

Instrumental Variable Quantile Regression with Misclassification*

Takuya Ura[†]

November 15, 2019

Abstract

This paper considers the instrumental variable quantile regression model (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2005, 2013) with a binary endogenous treatment. It offers two identification results when the treatment status is not directly observed. The first result is that, remarkably, the reduced-form quantile regression of the outcome variable on the instrumental variable provides a lower bound on the structural quantile treatment effect under the stochastic monotonicity condition (Small and Tan, 2007; DiNardo and Lee, 2011). This result is relevant, not only when the treatment variable is subject to misclassification, but also when any measurement of the treatment variable is not available. The second result is for the structural quantile function when the treatment status is measured with error; I obtain the sharp identified set by deriving moment conditions under widely-used assumptions on the measurement error. Furthermore, I propose an inference method in the presence of other covariates.

Keywords: Misclassification; Instrumental variable quantile regression; Partial identification; Binary endogenous treatment

*First version: October, 2016. I am grateful to Arthur Lewbel and four anonymous referees for comments and suggestions that have significantly improved this paper. I would like to thank Alexandre Belloni, Stéphane Bonhomme, Federico A. Bugni, A. Colin Cameron, V. Joseph Hotz, Shakeeb Khan, Jia Li, Matthew A. Masten, Arnaud Maurel, Adam M. Rosen, and seminar participants at Duke, UC Berkeley, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, Hakodate Conference in Econometrics, IAAE Annual Conference, Econometric Society North American Summer Meeting, and Econometric Society Asian Meeting for very helpful comments. The usual disclaimer applies.

[†]Department of Economics, University of California, Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616-5270; Email: takura@ucdavis.edu

1 Introduction

The instrumental variable quantile regression model (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2005, 2013) aims to investigate heterogeneous treatment effects in the presence of an endogenous binary treatment variable. In many empirical applications, the treatment variable is potentially mismeasured, so it is empirically relevant how researchers can use the instrumental variable quantile regression model with a mismeasured treatment variable. For example, Chernozhukov and Hansen (2004) use the instrumental variable quantile regression model to investigate the quantile treatment effect of 401(k) participation on saving behaviors, but the pension plan type is subject to measurement error in survey datasets. Using the Health and Retirement Study, Gustman, Steinmeier, and Tabatabai (2008) estimate that around one-fourth of the survey respondents misclassified their pension plan type. To the best of my knowledge, however, no paper has investigated the instrumental variable quantile regression model when a binary regressor is potentially misclassified and endogenous.

This paper has two identification results on the structural quantile function under the rank similarity condition.¹ First, I consider a reduced-form parameter that is the coefficient of the instrumental variable when I run the quantile regression of the outcome variable on the instrumental variable. I show that, under the rank similarity condition and the stochastic monotonicity condition (Small and Tan, 2007; DiNardo and Lee, 2011), this reduced-form parameter can be used as a lower bound for the structural quantile treatment effect. Empirical researchers routinely estimate reduced-form parameters as a part of their data analysis, e.g., Bitler, Hoynes, and Domina (2016). Although it has been used by empirical studies, the reduced-form quantile regression on the instrumental variable has not been formally related to the structural quantile treatment effect. Moreover, this result does not depend on the treatment variable or its measurement, and therefore it is relevant even when a measurement does not exist.

Second, I derive moment conditions for the structural quantile function when the treatment variable is measured with exogenous errors. The exogeneity of the measurement error is widely assumed in the measurement error literature (e.g., Bound, Brown, and Mathiowetz, 2001) and yields exclusion restrictions similar to Henry, Kitamura, and Salanié (2014). The moment conditions characterize the sharp identified set for the structural quantile function. I show that the structural quantile function can be under-identified even if the order condition for point identification holds. In other words, additional assumptions or variables are necessary to achieve point identification for the structural quantile function. As an example of additional restrictions, I consider two observed measurements for one latent treatment variable, and I show that the structural quantile function can be identified. I achieve point identification by combining two existing methods: misclassification correction techniques (Mahajan, 2006; Lewbel, 2007; Hu, 2008), and the identification results in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005, 2013).

Based on the partial identification result, I provide an inference method for the structural quantile function, by extending the inference method of Chernozhukov and Hansen (2008) to incorporate the misclassification probabilities. The proposed inference method can incorporate covariates other than the treatment variable, and it is computationally feasible by imposing a linear-in-parameters structure on the structural quantile function. I provide simulation studies and an empirical illustration to demonstrate the finite sample performance for the proposed inference method.

Related to this paper, several papers have considered the problem of mis-measured regressors in the quan-

¹Throughout this paper I maintain the rank similarity condition. Wüthrich (2019) investigates the instrumental variable quantile regression model without the rank similarity condition. His paper characterizes the estimand of Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005) when the rank similarity condition fails.

tile regression framework, e.g., Chesher (1991, 2017), Schennach (2008), Galvao and Montes-Rojas (2009), Wei and Carroll (2009), Firpo, Galvao, and Song (2017), and Song (2018). They focus on the case in which the mismeasured regressor is continuously distributed, whereas this paper focuses on a binary treatment variable in which the measurement error has to be nonclassical.

Mahajan (2006), Lewbel (2007), and Hu (2008) consider identification of the average treatment effect (or, more generally, the conditional density function of the outcome variable given the true treatment variable) when a discrete treatment variable is mismeasured. Their identification strategy is based on the assumption that the true treatment variable (or the individual treatment effect in Lewbel, 2007) is exogenous, and there is no straightforward way to modify their results to the endogenous treatment.

Calvi, Lewbel, and Tommasi (2017); Yanagi (2018); Ura (2018) investigate the local average treatment effect model with a mismeasured binary treatment. The local average treatment effect model is also a model for heterogeneous treatment effects in the presence of endogeneity but has a different structure than the instrumental variable quantile regression model.

Frazis and Loewenstein (2003), DiTraglia and García-Jimeno (2019) and Nguimkeu, Denteh, and Tchernis (2019) study a linear regression model in which a binary regressor is potentially misclassified and endogenous. Their approach is based on a homogenous treatment effect, which does not hold in the quantile treatment effect framework.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the instrumental variable quantile regression model (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2005, 2013) with a misclassified treatment variable. Section 3 studies the reduced-form quantile regression of the outcome variable on the instrumental variable. Section 4 presents the identified set for the structural quantile function. Section 5 proposes an inference method based on the identification analysis in Section 4. Section 6 provides an empirical illustration and simulation studies. Section 7 concludes. The appendix includes the proofs and additional results.

For the rest of this paper, I use the following notations. Pr denotes the true probability measure for the observed and unobserved random variables. $Q_{RV_1|RV_2}(\tau)$ is the τ -th conditional quantile of a continuous random variable RV_1 given a random variable RV_2 . $F_{RV_1|RV_2}$ is the conditional cumulative distribution function of a random variable RV_1 given a random variable RV_2 . $f_{RV_1|RV_2}$ is the conditional probability density function of a random variable RV_1 given a random variable RV_2 .

2 Instrumental variable quantile regression model with misclassification

In this section I present notations and assumptions that are essentially those of the instrumental variable quantile regression model (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2005, 2013), though the treatment variable D^* is not observed in this paper. For the sake of simplicity, I omit covariates other than the treatment variable when analyzing the identification problem. In the instrumental variable quantile regression model, Y is an outcome variable, D^* is a binary (true but latent) treatment variable taking values in $\{0, 1\}$, and Z is an instrumental variable. $D^* = 1$ means that the individual is treated; otherwise, $D^* = 0$.

In Chernozhukov and Hansen (2004) and Section 6.1 of this paper, the outcome variable Y is the net amount of financial assets in dollars, the treatment variable D^* is the participation status in a 401(k) program, and the instrumental variable Z is the 401(k) eligibility indicator of whether an employer offers a 401(k) program to employees.

The goal of this paper is to investigate treatment effects of D^* on Y . To model the relationship between

the outcome variable Y and the binary treatment variable D^* , I use the error term (U_0, U_1) and the (unknown) structural quantile function $q(d^*, u)$:

$$Y = q(D^*, U) \text{ where } U = (1 - D^*)U_0 + D^*U_1.$$

The random variable $q(d^*, U_{d^*})$ is the potential outcome variable when $D^* = d^*$. The parameter of interest is the τ -th quantile of the counterfactual outcome variable, $q(d^*, \tau)$, for a given value of $\tau \in (0, 1)$.

