in the Supplementary material [B.3](#). □

*Remark 3.* The assumption of  $\pi_i$  close to the extremes 0/1 is a standard assumption for inference under the model-based approach; see e.g., pg. 57 in [Lohr \(2021\)](#). Furthermore, in practice,  $\pi_i$  are either very small (e.g., for the household surveys or for small enterprise surveys) or close to 1 (e.g., large enterprise surveys).

Bringing this result together with Eqs. (12)-(16), and denoting by

$$\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \doteq \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i, \tag{18}$$

we get the final result:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\lambda} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \mid \lambda \right) \\
 &\approx \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\lambda} \left( \lambda_i^2 \right) \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)} \\
 &\approx \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \mathbf{F}_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \bar{\mathbf{U}}_i \right) \mathbf{F}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K,
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}(\lambda_i^2) = \pi_i$  is a standard result for the sample membership indicator  $\lambda_i$ , holding for any arbitrary sampling design (Särndal et al., 2003). Note that the analytical expression of the GMSE in Eq. (19) can be adapted to different sampling designs specified by the  $\pi_i$  values. In particular, when we have the popular SRS design of  $n$  units out of the  $N$  units of a register or population, the variables  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N)$  are identically distributed Bernoulli random variables with  $\pi_i = \mathbb{E}(\lambda_i) = \mathbb{E}(\lambda_i^2) = n/N$  (see e.g., Chapter 2 in Lohr, 2021).

The final linearised bound in Eq. (19) depends on the following quantities: the domain membership indicator  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)}$ , the sampling design specification  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ , the matrix  $\mathbf{F}_k$  as expressed in Eq. (17), the matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_i$  given in Eq. (18), and the variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i}$ . While the first two elements are pre-specified and known in advance, the latter matrices all depend on the parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{p}$ , which, in practice, is unknown and has to be estimated. We use its sample counterpart  $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}$ , leading to the following linearised GMSE estimator:

$$\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Lin}} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)T} \hat{\mathbf{F}}_k \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \hat{\mathbf{U}}_i \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \hat{\mathbf{U}}_i \right) \hat{\mathbf{F}}_k^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(d)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \tag{20}$$

with the generic matrix estimator  $\hat{D} = D|_{\boldsymbol{p}=\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}}$ .

*Remark 4.* The analytical expression for the GMSE derived in Eq. (19) is based on the estimator in Eq. (3), which considers  $\hat{Y}_{ik} = \hat{p}_{ik}$ , for all  $i$  and all  $k$ . However, in many cases, an estimator directly targeting the nature of the response variable, i.e.,  $\hat{Y}_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$ , may be of interest, instead. In a multinomial model, this is typically achieved by carrying out an additional step that involves taking a random draw from a multinomial distribution with parameters  $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Since this step introduces an additional source of variability, this must be reflected in the GMSE. Under the same conditions of Theorem 2, but focusing on the estimator  $\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \tilde{Y}_{ik}$ , with  $\tilde{Y}_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}_i)$ , it is straightforward to show that

$$\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Lin}} \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) = \widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Lin}} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{p}_{ik} (1 - \hat{p}_{ik}), \quad k = 1, \dots, K,$$

where the additional (positive) component reflects the variability of the outcomes of a multinomial model.

To facilitate implementability and computational efficiency, an alternative formulation of the results presented here, using the Kronecker product, is provided in the Supplementary material D.

## 4 Application to the Attained Level of Education

This section illustrates the application of the GMSE to education data from the Base Register of Individuals of the Italian ISSR. As described in Section 1.1, complete unit-level information for the attained level of education in Italy for a reference year  $t$  (denoted by  $Y_{ik}, i = 1, \dots, N; k = 1, \dots, K$ ) is retrieved from different data sources. Specifically, annual sample surveys are conducted to infer the education level of the entire population, while using auxiliary information from other two data sources: administrative data from the Ministry of Education, University and Research and the last Italian Census in 2011. These data sources define the following population partition in three subgroups differing in their informative content:

- Subgroup A (22% of the register units) – administrative data: Individuals who entered a national study program between 2011 and  $t - 2$ , attended a course in Italy between  $t - 2$  and  $t - 1$ , and for whom the information on the education level at  $t - 1$  is available. Based on the reference year  $t$ , this information may change, therefore, it represents the dynamic component of the ISSR.
- Subgroup B (73% of the register units) – 2011 census data: Individuals not in Subgroup A (not enrolled in any course between  $t - 2$  and  $t - 1$ ), but for whom education data from the 2011 Italian Census is available. This information has a static nature as it only refers to the 2011 census.
- Subgroup C (5% of the register units): Individuals not recorded in the administrative or census data, therefore, with no direct information on the education level from the previous years. This subgroup is composed mainly of adults, with a high percentage of not Italian citizens ( $> 60\%$ ).

Unobserved unit-level education data at time  $t$  (those not included in the sample survey) are imputed using a model-based approach. The lack of a uniform information pattern across the different subgroups – on both the response categories and the auxiliary data – motivated the use of a supervised approach, with the use of different conditional models varying in their covariate set as follows:

- Subgroup A – administrative data:  $p_{ik} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{ik} = 1|\mathbf{x}_i)$ , with the set of covariates  $\mathbf{x}$  given by  $X_1$  : age class,  $X_2$  : gender,  $X_3$  : Italian citizenship,  $X_4$  : education at  $t - 1$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , and  $X_5$  : province;
- Subgroup B – 2011 census data:  $p_{ik} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{ik} = 1|\mathbf{x}_i)$ , with the set of covariates  $\mathbf{x}$  given by  $X_1$  : age class,  $X_2$  : gender,  $X_3$  : Italian citizenship,  $X_4$  : education in 2011, for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , and  $X_5$  : province;
- Subgroup C – other auxiliary data:  $p_{ik} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{ik} = 1|\mathbf{x}_i)$ , with the set of  $\mathbf{x}$  given by  $X_1$  : age,  $X_2$  : gender,  $X_3$  : citizenship,  $X_5$  : province, and two alternative covariates on education specific to units belonging to two the following populations:  $C_1$ , given by those who changed their residence within Italy after 2014 ( $X_6$  : education of movers) and  $C_2$ , those not surveyed by the 2011 Italian Census, but later captured by post-Census operations ( $X_7$  : post-census education).

In each of the subgroups, a number of  $K = 8$  education categories are considered: Illiterate, Literate but no formal educational attainment, Primary education, Lower secondary education, Upper secondary education,

Bachelor’s degree or equivalent level, Master’s degree or equivalent level, PhD level. For details on the integration, model choice, and imputation procedure, we refer to [Di Zio et al. \(2019a\)](#).

For data confidentiality, the specific application illustrated in this section is based on a random subset of the entire Base Register of Individuals, accounting for  $\approx 10\%$  of the register units. Furthermore, for expositional simplicity, we restrict the analysis to the Italian region of Emilia Romagna and to Subgroup B, which covers most of the register units (73%). This leads to a final size of  $N = 296,565$  (sub-)register units with 2011 Census information available on the attained level of education in 2011. Among these, a total of  $n = 14,860$  units (5% of the total sub-register population) have been surveyed within the annual sample survey program for the reference year  $t = 2019$ . The data are made publicly available. Details on the population covariates (available for all sub-register units) is reported in [Table 1](#), while a summary of the outcome of interest (available only for the sample units) is depicted in [Figure 1](#) (right side).

Table 1: Register data (covariates, sample and domain membership) with their nature and marginal properties for Subgroup B of the register.

| Covariates                            | Variable type                  | Marginal frequency $\mathbf{p}_{X_j}$                    |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| $X_1$ : age class ((,28])             | Categorical: $\{1, \dots, 5\}$ | (0.012, 0.115, 0.208, 0.395, 0.270)                      |
| $X_2$ : gender (Female)               | Binary: $\{0, 1\}$             | (0.477, 0.523)                                           |
| $X_3$ : Italian citizenship (Yes)     | Binary: $\{0, 1\}$             | (0.071, 0.929)                                           |
| $X_4$ : education in 2011             | Categorical: $\{1, \dots, 8\}$ | (0.005, 0.024, 0.171, 0.294, 0.363, 0.026, 0.113, 0.004) |
| Sample membership                     |                                |                                                          |
| $\lambda$ : Sample indicator (Yes)    | Binary: $\{0, 1\}$             | (0.950, 0.050)                                           |
| Domain membership (internal)          |                                |                                                          |
| $\gamma^{(d)}$ , $d = X_2$ : gender   | Binary: $\{0, 1\}$             | (0.477, 0.523)                                           |
| Domain membership (external)          |                                |                                                          |
| $\gamma^{(d)}$ , $d = X_5$ : province | Categorical: $\{1, \dots, 9\}$ | (0.075, 0.065, 0.09, 0.1, 0.09, 0.12, 0.08, 0.16, 0.23)  |

For imputing unit-level data for the  $N - n = 281,705$  register units that are not part of the sample, a multinomial model has been fitted on the sample data using the aforementioned model for Subgroup B, with the exception of  $X_5$  : province, which will be used as an external domain. Results on the estimated regression coefficients are reported in [Table 2](#), highlighting the important role of previous information on the variable of interest  $Y_{ik}$ . Finally, model-based estimates of population totals for the attained level of education are illustrated in [Figure 1](#) (left side), along with a comparison to the sample survey data (right side). Estimates  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{Y}_{ik}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 8$ , are based on the deterministic estimator in [Eq. \(3\)](#), and are illustrative for the two gender domains ( $d \in \{\text{Male}, \text{Female}\}$ ). Estimates for the population totals are consistent with the sample data (in terms of both ordering and relative size); in particular, the highest percentage of individuals are observed in categories 4 Lower secondary (28.4%) and 5 Upper secondary (38.4%), while a very limited proportion belongs to classes 1 Illiterate (0.35%) and 8 PhD level (0.35%). This has an important impact on the variability or accuracy of the estimates, with a higher uncertainty for those classes characterised by a lower frequency.






