

PROXIMAL INDIRECT COMPARISON

ZEHAO SU¹, HELENE C. W. RYTGAARD¹, HENRIK RAVN² AND FRANK ERIKSSON¹¹Section of Biostatistics, University of Copenhagen
²Novo Nordisk A/S

We consider the problem of indirect comparison, where a treatment arm of interest is absent by design in the target randomized control trial (RCT) but available in a source RCT. The identifiability of the target population average treatment effect often relies on conditional transportability assumptions. However, it is a common concern whether all relevant effect modifiers are measured and controlled for. We highlight a new proximal identification result in the presence of shifted, unobserved effect modifiers based on proxies: an adjustment proxy in both RCTs and an additional reweighting proxy in the source RCT. We propose an estimator which is doubly-robust against misspecifications of the so-called bridge functions and asymptotically normal under mild consistency of the nuisance models. An alternative estimator is presented to accommodate missing outcomes in the source RCT, which we then apply to conduct a proximal indirect comparison analysis using two weight management trials.

KEYWORDS: Indirect comparison; meta-analysis; transportability; proximal causal inference; missing data.

1. INTRODUCTION

Indirect comparison is the contrast of treatments that are not compared in head-to-head randomized control trials (RCTs). An important application of indirect comparison in health technology assessment is the comparison of a new treatment and an existing treatment in the health system, when both treatments are only studied in placebo-controlled RCTs. Indirect comparison can be viewed as an instance of transportability in causal inference. For example, the transportability of the effect of the existing treatment versus placebo (or the lack of such transportability) from the source to the target RCT determines whether the effect between the new and the existing treatment can be established. It is therefore hardly surprising that current methods require effect-measure transportability for indirect comparison, adjusting for shifted effect modifiers (Colnet et al., 2024), that is, the effect modifiers that do not follow the same distribution across the RCTs. However, when there are unobserved shifted effect modifiers, the transportability cannot be established by controlling for the observed baseline variables. If the treatments are found in RCTs which are conducted with a considerable time gap apart, there may be changes in the standard of care that could affect the treatment effect. Social determinants of health, which are often unmeasured in RCTs, can also change the magnitude of the treatment effect.

We focus on characterizing the transportability bias through the use of negative controls or proxies. In observational studies negative controls help the detection of unmeasured confounding (Lipsitch et al., 2010). Appropriate proxies allow for the removal of confounding bias with proximal causal inference methods (Miao et al., 2018). In indirect comparisons, the threat of confounding is eliminated by randomization, but one can borrow the idea from this literature by selecting proxies that tackle the transportability bias.

In this paper, we propose a novel method that extends proximal causal inference to indirect comparison when individual patient data (IPD) is available in all RCTs. This data setup is uncommon in the network meta-analysis literature, where IPD is generally considered unavailable in at least the historical trials (Harari et al., 2023). Our proposed estimator relies on a complementary pair of

Zehao Su: zehao.su@sund.ku.dk

Helene C. W. Rytgaard: hely@sund.ku.dk

Henrik Ravn: hnr@novonordisk.com

Frank Eriksson: eriksson@sund.ku.dk

proxies, namely a reweighting proxy and an adjustment proxy. The proxies correspond to identification strategies that mirror participation odds weighting and the g-formula for transporting causal effects. We remark that while both proxies are required in the source RCT, only the adjustment proxy needs to be in the target RCT. Our proposed estimator handles both continuous and binary outcomes, as well as missing outcomes from the source RCT. We show that the estimator is robust against misspecifications of the nuisance functions of the proxies.

The rest of the article is structured as follows. In Sections 2 and 3, we introduce the mathematical notations and causal assumptions for the identifiability of the target parameter on the full data distribution involving unobserved variables and on the observed data distribution. In Section 4, we describe a proximal indirect comparison estimator and its asymptotic properties. Section 5 presents a related proximal indirect comparison estimator when the outcome is missing at random in the source RCT. Finally in Section 7, we present a critical evaluation of the proposed method and discuss possible extensions for future investigations.

2. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

Consider two treatment pairs, $A \in \{0, 1\}$ and $A \in \{0, -1\}$, where the former is the treatments investigated in the source RCT $S = 1$ and the latter is those in the target RCT $S = 0$. This corresponds to the situation where there is a treatment shared by the two RCTs, in this case $A = 0$, so that the comparison of the treatments $A = 1$ and $A = -1$ may be made with the help of the common treatment arm. The setup described here is a subset of network meta-analysis, which usually places interest on the causal effects comparing at least three different pairs of interventions. The treatment $A = 1$ that we wish to emulate, also referred to as the missing treatment, can be a placebo or an active treatment. Additionally in each RCT a set of baseline covariates X is measured. Let $Y(a)$ denote the potential outcome under the intervention $A = a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. In this paper we consider as the target parameter ψ the average treatment effect (ATE) in the target population comparing treatments $A = 1$ and $A = 0$, i.e. $E\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid S = 0\}$. The indirect comparison parameter $\theta = E\{Y(-1) - Y(1) \mid S = 0\}$ is the difference between the ATE $E\{Y(-1) - Y(0) \mid S = 0\}$ in the target RCT and ψ . For the identifiability of ψ , the natural effect measure for transportability is the conditional average treatment effect (CATE). The mean scale is a common choice in various problems where the outcome is continuous (e.g., body weight) or binary (e.g., occurrence of a cardiac arrest).

The fundamental problem of indirect comparison is that the treatment $A = 1$ is never observed in the target RCT $S = 0$. In order to establish identifiability for the target parameter in the observed data, we need a set of plausible assumptions which justify the transportability of the treatment-specific mean from the source population to the target population. The existing indirect comparison and network meta-analysis literature tend to assume effect-measure transportability (), which does not hold when conditioning on the observed baseline covariates cannot completely account for differences in the effect between RCTs. The violation is attributed to the existence of unmeasured, shifted effect modifiers. It may be tempting to adjust for as many baseline or pre-treatment variables as possible in order to establish the validity of effect-measure transportability, in hope of capturing all effect modifiers. However, this strategy is not foolproof as it may instead result in additional M-bias (Cinelli et al., 2022). Consider for example the causal diagram in Figure 1 and the structural equation $Y(a) = a\tau(X, U) + \mu(X, U, S) + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \perp (X, U, S)$ and τ is not constant in U . There is no marginal dependence between S and U , that is, the effect modifier U is not shifted. However, when we condition on covariates X , the path $S \rightarrow X \leftarrow U(\rightarrow Y)$ is opened, and CATE transportability conditioning on X is not possible in this scenario.

We thus propose a weaker version of CATE transportability conditioning on both the baseline covariates X and the unobserved effect modifiers U . We denote the propensity score in the source trial by $e(a \mid X) = P(A = a \mid X, S = 1)$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and assume that it is known.

FIGURE 1. Causal diagram representing the data generating mechanism where M -bias is induced by adjusting for the unobserved effect modifier U .
 ● Observed variables; ○ unobserved variables; ■ selection variable.





FIGURE 2. Causal diagram representing a model where Assumption 2 holds. The unobserved variables U and the baseline variables X can be connected as $U \rightarrow X$, $U \leftarrow X$ or $U \leftrightarrow X$.
 ● Observed variables; ○ unobserved variables; ■ selection variable.



ASSUMPTION 1. Suppose the following hold $P(X, U | S = 0)$ -almost surely:

- (i) (Consistency) $Y(a) = Y$ whenever $A = a \in \{0, 1\}$;
- (ii) (Randomization) $(Y(1), Y(0), U) \perp A | (X, S = 1)$;
- (iii) (CATE transportability) $E\{Y(1) - Y(0) | X, U, S = 0\} = E\{Y(1) - Y(0) | X, U, S = 1\}$;
- (iv) (Positivity) $P(S = 1 | X, U)e(a | X) > 0$.

Assumption 1(iv) is crucial in the transportability of causal effects from the source population $S = 1$ to the target population $S = 0$. It requires that all values of (X, U) observable in the target population must also be observable in the source population. The positivity assumption on trial participation essentially guarantees no extrapolation of information from the source trial. As we will see in Section 3, the violation of positivity not only compromises the identifiability of the target parameter but also has great implications on its estimation with observed data.

The causal assumptions give rise to the identification of the target parameter in the full data distribution. Let $\alpha = P(S = 0)$ be the probability of an individual in the joined population belonging to the target RCT and let the transformed outcome be $\tilde{Y} = (2A - 1)Y/e(A | X)$.

PROPOSITION 1—Latent identifiability. *Under Assumption 1,*

$$\psi = E\{E(\tilde{Y} | X, U, S = 1) | S = 0\} = \frac{1}{\alpha} E\left\{S \frac{P(S = 0 | X, U)}{P(S = 1 | X, U)} \tilde{Y}\right\}.$$

This presentation of the identification formula of ψ is very similar to the transportability results in Theorem 1 of Dahabreh et al. (2023), where the outcome model and the participation odds depend on the baseline covariates X only. The distinction mainly lies in their assumptions for the exchangeability of trial participation and subsequently the exchangeability of treatment assignment, which hold without the additional unobserved covariates U .

Proposition 1 suggests that in order to identify the target parameter ψ , we need at least the knowledge of either the mean outcome difference $E(\tilde{Y} | X, U, S = 1)$ or the trial participation odds $P(S = 0 | X, U)/P(S = 1 | X, U)$. However, both models depend on the unobserved effect modifiers U , and neither quantity would be identifiable without further assumptions and/or extra information.

3. REWEIGHTING AND ADJUSTMENT PROXIES

In this section, we borrow ideas from the proximal causal inference framework to handle scenarios in indirect comparison where CATE transportability fails to hold conditionally on the baseline covariates X . We refer to this approach as proximal indirect comparison. The core idea of proximal indirect

comparison is that the knowledge of a pair of proxies (Z, W) helps to learn the underlying dependence of the expectation of $Y(1) - Y(0)$ on U , thereby restoring the identifiability of the target parameter using observed data. The proxy Z is referred to as the reweighting proxy and W the adjustment proxy. The intuition is that Z will be used to reweight the samples from the source RCT, and W will appear in the adjustment formula as if we had adjusted for U .

We require that the proxies satisfy a set of conditional independences.

ASSUMPTION 2—Adjustment and reweighting proxies. Suppose that

- (i) $Z \perp W \mid (X, U, S = 1)$;
- (ii) $Z \perp Y \mid (A, X, U, S = 1)$;
- (iii) $W \perp S \mid (X, U)$;
- (iv) $(Z, W, U) \perp A \mid (X, S = 1)$.

These assumptions are not testable in general, and their validity should be examined on a case-by-case basis. Assumption 2(i) and (ii) state that the reweighting proxy Z does not affect the outcome Y nor the adjustment proxy W if we condition on the baseline covariates and the unobserved variables among those subjects who were recruited in the source RCT $S = 1$. Assumption 2(iii) states that the distribution of the adjustment proxy W does not vary between the RCTs, once the baseline covariates and the unobserved variables are controlled for. For Assumption 2(iii) to hold, if there is any observable difference in the adjustment proxy between the RCTs after adjustment of X , then it must be the exact same unobserved effect modifiers which violate the CATE transportability that account for this dependence. Moreover, the influence of the unobserved effect modifiers is also exposed by the association between the reweighting proxy and the adjustment proxy and the outcome not explained away by other observed variables. We make the remark that the reweighting proxy is not required in the target RCT.

The conditional independence assumption between the adjustment proxy W and the RCT indicator S seems rather strict. Assumption 2(iii) precludes causation from W to U as well as any confounding between them, since U would otherwise be a collider between S and W . However, W may be a cause of or share a common cause with unobserved, shifted prognostic variables. Assumption 2(ii) can be relaxed in light of the effect measure in question. It suffices to assume that $E(\tilde{Y} \mid Z, X, U, S = 1) = E(\tilde{Y} \mid X, U, S = 1)$ holds $P(X, U \mid S = 0)$ -almost surely. For example, the treatment-specific conditional mean outcome $E(Y \mid Z, A, X, U, S = 1)$ can depend on Z , as long as Z is not an effect modifier of A on Y on the CATE scale after adjusting for X and U . Examples of data generating mechanisms compatible with Assumption 2 are displayed in Figure 3.


We would like the adjustment proxy W to emulate the effect of U in the mean outcome difference model. Similarly, the reweighting proxy Z should take the place of U in the participation odds model. To this end, we introduce two sets of functions involving the proxies on the full data distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}^* &= \{h^*(W, X) \in L_2(W, X; P_1) : E\{\tilde{Y} - h^*(W, X) \mid X, U, S = 1\} = 0\}, \\ \mathbb{Q}^* &= \left\{ q^*(Z, X) \in L_2(Z, X; P_1) : E\{q^*(Z, X) \mid X, U, S = 1\} = \frac{P(S = 0 \mid X, U)}{P(S = 1 \mid X, U)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the conditions inside the sets hold $P(X, U \mid S = 0)$ -almost surely, P_1 stands for the conditional probability measure over $O_1 = (A, X, Y, W, Z)$ such that $P_1(O_1 \in \cdot) = P(O_1 \in \cdot, S = 1)/\alpha$, and $L_2(V; P_1)$ is the space of square integrable functions of V with respect to the probability measure P_1 . The functions h^* and q^* , if they exist, are referred to as the outcome bridge function and the trial bridge function, respectively. The defining conditions of the bridge functions show that they restore the unobserved nuisance functions given in Proposition 1 after being projected onto a subspace of the full data distribution.

A sufficient condition for \mathbb{H}^* or \mathbb{Q}^* to be nonempty is the relevance assumption for the proxy W or Z stating that it should at least be correlated with the unobserved effect modifiers U , after

FIGURE 3. Causal graphs representing different data generating mechanisms. The random variables U and U' are unobserved effect modifiers and non-effect-modifying prognostic variables, respectively. The baseline covariates X are suppressed for clarity. The wavy arrow \rightsquigarrow indicates a non-effect-modifying causal relationship. • Observed variables; ○ unobserved variables; ■ selection variable.



removing the dependence via the baseline covariates in the source trial. If the bridge functions do not exist, the measurements of the proxies will not grant extra information on U than what can be known from adjusting for X , making them ineffective in mimicking the dependence of U on S and of Y on U . See the discussions in Kallus et al. (2022), Examples 3 and 4. Some examples of unobserved effect modifiers are the standard of care and the social determinants of health among the RCT participants. These are often high-dimensional covariates that are not available from the experimental setting. Nonetheless, it may be reasonable to posit that only a low-dimensional subset of these covariates strongly contributes to effect modification, such as concomitant medication and employment stability. If this is true, then the number of proxies does not have to be large for the existence of bridge functions.

On the observed data distribution, we likewise define two sets of observed bridge functions:

$$\mathbb{H} = \{h'(W, X) \in L_2(W, X; P_1) : E\{\tilde{Y} - h'(W, X) \mid Z, X, S = 1\} = 0\},$$

$$\mathbb{Q} = \left\{q'(Z, X) \in L_2(Z, X; P_1) : E\{q'(Z, X) \mid W, X, S = 1\} = \frac{P(S = 0 \mid W, X)}{P(S = 1 \mid W, X)}\right\}.$$

Under the conditional independences in Assumption 2, we can relate the outcome bridge function $h^*(W, X)$ to the reweighting proxy Z and the participation bridge function $q^*(Z, X)$ to the adjustment proxy W . The existence of the bridge functions on the full data distribution implies their existence on the observed data distribution under proper proxy assumptions.

LEMMA 1. *If Assumption 2(i), (ii) and (iv) hold, then $\mathbb{H}^* \subset \mathbb{H}$. If Assumption 2(i) and (iii) hold, then $\mathbb{Q}^* \subset \mathbb{Q}$.*

The sets of observed bridge functions give rise to the following identifiability result.

PROPOSITION 2—Identifiability. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. If (i) $\mathbb{H} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbb{Q} \neq \emptyset$ and*

(ii) either $\mathbb{H}^* \neq \emptyset$ or $\mathbb{Q}^* \neq \emptyset$, then for any $h \in \mathbb{H}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, the target parameter ψ is identifiable as

$$\psi = \mathbb{E}\{h(W, X) \mid S = 0\} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}\{Sq(Z, X)\tilde{Y}\} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}\{Sq(Z, X)h(W, X)\}.$$

If there exist solutions to both of the equations in \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} , then they can essentially be regarded as the unobservable bridge functions in \mathbb{H}^* and \mathbb{Q}^* in the identification of the target parameter. In fact, that \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} are simultaneously nonempty is necessary for the observed data functional $\psi(P)$ to be $n^{1/2}$ -estimable under boundedness conditions related to the projected variance of the bridge functions (\cdot).

As the bridge functions need not be unique, the target parameter is a uniquely identified functional on possibly non-unique nuisance parameters. Although this poses no difficulty in identification of the target parameter, it largely hinders the statistical inference of estimators constructed using estimates of the bridge functions. We refer to Zhang et al. (2023) and Bennett et al. (2022) for in-depth discussions and careful handling of such issues.

Rather than CATE transportability, an indirect comparison can also assume mean transportability $\mathbb{E}\{Y(1) \mid X, U, S = 1\} = \mathbb{E}\{Y(1) \mid X, U, S = 0\}$. An analogous assumption to the existence of an outcome difference bridge function $h^* \in \mathbb{H}^*$ is the existence of functions $\tilde{h}^*(W, X)$ such that $\mathbb{E}\{Y - \tilde{h}^*(W, X) \mid X, A = 1, U, S = 1\} = 0$. This is also referred to as the unanchored indirect comparison (Phillippo et al., 2018). Unanchored indirect comparison is valid only when all shifted prognostic variables, observed and unobserved, are taken into account. From a practical point of view, the existence of bridge functions is related to the explanatory power of the proxies relative to the unobserved variables. The set of proxy required for identifiability of the causal parameter $\mathbb{E}\{Y(1) \mid S = 0\}$ via the outcome bridge \tilde{h}^* is potentially much larger than what is needed for the identifiability of ψ via the outcome difference bridge h^* .

