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Abstract

Respondent driven sampling (RDS) is an approach to sampling design utilizing the networks of social relationships that connect members of the target population to facilitate sampling by chain referral methods. Although this leads to biased sampling (such as oversampling participants with many acquaintances), most RDS studies typically measure each participant’s degree, and under the fundamental RDS assumption (that the probability to
sample an individual is proportional to his degree) use inverse-probability weighting in an attempt to correct for this bias. However, this assumption is tenuous at best, and should be avoided. Here we suggest a completely novel approach for inference in RDS which compensates for such problems by using a rich source of information that is usually ignored - the precise timing of recruitment. Our new approach, adapting methods developed for inference in epidemic processes, also allows us to develop new estimators for properties such as the prevalence of a disease and the total population size, as well as to test the assumption of recruitment proportional to degree. We find these estimators asymptotically consistent and normally distributed. This new approach thus has the potential to greatly improve the utility of data collected using RDS.

1 Introduction

Marginalized populations often suffer a disproportionate burden of infectious disease, yet the hard-to-reach or hidden nature of these populations makes them difficult to sample, limiting our knowledge of the very populations for which surveillance and prevention should be a priority. Respondent driven sampling (RDS) is an approach to sampling design that is increasingly widely used to study marginalized or highly stigmatized groups (e.g., injection drug users, men who have sex with men, sex workers) [9, 10]. RDS overcomes the hidden nature of these populations by utilizing the networks of social relationships that connect members of the target population to facilitate sampling by chain referral methods. “Seeds” are selected by convenience from the target population and given coupons. They use these coupons to recruit others, who themselves become recruiters. Recruits are given an incentive, usually money, for taking part in the survey and also for recruiting others. This process continues in recruitment waves until the survey is stopped. Estimation methods are then applied to account for the non-uniformly-random sample selection in an attempt to generate unbiased estimates of population composition for the target population. Following its introduction [9, 10] RDS has quickly become popular and relied on by major funding bodies, and has been adopted by the WHO (World Health Organization) and CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) for use in HIV surveillance activities.

As pointed out in [17], “RDS” is a package of two distinct components; namely, a sampling method and a method of statistical inference. The sampling method, with notable exceptions, has often been found to be efficient and popular, and has led to a wealth of new data [14].
However, the implied assumptions and performance of the second inferential component of the RDS “package” are far more vulnerable to criticism.

The most fundamental problem inference in RDS needs to address is biased sampling (such as over-sampling participants with many acquaintances) which might cause, e.g., the sample mean to be biased away from the true prevalence of the disease. Ideally, the best way to address biased sampling is to stratify the sample into different degree-classes: this is done by measuring each participant’s degree and estimating the prevalence as

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{k \geq 1} f_k \hat{p}_k
\]

where \( \{f_k\}_{k \geq 1} \) is the degree distribution of the population, and \( \hat{p}_k \) is the estimator of \( p_k \), the prevalence within degree class \( k \). However, this is not usually possible because the real degree distribution of the population is not known; moreover, when only using the observed degrees the degree distribution is, in fact, unidentifiable. Denoting the degree-dependent sampling probability by \( \pi_k \) it is clear that it is possible to estimate only the product \( \pi_k f_k \), not \( \pi_k \) and \( f_k \) separately. Current RDS studies attempt to rectify this problem by resorting to a set of assumptions which model recruitment as a homogenous random walk and culminate with the assumption that the sampling probability is proportional to degree, i.e. \( \pi_k \sim k \). Based on this assumption currently RDS researchers apply inverse-degree weighting as a substitute for inverse-probability weighting (i.e., a Horvitz-Thompson estimator [11]).

We believe, however, that the assumption above (“recruitment probability proportional to degree”), seemingly necessary to restore identifiability, is highly problematic. In particular, it is both very restrictive and unlikely to hold in reality, as well as being untestable. Fortunately, most RDS studies obtain additional valuable information which is usually discarded - not only is the order of recruitment known, but also the precise timing of recruitment; thus, this information can be used to overcome the above difficulty. Instead of the common naive and improvident approach, here we suggest modeling recruitment as a continuous time counting process, and utilize the established machinery [2] applied, for example, in survival analysis in stochastic epidemic [3] and software reliability [15].

