

# Nonparametric Estimation of Path-specific Effects in Presence of Nonignorable Missing Covariates

Jiawei Shan<sup>\*1</sup>, Ting Wang<sup>\*2</sup>, Wei Li<sup>3</sup>, and Chunrong Ai<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China

<sup>2,3</sup> Center for Applied Statistics and School of Statistics, Renmin University of China

<sup>4</sup> School of Management and Economics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen  
<sup>1,2,3</sup>{jwshan, ting.wang, weilistat}@ruc.edu.cn, <sup>4</sup>chunrongai@cuhk.edu.cn

September 4, 2024

## Abstract

The path-specific effect (PSE) is of primary interest in mediation analysis when multiple intermediate variables between treatment and outcome are observed, as it can isolate the specific effect through each mediator, thus mitigating potential bias arising from other intermediate variables serving as mediator-outcome confounders. However, estimation and inference of PSE become challenging in the presence of nonignorable missing covariates, a situation particularly common in epidemiological research involving sensitive patient information. In this paper, we propose a fully nonparametric methodology to address this challenge. We establish identification for PSE by expressing it as a functional of observed data and demonstrate that the associated nuisance functions can be uniquely determined through sequential optimization problems by leveraging a shadow variable. Then we propose a sieve-based regression imputation approach for estimation. We establish the large-sample theory for the proposed estimator, and introduce a robust and efficient approach to make inference for PSE. The proposed method is applied to the NHANES dataset to investigate the mediation roles of dyslipidemia and obesity in the pathway from Type 2 diabetes mellitus to cardiovascular disease.

KEYWORDS: Efficient estimation; mediation analysis; mediator-outcome confounding; missing not at random; multiple mediators.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Both authors contributed equally to this work.

# 1 Introduction

Mediation analysis is a powerful analytic tool to explore the mechanisms of treatment-outcome relationships in both experimental and observational studies. While it has traditionally been studied based on structural equation models (Baron and Kenny, 1986), the model-free concepts of natural direct and indirect effects were later formalized by Robins and Greenland (1992) and Pearl (2001) within the potential outcomes framework. This formalization separates identification assumptions from parametric constraints, enabling nonparametric identification and semiparametric inference for these causal estimands (Imai et al., 2010a; Tchetgen Tchetgen and Shpitser, 2012).

In epidemiological studies, mediation analysis has been widely employed to explore the mediated risk factors in the development of chronic diseases, for example, mechanisms by which type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) causes cardiovascular disease (Sharif et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2022). As indicated by Zhang et al. (2023), several intermediate variables, such as obesity and dyslipidemia, play a crucial role in the relationship between T2DM and cardiovascular events. The conventional mediation analysis approach typically regards intermediate variables collectively as a single vector-valued mediator variable, which makes it difficult to distinguish the specific mediation role of each intermediate variable. Sharif et al. (2019) examined the natural indirect effects of each risk factor separately. However, despite controlling for a set of pre-treatment covariates, their results may still be subject to potential bias if one intermediate variable induced by the treatment T2DM becomes a confounder between another intermediate variable and the cardiovascular outcome. For example, dyslipidemia is a common symptom for T2DM patients, which subsequently influences both obesity and the cardiovascular outcome (Vekic et al., 2019). This is known as a mediator-outcome confounding problem in mediation analysis (Avin et al., 2005), and a remedy is to consider the path-specific effect (PSE) instead of the natural indirect effect (Shpitser, 2013; Daniel et al., 2015; Miles et al., 2017). Essentially, the PSE mitigates mediator-outcome confounding by controlling for the counterfactuals of intermediate variables preceding the mediator of interest at the same treatment status when switching the potential mediator values. Miles et al. (2020) proposed a semiparametric approach for estimation of PSE in presence of mediator-outcome confounding. Zhou (2022) extended the framework to accommodate multiple mediators and developed a general methodology for identifying and estimating the PSEs.

A prevalent challenge impeding the estimation and inference of the PSE in epidemiological studies is the issue of missing data. Sensitive information related to privacy, such as lifestyle, mental health status, socioeconomic status, and other self-reported information, are often withheld by respondents. These involved variables are sometimes crucial covariates in identifying causal effects, particularly as pre-treatment covariates to

eliminate the confounding bias. For example, in empirical research exploring the causal mechanism between T2DM and cardiovascular disease using data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), baseline covariates such as age, gender, race, hypertension, and drinking are considered, with approximately 36% of the drinking data missing (Zhang et al., 2023). Compounding the issue, this missingness is likely nonignorable, also known as missing not at random (MNAR, Rubin, 1976), as individuals aware of the health risks associated with heavy drinking may be more reluctant to answer related questions (Bartlett et al., 2014). A widely adopted approach for addressing nonignorable missingness is the use of shadow variables (D’Haultfoeuille, 2010; Wang et al., 2014; Zhao and Ma, 2022; Miao et al., 2024). In our example, alcoholic hepatitis is considered a suitable shadow variable for recovering missing information about alcohol consumption because it is associated with long-term alcohol use; besides, it is diagnosed through physiological indicators obtained from laboratory data, which is independent of the missing process related to self-reported drinking behavior. These factors imply that alcoholic hepatitis meets the necessary criteria for a shadow variable. Several studies have utilized auxiliary or other observed variables as shadow variables to address nonignorable missing data in causal inference (Yang et al., 2019) or mediation analysis (Li and Zhou, 2017; Zuo et al., 2024; Shan et al., 2024). However, current methods for mediation analysis with potential mediator-outcome confounding and multiple mediators subject to nonignorable missing covariates are still lacking.

In this paper, we address these gaps in the current literature by providing a comprehensive methodology for identifying, estimating and making inference about the PSE when multiple intermediate variables are observed and pre-treatment covariates are subject to nonignorable missingness. We first establish identification of PSE by expressing it as a functional of observed data using a weighting method. The weight is identified by an integral equation with an available shadow variable, while the other nuisance functions are demonstrated to be unique solutions to specific weighted least squares optimization problems. Building on these identification results, we propose a sieve-based regression imputation estimator and establish its asymptotic normality despite the well-known challenges of ill-posedness in solving the integral equation (Kress, 1989). Our estimator exhibits two main advantages over classical parametric regression imputation methods: it is more flexible in accommodating nonlinear structures as it nonparametrically models and estimates nuisance functions using versatile sieves like power series and splines; and it is shown to attain the semiparametric efficiency bound. We also propose a novel approach for estimating the asymptotic variance and making efficient inference for the PSE. Unlike previous methods that estimate the density appearing in the influence function separately, we identify density ratios as a whole through optimization problems and employ a one-step estimation process.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines the counterfactuals,

the PSE of interest and specifies main assumptions. Section 3 derives the identifiable expression of the parameter of interest and introduces our estimation approach. Section 4 derives the large-sample properties and our inference methods. Section 5 provides a simulation study, and we apply our method to NHANES in Section 6. Technical proofs and additional results are provided in the supplementary materials.

## 2 Setup

Let  $A$  denote a binary treatment, and  $Y$  the outcome of interest. Let  $X$  be a set of pre-treatment covariates subject to nonignorable missingness, and let the binary variable  $R$  be the missingness indicator with  $R = 1$  if  $X$  is fully observed and 0 otherwise. Suppose we observe  $K$  causally ordered clusters of intermediate variables between  $A$  and  $Y$ , denoted by  $M_1, \dots, M_K$ , such that no component of  $M_{k'}$  causally affects any component of  $M_k$  for  $k < k'$ . Classical mediation analysis, which views all intermediate variables as a vector-valued mediator (Pearl, 2001), is a special case here with  $K = 1$ . There are  $2^K$  possible causal paths from treatment to outcome through different combinations of the  $K$  mediators. For example, when  $K = 2$ , the four paths are: (a)  $A \rightarrow Y$ ; (b)  $A \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow Y$ ; (c)  $A \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow Y$ ; (d)  $A \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow Y$ . Throughout, for any generic sequence  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots\}$ , we write  $\bar{v}_k = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ , and  $\bar{v}_0 = \emptyset$ . We employ the potential outcome framework to define path-specific effects. Let  $Y(a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)$  denote the potential outcome under treatment status  $A = a$  and mediator values  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_K = \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K$ ,  $M_k(a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  the potential value of the mediator  $M_k$  under treatment status  $a$  and mediator values  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} = \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . It allows us to define the *counterfactual functionals*:

$$\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}) \triangleq E \{Y(a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_K))\},$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_k(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_k) = (\bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1}), M_k(a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1})))$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , and  $a_1, \dots, a_{K+1}$  are treatment statuses with each taking values 0 or 1. For example, when  $K = 2$ ,  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_3) = E\{Y(a_3, M_1(a_1), M_2(a_2, M_1(a_1)))\}$ . Essentially,  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  excludes a proportion of nested counterfactuals, for example,  $E\{Y(a_3, M_1(a_1), M_2(a_2, M_1(a'_1)))\}$  with  $a_1 \neq a'_1$  when  $K = 2$ , which is typically unidentifiable according to the recanting witness criterion (Avin et al., 2005). A set of PSEs of interest are introduced by  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$ , as illustrated in the following examples.

**Example 1** (Mediation Analysis with treatment-induced mediator-outcome confounding). *Suppose  $K = 2$  and  $M_2$  is the mediator of interest, as shown in Figure 1. The natural direct and indirect effects are typically not identifiable because the mediator-outcome confounder  $M_1$  induced by the treatment exists. Specifically, the natural indirect effect through  $M_2$  is defined following Pearl (2001) as  $E\{Y(1, M_2(1))\} - E\{Y(1, M_2(0))\}$ , which*

is equal to

$$E\{Y(1, M_1(1), M_2(1, M_1(1)))\} - E\{Y(1, M_1(1), M_2(0, M_1(0)))\}, \quad (1)$$

by the composition assumption where  $M_1$  is set to what it should be in the nested counterfactual. The first term in (1) corresponds to  $\psi(1, 1, 1)$ , while the second term is typically unidentifiable because it accounts for counterfactuals under conflicting treatment values (Robins and Richardson, 2011). Referring to Shpitser (2013) and Miles et al. (2020), an alternative estimand quantifying the path-specific effect along the path  $A \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow Y$ , which is of primary interest, is defined via  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  as follows:

$$PSE_{A \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow Y} = \psi(1, 1, 1) - \psi(1, 0, 1).$$




Figure 1. Causal DAGs with the thick arrows indicating the PSE of interest.

**Example 2** (Mediation analysis with multiple ordered mediators). As an extension of Example 1, we aim to describe the mediation effects through each intermediate variable among  $M_1, \dots, M_K$ . Referring to Daniel et al. (2015) and Zhou (2022), the natural direct effect of  $A$  on  $Y$ , and the portion of path-specific natural indirect effects that operates through the  $k$ th mediator  $M_k$ , are respectively defined as

$$NDE_{A \rightarrow Y} = \psi(a_{K+1} = 1, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_K = \mathbf{0}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0}),$$

$$NIE_{A \rightarrow M_k \rightsquigarrow Y} = \psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{k-1} = \mathbf{0}, \underline{\mathbf{a}}_k = \mathbf{1}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_k = \mathbf{0}, \underline{\mathbf{a}}_{k+1} = \mathbf{1}), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\},$$

where  $\underline{\mathbf{a}}_k = (a_k, \dots, a_{K+1})$ . Figure 2 is a causal DAG for illustration. For instance,  $NIE_{A \rightarrow M_k \rightsquigarrow Y}$  is a composite effect of the causal paths  $A \rightarrow M_k \rightarrow Y$ ,  $A \rightarrow M_k \rightarrow M_{k+1} \rightarrow Y, \dots$ , and  $A \rightarrow M_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M_K \rightarrow Y$ . Then the total effect (TE) of  $A$  on  $Y$  can be decomposed as

$$TE \triangleq \psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1} = \mathbf{1}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0}) = NDE_{A \rightarrow Y} + \sum_{k=1}^K NIE_{A \rightarrow M_k \rightsquigarrow Y}.$$

In the following, we will concentrate on the estimation and inference of  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$ . The following assumptions are imposed by Zhou (2022) for identifying  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$ , which can be viewed as an extension of those proposed by Imai et al. (2010b) in mediation analysis.




Figure 2. Causal DAGs of some PSEs.

**Assumption 1** (Consistency).  $M_k = M_k(a_k, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  if  $A = a_k$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1} = \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , and  $Y = Y(a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)$  if  $A = a_{K+1}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_K = \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K$ .

**Assumption 2** (Sequential ignorability).  $\{M_1(a_1), M_2(a_2, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_1), \dots, Y(a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)\} \perp\!\!\!\perp A \mid X$ , and  $\{M_{k+1}(a_{k+1}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k), \dots, M_K(a_K, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1}), Y(a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)\} \perp\!\!\!\perp M_k(a_k, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}^*) \mid X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}$  for any  $a_1, \dots, a_{K+1}$ ,  $m_1, \dots, m_K$ ,  $m_1^*, \dots, m_{K-1}^*$ , and  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .

**Assumption 3** (Positivity).  $f_{A|X}(a \mid x) > \varepsilon > 0$  whenever  $f_X(x) > 0$ ;  $f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k}(a \mid x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) > \varepsilon > 0$  whenever  $f_{X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) > 0$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .

Assumptions 1 and 3 are standard in causal inference literature. Assumption 2 stipulates that baseline covariates control for all potential confounding between the treatment and mediators, as well as between the treatment and the outcome. Additionally, the covariates, treatment, and preceding mediators jointly control for any confounding between subsequent mediators and between the mediators and the outcome. Under Assumptions 1–3, Zhou (2022) showed that  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  can be expressed as

$$\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}) = \int_x \int_{\bar{\mathbf{m}}_K} E(Y \mid x, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^K dF(m_k \mid x, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \right\} dF(x). \quad (2)$$

Unfortunately, the identification formula (2) is infeasible if the covariates  $X$  have missing values. This becomes particularly challenging when the missingness is non-ignorable, namely  $R \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid (A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ , because the underlying joint distribution of  $(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  in this case is typically not identified by the observed data without additional information, even when strict parametric models are employed (Miao et al., 2016). Inspired by D’Haultfoeuille (2010) and Miao and Tchetgen Tchetgen (2018), we consider the shadow variable framework for identification. Let  $Z$  be a shadow variable satisfying the following assumptions.

**Assumption 4** (Shadow variable). (i)  $Z \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X \mid A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y$ , (ii)  $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp R \mid X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y$ .

**Assumption 5** (Completeness). For any squared-integrable function  $g$  and for any  $a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y$ ,  $E\{g(X) \mid Z, A = a, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K = \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, Y = y\} = 0$  almost surely if and only if  $g(X) = 0$  almost surely.