3.1. Connections to other proximal causal inference approaches

Ghassami et al. (2022) described a method of long-term treatment effect exploiting the internal validity of the experimental data while using proxies to account for confoundedness in the observational data. The target population is the one defined by the observational data, and the short-term outcome plays the role of outcome-inducing proxy W . The treatment bridge function q in their work is intended to emulate the inverse of the propensity score $P(A \mid U, X, S = 0)$ in the confounded data. Imbens et al. (2022) also employed proximal causal inference in their attempt to estimate long-term treatment effect via data fusion. The selection bridge function assumed in their work has a similar form as the trial bridge in \mathbb{Q} , in that they both capture the variability of the unobserved variables U between two data sources.

However, the problem studied in these two articles is fundamentally different, since the authors make the “data combination” assumption that the unobserved variables are independent of the RCT indicator S , possibly conditioning on some baseline covariates X (see Assumption 3 in Ghassami et al. (2022), Assumptions 3 and 10 in Imbens et al. (2022)). On the contrary, we are precisely interested in capturing the difference in distributions of unobserved variables between the study populations through the use of proxies in proximal indirect comparison. Additionally, both bridge functions in these works are assumed on the target population, whereas the bridge functions \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} in proximal indirect comparison are posited on the source population instead. In particular, the outcome bridge cannot be defined nor learned on the target population due to the impossibility of observing certain treatments of interest.

We make an important remark that for data fusion, it is often not necessary to observe one group of the proxies in both populations. For example, in Ghassami et al. (2022) the treatment-inducing proxy Z is only required in the observational regime. The short-term outcome S_1 in Imbens et al. (2022), which enjoys similar properties as a treatment-inducing proxy, appears also in the experimental regime only. In proximal indirect comparison, no reweighting proxy Z needs to be observed in the

target population.

Ghassami et al. (2021) proposed a closely related approach for causal mediation analysis and front-door adjustment in the presence of hidden mediators. For the identifiability of controlled and uncontrolled treatment-specific means, they assumed a treatment bridge function describing the difference between the unobserved variables under different interventions (their Assumption 3). Despite the resemblance of the bridge function, we are interested in relaxing the CATE transportability for the estimation of the treatment effect with at least one treatment arm that is not present in the target population. The unmeasured variables in indirect comparison cannot be a mediator in that the CATE transportability in Assumption 1(iii) is conditional on U . In addition, the RCT indicator S is not an intervention nor exposure, so conceptually U cannot be considered as a mediator between S and Y .

4. ASYMPTOTIC THEORY FOR TARGET PARAMETER ESTIMATION

Before presenting an estimator for the target parameter, we make a connection between the sampling scheme and the probability model. In the source trial $S_i = 1$, the observed data is an independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sample $(A_i, X_i, W_i, Z_i, Y_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$. In the target trial $S_i = 0$, the observed data is an i.i.d. sample of (X_i, W_i) , $i = n_1 + 1, n_1 + 2, \dots, n_1 + n_0$. For the asymptotic arguments, we require that the ratio n_0/n approaches the fixed number α between zero and one when n goes to infinity, where $n = n_0 + n_1$ is the total number of observations. Define the full data model as all distributions P^* over (O, U) that satisfy Assumption 2 where $O = (S, SA, X, SY, W, SZ)$. Then we can consider the observed data as an i.i.d. sample from P , the marginalization of the full data distribution to O . The collection of such marginal distributions is denoted by \mathcal{P} . Specifically, the propensity score in both models is fixed at $e(A | X)$, since the treatments in an RCT are usually administered according to a predetermined protocol.

In this section, we propose an estimator of the target parameter under the following regularity conditions on the observed data model.

ASSUMPTION 3—Regularity conditions. Suppose the following holds for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$:

- (i) The observed bridge function sets $\mathbb{H} = \{h\}$ and $\mathbb{Q} = \{q\}$ are singletons.
- (ii) The linear transformation $T : L_2(W, X; P_1) \rightarrow L_2(Z, X; P_1)$, where the map $(Th)(Z, X) = E\{h(W, X) | Z, X, S = 1\}$, and its adjoint are bijective.

In Appendix B, we give a sufficient condition for establishing the existence and uniqueness of observed bridge functions, namely completeness assumptions and more regularity conditions on the operators. That T and its adjoint are bijections is stronger than what is needed to propose regular estimators for $\psi(P)$, but these conditions enable the characterization of all regular estimators under \mathcal{P} . We also implicitly assume that at least one of \mathbb{H}^* and \mathbb{Q}^* is nonempty so that on the observed data distribution P , the target parameter is uniquely identified as $\psi(P) = E\{Sq(Z, X)h(W, X)\}/\alpha$.

PROPOSITION 3. Let $\mu(Z, W, A, X) = E(Y | Z, W, A, X, S = 1)$. The space of influence functions of the target parameter $\psi(P)$ defined on the model \mathcal{P} under Assumption 3 is a direct sum $\{\varphi(P) + S\{A - e(1 | X)\}c(Z, W, X) : c(Z, W, X) \in L_2(Z, W, X; P)\} \oplus \Lambda$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(P) = & \frac{S}{\alpha}q(Z, X)\frac{2A - 1}{e(A | X)}\{Y - \mu(Z, W, A, X)\} \\ & + \frac{S}{\alpha}q(Z, X)\{\mu(Z, W, 1, X) - \mu(Z, W, 0, X) - h(W, X)\} + \frac{1 - S}{\alpha}\{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \end{aligned}$$

is the efficient influence function, and the nuisance tangent space Λ is specified in the proof of this proposition in Appendix E.

The dependence on the outcome model μ can be removed by taking $0 \in \Lambda$ and

$$c(Z, W, X) = \frac{q(Z, X)}{\alpha} \left\{ \frac{\mu(Z, W, 1, X)}{e(1|X)} - \frac{\mu(Z, W, 0, X)}{e(0|X)} \right\},$$

in which case an influence function of $\psi(P)$ is

$$\phi(P) = \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \{\tilde{Y} - h(W, X)\} + \frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\}.$$

We draw an i.i.d. sample of size n from an underlying observed distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}$, of which n_0 are observations from the target trial. The observed sample has an empirical distribution P_n . In general, we do not have the knowledge of the bridge functions, in which case one often resorts to two-stage data-adaptive estimation of the target parameter. In the first stage we use the observed data P_n to obtain estimates of the bridge functions as nuisance functions to the estimation problem. In the second stage we plug in the estimated bridge functions to some valid estimating equations for the target parameter, and an estimate of the target parameter is obtained as the solution to the estimating equations.

Suppose $\hat{h}(W, X)$ and $\hat{q}(Z, X)$ are nonparametric or semiparametric estimators intended for the true, unique bridge functions $h(W, X)$ and $q(Z, X)$. Let $\hat{\alpha} = n_0/n$ be the proportion of samples from the target RCT. Propositions 2 and 3, together with the observation of the influence function $\phi(P)$, suggest a natural estimator of the target parameter $\psi(P)$ as

$$\hat{\psi}(\hat{P}_n) = \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P_n [S \hat{q}(Z, X) \{\tilde{Y} - \hat{h}(W, X)\} + (1-S) \hat{h}(W, X)].$$

The symbol \hat{P}_n is used to denote the empirical distribution P_n together with nuisance estimators such as $\hat{\alpha}$, \hat{h} and \hat{q} . We now characterize the asymptotic behavior of the estimator $\hat{\psi}$.

PROPOSITION 4. *Suppose that $\phi(\cdot)$ is P -Donsker for $P \in \mathcal{P}$ under Assumption 3, that $\hat{\alpha}$, $e(A|X)$, $h(W, X)$, $\hat{q}(Z, X)$, $P(S = 1|W, X)$ and $E(Y^2|Z, A, X, S = 1)$ are bounded and that $\|\hat{h} - \bar{h}\|_{P_1} = o_P(1)$, $\|\hat{q} - \bar{q}\|_{P_1} = o_P(1)$ for some $\bar{h}(W, X) \in L_2(W, X; P_1)$ and $\bar{q}(Z, X) \in L_2(Z, X; P_1)$. Then:*

- (i) *The estimator $\hat{\psi}(\hat{P}_n)$ is consistent for $\psi(P)$, if either $\bar{h} = h$ or $\bar{q} = q$.*
- (ii) *The estimator $\hat{\psi}(\hat{P}_n)$ is asymptotically linear with influence function $\phi(P)$, if $\bar{h} = h$, $\bar{q} = q$ and $\|\hat{q} - q\|_{P_1} \|\hat{h} - h\|_{P_1} = o_P(n^{-1/2})$.*

The Donsker class condition on $\phi(P)$ can be relaxed by applying cross-fitting to the estimation of the bridge functions. When the bridge functions are estimated using minimax criteria, their convergence in the $L_2(P)$ -norm can be established following the arguments from Kallus et al. (2022). A key assumption is the equivalence of the $L_2(P)$ -norm of the bridge functions and that of the projected bridge functions, the latter of which is easier to bound. For the outcome bridge function, it amounts to $\|\hat{h} - \bar{h}\|_{P_1} = O_P\{\|T(\hat{h} - \bar{h})\|_{P_1}\}$. The bijectivity of T from Assumption 3(ii) and that T is a bounded linear operator are sufficient for the norm equivalence.

The estimator $\hat{\psi}$ is doubly robust in the sense that it is consistent if either the outcome bridge function \bar{h} or the participation odds bridge function \bar{q} is correctly estimated. Moreover, the estimator is regular under the observed data model \mathcal{P} when both bridge functions converge to the ground truth, for example, at the sub-parametric $o_P(n^{-1/4})$ -rate. In this case, the squared empirical $L_2(P)$ -norm $P_n\{\phi(\hat{P}_n)\}^2$ is a consistent estimator of the asymptotic variance of the estimator.

While the asymptotics hold generally for the nonparametric model, we posit parametric models for the bridge functions in the numerical studies to illustrate the method. Following Cui et al. (2023), the finite-dimensional parameters in the bridge functions are estimated by the generalized method of moments (GMM) motivated by their influence functions. The details are available in Appendix A.

5. HANDLING MISSING OUTCOME

In our discussion thus far, we have ignored a common issue in many RCTs: study participants are typically followed over a period of time, during which some may drop out before the end of study, and their outcomes are not recorded. When the dropout mechanism is not missing completely at random, applying proximal indirect comparison in previous sections to the nonmissing population may not identify the ATE in the target RCT ψ due to potential selection bias. In this section, we propose estimators which correctly identifies the target parameter ψ under a missing-at-random (MAR) dropout pattern.

The binary missingness indicator Δ takes the value 0 when a study participant's outcome information is missing. Let the conditional probability of no dropout from the source trial be $\pi(Z, W, A, X) = P(\Delta = 1 | Z, W, A, X, S = 1)$. We assume that the missingness in the source trial is noninformative of the outcome, conditioning on all other observed variables, which is formalized below.

ASSUMPTION 4—Missing at random. Suppose that

- (i) $\Delta \perp Y | (Z, W, A, X, S = 1)$;
- (ii) $\pi(Z, W, A, X) > 0$ whenever $P(S = 1 | Z, W, A, X) > 0$.

In particular, Assumption 4 requires that the unobserved effect modifiers U do not directly affect the missing pattern. They are allowed to have an indirect effect through the proxies and the baseline covariates, upon controlling for which the missingness is ignorable. If the outcome is MAR, one can devise augmented estimators from the influence functions of the target parameter $\psi(P)$ defined on the data without missingness (Tsiatis, 2006). If missing outcomes are also present in the target RCT, the identifiability of the ATE θ comparing treatments $A = 0$ and $A = -1$ is lost relying only on randomization. A similar MAR assumption on the target RCT population is stated in Appendix D, which will be used in the real data example.

The observed data model subject to missingness \mathcal{P}^c is the collection of distributions over $O^c = (S, S\Delta, SA, X, W, SZ, S\Delta Y)$ such that $P^c(O^c, S\Delta = 1) = \pi(Z, W, A, X)P(O, S = 1)$ and $P^c(O^c, S = 0) = P(O, S = 0)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. In this sense, we can write every $P^c \in \mathcal{P}^c$ as a function $P^c(P)$. The definition of the sets of bridge functions \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} is valid for the model \mathcal{P}^c under MAR, which immediately makes the target parameter identifiable. Note that conditional mean of the outcome among subjects without missingness in the source trial $E(Y | \Delta = 1, Z, W, A, X, S = 1)$ is $\mu(Z, W, A, X)$.

PROPOSITION 5. Suppose Assumption 4 holds. For $P \in \mathcal{P}$ under Assumption 3, the efficient influence function of the target parameter $\psi(P)$ at $P^c(P) \in \mathcal{P}^c$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^c(P^c) = & \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \frac{\Delta(2A - 1)}{\pi(Z, W, A, X)e(A | X)} \{Y - \mu(Z, W, A, X)\} \\ & + \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \{\mu(Z, W, 1, X) - \mu(Z, W, 0, X) - h(W, X)\} + \frac{1 - S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In Section 4, the estimation of the outcome bridge with no missing outcome does not involve any nuisance parameter, in that the propensity score is assumed to be known, and $\tilde{Y} = (2A - 1)Y/e(A | X)$ can be treated as the de facto outcome in the analysis. However, in the presence of missingness on the outcome, we resort to two-stage estimation of the outcome bridge function. In the first stage a regression model is fitted for the outcome on the nonmissing participants, so that $\hat{\mu}(z, w, a, x)$ is the estimator of $\mu(z, w, a, x)$. Additionally, we fit a binary regression model $\hat{\pi}(z, w, a, x)$ for the probability of nonmissingness $\pi(z, w, a, x)$. In the second stage, the outcome bridge is estimated by a minimax optimization problem based on

$$\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu') = q'(Z, X) \left[\frac{2A - 1}{e(A | X)} \frac{\Delta}{\pi'(Z, W, A, X)} \{Y - \mu'(Z, W, A, X)\} \right. \\ \left. + \mu'(Z, W, 1, X) - \mu'(Z, W, 0, X) - h'(W, X) \right].$$

The intuition is that ζ can be used to construct a doubly-robust estimating equation, in the sense that for any q' , the population mean $P_1^c \zeta(h, q', \pi', \mu')$ evaluated at the true outcome bridge h is zero if either $\mu' = \mu$ or $\pi' = \pi$. The nuisance models are subsequently plugged into ζ , giving the estimated outcome bridge $\hat{h} = \arg \inf_{h' \in \mathbb{H}} \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{P_{1,n}^c \zeta(h', q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})\}^2$, where \mathbb{H}' is the bridge hypothesis class and \mathbb{Q}' is the critic class (Kallus et al., 2022). The former is the postulated model for the outcome bridge, and the latter is the adversarial class of functions used to construct the worst-case loss. With the nuisance models, we compose an estimator for the target parameter $\psi(P)$ motivated by the efficient influence function $\varphi^c(P^c)$ from Proposition 5:

$$\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) = \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P_n^c S \zeta(\hat{h}, \hat{q}, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) + \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P_n^c (1 - S) \hat{h}(W, X).$$

In Proposition 6, we show that the estimator $\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)$ is multiply-robust under some regularity conditions and convergence of the nuisance models. We use π_a , $\hat{\pi}_a$, μ_a and $\hat{\mu}_a$ as shorthand notations for $\pi(Z, W, a, X)$ and $\hat{\pi}(Z, W, a, X)$, $\mu(Z, W, a, X)$ and $\hat{\mu}(Z, W, a, X)$.

PROPOSITION 6. *Suppose that $\phi^c(\cdot)$ is P^c -Donsker for $P^c \in \mathcal{P}^c$, that $\hat{\alpha}$, $e(1 | X)$, $\pi(Z, W, A, X)$, $\hat{\pi}(Z, W, A, X)$, $\mu(Z, W, A, X)$, $h(W, X)$, $\hat{q}(Z, X)$ and $E(Y^2 | \Delta = 1, Z, W, A, X, S = 1)$ are bounded and that $\|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|_{P_1} = o_P(1)$, $\|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_{P_1} = o_P(1)$, $\|\hat{h} - h\|_{P_1} = o_P(1)$, $\|\hat{q} - q\|_{P_1} = o_P(1)$ for some nonrandom functions $\bar{\mu}_a(Z, W, X)$, $\bar{\pi}_a(Z, W, X)$, $\bar{h}(W, X)$ and $\bar{q}(Z, X)$ in $L_2(P_1)$. Then:*

- (i) *The estimator $\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)$ is consistent for $\psi(P)$, if either (a) $\bar{h} = h$ and $\bar{\mu}_a = \mu_a$, (b) $\bar{h} = h$ and $\bar{\pi}_a = \pi_a$, (c) $\bar{q} = q$ and $\bar{\pi}_a = \pi_a$, or (d) $\bar{q} = q$ and $\bar{\mu}_a = \mu_a$.*
- (ii) *The estimator $\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)$ is asymptotically linear with influence function $\varphi^c(P^c)$, if (a) $\bar{h} = h$, $\bar{q} = q$, $\bar{\pi}_a = \pi_a$, $\bar{\mu}_a = \mu_a$, and (b) $\|\hat{q} - q\|_{P_1} \{ \|\hat{h} - h\|_{P_1} + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_{P_1} \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|_{P_1} \} + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_{P_1} \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|_{P_1} = o_{P^c}(n^{-1/2})$.*

Using classical M-estimation theory, it is not hard to show that classes of smooth, parametric nuisance models and bridge functions permit the asymptotic linearity of the estimator $\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)$. However, in infinite-dimensional nuisance function classes, the conditions are not straightforward for a suitable convergence rate of the outcome bridge function estimated from the two-stage procedure. In Appendix A, we sketch sufficient conditions under which the estimated mean outcome difference bridge function converges with the quarter rate in the projected root mean squared error (RMSE); that is, $\|T(\hat{h} - h)\|_{P_1} = O_{P^c}(n^{-1/4})$ provided that $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\pi}$ converge fast enough. The rate can be improved to $o_{P^c}(n^{-1/4})$ with regularization on the nuisance function classes \mathbb{Q}' and \mathbb{H}' .

In the situation with missing data, we have suggested the estimator $\hat{\psi}^c$ based on the efficient influence function, which involves the estimation of the nuisance model μ and can be semiparametrically efficient under appropriate conditions. In comparison, the estimator $\hat{\psi}$ in the situation with no missing outcome is an asymptotically inefficient estimator, whereas it does not require the knowledge about μ . This discrepancy is necessitated by Assumption 4, since the identifiability of the target parameter ψ via the outcome bridge h builds on the projection of μ onto (Z, X) rather than that of \bar{Y} .