---

Readers interested in size-biased sampling without replacement where the sampling time is not known, and only the order of sampling is known, should consult ref. [8, 4].
It is worth noting that our approach, discarding the homogenous random walk model in favour of a “stochastic epidemic” model, is a very natural one. The recruitment process is akin to the spread of an epidemic in a population; hence, why not model it as one? This is particularly promising since it involves linking RDS to a larger, more developed literature \([3, 7, 16, 4]\), with a huge body of previous results.

In section 2.1 after introducing our new model for RDS, we discuss the related literature of epidemiological modeling and inference \([3, 7, 16]\) as well as certain related models dealing with inference for software reliability \([15, 12]\). Then, following some technical preliminaries (sec. 2.2.2), we derive the associated maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) and discuss their asymptotic properties (sections 2.2.2-2.2.3).

Our two main results, theorem 1 and its application theorem 2 demonstrate that the MLE for the degree distribution is asymptotically consistent and normally distributed and that similarly our new prevalence estimator is also asymptotically consistent and normally distributed (proven in the appendix).

2 Results

We begin by introducing our new statistical model; we then derive the associated MLE and discuss its properties. This is a generalisation of the model suggested in a previous paper by the same authors \([5]\) which was treated in a non-rigorous manner and studied only through simulations and evaluation on RDS data.

The notations here attempt to maintain compatibility with both epidemiological modeling \([3]\) as well as the theory of inference for continuous time counting process \([2, 15]\); minor unavoidable clashes, however, are explained below.

2.1 The new model. Setting and notations

Our approach for modeling RDS admits the following setting:

(M1) The size of the population, \(N\), is not known, although we may assume it is very large.

(M2) For each degree \(k\) there are \(N_k\) individuals in the population with degree \(k\).
(M3) Sampling is done without replacement with \( n_{k,t} \) as the (right continuous) counting process depicting the number of people with degree \( k \) recruited by time \( t \).

(M4) Between time \( t \) and \( t + \Delta t \) an individual with degree \( k \) is sampled with probability

\[
\lambda_{k,t} = \frac{\beta_k}{N} I_t (N_k - n_{k,t}) \Delta t + o(\Delta t) \tag{2}
\]

where \( I_t \) is the number of people already recruited and actively trying to recruit (invite) new individuals, and the constant \( \beta_k \) is a degree dependent “recruitment rate”.

Using \( g_t^- \) to denote the value of \( g \) just before \( t \), a more formal statement of (M4) is:

(M4') The multivariate counting process \( n_t := (n_{1,t}, n_{2,t}, \ldots, n_{d_{\text{max}},t}) \) has intensity

\[
\lambda_t := \left( \frac{\beta_1}{N} I_t^-(N_1 - n_{1,t}^-), \frac{\beta_2}{N} I_t^-(N_2 - n_{2,t}^-), \ldots, \frac{\beta_{d_{\text{max}}}}{N} I_t^-(N_{d_{\text{max}}} - n_{d_{\text{max}},t}^-) \right) \tag{3}
\]

namely, \( m_t := n_t - \int_0^t \lambda_s ds \) is a martingale (and clearly, \( \lambda_t \) is predictable, i.e. non-stochastic given the past).

The similarity of eq (3) to the widespread Susceptible-Infected-Removed (SIR) epidemiological model \(^3\) is quite striking. In the simplest version \( ^2 \) of the SIR model the susceptible set, \( S \), is depleted at a rate, \( dS \), proportional to its size and the size of the infected set, \( I \), i.e. \( dS = -\beta IS dt \). Thus, in RDS the “inviting” set is analogous to the infectious set in standard epidemiology modeling. Similarly, \( N - n \) is the analog of the susceptible set, \( S \), in standard epidemiology modeling. However, previous epidemiology-related works \( ^{16, 7, 3} \) have usually focused on the transmission parameters (in our model \( \beta_k \)’s), which are the least relevant to our application. As such they also assume knowledge of the degree distribution, which in our case is not only unknown but moreover it is actually one of the main objects of interest.

These features of epidemiological models are complemented by certain models dealing with inference in the field of software reliability \( ^{15, 12} \). In particular, the Jelinski-Moranda model

\(^2\)Hopefully less cumbersome than the alternative common notation, \( g_t^- \).