Figure 1: Number of individuals (counts) in each of the  $K = 8$  categories of the attained level of education: population estimates  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, k = 1, \dots, 8$  (Subgroup B of the register; left) obtained according to Eq. (3) and sample survey data (right) with respect to the internal domain  $\gamma^{(d)}, d = X_2: \text{Gender} \in \{\text{Male}, \text{Female}\}$ .

The GMSE estimates are reported in Table 3, where a comparison between the linearised estimator in Eq. (20) and a non-parametric bootstrap (see Section 12 in Chambers and Clark, 2012) is reported. We denote the two by  $\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Lin}}$  and  $\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Boot}}$ , respectively. Given the different size of each category  $k$ , as well as that of each different domain  $d$ , we also consider a measure of relative error, given by the coefficient of variation (CV; see e.g., Lohr, 2021). Assuming that the subgroup or category of interest is non-null, that is  $\theta_k^{(d)} \neq 0$ , this is given by:

$$\text{CV} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) = \frac{\sqrt{\text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right)}}{\mathbb{E} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (21)$$

In practice, an estimator  $\widehat{\text{CV}}_k^{(d)} = \widehat{\text{CV}} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right)$  will be employed, since both the numerator and denominator are unknown and these will be replaced by their correspondent sample estimators.

As expected, both methods suggest a lower estimation error for those classes with a higher size (frequency) of units, and viceversa for smaller classes. In particular, the two extreme classes of 1 **Illiterate** and 8 **PhD level** suffer the most: both show an estimated CV of approximately 12% when no domains are taken into account. When interest is in specific domains, the lowered size subgroup is affected the most, especially when it comes with a substantial unbalance with respect to some of the categories of interest. This occurs, for example, for the combination of domain  $d = \text{Male}$  and category  $k = 1$  **Illiterate**, where estimates, being based only 14 units in the sample (see Table 3), have an estimated CV of 22.22%. For the same category but domain  $d = \text{Female}$ , the number of sample units is more than double, and the relative CV reduces to 17.33%.

Depending on the granularity of the domain of interest, the error may incur an additional increase. However, the (sample/register) size of the category  $k$  remains the primary driver, especially when the domain is external, that is, when this is not part of the model. An in-depth relationship between the estimated relative error, the sample category size (counts), and the domain size is given in Figure 2 for the external domain of province,

Table 2: Model coefficients  $\beta_k, k = 1, \dots, K = 8$  for Subgroup B based on the sample survey data. Coefficients for  $k = 8$  are all set to zero since this is used as baseline category.

| Model covariate (dummy)      | Response Category $k$ |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                              | $k = 1$               | $k = 2$ | $k = 3$ | $k = 4$ | $k = 5$ | $k = 6$ | $k = 7$ | $k = 8$ |
| $X_0$ : Intercept            | 8.897                 | -0.543  | 6.021   | 8.730   | 8.018   | 0.028   | 0.574   | 0.000   |
| $X_1$ :: [29, 39]            | -1.344                | 6.426   | -0.130  | -1.586  | -2.059  | -1.687  | -2.862  | 0.000   |
| $X_1$ :: [40, 49]            | -0.894                | 7.927   | 0.577   | -0.852  | -1.427  | -1.638  | -2.270  | 0.000   |
| $X_1$ :: [50, 69]            | 0.966                 | 8.214   | 2.157   | -0.267  | -1.068  | -1.392  | -1.825  | 0.000   |
| $X_1$ :: [70, )              | 2.640                 | 11.259  | 4.524   | 0.755   | -0.085  | -1.151  | -0.867  | 0.000   |
| $X_2$ :: Female              | 0.821                 | 0.947   | 0.286   | -0.046  | 0.079   | 0.311   | 0.233   | 0.000   |
| $X_3$ :: Italian citizenship | -2.048                | -1.250  | -0.411  | 0.056   | 0.032   | -0.291  | 0.311   | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 2$             | 0.251                 | 3.542   | 3.475   | 2.110   | 2.391   | 8.305   | 1.772   | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 3$             | -0.999                | 1.997   | 4.431   | 2.827   | 2.548   | 7.951   | 8.471   | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 4$             | -6.377                | -4.379  | -2.595  | -0.143  | -0.492  | 3.409   | 3.863   | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 5$             | 0.016                 | 3.170   | 4.512   | 5.732   | 9.772   | 13.889  | 13.409  | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 6$             | -16.979               | -14.753 | -7.478  | -5.416  | -2.491  | 7.184   | 5.581   | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 7$             | -10.654               | -9.324  | -7.827  | -6.885  | -4.805  | 2.696   | 5.800   | 0.000   |
| $X_4$ :: $k = 8$             | -14.816               | -14.945 | -15.966 | -10.870 | -9.100  | -8.896  | -0.020  | 0.000   |

consisting in 9 categories. A further illustration is provided in Supplementary material C with respect to the estimated register counts, rather than the sample counts, showing similar results. For external domains, such as the province, it becomes clear that the accuracy or estimation error is a function of the marginal size of the class, and not of its conditional size given the province  $d$ . The constant value of the estimated CV for a given class  $k$  but for different provinces reflects this; see, e.g., the green points for  $k = 5$  Upper secondary in Figure 2. That is certainly not the case of an internal domain, defined, e.g., by variable  $X_2$  : gender, where is the conditional size to have a direct impact on the error (see Supplementary material C for further details).




Figure 2: Coefficient of variation ( $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ ; in log scale) with respect to the sample size of each class  $k = 1, \dots, 8$  and domain combination, with  $d \in X_5$ : province having 9 modalities.

The comparison between the linearised and bootstrap approach for the accuracy / GMSE estimation will become clearer in Section 5, when a benchmark comparator (that is, the Monte Carlo (MC) estimator, serving as “the truth”) will be reported. At this stage, we can notice that the two estimators are aligned in their direction and magnitude, with generally higher values shown for the bootstrap approach. Nonetheless, readers (especially

Table 3: Estimates of totals  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{Y}_{ik}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 8$  for the full register and for domain  $d \in X_2$  : Gender, with their estimated GMSE and CV (%) . The sample fraction  $n_k^{(d)} / \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  is between 3.9% and 5.2% across all cases. Bootstrap estimates are based on  $B = 1000$  bootstrap resamples (with replacement).

| Category $k$                                               | $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$ | Sample size $n_k^{(d)}$ | Linearised Estimator                   |                                      | Bootstrap Estimator                     |                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                                                            |                        |                         | $\widehat{\text{GMSE}}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ | $\widehat{\text{CV}}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ | $\widehat{\text{GMSE}}_k^{\text{Boot}}$ | $\widehat{\text{CV}}_k^{\text{Boot}}$ |
| Full register: $\gamma_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, N$             |                        |                         |                                        |                                      |                                         |                                       |
| 1 Illiterate                                               | 1039                   | 49                      | 15195                                  | 11.86%                               | 25938                                   | 15.38%                                |
| 2 Literate but no education                                | 6649                   | 340                     | 97462                                  | 4.70%                                | 141041                                  | 5.65%                                 |
| 3 Primary                                                  | 49886                  | 2572                    | 288343                                 | 1.08%                                | 764254                                  | 1.75%                                 |
| 4 Lower secondary                                          | 84174                  | 4285                    | 530144                                 | 0.87%                                | 2557366                                 | 1.90%                                 |
| 5 Upper secondary                                          | 113719                 | 5682                    | 497936                                 | 0.62%                                | 545618                                  | 0.65%                                 |
| 6 Bachelor degree                                          | 7234                   | 364                     | 91337                                  | 4.18%                                | 256850                                  | 7.00%                                 |
| 7 Master degree                                            | 32810                  | 1524                    | 171777                                 | 1.26%                                | 706125                                  | 2.56%                                 |
| 8 PhD level                                                | 1054                   | 44                      | 16074                                  | 12.02%                               | 35973                                   | 18.11%                                |
| Internal domain: $\gamma^{(d)}, d = \text{Male}$ (47.7%)   |                        |                         |                                        |                                      |                                         |                                       |
| 1 Illiterate                                               | 300                    | 14                      | 4435                                   | 22.22%                               | 12137                                   | 36.49%                                |
| 2 Literate but no education                                | 1569                   | 81                      | 24444                                  | 9.97%                                | 28522                                   | 10.74%                                |
| 3 Primary                                                  | 19631                  | 1015                    | 114420                                 | 1.72%                                | 300830                                  | 2.79%                                 |
| 4 Lower secondary                                          | 45853                  | 2306                    | 261562                                 | 1.12%                                | 1142715                                 | 2.33%                                 |
| 5 Upper secondary                                          | 56374                  | 2775                    | 243509                                 | 0.88%                                | 209053                                  | 0.81%                                 |
| 6 Bachelor degree                                          | 2701                   | 132                     | 36359                                  | 7.06%                                | 153317                                  | 14.50%                                |
| 7 Master degree                                            | 14443                  | 656                     | 76429                                  | 1.91%                                | 353488                                  | 4.12%                                 |
| 8 PhD level                                                | 510                    | 20                      | 7813                                   | 17.33%                               | 14960                                   | 24.13%                                |
| Internal domain: $\gamma^{(d)}, d = \text{Female}$ (52.3%) |                        |                         |                                        |                                      |                                         |                                       |
| 1 Illiterate                                               | 739                    | 35                      | 10721                                  | 14.01%                               | 12041                                   | 14.73%                                |
| 2 Literate but no education                                | 5080                   | 259                     | 72826                                  | 5.31%                                | 167424                                  | 8.06%                                 |
| 3 Primary                                                  | 30255                  | 1557                    | 172843                                 | 1.37%                                | 219218                                  | 1.55%                                 |
| 4 Lower secondary                                          | 38321                  | 1979                    | 265811                                 | 1.35%                                | 461937                                  | 1.77%                                 |
| 5 Upper secondary                                          | 57345                  | 2907                    | 251083                                 | 0.87%                                | 309445                                  | 0.97%                                 |
| 6 Bachelor degree                                          | 4533                   | 232                     | 54303                                  | 5.14%                                | 53537                                   | 5.10%                                 |
| 7 Master degree                                            | 18367                  | 868                     | 93330                                  | 1.66%                                | 113597                                  | 1.84%                                 |
| 8 PhD level                                                | 545                    | 24                      | 8069                                   | 16.5%                                | 9646                                    | 18.18%                                |