6. NUMERICAL RESULTS

6.1. Simulated data example

We generate the full data $(S\Delta, U, S, X, SA, Y, W, SZ)$ sequentially from the distributions described below. The baseline covariates $X \sim \Phi\{\text{Normal}((0, 0, 0)^T, \Sigma)\}$ are bounded between 0 and 1, where

$\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal distribution function and the covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.25 & 0.25 \\ 0.25 & 1 & 0.25 \\ 0.25 & 0.25 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The rest of the variables are obtained in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} U &\sim \text{Uniform}([-1, 0] \times [-1, 0] \times [-1, 0]), \\ S | (X, U) &\sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\text{expit}(-0.625 + 0.5X^T 1 + 0.5U^T 1)\}, \\ A | (X, S = 1) &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5), \\ Z | (U, X, S = 1) &\sim \text{Normal}(U + X, 0.25\text{Id}), \\ W | (U, X) &\sim \text{Normal}(U + X, 0.25\text{Id}), \\ Y | (W, A, X, U, S = 1) &\sim \text{Normal}(0.5 - A + U^T 1 + AU^T 1 + X^T 1 + W^T 1 + AW^T 1, 0.5^2), \\ \Delta | (Z, W, A, X, S = 1) &\sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\text{expit}(0.1Z^T 1 + 0.1W^T 1 + 0.7A + 0.3X^T 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The parameters are selected so that the probability α is close to 0.65 and that the marginal probability of missing outcome is approximately 0.3. In this data generating mechanism, U is an effect modifier while the study indicator S itself is a non-effect-modifying prognostic variable for the average treatment effect. It is clear that the transportability of the treatment-specific mean cannot hold, even conditioning on U .

Let $b(Z, X) = (1, Z, X)^T$, $c(W, X) = (1, W, X)^T$. As we show in Appendix C, the underlying bridge functions are unique and have the closed forms $h_\eta(W, X) = \eta^T c(W, X)$ and $q_\xi(Z, X) = \exp\{\xi^T b(Z, X)\}$, where η and ξ are nuisance parameter vectors of appropriate dimensions. We first consider the situation where the the outcome is observed without missingness and opted for three estimators, namely $\hat{\psi}_h(\hat{P}_n) = P_{0,n} h_{\hat{\eta}}(W, X)$, $\hat{\psi}_q(\hat{P}_n) = \hat{\alpha}^{-1} P_n \{S q_{\hat{\xi}}(Z, X) \bar{Y}\}$ and $\hat{\psi}(\hat{P}_n)$. The symbol $P_{0,n}$ denotes the empirical distribution of samples with $S = 0$. The nuisance parameter estimators with correctly specified h and q were obtained on the full sample via the generalized method of moments:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta} &= \arg \min_{\eta'} \|P_{1,n} b(Z, X) \{\bar{Y} - h_{\eta'}(W, X)\}\|_2^2, \\ \hat{\xi} &= \arg \min_{\xi'} \|P_n \{c(W, X)\}^3 \{S q_{\xi'}(Z, X) - (1 - S)\}\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

The cubic of the function $c(W, X)$ makes sure that the estimators $\hat{\psi}_h$ and $\hat{\psi}_q$ are numerically distinguishable, as the true bridge function $h_\eta(W, X)$ is linear.

In Appendix A we derive the influence functions of the parameters η and ξ and show that these form the basis of estimating equations. To contrast the behavior of the estimators under model specifications, we considered the configurations where neither h or q was misspecified (experiment 1), where q was misspecified (experiment 2), where h was misspecified (experiment 3), and where both h and q were misspecified (experiment 4). The misspecified models were fitted by replacing W and Z with $|W|^{1/2}$ and $|Z|^{1/2}$ wherever appropriate. Some summary statistics of the estimators from 1000 repeated samples of size $n \in \{1000, 2000\}$ are displayed in Table 1, where the reference Monte-Carlo target parameter was calculated by static interventions of A when $S = 0$. The standard errors of the estimators for $\hat{\psi}_h$ and $\hat{\psi}_q$ were obtained by plugging in the nuisance parameter estimates in the theoretical asymptotic variances shown in Appendix A. The estimators $\hat{\psi}_h$ and $\hat{\psi}_q$ showed little bias with confidence intervals having the correct coverage only when h and q were correctly estimated, respectively. This was contrasted by $\hat{\psi}$, which exhibited the doubly robust property as expected. The influence-function-based standard error for $\hat{\psi}$ also showed robustness against model misspecification. In Appendix C we present additional simulations under alternative data

TABLE 1. Simulation results of experiments 1–4. Bias: Monte-Carlo bias, 10^{-3} ; RMSE: root mean squared error, 10^{-1} ; SE: average of standard error estimates, 10^{-1} ; Coverage: 95% confidence interval coverage, %.

n	Experiment	Estimator	Mean	Bias	RMSE	SE	Coverage
1000	1	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.64	0.23	3.17	3.21	95.7
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.65	-10.17	3.96	3.99	95.5
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.64	2.48	3.70	3.75	95.4
	2	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.64	0.23	3.17	3.21	95.7
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.39	250.48	3.94	3.16	86.2
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.64	4.89	3.42	3.08	92.7
	3	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.39	256.35	3.90	3.05	86.6
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.65	-10.17	3.96	3.99	95.5
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.65	-3.91	4.07	3.84	93.8
	4	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.39	256.35	3.90	3.05	86.6
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.39	250.48	3.94	3.16	86.2
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.39	250.88	3.93	3.16	87.1
2000	1	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.65	-6.64	2.28	2.25	94.3
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.66	-18.41	2.69	2.68	95.5
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.65	-10.26	2.55	2.55	94.8
	2	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.65	-6.64	2.28	2.25	94.3
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.40	242.68	3.22	2.14	79.1
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.65	-6.11	2.40	2.11	92.3
	3	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.40	249.17	3.24	2.08	77.5
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.66	-18.41	2.69	2.68	95.5
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.66	-14.91	2.76	2.59	94.1
	4	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.40	249.17	3.24	2.08	77.5
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.40	242.68	3.22	2.14	79.1
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.40	242.76	3.21	2.14	78.7

generating mechanisms to investigate the behavior of the proximal estimators, including invalid proxies, nonunique bridge functions, weak proxies and near violation of positivity. In particular, we found that ridge regularization on the parameters η and ξ recovered valid inference for the doubly robust estimator when bridge functions were nonuniquely defined.

When outcomes were partially observed, we used only the multiply robust estimator $\hat{\psi}^c(\widehat{P}_n^c)$. On the source RCT sample, we fitted the adherence probability model $\hat{\pi}(Z, W, A, X)$ using a logistic regression linear in all covariates and the mean outcome model $\hat{\mu}(Z, W, A, X)$ on the subsample where $\Delta = 1$ using an ordinary linear regression with interaction between A and $(Z, W, X)^T$. The nuisance estimator of the outcome difference bridge was subsequently obtained as $\hat{\eta} = \arg \min_{\eta'} \|P_{1,n}^c \zeta(h_{\eta'}, b, \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})\|^2$, while the estimation of the participation odds bridge remained the same as in the setup without nonadherence. Again to demonstrate the robustness against model misspecifications, we considered the configurations where none of h , q , π and μ was misspecified (experiment 5), where q and π were misspecified (experiment 6), where q and μ were misspecified (experiment 7), where h and π were misspecified (experiment 8), where h and μ were misspecified (experiment 9) and where all of h , q , π and μ were misspecified (experiment 10). The misspecifications were done in the same way as experiments 1–4. However, the true model for μ does not have an easy closed-form expression. Therefore, all the posited models for μ could have been misspecified, whether intentionally or not. The results are displayed in Table 2. The estimator $\hat{\psi}^c$ retained small empirical biases under various model misspecifications, whereas the influence-function-based standard error in experiments 6 and 7 where q model was misspecified led to anticonservative confidence intervals.

TABLE 2. Simulation results of experiments 5–10. Bias: Monte-Carlo bias, 10^{-3} ; RMSE: root mean squared error, 10^{-1} ; SE: average of standard error estimates, 10^{-1} ; Coverage: 95% confidence interval coverage, %.

n	Experiment	Mean	Bias	RMSE	SE	Coverage
1000	5	-2.64	0.77	1.19	1.15	93.9
	6	-2.64	-0.47	1.24	1.12	91.8
	7	-2.64	2.28	3.08	2.68	90.8
	8	-2.64	5.17	1.24	1.27	95.8
	9	-2.63	10.71	3.30	3.16	94.0
2000	10	-2.40	248.08	3.73	2.72	82.3
	5	-2.65	-1.16	0.84	0.81	94.1
	6	-2.65	-1.04	0.84	0.77	93.0
	7	-2.65	-6.18	2.08	1.85	91.7
	8	-2.64	1.87	0.86	0.88	95.9
	9	-2.65	-3.89	2.23	2.22	95.1
	10	-2.39	250.09	3.14	1.85	73.0

6.2. Real data example

Proximal indirect comparison allows for treatment effect estimation via transportability in the presence of unobserved effect modifiers. For a real data application of our method, we make use of the individual-level patient data from two global weight management RCTs, namely SCALE (clinicaltrials.gov ID NCT03552757, M. J. Davies et al., 2015) and STEP-2 (clinicaltrials.gov ID NCT01272232, M. Davies et al., 2021). While these trials are inherently longitudinal, we ignore this structure for the sole purpose of illustrating our method. Whenever a subject deviates from the predetermined protocol at randomization, we treat the subsequent weight measurements as missing. Hence, the causal effects defined below should be interpreted as full compliance effects, rather than the intention-to-treat effects outlined in the statistical analysis plans of the chosen RCTs.

The active treatments are once-daily liraglutide, 3.0 mg or 1.8 mg in SCALE and once-weekly semaglutide, 2.4 mg or 1.0 mg in STEP-2, injected subcutaneously, all of which are glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) agonists. Both RCTs are placebo-controlled with placebos administered matched to their respective active treatments. These superiority trials are designed to show the efficacy of semaglutide and liraglutide for weight loss among overweight or obese adults with type-2 diabetes. However, the study populations in the RCTs can differ in practice due to the sampling of study participants. Since the studies were conducted 5 to 6 years apart, a concern for the transportability of treatment effect is the potential drift in social determinants of health which are unmeasured in both RCTs. The main objective of the statistical analysis is to provide a head-to-head comparison of the treatments liraglutide versus semaglutide in the study population of STEP-2, taking into account the unobserved social determinants.

The outcome Y is chosen as the body weight at week 44 since treatment start. This is the timepoint closest to the end of treatment where body weight is measured in both RCTs. In order to perform an anchored comparison (Phillippo et al., 2018), we make the assumption that the placebos used in these studies do not have any meaningful difference in their effect on the outcome, despite the differences in the frequency of administration and the volume of injection. We restate the parameter $\psi = E\{Y(1) - Y(0) | S = 0\}$, where $A = 1$ means liraglutide, 3.0 mg and $A = 0$ means placebo. To balance the study populations, we adjust for a set of baseline adjustment variables $X = \{\text{baseline body weight, age, sex, body-mass index, race, region, waist circumference, smoking status, duration of diabetes}\}$.

Our method further requires the selection of appropriate negative controls to account for these unobserved effect modifiers. For the adjustment proxy W , we choose the percentage of glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), the fasting plasma glucose (FPG) level and the fasting insulin level at baseline.

FIGURE 4. Hypothesized causal diagram of the observed and unobserved variables in the data example. The dashed arrows may or may not be present. BAV: baseline adjustment variables. ● Observed variables; ○ unobserved variables; ■ selection variable.




TABLE 3. Percentages of missing body weight measurement at week 44.

	SCALE		STEP-2	
	Liraglutide 3.0 mg	Placebo	Semaglutide 2.4 mg	Placebo
<i>N</i>	413	207	404	402
Missing (%)	23.49	43.96	11.39	12.69

In a review of the impact of social determinants among type-2 diabetic patients in the United States, Walker et al. (2014) pointed out that many studies support the link between these determinants on glycemic control measured in HbA1c. For the reweighting proxy Z , we select the baseline low-density lipoprotein (LDL) and high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol levels as well as the baseline level of triglycerides. Cholesterol level has previously been found to be linked to health systems factors and economic development in many countries worldwide (Venkitachalam et al., 2012). Furthermore, there is no evidence on the existence of causal pathways from the current lipid level of a person to the future body weight. Additional assumptions on the proxies are illustrated by the causal graph in Figure 4. Note that we assume the levels of HbA1c, FPG and fasting insulin differ between the study populations only because the social determinants and possibly the baseline adjustment variables are distributed differently.

To diminish the skewness, the measurements for FPG, fasting insulin, HDL cholesterol, VLDL cholesterol and triglycerides were log-transformed. Specifically for the estimation of the bridge functions, the numerical variables among X were transformed into an orthogonal quadratic basis, and ridge regularization was applied to the linear parameters. We compared the multiply robust proximal indirect comparison estimator to the standard doubly robust estimator proposed by Dahabreh et al. (2020), where CATE transportability holds conditional on X . The subjects with missing measurements for X , Z or W were removed from the analysis, which were 21/846 in SCALE and 1/1210 in STEP-2. Table 3 shows that the nonadherence percentages are drastically different between the subjects randomized to the liraglutide, 3.0 mg arm and the placebo arm in the SCALE trial. The difference is less pronounced in the STEP-2 trial, where nonadherence occurs much less frequently. We assumed that nonadherence at or before week 44 is missing completely at random within the study and treatment arm combination so that $\pi(Z, W, A, X) = P(\Delta = 1 | A, S = 1)$ for the proximal indirect comparison estimator. To obtain estimates of the indirect comparison estimand θ , we further estimated the average treatment effect $E\{Y(-1) - Y(0) | S = 0\}$ within STEP-2 using the standard doubly robust estimator (Bang & Robins, 2005), where $A = -1$ stands for the once-weekly semaglutide, 2.4 mg treatment. A detailed description of the estimators and postulated nuisance models can be found in Appendix D. Standard errors for all estimators were calculated as empirical L_2 -norms of the corresponding influence functions. The estimates and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are displayed in Table 4. The proximal estimate of ψ shrinks the weight loss effect of liraglutide at week 44 compared to the standard estimate from -3.62 kg to -3.18 kg.

TABLE 4. Results from the indirect comparison analysis with SCALE and STEP-2. Standard: estimators without the use of proxies detailed in Appendix D.

Estimand	Standard	95%-CI	Proximal	95%-CI
$\psi = E\{Y(1) - Y(0) S = 0\}$	-3.62	(-4.72, -2.51)	-3.18	(-4.16, -2.21)
$\theta = E\{Y(1) - Y(-1) S = 0\}$	-3.43	(-4.82, -2.03)	-3.86	(-5.15, -2.56)

If the modelling assumptions hold, we may postulate that the unobserved social determinants have shifted in the direction that dampens the effect of GLP-1 agonists. Consequently, the proximal estimate of the indirect comparison parameter θ is -3.86 kg versus the standard estimate of -3.43 kg, indicating an even stronger weight loss effect of semaglutide.

7. DISCUSSION

In this article we propose a novel method for indirect comparison in the presence of unmeasured, shifted effect modifiers. We tailor the proximal causal inference framework to the problem of indirect comparison, where the treatment of interest is not observed among the target population. We require the availability IPD and in particular the existence of a pair of proxies in the source RCT and that of an adjustment proxy in the target RCT. The proximal indirect comparison estimator can be bias-free even when the CATE transportability fails to hold on the observed data. Despite the fact that the target parameter can be treated as a functional of the observed data, its interpretability depends on the underlying full data distribution. Since proximal indirect comparison implicitly “adjusts” for unobserved prognostic factors and/or effect modifiers, the cautionary note on M-bias from Section 2 is still relevant. A particular challenge for applying proximal indirect comparison is the selection of proxies in RCTs. For example, safety measurements and vital signs which are routinely collected usually do not affect the outcome, but they tend to be suboptimal proxy candidates because their distributions do not vary much between populations after controlling for baseline covariates. Data linkage would allow subjects from RCTs to be identified in the health registry, thereby providing far more potential proxies to choose from. Besides, the collection of proxy variables can be extended before and after the running period of the RCTs. When medical history is treated as a proxy, data linkage also helps avoid the use of self-reported data from questionnaires.

There are many interesting directions for future research. Throughout the development of the article we have assumed the availability of IPD in both RCTs. However, if only aggregate data can be obtained in one of the RCTs, the data likelihood changes and the bridge functions cannot be estimated with the same integral equations. A possible solution follows the calibration approach () to balance the moments of baseline covariates and proxies between RCTs. In longitudinal studies like SCALE and STEP-2 described in Section 6.2, subjects sometimes deviate from the treatment plan or drop out before the end of studies. The extension of proximal indirect comparison to estimating the full compliance effect is straightforward, if one is willing to assume CATE transportability at baseline (Breskin et al., 2021) and no unmeasured time-varying confounding within RCTs. A more general transportability framework for observational longitudinal data under weaker causal assumptions can build on Ying et al. (2023). Finally beyond indirect comparisons, network meta-analyses compare more than three treatments from different studies. In a dense network, direct evidence can often be strengthened by indirect evidence. The formulation of proximal causal inference for data fusion is left for future work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank Marie Thi Dao Tran from Novo Nordisk A/S for valuable input and discussions on the choices of proxies in the clinical trials SCALE and STEP-2.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Zehao Su is funded by a research gift from Novo Nordisk A/S to the Section of Biostatistics, University of Copenhagen. Henrik Ravn is employed by Novo Nordisk A/S.