\(^3\)Most of the more elaborate epidemiological models could be adapted as well for RDS. For example, it is also possible to consider the case where a person’s probability to recruit new individuals is proportional to his degree. In this case we need to replace \( I_t \) in eq (3) with \( \tilde{I}_t \) which is the number of “edges” sampled so far; i.e., if \( x_t \) is the observation at time point \( t \), with \( x_t = 0 \) if no one was sampled and \( x_t = k \) otherwise ( \( k \) being the degree of the sampled individual) then \( \tilde{I}_t = \int x_t dt - I_t \). An even more general “recruitment” is considered in ref. \(^7\) addressing contagion and estimation in multitype epidemics.
assumes a computer program has an unknown number of “bugs”, \( N \), which are detected at a rate proportional to the number of remaining (undetected) bugs; i.e., the rate of detecting the \( i^{th} \) bug is \( \lambda_i = \beta(N - (i - 1)) \). In this case the motivation and approach for estimating \( N \) is more akin to RDS; however, two key differences still remain:

The first complication arises because the Jelinski-Moranda model is a special case of eq (3) with \( I_t \equiv N \), whereas in RDS \( I_t \) is more general and depends on the number of individuals detected (see section 2.2.1).

Second, the relatively minor complication that RDS is multivariate, unlike the univariate Jelinski-Moranda model, is further exacerbated by the fact that often the \( \{N_k\}_k \)'s themselves are nuisance parameters required for stratification further down the road.

Usually (M4') is followed by an examination of the likelihood function at time \( t \) given by:

\[
L(\beta, N; t) := \exp \left[ \int_0^t \sum_k \log \lambda_{k,t}(\beta_k, N_k)dn_{k,t} - \int_0^t \sum_k \lambda_{k,t}(\beta_k, N_k)dt \right] 
\] (4)

however, a few technical details still need to be stipulated (see next section) before carrying out an asymptotic analysis.

### 2.2 Asymptotic Analysis.

We begin by specifying a few technical details required for simple analysis (sec. 2.2.1); we then provide the necessary details from Kurtz’s theory of density dependent processes and demonstrate convergence of the counting process to a deterministic function (sec. 2.2.2). The notations and results from section 2.2.2 are used in section 2.2.3 to present our main results, Theorem 1 and its application Theorem 2, which are proven in the appendix.

#### 2.2.1 Asymptotic Analysis. Technical preliminaries

In our model, one of the parameters, \( N \), is the number of individuals. As discussed previously in similar settings (see p. 430, and 15) it is obviously not possible to derive any sensible large sample result by considering a sequence of models with \( N \) fixed. A more relevant large sample situations to consider is one in which there are more and more individuals in each degree-class within a larger and larger population. We therefore consider a sequence of RDS
models indexed by \( v \), and by introducing a dummy variable \( f_k \) we let \( v f_k \) denote the size of each degree class \( N_k \). Now we consider the estimation of the \( f_k \)'s (and \( \beta_k \)'s) as \( v \to \infty \); the result can be later rephrased in terms of \( N_k \)'s, with an analogous consistency and asymptotic normality. More precisely, the consistency of \( \hat{f}_k \) (or \( \hat{f}_k \to f_k \) as \( v \to \infty \)) implies \( \frac{\hat{N}_k}{N_k} \to 1 \) as \( N_k \to \infty \) and similarly, concerning asymptotic normality

\[
\sqrt{v} (\hat{f}_k - f_k) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_{\beta_i, N}) \quad \text{implies} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} (\hat{N}_k - N_k) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_{\beta_i, N})
\]

The formulation in (5) makes it clear that the number of different degree classes in the data cannot grow too fast (in order to avoid having too few observations from each degree class). The simplest and crudest restriction, which we focus on here for simplicity, is one in which the maximal degree, \( d_{\text{max}} \), is bounded by some constant, \( M \), \( \forall v \) (note that this implies the more general and important condition \( \forall i, j : \beta_i N_i = \Theta(\beta_j N_j) \) given that \( \beta_i \) is fixed for all \( i \)).

In general, the process \( I_t \) can evolve in an arbitrarily complicated manner; for example, in the SIR model in epidemiology each infected individual gets removed at rate \( \gamma \) which is also of interest. However, since this removal process is both observed fully and is uninteresting to us, we will skip modeling it here and treat the rather general case where \( I_t = I_0 + vg(v^{-1}n_t, t) \) where \( g \) is a non-negative continuous function and \( I_0 \) is the initial number of seeds used for recruitment (see T1 below).