To identify $q(d^*, u)$ even partially, it is necessary to impose some structure on the unknown function, $q(d^*, u)$, and on the unobserved variable, U_{d^*} . I impose the following assumptions based on Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005, 2013). Unlike their papers, I focus on the local exclusion restriction at the given value of τ , which is sufficient for deriving the testable implication in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005, Theorem 1) for the structural quantile function at τ .²

Assumption 1. *The mapping $u \mapsto q(d^*, u)$ is strictly increasing and left-continuous for every $u \in [0, 1]$, and has the inverse $y \mapsto q^{-1}(y, d^*)$.*

Assumption 2. *(i) $Pr(U_0 \leq \tau | Z) = Pr(U_1 \leq \tau | Z) = \tau$. (ii) $Pr(U_0 \leq \tau | D^*, Z) = Pr(U_1 \leq \tau | D^*, Z)$.*

Assumption 1 requires that the outcome variable Y is continuously distributed. Assumption 2 (i) is the exogeneity of the instrumental variable Z . This assumption allows for the endogeneity of the treatment variable D^* . Assumption 2 (ii) is the rank similarity condition on $U_{d^*} \leq \tau$. It is a relaxation of the rank invariance condition, $U_0 = U_1$, that an individual's rank, U_{d^*} , is the same regardless of whether the individual is treated or controlled. The rank similarity condition allows the two unobserved heterogeneity terms, U_1 and U_0 , to be different, though it still requires them to have the same distribution given the endogenous treatment assignment and the instrumental variable. It enables the τ -th quantile of the counterfactual outcome variable, $q(d^*, \tau)$, to be compared between the control group ($d^* = 0$) and the treatment group ($d^* = 1$). The rank similarity condition is a restriction on the unobserved heterogeneity in the outcome variable equation and has been widely used for investigating heterogeneous treatment effects (e.g., Doksum, 1974; Heckman, Smith, and Clements, 1997; Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2004).

Under the rank similarity condition, Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005) obtain the following relationship between the distribution of (Y, D^*, Z) and the structural quantile function $q(d^*, \tau)$.

Lemma 1 (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2005, Theorem 1). *Under Assumptions 1 and 2,*

$$Pr(U \leq \tau | Z) = \tau$$

and

$$Pr(Y \leq q(D^*, \tau) | Z) = \tau. \tag{1}$$

The rest of this paper adds the complication that the binary treatment variable D^* may not be observed. Then the equality (1) cannot be directly used for identifying the structural quantile function.

²The local restriction is a weaker condition than full independence between Z and U_{d^*} (Chesher, 2003). Technically speaking, U_{d^*} 's are not necessarily uniform random variables in this paper since the assumptions are only about the given value of τ , but the subsequent discussions in terms of the quantile treatment effect hold only when U_{d^*} 's are uniform random variables.

3 Quantile regression of Y on Z

In this section, I do not use any measurement of D^* . Instead the relationship between the outcome variable Y and the instrumental variable Z is used to provide a lower bound on the structural quantile treatment effect $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)$. Namely, $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ can be a lower bound on $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)$, when Z is a binary variable taking z_0 and z_1 . This analysis provides a new structural interpretation to $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$, which is computed as the regression coefficient from the quantile regression of Y on Z . When Z takes more than two values, the discussion in this section can be applied by selecting any two values in the support of Z or partitioning the support into two parts. It is worth clarifying that the results in this section and the following sections are valid regardless of whether Z is binary, discrete, continuous, or mixed.

In this section, I impose the stochastic monotonicity condition (Small and Tan, 2007 and DiNardo and Lee, 2011). It assumes a positive relationship between the treatment variable D^* and the instrumental variable Z in which, for every possible realization u of U , the probability of being treated $f_{U_1, D^*|Z=z}(u, 1)$ is weakly increasing in z , and the probability of being untreated $f_{U_0, D^*|Z=z}(u, 0)$ is weakly decreasing in z . The condition is weaker than the deterministic monotonicity condition (Imbens and Angrist, 1994; Angrist, Imbens, and Rubin, 1996) because it allows for defiers, i.e., some individuals who change D^* from 1 to 0 when Z increases.

Definition 1. *The stochastic monotonicity condition is that*

$$f_{U_0, D^*|Z=z_1}(u, 0) \leq f_{U_0, D^*|Z=z_0}(u, 0) \text{ and } f_{U_1, D^*|Z=z_1}(u, 1) \geq f_{U_1, D^*|Z=z_0}(u, 1) \quad (2)$$

for every $u \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 1 shows that, under the stochastic monotonicity condition in (2), $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ is biased towards zero compared to the structural quantile treatment effect $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and that the stochastic monotonicity condition holds.*

(a) *There is some unknown constant $\kappa \in [0, 1]$ such that*

$$Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) = \kappa \times (q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)). \quad (3)$$

(b) *If $f_{U_0, D^*|Z=z_1}(u, 0) < f_{U_0, D^*|Z=z_0}(u, 0)$ and $f_{U_1, D^*|Z=z_1}(u, 1) > f_{U_1, D^*|Z=z_0}(u, 1)$ in a neighborhood of τ , then $\kappa \neq 0$.*

This theorem provides a one-sided bound on $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)$: $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau) \geq Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ if $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) \geq 0$; and $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau) \leq Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ if $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) \leq 0$. This bound gives researchers a justification of using $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$, which is a lower bound for the structural quantile treatment effect. Note that $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ is a simple object to compute; it is obtained as the quantile regression coefficient on Z and various statistical software packages include linear and nonlinear quantile regressions (e.g., the qreg command in Stata).

The stochastic monotonicity condition cannot be removed from Theorem 1, but Lemma 5 in the appendix shows that Eq. (3) holds with $\kappa \in [-1, 1]$ even if the stochastic monotonicity condition does not hold. In other words, the inequality $|Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)| \leq |q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)|$ still holds without the stochastic monotonicity condition. I can use this inequality to test the significance of D^* by testing $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) = 0$.

4 Identified set for the structural quantile function

This section considers use of a potentially misclassified treatment variable D and provides the sharp identified set for the structural quantile function $q(\cdot, \tau)$. To extract some information about the true treatment D^* from its measurement D , I impose restrictions on the misclassification probabilities.

Assumption 3. (i) $(Pr(D = 1 | D^* = 0, Y, Z), Pr(D = 0 | D^* = 1, Y, Z)) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$ for some constants (π_0, π_1) . (ii) $Pr(D \neq D^* | D^* = 0, Y, Z) + Pr(D \neq D^* | D^* = 1, Y, Z) < 1$.

Assumption 3 (i) is that the measurement error does not depend on (Y, Z) . Assumption 3 (ii) is that the measurement D is positively correlated with the true treatment variable D^* . These assumptions are widely used in the literature on misclassification (e.g., Hausman, Abrevaya, and Scott-Morton, 1998, Mahajan, 2006; Lewbel, 2007; and Hu, 2008).

The sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ is the set of values for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ that exhausts all the information from the model and the data distribution. Let \mathcal{Q} be a subset of the set of functions of $\{0, 1\} \times [0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} , and \mathcal{P}^* be a subset of the set of probability distributions for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) .³ Given a distribution P for (Y, D, Z) , the sharp identified set for (q, P^*) is the set of elements (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) of $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ such that P is the distribution for $(\tilde{q}(D^*, U), D, Z)$ under \tilde{P}^* .⁴ The sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ is defined as the projection of the sharp identified set for (q, P^*) on the component $q(\cdot, \tau)$.

In the following theorem, I characterize the sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, by using moment equalities and inequalities.