REFERENCES

- BANG, H., & ROBINS, J. M. (2005). Doubly Robust Estimation in Missing Data and Causal Inference Models. *Biometrics*, 61(4), 962–973.
- BENNETT, A., KALLUS, N., MAO, X., NEWEY, W., SYRGKANIS, V., & UEHARA, M. (2022, December 25). *Inference on Strongly Identified Functionals of Weakly Identified Functions*. arXiv: 2208.08291 [econ, math, stat]. Retrieved February 9, 2023, from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2208.08291>
- BRESKIN, A., COLE, S. R., EDWARDS, J. K., BROOKMEYER, R., ERON, J. J., & ADIMORA, A. A. (2021). Fusion designs and estimators for treatment effects. *Statistics in Medicine*, 40(13), 3124–3137.
- CARRASCO, M., FLORENS, J.-P., & RENAULT, E. (2007, January 1). Chapter 77 Linear Inverse Problems in Structural Econometrics Estimation Based on Spectral Decomposition and Regularization. In J. J. HECKMAN & E. E. LEAMER (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics* (pp. 5633–5751, Vol. 6). Elsevier.
- CINELLI, C., FORNEY, A., & PEARL, J. (2022). A Crash Course in Good and Bad Controls. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 00491241221099552.
- COLNET, B., MAYER, I., CHEN, G., DIENG, A., LI, R., VAROQUAUX, G., VERT, J.-P., JOSSE, J., & YANG, S. (2024). Causal Inference Methods for Combining Randomized Trials and Observational Studies: A Review. *Statistical Science*, 39(1), 165–191.
- CUI, Y., PU, H., SHI, X., MIAO, W., & TCHETGEN TCHETGEN, E. (2023). Semiparametric Proximal Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 0(0), 1–12.
- DAHABREH, I. J., ROBERTSON, S. E., PETITO, L. C., HERNÁN, M. A., & STEINGRIMSSON, J. A. (2023). Efficient and robust methods for causally interpretable meta-analysis: Transporting inferences from multiple randomized trials to a target population. *Biometrics*, 79(2), 1057–1072.
- DAHABREH, I. J., ROBERTSON, S. E., STEINGRIMSSON, J. A., STUART, E. A., & HERNÁN, M. A. (2020). Extending inferences from a randomized trial to a new target population. *Statistics in Medicine*, 39(14), 1999–2014.
- DAVIES, M., FÆRCH, L., JEPPESEN, O. K., PAKSERESHT, A., PEDERSEN, S. D., PERREAULT, L., ROSENSTOCK, J., SHIMOMURA, I., VILJOEN, A., WADDEN, T. A., & LINGVAY, I. (2021). Semaglutide 2.4 mg once a week in adults with overweight or obesity, and type 2 diabetes (STEP 2): A randomised, double-blind, double-dummy, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet*, 397(10278), 971–984.
- DAVIES, M. J., BERGENSTAL, R., BODE, B., KUSHNER, R. F., LEWIN, A., SKJØTH, T. V., ANDREASEN, A. H., JENSEN, C. B., DEFONZO, R. A., & FOR THE NN8022-1922 STUDY GROUP. (2015). Efficacy of Liraglutide for Weight Loss Among Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: The SCALE Diabetes Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*, 314(7), 687–699.
- DIKKALA, N., LEWIS, G., MACKAY, L., & SYRGKANIS, V. (2020). Minimax estimation of conditional moment models. *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 12248–12262.
- FOSTER, D. J., & SYRGKANIS, V. (2023). Orthogonal statistical learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(3), 879–908.
- GHASSAMI, A., SHPITSER, I., & TCHETGEN, E. T. (2021, November 4). *Proximal Causal Inference with Hidden Mediators: Front-Door and Related Mediation Problems*. arXiv: 2111.02927 [math, stat].
- GHASSAMI, A., YANG, A., RICHARDSON, D., SHPITSER, I., & TCHETGEN, E. T. (2022, April 29). *Combining Experimental and Observational Data for Identification and Estimation of Long-Term Causal Effects*. arXiv: 2201.10743 [econ, math, stat].

- HARARI, O., SOLTANIFAR, M., CAPPELLERI, J. C., VERHOEK, A., OUWENS, M., DALY, C., & HEEG, B. (2023). Network meta-interpolation: Effect modification adjustment in network meta-analysis using subgroup analyses. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 14(2).
- IMBENS, G., KALLUS, N., MAO, X., & WANG, Y. (2022, March 16). *Long-term Causal Inference Under Persistent Confounding via Data Combination*. arXiv: 2202.07234 [econ, stat].
- JOSEY, K. P., BERKOWITZ, S. A., GHOSH, D., & RAGHAVAN, S. (2021). Transporting experimental results with entropy balancing. *Statistics in Medicine*, 40(19), 4310–4326.
- JOSEY, K. P., YANG, F., GHOSH, D., & RAGHAVAN, S. (2022). A calibration approach to transportability and data-fusion with observational data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 41(23), 4511–4531.
- KALLUS, N., MAO, X., & UEHARA, M. (2022, October 9). *Causal Inference Under Unmeasured Confounding With Negative Controls: A Minimax Learning Approach*. arXiv: 2103.14029 [cs, stat].
- KRESS, R. (2014). *Linear Integral Equations* (Vol. 82). Springer.
- LIPSITCH, M., TCHETGEN TCHETGEN, E., & COHEN, T. (2010). Negative Controls: A Tool for Detecting Confounding and Bias in Observational Studies. *Epidemiology*, 21(3), 383.
- MIAO, W., GENG, Z., & TCHETGEN TCHETGEN, E. J. (2018). Identifying causal effects with proxy variables of an unmeasured confounder. *Biometrika*, 105(4), 987–993.
- MIAO, W., SHI, X., & TCHETGEN, E. T. (2020, September 18). *A Confounding Bridge Approach for Double Negative Control Inference on Causal Effects*.
- PHILIPPO, D. M., ADES, A. E., DIAS, S., PALMER, S., ABRAMS, K. R., & WELTON, N. J. (2018). Methods for Population-Adjusted Indirect Comparisons in Health Technology Appraisal. *Medical Decision Making*, 38(2), 200–211.
- PHILIPPO, D. M., DIAS, S., ADES, A. E., BELGER, M., BRNABIC, A., SCHACHT, A., SAURE, D., KADZIOLA, Z., & WELTON, N. J. (2020). Multilevel network meta-regression for population-adjusted treatment comparisons. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 183(3), 1189–1210.
- RUBINO, D. M., GREENWAY, F. L., KHALID, U., O'NEIL, P. M., ROSENSTOCK, J., SØRRIG, R., WADDEN, T. A., WIZERT, A., GARVEY, W. T., & STEP 8 INVESTIGATORS. (2022). Effect of Weekly Subcutaneous Semaglutide vs Daily Liraglutide on Body Weight in Adults With Overweight or Obesity Without Diabetes: The STEP 8 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*, 327(2), 138–150.
- SEVERINI, T. A., & TRIPATHI, G. (2012). Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2), 491–498.
- STEWART, L. A., CLARKE, M., ROVERS, M., RILEY, R. D., SIMMONDS, M., STEWART, G., TIERNEY, J. F., & FOR THE PRISMA-IPD DEVELOPMENT GROUP. (2015). Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Individual Participant Data: The PRISMA-IPD Statement. *JAMA*, 313(16), 1657–1665.
- TCHETGEN, E. J. T., YING, A., CUI, Y., SHI, X., & MIAO, W. (2020, September 23). *An Introduction to Proximal Causal Learning*. arXiv: 2009.10982 [stat].
- TSIATIS, A. A. (2006). *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*. Springer.
- VENKITACHALAM, L., WANG, K., PORATH, A., CORBALAN, R., HIRSCH, A. T., COHEN, D. J., SMITH, S. C., OHMAN, E. M., STEG, P. G., BHATT, D. L., & MAGNUSON, E. A. (2012). Global Variation in the Prevalence of Elevated Cholesterol in Outpatients With Established Vascular Disease or 3 Cardiovascular Risk Factors According to National Indices of Economic Development and Health System Performance. *Circulation*, 125(15), 1858–1869.
- WAINWRIGHT, M. J. (2019). *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press.
- WALKER, R. J., SMALLS, B. L., CAMPBELL, J. A., STROM WILLIAMS, J. L., & EGEDE, L. E. (2014). Impact of social determinants of health on outcomes for type 2 diabetes: A systematic review. *Endocrine*, 47(1), 29–48.
- YING, A., CUI, Y., & TCHETGEN, E. J. T. (2022, April 27). *Proximal Causal Inference for Marginal Counterfactual Survival Curves*. arXiv: 2204.13144 [math, stat].
- YING, A., MIAO, W., SHI, X., & TCHETGEN TCHETGEN, E. J. (2023). Proximal causal inference for complex longitudinal studies. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(3), 684–704.
- ZHANG, J., LI, W., MIAO, W., & TCHETGEN TCHETGEN, E. (2023). Proximal causal inference without uniqueness assumptions. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 198, 109836.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. ASYMPTOTIC THEORY FOR ESTIMATORS OF BRIDGE FUNCTIONS

In the first part of the section, we present useful results on the asymptotics of the proximal indirect comparison estimators in the simulation study. In particular, we will derive their asymptotic variances under the assumption of parametric bridge functions.

ASSUMPTION A.1—Parametric bridge functions. Consider the model \mathcal{P} where \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} are singletons for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

- (i) $h(W, X) = h_\eta(W, X)$ for some Euclidean parameter η on a compactum \mathbb{H} .
- (ii) $q(Z, X) = q_\xi(Z, X)$ for some Euclidean parameter ξ on a compactum \mathbb{E} .

We give an outline of an M-estimator for the bridge function h following Miao et al. (2020). We choose some basis expansion $b(Z, X)$, whose dimension is at least as large as that of η .

PROPOSITION A.1—Influence functions of parametric bridge functions. *Suppose Assumption A.1 holds.*

- (i) *The influence functions of $\eta(P)$ at $P \in \mathcal{P}$ are $M_\eta^{-1} S b(Z, X) \{\tilde{Y} - h_\eta(W, X)\}$ for all $b(Z, X) \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $M_\eta = \mathbb{E}\{S b(Z, X) \partial_{\eta'} h_{\eta'}^T(W, X) |_{\eta'=\eta}\}$ is nonsingular.*
- (ii) *The influence functions of $\xi(P)$ at $P \in \mathcal{P}$ are $M_\xi^{-1} c(W, X) \{S q_\xi(Z, X) - (1 - S)\}$ for all $c(W, X) \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $M_\xi = -\mathbb{E}\{S c(W, X) \partial_{\xi'} q_{\xi'}^T(Z, X) |_{\xi'=\xi}\}$ is nonsingular.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION A.1. The proof of statement (i) is omitted, since it follows easily from the observation that the identification equation of h (and in this case, η)

$$\mathbb{E}[S\{\tilde{Y} - h_\eta(W, X)\}b(Z, X)] = 0$$

holds for all square integrable functions $b(Z, X)$. We only present the detailed arguments for statement (ii). The identification equation of q (and in this case, ξ)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[S\left\{q_\xi(Z, X) - \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W, X)}\right\}c(W, X)\right] = 0$$

holds for all square integrable functions $c(W, X)$. For the distribution P over the observed variables $O = (SY, SA, X, W, SZ, S)$, we consider a parametric submodel $\{P_\varepsilon\}$ where the density $p_\varepsilon(O) = p(O)\{1 + \varepsilon \mathcal{S}(O)\}$ for some bounded function $\mathcal{S}(O)$ such that $\mathbb{E}_P \mathcal{S}(O) = 0$ and ε near zero such that $p_\varepsilon(O) \geq 0$. Then $\mathcal{S}(O)$ is the score function under this submodel. Taking the Gateaux derivative on both sides of the equation along this submodel,

$$\partial_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}_{P_\varepsilon} \left[S \left\{ q_{\xi_\varepsilon}(Z, X) - \frac{P_\varepsilon(S = 0 | W, X)}{P_\varepsilon(S = 1 | W, X)} \right\} c(W, X) \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = 0.$$

Rearranging the terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathbb{E}\left\{S c(W, X) \partial_{\xi_\varepsilon} q_{\xi_\varepsilon}(Z, X) \Big|_{\xi_\varepsilon=\xi}\right\} \partial_\varepsilon \xi_\varepsilon \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[S \left\{ q_\xi(Z, X) - \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W, X)} \right\} c(W, X) \mathcal{S}(Z, W, X) \right] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}\left[S \frac{\partial_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon(S = 0 | W, X) |_{\varepsilon=0}}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W, X)} c(W, X) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}\left[S \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W, X) \partial_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon(S = 1 | W, X) |_{\varepsilon=0}}{\{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W, X)\}^2} c(W, X) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S}(Z, W, X) = E_P\{S(O) \mid Z, W, X, S = 1\}$. Ignoring the sign, the second term in the expression above is

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}} (1-s) \partial_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon(S = s \mid w, x)|_{\varepsilon=0} c(w, x) p(w, x) dw dx \\ &= E\{(1-S) [E\{\mathcal{S}(O) \mid S, W, X\} - E\{\mathcal{S}(O) \mid W, X\}] c(W, X)\} \\ &= E\{\mathcal{S}(O) \{(1-S) - P(S = 0 \mid W, X)\} c(W, X)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The third term is

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}} s \frac{P(S = 0 \mid w, x)}{P(S = 1 \mid w, x)} \partial_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon(S = s \mid w, x)|_{\varepsilon=0} c(w, x) p(w, x) dw dx \\ &= E\left\{S \frac{P(S = 0 \mid W, X)}{P(S = 1 \mid W, X)} [E\{\mathcal{S}(O) \mid S, W, X\} - E\{\mathcal{S}(O) \mid W, X\}] c(W, X)\right\} \\ &= E\left\{\mathcal{S}(O) \left\{S \frac{P(S = 0 \mid W, X)}{P(S = 1 \mid W, X)} - P(S = 0 \mid W, X)\right\} c(W, X)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the terms derived above into the derivative equation, we see that up to constant matrix multipliers, $\partial_\varepsilon \xi_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} \propto E_P[\{Sq_\xi(Z, X) - (1-S)\}c(W, X)\mathcal{S}(O)]$. By a limit argument that any function in $L_2(P)$ can be reached by a sequence of bounded functions, we conclude that the influence functions of ξ are of the form $\{Sq_\xi(Z, X) - (1-S)\}c(W, X)$. \square

The class of influence functions of ξ in Proposition A.1 implies that its estimation need not involve nuisance models for the participation odds $P(S = 0 \mid W, X)/P(S = 1 \mid W, X)$. A similar point was raised in the estimation of parametric treatment bridge functions to account for unmeasured confounding Cui et al. (2023).

PROPOSITION A.2. *We have the following asymptotic results under mild regularity conditions.*

(i) *If $h_\eta(W, X)$ is correctly specified and the nuisance estimator $\hat{\eta}$ approximately solves the estimating equation $\|P_n Sb(Z, X)\{\tilde{Y} - h_\eta(W, X)\}\| = o_P(n^{-1/2})$, then $\hat{\eta}$ is asymptotically normal with influence function*

$$\phi_\eta(P) = \{PSb(Z, X)\partial_{\eta'} h_{\eta'}^\top(W, X)|_{\eta'=\eta}\}^{-1} Sb(Z, X)\{\tilde{Y} - h_\eta(W, X)\}.$$

The estimator $\hat{\psi}_h = P_{0,n} h_{\hat{\eta}}(W, X)$ is asymptotically normal with influence function

$$\frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h_\eta(W, X) - \psi(P)\} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \{PS\partial_{\eta'} h_{\eta'}^\top(W, X)|_{\eta'=\eta}\} \phi_\eta(P).$$

(ii) *If $q_\xi(Z, X)$ is correctly specified and the nuisance estimator $\hat{\xi}$ approximately solves the estimating equation $\|P_n c(W, X)\{(1-S) - Sq_{\hat{\xi}}(Z, X)\}\| = o_P(n^{-1/2})$, then $\hat{\xi}$ is asymptotically normal with influence function*

$$\phi_\xi(P) = \{PSc(W, X)\partial_{\xi'} q_{\xi'}^\top(Z, X)|_{\xi'=\xi}\}^{-1} c(W, X)\{(1-S) - Sq_\xi(Z, X)\}.$$

The estimator $\hat{\psi}_q = P_n \{Sq_{\hat{\xi}}(Z, X)\tilde{Y}\}/\hat{\alpha}$ is asymptotically normal with influence function

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \{Sq_\xi(Z, X)\tilde{Y} - (1-S)\psi(P)\} + \frac{1}{\alpha} P\{S\tilde{Y}\partial_{\xi'} q_{\xi'}^\top(Z, X)|_{\xi'=\xi}\} \phi_\xi(P).$$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION A.2. A first-order Taylor expansion of the estimating equations around the true parameters η and ξ shows the influence functions ϕ_η and ϕ_ξ . The influence functions of $\hat{\psi}_h$ and $\hat{\psi}_q$ can be obtained by the same technique, with the exception that $\hat{\psi}_q$ should be additionally Taylor expanded around α . \square

In the second part of the section, we provide convergence rates of the minimax bridge function estimators in the presence of missingness on the outcome in the source RCT. The results are an extension of the finite sample analysis for minimax estimation in Kallus et al. (2022) to accommodate the plug-in of nuisance parameter estimates in the loss function.

We first look at the estimator $\hat{h} = \arg \inf_{h' \in \mathbb{H}} \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{P_{1,n}^c \zeta(h', q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})\}^2$ from Section 5 and bound its projected MSE. Note that the nuisance function estimates $\hat{\pi}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ may be obtained from the same sample P_n^c .