For simplicity, we tacitly treat the observation period \([0, \tau]\) with \( \tau \) as a finite number; however, a more general approach, which we pursue here in order to simplify other parts of the paper, is to allow for an observation period \([0, T^v] \) with \( T^v \) being stopping times tending to \( \tau \) in probability as \( v \) increases. In particular, denoting by \( N_{\text{min}} := \min_k(N_k) \) define:

\[
\tau := \inf_t \left( \sum_k n_{k,t} = N_{\text{min}} \right)
\]

Although (6), implying prior knowledge of \( N_{\text{min}} \), may appear to be a peculiar stopping time which could be easily weakened, we chose to keep it in order to avoid otherwise necessary distractions from our main point. In particular, this enables us not to specify a particular \( I_t \)

---

4 The sequence of counting processes, \( n^v_{v,t} \), are the multivariate collections of the (several) univariate processes \( n^v_{k,t} \) with \( v = 1, 2, ... \). Similarly, the intensities (3) and the likelihood (4) are indexed mutatis mutandis.

5 We write \( f(N) = \Theta(g(N)) \) if \( \frac{f(N)}{g(N)} \to \text{const} > 0 \).

6 As long as it is adapted to the self-exciting history of \( n_t \).
and preserve the very general condition (T1).

Finally, if we define the stochastic process $x_v(t)$ by

$$x_v(t) := v^{-1}n_t^v$$

in many practical situations, as is shown below, this stochastic process converges uniformly on $[0, \tau]$ in probability to a deterministic function $x_{\infty}(t)$ as $v \to \infty$. In order to apply Kurtz’s theorem (Kurtz’s law of large numbers) \cite{13} and obtain this convergence it is customary, for example in the study of stochastic epidemics, to have the dynamics (epidemic) initiated by a positive fraction of the population. In other words, even though $I_0$ might be a very small fraction of the entire population, we still have $I_0 = \Theta(N)$.

Summarizing all the technical details of this section, we have:

(T1) $v^{-1}I_t \equiv v^{-1}I_0 + g(v^{-1}n_t, t)$ where $g$ is a non-negative continuous function.

(T2) $\frac{d}{dt} \to \text{const} > 0$

(T3) The maximal degree, $d_{\text{max}}$, is bounded by some constant, $M, \forall v$.

(T4) The observation period $[0, \tau]$ satisfies:

$$\tau := \inf_{t} \left( \sum_k n_{k,t} = N_{\min} \right)$$

2.2.2 Asymptotic Analysis. Convergence to a deterministic function

For purposes of notational convenience, let us write momentarily the parameter space $(\vec{\beta}, \vec{N})$ as $\Phi$. Let $K := D([0, \tau])$ be the Skorokhod space composed of right-continuous functions on $[0, \tau]$ with left limits. The theory developed by Kurtz for the so-called density-dependent process \cite{13} deals with processes having an intensity function

$$\lambda^v_t(\Phi) = vX(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n_t^v)$$

Recall that the superscript $v$ indexes the sequence of processes, each of which evolves in time (subscript $t$) and depends on the parameters $\Phi$. The underlying process can be multivariate, and if we need to emphasize one of its components we can go further and write $\lambda^v_{i,t}(\Phi)$. 
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where $X := [0, \tau] \times \Phi \times K \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ can be a fairly general function depending on the past of the stochastic process up to, but not including, time $t$. In the multivariate case (8) means

$$
\lambda^v_t = vX(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n^v_t) := v(X_1(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n^v_t), X_2(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n^v_t), \ldots, X_{d_{\text{max}}}(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n^v_t))
$$

(9)

Using our model of RDS and definitions (8) and (9) we now have for the $j^{th}$ component of $X$ in RDS

$$
X_j(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n^v_t) = \beta_j \frac{I^v}{v}(f_j - \frac{n^v_{t,v}}{v})
$$

(10)

which is compatible with (8) if, for example, $\frac{I^v}{v}$ is a function of $v^{-1}n^v_t$ (as guaranteed by (T1-2) in the simplest case).

Two important properties of $X$ as defined in (8) and (10) are:

(P1) For all $x \in K$ and for all $\phi \in \Phi$ the function $X$ satisfies:

$$
\sup_{t \leq \tau} X(t, \phi, x) < \infty
$$

(P2) Lipschitz continuity: there exists a constant, $L$, not depending on $t$ such that for all $x, y \in K$ and all $t \in [0, \tau]$:

$$
|X(t, \phi, x) - X(t, \phi, y)| \leq L \sup_{s \leq t} |x(s) - y(s)|
$$

This makes it possible to apply Kurtz’s law of large numbers and obtain:

**Lemma 1.** Let $\phi_0$ be the true value of the parameter $\phi \in \Phi$. The process $x_v(t)$ as defined via (7) converges uniformly on $[0, \tau]$ in probability to $x_\infty(t)$ as $v \to \infty$, where $x_\infty(t) \in D([0, \tau])$ is the unique solution of

$$
x(t) = \int_0^t X(s, \phi_0, x)ds
$$

Proof. An immediate result of Kurtz’s law of large numbers [13], see for example [2] theorem II.5.4.