Theorem 2. *Assume that all the elements in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ satisfy Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. (a) Given a distribution P for the observed variables, if (y_0, y_1) belongs to the sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$, then*

$$P(Y \leq y_D | Z) - \tau = p_1(P(Y \leq y_0 | Z) - \tau) + p_0(P(Y \leq y_1 | Z) - \tau) \quad (4)$$

for some (p_0, p_1) with $p_0 + p_1 < 1$ such that

$$0 \leq p_0 \leq P(D = 1 | Y, Z) \text{ a.s. and } 0 \leq p_1 \leq P(D = 0 | Y, Z) \text{ a.s.}$$

(b) *The converse is also true if $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ includes all (q, P^*) 's satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3.*

The moment equality condition in Eq. (4) is equivalent to the main testable implication in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005) when $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$ where (π_0, π_1) are the true unknown misclassification probabilities

³ \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{P}^* are subsets because there can be restrictions on q and the distribution for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) . Also note that the distribution for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) can be characterized by

$$Pr(D = d, Z \leq z, U_0 \leq u_0, U_1 \leq u_0, D^* = d^*)$$

and the distribution for (Y, D, Z) can be characterized by

$$Pr(Y \leq y, D = d, Z \leq z).$$

The distribution P for (Y, D, Z) is induced by (q, P^*) via

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y \leq y, D = 0, Z \leq z) &= P^*(D = 0, q(0, U_0) \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + P^*(D = 0, q(1, U_1) \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ P(Y \leq y, D = 1, Z \leq z) &= P^*(D = 1, q(0, U_0) \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + P^*(D = 1, q(1, U_1) \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z). \end{aligned}$$

⁴I use \tilde{q} for a generic element of \mathcal{Q} and \tilde{P}^* for a generic element of \mathcal{P}^* , whereas I use q for the true structural quantile function and P^* for the true distribution for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) .

defined in Assumption 3. The moment inequality conditions about (π_0, π_1) are derived from the following calculations:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(D = 1 | Y, Z) &= \pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)Pr(D^* = 1 | Y, Z) \geq \pi_0 \\ Pr(D = 0 | Y, Z) &= \pi_1 + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)Pr(D^* = 0 | Y, Z) \geq \pi_1. \end{aligned}$$

As a corollary to Theorem 2, I can compare the identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ and the estimand in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005), which does not consider measurement error in D .

Corollary 1. *Suppose all the assumptions in Theorem 2 (b) hold. Every solution (y_0, y_1) to $P(Y \leq y_D | Z) - \tau = 0$, belongs to the sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$.*

As another corollary to Theorem 2, it is possible to relate $Q_{Y|Z}(\tau)$ to the identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$. Although $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ can be used as a lower bound for $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)$, it does not always belong to the identified set.

Corollary 2. *Consider two points, z_0 and z_1 , in the support of Z , and suppose all the assumptions in Theorem 2 (b) hold. Then $(y_0, y_1) = (Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau))$ belongs to the sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ if and only if $P(D = 1 | \{y_0 < Y \leq y_1 \text{ or } y_1 < Y \leq y_0\}, Z = z_0) \leq P(D = 1 | Y, Z)$ a.s. and $P(D = 0 | \{y_0 < Y \leq y_1 \text{ or } y_1 < Y \leq y_0\}, Z = z_1) \leq P(D = 0 | Y, Z)$ a.s.*

Note that, by the exogeneity of Z , $(q(0, \tau), q(1, \tau)) = (Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau))$ if $D^* = 1\{Z = z_1\}$. Corollary 2 is roughly related to the observation that, under Assumption 3, $D^* = 1\{Z = z_1\}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} P(D = 1 | \{y_0 < Y \leq y_1 \text{ or } y_1 < Y \leq y_0\}, Z = z_0) &= P(D = 1 | \{y_0 < Y \leq y_1 \text{ or } y_1 < Y \leq y_0\}, D^* = 0) \\ &= \pi_0 \\ &\leq \pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)P(D^* = 1 | Y, Z) \\ &= P(D = 1 | Y, Z) \\ P(D = 0 | \{y_0 < Y \leq y_1 \text{ or } y_1 < Y \leq y_0\}, Z = z_1) &= P(D = 0 | \{y_0 < Y \leq y_1 \text{ or } y_1 < Y \leq y_0\}, D^* = 1) \\ &= \pi_1 \\ &\leq \pi_1 + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)P(D^* = 0 | Y, Z) \\ &= P(D = 0 | Y, Z). \end{aligned}$$

The precise derivations are found in the proof in the Appendix.

4.1 Under-identification even with large variation in Z

In this section, I show that the structural quantile function is not point identified in general unless there is additional information on the model primitives (q, P^*) . The failure of point identification is due to the rank condition and happens regardless of the order condition based on Eq. (4), where the number of the parameters is 4, and the number of the equations is the number of the support points of Z . Theorem 3 presents this failure for a class of data generating processes. In particular, the theorem states that the quantile treatment effect can be under-identified if I cannot exclude that the treatment is exogenous. Based on the result, I need to impose additional assumptions (other than the ones maintained in this paper) to achieve point identification when the treatment variable is potentially misclassified.

Theorem 3. Consider $\bar{d}^* = 0$ or $\bar{d}^* = 1$. Assume (i) the mapping $u \mapsto q^{-1}(q(1, u), 0)$ is Lipschitz continuous, (ii) $q(d^*, \tau) \neq q(1 - d^*, \tau)$, (iii) (U_0, U_1) is independent of (D^*, Z) , (iv) $\pi_{\bar{d}^*} > 0$, and (v) for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the following three statements holds:

1. $\tilde{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ for every strictly increasing bijection t of $[0, 1]$ to $[0, 1]$ such that $|t(u) - u| \leq \varepsilon$ for every $u \in (0, 1)$, where $\tilde{q}(d^*, \cdot) = q(d^*, t(\cdot))$ and $\tilde{q}(1 - d^*, \cdot) = q(1 - d^*, \cdot)$.⁵
2. $\tilde{P}^* \in \mathcal{P}^*$ for every distribution \tilde{P}^* for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) such that \tilde{P}^* satisfies Assumption 2 and that

$$\tilde{P}^*(D = 1 - \bar{d}^* \mid U_0, U_1, D^* = \bar{d}^*, Z) = \pi_{\bar{d}^*} - \varepsilon$$

$$\tilde{P}^*(D = \bar{d}^* \mid U_0, U_1, D^* = 1 - \bar{d}^*, Z) = \pi_{1 - \bar{d}^*}$$

$$|\tilde{P}^*(U_0 \leq u_0, U_1 \leq u_1, D^* = d^*, Z \leq z) - P^*(U_0 \leq u_0, U_1 \leq u_1, D^* = d^*, Z \leq z)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then the sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ have more than one elements.

Condition (i) is a regularity condition. Condition (ii) is that the treatment variable can have a non-zero effect on the outcome variable at quantile index τ . Condition (iii) is that the treatment variable can be exogenous. Condition (iv) is that there is a non-zero measurement error. Condition (v) is a condition about the size of the parameter space $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$. A sufficient condition for (v) is that $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ includes all (q, P^*) 's satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3.

Condition (iii) needs a careful discussion. Theorem 3 states that the quantile treatment effect is not always point identified unless the treatment is assumed to be endogenous. This theorem is more relevant when I cannot exclude that D^* is exogenous than when D^* is known to be exogenous. When I cannot exclude that D^* is exogenous, there is a possibility for the lack of point identification. It can be possible to point-identify the quantile treatment function if I can assume that D^* is not exogenous.

4.2 Point identification with second measurement

Given the under-identification result in Theorem 3, I consider the case of two measurements for D^* to achieve point identification of the structural quantile function. The identification strategy is based on existing results in the econometric literature. I apply the results in Mahajan (2006), Lewbel (2007), and Hu (2008) to identify $f_{Y, D^* | Z}$. Given identification of $f_{Y, D^* | Z}$, I apply the results in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005, 2013) to identify the structural quantile function.

The following assumption and Lemma 2 are based on Theorem 1 in Hu (2008).

Assumption 4. (i) The two measurements, D and V , are conditionally independent given D^* . (ii) $0 < f_{D^* | Z = z_1}(0) < 1$. (iii) There are two points, v_0 and v_1 , in the support of V such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_{V | D^* = 0}(v_0) & f_{V | D^* = 0}(v_1) \\ f_{V | D^* = 1}(v_0) & f_{V | D^* = 1}(v_1) \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible. (iv) $P(D = D^* \mid D^*) > 1/2$. (v) There are two points, z_0 and z_1 , in the support of Z .

Lemma 2. Under Assumptions 3 and 4, $f_{(Y, D^*) | Z}$ is point identified.

⁵Based on the construction of \tilde{q} , this function \tilde{q} satisfies Assumption 1.