Assumption 4 emphasizes that the shadow variable should be associated with the missing covariates conditional on the other observed data, but independent of the missingness process conditional on both observed and missing data. In our motivating example, alcoholic hepatitis serves as a shadow variable for the partially observed drinking behavior. It is expected to satisfy the conditions because one of the main pathogenesis of alcoholic hepatitis is long-term alcohol use. Furthermore, alcoholic hepatitis is diagnosed based on laboratory data, which is fully observed and expected not to directly influence the propensity of respondents reporting their alcohol consumption. In fact, the shadow variable is also referred to as the “nonresponse instrument” in some literature (D’Haultfoeuille, 2010; Wang et al., 2014), and has been widely used for establishing identifiability (Miao and Tchetgen Tchetgen, 2016, 2018). Assumption 5 is a technical condition relevant to identification process, and holds for a wide range of parametric or semiparametric models such as exponential families (Newey and Powell, 2003; D’Haultfoeuille, 2011). Intuitively, it requires the shadow variable to be of as much variability as the missing variable. We also assume the response probability  $f(R = 1 | X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) > \underline{c} > 0$  for some constant  $\underline{c}$  to rule out the degenerate case. Under these assumptions, the identification of the joint distribution  $f(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  can be established similarly to the studies of, for example, Ding and Geng (2014); Yang et al. (2019). In this paper, we always assume the underlying data distribution satisfies these conditions and focus on robust estimation and efficient inference of  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  using observed data.

### 3 Estimation

To motivate our estimation approach, we first establish the identifiable expression of  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$ . Specifically, we express  $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  as a functional of fully observed data and demonstrate that the associated nuisance functions can be uniquely determined through sequential optimization problems. Then we propose a robust and efficient nonparametric approach for estimation. For notational simplicity, we consider a given treatment status  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}$  and denote  $\psi \equiv \psi(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  from now on. Let  $\mu_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) \triangleq E(Y | X, A = a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  and  $\mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \triangleq E\{\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) | X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  be a series of iterated conditional expectations. Then (2) implies that  $\psi = E\{\mu_1(X)\}$ . Let

$$\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = \frac{f(R = 0 | X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)}{f(R = 1 | X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)},$$

be the odds function. Then it is easy to check that  $\psi$  can be expressed as

$$\psi = E\{R\mu_1(X) + (1 - R)\mu_1(X)\} = E\{R\mu_1(X) + R\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\}.$$

Essentially, the odds function  $\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  summarizes the distribution shift between units with and without missingness. Once we obtain estimators of  $\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  and  $\mu_1(X)$ , an estimator of  $\psi$  is given by

$$\hat{\psi} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{R_i \hat{\mu}_1(X_i) + R_i \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\}. \quad (3)$$

In the following, we address the identification and estimation of  $\gamma$  and  $\mu_1$ .

We first consider  $\gamma$ . With an available shadow variable  $Z$  satisfying assumptions 4 and 5, similar to Li et al. (2023) and Miao et al. (2024), we show in Appendix B that  $\gamma$  is identified by the integral equation:

$$E \{ \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \} = \beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y), \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \triangleq f(R = 0 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) / f(R = 1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ . Here, Assumption 4 ensures that  $\gamma$  satisfies the integral equation (4), and Assumption 5 guarantees the unique solution of the equation. Note that the integral equation (4) is equivalent to

$$E \{ R\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \} = E(1 - R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y). \quad (5)$$

We define the criterion function

$$Q(\tilde{\gamma}) = E \left[ \left\{ E(R\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \right\}^2 \right], \quad \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma,$$

where  $\Gamma$  is the parameter space of  $\gamma$ . Then we have  $\gamma = \arg \inf_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma} Q(\tilde{\gamma})$ . Therefore, we can estimate  $\gamma$  by finding a minimizer of the sample analogue  $Q_n(\tilde{\gamma})$  of  $Q(\tilde{\gamma})$ . For this purpose, we first estimate the unknown conditional expectation  $E(\cdot \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  using a series estimator (Newey, 1997). Specifically, let  $\{p_j(\cdot)\}_{j=1}^\infty$  denote a sequence of known basis functions (such as power series, splines, Fourier series, etc.), with the property that its linear combination can approximate any squared integrable real-valued function of  $(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)$  well. Let  $\bar{\mathbf{p}}_n(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) = (p_1(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y), \dots, p_n(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y))^T$ , and  $\mathbf{P} = (\bar{\mathbf{p}}_n(Z_1, A_1, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,1}, Y_1), \dots, \bar{\mathbf{p}}_n(Z_n, A_n, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,n}, Y_n))^T$ . Then for a generic random variable  $V$  with realizations  $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , the estimator of  $E(V \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  is given by

$$\hat{E}(V \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i \bar{\mathbf{p}}_n(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)^T (\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{P})^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{p}}_n(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y).$$

Then the sample analogue  $Q_n(\tilde{\gamma})$  of  $Q(\tilde{\gamma})$  is given by

$$Q_n(\tilde{\gamma}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \hat{E} \{ R\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \} \right]^2.$$

Without imposing parametric assumptions on the functional form of  $\gamma$ , its parameter space



$\Gamma$  is typically an infinite-dimensional set, thus it is impractical to find a minimizer of  $Q_n(\tilde{\gamma})$  over  $\Gamma$  with finite samples. As a remedy, we employ a sieve approximation (Grenander, 1981) for  $\Gamma$ . Suppose  $\Gamma_n$  is a sieve space that is a computable and often finite-dimensional compact parameter space that becomes dense in  $\Gamma$  as  $n$  increases. Several commonly used sieve spaces and their corresponding approximation properties are well discussed in Chen (2007). For instance, let  $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{s_n}(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)$  denote a  $s_n$ -vector of basis functions similar to  $\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)$ . Considering  $\gamma$  is a probability ratio and has non-negative values, we suggest a sieve space  $\Gamma_n = \{\tilde{\gamma} : \tilde{\gamma}(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) = \exp[\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{s_n}(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}], \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{s_n}\}$ . Then an estimator of  $\gamma$  is given by

$$\hat{\gamma} = \arg \min_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_n} Q_n(\tilde{\gamma}).$$

Next we consider estimation of  $\mu_1(X)$ . Since  $\{\mu_k(\cdot)\}_{k=1}^{K+1}$  are defined sequentially as iterated conditional expectations, we should estimate from the innermost conditional expectation  $\mu_K$  and iterate outward until we reach the outermost conditional expectation  $\mu_1$ . When  $X$  is fully observed, Zhou (2022) proposed a regression-imputation approach by fitting a parametric model for the conditional mean of  $\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k)$  on  $(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  and then setting  $A = a_{k+1}$  for all units. However, it encounters two challenges in our setting. First, accurately specifying parametric models for all iterated regressions is difficult, especially in presence of missing values, unless the model of  $Y$  on  $(A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  and the models of  $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_k$  on  $(A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  are all linear, which is somewhat restrictive. Second, when  $X$  has missing values, it is not possible to directly apply the ordinary least squares regression. We remedy the first challenge by directly approximating the function space of  $\mu_k$ , denoted by  $\Lambda_k \subset \mathcal{L}_2(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$ , using an increasing sieve space. To address the second issue, we show in Appendix B that  $\mu_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  is the unique solution to the following criterion function of the weighted  $\mathcal{L}_2$ -projection problem, which involves only observed data:

$$\inf_{\mu \in \Lambda_{K+1}} E \left[ I(A = a_{K+1}) R \{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{Y - \mu(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\}^2 \right],$$

and  $\mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  is the unique solution to

$$\inf_{\mu \in \Lambda_k} E \left[ I(A = a_k) R \{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) - \mu(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\}^2 \right],$$

for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . Therefore, we construct an estimator  $\hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  by solving

$$\min_{\mu \in \Lambda_{K+1, n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_{K+1}) R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K, i}, Y_i)\} \{Y_i - \mu(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K, i})\}^2,$$

and then sequentially from  $K$  to 1, obtain estimators  $\hat{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  by solving

$$\min_{\mu \in \Lambda_{kn}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_k) R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{\hat{\mu}_{k+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k,i}) - \mu(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i})\}^2.$$

Here,  $\Lambda_{kn} = \{g : g(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{kn}}\}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$  is a finite-dimensional sieve space that becomes dense in  $\Lambda_k$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some given basis functions  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  as discussed in [Chen \(2007, p.5569\)](#). The estimation procedure can be easily implemented using basic computing software by the following outlined algorithm:

**Step 1.** Minimize  $Q_n(\tilde{\gamma})$  over  $\Gamma_n$  and obtain  $\hat{\gamma}$ ;

**Step 2.** Regress  $Y_i$  on  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})$  with weights  $I(A_i = a_{K+1})R_i\{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}$  and obtain  $\hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})$ ;

**Step 3.** Regress  $\hat{\mu}_{k+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k,i})$  on  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i})$  for  $k$  from  $K$  to 1 iteratively with weights  $I(A_i = a_k)R_i\{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}$  and obtain  $\hat{\mu}_k(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i})$ ;

**Step 4.** Obtain  $\hat{\psi}$  from equation (3).

Notably, step 2–3 can be implemented using, for example, the “lm” function in [R](#). We remark here that in the special case without data missingness, by simply setting  $\hat{\gamma} = 0$  in step 1, the algorithm remains valid as a nonparametric regression-imputation approach for estimation of  $\psi$ . Moreover, if  $\mu_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  is assumed to follow a specific parametric form, one only needs to find the estimator  $\hat{\mu}_k$  by solving the above optimization problem over this parametric space. Particularly, if  $\hat{\gamma} \equiv 0$  and  $\Lambda_{kn}$ ’s are fixed-dimensional spaces spanned by linear functions of  $(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$ , the proposed estimator reduces to the regression imputation estimator introduced by [Zhou \(2022\)](#).

## 4 Large-sample properties and inference

### 4.1 Asymptotic normality

In this section, we derive the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\psi}$ . We first introduce some notations. For a given  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}$ , we define

$$\omega_1(x) \triangleq f_{A|X}(a_1 | x)^{-1}, \quad (6a)$$

$$\omega_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \triangleq \frac{f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}}(a_{k-1} | x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})}{f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}}(a_k | x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})}, \quad k = 2, \dots, K+1, \quad (6b)$$

$$\phi(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \triangleq \mu_1(x) + \sum_{k=1}^K I(a = a_k) \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k \omega_j(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{j-1}) \right\} \left\{ \mu_{k+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) - \mu_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \right\}$$

$$+ I(a = a_{K+1}) \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{K+1} \omega_j(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{j-1}) \right\} \left\{ y - \mu_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) \right\}. \quad (6c)$$

Note that  $\omega_k$  and  $\phi$  vary with different choice of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}$ , here we omit the notations  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}$  for simplicity. Zhou (2022) showed that when  $X$  is fully observed, the efficient influence function of  $\psi$  is  $\phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \psi$ .

The first challenge in establishing asymptotic normality arises from ill-posed nature of the inverse problem in estimating  $\gamma$ , resulting in a slow convergence rate of  $\hat{\gamma}$ . We therefore introduce a pseudo metric that is weaker than conventional  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  metrics. It helps expedite the convergence of  $\hat{\gamma}$  to the true value, which is necessary in establishing asymptotic normality. We define an inner product

$$\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle_w = E \left[ E \{ R\gamma_1(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \} E \{ R\gamma_2(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \} \right],$$

and then define  $\|\gamma_1\|_w = \langle \gamma_1, \gamma_1 \rangle_w^{1/2}$  for any  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$ . It is easy to see  $\|\gamma_1\|_w \leq \|\gamma_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}$  for any  $\gamma_1$  by Jensen's inequality. The convergence results of  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_k$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$  are formally established in Appendix C. Importantly, we demonstrate that the convergence rates of  $\hat{\gamma}$  under the pseudo-metric  $\|\cdot\|_w$ , as well as  $\hat{\mu}_k$  under the  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  metrics, are all  $o_p(n^{-1/4})$  under standard regularity conditions for nonparametric regression.

Another challenge in obtaining the asymptotically linear representation of  $\hat{\psi}$  is that  $\hat{\gamma}$  typically lacks a closed form due to the complexity of  $\Gamma_n$  with regularization. To address this, we introduce a representer to capture the cumulative influence of  $\hat{\gamma}$  on  $\hat{\psi}$  and derive its linear representation. Let  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$  be the closure of the linear span of  $\Gamma$  under the metric  $\|\cdot\|_w$ , then  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$  is a Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_w$  defined above. Note that the linear functional  $\tilde{\gamma} \mapsto E \{ R\phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \}$  is continuous under  $\|\cdot\|_w$ , by Riesz representation theorem, there is  $\varrho \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}$  such that

$$\langle \varrho, \tilde{\gamma} \rangle_w = E \{ R\phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \},$$

holds for all  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}$ . We impose the following assumption.

**Assumption 6.** Assume that  $\varrho \in \Gamma$ , or there is  $\varrho_n \in \Gamma_n$  such that  $\|\varrho_n - \varrho\|_w = o(n^{-1/4})$ .

Assumption 6 requires the Riesz representer  $\varrho$  to fall in  $\Gamma$ , or be well approximated by the sieve space  $\Gamma_n$ . It is a technical condition that suffices for  $\sqrt{n}$ -estimability of  $\psi$ . It is commonly imposed and thoroughly discussed in the literature regarding the estimation of functionals involving ill-posed inverse problems (Ai and Chen, 2003; Santos, 2011; Severini and Tripathi, 2012). The asymptotic normality of  $\hat{\psi}$  is formally established in the following theorem and is proved in Appendix D.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1–6 and A.1–A.6 in Appendix A hold. We obtain*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\psi} - \psi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n IF(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) + o_p(1),$$

with the influence function

$$IF = R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \psi \\ - E\{R\varrho(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\}\{R\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - 1 + R\}.$$

It follows that  $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\psi} - \psi) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2)$  with  $\sigma^2 = E(IF^2)$ .

Theorem 1 demonstrates that  $\hat{\psi}$  exhibits  $\sqrt{n}$ -convergence and asymptotic normality, unaffected by the slow convergence rate of  $\hat{\gamma}$ . This result is the foundation for making inferences about the PSE, which will be discussed in the next subsection. Below we briefly discuss the efficiency of the proposed estimator in the following two remarks.

**Remark 4.1.** If all covariates  $X$  are observed, that is  $R \equiv 1$  and  $\gamma \equiv 0$ , the influence function of the proposed estimator  $\hat{\psi}$  turns out to be  $IF = \phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \psi$ , which is exactly the efficient influence functions of  $\psi$  in the full data law derived in Zhou (2022). Therefore, our approach also provides an efficient estimation of  $\psi$  when the data are completely observed by simply setting  $\hat{\gamma} = 0$ .