those willing to translate and apply these methods in official statistics), may find it useful to understand the computational trade-offs between  $\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Lin}}$  and  $\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{Boot}}$ , and the benefit extent of the former. For the application introduced here and in the simplest case where no domains are taken into account (that is, for the full register), the linearised approach requires  $< 6$  minutes, while the bootstrap approach (with  $B = 1000$  replicates) takes more around 10 times more, with 54 minutes. These values result from a Darwin (macOS) Kernel Version 22.5.0; root:xnu-8796.121.3-7/RELEASE\_X86\_64, using the `system.time()` function in R version 4.3.2. When an internal or an external domain is included, the bootstrap approach will incur a computational burden that increases linearly with the granularity of the domain. If there is a possibility to optimise the bootstrap code so as to save and re-use the different bootstrap replications over the domains of interest, this certainly comes with non-trivial memory burden, which may be infeasible for current systems. Interestingly, the linearised approach in Eq. (20), relies on a *single-time* computation of the plug-in estimators in Eq. (20), which are then re-used for any domain or sub-population of interest. Thus, it represents a faster and more feasible option for unplanned *on-the-fly* estimates requested by end users.

## 5 Simulation Comparison

To validate the proposed linearised GMSE estimation approach, and allow for a fair comparison with the bootstrap estimator, we run a set of simulation studies with varying sample sizes  $n = 0.05 \times N$ , where  $N \in \{100.000, 300.000, 500.000\}$ . We follow a data-driven approach, guided by real data described in Section 4, which refer to the ISTAT register of the attained level of education (response variable) and include a set of covariates as described in Table 1. In our simulations, covariate data are re-generated independently from an infinite population specified by  $\mathbf{x}_j \sim \text{Multinomial}(\mathbf{p}_{X_j}), \forall j$ , with correspondent parameters given in Table 1 (column 3). The sample membership indicator  $\lambda_i$  is generated independently as  $\lambda_i \sim \text{Bern}(\pi_i), i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $\pi_i = 0.05$  is the inclusion probability of each unit  $i$ . This mimics an SRS design with replacement. Furthermore, we account for the internal domain variable  $X_2$  : **gender**, and for an external one, given by  $X_5$  : **province** and generated as  $\gamma_2 = \mathbf{x}_5 \sim \text{Multinomial}(\mathbf{p}_{X_5})$ . If a variable  $X_j$  is used as a model predictor it represents an internal domain; otherwise it defines an external one. The response variable is generated according to the multinomial model of interest, as described in Section 3.1, with the ‘‘true’’ fixed coefficients  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_K)$  specified in Table 2. These are obtained from fitting the same model to the real education data. To facilitate replicability of the results, both data and R codes are made publicly available at <https://github.com/nina-DL/GMSE>.

The proposed GMSE estimation method and the bootstrap approach (based on  $B = 1000$  resamples) are compared with an MC estimator, serving as a benchmark for the true GMSE. The MC estimator is evaluated based on  $G = 100$  independent replicas of the sampling design and  $M = 100$  replicas of the response variable for each sample replicate. The corresponding GMSE and CV estimators are given, respectively, by:

$$\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{MC}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \widehat{\text{MSE}}_g^{\text{MC}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{p}_{ik}^{(m,g)} - \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} p_{ik} \right)^2 \right),$$

$$\widehat{\text{CV}}^{\text{MC}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) = \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{GMSE}}^{\text{MC}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)})}}{\mathbb{E}(\theta_k^{(d)})}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

where  $\hat{p}_{ik}^{(m,g)}$  is the parameter estimate obtained in the MC run in correspondence to the  $m$ -th replicate of the response model and the  $g$ -th sample-membership replicate. For the sake of space, we focus on the second measure, and report the CV (in %) results for the different sample sizes in Table 4.

Overall, the proposed estimator  $\widehat{\text{CV}}_k^{\text{Lin}}$  is well aligned with the MC benchmark  $\widehat{\text{CV}}_k^{\text{MC}}$ , especially in cases with a reasonable amount  $n_k$  of observations of that specific category  $k$ . Alignment improves as the register size  $N$  increases; we emphasise that official registers are typically of very large sizes, thus making any difference between the linearised estimator and the true variability negligible. The bootstrap approach shows in general an increased variability estimate, with a much higher divergence from its true value, and a much higher uncertainty in this estimate as Figure 3 shows. While, for computational reasons, the values in Table 4 refer to a single simulation run and may thus be prone to simulation randomness, in Figure 3 the three different estimation approaches are compared in terms of their variability, by generating  $S = 100$  independent finite populations (registers) of

Table 4: Estimates of the CV (in %) with respect to the register totals estimates  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} \hat{Y}_{ik}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 8$ , with  $\gamma_i = 1, i = 1, \dots, N$  with the three different estimators, and for  $N \in \{100,000, 300,000, 500,000\}$ .

| Category $k$                | $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$ | Sample size $n_k^{(d)}$ | $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ (%) | $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{Boot}}$ (%) | $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{MC}}$ (%) |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| $N = 100,000; n = 5,000$    |                        |                         |                                   |                                    |                                  |
| 1 Illiterate                | 308                    | 15                      | 19.73%                            | 25.77%                             | 19.95%                           |
| 2 Literate but no education | 1886                   | 81                      | 9.64%                             | 13.20%                             | 9.47%                            |
| 3 Primary                   | 14537                  | 724                     | 2.42%                             | 3.18%                              | 2.39%                            |
| 4 Lower secondary           | 30854                  | 1517                    | 1.55%                             | 1.96%                              | 1.53%                            |
| 5 Upper secondary           | 38667                  | 1929                    | 1.10%                             | 1.36%                              | 1.08%                            |
| 6 Bachelor degree           | 2183                   | 107                     | 7.69%                             | 9.78%                              | 7.50%                            |
| 7 Master degree             | 11247                  | 609                     | 1.92%                             | 2.59%                              | 1.87%                            |
| 8 PhD level                 | 317                    | 12                      | 15.52%                            | 21.43%                             | 15.53%                           |
| $N = 300,000; n = 15,000$   |                        |                         |                                   |                                    |                                  |
| 1 Illiterate                | 949                    | 58                      | 14.21%                            | 23.34%                             | 13.90%                           |
| 2 Literate but no education | 5613                   | 292                     | 5.48%                             | 5.94%                              | 5.22%                            |
| 3 Primary                   | 41411                  | 2216                    | 1.43%                             | 2.10%                              | 1.39%                            |
| 4 Lower secondary           | 92610                  | 4626                    | 0.87%                             | 1.18%                              | 0.84%                            |
| 5 Upper secondary           | 116326                 | 5892                    | 0.63%                             | 0.73%                              | 0.61%                            |
| 6 Bachelor degree           | 6464                   | 296                     | 4.37%                             | 5.18%                              | 4.40%                            |
| 7 Master degree             | 33711                  | 1704                    | 1.15%                             | 1.3%                               | 1.14%                            |
| 8 PhD level                 | 915                    | 42                      | 11.41%                            | 17.47%                             | 11.13%                           |
| $N = 500,000; n = 25,000$   |                        |                         |                                   |                                    |                                  |
| 1 Illiterate                | 1581                   | 80                      | 10.86%                            | 14.92%                             | 9.91%                            |
| 2 Literate but no education | 9375                   | 469                     | 4.22%                             | 4.51%                              | 4.10%                            |
| 3 Primary                   | 72608                  | 3656                    | 1.10%                             | 1.30%                              | 1.08%                            |
| 4 Lower secondary           | 154465                 | 7763                    | 0.68%                             | 0.76%                              | 0.66%                            |
| 5 Upper secondary           | 193322                 | 9680                    | 0.49%                             | 0.52%                              | 0.49%                            |
| 6 Bachelor degree           | 10936                  | 552                     | 3.38%                             | 4.01%                              | 3.35%                            |
| 7 Master degree             | 56129                  | 2880                    | 0.89%                             | 1.16%                              | 0.87%                            |
| 8 PhD level                 | 1583                   | 79                      | 8.77%                             | 10.48%                             | 8.38%                            |

the prespecified size  $N = 100,000$ . Importantly, the illustration in Figure 3 highlights the advantages of the linearised estimator, not only in terms of potential bias, but also in terms of its variability. This is especially true for classes of low sizes such as the extreme ones.

