

# Two-Phase Sampling

Caleb Leedy

April 11, 2024

## Topic 1: Classical Two-Phase Sampling

### Background and Introduction

Consider a finite population of size  $N$  containing elements  $(X_i, Y_i)$  where an initial (Phase 1) sample of size  $n$  is selected and  $X_i$  is observed. Then from the Phase 1 sample of elements, a (Phase 2) sample of size  $r < n$  is selected and  $Y_i$  is observed. This is two-phase sampling (See Fuller 2009, Kim 2024 for general references.) The goal of two-phase sampling is to construct an estimator of  $Y$  not only using the observed information from the Phase 2 sample but also incorporating the extra auxiliary information of  $X$  from the Phase 1 sample, and the challenge is doing this efficiently.

An easy-to-implement unbiased estimator in the spirit of a Horvitz-Thompson estimator (Horvitz and Thompson 1952, Narain 1951) is the  $\pi^*$ -estimator. Let  $\pi_i^{(2)}$  be the response probability of element  $i$  being observed in the Phase 2 sample. Then, allowing the elements in the Phase 1 sample to be represented by  $A_1$  and the elements in the Phase 2 sample to be denoted as  $A_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_i &= \sum_{A_2: i \in A_2} \Pr(A_2) \\ &= \sum_{A_1: A_2 \subseteq A_1} \sum_{A_2: i \in A_2} \Pr(A_2 \mid A_1) \Pr(A_1) \\ &= \sum_{A_1: i \in A_1} \sum_{A_2: i \in A_2} \Pr(A_2 \mid A_1) \Pr(A_1).\end{aligned}$$

If we define  $\pi_{2i|1}^{(2)} = \sum_{A_2: i \in A_2} \Pr(A_2 \mid A_1)$  and  $\pi_i^{(1)} = \sum_{A_1: i \in A_1} \Pr(A_1)$  then,

$$\pi_i = \pi_{2i|1}^{(2)} \pi_i^{(1)}.$$

This means that we can define the  $\pi^*$ -estimator as the following design unbiased estimator:

$$\hat{Y}_{\pi^*} = \sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{y_i}{\pi_{2i|1}^{(2)} \pi_i^{(1)}}.$$

Dr. Kim: Should I provide the proof for design unbiasedness of  $\hat{Y}_{\pi^*}$ ?

While unbiased, the  $\pi^*$ -estimator unfortunately does not account for the additional information contained in the auxiliary Phase 1 variable  $X$ . The two-phase regression estimator  $\hat{Y}_{reg,tp}$  does incorporate  $X$ . The regression estimator has the form,

$$\hat{Y}_{reg,tp} = \sum_{i \in A_1} \frac{x_i \hat{\beta}_2}{\pi_i^{(1)}} + \sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{1}{\pi_i^{(1)} \pi_{2i|1}^{(2)}} (y_i - x_i \hat{\beta}_2)$$

where  $\hat{\beta}_2 = \left( \sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{x_i x_i'}{\pi_{2i|1}^{(2)}} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{x_i y_i}{\pi_i^{(1)} \pi_{2i|1}^{(2)}}$ . The regression estimator is the minimum variance design consistent linear estimator which is easily shown to be the case because  $\hat{Y}_{reg,tp} = \sum_{i \in A_2} \hat{w}_{2i} y_i / \pi_i^{(1)}$  where

$$\hat{w}_i = \operatorname{argmin}_w \sum_{i \in A_2} (w_i - \pi_{2i|1}^{-1})^2 \text{ such that } \sum_{i \in A_2} w_i x_i / \pi_i^{(1)} = \sum_{i \in A_1} x_i / \pi_i^{(1)}.$$

This means that  $\hat{Y}_{reg,tp}$  is also a calibration estimator. The idea that regression estimation is a form of calibration was extended by Deville and Sarndal 1992 to consider loss functions other than just squared loss. They generalized the loss function to minimize  $\sum_i G(w_i, d_i) q_i$  for weights  $w_i$  and design-weights  $d_i$  where  $G()$  is non-negative, strictly convex function with respect to  $w$ , defined on an interval containing  $d_i$ , with  $g(w_i, d_i) = \partial G / \partial w$  continuous.<sup>1</sup> This generalization includes empirical likelihood estimation, and maximum entropy estimation among others. The variance estimation is based on a linearization that shows that minimizing the generalized loss function subject to the calibration constraints is asymptotically equivalent to a regression estimator.

While this generalization is useful to an analyst who may want different properties of their estimator from maximum entropy estimation rather than the minimal squared loss, unless  $\pi_{2i|1}^{-1} \in C(X)$ , the estimator is not design consistent. Furthermore, at a conceptual level, the regression estimator has a nice feature that its two terms can be thought about as minimizing variance and bias correction,

$$\hat{Y}_{reg,tp} = \underbrace{\sum_{i \in A_1} \frac{x_i \hat{\beta}_2}{\pi_i^{(1)}}}_{\text{Minimizing the variance}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{1}{\pi_i^{(1)} \pi_{2i|1}^{(2)}} (y_i - x_i \hat{\beta}_2)}_{\text{Bias correction}}.$$

The Deville and Sarndal 1992 method incorporates the design weights into the loss function, which is the part minimizing the variance. Instead, there is a desire to get design consistency

<sup>1</sup>The Deville and Sarndal 1992 paper considers regression estimators for a single phase setup, which we apply to our two-phase example.

from the calibration term. In Kwon, Kim, and Qiu 2024, the authors show that for a generalized entropy function  $G(w)$ , including a term of  $g(\pi_{2i|1}^{-1})$  into the calibration for  $g = \partial G / \partial w$  not only creates a design consistent estimator, but it also has better efficiency than the generalized regression estimators of Deville and Sarndal 1992.