**Remark 4.2.** We show in Appendix D.2 that the proposed estimator  $\hat{\psi}$  attains the semiparametric efficiency bound in the semiparametric model  $\mathcal{M}_{sp}$  which places no restriction on the observed data distribution other than the model restriction (4) at key submodels. This reflects that our approach effectively leverages the information of observed data.

## 4.2 Variance estimation and inference

We consider estimating the asymptotic variance  $\sigma^2$  and constructing confidence intervals for  $\psi$ . To achieve this, we need to estimate the unknown functions that appear in the influence function of  $\psi$  as described in Theorem 1. For estimation of  $\phi(\cdot)$ , we need to estimate the unknown functions  $\omega_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$  defined in (6a)–(6b). The following lemma provides their identifiable formulas and is proved in Appendix D.3.

**Lemma 1.** *We have that  $\omega_1(x)$  satisfies the following conditional moment restriction*

$$E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\{I(A = a_1)\omega_1(X) - 1\} \mid R = 1, X] = 0,$$

and for  $k \in \{2, \dots, K+1\}$ ,  $\omega_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  satisfies the following conditional moment

restriction

$$E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{I(A = a_k)\omega_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - I(A = a_{k-1})\} \mid R = 1, X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}] = 0.$$

Similar to the approach used for estimating  $\gamma$  from (5), we can solve the integral equations in Lemma 1 by minimizing the corresponding optimization problems over finite-dimensional sieve spaces. Specifically, an estimator  $\widehat{\omega}_1(x)$  can be obtained by solving

$$\min_{\widehat{\omega}_1 \in \Lambda_{1n}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \widehat{E}[\{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{I(A = a_1)\widehat{\omega}_1(X) - 1\} \mid R = 1, X_i]^2,$$

and for  $k \in \{2, \dots, K+1\}$ , estimators  $\widehat{\omega}_k(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  are obtained by solving

$$\min_{\widehat{\omega}_k \in \Lambda_{kn}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \widehat{E}[\{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{I(A = a_k)\widehat{\omega}_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - I(A = a_{k-1})\} \mid R = 1, X_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1, i}]^2,$$

respectively. Then we obtain an estimator of  $\phi(\cdot)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\phi}(x, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) &= \widehat{\mu}_1(x) + \sum_{k=1}^K I(a = a_k) \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k \widehat{\omega}_j(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{j-1}) \right\} \left\{ \widehat{\mu}_{k+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_k) - \widehat{\mu}_k(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \right\} \\ &\quad + I(a = a_{K+1}) \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{K+1} \widehat{\omega}_j(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{j-1}) \right\} \left\{ y - \widehat{\mu}_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

It is worth noting that (7) represents a general formula applicable to any  $\overline{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}$ . However, in specific cases where  $a_k = a_{k-1}$ , (6b) implies that  $\omega_k(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \equiv 1$ , allowing for a simplification of (7) without the need of  $\widehat{\omega}_k$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_k$ . Moreover, unlike the method proposed by Zhou (2022), which estimates the densities appearing in the numerator and denominator of  $\omega_k$  separately, we propose a one-step approach that directly estimates  $\omega_k$ , resulting in greater stability. Next, we consider the estimation of the representer  $\varrho$  in Assumption 6. It can be observed that  $\varrho$  is a solution to the optimization problem

$$\inf_{\widehat{\varrho} \in \Gamma} \frac{1}{2} E \left[ \{E(R\widehat{\varrho}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2 \right] - E \{R\phi(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\widehat{\varrho}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}.$$

It suggests an estimator  $\widehat{\varrho}$  that solves

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\widehat{\varrho} \in \Gamma_n} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \widehat{E}\{R\widehat{\varrho}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\} \right]^2 \\ - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \widehat{\phi}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \widehat{\varrho}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1, one can then construct an estimator of the asymptotic variance  $\sigma^2$  by

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{IF}_i^2 \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \hat{\phi}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - \hat{\psi} \right. \\ \left. - \widehat{E}\{R\hat{\rho}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\} \{R_i \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - 1 + R_i\} \right]^2.$$

Then the 95% symmetric confidence interval for  $\psi$  is given by  $[\hat{\psi} - 1.96\hat{\sigma}/\sqrt{n}, \hat{\psi} + 1.96\hat{\sigma}/\sqrt{n}]$ .

The above procedure can be slightly modified to make inference for PSE. As an illustration, an estimator of  $\text{NDE}_{A \rightarrow Y}$  is given by  $\widehat{\text{NDE}}_{A \rightarrow Y} = \hat{\psi}(a_{K+1} = 1, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_K = \mathbf{0}) - \hat{\psi}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0})$ . Then Theorem 1 implies that

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\text{NDE}}_{A \rightarrow Y} - \text{NDE}_{A \rightarrow Y}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma_{\text{NDE}}^2),$$

where  $\sigma_{\text{NDE}}^2 = E[\{IF(a_{K+1} = 1, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_K = \mathbf{0}) - IF(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0})\}^2]$ , and  $IF(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  is the influence function of  $\hat{\psi}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1})$  obtained in Theorem 1 for a given treatment status  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1}$ . The asymptotic variance  $\sigma_{\text{NDE}}^2$  is estimated by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{NDE}}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{IF}_i(a_{K+1} = 1, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_K = \mathbf{0}) - \widehat{IF}_i(\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0}) \right\}^2,$$

and the confidence interval can be constructed following standard procedures.

## 5 Simulation

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to demonstrate the finite-sample performance of the proposed estimators. We generate independent and identically distributed samples through the following data generating mechanism. Let  $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_5) \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_5)$  be the random noise. Let  $\Phi$  be the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. We generate the component of covariates subject to nonignorable missingness by  $X_1 \sim \Phi(\alpha\varepsilon_1 + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2}\varepsilon_2)$  with  $\alpha = 0.6$ , and the shadow variable by  $Z \sim \Phi(\varepsilon_1)$ . Notably, the completeness assumption 5 holds following Theorem 2.1 of D'Haultfoeuille (2011). We also generate fully observed covariates  $X_2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$  and  $X_3 \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ . The treatment  $A$  is generated from a Bernoulli distribution such that  $A \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\text{expit}(-0.1 + X_1 - X_2 + 0.2X_3)\}$ , where  $\text{expit}(u) = \exp(u)/\{1 + \exp(u)\}$ . We generate two mediators  $(M_1, M_2)$  as follows:

$$M_1 = -1 + 0.5A - 2\sin(X_1) + 3X_1^2 - 2X_2 + X_3 + \varepsilon_3, \\ M_2 = 1 - 0.5A + X_1 + X_2^2 - X_3 - 0.5AM_1 + \varepsilon_4.$$

The outcome is generated by  $Y = -1 + 0.5A - 1.5M_1 + 1.5M_2 + 3X_1 + 3X_1^2 - 3\sin(X_2) + X_2^2 - X_3 + 0.5AM_1 + 0.5AM_2 + \varepsilon_5$ . Here, the models of the mediators and outcome are nonlinear in covariates and include interaction terms to account for heterogeneity, making them more representative of complex real-world scenarios. Finally, the missingness indicator of  $X_1$  is generated by

$$R \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\text{expit}(0.1 - 2X_1 + 1.5X_2 + X_3 + 0.5A\varepsilon_3 - 0.5A\varepsilon_4 - 0.1\varepsilon_5)\}.$$

It is worth noting that the true model of the log-odds function  $\log \gamma$  also includes nonlinear and interaction terms implicitly through  $(\varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_4, \varepsilon_5)$ . The missing proportion of  $X_1$  is approximately 43.7%.

We consider the following four methods for comparison: (a) Oracle, an ideal scenario that utilizes the underlying true data; (b) SRI (short for sieve-based regression imputation), the proposed estimator using polynomials of order 3 as the sieve basis. (c) MI, a multiple imputation estimator that fills in the missing values by generating plausible values according to the observed data distribution (Little and Rubin, 2002); and (d) CCA, a complete-case analysis that restricts the analysis to only those units that have no missing values. For all these methods, we generate 1000 simulations of sample size 1000 and 2000. For simplicity, we use  $\text{NIE}_{M_k}$  to denote  $\text{NIE}_{A \rightarrow M_k \rightsquigarrow Y}$  in the following.

Table 1 presents the bias, standard error, and 95% coverage probability of different estimators, and Figure 3 displays the boxplots over 1000 replications. The results indicate that the proposed estimator, which effectively uses the shadow variable to make up for missing data, is comparable to the oracle estimator, both having negligible biases. In contrast, both MI and CCA estimators are significantly biased as expected. Meanwhile, the proposed estimator achieves coverage probabilities close to the nominal level, while both MI and CCA estimators demonstrate poor coverage due to their substantial bias. This suggests that the multiple imputation method, although easy to implement and widely used in practice to address missing data problems, may fail and introduce misleading inference when the missingness is nonignorable.

## 6 Application to NHANES

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a chronic condition with high global prevalence, increasing the risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) morbidity and mortality. We apply the proposed methodology to the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) with the aim of elucidating the mediation roles of dyslipidemia and obesity in the pathway from T2DM to CVD. NHANES collects data through interviews, physical examinations, and laboratory testing to provide comprehensive health-related information, including chronic diseases, dietary and lifestyle habits, as well as a wide range of public




Figure 3. Boxplots of various estimators across 1000 replications. White boxes represent a sample size of 1000, while grey boxes indicate a sample size of 2000. The horizontal lines indicate the true values.

Table 1. Boxplots of various estimators across 1000 replications. White boxes represent a sample size of 1000, while grey boxes indicate a sample size of 2000. The horizontal lines indicate the true values.

Methods		$n = 1000$				$n = 2000$			
		NDE	$NIE_{M_1}$	$NIE_{M_2}$	TE	NDE	$NIE_{M_1}$	$NIE_{M_2}$	TE
Oracle	Bias	-0.003	0.001	0.007	0.005	0.000	0.005	-0.008	-0.003
	SE	0.075	0.137	0.149	0.170	0.055	0.097	0.101	0.124
	CP	0.954	0.962	0.959	0.947	0.941	0.950	0.958	0.951
SRI	Bias	0.002	-0.008	0.000	-0.006	0.006	-0.001	-0.013	-0.009
	SE	0.105	0.178	0.177	0.195	0.076	0.135	0.122	0.138
	CP	0.943	0.970	0.966	0.954	0.959	0.950	0.977	0.967
MI	Bias	-0.073	0.044	-0.049	-0.077	-0.071	0.049	-0.064	-0.086
	SE	0.088	0.155	0.147	0.180	0.066	0.112	0.100	0.129
	CP	0.764	0.917	0.915	0.903	0.654	0.901	0.896	0.877
CCA	Bias	-0.103	-0.270	-0.311	-0.684	-0.100	-0.266	-0.328	-0.695
	SE	0.112	0.189	0.198	0.222	0.079	0.133	0.142	0.164
	CP	0.829	0.738	0.670	0.148	0.708	0.502	0.380	0.011



health-related topics. For this study, we select 2670 individuals aged 20-60 from the NHANES 2013-2014 dataset. According to the American Diabetes Association, the binary treatment T2DM is diagnosed by insulin or oral hypoglycemic use, a fasting blood glucose level  $\geq 126$  mg/dL, or an HbA1c level  $\geq 6.5\%$ . The binary outcome CVD is diagnosed by conditions such as congestive heart failure, coronary heart disease, angina pectoris, myocardial infarction, or stroke. As discussed in the introduction, we denote dyslipidaemia measured by blood lipid levels as  $M_1$  and obesity measured by waist circumference as  $M_2$ . Additionally, we consider five baseline covariates: age, gender, race, hypertension and drinking status. Drinking status is categorized either heavy drinker (consuming  $\geq 3$  drinks per day for females and  $\geq 4$  drinks per day for males) or mild drinker/nondrinker, based on self-reported information from a standardized health questionnaire. Among the 2670 participants, approximately 35.8% of the drinking status data are missing. The missingness in the drinking variable is primarily dependent on its value (Bartlett et al., 2014), as individuals aware of the negative health impacts of heavy drinking are more likely to withhold their responses. It is plausible that the missingness of covariate drinking is not at random. We select alcoholic hepatitis as the shadow variable  $Z$ , where  $Z = 1$  indicates a positive diagnosis based on laboratory measurements, and  $Z = 0$  otherwise. As previously discussed, alcoholic hepatitis is strongly associated with heavy drinking, and its symptoms often improve significantly with abstinence. Additionally, alcoholic hepatitis is diagnosed based on laboratory data, which is not expected to directly influence the reporting of drinking status.

We calculate various PSEs using the methods mentioned in simulation studies, and the results are shown in Table 2. The 95% confidence intervals for  $\text{NIE}_{M_1}$  and  $\text{NIE}_{M_2}$  do not include 0, which means both dyslipidaemia and obesity are significant mediators in the causal pathway linking T2DM and CVD. Additionally, the mediating effect through dyslipidaemia amounts for 5.8% of the TE, while the effect through obesity amounts for 8.9%. This indicates that obesity plays a slightly more significant mediating role in the pathway from T2DM to CVD. The direct effect of T2DM accounts for 85.3% of the TE. Although a significant proportion of residual cardiovascular risk remains due to T2DM itself, it is important to note that about 15% of this risk is attributable to dyslipidemia and obesity. This suggests that about 15% relative risk reduction could be achieved by managing weight and lowering blood lipid levels. The results align closely with the established conclusions on cardiovascular outcomes in T2DM. To emphasize the potential influence of mediator-outcome confounding, we also calculate the results by treating dyslipidemia and obesity as separate mediators, as performed by Sharif et al. (2019). The natural indirect effect of dyslipidemia is estimated at  $0.862 \times 10^{-2}$ , amounting for about 5.8% of TE, while the natural indirect effect of obesity is  $1.407 \times 10^{-2}$ , amounting for 9.5% of the TE. The estimate for dyslipidaemia aligns with the PSE as expected, whereas the estimate for obesity appears to be slightly overestimated compared to the PSE. This indicates that ignoring dyslipidemia when evaluating the mediation effect

of obesity may introduce slight confounding bias. This finding is consistent with the theoretical results discussed earlier. Compared with the SRI method, both MI and CCA methods underestimate the PSEs to varying degrees. This indicates that assuming the missingness of drinking behavior to be completely at random or at random is, to some extent, unreasonable, thereby lending greater credibility to the proposed SRI method in this study.

Table 2. Point estimates, standard error and 95% confidence intervals of  $\text{NIE}_{M_1}$ ,  $\text{NIE}_{M_2}$ , NDE and TE. All entries are in units of  $10^{-2}$ .