Chernozhukov and Hansen (2013) provide a simple sufficient condition for the the global identification of the structural quantile function given $f_{(Y,D^*)|Z}$. I borrow the following assumption and identification result from Chernozhukov and Hansen (2013, Section 3.1).

Assumption 5. *There is a cube \mathcal{L} with $(q(0, \tau), q(1, \tau)) \in \mathcal{L}$ such that*

$$\frac{f_{(Y,D^*)|Z=z_1}(y_1, 1)}{f_{(Y,D^*)|Z=z_1}(y_0, 0)} > \frac{f_{(Y,D^*)|Z=z_0}(y_1, 1)}{f_{(Y,D^*)|Z=z_0}(y_0, 0)}$$

$$f_{(Y,D^*)|Z=z_1}(y_1, 1) > 0 \text{ and } f_{(Y,D^*)|Z=z_0}(y_0, 0) > 0$$

for all $(y_0, y_1) \in \mathcal{L}$.

Lemma 3. *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 5, $(q(0, \tau), q(1, \tau))$ is uniquely determined from $f_{(Y,D^*)|Z}$.*

By combining Lemmas 2 and 3, I can point-identify the structural quantile function when there are two measurements for D^* .

Theorem 4. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, $(q(0, \tau), q(1, \tau))$ is identified.*

5 Inference procedure with covariates

This section proposes an inference method for the structural quantile function. The method extends the inference method in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2008) to incorporate misclassification probabilities. To include control variables X , I impose a linear-in-parameters structure on the structural quantile function:

$$Y = q(D^*, X, U) \text{ with } q(d^*, x, \tau) = \alpha_0 d^* + x' \beta_0. \quad (5)$$

In this section, I focus on constructing a confidence interval for α_0 .

With control variables X , I modify Assumptions 1-3 into the following assumptions:

Assumption 6. *With probability one, the mapping $u \mapsto q(d^*, X, u)$ is strictly increasing and left-continuous for every $u \in [0, 1]$.*

Assumption 7. *(i) $Pr(U_0 \leq \tau | Z, X) = Pr(U_1 \leq \tau | Z, X) = \tau$. (ii) $Pr(U_0 \leq \tau | D^*, Z, X) = Pr(U_1 \leq \tau | D^*, Z, X)$.*

Assumption 8. *(i) For each $d^* = 0, 1$, $Pr(D \neq D^* | D^* = d^*, Y, Z, X)$ is a constant, denoted by π_{d^*} . (ii) $Pr(D \neq D^* | D^* = 0, Y, Z, X) + Pr(D \neq D^* | D^* = 1, Y, Z, X) < 1$.*

Given n i.i.d. copies $\{(Y_i, D_i, X_i, Z_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ of (Y, D, X, Z) , I construct a confidence interval for α_0 via the following two steps. In the first step, I construct a confidence interval for (π_0, π_1) . In the second step, given each point in the confidence interval for (π_0, π_1) , I construct a confidence interval for α_0 . For the size control, I use the Bonferroni correction for the first and second steps.

I assume there is a $(1 - \text{size}_1)$ confidence region, CI_1 , for (π_0, π_1) with the following condition.

Assumption 9. $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Pr((\pi_0, \pi_1) \in CI_1) \geq 1 - \text{size}_1$.

In the empirical illustration, I construct CI_1 by conducting one-tailed t -tests based on $\pi_0 \leq E[D | Z = 0]$ and $\pi_1 \leq E[1 - D | Z = 1]$, where I use $\text{size}_1/2$ for each t -test. In the empirical illustration, I obtain a bounded confidence interval α_0 by using $E_n[D | Z = 0] = 0$ and $E_n[1 - D | Z = 1] \approx 0.3$.

For every value of (p_0, p_1) , I am going to test $H_0 : \alpha_0 = \alpha$ against $H_1 : \alpha_0 \neq \alpha$. At the true value (α_0, π_0, π_1) of (α, p_0, p_1) , the following testable implications (cf. Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2008) hold.⁶

Lemma 4. *Under Assumptions 6-8,*

$$0 \in \arg \min_{\gamma} \min_{\beta} Q_0(\theta; \alpha_0, \pi_0, \pi_1).$$

where $\nu_0(y, x, z) = E[D \mid Y = y, X = x, Z = z]$, $t_+ = 1\{t \geq 0\} \cdot t$, $\rho_{\tau}(t) = (\tau - 1\{t \leq 0\})t$, $\theta = (\beta', \gamma)'$, $W = [X', Z']'$ and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1) &= E[\rho_{\tau}(Y - W'\theta)(1 - p_1 - D)] + E[\rho_{\tau}(Y - \alpha - W'\theta)(D - p_0)]. \\ &= E[\rho_{\tau}(Y - W'\theta)(1 - p_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))_+] + E[\rho_{\tau}(Y - \alpha - W'\theta)(\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+]. \end{aligned}$$

I assume that $Q_0(\theta; \alpha_0, \pi_0, \pi_1)$ has a unique minimizer over θ for the true parameter value (α_0, π_0, π_1) , which is implied by Assumption 12 (1). Since (α_0, π_0, π_1) is unknown, I estimate

$$\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} Q_n(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1)$$

for every value of (α, p_0, p_1) , where $\hat{\nu}(y, x, z)$ is a estimator for $\nu_0(y, x, z)$, and

$$Q_n(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1) = E_n[\rho_{\tau}(Y - W'\theta)(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+] + E_n[\rho_{\tau}(Y - \alpha - W'\theta)(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+].$$

The objective function $Q_n(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1)$ is convex in θ , which is the result of using $\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z)$ instead of D . This transformation comes from Buchinsky and Hahn (1998) and Abadie, Angrist, and Imbens (2002).⁷ To simplify the arguments, I consider a parametric model $\nu_0(y, x, z) = \nu_{\delta_0}(y, x, z)$ and an estimator $\hat{\delta}$ for δ_0 with the following assumptions.

Assumption 10. (i) $E[D^* \mid Y, X, Z]$ is bounded away from zero and one. (ii) $\sup_{(y, x, z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| = o_p(1)$ where $\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) = \nu_{\hat{\delta}}(y, x, z)$. (iii) $E_n \left[W(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)(\hat{\delta} - \delta_0)) \right] = o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0(\nu) &= (\tau - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\})(1 - \pi_1 - \nu(Y, X, Z)) + (\tau - 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\})(\nu(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0) \\ \Xi_0(\delta) &= (1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\}) - 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_{\delta}(Y, X, Z). \end{aligned}$$

(iv) There are n random variables, $\psi_{\delta, 1}, \dots, \psi_{\delta, n}$, such that $\hat{\delta} - \delta_0 = E_n[\psi_{\delta}] + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ with $E[\|\psi_{\delta}\|^2] < \infty$. (v) There is an estimator, $(\widehat{\psi}_{\delta, 1}, \dots, \widehat{\psi}_{\delta, n})$, for $(\psi_{\delta, 1}, \dots, \psi_{\delta, n})$, that satisfies $E[\|\widehat{\psi}_{\delta} - \psi_{\delta}\|^2] = o(1)$. (vi) There is an estimator $\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_{\delta}}$ for $\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_{\delta}$ that satisfies $E \left[\left\| W \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_{\delta}}(Y, X, Z) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_{\delta}(Y, X, Z) \right) \right\|^2 \right] = o(1)$. (vii) $E \left[\left\| W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_{\delta}(Y, X, Z) \right\|^2 \right] < \infty$.

The optimization of $Q_n(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1)$ is implemented in the same way as the linear quantile regression. Namely, I can rewrite the objective function as $Q_n(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \rho_{\tau}(\check{Y}_i - \check{W}'_i \theta)$, where

$$\check{Y}_i = \begin{cases} Y_i(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y_i, X_i, Z_i))_+ & \text{if } i \leq n \\ Y_{i-n}(\hat{\nu}(Y_{i-n}, X_{i-n}, Z_{i-n}) - p_0)_+ & \text{if } i \geq n + 1 \end{cases}$$

⁶As in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2008), I can replace Z with a function $g(X, Z)$ of (X, Z) .