## 6 Discussion and Conclusion

In examining the ongoing paradigm shift in official statistics globally, this work emphasised – while echoing existing literature (Lohr and Raghunathan, 2017; De Broe et al., 2021) – the critical importance of establishing agreed-upon quality standards and methods for estimating accuracy. Overall, the updated paradigm should address the problem of designing the production of official statistics within an *integrated data ecosystem*, covering challenges not only on data-managing capabilities, statistical methods for data integration, data governance, etc., but also ensuring high-quality publication standards and transparently disclosing any quality issues when user-specific statistics are allowed to be produced. As discussed in Lohr and Raghunathan (2017), the novelty of new data production processes should also reflect a closer, continuous, and more structured relationship with end users, with the aim of identifying and responding to new or established objectives, while maintaining




Figure 3: Estimates of the CV with the three different estimators, and for  $N = 100.000$ , with  $n = 0.05 \times N = 5000$ . All results are based on  $S = 100$  replications of the three evaluation procedures.

transparency about the quality of the produced statistics. Therefore, providing properly characterised statistics, along with reliable accuracy estimates, remains of fundamental importance.

Two main approaches have been followed in the literature to measure the accuracy, namely, the mean squared error or the variance of an estimator. The first approach involves resampling methods and mainly focus on either parametric or non-parametric bootstrap-based strategies (see e.g., Mashreghi et al., 2016; Shao, 2003, for a survey). These heavily depend on the number of data to be processed (which can be millions and millions in register data), and can lead to extreme computational burden. The second approach relies on approximations based on Taylor linearisation (see e.g., Graf and Tillé, 2014; Vallée and Tillé, 2019), and requires the effort to derive analytical formulas case by case.

In this work, we followed the second class of approaches, focusing on an accuracy measure that extends the classical mean squared error to a generalised mean squared error (GMSE; Alleva et al., 2021) that may encompass different sources of error. Here, we focused on two important sources of uncertainties that characterise all modern integrated systems of data: sampling uncertainty and model uncertainty. A computational strategy for enabling users to quickly support their statistics with a GMSE has been derived for multi-category outcomes, possibly one of the most common types of outcomes in official statistics, as discussed in Section 1.1.

The GMSE has notable advantages. First, the proposed measure results in a more comprehensive and highly transparent solution as it explicitly considers the uncertainty deriving from various factors that influence the inferential process used to construct the estimates from the register. Second, because of this, it is characterised by greater robustness in the event of model failures and long-term stability: the measure will only change if the data generation model—based on the auxiliary variables—undergoes significant alterations or if the sampling design of

the dataset used for predictions changes. Third, in terms of its computational aspects, the GMSE is user-friendly and allows for on-the-fly release of statistical estimates along with the associated accuracy measurements. Once the estimates of the unknown model parameters are obtained, the computation of the GMSE is straightforward, easy to use and communicate to users. This makes it an ideal tool for safeguarding impartiality and equal access, while adhering to a fundamental principle of official statistics that asserts that these “*have to be available to all users, i.e. they have to be public.*” (Bruengger, 2008).

The primary barrier to the widespread use of GMSE is the foundational work of methodological statisticians in deriving linearised forms of the working and predictive model, a well-known challenge in the second class of accuracy estimation approaches. An important consideration is for predictions made without explicitly assuming a statistical model. While this may be sometimes the case, such exploitation is beneficial for enhancing the transparency of the statistical processes used to create the registers. We also note that our proposed method can be extended to predictions generated by artificial intelligence. For instance, the Explainable AI approach allows one to locally approximate complex AI prediction functions (or “black-box” models) using simpler and more interpretable models (Confalonieri et al., 2021). Nevertheless, this area requires further theoretical exploration and empirical analysis. In the case of model-free predictions, an interesting direction to explore the field of conformal prediction and its finite-sample validity in exchangeable data (Vovk et al., 2005).

The GMSE could be accepted as a measure of global accuracy by the leading professional groups of methodologists within NSIs, including those who base their inferences solely on statistical models and those who primarily rely on sampling design and use models as supplementary tools. Bayesian statisticians could adopt this approach by considering a specific expectation operator related to the *a-priori* variability of model parameters.

In conclusion, with this work, we aim to support the advancement of current practices in official statistics, facilitating a flexible yet correct use of registry data by augmenting the production of estimates with their corresponding quality.

## References

- Alleva, G. (2017a). Emerging challenges in official statistics: new sources, methods and skills. Technical report, SIS2017 Statistical Conference. Statistics and Data Science: new challenges, new generations.
- Alleva, G. (2017b). The new role of sample surveys in official statistics. Technical report, ITACOSM 2017: The 5th Italian Conference on Survey Methodology.
- Alleva, G., Falorsi, P. D., Petrarca, F., and Righi, P. (2021). Measuring the accuracy of aggregates computed from a statistical register. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 37(2):481–503.
- Ascari, G., Blix, K., Brancato, G., Burg, T., McCourt, A., van Delden, A., Krapavickaitė, D., Ploug, N., Soltus, S., Stoltze, P., et al. (2020). Quality of multisource statistics—the KOMUSO project. *The survey statistician*, 81:36–51.

- Biemer, P., Trewin, D., Bergdahl, H., and Japac, L. (2014). A system for managing the quality of official statistics. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 30(3):381–415.
- Biemer, P. P. (2010). Total Survey Error: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(5):817–848.
- Bruengger, H. (2008). How Should a Modern National System of Official Statistics Look? *UNECE, Statistical Division*.
- Bycroft, C. and Matheson-Dunning, N. (2020). Use of administrative records for non-response in the New Zealand 2018 Census. *Statistical Journal of the IAOS*, 36(1):107–115.
- Chambers, R. L. and Clark, R. (2012). *An introduction to model-based survey sampling with applications*. Oxford University Press.
- Citro, C. F. (2014). From multiple modes for surveys to multiple data sources for estimates. *Survey Methodology*, 40(2):137–162.
- Confalonieri, R., Coba, L., Wagner, B., and Besold, T. R. (2021). A historical perspective of explainable artificial intelligence. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 11(1):e1391.
- Daalmans, J. (2017). *Mass imputation for census estimation*. Statistics Netherlands.
- Daas, P., Ossen, S., Tennekes, M., Zhang, L.-C., Hendriks, C., Foldal Haugen, K., Cerroni, F., Di Bella, G., Laitila, T., Wallgren, A., et al. (2011). Report on methods preferred for the quality indicators of administrative data sources. Technical report, Blue - ETS Project, Deliverable 4.2.
- Daas, P. J., Puts, M. J., Buelens, B., and van den Hurk, P. A. (2015). Big data as a source for official statistics. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 31(2):249–262.
- De Broe, S., Struijs, P., Daas, P., van Delden, A., Burger, J., van den Brakel, J., ten Bosch, O., Zeelenberg, K., and Ypma, W. (2021). Updating the paradigm of official statistics: New quality criteria for integrating new data and methods in official statistics. *Statistical Journal of the IAOS*, 37(1):343–360.
- De Waal, T., van Delden, A., and Scholtus, S. (2020). Multi-source statistics: basic situations and methods. *International Statistical Review*, 88(1):203–228.
- Di Zio, M., Filippini, R., and Rocchetti, G. (2019a). An imputation procedure for the italian attained level of education in the register of individuals based on administrative and survey data. *Measuring well-being at local level using remote sensing and official statistics data*.
- Di Zio, M., Filippini, R., and Rocchetti, G. (2019b). An imputation procedure for the italian attained level of education in the register of individuals based on administrative and survey data. *Rivista di Statistica Ufficiale*, Issue 2-3(2019):143–174.