Estimands	Methods	Point Estimates	Standard Error	95% Confidence Intervals
$\text{NIE}_{M_1}$	SRI	0.860	0.266	[0.338,1.382]
	MI	0.639	0.189	[0.269,1.009]
	CCA	0.677	0.214	[0.258,1.096]
$\text{NIE}_{M_2}$	SRI	1.319	0.631	[0.082,2.556]
	MI	0.818	0.376	[0.081,1.554]
	CCA	1.015	0.509	[0.017,2.013]
NDE	SRI	12.602	2.835	[7.045,18.159]
	MI	10.312	1.954	[6.483,14.141]
	CCA	10.276	2.542	[5.294,15.258]
TE	SRI	14.781	2.757	[9.377,20.185]
	MI	11.769	1.908	[8.028,15.509]
	CCA	11.968	2.536	[6.998,16.938]

## 7 Discussion

In this paper, we develop a methodology for estimating and making inferences about path-specific effects when multiple intermediate variables are involved and pre-treatment covariates are subject to nonignorable missingness. This issue is commonly encountered in epidemiological research and related dataset. Our method utilizes an auxiliary shadow variable, typically obtainable from related laboratory data, to recover information on missing covariates. Our method has several attractive features: (i) it accommodates a wide range of nonparametric models, allowing for complex nonlinear structures and thereby reducing the risk of model misspecification; (ii) our estimation procedure is robust and easy to implement using standard statistical software; (iii) we offer an alternative approach for estimating asymptotic variance that avoids the instability caused by inverse probability.

Some possible directions for future research remain open. The proposed estimation is based on the regression-imputation formula of  $\psi$ , which requires relatively stringent

conditions on the consistency and convergence rate of each nuisance estimator. To alleviate these conditions, a potential approach is to develop semiparametric estimation that leverages the benefits of Neyman orthogonality and incorporates state-of-the-art machine learning techniques. However, it faces some challenging problems, for example, how to construct orthogonal scores, and how to employ machine learning to solving the integral equation. Additionally, other estimands instead of nature direct and indirect effects are of interest if there is a mediator–outcome confounder affected by the treatment, such as interventional direct and indirect effects (Vanderweele et al., 2014). These estimands have distinct identification formulas and also face the challenge of missing data in real-world studies. These problems will be explored in future work.

## Supplementary Material

The supplementary material includes additional assumptions, derivation of identifiable expressions of  $\gamma$ ,  $\mu_k$  and  $\psi$  in Section 3, intermediate results including precise convergence rates of nuisance estimators, discussion about the efficiency of the proposed estimator, and all technical proofs of lemmas and theorems.

## References

- Ai, C. and Chen, X. (2003). Efficient estimation of models with conditional moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Econometrica*, 71(6):1795–1843.
- Avin, C., Shpitser, I., and Pearl, J. (2005). Identifiability of path-specific effects. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI'05*, pages 357–363, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6):1173–1182.
- Bartlett, J. W., Carpenter, J. R., Tilling, K., and Vansteelandt, S. (2014). Improving upon the efficiency of complete case analysis when covariates are mmar. *Biostatistics*, 15(4):719–730.
- Chen, X. (2007). Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models. In Heckman, J. J. and Leamer, E. E., editors, *Handbook of Econometrics*, volume 6, pages 5549–5632. Elsevier.
- Daniel, R. M., De Stavola, B. L., Cousens, S. N., and Vansteelandt, S. (2015). Causal mediation analysis with multiple mediators. *Biometrics*, 71(1):1–14.

- D'Haultfoeuille, X. (2010). A new instrumental method for dealing with endogenous selection. *Journal of Econometrics*, 154(1):1–15.
- D'Haultfoeuille, X. (2011). On the completeness condition in nonparametric instrumental problems. *Econometric Theory*, 27(3):460–471.
- Ding, P. and Geng, Z. (2014). Identifiability of subgroup causal effects in randomized experiments with nonignorable missing covariates. *Statistics in Medicine*, 33(7):1121–1133.
- Grenander, U. (1981). *Abstract Inference*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Wiley, New York, NY.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., and Tingley, D. (2010a). A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 15(4):309–334.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., and Yamamoto, T. (2010b). Identification, inference and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science*, 25(1):51–71.
- Kress, R. (1989). *Linear Integral Equations*, volume 82 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- Li, W., Miao, W., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2023). Non-parametric inference about mean functionals of non-ignorable non-response data without identifying the joint distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(3):913–935.
- Li, W. and Zhou, X.-H. (2017). Identifiability and estimation of causal mediation effects with missing data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 36(25):3948–3965.
- Little, R. J. A. and Rubin, D. B. (2002). *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 1st edition.
- Miao, W., Ding, P., and Geng, Z. (2016). Identifiability of normal and normal mixture models with nonignorable missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(516):1673–1683.
- Miao, W., Liu, L., Li, Y., Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., and Geng, Z. (2024). Identification and semiparametric efficiency theory of nonignorable missing data with a shadow variable. *ACM/IMS Journal of Data Science*, 1(2):1–23.
- Miao, W. and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. (2018). Identification and inference with nonignorable missing covariate data. *Statistica Sinica*, 28(4):2049–2067.
- Miao, W. and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. (2016). On varieties of doubly robust estimators under missingness not at random with a shadow variable. *Biometrika*, 103(2):475–482.

- Miles, C. H., Shpitser, I., Kanki, P., Meloni, S., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. (2017). Quantifying an adherence path-specific effect of antiretroviral therapy in the nigeria pepfar program. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(520):1443–1452.
- Miles, C. H., Shpitser, I., Kanki, P., Meloni, S., and Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J. (2020). On semiparametric estimation of a path-specific effect in the presence of mediator-outcome confounding. *Biometrika*, 107(1):159–172.
- Newey, W. K. (1997). Convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, 79(1):147–168.
- Newey, W. K. and Powell, J. L. (2003). Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, 71(5):1565–1578.
- Pearl, J. (2001). Direct and indirect effects. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI'01, pages 411–420, San Francisco, CA, USA. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Robins, J. M. and Greenland, S. (1992). Identifiability and exchangeability for direct and indirect effects. *Epidemiology*, 3(2):143–155.
- Robins, J. M. and Richardson, T. S. (2011). *Alternative Graphical Causal Models and the Identification of Direct Effects*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592.
- Santos, A. (2011). Instrumental variable methods for recovering continuous linear functionals. *Journal of Econometrics*, 161(2):129–146.
- Severini, T. A. and Tripathi, G. (2012). Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2):491–498.
- Shan, J., Li, W., and Ai, C. (2024). Efficient nonparametric inference of causal mediation effects with nonignorable missing confounders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05384*.
- Sharif, S., Groenwold, R. H., van der Graaf, Y., Berkelmans, G. F., Cramer, M. J., Visseren, F. L., Westerink, J., study group, S., van Petersen, R., Dinther, B., et al. (2019). Mediation analysis of the relationship between type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality: Findings from the smart cohort. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism*, 21(8):1935–1943.
- Shpitser, I. (2013). Counterfactual graphical models for longitudinal mediation analysis with unobserved confounding. *Cognitive Science*, 37(6):1011–1035.

- Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. and Shpitser, I. (2012). Semiparametric theory for causal mediation analysis: Efficiency bounds, multiple robustness and sensitivity analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1816–1845.
- Vanderweele, T. J., Vansteelandt, S., and Robins, J. M. (2014). Effect decomposition in the presence of an exposure-induced mediator-outcome confounder. *Epidemiology*, 25(2):300–306.
- Vekic, J., Zeljkovic, A., Stefanovic, A., Jelic-Ivanovic, Z., and Spasojevic-Kalimanovska, V. (2019). Obesity and dyslipidemia. *Metabolism*, 92:71–81.
- Wang, L., Sun, M., Guo, Y., Yan, S., Li, X., Wang, X., Hu, W., Yang, Y., Li, J., and Li, B. (2022). The role of dietary inflammatory index on the association between sleep quality and long-term cardiovascular risk: a mediation analysis based on NHANES (2005–2008). *Nature and Science of Sleep*, 14:483–492.
- Wang, S., Shao, J., and Kim, J. K. (2014). An instrumental variable approach for identification and estimation with nonignorable nonresponse. *Statistica Sinica*, 24(3):1097–1116.
- Yang, S., Wang, L., and Ding, P. (2019). Causal inference with confounders missing not at random. *Biometrika*, 106(4):875–888.
- Zhang, Q., Xiao, S., Jiao, X., and Shen, Y. (2023). The triglyceride-glucose index is a predictor for cardiovascular and all-cause mortality in cvd patients with diabetes or pre-diabetes: evidence from NHANES 2001–2018. *Cardiovascular Diabetology*, 22(1):279.
- Zhao, J. and Ma, Y. (2022). A versatile estimation procedure without estimating the nonignorable missingness mechanism. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(540):1916–1930.
- Zhou, X. (2022). Semiparametric estimation for causal mediation analysis with multiple causally ordered mediators. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(3):794–821.
- Zuo, S., Ghosh, D., Ding, P., and Yang, F. (2024). Mediation analysis with the mediator and outcome missing not at random. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 0(0):1–21.

# Supplementary Material for “Nonparametric Estimation of Path-specific Effects in Presence of Nonignorable Missing Covariates”

Jiawei Shan<sup>\*1</sup>, Ting Wang<sup>\*2</sup>, Wei Li<sup>3</sup>, and Chunrong Ai<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Statistics and Big Data, Renmin University of China

<sup>2,3</sup> Center for Applied Statistics and School of Statistics, Renmin University of China

<sup>4</sup> School of Management and Economics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen

<sup>1,2,3</sup>{jwshan,ting.wang,weilistat}@ruc.edu.cn, <sup>4</sup>chunrongai@cuhk.edu.cn

September 4, 2024

## OUTLINE

Appendix [A](#) includes additional technical assumptions used in this paper. Appendix [B](#) provides details about identifiability of  $\gamma$ ,  $\mu_k$  and  $\psi$ . Appendix [C](#) presents important intermediate results regarding the convergence rates of the nuisance estimators  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_k$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$  under various metrics, which are crucial for establishing asymptotic normality. Appendix [D](#) provides the proof of Theorem [1](#) regarding asymptotic normality, discusses the efficiency of  $\hat{\psi}$ , and gives the proof of Lemma [1](#) in the main text. Finally, Appendix [E](#) contains auxiliary lemmas used in the proofs along with their corresponding proofs.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Both authors contributed equally to this work.

## APPENDIX A Additional assumptions

The following assumptions are required for theoretic derivations.

**Assumption A.1.** (i)  $\psi \in \Psi$  that is compact, and for any  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  and  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma}(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in C_B^\alpha(\mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y})$  for some  $B > 0$  and  $\alpha > (d_x + K + 1)/2$  with  $d_x$  the dimension of  $X$ ; (ii)  $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}$  is compact and convex with nonempty interior.

**Assumption A.2.** (i)  $\Gamma_n$  is a nonempty closed convex subset of  $\Gamma$ ; (ii) There is an operator  $\Pi_n$  such that for any  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ ,  $\Pi_n \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_n$  satisfying that  $\|\Pi_n \tilde{\gamma} - \tilde{\gamma}\|_\infty = O(s_n^{-\alpha_1})$  with  $\alpha_1 > 0$ .

**Assumption A.3.** (i) The eigenvalues of

$\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}$  is bounded above and bounded away from zero for all  $l_n$ ; (ii) There is  $\pi_{\tilde{\gamma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_n}$  such that  $\sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0, 1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |E(R\tilde{\gamma} | z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^\top \pi_{\tilde{\gamma}}| = O(l_n^{-\alpha_2})$  uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  with  $\alpha_2 > 0$ ; (iii)  $\zeta_{1n}^2 l_n/n = o(1)$  and  $\zeta_{1n} l_n^{-\alpha_2} = o(1)$ , where  $\zeta_{1n} \triangleq \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0, 1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} \|\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)\|$ ; (iv)  $l_n \geq s_n$ .

Recall that

$$\Lambda_{kn} = \left\{ g : g(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})^\top \boldsymbol{\pi} = \sum_{j=1}^{t_{kn}} \pi_j u_{kj}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}), \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{kn}} \right\},$$

is used in estimating  $\mu_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K + 1\}$ .

**Assumption A.4.** For  $k \in \{1, \dots, K + 1\}$ , we assume: (i) The eigenvalue of the  $t_{kn}$ -by- $t_{kn}$  matrix  $E\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^\top\}$  is bounded above and bounded away from zero for all  $t_{kn}$ ; (ii) There is  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{1k} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{kn}}$  such that  $\sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{k-1}} |\mu_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{1k}| = O(t_{kn}^{-\alpha_{3k}})$  with  $\alpha_{3k} > 0$ ; (iii) There is  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{2k} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{kn}}$  such that  $\sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{k-1}} \left| \prod_{j=1}^k \omega_j(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{j-1}) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{2k} \right| = O(t_{kn}^{-\alpha_{3k}})$ ; (iv)  $\zeta_{2kn}^2 t_{kn}/n = o(1)$  and  $\zeta_{2kn} t_{kn}^{-\alpha_{3k}} = o(1)$ , where  $\zeta_{2kn} \triangleq \sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{k-1}} \|\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})\|$ .

**Assumption A.5.** (i)  $s_n^{-2\alpha_1} + \zeta_{1n}^2 (l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}) = o(n^{-1/2})$ ; (ii)  $\zeta_{2kn}^2 \sqrt{t_{kn}^2/n} = o(1)$  and  $\sqrt{nt_{kn}^{-\alpha_{3k}}} = o(1)$ , for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K + 1\}$ .

Let  $\varepsilon_{K+1} \triangleq I(A = a_{K+1})\{Y - \mu_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\}$  and  $\varepsilon_k \triangleq I(A = a_k)\{\mu_{k+1}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) - \mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  denote a sequence of residual variables with finite second order moments. Let  $h_{k,j}^*$ ,  $k \in \{1, \dots, K + 1\}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, t_{kn}\}$  be solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{h_{k,j} \in \mathcal{L}_2(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)} E \left[ \{1 + R\varepsilon_k u_{k,j}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) h_{k,j}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2 \right] \\ + E \left[ E\{Rh_{k,j}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**Assumption A.6.** For  $k \in \{1, \dots, K + 1\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, t_{kn}\}$ , we assume:

(i)  $E\{1 + R\varepsilon_k u_{k,j}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) h_{k,j}^*(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} > 0$ ; (ii)  $h_{k,j}^* \in \Gamma$ , or there exists  $h_{k,nj}^* \in \Gamma_n$  such that  $\|h_{k,j}^* - h_{k,nj}^*\|_\infty = O(s_n^{-\alpha_1})$ .