⁷I am thankful to a referee for proposing this transformation.

$$\check{W}_i = \begin{cases} W_i(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y_i, X_i, Z_i))_+ & \text{if } i \leq n \\ W_{i-n}(\hat{\nu}(Y_{i-n}, X_{i-n}, Z_{i-n}) - p_0)_+ & \text{if } i \geq n + 1. \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n, n + 1, \dots, 2n$.⁸

To estimate the asymptotic variance for $\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)$, I use a kernel function $K(\cdot)$ and a bandwidth h . For every value of (α, p_0, p_1) , I estimate the asymptotic variance for $\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)$ by

$$\hat{\Omega}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) = E_n[\hat{\lambda}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)WW']^{-1}E_n[\hat{s}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)\hat{s}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)']E_n[\hat{\lambda}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)WW']^{-1},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\xi}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) &= (\tau - 1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq 0\})(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z)) \\ &\quad + (\tau - 1\{Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq 0\})(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0) \\ \hat{\Xi}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) &= 1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq 0\}\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta}}\nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \\ &\quad - 1\{Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq 0\}\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta}}\nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \\ \hat{s}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) &= \hat{\xi}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)W + E_n\left[W\hat{\Xi}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)\right]\widehat{\psi}_\delta \\ \hat{\lambda}(\alpha; p_0, p_1) &= K_h(Y - W'\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1))(1 - p_1 - D) \\ &\quad + K_h(Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}(\alpha; p_0, p_1))(D - p_0). \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\hat{\Omega}_\gamma(\alpha; p_0, p_1)$ the asymptotic variance for $\hat{\gamma}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)$.

The proposed confidence interval for α_0 is

$$CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2) = \bigcup_{(p_0, p_1) \in CI_1} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} : T(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq cv\},$$

where \mathcal{A} is the parameter space for α , the test statistic is

$$T(\alpha; p_0, p_1) = n\hat{\gamma}(\alpha; p_0, p_1)'\hat{\Omega}_\gamma(\alpha; p_0, p_1)^{-1}\hat{\gamma}(\alpha; p_0, p_1),$$

and the critical value cv is the $(1 - \text{size}_2)$ quantile of the χ^2 distribution with $\dim(\gamma)$ degrees of freedom. I impose the following assumptions, and the proposed confidence interval satisfies the asymptotic size control.

Assumption 11. (1) The parameter space for θ , denoted by Θ , is compact. (2) $\theta_0 \equiv (\beta'_0, 0')'$ is in the interior of Θ .

⁸Note that $\rho_\tau(t)c = (\tau - 1\{t \leq 0\})tc = (\tau - 1\{ct \leq 0\})ct = \rho_\tau(ct)$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \geq 0$. Since the weights, $(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+$ and $(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+$, are non-negative, I have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+ &= \rho_\tau(Y(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+ - (W(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+)'\theta) \\ \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha - W'\theta)(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+ &= \rho_\tau((Y - \alpha)(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+ - (W(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+)'\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(\theta; \alpha, p_0, p_1) &= E_n[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - p_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+] + E_n[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha - W'\theta)(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - p_0)_+] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \rho_\tau(\check{Y}_i - \check{W}'_i\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 12. (i) $E[f_{Y-\alpha_0 D^* | Z, X}(W'\theta_0)WW']$ is invertible. (ii) $E[\|W\|^4]$ is finite. (iii) $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} Pr(|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \epsilon \cdot \|W\|) = 0$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} Pr(|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq \epsilon \cdot \|W\|) = 0$. (iv) There is a constant C such that $\max\{f_{Y|X, Z, D}, f_{Y|X, Z, D}^{(1)}\} < C$ a.s.

Assumption 13. (i) $h \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{nh} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (ii) K is differentiable with $\sup_v |K^{(1)}(v)| < \infty$, $\int K(v)dv = 1$, $\int |K(v)v|dv < \infty$, and $\int K(v)^2 dv < \infty$.

Theorem 5. Under Assumptions 6-13, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Pr(\alpha_0 \in CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)) \geq 1 - (\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)$.

Assumption 11 is a regularity condition on the parameter. Assumption 12 (i) is that the Hessian matrix is non-singular, and it implies point identification of θ_0 given the true value (α_0, π_0, π_1) . Assumption 12 (ii)-(iv) is a regularity condition on the distribution of the observables. Assumption 13 is a restriction on the bandwidth and the kernel function, which is used to estimate the asymptotic variance $\hat{\Omega}_\gamma(\alpha; p_0, p_1)$.

6 Empirical illustration and Monte Carlo simulations

This section investigates the finite sample performance of the proposed method using an existing empirical application and simulate datasets. As emphasized in Section 4.1, the inference results presented in this section are valid regardless of whether the structural quantile function is point or partially identified.

6.1 Empirical illustration

As an empirical illustration, I study the quantile treatment effects of the 401(k) participation on financial savings (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2004) and consider the problem of mis-measured 401(k) participation.⁹ I use the same dataset as Chernozhukov and Hansen (2004), which is an extract from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) of 1991. The sample consists of households in which at least one person is in employment, and which has no income from self-employment. The resulting sample size is 9,915.

The model is based on Chernozhukov and Hansen (2004). The outcome variable Y is the net amount of financial assets in dollars, and the measured treatment variable D is self-reported participation in a 401(k) program. Participation in a 401(k) program may be endogenous because participants might be concerned more about retirement plans than non-participants. To control for endogeneity, I use 401(k) eligibility, an indicator variable of whether an employer offers a 401(k) program, as an instrumental variable Z , where z_1 means eligibility and z_0 means ineligibility. The control variables include a constant, family income, age, age squared, marital status, and family size. I present the summary statistics for (Y, D, Z) in Table 1.

When I compute the confidence intervals, I use $(\text{size}_1, \text{size}_2) = (1\%, 4\%)$, where size_1 is used to construct a confidence interval for unknown misclassification probabilities (π_0, π_1) and size_2 is used for the critical value cv . The confidence interval for (π_0, π_1) is $CI_1 = \{0\} \times [0, 0.31]$ for (π_0, π_1) , where $\{0\}$ follows from $E_n[D | Z = 0] = 0$ and $[0, 0.31]$ comes from one-tailed t -test for $\pi_1 \leq E[1 - D | Z = 1]$ with size 0.5%. I estimate $\nu_0(y, x, z)$ by probit regression of D on all the interactions of $(1, X, Z)$ and the cubic polynomials of Y .¹⁰ Using $p_0 = 0$ and grid points $p_1 = 0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, 0.31$ for CI_1 , I compute $CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)$ by $\bigcup_{p_1=0,0.01,0.02,\dots,0.31} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} : T(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq cv\}$.

Figure 1 shows the 95% confidence intervals based on Section 5, where I use the specification in Eq.

⁹Ura (2018) uses the same empirical setting to investigate the local average treatment effect under treatment misclassification.

¹⁰The interaction terms can be written as $(1, X', Z', Y, Y \cdot X', Y \cdot Z', Y^2, Y^2 \cdot X', Y^2 \cdot Z', Y^3, Y^3 \cdot X', Y^3 \cdot Z')$.

(5) and X includes the same covariates as in Benjamin (2003) and Chernozhukov and Hansen (2004).¹¹ I also compute the 95% confidence interval when I assume $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$, i.e., no misclassification. The confidence intervals that assume $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$ are exactly the same as the confidence intervals proposed in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2008, Section 3). All the confidence intervals are point-wise, that is, computed separately for each quantile index τ .

In this empirical exercise, the confidence intervals proposed in this paper are comparable in lengths to those that assume no misclassification. There are several features of this empirical exercise that make the confidence intervals tight (compared to those that assume no misclassification). First, in this empirical exercise, $E_n[D \mid Z = z_0] = 0$ implies $\pi_0 = 0$, so under-identification for $q(\cdot, \tau)$ mainly comes from under-identification for the scalar parameter π_1 . It makes the degree of under-identification smaller than when π_0 and π_1 are both under-identified. Second, the confidence intervals that assume $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$, are large enough to include the confidence interval with another value of (p_0, p_1) . Figure 2 shows the confidence intervals that assume $(p_0, p_1) = (0, 0)$ and that with $(p_0, p_1) = (0, 0.31)$, where the points $(0, 0)$ and $(0, 0.31)$ are the two endpoints for CI_1 . The confidence intervals that assume $(p_0, p_1) = (0, 0)$ include those that assume $(p_0, p_1) = (0, 0.31)$ for almost all the values of τ .