PROPOSITION A.3. *Suppose $T(\mathbb{H}' - h) \in \mathbb{Q}'$, $\mathbb{H} = \{h\} \subset \mathbb{H}'$, $1/e(A | X) < \infty$, $|Y| < \infty$, that $\hat{\pi} \in \mathbb{P}$, $\hat{\mu} \in \mathbb{M}$ and that \mathbb{H}' , \mathbb{Q}' , $1/\mathbb{P}$ and \mathbb{M} are uniformly bounded P -Donsker classes. Then $\|T(\hat{h} - h)\|_{P_1}^2 = O_P(n^{-1/2} + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_P \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|)$.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION A.3. Since the estimation of the outcome bridge function involves only the source RCT population P_1 , we drop this notation in the presentation of the proof and abuse the notation P_n and P to mean $P_{1,n}$ and P_1 . The worst-case bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\zeta(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| \\ & \leq \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |(P_n - P)\zeta(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| + \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P_n\zeta(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| \\ & \leq \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |(P_n - P)\zeta(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| + \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P_n\zeta(h, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| \\ & \leq \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |(P_n - P)\zeta(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| + \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |(P_n - P)\zeta(h, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| + \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\zeta(h, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})|. \end{aligned}$$

Then the projected mean squared error of the estimated bridge function \hat{h} is

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\hat{h} - h)\|^2 & \leq \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\{q'T(\hat{h} - h)\}| && (T(\hat{h} - h) \in \mathbb{Q}') \\ & = \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\{q'(\hat{h} - h)\}| \\ & = \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\zeta(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| + \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\zeta(h, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{h' \in \mathbb{H}', q' \in \mathbb{Q}', \pi' \in \mathbb{P}, \mu' \in \mathbb{M}} |(P_n - P)\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu')| + 2 \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} |P\zeta(h, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| \\ & \lesssim \sup_{h' \in \mathbb{H}', q' \in \mathbb{Q}', \pi' \in \mathbb{P}, \mu' \in \mathbb{M}} |(P_n - P)\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu')| + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\| \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $\|\mathbb{Q}'\|_\infty < \infty$, $\|1/\mathbb{P}\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|1/e(A | X)\|_\infty < \infty$. The uniform boundedness assumed ensures the permanence of the Donsker class such that $\{\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu') : h' \in \mathbb{H}', q' \in \mathbb{Q}', \pi' \in \mathbb{P}, \mu' \in \mathbb{M}\}$ is also P -Donsker. Therefore the empirical process term is of the order $O_P(n^{-1/2})$. \square

The convergence rate of the projected RMSE $\|T(\hat{h} - h)\|_{P_1}$ is upper-bounded by the convergence rate of the square-root of the error product $\|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_{P_1} \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|_{P_1}$ and the convergence rate of an empirical process term. When the bridge class contains the true outcome bridge and the critic class is rich, the Donsker condition on the nuisance function classes leads to the convergence rate $O_P(n^{-1/4})$.

We introduce necessary notations before listing the auxiliary lemmas needed to show the convergence rate of the projected MSE of the estimated bridge function from the stabilized and regularized minimax problem. The localized Rademacher complexity for a function class \mathbb{F} is a nonrandom quantity $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathbb{F}; \delta) = \mathbb{E}\{\sup_{f \in \mathbb{F}, \|f\| \leq \delta} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i f(V_i)\}/n$, where $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables. The star hull of a function class \mathbb{F} is denoted by $\text{star}(\mathbb{F})$. The shifted function class $\mathbb{F} - \bar{f}$ for some function \bar{f} is the set $\{f - \bar{f} : f \in \mathbb{F}\}$.

LEMMA A.1—Theorem 14.1 in Wainwright (2019). *Given a star-shaped and B-uniformly bounded function class \mathbb{F} , let δ_n be any positive solution of the inequality $\mathcal{R}_n(\mathbb{F}; \delta) \leq \delta^2/B$. Then for any $f \in \mathbb{F}$ and $t \geq \delta_n$, we have $2|\|f\|_n^2 - \|f\|^2| \leq \|f\|^2 + t^2$.*

LEMMA A.2—Lemma 14 in Foster and Syrgkanis (2023). *Consider a B-uniformly bounded function class \mathbb{F} and pick any $\bar{f} \in \mathbb{F}$. Let δ_n be the solution to $\mathcal{R}_n(\text{star}(\mathbb{F} - \bar{f}); \delta) \leq \delta^2/B$. If the loss function $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is L-Lipschitz in the first argument, then for $\tilde{\delta}_n = \delta_n + \sqrt{c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)/n}$ with some universal constants c_1, c_2 , the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$:*

$$|(P_n - P)\{\ell(f, g) - \ell(\bar{f}, g)\}| \leq 18L\tilde{\delta}_n(\|f - \bar{f}\| + \tilde{\delta}_n).$$

PROPOSITION A.4. *Assume $1/e(A|X) < \infty$, $\hat{\pi}(Z, W, A, X) > 0$, $|Y| < \infty$ and that \mathbb{H}' , \mathbb{Q}' are uniformly bounded. Let $\hat{h} = \arg \inf_{h' \in \mathbb{H}'} \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{P_{1,n}\zeta(h', q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - \lambda\|q'\|_{P_{1,n}}^2 + \gamma\|h'\|_{P_{1,n}}^2\}$. For any fixed $\bar{h} \in \mathbb{H}'$, assume further that \mathbb{Q}' is symmetric and star-shaped and that δ_n upper bounds the critical radii of \mathbb{Q}' and the star hull of the following class:*

$$\{q(Z, X)\{h(W, X) - \bar{h}(W, X)\} : h \in \mathbb{H}, q \in \mathbb{Q}'\}.$$

Then with probability $1 - \delta$, we have for any $h \in \mathbb{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(\hat{h} - h)\|_{P_1} &\lesssim (1 + \lambda + \lambda^{-1})[\delta_n + \sqrt{\{1 + \log(1/\delta)\}/n}] + \sup_{h' \in \mathbb{H}} \inf_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \|T(h' - \bar{h}) - q'\|_{P_1} \\ &\quad + (1 + [\delta_n + \sqrt{\{1 + \log(1/\delta)\}/n}]^{-1} \lambda^{-1}) \|T(h - \bar{h})\|_{P_1} \\ &\quad + [\delta_n + \sqrt{\{1 + \log(1/\delta)\}/n}]^{-1} \{ \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_{P_1} \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|_{P_1} + \gamma \}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION A.4. The proof of the proposition closely follows the proof of Theorem 7 in Kallus et al. (2022) and the proof of Theorem 1 in Dikkala et al. (2020). Since the estimation of the outcome bridge function involves only the source RCT population P_1 , we drop this notation in the presentation of the proof and abuse the notation P_n and P to mean $P_{1,n}$ and P_1 . Define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(h', q', \pi', \mu') &= P\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu'), \\ \mathcal{F}_n(h', q', \pi', \mu') &= P_n\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu'), \\ \mathcal{F}^\lambda(h', q', \pi', \mu') &= P\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu') - \lambda\|q'\|^2, \\ \mathcal{F}_n^\lambda(h', q', \pi', \mu') &= P_n\zeta(h', q', \pi', \mu') - \lambda\|q'\|_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\delta}_n = \delta_n + \sqrt{c_1 \log(c_2/\delta)/n}$, where δ_n upper bounds the critical radius of \mathbb{Q}' . From Lemma A.1, we have for any $q' \in \mathbb{Q}'$,

$$2|\|q'\|_n^2 - \|q'\|^2| \leq \|q'\|^2 + \tilde{\delta}_n^2. \quad (1)$$

We now apply Lemma A.2 to the loss function $\ell = \zeta$ with the first argument being q' and the second argument being $\zeta(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})/q'$. The loss function is Lipschitz with respect to the first argument, since the second argument is uniformly bounded by a constant due to the uniform boundedness of Y , \mathbb{H}' , $1/P$ and \mathbb{M} . Therefore, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$|(\mathcal{F}_n - \mathcal{F})(\bar{h}, q', \pi', \mu')| = |(P_n - P)\zeta(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu})| \lesssim \tilde{\delta}_n(\|q'\| + \tilde{\delta}_n)$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) &= \mathcal{F}(h, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) + P\{q(h - \bar{h})\} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\| \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\| + P\{q(h - \bar{h})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we used the uniform boundedness of \mathbb{Q}' and that $\hat{\pi}$ is bounded away from zero. Omitting the same arguments from Kallus et al. (2022) and Dikkala et al. (2020), we arrive at the upper bound of the quantity

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{ \mathcal{X}_n(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - \mathcal{X}_n(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - 2\lambda \|q'\|_n^2 \} \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \mathcal{X}_n^\lambda(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) + \gamma (\|\bar{h}\|_n^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_n^2) \\
& \lesssim \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{ \mathcal{X}(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - \lambda \|q'\|^2 \} + (1 + \lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \delta_n^2 + \gamma (\|\bar{h}\|_n^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_n^2) \\
& \lesssim \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{ \mathcal{X}(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - \lambda \|q'\|^2 \} + (1 + \lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \delta_n^2 + \gamma \\
& \lesssim \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{ \|T(h - \bar{h})\| \|q'\| - \lambda \|q'\|^2 \} + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\| \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\| + (1 + \lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \delta_n^2 + \gamma \\
& \lesssim \lambda^{-1} \|T(h - \bar{h})\| + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\| \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\| + (1 + \lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \delta_n^2 + \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Define for any $h' \in \mathbb{H}'$ the best approximation of the projection $q_{h'} = \arg \inf_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \|T(\bar{h} - h') - q'\|$ and the minimum dissimilarity $\varepsilon_n = \sup_{h' \in \mathbb{H}'} \inf_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \|T(\bar{h} - h') - q'\|$. The lower bound of the quantity above can be obtained by the exact same arguments used in Kallus et al. (2022), with which we have either $\|q_{\hat{h}}\| < \tilde{\delta}_n$, or $\|q_{\hat{h}}\| \geq \tilde{\delta}_n$ and then

$$\tilde{\delta}_n \{ \|T(\hat{h} - \bar{h})\| - \varepsilon_n \} - \delta_n^2 \lesssim \sup_{q' \in \mathbb{Q}'} \{ \mathcal{X}_n(\hat{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - \mathcal{X}_n(\bar{h}, q', \hat{\pi}, \hat{\mu}) - 2\lambda \|q'\|_n^2 \}.$$

Combining the two bounds, with probability $1 - \delta$, we have for any $h \in \mathbb{H}$, $\|T(\hat{h} - h)\| \lesssim (1 + \lambda + \lambda^{-1}) \delta_n + (1 + \tilde{\delta}_n^{-1} \lambda^{-1}) \|T(h - \bar{h})\| + \tilde{\delta}_n^{-1} \{ \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\| \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\| + \gamma \} + \varepsilon_n$.

□

COROLLARY 1. *Suppose the assumptions in Proposition A.4 hold. Furthermore, assume that $\mathbb{H} = \{h\} \subset \mathbb{H}'$, $T(\mathbb{H}' - h) \subset \mathbb{Q}'$, $\lambda = O(1)$, $\gamma = O(\delta_n^2)$ and $\sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a\|_{P_1} \|\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a\|_{P_1} = O_P(r_n)$. Then with probability $1 - 2\delta$, we have for any $h \in \mathbb{H}$ and some positive constant M_δ that*

$$\|T(\hat{h} - h)\|_{P_1} \lesssim \delta_n + M_\delta \delta_n^{-1} r_n + \sqrt{\{1 + \log(1/\delta)\}/n}.$$

From Corollary 1 we can conclude the convergence rates of the projected RMSE $\|T(\hat{h} - h)\|_{P_1}$ with various choices of the upper bound of critical radius and the product error rate r_n . For $\delta_n \asymp n^{-1/4}$ and $r_n \asymp n^{-1/2}$, the projected RMSE is $O_P(n^{-1/4})$. Compared with the crude analysis, there is no gain in the convergence rate of \hat{h} , but the Donsker class condition on various nuisance function classes is removed and replaced by the weaker critical radius condition. When $\delta_n = o(n^{-1/4})$ and $r_n = o(n^{-1/2})$, the projected RMSE has an improved rate $o_P(n^{-1/4})$.

APPENDIX B. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF BRIDGE FUNCTIONS

For estimation and inference, it is much easier to take the existence and uniqueness of \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} as the primary condition. An alternative presentation of the results is to view the identification formulas in Proposition 2 directly as parameters of interest. This is the approach taken by many works in proximal causal inference (). Then with Assumption 2 and the completeness assumptions on the distribution $p(U|W, X, S=1)$ and $p(U|Z, X, S=1)$, one arrives at $\mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{H}^*$ and $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{Q}^*$. That is, under these alternative assumptions, the two parameters of interest will have the right causal interpretation.

For simplicity we make use of the following completeness conditions on the observed data distribution, under which \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} must be either empty sets or singletons.

ASSUMPTION B.1—Completeness. The following conditions hold P_1 -almost surely:

- (i) $E\{g(W, X) \mid Z, X, S = 1\} = 0$ implies $g(W, X) = 0$;
- (ii) $E\{g(Z, X) \mid W, X, S = 1\} = 0$ implies $g(Z, X) = 0$.

We introduce some notations. When T and T^* are compact operators, there exist orthonormal sequences (f_n) in $L_2(Z, X; P_1)$ and (g_n) in $L_2(W, X; P_1)$ and a positive sequence of real numbers (σ_n) such that $Tg_n = \sigma_n g_n$ and $T^*f_n = \sigma_n f_n$ for all positive integer n (Theorem 15.16 in Kress, 2014).

ASSUMPTION B.2—Relevance. The following regularity conditions hold:

- (i) T and T^* are compact operators;
- (ii) $E(\tilde{Y} \mid Z, X, S = 1) \in L_2(Z, X; P_1)$;
- (iii) $\{P(S = 1 \mid W, X)\}^{-1}P(S = 0 \mid W, X) \in L_2(W, X; P_1)$;
- (iv) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\sigma_n)^{-2} |\langle E(\tilde{Y} \mid Z, X, S = 1), g_n \rangle_{L_2(Z, X; P_1)}|^2 < \infty$;
- (v) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\sigma_n)^{-2} |\langle \{P(S = 1 \mid W, X)\}^{-1}P(S = 0 \mid W, X), g_n \rangle_{L_2(W, X; P_1)}|^2 < \infty$.

PROPOSITION B.1—Identifiability of bridge functions. *The following statements hold:*

- (i) Under Assumption B.2(i), (ii) and (iv) and in Assumption B.1(i), the bridge function $\mathbb{H} = \{h\}$ is a.s. uniquely identifiable.
- (ii) Under in Assumption B.2(i), (iii) and (v) and Assumption B.1(ii), the bridge function $\mathbb{Q} = \{q\}$ is a.s. uniquely identifiable.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION B.1. We only show the proof of the first index of Proposition B.1. The singular value decomposition of T exists by Assumption B.2(i). By definition, the nonemptiness of \mathbb{H} is equivalently expressed as a linear integral equation in Hilbert spaces $Th(W, X) = E\{\tilde{Y} \mid Z, X, S = 1\}$. Applying Picard's Theorem (Theorem 15.18 in Kress, 2014), the equation for h has a solution due to Assumption B.2(ii) and (iv). We will use proof by contradiction to show the second part of the statement. Suppose on the contrary that there exist two solutions $h \neq h'$ to the equation in \mathbb{H} , such that $E(h - h' \mid Z, X, S = 1) = 0$ holds $P_1(Z, X)$ -almost surely. Then by Assumption B.1(i), we must have $h = h'$ almost surely. The proof for the second index can be similarly obtained using the assumptions shown in Proposition B.1. \square

In general the operators T and its adjoint T^* are not compact operators. A sufficient condition for Assumption B.2(i) to hold is that $\iint p(w \mid z, X, S = 1)p(z \mid w, X, S = 1)dw dz < \infty$ (see Example 2.3 in Carrasco et al., 2007). Then T is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, which is guaranteed to be compact. Sufficient conditions for \mathbb{H}^* and \mathbb{Q}^* being singletons can be obtained by considering linear operators from $L_2(U, X; P_1)$ to $L_2(W, X; P_1)$ and $L_2(Z, X; P_1)$. See also Kallus et al. (2022), pp. 41, Proof of Lemma 10.

APPENDIX C. DETAILS OF THE SIMULATED DATA EXAMPLE

The baseline covariates X , the unobserved variables U , the negative control outcomes W , and the negative control treatments Z are multivariate. The rest of the variables are univariate. We use b , β , and B for scalar, vector, and matrix coefficients. Their dimensions should be clear from the context. We generated the data sequentially according to (excluding X and U , which can follow arbitrary joint distributions):

$$\begin{aligned} S \mid (X, U) &\sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\expit(b_s + \beta_{sX}^T X + \beta_{sU}^T U)\}, \\ A \mid (X, U, S = 1) &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(b_a), 0 < b_a < 1, \\ Z \mid (X, U, S = 1) &\sim \text{Normal}(\beta_z + B_{zu}U + B_{zX}X, \Sigma_z), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
W | (X, U) &\sim \text{Normal}(\beta_w + B_{wu}U + B_{wx}X, \Sigma_w), \\
Y | (W, A, X, U, S = 1) &\sim \text{Normal}(b_y + b_{ya}A + \beta_{yu}^T U + \beta_{y(au)}^T (AU) + \beta_{yx}^T X \\
&\quad + \beta_{yw}^T W + \beta_{y(aw)}^T (AW), \sigma_y^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The conditional distribution $W | (A, X, U, S = 1)$ is the same as the conditional distribution of $W | (X, U, S = 1)$. The conditional expectation

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\{Y | A = 1, X, U, S = 1\} - E\{Y | A = 0, X, U, S = 1\} \\
&= E\{E(Y | W, A = 1, X, U, S = 1) - E(Y | W, A = 0, X, U, S = 1) | X, U, S = 1\} \\
&= b_{ya} + \beta_{y(au)}^T U + \beta_{y(aw)}^T E(W | X, U, S = 1) \\
&= b_{ya} + \beta_{y(aw)}^T \beta_w + (\beta_{y(au)}^T + \beta_{y(aw)}^T B_{wu})U + \beta_{y(aw)}^T B_{wx}X.
\end{aligned}$$

Let the outcome bridge function $h(W, X) = \eta_0 + \eta_w^T W + \eta_x^T X$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
E\{h(W, X) | X, U, S = 1\} &= \eta_0 + \eta_x^T X + \eta_w^T E(W | X, U, S = 1) \\
&= \eta_0 + \eta_w^T \beta_w + (\eta_x^T + \eta_w^T B_{wx})X + \eta_w^T B_{wu}U.
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the coefficients in the two expressions, we have the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_0 + \eta_w^T \beta_w &= b_{ya} + \beta_{y(aw)}^T \beta_w \\
\eta_x^T + \eta_w^T B_{wx} &= \beta_{y(aw)}^T B_{wx} \\
\eta_w^T B_{wu} &= \beta_{y(au)}^T + \beta_{y(aw)}^T B_{wu},
\end{aligned}$$

so the parameters of the bridge function are

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_0 &= b_{ya} - \beta_w^T B_{wu}^{-T} \beta_{y(au)}, \\
\eta_x &= -B_{wx}^T B_{wu}^{-T} \beta_{y(au)}, \\
\eta_w &= B_{wu}^{-T} \beta_{y(au)} + \beta_{y(aw)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The probability ratio

$$\frac{P(S = 0 | X, U)}{P(S = 1 | X, U)} = \exp(-b_s - \beta_{sx}^T X - \beta_{su}^T U).$$

Let the treatment-trial bridge function

$$q(Z, X) = \exp(\xi_0 + \xi_z^T Z + \xi_x^T X),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
E\{q(Z, X) | X, U, S = 1\} &= \exp(\xi_0 + \xi_x^T X) E\{\exp(\xi_z^T Z) | X, U, S = 1\} \\
&= \exp(\xi_0 + \xi_x^T X) \exp\left\{\xi_z^T (\beta_z + B_{zu}U + B_{zx}X) + \frac{1}{2}\xi_z^T \Sigma_z \xi_z\right\} \\
&= \exp\left\{\xi_0 + \xi_z^T \beta_z + \frac{1}{2}\xi_z^T \Sigma_z \xi_z + (\xi_x^T + \xi_z^T B_{zx})X + \xi_z^T B_{zu}U\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the moment generating function of the conditional distribution $Z | (X, U, S = 1)$.