- European Statistical System Committee (2018). Bucharest memorandum on official statistics in a datafied society (trusted smart statistics). *Luxembourg City (Luxembourg): Eurostat*.
- Eurostat (2014). ESS handbook for quality reports. Technical report, European Statistical System.
- Eurostat (2020). European Statistical System handbook for quality and metadata reports. Technical report, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fabrizi, E., Montanari, G. E., and Giovanna Ranalli, M. (2016). A hierarchical latent class model for predicting disability small area counts from survey data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 179(1):103–131.
- Gjaltema, T. (2022). High-level group for the modernisation of official statistics (hlg-mos) of the united nations economic commission for europe. *Statistical Journal of the IAOS*, 38(3):917–922.
- Graf, E. and Tillé, Y. (2014). Variance estimation using linearization for poverty and social exclusion indicators. *Survey Methodology*, 40(1):61–80.
- Groves, R. M. (2011). Three eras of survey research. *Public opinion quarterly*, 75(5):861–871.
- Henderson, H. V., Pukelsheim, F., and Searle, S. R. (1983). On the history of the Kronecker product. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 14(2):113–120.
- Holt, D. T. (2007). The official statistics olympic challenge: Wider, deeper, quicker, better, cheaper. *The American Statistician*, 61(1):1–8.
- Isaki, C. T. and Fuller, W. A. (1982). Survey Design under the Regression Superpopulation Model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 77(377):89–96.
- Istat (2016). ISTAT’s Modernisation Programme. Technical report, ISTAT: Istituto Nazionale di Statistica.
- Kim, J. K. and Rao, J. (2009). A unified approach to linearization variance estimation from survey data after imputation for item nonresponse. *Biometrika*, 96(4):917–932.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1997). *The structure of scientific revolutions*, volume 962. University of Chicago press Chicago.
- Lohr, S. L. (2021). *Sampling: design and analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Lohr, S. L. and Raghunathan, T. E. (2017). Combining Survey Data with Other Data Sources. *Statistical Science*, 32(2):293–312.
- López-Vizcaíno, E., Lombardía, M. J., and Morales, D. (2015). Small area estimation of labour force indicators under a multinomial model with correlated time and area effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 178(3):535–565.
- Lundy, E. R. (2022). Predicting the quality and evaluating the use of administrative data for the 2021 Canadian Census of Population. *Statistical Journal of the IAOS*, 38(4):1177–1183.

- Marino, M. F., Ranalli, M. G., Salvati, N., and Alfo, M. (2019). Semiparametric empirical best prediction for small area estimation of unemployment indicators. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13(2):1166–1197.
- Mashreghi, Z., Haziza, D., and Léger, C. (2016). A survey of bootstrap methods in finite population sampling. *Statistics Surveys*, 10:1–52.
- Molina, I., Saei, A., and José Lombardía, M. (2007). Small area estimates of labour force participation under a multinomial logit mixed model. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 170(4):975–1000.
- Nedyalkova, D. and Tille, Y. (2008). Optimal sampling and estimation strategies under the linear model. *Biometrika*, 95(3):521–537.
- Radermacher, W. J. (2018). Official statistics in the era of big data opportunities and threats. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 6(3):225–231.
- Särndal, C.-E., Swensson, B., and Wretman, J. (2003). *Model assisted survey sampling*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Scholtus, S. and Daalmans, J. (2021). Variance estimation after mass imputation based on combined administrative and survey data. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 37(2):433–459.
- Shao, J. (2003). Impact of the bootstrap on sample surveys. *Statistical Science*, 18(2):191–198.
- Vallée, A.-A. and Tillé, Y. (2019). Linearisation for variance estimation by means of sampling indicators: Application to non-response. *International Statistical Review*, 87(2):347–367.
- Valliant, R. (2009). Model-based prediction of finite population totals. In *Handbook of Statistics*, volume 29, pages 11–31. Elsevier.
- Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer.
- Wallgren, A. and Wallgren, B. (2014). *Register-based Statistics: statistical methods for administrative data*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wolter, K. M. (1986). Some Coverage Error Models for Census Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(394):338.
- Zhang, L.-C. (2012). Topics of statistical theory for register-based statistics and data integration. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 66(1):41–63.
- Ziegler, A. (2011). *Generalized estimating equations*, volume 204. Springer Science & Business Media.

## Acknowledgments

The authors express their sincere gratitude to ISTAT for their continuous support, with special thanks to Romina Filippini and Simona Toti for their assistance with the data. Appreciation is also extended to Brunero Liseo and Marco Di Zio for their valuable discussions during the development of this work and for their insightful feedback.

## Supplementary Material

### A Innovation in the current official-statistics framework

It is important to underline that the community of national and international agencies producing official statistics are well aware of the challenge they face in the integration of new data sources in the different phases of production. This is demonstrated by the Experimental Statistics <sup>1</sup> which since some years represent a production line of many national statistical institutions (NSIs) – also allowing the collection of user feedback – and by international projects to experiment methodologies and computational solutions for the production of statistics based on the integration of multiple sources, including Big Data (Daas et al., 2015). Like administrative data, Big Data are generated outside the control of NSIs, and in analogy with what has been developed and now consolidated on administrative data, various international projects have focused on the definition of quality dimensions to be considered for Big Data as input to a statistical process. The awareness of the NSIs of having to move in a new data ecosystem and the need for commitment to a deep innovation of production processes guided the revision of the European Statistics Code of Practice in 2017 (Eurostat, 2020).

First, the Principle 12 on *Data Accuracy and Reliability*, consistently with the processes of integration of different sources that today characterize the production of official statistics, states that Source data, integrated data, intermediate results and statistical outputs are regularly assessed and validated and that Systems for assessing and validating source data, integrated data, intermediate results and statistical outputs are in place.

Second, in the Principle 7 on *Sound Methodology* of the data production processes, the Code states that Statistical authorities actively encourage the exploration of new and innovative methods for statistics. They develop methodological work and supporting IT solutions to ensure the quality of statistics, especially when new and alternative data collection modes and sources are used as input and statistical authorities take initiatives and participate in the development of innovative methods for collecting and processing data including the integration of new and/or alternative data sources and geospatial data.

Along this direction, the Bucharest Memorandum on *Official Statistics in a datafied society – Trusted Smart Statistics* (European Statistical System Committee, 2018) welcomes and embraces the opportunity for official statistics in a datafied society and economy, and encourages the European Statistical System (ESS) to implement practical and mature cases of using 'big data-enhanced' <sup>2</sup> statistical products and develop experimental statistics

<sup>1</sup><https://www.istat.it/en/announcement-and-analysis/experimental-statistics/>

<sup>2</sup>The Istat modernisation project is consistent with the ESS Vision 2020, the Transformative Agenda for Official Statistics (Eurostat, 2020) and the guidelines of the High Level Group on Modernisation of the production and dissemination of Official Statistics (Gjaltema, 2022)

on new phenomena. In particular, agree that the variety of new data sources, computational paradigms and tools will require amendments to the statistical business architecture, processes, production models, IT infrastructures, methodological and quality frameworks, and the corresponding governance structures, and therefore invite the ESS to formally outline and assess such amendments. Therefore, the introduction of Trusted Smart Statistics is changing the approach to the statistical use of Big Data, combining traditional methods of official statistical production with a different paradigm.

## B Proofs of the technical results

### B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that: i) the estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  associated to the working model  $f_k(\cdot; \beta)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , is model-unbiased, that is,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\beta}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \beta$ , for all samples  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , and that ii) the sampling design is non-informative. Then the following tight upper bounds hold for the individual-category and the cumulated GMSE:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GMSE}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\ \text{GMSE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(d)}) &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \left[ \text{tr} \left( \text{Var}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(d)}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the trace of a square matrix  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\lesssim$  stands for “less than or approximately equal to”.

Before proving Theorem 1, we note that condition ii) holds for most of the surveys conducted by national statistical institutes and it postulates that the sample design is such that the sample and population models coincide. Operationally, it allows for the interchange of the order of expectations  $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}$ .

To derive the approximated expression of the GMSE  $(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} (\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)})^2$ , we add and subtract the quantity  $\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \beta)$  inside the argument of the expectation, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GMSE}(\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)}) &= \mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} (\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \pm \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)})^2 \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} (\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)})^2}_{\text{Part I}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} (\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)})^2}_{\text{Part II}} + 2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} ((\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)})(\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)}))}_{\text{Part III}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by the law of total expectation and under condition i), the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{Y})} (\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} (\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\beta})|\boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \beta) \right) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} (\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)}) = \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)},$$

since  $\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  is a fixed quantity.

**Part I.** By using the argument above and by applying the law of total variance we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right) \right)^2 = \text{Var}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right) + \text{Var}_\lambda \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right),\end{aligned}$$

given that, from condition i), we have that  $\mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right) = \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)}$ , implying  $\text{Var}_\lambda \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right) = \text{Var}_\lambda \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right) = 0$ , since  $\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  is a fixed quantity.

**Part II.** Noticing that the only term affected by randomness is  $\theta_k^{(d)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i^{(d)} Y_{ik}$ , with randomness uniquely coming from the model and such that  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ik} | \mathbf{x}_i) = f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2 &= \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2 = \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2 + \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2 - 2\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2 - \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2 = \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2 - \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) \right)^2 \\ &= \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

**Part III.** For the last component, using condition i) and similar considerations as in Part I and Part II, and distinguishing between two cases depending on whether  $\mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right) = \theta_k^{(d)}$  (A) or not (B), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right) \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} - \theta_k^{(d)} \right) \right) &= \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right) - \mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \theta_k^{(d)} \right) - \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2 + \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) \\ &= \left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2 - \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right) \right) - \cancel{\left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2} + \cancel{\left( \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right)^2} \\ &= \begin{cases} \left( \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) \right)^2 - \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right)^2 = -\text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) & (A) \\ \tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) - \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right) \right) = -\text{Cov}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right), \theta_k^{(d)} \right), & (B) \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from  $\tilde{\theta}_k^{(d)} = \mathbb{E}_{(\lambda, \mathbf{Y})} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} \right) = \mathbb{E}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right) \right)$ . Notice that the case (A) is associated with the setting in which  $\gamma_i^{(d)} \in \mathbf{x}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , that is, when the model  $f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta})$  has a domain intercept. This is likely to happen for large domains, indicating that there are sample observations at the domain level which are used for estimating the model.