6.2 Monte Carlo simulations

For Monte Carlo simulations, I consider the following data generating process. The instrumental variable Z takes z_0 with probability 0.5 and z_1 with probability 0.5. The error term (\tilde{U}, V) is a two-dimensional mean-zero normal random vector with variance 1 and correlation coefficient 0.5, independent of Z . The covariate X is $X = (1, \tilde{X})$, where \tilde{X} is a four-dimensional standard normal random vector with identity covariance matrix, independent of (Z, \tilde{U}, V) . The latent treatment variable D^* is determined by

$$D^* = 1\{1\{Z = z_1\} + X'\beta + V > 0\},$$

and the outcome variable Y is determined by

$$Y = \exp(\Phi(\tilde{U}) - 0.5)D^* + X'\beta + \tilde{U},$$

where Φ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function and $\beta = (-(2 \times 1)^{-1}, -(2 \times 2)^{-1}, \dots, -(2 \times 5)^{-1})'$. The measurement D is determined by

$$D = \begin{cases} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - \pi_0 \\ 1 & \text{with probability } \pi_0 \end{cases} & \text{if } D^* = 0 \\ \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } \pi_1 \\ 1 & \text{with probability } 1 - \pi_1 \end{cases} & \text{if } D^* = 1. \end{cases}$$

The values of (π_0, π_1) are chosen in $\{0, 0.1, 0.2\}$, which results in 9 combinations of the data generating processes. The true values for α_0 is $\exp(\tau - 0.5)$.

In this simulation exercise I compute coverage frequencies of two inference methods over $[\alpha_0 - 1, \alpha_0 + 1]$. One is the proposed inference method and the other is the inference method that assumes no misclassification,

¹¹ X includes a constant, age, age², income categories, family size, education dummies, marital status dummy, two-earner status dummy, defined benefit pension status dummy, IRA participation status dummy, and homeownership status dummy. The number of the covariates in X is 18.

that is, $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$. I use $n = 1,000$ and $(\text{size}_1, \text{size}_2) = (1\%, 4\%)$, and all the results are based on 5,000 simulations.¹²

Figure 3 summarizes the simulation results when there is no misclassification, that is, $(\pi_0, \pi_1) = (0, 0)$. In this case, both the proposed method and the method that assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$ have correct size, i.e., the coverage frequency at the true value of α is at least 95%. The proposed inference method is less powerful than that with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$, but this is the cost for achieving robustness to misclassification.

Figures 4-11 summarize the simulation results when there is some misclassification. I experiment with $(\pi_0, \pi_1) = (0.1, 0), (0, 0.1), (0.2, 0), (0.1, 0.1), (0, 0.2), (0.2, 0.1), (0.1, 0.2), (0.2, 0.2)$. The method that assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$ does not have correct size as (π_0, π_1) becomes far from $(0, 0)$, but the proposed method always has correct size. This is consistent with Theorem 5, which shows that the proposed method has correct size even in the presence of misclassification.

To summarize these simulation results, the proposed inference method covers the true parameter value at least with the pre-specified significance level in finite samples. A practitioner could obtain a narrower confidence interval by assuming no misclassification, but the confidence interval may not cover the true parameter with correct size when there is non-negligible misclassification.

7 Conclusion

This paper extends the instrumental variable quantile regression model (Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2005, 2013) for a binary regressor, to situations when this binary regressor is potentially misclassified. The first identification result is that under the rank similarity condition and the stochastic monotonicity condition, the reduced-form question effect, $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$, is biased towards zero compared to the structural quantile treatment effect $q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau)$. The second identification results characterizes the sharp identified set for $q(d^*, \tau)$ under widely-used assumptions. I provide an inference method for the structural quantile function, and demonstrate its finite sample performance in simulation studies and an empirical illustration.

¹² I compute $CI_1 = [0, \bar{c}_0] \times [0, \bar{c}_1]$ where the value of \bar{c}_0 comes from one-tailed t -test for $\pi_0 \leq E[D | Z = 0]$ with size 0.5% and the value of \bar{c}_1 comes from one-tailed t -test for $\pi_1 \leq E[1 - D | Z = 1]$ with size 0.5%. As in the empirical exercise, I estimate $\nu_0(y, x, z)$ by the probit regression of D on all the interactions of $(1, X, Z)$ and the cubic polynomials of Y . Using 1% grid points $(p_0, p_1) \in \{0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, \bar{c}_0\} \times \{0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, \bar{c}_1\}$, I compute $CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)$ by $\bigcup_{p_1=0,0.01,0.02,\dots,\bar{c}_1} \bigcup_{p_0=0,0.01,0.02,\dots,\bar{c}_0} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} : T(\alpha; p_0, p_1) \leq cv\}$.

	sample size	mean	std. dev.
Y : family net financial assets (in \$1000)	9,915	18.05	63.52
D : 401(k) participation	9,915	0.26	0.44
Z : 401(k) eligibility	9,915	0.37	0.48

Table 1: Summary statistics for Y , D and Z




Figure 1: The (point-wise) 95% confidence intervals for α_0 . The solid curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dash-dotted line (—.) curve represents the inference method that assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 2: The (point-wise) 95% confidence intervals for α_0 . The dashed (--) curve represents the inference method that assumes $(\pi_0, \pi_1) = (0, 0.31)$, and the dash-dotted line (-.) curve represents the inference method that assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 3: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$. The dash-dot (-.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (--) curve represents the inference method that assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 4: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.1$ and $\pi_1 = 0$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 5: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0$ and $\pi_1 = 0.1$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 6: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.2$ and $\pi_1 = 0$. The dash-dot (—) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 7: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0.1$. The dash-dot (—) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 8: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0$ and $\pi_1 = 0.2$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 9: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.2$ and $\pi_1 = 0.1$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 10: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.1$ and $\pi_1 = 0.2$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (--) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.




Figure 11: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0.2$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (--) curve represents the inference method that (wrongly) assumes $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$.

References

- ABADIE, A., J. ANGRIST, AND G. IMBENS (2002): “Instrumental Variables Estimates of the Effect of Subsidized Training on the Quantiles of Trainee Earnings,” *Econometrica*, 70, 91–117.
- ANGRIST, J. D., G. W. IMBENS, AND D. B. RUBIN (1996): “Identification of Causal Effects using Instrumental Variables,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 444–455.
- BENJAMIN, D. J. (2003): “Does 401(k) eligibility increase saving?: Evidence from propensity score subclassification,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 87, 1259 – 1290.
- BITLER, M. P., H. W. HOYNES, AND T. DOMINA (2016): “Experimental Evidence on Distributional Effects of Head Start,” Working paper.
- BOUND, J., C. BROWN, AND N. MATHIOWETZ (2001): “Measurement Error in Survey Data,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, ed. by J. Heckman and E. Leamer, Elsevier, vol. 5, chap. 59, 3705–3843.
- BUCHINSKY, M. AND J. HAHN (1998): “An alternative estimator for the censored quantile regression model,” *Econometrica*, 66, 653.
- CALVI, R., A. LEWBEL, AND D. TOMMASI (2017): “LATE With Mismeasured or Misspecified Treatment: An Application To Women’s Empowerment in India,” Working paper.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V. AND C. HANSEN (2004): “The Effects of 401(K) Participation on the Wealth Distribution: An Instrumental Quantile Regression Analysis,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86, 735–751.
- (2005): “An IV Model of Quantile Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 73, 245–261.
- (2008): “Instrumental variable quantile regression: A robust inference approach,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 142, 379 – 398.
- (2013): “Quantile Models with Endogeneity,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 5, 57–81.
- CHESHER, A. (1991): “The Effect of Measurement Error,” *Biometrika*, 78, 451–462.
- (2003): “Identification in Nonseparable Models,” *Econometrica*, 71, 1405–1441.
- (2017): “Understanding the effect of measurement error on quantile regressions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 200, 223 – 237.
- DI NARDO, J. AND D. S. LEE (2011): “Program Evaluation and Research Designs,” in *Handbook of Labor Economics*, ed. by O. Ashenfelter and D. Card, Elsevier, vol. 4, Part A, chap. 5, 463–536.
- DI TRAGLIA, F. J. AND C. GARCÍA-JIMENO (2019): “On Mis-measured Binary Regressors: New Results and Some Comments on the Literature,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 209, 376–390.
- DOKSUM, K. (1974): “Empirical Probability Plots and Statistical Inference for Nonlinear Models in the Two-Sample Case,” *Annals of Statistics*, 2, 267–277.
- FIRPO, S., A. F. GALVAO, AND S. SONG (2017): “Measurement Errors in Quantile Regression Models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 198, 146–164.
- FRAZIS, H. AND M. A. LOEWENSTEIN (2003): “Estimating Linear Regressions with Mismeasured, Possibly Endogenous, Binary Explanatory Variables,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 117, 151–178.
- GALVAO, A. F. AND G. MONTES-ROJAS (2009): “Instrumental Variables Quantile Regression for Panel Data with Measurement Errors,” Working paper.
- GUSTMAN, A. L., T. STEINMEIER, AND N. TABATABAI (2008): “Do Workers Know About Their Pension Plan Type? Comparing Workers’ and Employers’ Pension Information,” in *Overcoming the Saving Slump: How to Increase the Effectiveness of Financial Education and Saving Programs*, ed. by A. Lusardi, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 47–81.