Comparing the coefficients in the two expressions, we have the following system of equations:

$$\xi_0 + \xi_z^T \beta_z + \frac{1}{2}\xi_z^T \Sigma_z \xi_z = -b_s$$

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_x^\top + \xi_z^\top B_{zx} &= -\beta_{sx}^\top \\ \xi_z^\top B_{zu} &= -\beta_{su}^\top,\end{aligned}$$

so the parameters of the bridge function are

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_0 &= -b_s + \beta_z^\top B_{zu}^{-\top} \beta_{su} - \frac{1}{2} \beta_{su}^\top B_{zu}^{-1} \Sigma_z B_{zu}^{-\top} \beta_{su}, \\ \xi_x &= -\beta_{sx} + B_{zx}^\top B_{zu}^{-\top} \beta_{su}, \\ \xi_z &= -B_{zu}^{-\top} \beta_{su}.\end{aligned}$$

We consider the setup without missing data; that is, the outcome is always observed in the source RCT. In experiment 11, we investigated the behaviour of proximal indirect comparison estimators in the absence of unmeasured effect modifiers, where U was set as a zero vector. To understand the impact of the violation of the proxy assumptions (here Assumption 2(ii) and (iii)), we replaced the conditional distribution of Y with $Y | (Z, W, A, U, S = 0) \sim \text{Normal}(0.5 - A + U^\top 1 + AU^\top 1 + X^\top 1 + W^\top 1 + AW^\top 1 + Z^\top 1 + AZ^\top 1, 0.5^2)$ in experiment 13 and the condition distribution of W with $W | (X, S) \sim \text{Normal}(S1 + X + U, 0.25\text{Id})$ in experiment 14. In experiment 15, we simulated $U \sim \text{Uniform}([-1, 0])$ as a scalar-valued random variable but maintained the proxies as vectors, so that the bridge functions are no longer uniquely identified. The importance of the existence of the bridge functions was studied in experiment 17 by simulating Z from $Z | (U, X, S = 0) \sim \text{Normal}(0.05U + X, 0.25\text{Id})$, making Z nearly uncorrelated with U given X in the source RCT. Likewise in experiment 18, we simulated W from $W | (U, X) \sim \text{Normal}(0.05U + X, 0.25\text{Id})$ so that W is nearly uncorrelated with U given X . In experiment 19, we examined the effect on near violation of positivity by changing the conditional probability $P(S = 1 | U, X)$ to $\text{expit}(-0.675 + 0.5X^\top 1 + 2.5U^\top 1)$ so that the participation odds $P(S = 0 | U, X) / P(S = 1 | U, X)$ is large, as the coefficient of U is disproportionately large. Finally in experiments 12 and 16, the data were simulated as in experiments 11 and 15, whereas the bridge functions were estimated with ridge regularization. That is, the fitted bridge functions were $h_{\hat{\eta}_\lambda}(W, X)$ and $q_{\hat{\xi}_\lambda}(Z, X)$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\eta}_\lambda &= \arg \min_{\eta'} \|P_{1,n} b(Z, X) \{\tilde{Y} - h_{\eta'}(W, X)\}\|_2^2 + \lambda_h (\eta')^\top D_h \eta', \\ \hat{\xi}_\lambda &= \arg \min_{\xi'} \|P_n \{c(W, X)\}^3 \{Sq_{\xi'}(Z, X) - (1 - S)\}\|_2^2 + \lambda_q (\xi')^\top D_q \xi',\end{aligned}$$

with fixed regularization parameters $\lambda_h = \lambda_q = 10^{-4}$ and D_h and D_q being identity matrices of appropriate dimensions with their upper left corners changed to zero, so that the intercept is unpenalized. All results from the additional simulation studies are displayed in Tables 5 and 6.

APPENDIX D. DETAILS OF THE REAL DATA EXAMPLE

We state an MAR assumption in the target RCT, since some individuals were lost to follow-up in STEP-2. The full compliance ATE θ is identified under this additional assumption.

ASSUMPTION D.1—Missing at random. Suppose that

- (i) $\Delta \perp Y | (A, X, S = 0)$;
- (ii) $P(\Delta = 1 | A, X, S = 0) > 0$ whenever $P(S = 0 | A, X) > 0$.

Let $m(A, X, S) = E(Y | \Delta = 1, A, X, S)$ and by an abuse of notation $p(X) = P(S = 1 | X)$, $e(A | X, S) = P(A | X, S)$. We assumed linear models for $\mu(Z, W, A, X)$, $m(A, X, S)$ and $\log[p(X) / \{1 - p(X)\}]$. Let \tilde{X} denote the design vector without intercept from the baseline adjusting variables X with numerical variables transformed into the orthogonal quadratic basis and categorical variables transformed into dummy variables. The bridge functions were assumed to follow parametric forms $h(W, X) = h_\eta(W, X) = \eta^\top \tilde{c}(W, X)$ and $q(Z, X) = q_\xi(Z, X) = \xi^\top \tilde{b}(Z, X)$, where

TABLE 5. Additional simulation results of experiments 11–19 with sample size $n = 1000$. Bias: Monte-Carlo bias, 10^{-3} ; RMSE: root mean squared error, 10^{-1} ; SE: average of standard error estimates, 10^{-1} ; Coverage: 95% confidence interval coverage, %.

n	Experiment	Estimator	Mean	Bias	RMSE	SE	Coverage
1000	11	$\hat{\psi}_h$	0.40	-3.29	60.24	585.37	100.00
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	0.38	-25.55	9.79	1318.56	97.39
		$\hat{\psi}$	0.17	-232.71	140.78	65.29	98.59
	12	$\hat{\psi}_h$	0.40	-8.56	3.39	63.76	99.80
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	0.39	-12.37	3.36	42.13	99.50
		$\hat{\psi}$	0.39	-13.32	3.36	3.31	94.70
	13	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.84	-93.51	4.87	4.82	95.30
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.87	-116.60	6.41	6.27	95.70
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.84	-93.01	5.83	5.78	94.80
	14	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-5.45	-2802.40	52.29	44.69	90.60
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.01	631.36	33.84	1.65	5.48
		$\hat{\psi}$	-5.13	-2487.30	53.51	28.60	55.01
	15	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-1.83	-169.06	43.99	379.44	100.00
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-1.70	-37.91	5.68	150.45	96.70
		$\hat{\psi}$	-1.86	-206.71	56.19	28.78	97.49
	16	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-1.65	3.76	2.39	28.39	99.70
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-1.66	-5.54	2.56	27.70	99.50
		$\hat{\psi}$	-1.66	-0.08	2.51	2.47	94.20
	17	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.73	-79.91	72.12	725.79	100.00
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.52	121.77	10.02	24.72	90.67
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.64	8.94	73.71	41.25	95.49
	18	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-1.09	85.97	60.62	582.12	100.00
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-1.10	84.36	6.68	947.45	96.40
		$\hat{\psi}$	-1.31	-134.55	70.33	40.68	99.00
	19	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.67	-111.00	31.82	44.00	94.10
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.22	336.45	19.65	7.44	44.10
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.43	130.62	29.32	18.92	83.47

TABLE 6. Additional simulation results of experiments 11–19 with sample size $n = 2000$. Bias: Monte-Carlo bias, 10^{-3} ; RMSE: root mean squared error, 10^{-1} ; SE: average of standard error estimates, 10^{-1} ; Coverage: 95% confidence interval coverage, %.

n	Experiment	Estimator	Mean	Bias	RMSE	SE	Coverage
2000	11	$\hat{\psi}_h$	0.56	154.81	37.69	367.80	100.00
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	0.40	-2.34	6.72	59.25	98.99
		$\hat{\psi}$	0.42	9.49	91.75	39.15	98.79
	12	$\hat{\psi}_h$	0.42	11.12	2.45	84.90	99.80
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	0.41	6.37	2.42	33.26	99.80
		$\hat{\psi}$	0.41	4.56	2.42	2.32	92.80
	13	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.85	-104.03	3.59	3.37	93.80
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.87	-124.49	4.40	4.19	95.40
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.86	-110.04	4.08	3.90	94.50
	14	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-5.60	-2955.11	42.89	31.01	84.30
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.35	293.72	39.12	2.15	4.41
		$\hat{\psi}$	-5.29	-2649.47	51.14	32.02	62.07
	15	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-1.58	77.82	20.55	144.31	99.70
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-1.68	-24.05	4.03	548.32	97.00
		$\hat{\psi}$	-1.67	-16.70	26.86	17.81	98.30
	16	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-1.66	-3.03	1.64	18.46	99.20
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-1.67	-8.20	1.78	24.66	99.40
		$\hat{\psi}$	-1.66	-7.20	1.73	1.74	95.20
	17	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.78	-131.67	75.44	528.18	100.00
		$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.51	136.13	8.89	1529.49	92.30
		$\hat{\psi}$	-2.59	51.16	67.84	27.79	92.29
18	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-1.08	98.20	43.26	293.16	100.00	
	$\hat{\psi}_q$	-1.11	71.73	4.91	494.91	97.29	
	$\hat{\psi}$	-0.93	249.01	68.86	29.61	98.99	
19	$\hat{\psi}_h$	-2.58	-17.43	12.05	11.62	94.80	
	$\hat{\psi}_q$	-2.61	-53.22	17.31	11.60	51.69	
	$\hat{\psi}$	-2.66	-99.47	17.48	15.17	88.39	

TABLE 7. Additional estimates from the indirect comparison analysis with SCALE and STEP-2. The estimands are direct comparisons of the treatments administered in the respective trials.

Estimand	Estimate	95%-CI
$E\{Y(-1) - Y(0) \mid S = 0\}$	-7.04	(-7.91, -6.18)
$E\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid S = 1\}$	-3.97	(-5.08, -2.86)

$\tilde{c}(W, X) = (1, W, \tilde{X})$ and $\tilde{b}(Z, X) = (1, Z, \tilde{X})$. Again abusing the symbol, we denote the probability of adherence by $\pi(A, S) = P(\Delta = 1 \mid A, S)$ where $\pi(A, 1) = \pi(Z, W, A, X)$.

The linear parameters in the bridge functions are fitted using the ridge-regularized generalized method of moment such that

$$\hat{\eta}_\lambda = \arg \min_{\eta'} \|P_{1,n}^c \zeta(\hat{\pi}(A, 1), \hat{\mu}(Z, W, A, X), h_{\eta'}(W, X), \tilde{b}(Z, X))\|^2 + \lambda_{h,n}(\eta')^T D_h \eta',$$

$$\hat{\xi}_\lambda = \arg \min_{\xi'} \|P_n^c \tilde{c}(W, X) \{Sq_{\xi'}(Z, X) - (1 - S)\}\|^2 + \lambda_{q,n}(\xi')^T D_q \xi',$$

where D_h and D_q are identity matrices of appropriate dimensions with their upper left corners changed to zero. The data-adaptive regularization factors $\lambda_{h,n}$ and $\lambda_{q,n}$ are chosen with 10-fold cross validation from a prespecified grid. The models $m(A, X, S)$ and $\pi(A, S)$ are fitted separately for SCALE and STEP-2 samples to allow for full interaction between S and the other variables. The models $\mu(Z, W, A, X)$ and $m(A, X, S)$ are fitted separately for each treatment arm to allow for full interaction between S and the other variables. Then the modified target population ATE estimator from Dahabreh et al. (2020) for ψ is

$$\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P_n^c \left[\frac{S(2A - 1)\Delta}{e(A \mid S)\hat{\pi}(A, S)} \frac{1 - \hat{p}(X)}{\hat{p}(X)} \{Y - \hat{m}(A, X, S)\} + (1 - S)\{\hat{m}(1, X, S) - \hat{m}(0, X, S)\} \right],$$

and the modified standard doubly robust ATE estimator from Bang and Robins (2005) for $E\{Y(-1) - Y(0) \mid S = 0\}$ is

$$\frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P_n^c \left[\frac{(1 - S)(-2A - 1)\Delta}{e(A \mid S)\hat{\pi}(A, S)} \{Y - \hat{m}(A, X, S)\} + (1 - S)\{\hat{m}(-1, X, S) - \hat{m}(0, X, S)\} \right].$$

For comparison, we also computed the ATE estimate for $E\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid S = 1\}$ by

$$\frac{1}{1 - \hat{\alpha}} P_n^c \left[\frac{S(2A - 1)\Delta}{e(A \mid S)\hat{\pi}(A, S)} \{Y - \hat{m}(A, X, S)\} + S\{\hat{m}(1, X, S) - \hat{m}(0, X, S)\} \right].$$

The additional estimates not shown in Table 4 are reported in Table 7 for reference.

In the following we present the PRISMA-IPD checklist for the reporting of meta-analysis with IPD (Stewart et al., 2015).

1. Title: Indirect comparison of once-weekly semaglutide 2.4 mg and once-daily liraglutide 3.0 mg in patients with type 2 diabetes from STEP-2 weight management trial.
2. Structured summary: Not applicable.
3. Rationale: The effect of weight loss from semaglutide and liraglutide has never been compared head-to-head on the obese population with type-2 diabetes. The only direct evidence available from an RCT is from the STEP-8 trial (Rubino et al., 2022) on a nondiabetic population with a relatively small sample size.
4. Objectives: The average treatment effect in body weight 44 after the initiation of the treatment, in the study population of the STEP-2 trial, comparing once-weekly semaglutide 2.4 mg and once-daily liraglutide 3.0 mg.
5. Protocol and registration: No applicable.

6. Eligibility criteria: All subjects from the SCALE and STEP-2 trials who were randomized are considered eligible, excluding those with missing measurements in the baseline variables specified in point 11.
7. Identifying studies-information sources: Not applicable.
8. Identifying studies-search: Not applicable.
9. Study selection processes: The inclusion-exclusion criteria used in the SCALE and STEP-2 trials are virtually identical.
10. Data collection processes: The IPD were retrieved from the internal trial database in Novo Nordisk A/S by agreement.
11. Data items: The baseline variables included in the indirect comparison, except the randomized treatment, are on of the three groups: the hypothesized treatment effect modifiers of liraglutide 3.0 mg versus placebo, the adjustment proxies and the reweighting proxies. The definitions of the proxies can be found in Section 3 of the manuscript, and the rationale for selecting the proxies is explicated in Section 6.2. The collected baseline variables from the STEP-2 trial include: randomized treatment (categorical, liraglutide 3.0 mg, liraglutide 1.8 mg and placebo), body weight (kg, continuous), body-mass index ($\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$, continuous), smoking status (categorical, current smoker, previous smoker, never smoked), duration of diabetes (years, continuous), waist circumference (cm, continuous), age (years, continuous), sex (binary), race (categorical, white, black and others), region of the clinic (categorical, Europe, North America and others), hemoglobin A1c ($\text{mmol}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$, continuous), fasting plasma glucose ($\text{mmol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, continuous) and fasting serum insulin ($\text{pmol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, continuous). The baseline variables from the SCALE trial are those from the STEP-2 trial plus serum high-density lipoprotein ($\text{mmol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, continuous), serum very low-density lipoprotein ($\text{mmol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, continuous) and serum triglycerides ($\text{mmol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$, continuous), where the randomized treatment is one of semaglutide 2.4 mg, semaglutide 1.0 mg and placebo. The outcome from both trials is the body weight in week 44 since treatment initiation. No imputation is performed for missing measurements.
- A1. IPD integrity: See M. J. Davies et al. (2015) and M. Davies et al. (2021). No additional checking was performed.
12. Risk of bias assessment in individual studies: Subjects' deviation from protocol was observed in both RCTs. A simple reweighting technique was performed to balance subjects who deviated from the protocol against those who did not. Protocol deviation is assumed to be completely at random within the treatment arm of each RCT.
13. Specification of outcomes and effect measures: The estimand is the week 44 body weight since treatment on the study population of STEP-2, comparing once-weekly semaglutide, 2.4 mg and once-daily liraglutide, 3.0 mg. The effect measure is difference in means of the week 44 body weight.
14. Synthesis methods: Refer to Section 6.2 and earlier expositions within this section for details.
- A2. Exploration of variation in effects: No subgroup analysis was performed.
15. Risk of bias across studies: The proximal indirect comparison estimator is susceptible to bias from the invalidity of proxies (Assumption 2) or the nonexistence of bridge functions. The target population ATE estimator in Dahabreh et al. (2020) may be biased if there are unobserved, shifted effect modifiers. Both estimators are positivity or overlap of the study populations of SCALE and STEP-2.
16. Additional analyses: No additional analysis was performed.
17. Study selection and IPD obtained: The studies SCALE and STEP-2 were selected specifically for the comparison of the two GLP-1 receptor agonists for weight management among overweight patients with type II diabetes. The IPD were available from Novo Nordisk.
18. Study characteristics: See M. J. Davies et al. (2015) and M. Davies et al. (2021).
- A3. IPD integrity: See M. J. Davies et al. (2015) and M. Davies et al. (2021). No issue was identified.
19. Risk of bias within studies: No bias assessment was conducted.

20. Results of individual studies: See Table 7.
21. Results of syntheses: See Table 4.
22. Risk of bias across studies: No bias assessment was conducted.
23. Additional analyses: No additional analysis was performed.
24. Summary of evidence: See Section 6.2.
25. Strengths and limitations: Not evaluated.
26. Conclusions: See Section 6.2.
- A4. Implications: Not evaluated.
27. Funding: See conflict of interest after the main text. The IPD were supplied by Novo Nordisk A/S.