**Remark:** note that (T1) easily provides similar convergence of $v^{-1}I^v_t$ to some deterministic function $I^\infty(t)$.

The following properties of $X$ can now also be shown to hold:
(P3) There exist neighbourhoods $\Phi_0$ and $K_0$ of $\phi_0$ and $x_\infty$ respectively, such that the function $X(t, \phi, x)$ and its derivatives with respect to $\phi$ of the first, second and third order exist, are continuous functions of $\phi$ and $x$ and are bounded on $[0, \tau] \times \Phi_0 \times K_0$.

(P4) The function $X(t, \phi, x)$ is bounded away from zero on $[0, \tau] \times \Phi_0 \times K_0$.

(P5) For $1 \leq i \leq 2d_{\text{max}}$ let $\phi^i$ denote the parameter $f_i$ if $1 \leq i \leq d_{\text{max}}$ and otherwise denote the parameter $\beta_{i-d_{\text{max}}}$ if $d_{\text{max}} + 1 \leq i \leq 2d_{\text{max}}$. The matrix $\Sigma = \{\sigma_{ij}(\phi_0)\}$ is positive definite, with for $1 \leq i, j \leq 2d_{\text{max}}$ and $\phi \in \Phi_0$:

$$\sigma_{ij}(\phi) := \int_0^\tau \sum_k \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^i} X_k(s, \phi, x_\infty) \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^j} X_k(s, \phi, x_\infty) \frac{X_k(s, \phi, x_\infty)}{X_k(s, \phi, x_\infty)} ds$$

(P3) is trivial and (P4) is an immediate result of (T4), whereas (P5), a long and straightforward calculation, will be dealt with in the appendix.

Finally we have everything at hand to present (and prove) our main results.

2.2.3 Asymptotic Analysis. Consistency and normality of the MLE and application to prevalence estimation.

Summarizing previous sections in the model (M1-3,4') it is obviously not possible to derive any sensible large sample result by considering a sequence of models with $N$ fixed. We therefore consider a sequence of RDS models indexed by $v$, and introducing a dummy variable $f_k$ we let $v f_k$ denote the size of each degree class $N_k$ (see footnote 4, and the discussion leading to it).

The likelihood function eq. (4) is thus also indexed by $v$ and rewritten as

$$L_v(\vec{\beta}, \vec{N}; t) := \exp \left[ \int_0^t \sum_k v \log v X_k(t, \Phi, x_v) d n_k^{v}; t - v \int_0^t \sum_k X_k(t, \Phi, x_v) dt \right]$$

(11)

with $X_k$ as defined in (9) and (10) and $x_v$ as in (7). Similarly, define the log-likelihood function

$$C_v(\vec{\beta}, \vec{N}; t) := \log L_v$$

(12)

\footnote{Our goal here was primarily to allow practitioners interested mostly in applications to skip sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 while keeping the rest of the paper “self contained”. Moving the technical sections to an appendix, on the other hand, would impede readability of the paper for theoreticians - which accounts for the slight repetition.}
and the minus observed information matrix:

\[ I_{ij}^{(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{N}; t)} := \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^i \partial \phi^j} C_v \]  

(13)

with \( \phi^i \) as defined in (P5).

Our main theorems are:

**Theorem 1.** Consider a sequence of RDS counting processes \((M1-3)\) with intensity function \((M4')\) with \((\tilde{N}, \tilde{\beta})\) as parameters. Assume we can index the sequence with \( v \to \infty \) obtaining a reparameterization \((\tilde{f}, \tilde{\beta})\) with \((\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{\beta}_0)\) as the true (unknown) values. If conditions \((T1-4)\) holds then:

There exists a unique consistent solution \((\tilde{f}_v, \tilde{\beta}_v)\) to the likelihood equations, \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^i} C_v(\Phi, \tau) = 0 \).