- HAUSMAN, J. A., J. ABREVAYA, AND F. M. SCOTT-MORTON (1998): “Misclassification of the dependent variable in a discrete-response setting,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 87, 239–269.
- HECKMAN, J. J., J. SMITH, AND N. CLEMENTS (1997): “Making The Most Out Of Programme Evaluations and Social Experiments: Accounting For Heterogeneity in Programme Impacts,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 64, 487–535.
- HENRY, M., Y. KITAMURA, AND B. SALANIÉ (2014): “Partial Identification of Finite Mixtures in Econometric Models,” *Quantitative Economics*, 5, 123–144.
- HU, Y. (2008): “Identification and Estimation of Nonlinear Models with Misclassification Error using Instrumental Variables: A General Solution,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 144, 27–61.
- IMBENS, G. W. AND J. D. ANGRIST (1994): “Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 62, 467–75.
- LEWBEL, A. (2007): “Estimation of Average Treatment Effects with Misclassification,” *Econometrica*, 75, 537–551.
- MAHAJAN, A. (2006): “Identification and Estimation of Regression Models with Misclassification,” *Econometrica*, 74, 631–665.
- NEWBY, W. K. AND D. MCFADDEN (1994): “Large Sample Estimation and Hypothesis Testing,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, ed. by R. F. Engle and D. L. McFadden, Elsevier, vol. 4, chap. 36, 2111–2245.
- NGUIMKEU, P., A. DENTEH, AND R. TCHERNIS (2019): “On the Estimation of Treatment Effects with Endogenous Misreporting,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 208, 487–506.
- POLLARD, D. (1991): “Asymptotics for least absolute deviation regression estimators,” *Econometric Theory*, 7, 186–199.
- SCHENNACH, S. M. (2008): “Quantile Regression with Mismeasured Covariates,” *Econometric Theory*, 24, 1010–1043.
- SMALL, D. S. AND Z. TAN (2007): “A Stochastic Monotonicity Assumption for the Instrumental Variables Method,” Working paper.
- SONG, S. (2018): “Nonseparable Triangular Models with Errors in Endogenous Variables,” Working paper.
- URA, T. (2018): “Heterogeneous Treatment Effects with Mismeasured Endogenous Treatment,” *Quantitative Economics*, 9, 1335–1370.
- WEI, Y. AND R. J. CARROLL (2009): “Quantile Regression With Measurement Error,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 1129–1143.
- WÜTHRICH, K. (2019): “A Comparison of Two Quantile Models with Endogeneity,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, forthcoming.
- YANAGI, T. (2018): “Inference on Local Average Treatment Effects for Misclassified Treatment,” *Econometric Reviews*, forthcoming.

A Identified set with a discrete outcome variable

It is possible to modify Theorem 2 when the outcome variable is discrete. Instead of Assumptions 1-2, I assume the following two conditions.

Assumption 14. *The mapping $u \mapsto q(d^*, u)$ is weakly increasing and left-continuous for every $u \in [0, 1]$.*

Assumption 15. *(i) $\Pr(U_0 \leq \tau \mid Z) \geq \tau$ and $\Pr(U_1 \leq \tau \mid Z) \geq \tau$. (ii) $\Pr(U_0 \leq \tau \mid D^*, Z) = \Pr(U_1 \leq \tau \mid D^*, Z)$.*

Under the above two assumptions, Theorem 2 can be modified as follows:

Theorem 6. *Assume that all the elements in $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ satisfy Assumptions 3, 14, and 15. (a) Given a distribution P for the observed variables, if (y_0, y_1) belongs to the sharp identified set for $q(\cdot, \tau)$, then*

$$P(Y \leq y_D \mid Z) - \tau \geq p_1(P(Y \leq y_0 \mid Z) - \tau) + p_0(P(Y \leq y_1 \mid Z) - \tau) \quad (6)$$

for some (p_0, p_1) with $p_0 + p_1 < 1$ such that

$$0 \leq p_0 \leq P(D = 1 \mid Y, Z) \text{ a.s.}$$

$$0 \leq p_1 \leq P(D = 0 \mid Y, Z) \text{ a.s.}$$

(b) *The converse is also true if $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ includes all (q, P^*) 's satisfying Assumptions 3, 14, and 15.*

Proof. The proof for (a) is as follows. Define $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$. By Assumption 3,

$$\begin{pmatrix} P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Y, Z) \\ P^*(D^* = 1 \mid Y, Z) \end{pmatrix} = (1 - p_0 - p_1)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} P(D = 0 \mid Y, Z) - p_1 \\ P(D = 1 \mid Y, Z) - p_0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Using Eq. (7),

$$\begin{aligned} & P(Y \leq y_D \mid Z) - p_1 P(Y \leq y_0 \mid Z) - p_0 P(Y \leq y_1 \mid Z) \\ &= (P(D = 0 \mid Y \leq y_0, Z) - p_1) P(Y \leq y_0 \mid Z) \\ &\quad + (P(D = 1 \mid Y \leq y_1, Z) - p_0) P(Y \leq y_1 \mid Z) \\ &= (1 - p_0 - p_1) P(D^* = 0 \mid Y \leq y_0, Z) P(Y \leq y_0 \mid Z) \\ &\quad + (1 - p_0 - p_1) P(D^* = 1 \mid Y \leq y_1, Z) P(Y \leq y_1 \mid Z) \\ &= (1 - p_0 - p_1) P(Y \leq y_{D^*} \mid Z). \end{aligned}$$

Since Assumption 14 implies

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y \leq y_{D^*} \mid Z) &= P(q(D^*, U) \leq q(D^*, \tau) \mid Z) \\ &\geq P(U \leq \tau \mid Z) \\ &= P(U_0 \leq \tau \mid D^* = 0, Z) P(D^* = 0 \mid Z) + P(U_1 \leq \tau \mid D^* = 1, Z) P(D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &= P(U_0 \leq \tau \mid D^* = 0, Z) P(D^* = 0 \mid Z) + P(U_0 \leq \tau \mid D^* = 1, Z) P(D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &= P(U_0 \leq \tau \mid Z) \\ &\geq \tau, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$P(Y \leq y_D | Z) - p_1 P(Y \leq y_0 | Z) - p_0 P(Y \leq y_1 | Z) \geq (1 - p_0 - p_1)\tau,$$

and then Eq. (6) holds. Moreover, by Eq. (7), $P^*(D^* = d^* | Y, Z) \geq 0$ implies $P(D = 0 | Y, Z) \geq p_1$ and $P(D = 1 | Y, Z) \geq p_0$.