Jointly considering the three parts and the two cases (A) and (B), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{GMSE} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}, \theta_k^{(d)} \right) &= \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right) - \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) & (A) : \gamma_i^{(d)} \in \mathbf{x}_i \\ \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right) + \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) - 2\text{Cov}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right), \theta_k^{(d)} \right) & (B) : \gamma_i^{(d)} \notin \mathbf{x}_i \end{cases} \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right).\end{aligned}$$

The final inequality arises from observing that in (A) the term  $\text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \theta_k^{(d)} \right) > 0$  enters with a negative sign and that in (B) it is of the same order of magnitude of  $\text{Cov}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right), \theta_k^{(d)} \right)$  as it represents the model

covariance between the two population totals for the same category  $k$ ,  $\theta_k^{(d)}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \mathbf{Y} \right)$ , having thus a positive sign. Furthermore, it is also important to note that the first component  $\mathbb{E}_\lambda \text{Var}_\mathbf{Y} \left( \hat{\theta}_k^{(d)} | \lambda \right)$  is the dominant component, of primary order compared to the remaining terms.

## B.2 Derivation of the multinomial model results

We assume that the outcome variable for each unit  $i$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , follows a multinomial regression model, that is,  $\mathbf{Y}_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(1, \mathbf{p}_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_i = (p_{i1}, \dots, p_{ik}, \dots, p_{iK})^T$  denotes the unknown event probabilities in  $[0, 1]$  of each category  $k$ , such that  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} = 1$ . Under this model, we have that:

$$P(Y_{i1} = y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iK} = y_{iK} | \mathbf{p}_i) = p_{i1}^{y_{i1}} \cdots p_{iK}^{y_{iK}} = \prod_{k=1}^K p_{ik}^{y_{ik}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Probabilities  $\mathbf{p}_i$  are defined based on the set of individual covariates  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^J$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , according to the multinomial logistic regression model where  $K$  is taken as the baseline category:

$$p_{ik} = f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k}, & k = 1, \dots, K-1 \\ \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_k}, & k = K. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Under the assumption of independence among the  $N$  units, and considering the sampling membership indicators  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ , the joint density function is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \prod_{i=1}^N \left( \prod_{k=1}^K p_{ik}^{y_{ik}} \right)^{\lambda_i} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K p_{ik}^{y_{ik} \lambda_i}, && ((ab)^x = a^x b^x) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} p_{ik}^{y_{ik} \lambda_i} \cdot p_{iK}^{y_{iK} \lambda_i} && (\text{separate the } K\text{-th term}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} p_{ik}^{y_{ik} \lambda_i} \cdot p_{iK}^{(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} y_{ik}) \lambda_i} && (\sum_{i=1}^k y_{ik} = 1) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} p_{ik}^{y_{ik} \lambda_i} \cdot \frac{p_{iK}^{\lambda_i}}{p_{iK}^{\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} y_{ik} \lambda_i}} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} p_{ik}^{y_{ik} \lambda_i} \cdot \frac{p_{iK}^{\lambda_i}}{\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} p_{ik}^{y_{ik} \lambda_i}} && (a^{x+y} = a^x a^y) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \left( \frac{p_{ik}}{p_{iK}} \right)^{y_{ik} \lambda_i} \cdot p_{iK}^{\lambda_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in a classical inference setting procedures are conditioned on the observed sample only, thus, the sample membership terms are omitted.

Now, taken into account Eq. (22), the likelihood and the log-likelihood functions are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \left( \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj} \right)^{y_{ik} \lambda_i} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right)^{\lambda_i}, \\
 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \left( \lambda_i y_{ik} \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj} \right) - \lambda_i \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj} \right) \right] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \left( y_{ik} \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj} \right) - \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj} \right) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The MLEs  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_k = (\hat{\beta}_{k1}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{kJ})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , of the unknown parameters can be obtained as the solution of the problem:

$$\frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \beta_{kj}} = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, j = 1, \dots, J, \quad (23)$$

with overall  $K \times J$  number of equations, which is equivalent to setting

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{g}_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0},$$

where  $\mathbf{0}$  is a vector of  $H$  zeroes and  $\mathbf{g}_i = \{g_{ikj}\}_{k=1, \dots, K-1, j=1, \dots, J}$  is a function of both  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_i$ .

Although technically a matrix, we can consider  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  to be a column vector by appending each of the additional columns below the first. This would be useful in forming the matrix of second partial derivatives  $\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ . Now, for a generic  $k$  and  $j$ , we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \beta_{kj}} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \left[ y_{ik} x_{ij} - \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_{kj}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj} \right)}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \left[ y_{ik} x_{ij} - \frac{x_{ij} \cdot \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} \left( y_{ik} - \frac{\exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right) \quad (24)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} \underbrace{(y_{ik} - p_{ik})}_{g_{ikj}} \quad (25)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i g_{ikj}(y_{ik} | \boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad (26)$$

The Hessian, or second-order derivatives matrix, say  $\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , of dimension  $H \times H$  is now be obtained as:

$$\mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = [a_{(kj)(k'j')}], \quad a_{(kj)(k'j')} \doteq \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \beta_{kj} \partial \beta_{k'j'}}, \quad (27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \beta_{kj} \partial \beta_{k'j'}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_{k'j'}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \lambda_i y_{ik} x_{ij} - \lambda_i \frac{x_{ij} \cdot \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right] \\
 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_{k'j'}} \sum_{i=1}^N -\lambda_i \frac{x_{ij} \cdot \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N -\lambda_i x_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_{k'j'}} \left( \frac{\exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \exp \sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right) \\
 &= \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^N -\lambda_i x_{ij} \frac{\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}\right) \cdot e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \cdot x_{ijj'} - e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \cdot e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \cdot x_{ijj'}}{\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}\right)^2}, & k' = k \\ \sum_{i=1}^N -\lambda_i x_{ij} \frac{0 - e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \cdot e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{k'j}} \cdot x_{ijj'}}{\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}\right)^2}, & k' \neq k \end{cases} \\
 &= \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^N -\lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} \frac{e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} - e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}\right)}{\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}\right)^2}, & k' = k \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} \frac{e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \cdot e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{k'j}}}{\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}}\right)^2}, & k' \neq k \end{cases} \\
 &= \begin{cases} -\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} (1 - p_{ik}), & k' = k \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} p_{ik'}, & k' \neq k \end{cases}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1,1)} & \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1,2)} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1,K)} \\ \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(2,1)} & \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(2,2)} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(2,K)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(K,1)} & \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(K,2)} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(K,K)} \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= \begin{bmatrix} \overbrace{\left[ -\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i p_{i1} (1 - p_{i1}) \right]}^{J \times J} & \cdots & \cdots & \overbrace{\left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i p_{i1} p_{i2} \right]}^{J \times J} \\ \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i p_{i2} p_{i1} \right] & \vdots & \vdots & \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i p_{i2} p_{i(K-1)} \right] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i p_{i(K-1)} p_{i1} \right] & \cdots & \cdots & \left[ -\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i p_{i(K-1)} (1 - p_{i(K-1)}) \right] \end{bmatrix} \\
 &= -\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \begin{bmatrix} \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(1)}^2 \right]}^{J \times J} & \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(1,2)} \right]}^{J \times J} & \cdots & \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(1,K-1)} \right]}^{J \times J} \\ \left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(2,1)} \right] & \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(2)}^2 \right]}^{J \times J} & \cdots & \left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(2,K-1)} \right] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(K-1,1)} \right]}^{J \times J} & \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(K-1,2)} \right]}^{J \times J} & \cdots & \overbrace{\left[ \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}'_i \sigma_{i(K-1)}^2 \right]}^{J \times J} \end{bmatrix}
 \end{aligned}$$

with the generic  $\sigma_{i(k)}^2 = p_{ik}(1 - p_{ik})$  being the variance of  $Y_{ik}$  and  $\sigma_{i(k,k')} = -p_{ik}p_{ik'}$  the covariance between  $Y_{ik}$



and  $Y_{ik'}$ . The full variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i}$  related to the multinomial model is given by