We give a brief discussion of above assumptions. Assumption A.1 imposes the compact parameter spaces. Specifically, Assumption A.1(i) requires that each function  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  is sufficiently smooth and bounded, and is compact under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . It is a commonly imposed condition in the nonparametric and semiparametric literature to deal with the ill-posed problem arising from discontinuity of the solution to the integral equation. Assumption A.1(ii) requires the support of  $(Z, X, \overline{M}, Y)$  to be bounded. In fact, this assumption can be relaxed if we restrict the tail behavior of the joint distribution of  $(Z, X, \overline{M}, Y)$ , which will be illustrated in our simulation studies. Assumption A.2 specifies  $\Gamma_n$  and its approximation error. The approximation properties of common sieves are already known in the literature to satisfy this assumption, see Hirano et al. (2003); Chen (2007) for detailed discussions. Assumption A.3(i)-(iii) and Assumption A.4 are typical conditions in the use of series estimators for conditional mean functions and we discuss them later together. Assumption A.3(iv) states the relationship between the sieve sizes  $l_n$  and  $s_n$ , which guarantees the feasibility of the empirical optimization problem in obtaining  $\hat{\gamma}$ . Assumption A.4(i) essentially ensures the sieve approximation estimator is nondegenerate, which is common in sieve regression literature (see e.g. Newey, 1997). Assumption A.4(ii)(iii) requires the sieve approximation error of  $\mu_k$  and cumulative product of  $\omega_k$  to shrink at a polynomial rate, which holds for a wide range of basis functions (see e.g. Chen, 2007, p.5573). The polynomial rate typically depends positively on the smoothness of the estimand and negatively on the dimension of arguments. Assumption A.4(iv) is a rate requirement to ensure the convergence of the series estimation. Newey (1997) shows that  $\zeta_{2kn}$  is  $O(t_{kn})$  if  $\bar{u}_k(x, \bar{m}_{k-1})$  is a power series, and is  $O(\sqrt{t_{kn}})$  if it is a B-spline. Assumption A.5 introduces further constraints on the smoothness parameters  $(s_n, l_n, t_{kn})$ , strengthening the conditions in Assumption A.2(ii) and A.3(iii) and Assumption A.4(iv), respectively. Specifically, in (i), the rate  $s_n^{-\alpha_1}$  signifies the approximation error of the sieve space  $\Gamma_n$  for  $\Gamma$ , and this restriction is satisfied under mild conditions (Chen, 2007). The rate  $\zeta_{1n}^2(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2})$  corresponds to the squared convergence rate of series estimation in a supremum norm (Newey, 1997). Similarly (ii) is the rate constraints of the variance  $(\zeta_{2kn}^2 t_{kn}/n)$  in a supremum norm and the approximation error  $(t_{kn}^{-\alpha_{3k}})$  in series estimation. Assumption A.6 are regularity conditions for obtaining  $\sqrt{n}$ -convergence of plug-in sieve minimum distance estimators of specific functionals (Ai and Chen, 2007). The  $\sqrt{n}$ -estimability of linear/nonlinear functionals when the nonparametric component depends on endogenous variables are also discussed in Severini and Tripathi (2012) and Ai and Chen (2012).

## APPENDIX B Identification

In this section we provide details about identifiability of  $\gamma$ ,  $\mu_k$  and  $\psi$ . Recall the definition of parameters in the main text:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) &\triangleq \frac{f(R = 0 \mid X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)}{f(R = 1 \mid X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)}, \\ \mu_{K+1}(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K) &\triangleq E(Y \mid X, A = a_{K+1}, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K), \\ \mu_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) &\triangleq E\{\mu_{k+1}(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_k) \mid X, A = a_k, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}.\end{aligned}$$

We first show that under Assumptions 4–5,  $\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  is the unique solution to the following integral equation with respect to the observed law only:

$$E\{R\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} = E(1 - R \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

which is equivalent to Equation (4) in the main text because  $E(1 - R \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = f(R = 0 \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  and

$$\begin{aligned}E\{R\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \\ = f(R = 1 \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)E\{\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that (B.1) can be written as

$$E[R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] = 1.$$

Suppose  $\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  is a solution of (B.1), it satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned}1 &= E[R\{1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] \\ &= E[E(R \mid Z, X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\{1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] \\ &= E[E(R \mid X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\{1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] \\ &= E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^{-1}\{1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y],\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is by assumption 4(ii). Then the completeness assumption 5 implies that  $\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  almost surely. Therefore,  $\gamma$  is the unique solution to (B.1) and hence identified by the observe data.

Next, we establish identifiability of  $\mu_{K+1}(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  by demonstrating that it is the unique solution to the optimization problem

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{L}_2(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K)} E[I(A = a_{K+1})R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\{Y - \mu(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K)\}^2]. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since (B.2) is a convex optimization problem, suppose  $\tilde{\mu}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  is the solution to (B.2). Then  $\tilde{\mu}$  satisfies the first-order condition:

$$E [I(A = a_{K+1})R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\{Y - \tilde{\mu}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\}\mu(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)] = 0, \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{L}_2(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K).$$

It follows that

$$E [I(A = a_{K+1})R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\{Y - \tilde{\mu}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\} | X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K] = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) &= \frac{E[YI(A = a_{K+1})R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K]}{E[I(A = a_{K+1})R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K]} \\ &= \frac{E[Y\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | R = 1, X, A = a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K]}{E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, X, A = a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &E[Y\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | R = 1, X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K] \\ &= \int y \frac{f(y | R = 1, X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)}{f(R = 1 | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, y)} dy \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^{-1} \int y \frac{f(R = 1, y | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)}{f(R = 1 | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, y)} dy \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^{-1} \int y f(y | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) dy \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^{-1} E(Y | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K), \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

and similarly,

$$E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K\} = f(R = 1 | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^{-1}. \tag{B.4}$$

Combining (B.3) and (B.4) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) &= \frac{E[Y\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | R = 1, X, A = a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K]}{E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, X, A = a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K\}} \\ &= E(Y | X, a_{K+1}, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) \\ &= \mu_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by the definition of  $\mu_{K+1}$ . It follows that  $\mu_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)$  is identified by (B.2).

Similarly we shall demonstrate that  $\mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  is the unique solution to

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{L}_2(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})} E [I(A = a_k)R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\{\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) - \mu(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\}^2], \quad (\text{B.5})$$

for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . Suppose  $\tilde{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  is a solution to (B.5), then the first-order condition implies that  $\tilde{\mu}_k$  satisfies

$$E [I(A = a_k)R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}, Y)\}\{\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) - \tilde{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\} | X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}] = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) &= \frac{E[\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k)I(A = a_k)R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]}{E[I(A = a_k)R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]} \\ &= \frac{E[\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k)\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | R = 1, X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]}{E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &E [\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k)\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | R = 1, X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}] \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} \iint \mu_{k+1}(X, m_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \frac{f(m_k, y, R = 1 | a_k, X)}{f(R = 1 | X, a_k, m_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})} dm_k dy \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} \iint \mu_{k+1}(X, m_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) f(m_k, y | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) dm_k dy \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} \int \mu_{k+1}(X, m_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) f(m_k | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) dm_k \\ &= f(R = 1 | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} E\{\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\}, \quad (\text{B.6}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\} = f(R = 1 | X, a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1}. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Combining (B.6) and (B.7), we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) &= \frac{E[\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k)\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} | R = 1, X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]}{E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\}} \\ &= E\{\mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) | X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}\} \\ &= \mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . It follows that  $\mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})$  is identified by (B.5).

Finally, note that

$$\psi = E\{\mu_1(X)\} = E\{R\mu_1(X)\} + E\{(1 - R)\mu_1(X)\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
E\{(1-R)\mu_1(X)\} &= E\{E(1-R | X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\} \\
&= E\{f(R=0 | X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\} \\
&= E\{f(R=1 | X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\} \\
&= E\{E(R | X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\} \\
&= E\{R\gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\psi = E\{R\mu_1(X) + R\gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X)\}.$$

## APPENDIX C Convergence rates

In this section we establish convergence rates of nuisance estimators  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_k$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$  under various metrics (stated in Theorems C.1 and C.2 later), which are necessary for establishing the asymptotic normality of  $\hat{\psi}$ . Recall that

$$\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle_w = E\left[E\{R\gamma_1(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y) | Z, A, \bar{M}_K, Y\}E\{R\gamma_2(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y) | Z, A, \bar{M}_K, Y\}\right],$$

and  $\|\gamma_1\|_w = \langle \gamma_1, \gamma_1 \rangle_w^{1/2}$  for any  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$ . We use the calligraphic letter  $\mathcal{V}$  to denote the support of  $V$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2(V) \equiv \{g : \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathcal{V}} |g(v)|^2 f_V(v) dv < \infty\}$ . For any function  $g \in \mathcal{L}_2(V)$ , the  $\mathcal{L}_2$  metric is denoted as  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = (\int_{\mathcal{V}} |g(v)|^2 f_V(v) dv)^{1/2}$ , and the  $\mathcal{L}_\infty$  (supremum) metric is denoted as  $\|g\|_\infty = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |g(v)|$ .

### C.1 Convergence rate of $\hat{\gamma}$

The consistency of  $\hat{\gamma}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  and the convergence rate under  $\|\cdot\|_w$  are established in the following theorem.

**Theorem C.1.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1–A.3 hold. We have*

$$\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w = O_p(\sqrt{l_n/n} + l_n^{-\alpha_2} + s_n^{-\alpha_1}).$$

*Additionally, suppose Assumption A.5 holds, we have  $\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w = o_p(n^{-1/4})$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of consistency of  $\hat{\gamma}$  under the supremum norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  proceeds by verifying the conditions of Theorem 1 of Newey and Powell (2003). Assumptions 1-5 of Newey and Powell (2003) are satisfied by Assumption 5, Assumption A.1(i), Assumption A.2(ii) and

Assumption A.3(ii). Then applying Theorem 4.1 in Newey and Powell (2003), we obtain

$$\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1).$$

We denote  $\gamma_n = \Pi_n \gamma \in \Gamma_n$ . By the definition of  $\hat{\gamma}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\gamma_n - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

By Lemma E.1, (C.1) implies that there exist constants  $C, C' > 0$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & CE[\{E(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] \\ & \leq C' E[\{E(R\gamma_n - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] + O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

By Assumption A.2(ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\{E(R\gamma_n - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] \\ & = E[(E[R(\gamma_n - \gamma) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y])^2] \leq \|\gamma_n - \gamma\|_\infty^2 = O(s_n^{-2\alpha_1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

By the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_w$ , we have

$$E[\{E(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] = \|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w^2. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Combining (C.2), (C.3) and (C.4) yields that

$$\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2} + s_n^{-2\alpha_1}).$$

■

## C.2 Convergence rate of $\hat{\mu}_k$

The convergence rates of  $\hat{\mu}_k$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$  under  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  are established in the following theorem.

**Theorem C.2.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1–A.4 and A.6 in the supplementary material hold. If  $\max\{s_n^{-2\alpha_1}, l_n^{-2\alpha_2}, l_n/n\} = o(n^{-1/2})$ ,  $0 < \lambda_k = o(n^{-1/2})$  and  $\max\{t_{kn}/n, t_{kn}^{-2\alpha_{3k}}\} = o(\lambda_k)$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K+1\}$ , then we have*

$$\|\hat{\mu}_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = O_p(\sqrt{\lambda_{K+1}}), \quad \|\hat{\mu}_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1}\|_\infty = O_p(\zeta_{2(K+1)n} \sqrt{\lambda_{K+1}}),$$

and for  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ ,

$$\|\widehat{\mu}_k - \mu_k\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = O_p(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_{3j}}), \quad \|\widehat{\mu}_k - \mu_k\|_{\infty} = O_p\left\{\zeta_{2kn}(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_{3j}})\right\}.$$

*Proof.* We first calculate the convergence rate of  $\widehat{\mu}_{K+1}$ . For notational simplicity, throughout the proof of this theorem we use the abbreviation  $\alpha_3$  and  $t_n$  to denote  $\alpha_{3,K+1}$  and  $t_{K+1,n}$  when no confusion arises. Let  $T \triangleq I(A = a_{K+1})$  and  $T_i \triangleq I(A_i = a_{K+1})$ . By Assumption A.4(ii), there exists  $\mu_{K+1,n}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) = \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}$  with  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_n}$  such that

$$\sup_{(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K)| = O(t_n^{-\alpha_3}). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Recall that  $\widehat{\mu}_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) = \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1}$  with

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \widehat{\gamma}_i) \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^\top \right\}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \widehat{\gamma}_i) Y_i \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}),$$

Then by Assumption A.4(i)(iv),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mu}_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} &\leq \|\widehat{\mu}_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1,n}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \|\mu_{K+1,n} - \mu_{K+1}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\ &\leq \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}\| \text{Eig}_{\max}^{1/2}(E\{\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(M, X^*) \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(M, X^*)^\top\}) \\ &\quad + \sup_{(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K)| \\ &\lesssim \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}\| + O(t_n^{-\alpha_3}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where  $\text{Eig}_{\max}(\cdot)$  indicates the maximal eigenvalue of a matrix, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mu}_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1}\|_{\infty} &\leq \|\widehat{\mu}_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1,n}\|_{\infty} + \|\mu_{K+1,n} - \mu_{K+1}\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}\| \sup_{(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_K} \|\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K)\| \\ &\quad + \sup_{(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K)| \\ &\lesssim \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}\| \zeta_{2(K+1)n} + O(t_n^{-\alpha_3}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Combining (C.6), (C.7) and the result

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}\| = O_p(\sqrt{\lambda_{K+1}}). \quad (\text{C.8})$$

that we will prove soon later yields the theorem. Now we prove (C.8) holds under Assumptions A.1, A.4 and A.6. Following Newey (1997), by Assumption 3 and A.4(i),

and Theorem C.1, with probability approaching one

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^\top \right\}^{-1}$$

is invertible and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}\| \\ & \lesssim \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{Y_i - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\} \right\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9a})$$

$$+ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\} \right\| \quad (\text{C.9b})$$

$$+ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{\mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\} \right\|. \quad (\text{C.9c})$$

For term (C.9a), following Newey (1997), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{Y_i - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\} \right\| \\ & \lesssim \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\} \right\| \\ & \quad + \sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)| \\ & = O_P(\sqrt{t_n/n} + t_n^{-\alpha_3}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

For term (C.9b), we define

$$W_{ij}(\tilde{\gamma}) = T_i R_i \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_i, Y_i) u_j(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\}.$$