Moreover, this solution provides a local maximum of the likelihood function \((11)\) and:

\[
\sqrt{v} \left( (\tilde{f}_v, \tilde{\beta}_v) - (\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{\beta}_0) \right)^T \overset{D}{\to} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^{-1})
\]

where \( \Sigma, \) given by \((P5)\), can be estimated consistently from the observed information matrix \((13)\).

**Proof.** Since the intensity \( \lambda^v(\Phi) \) can be written as \( vX(t, \Phi, v^{-1}n^v_i) \) where \( X \) fulfills conditions \((P1-5)\), this is an immediate result of theorems VI.1.1 and VI.1.2 of \([2]\), see for example the less general (and similar to our case) theorem 1 of \([15]\) (P1-4 were treated in sec. \(2.2.2\) and P5 is shown in the appendix). \(\square\)

As discussed earlier, researchers working on RDS are typically not interested in the degree distribution per se, but rather in the prevalence of, for example, HIV. However, having obtained an estimate \( \tilde{f} \) of the degree distribution, it is straightforward to stratify and weight the observations in order to obtain an estimate, \( \tilde{H} \), of, e.g., the prevalence of HIV:

\[
\tilde{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f_{d_i} Y_i}{n_{d_i}}
\]

(14)

where \( n \) is the sample size, \( n_k \) is the number of individuals in the sample having degree \( k \), \( Y_i = 1 \) if individual \( i \) is HIV infected and \( Y_i = 0 \) otherwise. It is easy to see that alternatively to \((14)\),
having an individual-based viewpoint, $\hat{H}$ could be calculated with a degree-class view in mind:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_k \frac{n_k^+}{n_{k,r}}$$

(15)

where $n_k^+$ the number of HIV infected individuals in the sample having degree $k$.

Denote by $N_k^+$ the number of HIV infected individuals in the population having degree $k$. It might be safe to assume that the distribution of $\sqrt{v}(\frac{n_k^+}{n_{k,r}} - \frac{N_k^+}{N_k})$ is well approximated by a normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2_{\hat{p}_k})$ independent of everything else (where subscript $p_k$ serves to indicate that this is the variance of $\hat{p}_k := \frac{n_k^+}{n_{k,r}}$, the estimator of $p_k := \frac{N_k^+}{N_k}$ the prevalence within degree class $k$).

Remark: For example, if $n_k^+$ is distributed hypergeometrically $HG(N_k, N_k^+, n_{k,r}; n_k^+)$, we can even justify $\sigma^2_{\hat{p}_k} = \frac{1}{n_{k,r}} \frac{N_k^+ N_k - N_k^+ N_k - n_{k,r}}{N_k^+ N_k - 1}$.

Denoting similarly by $\sigma^2_{f_k}$ as the variance of the estimator of $f_k$ (see (P5) and the proof of theorem 1) our second main result is:

**Theorem 2.** $\hat{H}$, the prevalence estimator given by (14) is asymptotically consistent and distributed normally:

$$\sqrt{v}(\hat{H} - H_0) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \sum_k p_k^2 \sigma^2_{\hat{p}_k} + \sum_k f_k^2 \sigma^2_{f_k})$$

where $H_0$ is the true prevalence within the population.

**Proof.** A simple application of the delta method (see appendix).

3 Discussion

It should be emphasised that the new approach presented here and its underlying assumptions are genuinely more parsimonious and easier to control and correct than the naive and unsupported assumptions underlying current approach. Despite additional “noise” and possibly model misspecification, a statistical model utilizing more information (such as the temporal statistics here) does not merely replace a set of old assumptions with new assumptions; in particular, the new assumptions can be tested and improved (applying, e.g., AIC or FIC) whereas the current approach has severe unidentifiability concerns.

Presumably, one major problematic assumption regarding RDS as a sampling method con-
cerns the securing of a large enough sample from each degree-class. Although it might appear, via the requirements stipulated here, that this is a problem unique to our new inference approach, it is actually at least as big a concern to the standard approach. Indeed, when applying the inverse-degree approach there is a “hidden” stage of estimating the degree distribution, resulting with a prevalence estimator similar to (15) (although with different \( \tilde{f}_k \), of course). Thus, through our second theorem (th. 2) we also uncover and quantify this effect for the first time.

Here we addressed only the simplest possible frequentist model. More elaborate models could be constructed that account, for example, for homophily through consideration of recruitment probabilities depending on the state of both recruiter and recruitee and covariates other than degree. Moreover, a Bayesian approach is possible as well: often some prior estimate of \( N \) is available; using a prior for the degree distribution in a fairly straightforward manner might alleviate the difficulties due to sparsity of samples from different degree-classes.