APPENDIX E. PROOFS

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1. The conditional expectation of the potential outcome is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X, U, S = 0\} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X, U, S = 1\} && \text{[Assumption 1(iii)]} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\{Y(1) \mid A = 1, X, U, S = 1\} - \mathbb{E}\{Y(0) \mid A = 0, X, U, S = 1\} && \text{[Assumption 1(ii) and (iv)]} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 1, X, U, S = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 0, X, U, S = 1). && \text{[Assumption 1(i)]}
 \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding from the equation above, it is immediate that the target parameter is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi &= \mathbb{E}\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid S = 0\} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{Y(1) - Y(0) \mid X, U, S = 0\} \mid S = 0] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 1, X, U, S = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 0, X, U, S = 1) \mid S = 0\} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{(2A - 1)Y}{\mathbb{P}(A \mid X, U, S = 1)} \mid X, U, S = 1\right\} \mid S = 0\right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)} \mid X, U, S = 1\right\} \mid S = 0\right]. && \text{[Assumption 1(ii)]}
 \end{aligned}$$

Then we show the inverse probability weighting representation via the identification formula above. Starting from the g-formula representation, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)} \mid X, U, S = 1\right\} \mid S = 0\right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{S(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)\mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid X, U)} \mid X, U\right\} \mid S = 0\right] \\
 &= \iint \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{S(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)\mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid X, U)} \mid X = x, U = u\right\} p(u, x \mid S = 0) du dx,
 \end{aligned}$$

and by a simple manipulation of probability densities, showing that $p(u, x \mid S = 0) = \mathbb{P}(S = 0 \mid X = x, U = u)p(x, u)/\mathbb{P}(S = 0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \iint \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{S(2A - 1)Y\mathbb{P}(S = 0 \mid X, U)}{e(A \mid X)\mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid X, U)} \mid X = x, U = u\right\} p(u, x) du dx \\
 &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{S(2A - 1)\mathbb{P}(S = 0 \mid X, U)Y}{e(A \mid X)\mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid X, U)}\right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. By Assumption 2(i), (ii) and (iv), for any $h^* \in \mathbb{H}^*$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} \middle| Z, X, U, S = 1\right\} = \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W, X) | Z, X, U, S = 1\}.$$

The first result of the lemma is immediate after integrating both sides of the equation with respect to the conditional density of U given $(Z, X, S = 1)$.

By Assumption 2(i), for any $q^* \in \mathbb{Q}^*$,

$$\mathbb{E}\{q^*(Z, X) | W, X, U, S = 1\} = \mathbb{E}\{q^*(Z, X) | X, U, S = 1\} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | X, U)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | X, U)}.$$

The second result of the lemma follows by integrating both sides with respect to the density $p(u | W, X, S = 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{q^*(Z, X) | X, W, S = 1\} \\ &= \int \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | X, u)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | X, u)} p(u | W, X, S = 1) du \\ &= \int \frac{p(u | S = 0, X) \mathbb{P}(S = 0 | X)}{p(u | S = 1, X) \mathbb{P}(S = 1 | X)} \frac{p(W | u, X, S = 1) p(u | X, S = 1)}{p(W | X, S = 1)} du \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | X) p(W | S = 1, X)} \int p(W | u, X, S = 1) p(u | S = 0, X) du \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | X) p(W | S = 1, X)} \int p(W | u, X, S = 0) p(u | S = 0, X) du \quad [\text{Assumption 2(iii)}] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | X) p(W | S = 0, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | X) p(W | S = 1, X)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W, X)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2. The g-formula identification given any $h^* \in \mathbb{H}^* \neq \emptyset$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} \middle| X, U, S = 1\right\} \middle| S = 0\right] && (\text{Proposition 1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h^*(W, X) | X, U, S = 1\} | S = 0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h^*(W, X) | X, U, S = 0\} | S = 0] && [\text{Assumption 2(iii)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W, X) | S = 0\}, \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}\left\{S \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W, X)} h^*(W, X)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

and for any $q \in \mathbb{Q} \neq \emptyset$, we can write the parameter as

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}[S \mathbb{E}\{q(Z, X) | W, X, S = 1\} h^*(W, X)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}\{S q(Z, X) h^*(W, X)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}[S q(Z, X) \mathbb{E}\{h^*(W, X) | Z, X, S = 1\}] \end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 1 is

$$= \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}[S q(Z, X) \mathbb{E}\{h(W, X) | Z, X, S = 1\}]$$

$$= E\{h(W, X) \mid S = 0\},$$

for any $h \in \mathbb{H}$.

On the other hand, the inverse-probability identification given any $q^* \in \mathbb{Q}^* \neq \emptyset$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left\{ \frac{S(2A - 1)P(S = 0 \mid X, U)Y}{e(A \mid X)P(S = 1 \mid X, U)} \right\} && \text{(Proposition 1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left[\frac{S(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)} E\{q^*(Z, X) \mid X, U, S = 1\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left[\frac{S(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)} E\{q^*(Z, X) \mid Y, A, X, U, S = 1\} \right] && \text{[Assumption 2(ii) and (iv)]} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left\{ \frac{S(2A - 1)}{e(A \mid X)} q^*(Z, X) Y \right\}, \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left[S q^*(Z, X) E \left\{ \frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A \mid X)} \mid Z, X, S = 1 \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and for any $h \in \mathbb{H} \neq \emptyset$, we can write the parameter as

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E[S q^*(Z, X) E\{h(W, X) \mid Z, X, S = 1\}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E\{S q^*(Z, X) h(W, X)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E[SE\{q^*(Z, X) \mid W, X, S = 1\} h(W, X)], \end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 1 is

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E[SE\{q(Z, X) \mid W, X, S = 1\} h(W, X)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left\{ \frac{S(2A - 1)}{e(A \mid X)} q(Z, X) Y \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Therefore, the parameter is identified when either (i) \mathbb{H}^* (hence \mathbb{H}) and \mathbb{Q} are nonempty or (ii) \mathbb{Q}^* (hence \mathbb{Q}) and \mathbb{H} are nonempty. This is equivalent to the statement in the proposition. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3. The likelihood of the observed data O can be factorized as

$$p(O) = \{p(Y \mid A, Z, W, X, S = 1)e(A \mid X)p(W \mid Z, X, S = 1)p(Z \mid X, S = 1)\}^S p(W \mid X, S = 0)^{(1-S)} p(X, S),$$

due to the fact that $(Z, W) \perp A \mid (X, S = 1)$. The tangent space at $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is a subset of the Hilbert space $L_2(P)$ which is the closure of the score functions of parametric subdistributions that contain P and fulfill the constraints specified by the identification equations in \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{Q} . Let $\{P_\varepsilon\} \subset \mathcal{P}$ be a parametric submodel fulfilling Assumption 3 and $P_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} = P$, and denote the score function by $\mathcal{S}(O) = \partial_\varepsilon \log p_\varepsilon(O)|_{\varepsilon=0}$. We first characterize which properties of the score functions $\mathcal{S}(O)$ the restrictions on \mathcal{P} imply. Considering the factorization of the likelihood, the score function can be shown to have a sum structure; that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(O) &= S\{\mathcal{S}(Y \mid Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W \mid Z, X) + \mathcal{S}(Z \mid X)\} \\ &\quad + (1 - S)\mathcal{S}(W \mid X) + \mathcal{S}(X, S) \in L_2(P), \end{aligned}$$

where the partial scores $\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(Z|X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|X)$ and $\mathcal{S}(X, S)$ satisfy the conditional moment conditions $E\{\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)|Z, W, A, X, S = 1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)|Z, X, S = 1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(Z|X)|X, S = 1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(W|X)|X, S = 0\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(X, S)\} = 0$. Additionally, let $h_\varepsilon(W, X) \in L_2(W, X; P_1)$ be a function that is differentiable at $\varepsilon = 0$ with $h_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} = h$ and that fulfills the identification equation in \mathbb{H} , namely

$$E_{P_\varepsilon} \left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h_\varepsilon(W, X) \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right\} = 0. \quad (2)$$

Differentiating both sides of the equation above with respect to ε and evaluating at zero, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_\varepsilon \iint \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \frac{(2a-1)y}{e(a|X)} - h_\varepsilon(w, X) \right\} p_\varepsilon(y, w | Z, a, X, S = 1) e(a|x) dy dw \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= -E\{\partial_\varepsilon h_\varepsilon(W, X)|_{\varepsilon=0} | Z, X, S = 1\} \\ &\quad + E \left[\left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \{ \mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) \} \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

From this we know that the score components $\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)$ and $\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)$ must satisfy

$$E \left[\left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \{ \mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) \} \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right] \in \text{Range}(T), \quad (4)$$

which is $L_2(Z, X; P_1)$ by the surjectivity of T .

Denote the adjoint of T by T^* . It is a linear transformation $T^* : L_2(Z, X; P_1) \rightarrow L_2(W, X; P_1)$, where $(T^*q)(W, X) = E\{q(Z, X) | W, X, S = 1\}$. This can be verified by checking the equality $\langle h, T^*q \rangle_{L_2(W, X; P_1)} = \langle Th, q \rangle_{L_2(Z, X; P_1)}$. Let $q_\varepsilon(Z, X) \in L_2(Z, X; P_1)$ be a function that is differentiable at $\varepsilon = 0$ with $q_\varepsilon|_{\varepsilon=0} = q$ and that fulfills the identification equation in \mathbb{Q} , namely

$$E_{P_\varepsilon} \{ q_\varepsilon(Z, X) | W, X, S = 1 \} = \frac{P_\varepsilon(S = 0 | W, X)}{P_\varepsilon(S = 1 | W, X)}.$$

Omitting the calculations, differentiating the equation above with respect to ε at zero yields

$$\begin{aligned} -E\{\partial_\varepsilon q_\varepsilon(Z, X)|_{\varepsilon=0} | W, X, S = 1\} &= E[q(Z, X) \{ \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) + \mathcal{S}(Z|X) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{S}(W|X) - \mathcal{S}(S = 0, X) + \mathcal{S}(S = 1, X) \} | W, X, S = 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

From this we know that the score components $\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(Z|X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|X)$ and $\mathcal{S}(S, X)$ must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} E[q(Z, X) \{ \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) + \mathcal{S}(Z|X) \\ - \mathcal{S}(W|X) - \mathcal{S}(S = 0, X) + \mathcal{S}(S = 1, X) \} | W, X, S = 1] &\in \text{Range}(T^*), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which is $L_2(W, X; P_1)$ by the surjectivity of T^* .

To complete the characterization of the tangent space, we need to find a parametric submodel $\{P_\varepsilon\}$ whose score function is as described above. For ε varying in a small compact set around zero, consider the parametric submodel with density $p_\varepsilon(O)$ factorizable as

$$\begin{aligned} p_\varepsilon(O) &= \{ p_\varepsilon(Y | A, Z, W, X, S = 1) e(A | X) p_\varepsilon(W | Z, X, S = 1) p_\varepsilon(Z | X, S = 1) \}^S \\ &\quad p_\varepsilon(W | X, S = 0)^{(1-S)} p_\varepsilon(X, S) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $p_\varepsilon(Y | A, Z, W, X, S = 1) = p(Y | A, Z, W, X, S = 1) \{ 1 + \varepsilon \mathcal{S}(Y | A, Z, W, X) \}$, $p_\varepsilon(W | Z, X, S = 1) = p(W | Z, X, S = 1) \{ 1 + \varepsilon \mathcal{S}(W | Z, X) \}$, $p_\varepsilon(Z | X, S = 1) = p_\varepsilon(Z | X, S = 1) \{ 1 + \varepsilon \mathcal{S}(Z | X) \}$,

$p_\varepsilon(W|X, S=0) = p(W|X, S=0)\{1 + \varepsilon\mathcal{S}(W|X)\}$ and $p_\varepsilon(X, S) = p(X, S)\{1 + \varepsilon\mathcal{S}(X, S)\}$, where also $E\{\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)|Z, W, A, X, S=1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)|Z, X, S=1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(Z|X)|X, S=1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(W|X)|X, S=0\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}(X, S)\} = 0$, and that $\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(Z|X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|X)$ and $\mathcal{S}(X, S)$ are bounded and conditionally square integrable with respect to P in the same way as the mean conditions before. This submodel passes through P at $\varepsilon = 0$. The propensity score $e(a|X)$ is left out of the parameterization, since it is assumed to be known. The existence of h_ε and q_ε on this submodel and their differentiability at $\varepsilon = 0$ can be shown with the bijectivity of T and T^* and the implicit function theorem on Banach spaces following the arguments in the proof of Theorem 11 in Kallus et al. (2022).

The closure of the set of score functions obtained by the parametric submodels obtained in this way forms the tangent space. Therefore, the tangent space of the statistical model \mathcal{P} at P is the subspace of the Hilbert space $L_2(P)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} = \{ & \mathcal{S}(O) = S\{\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) + \mathcal{S}(Z|X)\} + (1-S)\mathcal{S}(W|X) + \mathcal{S}(X, S) : \\ & E\{\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)|Z, W, A, X, S=1\} = 0, E\{\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)|Z, X, S=1\} = 0, \\ & E\{\mathcal{S}(Z|X)|X, S=1\} = 0, E\{\mathcal{S}(W|X)|X, S=0\} = 0, E\{\mathcal{S}(X, S)\} = 0, \\ & \mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X), \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X), \mathcal{S}(Z|X), \mathcal{S}(W|X), \mathcal{S}(X, S) \text{ satisfy (4) and (6)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The orthocomplement of the tangent space is the direct sum of the space $\{Sc(Z, W, X)\{A - e(1|X)\} : c(Z, W, X) \in L_2(P)\}$ and the nuisance subspace Λ comprising 0 and $\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)$, $\mathcal{S}(Z|X)$, $\mathcal{S}(W|X)$ and $\mathcal{S}(X, S)$ that do not satisfy Equations (4) and (6).

The target parameter is $\psi(P) = E\{h(W, X) | S=0\}$ under $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Viewing the target parameter as a statistical functional $\psi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Gateaux derivative of $\psi(P)$ at P along the submodels P_ε is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\varepsilon \psi(P_\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \partial_\varepsilon \iint h_\varepsilon(w, x) p_\varepsilon(w, x | S=0) dw dx \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= E[\partial_\varepsilon h_\varepsilon(W, X)|_{\varepsilon=0} | S=0] + \iint h(w, x) \partial_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon(w, x | S=0)|_{\varepsilon=0} dw dx. \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

We now study the two terms separately. The first term in Equation (7) is

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} E \left[\frac{SP(S=0|W, X)}{P(S=1|W, X)} \partial_\varepsilon h_\varepsilon(W, X)|_{\varepsilon=0} \right]$$

and substituting the identification equation of q , the previous term is

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E[SE\{q(Z, X) | W, X, S=1\} \partial_\varepsilon h_\varepsilon(W, X)|_{\varepsilon=0}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E[Sq(Z, X) E\{\partial_\varepsilon h_\varepsilon(W, X)|_{\varepsilon=0} | Z, X, S=1\}], \end{aligned}$$

which by the component involving the directional derivative calculate with respect to h in Equation (3) can be developed further as

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left(Sq(Z, X) E \left[\left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \right. \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. \left. \mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) \right\} \Big| Z, X, S=1 \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left[Sq(Z, X) \left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. \left. [S\{\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) + \mathcal{S}(Z|X)\} + (1-S)\mathcal{S}(W|X) + \mathcal{S}(X, S)] \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \mathcal{S}(O) \right].$$

In the second to last step we added the scores $S\mathcal{S}(Z|X)$ and $\mathcal{S}(X, S)$ because their products with the remaining terms all have zero mean due to the identification equation of h . The score $(1-S)\mathcal{S}(W|X)$ was added because the factor S renders their product zero.

The second term in Equation (7) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}} (1-s)h(w, x) \partial_\varepsilon \{p_\varepsilon(w|x, S=0)p_\varepsilon(s, x)\}|_{\varepsilon=0} dw dx \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \iint \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}} (1-s) \partial_\varepsilon \{p_\varepsilon(w|x, S=0)p_\varepsilon(s, x)\}|_{\varepsilon=0} dw dx \mathbb{E}\{(1-S)h(W, X)\} \\ & = \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}} (1-s)h(w, x) \{\mathcal{S}(w|x) + \mathcal{S}(s, x)\} p(w|x, S=0)p(x, s) dw dx \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{\alpha} \iint \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}} (1-s)\psi(P) \{\mathcal{S}(w|x) + \mathcal{S}(s, x)\} p(w|x, S=0)p(x, s) dw dx \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \{(1-S)\mathcal{S}(W|X) + \mathcal{S}(X, S)\} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. [S\{\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}(W|Z, X) + \mathcal{S}(Z|X)\} + (1-S)\mathcal{S}(W|X) + \mathcal{S}(X, S)] \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \mathcal{S}(O) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The scores $S\mathcal{S}(Y|Z, W, A, X)$, $S\mathcal{S}(W|Z, X)$ and $S\mathcal{S}(Z|X)$ were added in the second to last step because the factor $(1-S)$ renders their products zero. Collecting the two results above, we have that

$$\partial_\varepsilon \psi(P_\varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} = \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} + \frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \right] \mathcal{S}(O) \right),$$

which shows that the factor next to $\mathcal{S}(O)$ is an influence function of the parameter $\psi(P)$ at $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Next, we will show that $\varphi(P)$ is also an influence function. Define the function

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'(P) & = \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \left\{ \frac{(2A-1)Y}{e(A|X)} - h(W, X) \right\} + \frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \\ & \quad - \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Y}{\{e(A|X)\}^2} \middle| Z, W, X, S=1 \right] \{A - e(1|X)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which expands as

$$\begin{aligned} & = \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \frac{(2A-1)}{e(A|X)} \{Y - \mathbb{E}(Y|Z, W, A, X, S=1)\} \\ & \quad - \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) h(W, X) + \frac{1-S}{\alpha} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\} \\ & \quad + \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \frac{(2A-1)}{e(A|X)} \mathbb{E}(Y|Z, W, A, X, S=1) \\ & \quad - \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y|Z, W, A=1, X, S=1)}{e(1|X)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y|Z, W, A=0, X, S=1)}{e(0|X)} \right\} \{A - e(1|X)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms of the last equation is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \{E(Y | Z, W, A = 1, X, S = 1) - E(Y | Z, W, A = 0, X, S = 1)\} \\ = \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) E \left\{ \frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} \middle| Z, W, X, S = 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $\varphi'(P) = \varphi(P)$. Moreover, since

$$E \left\{ \left(\frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) E \left[\frac{Y}{\{e(A | X)\}^2} \middle| Z, W, X, S = 0 \right] \{A - e(1 | X)\} \right) \mathcal{S}(O) \right\} = 0,$$

it follows that $\varphi(P)$ is an influence function of $\psi(P)$ at $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

To conclude the proof, we check that the function $\varphi(P)$ is indeed an element of the tangent space of \mathcal{P} at P . Consider the decomposition that

$$\varphi(P) = S \mathcal{S}^*(Y | Z, W, A, X) + S \mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X) + (1 - S) \mathcal{S}^*(W | X) + \mathcal{S}^*(S, X)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^*(Y | Z, W, A, X) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \frac{(2A - 1)}{e(A | X)} \{Y - E(Y | A, Z, W, X, S = 1)\}, \\ \mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \left[E \left\{ \frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} \middle| Z, W, X, S = 1 \right\} - h(W, X) \right], \\ \mathcal{S}^*(W | X) &= \frac{1}{\alpha} [h(W, X) - E\{h(W, X) | X, S = 0\}] \\ \mathcal{S}^*(S, X) &= \frac{1 - S}{\alpha} [E\{h(W, X) | X, S = 0\} - \psi(P)]. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we show that $E\{\mathcal{S}^*(Y | Z, W, A, X) | Z, W, A, X, S = 1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X) | Z, X, S = 1\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}^*(W | X) | X, S = 0\} = 0$, $E\{\mathcal{S}^*(S, X)\} = 0$, and that $\mathcal{S}^*(Y | Z, W, A, X)$, $\mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X)$, $\mathcal{S}^*(Z | X) = 0$, $\mathcal{S}^*(W | X)$, $\mathcal{S}^*(S, X)$ satisfy Equations (4) and (6). It is easy to see that the conditional expectations are indeed zero by the definition of h and $\psi(P)$.