Note that  $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}(\hat{\gamma})$  is a plug-in estimator of smooth functionals where the nonparametric component  $\tilde{\gamma}$  depends on endogenous variables and is estimated by the sieve minimum distance. Under Assumptions A.1, A.2, A.3 and A.6, Ai and Chen (2007) showed that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}(\hat{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}(\gamma) = -E\{1 + R\varepsilon_{K+1} u_j(M, X) h_{K+1,j}^*(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^{-1} \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E\{R h_{K+1,j}^* | Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\} \{R_i \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_i, Y_i) - 1 + R\} + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$



It follows that

$$|(\text{C.9b})| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{t_n} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}(\hat{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ij}(\gamma) \right|^2} = O_p(\sqrt{t_n/n}),$$

since  $E(R\gamma - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = 0$  almost surely. For term (C.9c), we define

$$V_{ij}(\tilde{\gamma}) = T_i R_i \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_i, Y_i) u_j(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{\mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})\},$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, t_n$ , and  $V_{i\cdot}(\tilde{\gamma}) = (V_{i1}(\tilde{\gamma}), \dots, V_{it_n}(\tilde{\gamma}))^\top$ . Define the class of functions

$$\mathcal{G}_j = \{tru_j(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) \{\mu_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)\} \tilde{\gamma}(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{G}_j$  consists of functions that is linear and hence Lipschitz continuous in  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , then Theorem 2.7.11 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) implies that  $N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_j, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq N(\epsilon/C, \Gamma, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  for some  $C > 0$ . Thus, by Assumption A.1 and then Theorem 2.5.6 and 2.7.1 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), we have  $\mathcal{G}_j$  is a Donsker class. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{ij}(\tilde{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{ij}(\gamma) - E\{V_{ij}(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{i\cdot}(\tilde{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{i\cdot}(\gamma) - E\{V_{i\cdot}(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\} \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{t_n} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{ij}(\tilde{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{ij}(\gamma) - E\{V_{ij}(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\} \right|^2 = o_p(t_n/n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|E\{V_{i\cdot}(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\}\|^2 \\ &\leq \text{Eig}_{\max}^{-1}(E\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^\top\}) E\{TR(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)(\mu_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1,n}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\}^\top \\ &\quad \times E\{\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^\top\}^{-1} E\{TR(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)(\mu_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1,n}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\} \\ &\lesssim E\left[\{TR(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)(\mu_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1,n})\}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)|^2 \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty^2 = o(t_n^{-2\alpha_3}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.12})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ , where the second inequality is because the product is the squared norm of  $\mathcal{L}_2$ -projection of  $TR(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)(\mu_{K+1} - \mu_{K+1,n})$  on the space linearly spanned by  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)$ . We denote  $\Gamma_0 = \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ .

By Chebyshev's inequality, (C.11) and (C.12) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\text{C.9c})|^2 &\leq \sup_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i(\tilde{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \{ \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \} \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(\tilde{\gamma}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(\gamma) - E\{V_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\} \right\|^2 + \sup_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0} \|E\{V_i(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\}\|^2 \\
&= o_p(t_n/n + t_n^{-2\alpha_3}).
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\max\{t_n/n, t_n^{-\alpha_3}\} = o(\lambda_{K+1})$ , then combining the results of (C.9a)-(C.9c) yields (C.8).

Next, we calculate the convergence rate of  $\hat{\mu}_K$ . Let  $S \triangleq I(A = a_K)$  and  $S_i \triangleq I(A_i = a_K)$ . By Assumption A.4(ii), there exists  $\mu_{K_n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1}) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1})^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_K$  with  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{K_n}}$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mu_K(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1}) - \mu_{K_n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1})| = O(t_{K_n}^{-\alpha_3 K}). \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Recall that  $\hat{\mu}_K(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1}) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1})^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_K$  with

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_K &= \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i(1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i})^\top \right\}^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i(1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to part (i), the convergence rate of  $\hat{\mu}_K$  in Theorem C.2 is obtained following the conclusion

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_K - \boldsymbol{\pi}_K\| = O_p(\sqrt{\lambda_K} + t_n^{-\alpha_3}). \quad (\text{C.14})$$

Now we prove (C.14) holds under Assumptions A.1, A.4 and A.6. Suppose  $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{1,K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{1,K+1}\|$  satisfies (C.14). Following Newey (1997), by Assumptions 3 and A.4(i), with probability approaching one

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i(1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i})^\top \right\}^{-1}$$

is invertible and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_K - \boldsymbol{\pi}_K\| \\
&\lesssim \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i(1 + \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K_n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \} \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \} \right\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \mu_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) - \mu_{Kn}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \} \right\| \\
& + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \} \right\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.15}$$

Similar to (C.9a), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{Kn}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \} \right\| \\
& = O_P(\sqrt{t_{Kn}/n} + t_{Kn}^{-\alpha_{3K}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.16}$$

Similar to (C.9b), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \} \right\| \\
& = O_p(\sqrt{t_{Kn}/n}),
\end{aligned} \tag{C.17}$$

Similar to (C.9c), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \mu_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) - \mu_{Kn}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \} \right\| \\
& = o_p(\sqrt{t_{Kn}/n} + t_{Kn}^{-\alpha_{3K}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.18}$$

We consider the last term of (C.15). For any  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ , we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \} \right\| \\
& \lesssim \sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)| \\
& + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \} \right\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.19}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - E[SR(1 + \tilde{\gamma}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^\top] (\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}) \right\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}) u_{K_j}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - E[SR(1 + \tilde{\gamma})u_{K_j}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1})\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^T] \right\|^2 \cdot \left\| (\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}) \right\|^2 \\
&= O(t_{K_n}) \cdot O_p(t_n/n) \cdot O_p(\lambda_{K+1}) = o_p(t_{K_n}/n), \tag{C.20}
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$  by (C.8) because  $\mathcal{G}_{ij} \equiv \{sr(1 + \tilde{\gamma})u_{K,i}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K-1})u_j(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, t_{K_n}$  and  $j = 1, \dots, t_n$  are Donsker by Assumption A.1 and Theorem 2.5.6, 2.7.1 and 2.7.11 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996). Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} &= E\{TR(1 + \gamma)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^T\}^{-1} \\
&\quad \times E\{SR(1 + \gamma)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1})^T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_n \times t_{K_n}},
\end{aligned}$$

and  $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j$  is the  $j$ -th column of  $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$ . By Assumptions 3 and A.4(i) and Theorem C.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| E[SR(1 + \tilde{\gamma})\bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1})\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)^T](\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{K+1} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{K+1}) \right\|^2 \\
&\lesssim \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) (Y_i - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \right\|^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) (Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) (\mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) (Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j \right|^2 \\
&\quad + \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) (\mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \right\|^2, \tag{C.21}
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Notice that  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j$  is the weighted  $\mathcal{L}_2$  projection of  $u_{K_j}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K}(a_K | x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)/f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K}(a_{K+1} | x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)$  on the linear space spanned by  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)$  and thus has finite second moment by Assumption 3 and A.4(i). Then by Assumption A.1, similar to (C.9b), we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) (Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j \right|^2 = O_p(t_{K_n}/n). \tag{C.22}$$

Similar to (C.9c), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) (\mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j \right|^2 \\ &= o_p(t_{K_n}/n + t_n^{-2\alpha_3}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

We also have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t_{K_n}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) (Y_i - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})^T \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_j \right|^2 = O_p(t_{K_n}/n), \quad (\text{C.24})$$

because  $E[I(A = a_{K+1})R(1 + \gamma)(Y - \mu_{K+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K)) \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K] = 0$ . By Assumption 3, Assumption A.4(i),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}^T \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i R_i (1 + \gamma_i) (\mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1,n}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i})) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \right\|^2 \\ & \lesssim \sup_{(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) \in \mathcal{X} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K} |\mu_{K+1}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K) - \mu_{K+1,n}(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K)|^2 = O_p(t_n^{-2\alpha_3}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.25})$$

Combining (C.19)–(C.25) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_K(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K-1,i}) \{ \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) - \mu_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \} \right\| \\ &= O_p(\sqrt{t_{K_n}/n} + t_n^{-\alpha_3}). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $\max\{\sqrt{t_{K_n}/n}, t_{K_n}^{-\alpha_3 K}\} = o(\lambda_K)$ , then (C.14) follows, and we obtain

$$\|\hat{\mu}_K - \mu_K\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = O_p(\sqrt{\lambda_K} + t_n^{-\alpha_3}), \quad \text{and} \|\hat{\mu}_K - \mu_K\|_{\infty} = O_p\left\{ \zeta_{2K_n}(\sqrt{\lambda_K} + t_n^{-\alpha_3}) \right\}.$$

For  $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ , we can obtain

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_k - \boldsymbol{\pi}_k\| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_3 j}\right). \quad (\text{C.26})$$

iteratively following very similar procedure of calculating  $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_K - \boldsymbol{\pi}_K\|$ . It follows that

$$\|\hat{\mu}_k - \mu_k\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = O_p\left(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_3 j}\right), \quad \|\hat{\mu}_k - \mu_k\|_{\infty} = O_p\left\{ \zeta_{2kn}(\sqrt{\lambda_k} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_3 j}) \right\}.$$

Then we complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

## APPENDIX D Asymptotic normality

### D.1 Proof of Theorem 1.

*Proof.* Let  $0 < \epsilon_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ , and  $\varrho_0$  satisfies Assumption 6. Let  $\varrho_n = \Pi_n \varrho_0 \in \Gamma_n$  with the operator  $\Pi_n$  defined in Assumption A.2(ii). By Assumption A.2(i),  $\hat{\gamma} \pm \epsilon_n \varrho_n \in \Gamma_n$ . By the definition of  $\hat{\gamma}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\hat{E}\{R(\hat{\gamma} \pm \epsilon_n \varrho_n) - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\}]^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \pm \epsilon_n \hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\
&= \frac{\pm \epsilon_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \\
&\quad + \frac{\epsilon_n^2}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2, \tag{D.1}
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $0 < \epsilon_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ . By lemma E.5 and Assumption A.1(i), A.2 and A.3(iii), we have

$$\frac{\epsilon_n^2}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 = O_p(\epsilon_n^2). \tag{D.2}$$

Combining (D.1) and (D.2) yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \tag{D.3}$$

Then by Lemmas E.2 and E.3, Theorem C.1, Assumption A.5(i), and the Cauchy Schwarz inequality, (D.3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - \hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{E}(R\hat{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \tag{D.4}
\end{aligned}$$

We denote  $\widehat{E}^{(d)}(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \triangleq \widehat{E}\{E(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\}$ . By exchanging summation, (D.4) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{E}^{(d)}(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - 1 + R_i\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Then by Lemma E.4, Theorem C.1 and Assumption A.5(i), (D.5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - 1 + R_i\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{E(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - \widehat{E}^{(d)}(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{R_i \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - 1 + R_i\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{E}^{(d)}(R_{\varrho_0} \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - 1 + R_i\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Recall the definition of  $\omega_1(x) = f_{A|X}(a_1 \mid x)^{-1}$ . By Assumption A.4(iii), there exists  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{1n}}$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\omega_1(x) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{21}| = O(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_4}). \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mu}_1(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \widehat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \right\}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \widehat{\mu}_1(X_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \\ & \quad \times \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \right]^{-1} \\ & \quad \times \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \widehat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \widehat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \widehat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{\hat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) = 0. \quad (\text{D.8})$$

By Assumption A.5(ii), Theorems C.1 and C.2, (D.7) and (D.8) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \omega_1(X_i) \{\hat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{\omega_1(X_i) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{21}\} \{\hat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{\hat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{21} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\omega_1(x) - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{21}| = O_p(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_4}) = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Similarly we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_k) R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k \omega_j(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1,i}) \right\} \left\{ \hat{\mu}_{k+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) - \hat{\mu}_k(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i}) \right\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.10})$$

for  $k \in \{2, \dots, K\}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_{K+1}) R_i \{1 + \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{K+1} \omega_j(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1,i}) \right\} \left\{ Y_i - \hat{\mu}_{K+1}(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}) \right\} = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{K+1})$  and define

$$\begin{aligned} & \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = R \{1 + \boldsymbol{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \\ & \quad \times \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K I(A = a_k) \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^k \omega_j(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1}) \right\} \left\{ \mu_{k+1}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_k) - \mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + I(A = a_{K+1}) \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{K+1} \omega_j(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1}) \right\} \left\{ Y - \mu_{K+1, \mathbf{a}_{K+1}}(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K) \right\} \right] \\ & \quad - E\{R \varrho_0(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \{R \boldsymbol{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - 1 + R\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.12})$$



Then combining (D.6), (D.9), (D.10) and (D.11) yields that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i; \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}) = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{D.13})$$

Finally, recalling that

$$\hat{\psi} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{R_i \hat{\mu}_1(X_i) + R_i \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi} - \psi &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{R_i \hat{\mu}_1(X_i) + R_i \hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{\mu}_1(X_i)\} - \psi \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{R_i \mu_1(X_i) + R_i \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \mu_1(X_i)\} - \psi \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{\hat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \mu_1(X_i)\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{\hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \mu_1(X_i)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.14})$$

By Lemma E.6, Theorems C.1 and C.2, Assumption A.1 and A.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{\hat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \mu_1(X_i)\} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{\hat{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \hat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i) \mu_1(X_i)\} \\ &- E \left[ R \{\hat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X)\} + R \{\hat{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y) \hat{\mu}_1(X) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y) \mu_1(X)\} \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i; \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{M}_{K,i}, Y_i; \gamma, \mu) \\ &- E \left[ \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y; \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}) - \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y; \gamma, \mu) \right] = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.15})$$

Recalling the definition of  $\phi$  in the main text, the pathwise derivative of

$$E[R\mu_1(X) + R\gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\mu_1(X) + \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y; \gamma, \mu)]$$

with respect to  $(\gamma, \mu)$  in the direction  $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mu})$  evaluated at the true value, denoted by  $A(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mu})$ , is

$$\begin{aligned} A(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mu}) &= E \left[ R \{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\} \{1 - I(A = a_1) \omega_1(X)\} \tilde{\mu}_1(X) \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=2}^{K+1} E \left[ R \{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{M}_K, Y)\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_j(X, \bar{M}_{j-1}) \right\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times \left\{ I(A = a_{k-1}) - I(A = a_k) \omega_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \right\} \tilde{\mu}_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \Big] \\
& + E\{R\phi(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \\
& - E\{E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, X) R \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}. \tag{D.16}
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 6 and lemma 1 in the main text, (D.16) implies that

$$A(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mu}) \equiv 0, \tag{D.17}$$

for any  $\tilde{\gamma}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Then by Lemma E.7 and Assumptions A.1 and A.4, and Theorem C.1, (D.17) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[ R\{\hat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X)\} + R\{\hat{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \hat{\mu}_1(X) - \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mu_1(X)\} \right] \\
& + E\left[ \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}) - \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \gamma, \mu) \right] \\
& = A(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma, \hat{\mu} - \mu) + \mathfrak{R}(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}) = o_p(n^{-1/2}), \tag{D.18}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{R}(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\mu}) & \triangleq E\left[ R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{1 - I(A = a_1) \omega_1(X)\} \{\tilde{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X)\} \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=2}^{K+1} E\left[ R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_j(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1}) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \{I(A = a_{k-1}) - I(A = a_k) \omega_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\} \{\tilde{\mu}_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - \mu_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (D.13), (D.14), (D.15) and (D.18) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi} - \psi & = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{R_i \mu_1(X_i) + R_i \gamma(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \mu_1(X_i)\} - \psi \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i; \gamma, \mu) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\
& = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n IF(R_i, Z_i, X_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& IF(R, Z, RX, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \\
& = R\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \phi(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \psi \\
& \quad - E\{R\varrho(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \{R\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - 1 + R\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Theorem 1 is derived following the central limit theorem and the Slutsky theorem.  $\blacksquare$

## D.2 Efficiency of $\widehat{\psi}$

We demonstrate that the proposed estimator  $\widehat{\psi}$  is locally efficient in the sense that it attains the semiparametric efficiency bound for  $\psi$  in the semiparametric model  $\mathcal{M}_{sp}$  under the following condition, which is a symmetric counterpart of Assumption 5.