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}_i} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{i1}(1-p_{i1}) & -p_{i1}p_{i2} & \dots & -p_{i1}p_{i(K-1)} \\ -p_{i2}p_{i1} & p_{i2}(1-p_{i2}) & \dots & -p_{i2}p_{i(K-1)} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ -p_{i(K-1)}p_{i1} & -p_{i(K-1)}p_{i2} & \dots & p_{i(K-1)}(1-p_{i(K-1)}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Given its role in the linearised GMSE, below we also provide the formulation of matrix  $\mathbf{F}_k = \left[ \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\beta}_{lj}} \right]_{\hat{\beta}_{lj}=\beta_{lj}}$ , in the case of the multinomial model:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\beta}_{lj}} \Big|_{\hat{\beta}_{lj}=\beta_{lj}} = \frac{x_{ij} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} - e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right)}{\left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right)^2} = x_{ij} p_{ik} (1 - p_{ik}), & l = k \\ \frac{\partial f_k(\mathbf{x}_i; \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial \hat{\beta}_{lj}} \Big|_{\hat{\beta}_{lj}=\beta_{lj}} = \frac{-x_{ij} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \left( e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{lj}} \right)}{\left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} e^{\sum_{j=1}^J x_{ij} \beta_{kj}} \right)^2} = -x_{ij} p_{ik} p_{il}, & l \neq k. \end{cases}$$

### B.3 Approximation of matrix $\mathbf{A}_\beta$

The Hessian matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\beta$  has been derived in Eq. (27) and is given by:

$$\mathbf{A}_\beta = [a_{(kj)(k'j')}], \quad a_{(kj)(k'j')} \doteq \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \beta_{kj} \partial \beta_{k'j'}} = \begin{cases} -\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} (1 - p_{ik}), & k' = k \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} p_{ik'}, & k' \neq k \end{cases}.$$

We want to show that, under the setup in Sections 2 and 3.1, the following approximation is reasonable, removing in this way the dependence on the random variable  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ :

$$\mathbf{A}_\beta \approx \mathbf{A}_\beta |_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\boldsymbol{\pi}}.$$

We first notice that the only random variable in  $\mathbf{A}_\beta$  is given by  $\lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ , while the terms  $x_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, N, j = 1, \dots, J$  and  $p_{ik}, i = 1, \dots, N, k = 1, \dots, K$  are fixed. For simplicity, we focus on a single combination  $j, j', k, k'$ , with the generalisation naturally following. We set  $c_i \doteq x_{ij} x_{ij'} p_{ik} p_{ik'}$  (the case with  $k' = k$  would not make a difference), and let:

$$a_i \doteq a_{(kj)(k'j')} = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i c_i.$$

Noticing that  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are a set of real constants, we want to show that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i c_i \approx \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i c_i.$$

Assuming a non-informative design, with  $\mathbb{E}(\lambda_i) = \pi_i$  and  $\text{Var}(\lambda_i) = \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$ , first, we note that the two

quantities have the same expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}(a_i) = \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i c_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i c_i = \tilde{a}_i = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{a}_i).$$

For the variance, assuming for simplicity a simple random design with replacement (implying independence), we have that:

$$\text{Var}(a_i) = \text{Var} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i c_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i (1 - \pi_i) c_i^2,$$

and the lower the variance, the better the approximation. In particular, the identity holds with probability one when this variance goes to 0, meaning that  $a_i$  is a degenerate distribution at  $\tilde{a}_i$ . This happens in the following cases:

- (i) when  $c_i = 0$ , for all  $i$ ;
- (ii) when  $\pi_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , for all  $i$ , that is, when the entire population is part of the sample (this rarely happens, except for census surveys, and in that case, one would not need to evaluate the register accuracy under sampling randomness).

Since cases (i)-(ii) are rare or of no interest in practice, we are interested in a good approximation that holds when quantities  $c_i$ 's and/or  $\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$  are very small, potentially close to 0. Regarding the  $c_i$ 's, in our specific setting, the design matrix is defined based on a dummy format (with only 0/1 values) and the  $p_{ik}$ 's are values in  $(0, 1)$ , making it a very small constant. For the terms  $\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$ , these are high when  $\pi_i \approx 0.5$  and very small when they are close to the extremes 0/1. The latter is often the case in surveys, with  $\pi_i$  being typically very small; in our case, for instance, we have  $\pi_i = 0.05$  and this is already a decently high value.

### C Additional results




Figure 4: Coefficient of variation ( $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ ; in log scale) with respect to the register total estimates  $\hat{\theta}_k^{(d)}$  for each class  $k = 1, \dots, 8$  and domain combination, with  $d \in X_5$ : **province** having 9 modalities.




Figure 5: Coefficient of variation ( $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ ; in log scale) with respect to the sample size of each class  $k = 1, \dots, 8$  and domain combination, with  $d \in X_2$ : **gender** having 2 modalities.




Figure 6: Coefficient of variation ( $\widehat{CV}_k^{\text{Lin}}$ ; in log scale) with respect to the register total estimates of each class  $k = 1, \dots, 8$  and domain combination, with  $d \in X_2$ : gender having 2 modalities.

## D Kronecker Formulation

### D.1 Why the need to introduce an alternative formulation

In this section, we derive an alternative formulation of the GMSE estimator for the multinomial model. This is a more compact and completely matrix formulation of the GMSE estimator that, compared to the one derived in the article, hereinafter referred to as the Standard formulation (SF), allows us to avoid the introduction of summations. Furthermore, the alternative formulation leads to the definition of a single formula that allows us to obtain the GMSE estimate simultaneously for all K estimation categories and for all D domains. This feature can further facilitate the application of the method by enhancing one of its main characteristics for which it was proposed, that is, that of producing on-the-fly estimates of the quality level of the estimates from the register. Furthermore, the characteristics described can be successful in the application of the studied method on large masses of data, such as statistical registers of National Statistical Institutes that refer to population units. For this reason, in writing the R code that implements the GMSE, two different R programs were developed. The first implements the formulas of the SF, while the second implements those of the alternative formulation. Furthermore, since the new formulation can produce very large matrices, for this formulation, a version based on a block sum was then derived. This which allows to reduce the number of records of the matrices referred to each single block. Naturally, the two new versions coincide in the case of a single block. In the following pages we give only the alternative formulation in the case of a single block because its adaptation to the more general case of two or more blocks is straightforward.

### D.2 Extended notation

In the following, we introduce a general notation based on block vectors and matrices, useful for deriving the GMSE estimator according to the new formulation. In particular,  $* = \text{col}_{b=1}^B \{*_b\} = [*_b]$  is a column vector

(when  $*$   $\equiv a$ , for  $a$  a generic scalar) or a column block vector (when  $*$   $\equiv \mathbf{a}$ ) or a column block matrix (when  $*$   $\equiv \mathbf{A}$ ), being  $b$  ( $b = 1, \dots, B$ ) the index denoting the  $b$ -th element or block; for example, when  $*_b = \mathbf{A}_b$  the general notation becomes  $\mathbf{A} = \text{col}_{b=1}^B \{\mathbf{A}_b\} = [\mathbf{A}_b]$ . In most cases, we will use the last notation after the equals sign, which is more synthetic and compact. Similarly we indicate with  $* = \text{row}_{b=1}^B \{*_b\}$  a row vector or row block vector or block matrix ( $b = 1, \dots, B$ ). Furthermore  $\text{diag}_{b=1}^B \{*_b\}$  is a diagonal matrix made up of  $B$  elements or blocks  $*_b$  ( $\equiv a_b, \mathbf{a}_b, \mathbf{A}_b$ );  $\text{mat}_{b,b'=1}^{B,B'} \{*_bb'\}$  is matrix or block matrix made up of  $B \times B'$  elements or blocks  $*_{bb'}$  ( $\equiv a_{bb'}, \mathbf{a}_{bb'}, \mathbf{A}_{bb'}$ );  $\Delta_{\mathbf{a}} = \text{diag}_{b=1}^B \{a_b\}$  is a diagonal matrix made up of the elements of a vector,  $\mathbf{a} = [a_b]$  ( $b = 1, \dots, B$ ). It is also useful to introduce some indicator vectors and matrices:  $\mathbf{1}_c$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_c$  and  $\mathbf{0}_{c;1c'}$  are vectors of order  $c$ : the first is composed of all values equal to "1", the second of all values equal to "0" while the third is equal to the previous one except for the element  $c'$  which is set equal to "1";  $\mathbf{I}_a$ , is the identity matrix of order  $a$ ;  $\mathbf{I}_{a;b} = \mathbf{1}_b \otimes \mathbf{I}_c$  is a  $[(b \times c) \times c]$ -dimensional matrix composed by  $b$  column blocks each one equal to  $\mathbf{I}_c$ . Finally for two general matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  of order  $(r \times c)$  and matrix  $\mathbf{B}$  of order  $(s \times d)$ , let's consider the following multiplication operators:  $\mathbf{A}\#\mathbf{B}$ , which applies under condition  $r = s$  and denotes the matrix of order matrix  $[r \times (c \times s)]$  obtained by the *element-by-element product*,  $\mathbf{a}_j\#\mathbf{B}$ , of each column vector  $\mathbf{a}_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, c$ , of matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  by matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ . Let's note that in case in which we have a vector  $\mathbf{b}$  of order  $r$ , instead of matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ , the generic column vector of  $\mathbf{A}\#\mathbf{b}$  is  $\mathbf{a}_j\#\mathbf{b}$ ;  $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$ , is the matrix of order  $[(r \times s) \times (c \times d)]$  obtained by the *direct product* of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  denoting the product  $a_{ij}\mathbf{B}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, r; j = 1, \dots, c$ ) of each element of  $\mathbf{A}$  for matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ . The matrix  $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$  goes by the name of Kronecker product because of Kronecker's association with the determinant of  $\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}$ , although in this regard (Henderson et al., 1983) suggest that "Zehfluss product" would be more appropriate.