The conditional expectation of the product as in Equation (4) is

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\left\{ \frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \{ \mathcal{S}^*(Y | Z, W, A, X) + \mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X) \} \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right] \\ = E \left[\frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} \mathcal{S}^*(Y | Z, W, A, X) \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right] \\ \quad + E \left[\left\{ \frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} - h(W, X) \right\} \mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X) \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right] \\ = \frac{q(Z, X)}{\alpha} E \left[\text{Var} \left\{ \frac{Y}{e(A | X)} \middle| Z, W, A, X, S = 1 \right\} \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right] \\ \quad + \frac{q(Z, X)}{\alpha} \text{Var} \left[E \left\{ \frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} \middle| Z, W, X, S = 1 \right\} - h(W, X) \middle| Z, X, S = 1 \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is $L_2(Z, X; P_1)$. On the other hand, the conditional expectation of the product as in Equation (6) is

$$\begin{aligned} E[q(Z, X) \{ \mathcal{S}^*(W | Z, X) - \mathcal{S}^*(W | X) - \mathcal{S}^*(S = 0, X) + \mathcal{S}^*(S = 1, X) \} | W, X, S = 1] \\ = \frac{1}{\alpha} E \left(\{q(Z, X)\}^2 \left[\frac{(2A - 1)Y}{e(A | X)} - h(W, X) \right] \middle| W, X, S = 0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\mathbb{P}(S=0 | W, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1 | W, X)} \{h(W, X) - \psi(P)\},$$

which is indeed $L_2(W, X; P_1)$. Therefore, the influence function $\varphi(P) \in \mathcal{T}$ is the efficient influence function of $\psi(P)$ at $P \in \mathcal{P}$. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4. Define $\tilde{\phi}(P) = \phi(P) + (1-S)\psi(P)/\alpha$ for $P \in \mathcal{P}$. That $\phi(\cdot)$ is P -Donsker implies that $\tilde{\phi}(\cdot)$ is P -Donsker, which is also P -Glivenko-Cantelli. To show consistency, consider the difference $\hat{\psi}(\hat{P}_n) - \psi(P) = (P_n - P)\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) + \{P\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - (\alpha/\hat{\alpha})\psi(P)\} - (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha)\psi(P)/\hat{\alpha}$. The absolute value of the second term

$$\begin{aligned} P\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - (\alpha/\hat{\alpha})\psi(P) &= \hat{\alpha}^{-1}P\{S\hat{q}(\bar{Y} - \hat{h}) + (1-S)\hat{h}\} - (\alpha/\hat{\alpha})\psi(P) \\ &= \hat{\alpha}^{-1}P\{S\hat{q}(h - \hat{h}) + S\hat{q}\hat{h}\} - (\alpha/\hat{\alpha})\psi(P) \\ &= \hat{\alpha}^{-1}P\{S(\hat{q} - q)(h - \hat{h}) + S\hat{q}h\} - (\alpha/\hat{\alpha})\psi(P) \\ &\lesssim \|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P. \end{aligned}$$

The three terms all converge in probability to zero by the uniform law of large numbers applied to the P -Glivenko-Cantelli class $\tilde{\phi}(\cdot)$, $\|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P = o_P(1)$ and the trivial consistency of $\hat{\alpha}$. Working under the assumption $\|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P = o_P(n^{-1/2})$, further express the difference as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}(\hat{P}_n) - \psi(P) &= (P_n - P)\{\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - \tilde{\phi}(P)\} + P_n\tilde{\phi}(P) - \psi(P) + \left\{P\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{\alpha}}\psi(P)\right\} - \frac{\hat{\alpha} - \alpha}{\hat{\alpha}}\psi(P) \\ &= P_n\phi(P) + (P_n - P)\{\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - \tilde{\phi}(P)\} + \frac{(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha)^2}{\alpha\hat{\alpha}}\psi(P) + o_P(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

For the last equality, we use that $P_n\tilde{\phi}(P) = P_n\phi(P) + P_n(1-S)\psi(P)/\alpha = P_n\phi(P) + (\hat{\alpha}/\alpha)\psi(P)$ and the bound from the preceding display. The second term is an empirical process term of order $o_P(n^{-1/2})$ if $\|\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - \tilde{\phi}(P)\|_P = o_P(1)$ and $\tilde{\phi}(\cdot)$ is P -Donsker. Applying the central limit theorem to $\hat{\alpha}$, the third term is of the order $O_P(n^{-1}) = o_P(n^{-1/2})$. To conclude the proof, we show that $\|\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - \tilde{\phi}(P)\|_P$ indeed converges in probability to zero under $\|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P = o_P(1)$, $\|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P = o_P(1)$ and the boundedness conditions. We have $\|S\hat{q}\|_P \leq \|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P + \|S\hat{q}\|_P = o_P(1) + 1 = O_P(1)$, and similarly $\|S\hat{h}\|_P = O_P(1)$. Furthermore, by the boundedness of \hat{q} , \hat{h} and h , the terms $\|S\hat{q}(\hat{h} - h)\|_P$ and $\|S\hat{q}h\|_P$ are also bounded in probability. The $L_2(P)$ -norm of the plug-in function $\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n)\|_P &\lesssim \|S\hat{q}\bar{Y}\|_P + \|S\hat{q}(\hat{h} - h)\|_P + \|S\hat{q}h\|_P + \|(1-S)\hat{h}\|_P \\ &\lesssim \left(\mathbb{E} \left[S\hat{q}^2 \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y^2 | Z, A = a, X, S = 1)}{e(a | X)} \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ S \frac{\mathbb{P}(S=0 | W, X)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1 | W, X)} \hat{h}^2 \right\} \right]^{1/2} + O_P(1) \\ &\lesssim \|S\hat{q}\|_P + \|S\hat{h}\|_P + O_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is indeed bounded in probability. The $L_2(P)$ -distance between the plugin and the true function is

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n) - \tilde{\phi}(P)\|_P &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \|S(\hat{q} - q)\bar{Y}\|_P + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|S(\hat{q}\hat{h} - qh)\|_P + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|(1-S)(\hat{h} - h)\|_P + \frac{|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha|}{\hat{\alpha}} \|\tilde{\phi}(\hat{P}_n)\|_P, \end{aligned}$$

and by similar arguments above, we bound the distance as

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P + \|S(\hat{q} - q)\hat{h}\|_P + \|Sq(\hat{h} - h)\|_P + \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P + |\hat{\alpha} - \alpha|O_P(1) \\ &\leq \|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P\{1 + O_P(1)\} + \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P\{1 + O_P(1)\} + o_P(1) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5. Using Theorem 8.3 in Tsiatis (2006), the space of influence functions of the parameter $\psi(P)$ at P^c under the model \mathcal{P}^c and Assumption 3 is

$$\left\{ \Pi \left[\left\{ \frac{S\Delta}{\pi(Z, W, A, X)} + (1 - S) \right\} \phi(P) \mid (\Lambda^c)^\perp \right] : \phi \in \Phi(P) \right\},$$

where $\Phi(P)$ is the set of influence functions of $\psi(P)$ under the observed data model without missingness \mathcal{P} in Proposition 3, and the nuisance tangent space for the missing data mechanism is

$$\Lambda^c = \{S\{\Delta - \pi(Z, W, A, X)\}c(Z, W, A, X) : E[\{c(Z, W, A, X)\}^2 | S = 1] < \infty\}.$$

In the following we calculate the projection of $\Delta\phi(P)/\pi(Z, W, A, X)$ onto Λ^c . Suppose the projection has the form $S\{\Delta - \pi(Z, W, A, X)\}c^*(Z, W, A, X)$. Then the function c^* satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(\left[\frac{\Delta\phi(P)}{\pi(Z, W, A, X)} - \{\Delta - \pi(Z, W, A, X)\}c^*(Z, W, A, X) \right] \right. \\ \left. \{\Delta - \pi(Z, W, A, X)\} \mid Z, W, A, X, S = 1 \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the expression of an arbitrary $\phi(P)$ with $b(Z, W, X)$, the solution is

$$\begin{aligned} c^*(Z, W, A, X) = \frac{q(Z, X)}{\alpha\pi(Z, W, A, X)} \{ \mu(Z, W, 1, X) - \mu(Z, W, 0, X) - h(W, X) \} \\ + \frac{b(Z, W, X)}{\pi(Z, W, A, X)} \{ A - e(1 | X) \}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the projection

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pi \left[\left\{ \frac{S\Delta}{\pi(Z, W, A, X)} + (1 - S) \right\} \phi(P) \mid (\Lambda^c)^\perp \right] \\ &= \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \frac{2A - 1}{e(A | X)} \frac{\Delta}{\pi(Z, W, A, X)} \{ Y - \mu(Z, W, A, X) \} \\ &\quad + \frac{S}{\alpha} q(Z, X) \{ \mu(Z, W, 1, X) - \mu(Z, W, 0, X) - h(W, X) \} \\ &\quad + \frac{1 - S}{\alpha} \{ h(W, X) - \psi(P) \} + S \{ A - e(1 | X) \} b(Z, W, X). \end{aligned}$$

From this we conclude that the efficient influence function $\varphi^c(P^c)$ is as stated in Proposition 5. □

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6. The boundedness conditions in the statement of the proposition are restated as follows: $\hat{\alpha} \geq \delta, \delta \leq e(A | X) \leq 1 - \delta, P(S = 1 | W, X) \geq \delta, \pi(Z, W, A, X) \wedge \hat{\pi}(Z, W, A, X) \geq \delta, \hat{q}(Z, X) \leq M, h(W, X) \leq M, \mu(Z, W, A, X) \leq M$ and $E(Y^2 | \Delta = 1, Z, W, A, X, S = 1) \leq M$. Define $\tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c) = \varphi^c(P^c) + (1 - S)\psi^c(P^c)/\alpha$ for $P^c \in \mathcal{P}^c$. That $\varphi^c(\cdot)$ is P -Donsker implies that $\tilde{\varphi}^c(\cdot)$ is P^c -Donsker and thus also P^c -Glivenko-Cantelli. Denoting $\mu(Z, W, a, X), \hat{\mu}(Z, W, a, X), \pi(Z, W, a, X)$ and $\hat{\pi}(Z, W, a, X)$ by $\mu_a, \hat{\mu}_a, \pi_a$ and $\hat{\pi}_a$, the remainder term is

$$\tilde{R}^c(\hat{P}_n^c, P^c) = P^c \tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{\alpha}} \psi(P)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= P \left[\frac{S}{\hat{\alpha}} \hat{q} \frac{2A-1}{e(A|X)} \frac{\Delta}{\hat{\pi}} (Y - \hat{\mu}) + \frac{S}{\hat{\alpha}} \hat{q} (\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 - \hat{h}) + \frac{1-S}{\hat{\alpha}} \hat{h} \right] - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{\alpha}} \psi(P) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P \left[S \hat{q} \left\{ \frac{\pi_1}{\hat{\pi}_1} (m_1 - \hat{\mu}_1) - \frac{\pi_0}{\hat{\pi}_0} (m_0 - \hat{\mu}_0) \right\} + S \hat{q} (\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 - \hat{h}) + S q \hat{h} \right] - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{\alpha}} \psi(P) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hat{\alpha}} P \left\{ S \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{1-a} (\hat{q} - q) \frac{\pi_a}{\hat{\pi}_a} (\mu_a - \hat{\mu}_a) + S \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{1-a} q \frac{\pi_a - \hat{\pi}_a}{\hat{\pi}_a} (\mu_a - \hat{\mu}_a) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + S \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} (-1)^{1-a} (\hat{q} - q) (\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a) - S (\hat{q} - q) (\hat{h} - h) + S q \hat{h} \right\} - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{\alpha}} \psi(P) \\
 &\leq (\|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P + 1) \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|S(\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a)\|_P \|S(\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a)\|_P + \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P \|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P.
 \end{aligned}$$

To show consistency, consider the difference $\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \psi(P) = (P_n^c - P^c) \tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) + \{P^c \tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - (\alpha/\hat{\alpha})\psi(P)\} - (\hat{\alpha} - \alpha)\psi(P)/\hat{\alpha}$. The three terms all converge in probability to zero by the uniform law of large numbers applied to the P^c -Glivenko-Cantelli class $\tilde{\varphi}^c(\cdot)$, $\tilde{R}^c(\hat{P}_n^c, P^c) = o_{P^c}(1)$ and the trivial consistency of $\hat{\alpha}$. Working under the assumption $\tilde{R}^c(\hat{P}_n^c, P^c) = o_{P^c}(n^{-1/2})$, we further express the difference as $\hat{\psi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \psi(P)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (P_n^c - P^c) \{\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c)\} + P_n^c \tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c) - \psi(P) + \left\{ P^c \tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \frac{\alpha}{\hat{\alpha}} \psi(P) \right\} - \frac{\hat{\alpha} - \alpha}{\hat{\alpha}} \psi(P) \\
 &= P_n^c \varphi(P^c) + (P_n^c - P^c) \{\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c)\} + \frac{(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha)^2}{\alpha \hat{\alpha}} \psi(P) + o_{P^c}(n^{-1/2}).
 \end{aligned}$$

The second term is an empirical process term of order $o_{P^c}(n^{-1/2})$ if $\|\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c)\|_{P^c}$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^c(\cdot)$ is P^c -Donsker. By the central limit theorem, the third term is of the order $O_{P^c}(n^{-1}) = o_{P^c}(n^{-1/2})$. To conclude the proof, we show that $\|\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c)\|_{P^c}$ indeed converges in probability to zero under $\|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P = o_P(1)$, $\|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P = o_P(1)$, $\|S(\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a)\|_P = o_P(1)$, $\|S(\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a)\|_P = o_P(1)$ and the boundedness conditions. The $L_2(P^c)$ -norm of the plugin function $\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)$ is $\|\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)\|_{P^c}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lesssim \left\| S \hat{q} \frac{(2A-1)}{e(A|X)} \frac{\Delta}{\hat{\pi}} Y \right\|_{P^c} + \left\| S \hat{q} \frac{(2A-1)}{e(A|X)} \frac{\Delta}{\hat{\pi}} \hat{\mu} \right\|_{P^c} + \|S \hat{q} (\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 - \hat{h})\|_P + \|(1-S)\hat{h}\|_P \\
 &\lesssim \left(\mathbb{E} \left[S \hat{q}^2 \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} E_0(Y^2 | \Delta = 1, Z, W, A = a, X, S = 1) \right] \right)^{1/2} + \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ S \frac{P(S=0|W, X)}{P(S=1|W, X)} \hat{h}^2 \right\} \right]^{1/2} \\
 &+ \|S \hat{q} (\hat{\mu}_1 + \hat{\mu}_0)\| + O_P(1) \lesssim O_P(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

This is because the norms of the nuisance estimators $\|S \hat{q}\|_P$, $\|S \hat{h}\|_P$ and $\|S \hat{\mu}_a\|_P$ are bounded by probability. The $L_2(P^c)$ -distance between the plugin and the true function is $\|\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c) - \tilde{\varphi}^c(P^c)\|_{P^c}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left\| S (\hat{q} - q) \frac{2A-1}{e(A|X)} \frac{\Delta}{\hat{\pi}} Y \right\|_{P^c} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \left\| S q \frac{2A-1}{e(A|X)} \frac{\Delta(\pi_0 - \hat{\pi})}{\hat{\pi} \pi_0} Y \right\|_{P^c} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|(1-S)(\hat{h} - h)\|_P \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|S[\hat{q}(\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 - \hat{h}) - q(m_1 - m_0 - h)]\|_P + \frac{|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha|}{\hat{\alpha}} \|\tilde{\varphi}^c(\hat{P}_n^c)\|_{P^c},
 \end{aligned}$$

and by similar arguments above, we bound the distance as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\lesssim \|S(\hat{q} - q)\|_P + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|S q (\hat{\pi}_a - \pi_a)\|_P + \|S(\hat{h} - h)\|_P + \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \|S q (\hat{\mu}_a - \mu_a)\|_P \\
 &\quad + \|S q (\hat{h} - h)\|_P + \|S(\hat{q} - q)(\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_0 - \hat{h})\|_P + |\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| O_P(1) \\
 &\lesssim o_P(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

□