Finally, another advantage of our approach is its ease of use and integration with current methods and protocols for sampling in RDS - there is practically no need for design adjustments (apart from careful recording of interview times). The simplified representation of the recruitment process (e.g., no seeds are introduced during sampling; the possibility of a limited number of coupons per recruiter) is not required and was applied here merely to maintain clarity; such nuisance process (see sec. 2.2.1 addressing (T1)) could be easily accounted for.

4 Appendix

Theorems 1 and 2 are derived in detail below.

For theorem 1 we first need to show that (P5) holds:

The matrix \( \Sigma \) contains the four blocks \( \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \) with \( A \), for example, depicting the association between the different \( f_i \)'s and \( D \) depicting the association between the different \( \beta_i \)'s. A simple calculation shows that the matrix \( A \) is a diagonal matrix with entries:

\[
a_{ii} = \int_{0}^{\tau} \frac{\beta_i I_s^{\infty} \tilde{f}_i - n_{i,s}^{\infty}}{f_i - n_{i,s}^{\infty}} ds
\]

(16)

where \( I_s^{\infty} \) is the deterministic function that \( v^{-1} I_s \) converges to, and similarly \( n_{i,s}^{\infty} \) is the deter-
ministic function that $v^{-1}n_{k,s}^v$ converges to (note we have omitted the “just before” notation, $g^-$, from $I$ and $n$. This may be done since the integration is with respect to Lebesgue’s measure, $ds$).

Similarly, the matrices $B,C,D$ are also diagonal matrices with entries:

$$b_{ii} = c_{ii} = \int_0^\tau I_s^\infty ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

$$d_{ii} = \int_0^\tau I_s^\infty \frac{(f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty)}{\beta_i} ds$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

The invertibility of $\Sigma$ can be demonstrated by a direct calculation of its inverse using the fact that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (AD - BC)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (AD - BC)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D & -B \\ -C & A \end{pmatrix}$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

thus we need only show that $AD - BC$ is invertible; i.e., that for all $i$

$$\int_0^\tau \frac{\beta_i I_s^\infty}{f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty} ds \int_0^\tau \frac{I_s^\infty(f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty)}{\beta_i} ds - \int_0^\tau I_s^\infty ds \int_0^\tau I_s^\infty ds \neq 0$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)

but for the first term in (20) we have

$$\int_0^\tau \frac{\beta_i I_s^\infty}{f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty} ds \int_0^\tau \frac{I_s^\infty(f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty)}{\beta_i} ds = \int_0^\tau \left( \sqrt{I_s^\infty} \frac{I_s^\infty}{f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty} \right)^2 ds \int_0^\tau \left( \sqrt{I_s^\infty(f_i - n_{i,s}^\infty)} \right)^2 ds > \left( \int_0^\tau I_s^\infty ds \right)^2$$

with strict inequality after applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for two non-linearly dependent functions.

This allows us to apply theorems VI.1.1 and VI.1.2 of [2] and establish the “existence” part. The following calculations demonstrate the uniqueness of the solution.

Differentiating the log-likelihood gives

$$\frac{dC}{\partial \beta_k} = \frac{n_{k,\tau}}{\beta_k} - \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{N} (N_k - n_{k,t}^-) I_t^- dt$$ \hspace{1cm} (21)

and

$$\frac{dC}{\partial N_k} = \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{N_k - n_{k,t}^-} dn_{k,t} - \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{N} \beta_k I_t^- dt$$ \hspace{1cm} (22)
These can be written as pairs of equations with two unknowns, and equated to 0, which yield $\hat{N}_k$, a MLE for $N_k$, via the (unique) solution to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \frac{1}{\hat{N}_k - i} = \frac{n_{k,\tau} \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt}{\hat{N}_k \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt - \int_0^{\tau} n_{k,t} I_t dt}$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

Rearranging (23) we get:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \prod_{0 \leq i < n_{k,\tau}, i \neq j} (\hat{N}_k - i) \left( \hat{N}_k \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt - \int_0^{\tau} n_{k,t} I_t dt \right) - n_{k,\tau} \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt \prod_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} (\hat{N}_k - j) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

and

$$\left( \hat{N}_k \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt - \int_0^{\tau} n_{k,t} I_t dt \right) \sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \frac{\hat{N}_k!}{(\hat{N}_k - n_{k,\tau})!(\hat{N}_k - j)!} - \frac{n_{k,\tau} \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt \hat{N}_k!}{(N_k - n_{k,\tau})!} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