In this regard, it is noted that since the alternative formulation is based on the application of the Kronecker product to the vectors and matrices already introduced for the SF, the alternative formulation of the GMSE given below will be referred to in the following as the Kronecker Formulation (KF) of the GMSE.

### D.3 Parameter and estimator

Under KF, the target parameter is a  $(D \times K)$ -dimensional vector formally defined as

$$\theta = [\theta^{(d)}] = \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \mathbf{y}, \quad (28)$$

whose  $d$ -th block is the  $K$ -dimensional vector

$$\theta^{(d)} = [\theta_k^{(d)}] = \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(d),T} \mathbf{y}, \quad (29)$$

in which  $K$ -th element is

$$\theta_k^{(d)} = \gamma_k^{(d),T} \mathbf{y}, \quad (30)$$

being Eq. (1) the correspondent expression under SF. In the above formulas:  $\mathbf{\Gamma} = (\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(d)}, \dots, \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(D)})$  is a matrix of order  $[T \times (D \times K)]$ , for  $T = N \times K$ , in which  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(d)} = [\gamma^{(d)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_K] \cdot \mathbf{I}_{K;N}$  is the  $d$ -th block matrix of order  $[T \times K]$  being  $\gamma_k^{(d)}$  ( $k = 1, \dots, K$ ) the  $k$ -th column vector of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(d)}$ ;  $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{Y}_i]$  is a  $T$ -dimensional vector whose  $i$ -th, for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , block is the vector  $\mathbf{Y}_i = [Y_{ik}]$  of the  $K$  response categories  $Y_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^K Y_{ik} = 1$  with  $\mathbf{Y}_i \sim Mult(\mathbf{1}_K, \mathbf{p}_i)$ .

The natural estimator  $\hat{\theta} = [\theta^{(d)}]$  for  $\hat{\theta}^{(d)} = [\theta_k^{(d)}]$  is

$$\hat{\theta} = [\hat{\theta}^{(d)}] = \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}. \quad (31)$$

in which  $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = [\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i]$  is the predictor of  $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{Y}_i]$  for  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i = [\hat{Y}_{ik}]$ .

We derive first the KF of  $\hat{Y}_{ik}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N; k = 1, \dots, K$ . To this aim let's consider the general expression of working model already introduced for SF and through Kronecker product we pass for the  $i$ -th unit from the  $J$ -dimensional vector  $\mathbf{x}_i$  to  $[(J \times K) \times K]$ -dimensional matrix  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_i = \mathbf{x}_i \otimes \mathbf{I}_K$ . Note that  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_i$  has been already introduced under SF before formula in Eq. (16). Under KF we get a reordering by  $k$  and  $j$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , of the rows of the original one. Let's introduce now the working model  $\mathbf{E}(Y_{ik}|\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i) = f(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i; \beta) = p_{ik}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N; k = 1, \dots, K$ , with  $f$  a known function depending on the  $H = (J \times K)$ -dimensional unknown parameter vector  $\beta = (\beta_1^T, \dots, \beta_j^T, \dots, \beta_J^T)^T$ , for  $\beta_j = (\beta_{1j}, \dots, \beta_{Kj})^T$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , measuring the relationship between the outcome  $Y_{ik}$  and the set of covariates  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathbf{R}^H$ . Note that in our specific case of Multinomial model,  $p_{ik} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{ik} = 1|\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i)$ , with  $\sum_{k=1}^K p_{ik} = 1, \forall i$ . Then, the predictor  $\hat{Y}_{ik}$  of  $Y_{ik}$  is

$$\hat{Y}_{ik} = \hat{p}_{ik} = f(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i; \hat{\beta}), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (32)$$

and the predictor  $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = [\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i]$  of  $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{Y}_i]$ , for  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i = [\hat{Y}_{ik}]$ , is

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \hat{\mathbf{p}} = f(\dot{\mathbf{X}}; \hat{\beta}), \quad (33)$$

in which  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = (\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1^T, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_i^T, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_N^T)^T$ , for  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i = [\hat{p}_{ik}]$  and  $\mathbf{p}_i = [p_{ik}]$ , are the correspondent consistent estimators of  $\beta$  and  $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{p}_i^T, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N^T)^T$  respectively based on the data of a generic sample  $s$  of fixed size  $n$ . In particular  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i, \dots, \lambda_N)^T$  for  $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = n$  denotes the random variable vector defining the sample membership satisfying  $E(\lambda) = \pi = [\pi_i]$  for  $\pi_i \in (0, 1]$  the inclusion probability of unit  $i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and  $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = [\dot{\mathbf{X}}_i^T]$  being the overall covariate matrix of order  $(T \times H)$ . In order to derive KF let's introduce too the following extra notation  $\dot{\lambda} = \lambda \otimes \mathbf{1}_K$  and  $\dot{\pi} = \pi \otimes \mathbf{1}_K$ . We note that the  $k$ -th ( $k = 1, \dots, K$ ) row of  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_i^T = [\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i^T]$  is a  $H$ -dimensional vector of the form  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}^T = (x_{i1} \cdot \mathbf{0}_{K;1k}^T, \dots, x_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{0}_{K;1k}^T, \dots, x_{iJ} \cdot \mathbf{0}_{K;1k}^T)$ .

#### D.4 Multinomial logistic estimator

To give the explicit expression of  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ , of the unknown parameter vector  $\mathbf{p}$ , under multinomial logistic regression model in Eq. (13), let's introduce the following extra notation:  $T$ -dimensional vector  $\hat{\mathbf{e}} = \exp(\dot{\mathbf{X}}\hat{\beta})$ ; the

correspondent  $(N \times K)$ -dimensional matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{E}} = [\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i^T]$  whose  $i$ -th row, for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , is given by the  $K$  dimensional vector  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i^T$ ;  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_+ = \hat{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \mathbf{1}_K$ ;  $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_+ = \mathbf{1}_T + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_+ \otimes \mathbf{1}_K$ . The KF estimator of  $\mathbf{p}$  is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{e}}}{\hat{\mathbf{d}}_+} = \left[ \frac{\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i}{\hat{\mathbf{d}}_{+i}} \right] = [\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i]. \quad (34)$$

The generic element of vector  $\hat{\mathbf{e}} = [e_{ik}]$  referred to the baseline category  $k = K$  is given by  $\hat{e}_{iK} = \exp(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{iK}^T \hat{\beta}) = 1$  being  $\hat{\beta} = \mathbf{0}_H$ .

The estimator in Eq. (34) is a function of  $\hat{\beta}$  and the MLE estimator of  $\beta$  is the solution of the set of  $H$  estimating equations  $\mathbf{l}_\beta = \ell(\beta)/\partial\beta = \mathbf{0}_H$  in which  $\ell(\beta)$  is the log-likelihood of the working model. The KF of the estimating equations is

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{G}^T \dot{\lambda} = \mathbf{0}_H. \quad (35)$$

in which  $\mathbf{G}$  is a matrix of order  $(T \times H)$  depending on  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$  given by

$$\mathbf{G} = \dot{\mathbf{X}} \# [\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{p}]. \quad (36)$$

Using the result in Chambers and Clark (2012), we can employ the first-order approximation in Eq. (10) to linearize  $\hat{\beta}$  around its expected value  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\beta}|\lambda) = \beta$

$$\left( \hat{\beta} - \beta \right) \approx -\mathbf{A}_\beta^{-1} \mathbf{G}^T \dot{\lambda}. \quad (37)$$

The explicit expression of  $H$ -dimensional square matrix  $\mathbf{A}_\beta$  is

$$\mathbf{A}_\beta = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}}{\partial \beta} = [\dot{\mathbf{X}}^T \# \Delta] \dot{\pi}, \quad (38)$$

in which  $\Delta$  is a matrix of order  $(T \times H)$  given by

$$\Delta = \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial \beta} = -[\dot{\mathbf{X}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}}_+ \# \mathbf{P}_{J+}] \# \mathbf{p} \quad (39)$$

where  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_+ = \dot{\mathbf{X}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_K^T \otimes \mathbf{1}_K$  and  $\mathbf{P}_{J+} = \mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_J$  in which  $\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{p}_i^T]$ .

Finally taking account of SF in Eq. (18) of the linearised  $GMSE$  estimator, we obtain the correspondent KF for  $\hat{\theta}$ . This is given by the diagonal elements of

$$GMSE^{\text{Lin}}(\hat{\theta}) = \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \left( \dot{\pi} \# \dot{\mathbf{U}} \dot{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{Y}} \dot{\mathbf{U}} \right) \mathbf{\Gamma} \quad (40)$$

in which:

$$\dot{\mathbf{U}} = -[\dot{\mathbf{X}} \# \dot{\pi}] \mathbf{A}_\beta^{-1}, \quad (41)$$

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{1}_T \otimes \Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}} \quad (42)$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{I}_{K;N} - \mathbf{p}\#[\mathbf{P} \otimes \mathbf{1}_J]. \quad (43)$$