**Assumption D.1** (Completeness). *For any squared-integrable function  $g$  and for any  $a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y$ ,  $E\{g(Z) \mid X, A=a, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K=\bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, Y=y\} = 0$  almost surely if and only if  $g(Z) = 0$  almost surely.*

**Proposition 1.** *The estimator  $\widehat{\psi}$  attains the semiparametric efficiency bound of  $\psi$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{sp}$  at the submodels where Assumption D.1 holds.*

*Proof.* In order to demonstrate that the proposed estimator  $\widehat{\psi}$  is efficient, we present a proof in two steps. Firstly, we derive the tangent space, and secondly, we show the influence function derived in Theorem 1 belongs to the tangent space. The distribution of observed data  $O = (R, RX, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  is

$$f(O) = f(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \{f(X \mid R=1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)f(R=1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^R \\ \times \{f(R=0 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^{1-R}.$$

Consider a regular parametric submodel  $f_\tau(O)$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{sp}$  indexed by  $\tau$  that equals  $f(O)$  when  $\tau = 0$ . Then the corresponding score is given by

$$S(O) = S(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) + R\{S(X \mid R=1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) + S(R=1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \\ - \frac{1-R}{\beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)} S(R=1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y),$$

where

$$S(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = \partial \log f_\tau(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) / \partial \tau|_{\tau=0}, \\ S(R=1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = \partial \log f_\tau(R=1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) / \partial \tau|_{\tau=0}, \\ S(X \mid R=1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = \partial \log f_\tau(X \mid R=1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) / \partial \tau|_{\tau=0}, \\ \beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = f(R=0 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) / f(R=1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y).$$

Recalling that

$$E\{\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R=1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} = \beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y),$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} E_t\{\gamma_t(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \beta_t(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R=1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\}|_{t=0} = 0.$$

Equivalently,

$$\int \frac{\partial \{\gamma_t(x, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \beta_t(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} f_t(x | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)}{\partial t} \Big|_{t=0} dx = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)S(X | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \\ & + \frac{S(R = 1 | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)}{f(R = 1 | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)} = -E \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_t(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{R\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)S(X | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \\ & + S(R = 1 | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) = -E \left\{ R \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_t(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \right\}. \quad (\text{D.19}) \end{aligned}$$

From (D.19), we obtain that the tangent space is  $\Lambda_1 \oplus \Lambda_2$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 &= \left\{ S(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \in \mathcal{L}_2(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) : E\{S(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} = 0 \right\}, \\ \Lambda_2 &= \left\{ RS(X | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \right. \\ & \quad + \left\{ R - (1 - R)/\beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \right\} S(R = 1 | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \in \Lambda_1^\perp : \\ & \quad E\{S(X | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} = 0, \text{ and} \\ & \quad E\{R\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)S(X | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \\ & \quad \left. + S(R = 1 | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the operator that maps  $g(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \in \mathcal{L}_2(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  to  $E\{g(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \in \mathcal{L}_2(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})$  is the range space of  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $A^\perp$  denotes the orthogonal complement of  $A$ , and  $\text{cl}(A)$  refers to the closure of  $A$ .

In order to show  $\hat{\psi}$  is efficient, we only need to show that the influence function derived in Theorem 1 belongs to the tangent space above. For notational simplicity, below we use  $\gamma$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\nu$  to denote  $\gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ ,  $\phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ ,  $\beta(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  and  $E(R\varrho_0 | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ , respectively. Then we have the following decomposition of the influence function

$$\begin{aligned} IF &= R(1 + \gamma)\phi - \psi - \nu(R\gamma - 1 + R) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta + 1} E\{(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} + \nu - \psi \\ & \quad + R(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) - RE\{(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} \\ & \quad + \left( R - \frac{1 - R}{\beta} \right) \frac{\beta}{\beta + 1} E\{(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) | R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\beta + 1} = f(R = 1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y),$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[ \frac{1}{\beta + 1} E\{(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} + \nu - \psi \right] \\ &= E \left[ E\{R(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y\} + \nu - \psi \right] \\ &= E[R(1 + \gamma)\phi + \nu(R\gamma - 1 + R) - \psi] = E(IF) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\frac{1}{\beta + 1} E[(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] + \nu - \psi \in \Lambda_1.$$

According to Assumption D.1, we have  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}') = 0$  and hence  $cl(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{T})) = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}')^\perp = \mathcal{L}_2(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ . Here  $\mathcal{T}'$  is the adjoint operator of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}')$  is its null space. Take

$$\begin{aligned} S(X \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) &= (1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) - E[(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y], \\ S(R = 1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) &= \frac{\beta}{\beta + 1} E[(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y]. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} & E[S(X \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] = 0, \text{ and} \\ & E \left[ R(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) S(X \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y \right] \\ & \quad + S(R = 1 \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \in \mathcal{L}_2(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y). \end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & R(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) - RE[(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] \\ & \quad + \left( R - \frac{1 - R}{\beta} \right) \frac{\beta}{\beta + 1} E[(1 + \gamma)(\phi - \nu) \mid R = 1, Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y] \in \Lambda_2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 1. ■

### D.3 Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof.* We first show that  $\omega_1(x) \triangleq f_{A|X}(a_1 \mid x)^{-1}$  satisfies the conditional moment restriction

$$E \left[ \{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{I(A = a_1)\omega_1(X) - 1\} \mid R = 1, X \right] = 0.$$

Note that it is equivalent to

$$E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_1) \mid R = 1, X]\omega_1(X) = E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, X\}.$$

So we only need to show that

$$\omega_1(X) = \frac{E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, X\}}{E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_1) \mid R = 1, X]}.$$

By the definition of  $\gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_1) \mid R = 1, X] \\ &= \iint \frac{f(A = a_1, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y \mid R = 1, X)}{f(R = 1 \mid X, A = a_1, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)} d\overline{\mathbf{m}}_K dy \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X)^{-1} \iint \frac{f(A = a_1, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y, R = 1 \mid X)}{f(R = 1 \mid X, A = a_1, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)} d\overline{\mathbf{m}}_K dy \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X)^{-1} \iint f(A = a_1, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y \mid X) d\overline{\mathbf{m}}_K dy \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X)^{-1} f(A = a_1 \mid X). \end{aligned} \tag{D.20}$$

Similarly, we can deduce that

$$E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, X\} = f(R = 1 \mid X)^{-1}. \tag{D.21}$$

Combining (D.20) and (D.21) yields that

$$\frac{E\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mid R = 1, X\}}{E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_1) \mid R = 1, X]} = f_{A|X}(a_1 \mid X)^{-1} = \omega_1(X),$$

which is the result we aim for.

Next we show that for  $k \in \{2, \dots, K + 1\}$ ,

$$\omega_k(x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}) \triangleq \frac{f_{A|X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}}(a_{k-1} \mid x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})}{f_{A|X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}}(a_k \mid x, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})}$$

satisfies the conditional moment restriction

$$E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}\{I(A = a_k)\omega_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - I(A = a_{k-1})\} \mid R = 1, X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}] = 0.$$

In the same way, the above moment restriction is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_k) \mid R = 1, X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]\omega_k(X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \\ &= E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_{k-1}) \mid R = 1, X, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

So we only need to show that

$$\omega_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) = \frac{E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_{k-1}) \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]}{E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_k) \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_k) \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}] \\ &= \iint \frac{f(A = a_k, \mathbf{m}_k, y \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})}{f(R = 1 \mid X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}, \mathbf{m}_k, y)} d\mathbf{m}_k dy \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} \iint \frac{f(A = a_k, \mathbf{m}_k, y, R = 1 \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})}{f(R = 1 \mid X, A = a_k, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}, \mathbf{m}_k, y)} d\mathbf{m}_k dy \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} \iint f(A = a_k, \mathbf{m}_k, y \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) d\mathbf{m}_k dy \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} f(A = a_k \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_{k-1}) \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}] \\ &= f(R = 1 \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})^{-1} f(A = a_{k-1} \mid X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_{k-1}) \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]}{E[\{1 + \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}I(A = a_k) \mid R = 1, X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}]} \\ &= \frac{f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}}(a_{k-1} \mid x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})}{f_{A|X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}}(a_k \mid x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1})} = \omega_k(x, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

## APPENDIX E Auxillary lemmas

**Lemma E.1.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1, A.2 and A.3 hold. Then there exists finite constants  $C, C' > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & CE[\{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] - O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\ & \leq C' E[\{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] + O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_n$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by verifying the conditions of Lemma C.2(ii) of [Chen and Pouzo \(2012\)](#). Assumption C.2(i) of [Chen and Pouzo \(2012\)](#) is satisfied since  $|R\gamma - 1 + R|$  is uniformly bounded over  $\gamma \in \Gamma_n \subset \Gamma$  by Assumption A.1(i) and Assumption A.2(i). Assumption C.2(i) of [Chen and Pouzo \(2012\)](#) is satisfied by Assumption A.3(ii) with their  $b_{m,J_n}^2$  being  $l_n^{-2\alpha_2}$  here. Denote

$$\mathcal{O}_j = \{f_j = p_j(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)(r\gamma - 1 + r) : \gamma \in \Gamma\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, l_n. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Note that  $f_j$  is linear and hence Lipschitz continuous in  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , and

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq l_n} E[p_j(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)^2] \lesssim 1,$$

by Assumption A.3(i). Then Theorem 2.7.11 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) implies that  $N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{O}_j, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}) \leq N(\epsilon/C, \Gamma, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  for some constant  $C > 0$ . Thus, by Assumption A.1 and then Theorem 2.5.6 and 2.7.1 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), we have

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq l_n} J_{[]}^2(1, \mathcal{O}_j, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}) \lesssim 1. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Thus, (E.2) implies that Assumption C.2(iii) of [Chen and Pouzo \(2012\)](#) is satisfied with their  $C_n \lesssim 1$ . In addition, Assumption C.1 of [Chen and Pouzo \(2012\)](#) is satisfied by Assumption A.1(iii) and Assumption A.3(i)(iii). Thus, the result of the lemma follows by Lemma C.2(ii) of [Chen and Pouzo \(2012\)](#).  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma E.2.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and A.3 hold. We have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}) + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w = o_p(n^{-1/4})\}$ .

*Proof.* For any  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ , by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{4}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{4}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{E}(1 - R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(1 - R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.3})$$



Define the class of functions  $\mathcal{G} = \{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^2 : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}$ . Note that for every  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |E(R\gamma_1 - 1 + R \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^2 - E(R\gamma_2 - 1 + R \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^2| \\ & \leq |E\{R(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y\}| \times |E\{R(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) - 2 + 2R \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y\}| \\ & \lesssim \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Assumption A.1 and Theorem 2.5.6, 2.7.1 and 2.7.11 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), we conclude  $\mathcal{G}$  is a Donsker class. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 - E[\{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] = o_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{E.4})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . By the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_w$  and (4), we know

$$E[\{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\}^2] = \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w^2. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Combining (E.4) and (E.5) yields that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 = o_p(n^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{E.6})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w = o_p(n^{-1/4})\}$ . By Lemma E.5, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}), \quad (\text{E.7})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . Following [Newey \(1997\)](#), we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(1 - R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(1 - R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}). \quad (\text{E.8})$$

Then the proof is completed by combining (E.3), (E.6)–(E.8). ■

**Lemma E.3.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1, A.2 and A.3 hold. We have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 = O_p(\sqrt{l_n/n} + l_n^{-\alpha_2} + s_n^{-\alpha_1}).$$

*Proof.* By Cauchy Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\}^2 \\
& \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ E\{R(\varrho_n - \varrho_0) \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\} \right]^2. \tag{E.9}
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $\varrho_n = \Pi_n \varrho_0$  and Assumption A.2(ii), we have

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ E\{R(\varrho_n - \varrho_0) \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i\} \right]^2 \lesssim \|\varrho_n - \varrho_0\|_\infty^2 = O_p(s_n^{-2\alpha_1}). \tag{E.10}$$

By Lemma E.5,  $\varrho_n \in \Gamma_n \subset \Gamma$ , and assumption A.3, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{E}(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\varrho_n \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\}^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}). \tag{E.11}$$

Combining (E.9), (E.10) and (E.11) yields the result of the lemma.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma E.4.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and A.3 hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{E}^{(d)}(R\varrho_0 \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\} \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - 1 + R_i\} \\
& = O_p\{l_n^{-\alpha_2}(\sqrt{l_n/n} + l_n^{-\alpha_2})\} + o_p(n^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w = o_p(n^{-1/4})\}$ , where the notation  $\widehat{E}^{(d)}$  is defined in (D.5).