Dividing by $\frac{\hat{N}_k!}{(N_k - n_{k,\tau})!}$ and substituting $\sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} 1$ for $n_{k,\tau}$ we get

$$\left( \hat{N}_k \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt - \int_0^{\tau} n_{k,t} I_t dt \right) \sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \frac{1}{(\hat{N}_k - j)} - \sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

or

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \left( \frac{\hat{N}_k \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt - \int_0^{\tau} n_{k,t} I_t dt}{(N_k - j)} \right) - \sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \left( \frac{\hat{N}_k - j \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt}{(N_k - j)} \right) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

and finally

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n_{k,\tau}-1} \left( \frac{j \int_0^{\tau} I_t dt - \int_0^{\tau} n_{k,t} I_t dt}{(N_k - j)} \right) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

Let $N_k^\ast$ be a solution to eq. (28) and assume in contradiction eq. (28) has another solution, $N_k^\ast < N_k^\ast$, in the range $\hat{N}_k \geq n_{k,\tau}$. Notice the tail of the sum in eq. (28) is comprised of positive terms (and perhaps an irrelevant zero term) which are required to cancel out the negative terms comprising the beginning of the sum; write this as $Head(\hat{N}_k) + Tail(\hat{N}_k) = 0$, emphasizing the functional relationship of (28) and $\hat{N}_k$. Let $j^\ast$ be the index of the first positive term in the sum (28), in other words: $Head(\hat{N}_k)$ is comprised of $j^\ast$ negative terms (ignoring the possibility of an irrelevant zero term).

Since $N_k^\ast$ is a solution to eq. (28) we have $Head(N_k^\ast) + Tail(N_k^\ast) = 0$. However, $Tail(N_k^\ast) \geq$
\[
\frac{N^*_k - j^*}{N^*_k - j^*} Tail(N^*_k) \quad \text{while} \quad |Head(N^*_k)| \leq \frac{N^*_k - j^* + 1}{N^*_k - j^* + 1} |Head(N^*_k)|. \quad \text{We finish by concluding} \quad Head(N^*_k) + Tail(N^*_k) \neq 0, \text{ i.e. a contradiction.}
\]

\[\square\]

For theorem 2 we apply the delta method (assuming \(\sqrt{v}(\hat{p}_k - p_k)\) converges to \(\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_{\hat{p}_k})\), and since from theorem 1 we have \(\sqrt{v}(f_k - f_k) \xrightarrow{v \to \infty} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_{f_k})\); see also eq. (16-19)).

Define the concatenated random vector \(\hat{\phi} := (\hat{f}, \hat{p})^T = (\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2, ..., \hat{f}_{d_{\text{max}}}, \hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, ..., \hat{p}_{d_{\text{max}}})^T\) with a covariance matrix \(C := \text{diag}\{\sigma^2_{\hat{f}_1}, \sigma^2_{\hat{f}_2}, ..., \sigma^2_{\hat{f}_{d_{\text{max}}}}, \sigma^2_{\hat{p}_1}, \sigma^2_{\hat{p}_2}, ..., \sigma^2_{\hat{p}_{d_{\text{max}}}}\}\). Rewrite \(\hat{H}\) as the function
\[
h(\hat{f}, \hat{p}) = \sum_k \hat{f}_k \hat{p}_k
\]
with \(\nabla h(\hat{f}, \hat{p}) = (\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2, ..., \hat{p}_{d_{\text{max}}}, \hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2, ..., \hat{f}_{d_{\text{max}}})^T\). From the delta method we have
\[
\sqrt{v}(h(\hat{\phi}) - h(\phi_0)) \xrightarrow{v \to \infty} \mathcal{N}(0, \nabla h(\phi_0)^T C \nabla h(\phi_0))
\]
where \(\phi_0\) contains the true values of the associated estimated parameters. Since \(h(\phi_0) = H_0\) and \(\nabla h(\phi_0)^T C \nabla h(\phi_0) = \sum_k \hat{p}_k^2 \sigma_{\hat{f}_k}^2 + \sum_k \hat{f}_k^2 \sigma_{\hat{p}_k}^2\) theorem 2 is now established. \(\square\)
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