Unfortunately, the method of Kwon, Kim, and Qiu 2024 requires known calibration levels (no uncertainty) for the finite population. It does not handle the two-phase setup where we need to estimate the finite population total of  $x$  from the Phase 1 sample. Hence, we extend this method to have a valid variance estimator when including estimated Phase 1 weights.

## Methodology

We follow the approach of Kwon, Kim, and Qiu 2024 for the debiased calibration method. We consider maximizing the generalized entropy Gneiting and Raftery 2007,

$$H(w) = - \sum_{i \in A_2} G(w_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $G : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is strictly convex, differentiable function subject to the constraints:

$$\sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{x_i w_i}{\pi_i^{(1)}} = \sum_{i \in A_1} \frac{x_i}{\pi_i^{(1)}} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{g(\pi_{2i|1}^{-1}) w_i}{\pi_i^{(1)}} = \sum_{i \in A_1} \frac{g(\pi_{2i|1}^{-1})}{\pi_i^{(1)}}. \quad (3)$$

The first constraint is the existing calibration constraint and the second ensures that design consistency is achieved. Here,  $g(w) = \partial G / \partial w$ . The original method of Kwon, Kim, and Qiu 2024 only considered having finite population quantities on the right hand side of 2. Let  $z_i = (x_i, g(\pi_{2i|1}^{-1}))$ . To solve this minimization problem, we use the convex conjugate function  $F(w) = -G(g^{-1}) + g^{-1}(w)w$ , and instead find

$$\hat{\lambda} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \Lambda_A} \sum_{i \in A_2} F(w_i) + \lambda_1^T \sum_{i \in A_1} \frac{z_i}{\pi_{2i|1}}$$

for  $\Lambda_A = \{\lambda : \lambda^T z_i \in g(\mathcal{V}) \text{ for all } i \in A_2\}$ .

## Theoretical Results

We prove two results in this section in the same spirit as Kwon, Kim, and Qiu 2024. First, we state the assumptions of our analysis then we give the results.

- [A1 ]  $G(w)$  is strictly convex and twice differentiable in an interval  $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,
- [A2 ] There exists  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{V}$  with  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that  $c_1 < \pi_{2i|1} < c_2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,
- [A3 ] If  $\pi_{2ij|1}$  is joint inclusion probability of elements  $i$  and  $j$  and  $\Delta_{2ij|1} = \pi_{2ij|1} - \pi_{2i|1}\pi_{2j|1}$  then,
- $$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i,j \in A_1: i \neq j} |\Delta_{2ij|1}| < \infty,$$
- [A4 ] Assume that  $\Sigma_z = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in U} z_i z_i^T / N$  exists and is positive definite, the average fourth moment of  $(y_i, x_i^T)$  is finite ( $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in U} \|(y_i, x_i^T)\|^4 / N < \infty$ ), and  $\Gamma(\lambda) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in U} f'(\lambda^T z_i) z_i z_i^T / N$  exists in a neighborhood around  $\lambda_0 = (\mathbf{0}, 1)$ .
- [A5 ] FIXME: We need to make an assumption about how Phase 2 relates to Phase 1 which relates to the finite population.

**Theorem 1.** *Design Consistency* Suppose that Conditions [A1] - [A5] hold. Then the solution  $\hat{w}$  to 1 subject to 2 and 3 exists and is unique with probability approaching 1. Furthermore, the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{DCE} = \sum_{i \in A_2} \frac{\hat{w} y_i}{\pi_i^{(1)}}$  satisfies

$$\hat{\theta}_{DCE} = \hat{\theta}_{DC} + o_p(\text{FIXME})$$

where  $\hat{\theta}_{DC}$  is the debiased calibration estimator of Kwon, Kim, and Qiu 2024.

**Theorem 2.** *(Asymptotic Normality)*

## Simulation Studies

## Topic 2: Non-nested Two-Phase Sampling

## Topic 3: Multi-source Two-Phase Sampling

## References

- Deville, Jean-Claude and Carl-Erik Sarndal (1992). “Calibration estimators in survey sampling”. In: *Journal of the American statistical Association* 87.418, pp. 376–382.
- Fuller, Wayne A (2009). *Sampling statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gneiting, Tilmann and Adrian E Raftery (2007). “Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation”. In: *Journal of the American statistical Association* 102.477, pp. 359–378.
- Horvitz, Daniel G and Donovan J Thompson (1952). “A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe”. In: *Journal of the American statistical Association* 47.260, pp. 663–685.
- Kim, Jae Kwang (2024). *Statistics in Survey Sampling*. arXiv.
- Kwon, Yonghyun, Jae Kwang Kim, and Yumou Qiu (2024). *Debiased calibration estimation using generalized entropy in survey sampling*. arXiv: 2404.01076 [stat.ME].

Narain, RD (1951). “On sampling without replacement with varying probabilities”. In: *Journal of the Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics* 3.2, pp. 169–175.