*Proof.* For notational simplicity, we denote  $g(Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \triangleq E(R\varrho_0 \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$  and  $\widehat{g}(Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \triangleq \widehat{E}^{(d)}(R\varrho_0 \mid Z, A, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)$ . By Assumption A.3(ii), there exists  $g_n(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) = \overline{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_g$  such that

$$\sup_{(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |g(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - g_n(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)| = O(l_n^{-\alpha_2}). \tag{E.12}$$

Note that  $\widehat{g}(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) = \overline{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \overline{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_g$  with

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_g = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \overline{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)^\top \right\}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \overline{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) g(Z_i, A_i, \overline{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i), \tag{E.13}$$

Then by Assumption A.3(i), with probability approaching one

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)^\top \right\}$$

is invertible and

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_g - \boldsymbol{\pi}_g\| \lesssim \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |g(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - g_n(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)| = O_p(l_n^{-\alpha_2}). \quad (\text{E.14})$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}^2 \\ & \lesssim \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_g - \boldsymbol{\pi}_g\|^2 + \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |g(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - g_n(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)|^2 = O_p(l_n^{-2\alpha_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.15})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} (R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i) \\ & = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} E(R \tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \\ & \quad \times \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R \tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.16})$$

Combining (E.6) and (E.15), by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} E(R \tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \\ & = o_p(n^{-1/2}) + O_p(l_n^{-2\alpha_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.17})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_w = o_p(n^{-1/4})\}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R \tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right| \\ & \leq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_g - \boldsymbol{\pi}_g\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R \tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right\| \\ & \quad + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g_n(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R \tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.18})$$

By Assumption A.1 and Theorem 2.5.6, 2.7.1 and 2.7.11 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we conclude  $\mathcal{G}_j = \{tp_j(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)\{r\tilde{\gamma} - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)\} : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, l_n$ , are Donsker. It implies that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n p_j(M_i, Y_i, Z_i) \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} = O_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . Then we obtain

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{p}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right\| = O_p(\sqrt{l_n/n}), \quad (\text{E.19})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . By Chebyshev's inequality, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g_n(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right| = O_p(n^{-1/2} l_n^{-\alpha_2}). \quad (\text{E.20})$$

Combining (E.16), (E.19) and (E.20) yields that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\hat{g}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - g(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}_i - 1 + R_i - E(R\tilde{\gamma} - 1 + R \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right| = O_p(l_n^{-\alpha_2} \sqrt{l_n/n}), \quad (\text{E.21})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . Combining (E.16), (E.17) and (E.21) yields the result of the lemma.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma E.5.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and A.3 hold. Then we have*

$$\sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0, 1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} \left| \hat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \right| = O_p(\zeta_{1n}(\sqrt{l_n/n} + l_n^{-\alpha_2}) + l_n^{-\alpha_2}),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \hat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\}^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ .

*Proof.* For any  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ , let

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\tilde{\gamma}} = (\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{P})^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) R_i \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i).$$

Then  $\hat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) = \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ . By Assumption A.3(ii), there exists  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_n}$  such that

$$\sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^T \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}| = O(l_n^{-\alpha_2}), \quad (\text{E.22})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . By the triangle inequality and Assumption A.3(i)(iii), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} \left| \hat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \right| \\ & \leq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\tilde{\gamma}} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}\| \zeta_{1n} + \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^T \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.23})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \hat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\}^2 \\ & \lesssim \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\tilde{\gamma}} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}\|^2 \text{Eig}_{\max}(E\{\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)^T\}) \\ & \quad + \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^T \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.24})$$

Following Newey (1997), by Assumption A.3(i), with probability approaching one  $(\mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{P})/n$  is invertible and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{\tilde{\gamma}} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}\| & \lesssim \sup_{(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} |E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)^T \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\tilde{\gamma}}| \\ & \quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.25})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . Note that  $p_j(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)r\tilde{\gamma}$  is linear and hence Lipschitz continuous in  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  under  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ . Then by Assumption A.1 and Theorem 2.5.6, 2.7.1 and 2.7.11 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we conclude  $\mathcal{G}_j = \{p_j(z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)r\tilde{\gamma} : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, l_n$  is Donsker. It follows that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{l_n}(Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \{R_i \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i)\} \right\| = O_p(\sqrt{l_n/n}), \quad (\text{E.26})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . Combining (E.22), (E.23), (E.25) and (E.26) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(z,a,\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K,y}) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0,1\} \times \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K \times \mathcal{Y}} \left| \widehat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K,y}) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_{K,y}) \right| \\ & = O_p(\zeta_{1n}(\sqrt{l_n/n} + l_n^{-\alpha_2}) + l_n^{-\alpha_2}), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . And Combining (E.22), (E.24), (E.25) and (E.26) yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \widehat{E}(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R\tilde{\gamma} \mid Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \right\}^2 = O_p(l_n/n + l_n^{-2\alpha_2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

**Lemma E.6.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1, A.4 and A.5 hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ \widehat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \mu_1(X_i) \} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \widehat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \mu_1(X_i) \} \\ & - E \left[ R \{ \widehat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X) \} + R \{ \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \widehat{\mu}_1(X) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mu_1(X) \} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i; \tilde{\gamma}, \widehat{\mu}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i; \gamma, \mu) \\ & - E \left[ \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \tilde{\gamma}, \widehat{\mu}) - \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \gamma, \mu) \right] = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1) \}$ .

*Proof.* We first notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ \widehat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \mu_1(X_i) \} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \widehat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \mu_1(X_i) \} \\ & - E \left[ R \{ \widehat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X) \} + R \{ \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \widehat{\mu}_1(X) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \mu_1(X) \} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i; \tilde{\gamma}, \widehat{\mu}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi(R_i, Z_i, X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i; \gamma, \mu) \\ & - E \left[ \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \tilde{\gamma}, \widehat{\mu}) - \varpi(R, Z, X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y; \gamma, \mu) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \} \{ 1 - I(A_i = a_1) \omega_1(X_i) \} \{ \widehat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \mu_1(X_i) \} \\ & - E \left[ R \{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \} \{ 1 - I(A = a_1) \omega_1(X) \} \{ \widehat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X) \} \right] \tag{E.27} \\ & + \sum_{k=2}^{K+1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_j(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1,i}) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \{ I(A_i = a_{k-1}) - I(A_i = a_k) \omega_k(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i}) \} \{ \widehat{\mu}_k(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i}) - \mu_k(X_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1,i}) \} \right. \\ & \left. - E \left[ R \{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_j(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1}) \right\} \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \left\{ I(A = a_{k-1}) - I(A = a_k) \omega_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \right\} \left\{ \hat{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - \mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \right\} \Big] \Big) \quad (\text{E.28})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - \gamma(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \} \{ \phi(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) - E(R_{\varrho_0} | Z_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \} \\ &- E \left[ R \{ \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \} \{ \phi(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - E(R_{\varrho_0} | Z, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.29})$$

In what follows, we will show that (E.27)–(E.29) are all  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ . We consider (E.27). By Assumption A.4(ii), there exist  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{1n}}$  such that  $\mu_{1n}(x) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{11}$  and

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mu_1(x) - \mu_{1n}(x)| = O_p(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_{31}}).$$

Let  $\epsilon = 1 - I(A = a_1) \omega_1(X)$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X_i, A_i, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{K,i}, Y_i) \} \{ 1 - I(A_i = a_1) \omega_1(X_i) \} \{ \hat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \mu_1(X_i) \} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - E \left[ R \{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) \} \{ 1 - I(A = a_1) \omega_1(X) \} \{ \hat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X) \} \right] \right| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mu_1(x) - \mu_{1n}(x)| \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}_i) \epsilon_i \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) - E \{ R (1 + \tilde{\gamma}) \epsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X) \} \right] \right\| \cdot \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{11} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{11}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.30})$$

Because  $r\epsilon u_{1j}(x)(1 + \tilde{\gamma})$  for  $j = 1, \dots, t_{1n}$  is linear and hence Lipschitz continuous in  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , by Assumption A.1 and Theorem 2.5.6, 2.7.1 and 2.7.11 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), we conclude  $\mathcal{G}_j = \{r\epsilon u_{1j}(x)(1 + \tilde{\gamma}) : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}$  is Donsker. It follows that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ R_i (1 + \tilde{\gamma}_i) \epsilon_i \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i) - E \{ R (1 + \tilde{\gamma}) \epsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X) \} \right] \right\| = O_p(\sqrt{t_{1n}/n}), \quad (\text{E.31})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ . By Assumption A.5, combining (C.26), (E.30) and (E.31) yield that

$$(\text{E.27}) = O_p(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_{31}}) + O_p(\sqrt{t_{1n}/n}) O_p(\sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sum_{j=2}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_{3j}}) = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Similarly, we can obtain (E.28) =  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ . As for (E.29), note that  $r\tilde{\gamma}\{\phi(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - E(R_{\varrho_0} | z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)\}$  is linear and hence Lipschitz continuous in  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . Then by Assumption A.1 and Theorem 2.5.6, 2.7.1 and 2.7.11 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), we conclude  $\mathcal{G} = \{r\tilde{\gamma}\{\phi(x, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y) - E(R_{\varrho_0} | z, a, \bar{\mathbf{m}}_K, y)\} : \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma\}$  is a Donsker class. Thus the stochastic equicontinuity implies that (E.29) =  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$  uniformly over  $\{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Then we complete the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma E.7.** *Suppose Assumptions A.1, A.4 and A.5 hold. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{1 - I(A = a_1)\omega_1(X)\} \{\hat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X)\}] \\
& + \sum_{k=2}^{K+1} E\left[R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_j(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1}) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \{I(A = a_{k-1}) - I(A = a_k)\omega_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\} \{\hat{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - \mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1})\} \right] \\
& = o_p(n^{-1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ .

*Proof.* By Assumption A.4(ii), there exist  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{t_{1n}}$  such that  $\mu_{1n}(x) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\pi}_{11}$  and

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mu_1(x) - \mu_{1n}(x)| = O_p(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_{31}}).$$

Let  $\epsilon = 1 - I(A = a_1)\omega_1(X)$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| E[R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{1 - I(A = a_1)\omega_1(X)\} \{\hat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X)\}] \right| \\
& \lesssim \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mu_1(x) - \mu_{1n}(x)| + \left| E\{R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)^\top\} \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{11} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{11}\} \right|. \tag{E.32}
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 \triangleq E[I(A = a_1)R(1 + \gamma)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)^\top]^{-1}E[R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \\
& = E \left[ \frac{E\{R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon | X\}}{\sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)}} \sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X) \right] \\
& \quad \times E[f(a_1 | X)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)\bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)^\top]^{-1} \sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)
\end{aligned}$$

is the  $\mathcal{L}_2$ -projection of  $\frac{E\{R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon | X\}}{\sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)}}$  on the space linearly spanned by  $\{\sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)\}$ .

Thus we obtain

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(x)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} - \frac{E\{R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon | X\}}{\sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)}} \right| = o(1). \tag{E.33}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |E[R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)^\top](\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{11} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{11})| \\
& \lesssim \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i (1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \{\hat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \mu_{1n}(X_i)\} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right|
\end{aligned}$$



$$\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i (1 + \gamma_i) \{ \mu_1(X_i) - \mu_{1n}(X_i) \} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right| \quad (\text{E.34a})$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i (1 + \gamma_i) \{ \mu_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \mu_1(X_i) \} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right| \quad (\text{E.34b})$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \{ \mu_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \mu_1(X_i) \} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right| \quad (\text{E.34c})$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i) \{ \mu_1(X_i) - \mu_{1n}(X_i) \} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right| \quad (\text{E.34d})$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(A_i = a_1) R_i (1 + \hat{\gamma}_i) \{ \hat{\mu}_2(X_i, M_{1i}) - \mu_2(X_i, M_{1i}) \} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X_i)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \right|. \quad (\text{E.34e})$$

Assumption A.4(ii), A.5(ii) and (E.33) implies that

$$(\text{E.34a}) \lesssim \sup_{(m,x) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}} |\mu_1(x) - \mu_{1n}(x)| \cdot \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = O_p(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_{31}}) o_p(1) = o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Note that (E.33) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & E|(\text{E.34b})|^2 \\ &= n^{-1} E \left[ \{ I(A = a_1) R (1 + \gamma) \{ \mu_2(X, M_1) - \mu_1(X) \} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \}^2 \right] \\ &= n^{-1} E \left[ \left\{ \frac{I(A = a_1) R (1 + \gamma) \{ \mu_2(X, M_1) - \mu_1(X) \}}{\sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)}} \cdot \frac{E\{R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon | X\}}{\sqrt{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)}} \right\}^2 \right] \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\ &\lesssim n^{-1} E \left[ \frac{E \left[ I(A = a_1) R (1 + \gamma)^2 \{ \mu_2(X, M_1) - \mu_1(X) \}^2 | X \right]}{f_{A|X}(a_1 | X)^2} R (\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)^2 \epsilon^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim n^{-1} \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty^2 = o(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Then the Chebyshev inequality implies that (E.34b) =  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ . Similar to (C.9b), we can obtain (E.34c) =  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$  under Assumptions A.1, A.2, A.3 and A.6. Similarly to (C.9c), we obtain (E.34d) =  $o_p(t_{1n}^{-\alpha_{31}}) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$  by Assumption A.5. As for (E.34e), it can be calculated similar to the last term of (C.15). Then we obtain

$$(\text{E.34e}) \lesssim \|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty \cdot O_p(n^{-1/2} + \sum_{j=2}^{K+1} t_{jn}^{-\alpha_{3j}}) = o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Combing above arguments implies that

$$\left| E\{R(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)\epsilon \bar{\mathbf{u}}_1(X)^\top\} \{ \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_{11} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_{11} \} \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{E.35})$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Combining (E.32) and (E.35) yields

that

$$E\left[R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \{1 - I(A = a_1)\omega_1(X)\} \{\hat{\mu}_1(X) - \mu_1(X)\}\right] = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

uniformly over  $\tilde{\gamma} \in \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty = o_p(1)\}$ . Similarly we can obtain

$$E\left[R\{\tilde{\gamma}(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y) - \gamma(X, A, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_K, Y)\} \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \omega_j(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{j-1}) \right\} \times \left\{ I(A = a_{k-1}) - I(A = a_k)\omega_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \right\} \left\{ \hat{\mu}_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) - \mu_k(X, \bar{\mathbf{M}}_{k-1}) \right\}\right] = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

for  $k \in \{2, \dots, K+1\}$ . Then we complete the proof of the lemma.  $\blacksquare$

## References

- Ai, C. and Chen, X. (2007). Estimation of possibly misspecified semiparametric conditional moment restriction models with different conditioning variables. *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(1):5–43.
- Ai, C. and Chen, X. (2012). The semiparametric efficiency bound for models of sequential moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2):442–457.
- Chen, X. (2007). Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models. In Heckman, J. J. and Leamer, E. E., editors, *Handbook of Econometrics*, volume 6, pages 5549–5632. Elsevier.
- Chen, X. and Pouzo, D. (2012). Estimation of nonparametric conditional moment models with possibly nonsmooth generalized residuals. *Econometrica*, 80(1):277–321.
- Hirano, K., Imbens, G. W., and Ridder, G. (2003). Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189.
- Newey, W. K. (1997). Convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, 79(1):147–168.
- Newey, W. K. and Powell, J. L. (2003). Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, 71(5):1565–1578.
- Severini, T. A. and Tripathi, G. (2012). Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2):491–498.

van der Vaart, AW. and Wellner, J. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media.