In the proof for (b), I need to find $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ such that $\tilde{q}(d^*, \tau) = y_{d^*}$ and that P is the distribution for (Y, D, Z) under \tilde{P}^* . For each $d^* = 0, 1$, there is a strictly increasing bijection $t_{d^*} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $t_{d^*}(\tau) = F_{Y|D=d^*}(y_{d^*})$. For each $d^* = 0, 1$ and every $u \in [0, 1]$, define

$$\tilde{q}(d^*, u) = Q_{Y|D=d^*}(t_{d^*}(u)).$$

Define the distribution \tilde{P}^* for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^*(D = 1 - d^* | Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) &= p_{D^*} \\ \tilde{P}^*(Z \leq z, U_0 \leq u_0, U_1 \leq u_1, D^* = d^*) &= \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq q(d^*, \min\{u_0, u_1\}), Z \leq z, D^* = d^*), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D^* = 0) \\ \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D^* = 1) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - p_0 & p_1 \\ p_0 & 1 - p_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} P(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D = 0) \\ P(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D = 1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

By the construction, the distribution for (Y, D, Z) under (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) is P , and $\tilde{q}(d^*, \tau) = y_{d^*}$ for each $d^* = 0, 1$. To show $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$, it suffices to show that Assumptions 14 and 3 holds for (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) . For the rest of the proof, I am going to show Assumptions 2 (i).¹³ By rearranging Eq. (6),

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &\leq \frac{1 - p_1}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_0, D = 0 | Z) - \frac{p_1}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_0, D = 1 | Z) \\ &\quad - \frac{p_0}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_1, D = 0 | Z) + \frac{1 - p_0}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z) \end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (8),

$$\tau \leq \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_0, D^* = 0 | Z) + \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_1, D^* = 1 | Z).$$

The definition of \tilde{q} and \tilde{P}^* implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^*(U_0 \leq \tau | Z) &= \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_0, D^* = 0 | Z) + \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_1, D^* = 1 | Z) \geq \tau \\ \tilde{P}^*(U_1 \leq \tau | Z) &= \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_0, D^* = 0 | Z) + \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_1, D^* = 1 | Z) \geq \tau, \end{aligned}$$

which is Assumptions 2 (i). □

¹³Assumption 14 follows from the definition of \tilde{q} . Assumption 2 (ii) follows from the definition of \tilde{P}^* . Assumption 3 follows from $\tilde{P}^*(D \neq D^* | Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) = p_{D^*}$.

B Proofs of the results in the main text

Proof of Theorem 1

Lemma 5. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $Q_{Y|Z}(\tau)$ is a convex combination of $q(1, \tau)$ and $q(0, \tau)$.*

Proof. By the monotonicity of $q(\cdot, d^*)$ and Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= P(Y \leq q(D^*, \tau) \mid Z) \\ &\geq P(Y \leq \min\{q(1, \tau), q(0, \tau)\} \mid Z) \\ &= F_{Y|Z}(\min\{q(1, \tau), q(0, \tau)\})\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= P(Y \leq q(D^*, \tau) \mid Z) \\ &\leq P(Y \leq \max\{q(1, \tau), q(0, \tau)\} \mid Z) \\ &= F_{Y|Z}(\max\{q(1, \tau), q(0, \tau)\}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $Q_{Y|Z}(\cdot)$ is monotonic, it follows that

$$\min\{q(1, \tau), q(0, \tau)\} \leq Q_{Y|Z}(\tau) \leq \max\{q(1, \tau), q(0, \tau)\}.$$

□

By Lemma 5, the statement of theorem holds if $q(1, \tau) = q(0, \tau)$. The rest of the proof is going to focus on $q(1, \tau) > q(0, \tau)$. By Lemma 5, there is some $\kappa \in [-1, 1]$ such that $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) - Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) = \kappa(q(1, \tau) - q(0, \tau))$. Here it is sufficient to show $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) \geq Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ for Theorem 1 (a) and $Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau) > Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)$ for Theorem 1 (b). Since $Q_{Y|Z}(\tau)$ is a convex combination of $q(1, \tau)$ and $q(0, \tau)$, I have $q(1, \tau) \geq Q_{Y|Z}(\tau) \geq q(0, \tau)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}P(Y \leq Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) + P(Y \leq Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &= F_{Y|Z}(Q_{Y|Z}(\tau)) \\ &= \tau \\ &= P(q(D^*, U) \leq q(D^*, \tau) \mid Z) \\ &= P(q(0, U) \leq q(0, \tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) + P(q(1, U) \leq q(1, \tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z),\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$P(q(0, \tau) < q(0, U) \leq Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) = P(Q_{Y|Z}(\tau) < q(1, U) \leq q(1, \tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z).$$

Using the monotonicity of $u \mapsto q(d^*, u)$,

$$P(\tau < U \leq q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), 0), D^* = 0 \mid Z) = P(q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), 1) < U \leq \tau, D^* = 1 \mid Z).$$

Using the density function $f_{U_{d^*}, D^* | Z}(y, d^*)$, the above equation can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\tau}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), 0)} f_{U_0, D^* | Z}(u, 0) du = \int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z}(\tau), 1)}^{\tau} f_{U_1, D^* | Z}(u, 1) du. \quad (9)$$

First, I am going to show Theorem 1 (a). Evaluate Eq. (9) at $Z = z_0$ and then

$$\int_{\tau}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 0)} f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 0) du = \int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 1)}^{\tau} f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 1) du.$$

Since $f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 0) \leq f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 0)$ and $f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 1) \geq f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 1)$,

$$\int_{\tau}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 0)} f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 0) du \leq \int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 1)}^{\tau} f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 1) du.$$

Subtracting the above equation from Eq. (9) at $Z = z_1$, and then

$$\int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau), 0)}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 0)} f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 0) du \leq \int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 1)}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau), 1)} f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 1) du.$$

Using $Y = q(D^*, U)$,

$$\int_{Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau)}^{Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)} f_{Y, D^* | Z=z_1}(y, 0) dy \leq \int_{Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)}^{Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau)} f_{Y, D^* | Z=z_1}(y, 1) dy,$$

and then

$$\int_{Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)}^{Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau)} f_{Y, D^* | Z=z_1}(u) du \geq 0,$$

which implies $\tau - F_{Y, D^* | Z=z_1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau)) \geq 0$.

Then, I am going to show Theorem 1 (b). To the contrary, suppose $Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) \leq Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau)$. By Theorem 1 (a), $Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) = Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau)$. Using $\Delta f_{U_{d^*}, D^* | Z}(u, d^*) = f_{U_{d^*}, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, d^*) - f_{U_{d^*}, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, d^*)$, Eq. (9) implies

$$\int_{\tau}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 0)} \Delta f_{U_0, D^* | Z}(u, 0) du = \int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 1)}^{\tau} \Delta f_{U_1, D^* | Z}(u, 1) du.$$

Since $f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 0) \leq f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 0)$ and $f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 1) \geq f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 1)$,

$$\int_{\tau}^{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 0)} |\Delta f_{U_0, D^* | Z}(u, 0)| du = - \int_{q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 1)}^{\tau} |\Delta f_{U_1, D^* | Z}(u, 1)| du.$$

Since $f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 0) < f_{U_0, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 0)$ and $f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_1}(u, 1) > f_{U_1, D^* | Z=z_0}(u, 1)$ in a neighborhood of τ , the above equation implies $q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 0) = \tau = q^{-1}(Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), 1)$, which contradicts $q(1, \tau) > q(0, \tau)$.

Proof of Theorem 2

The proof for (a) is as follows. By Assumption 3,

$$\begin{pmatrix} P^*(D^* = 0 | Y, Z) \\ P^*(D^* = 1 | Y, Z) \end{pmatrix} = (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} P(D = 0 | Y, Z) - \pi_1 \\ P(D = 1 | Y, Z) - \pi_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Eq. (1) in Lemma 1 becomes Eq. (4). Moreover, $P^*(D^* = d^* | Y, Z) \geq 0$ implies $P(D = 0 | Y, Z) \geq \pi_1$ and $P(D = 1 | Y, Z) \geq \pi_0$.

In the proof for (b), I need to find $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ such that $\tilde{q}(d^*, \tau) = y_{d^*}$ and that P is the distribution for (Y, D, Z) under \tilde{P}^* . For each $d^* = 0, 1$, there is a strictly increasing bijection $t_{d^*} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $t_{d^*}(\tau) = F_{Y|D=d^*}(y_{d^*})$. For each $d^* = 0, 1$ and every $u \in [0, 1]$, define

$$\tilde{q}(d^*, u) = Q_{Y|D=d^*}(t_{d^*}(u)).$$

Define the distribution \tilde{P}^* for (D, Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^*(D \neq D^* | Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) &= p_{D^*} \\ \tilde{P}^*(Z \leq z, U_0 \leq u_0, U_1 \leq u_1, D^* = d^*) &= \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq q(d^*, \min\{u_0, u_1\}), Z \leq z, D^* = d^*), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D^* = 0) \\ \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D^* = 1) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - p_0 & p_1 \\ p_0 & 1 - p_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} P(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D = 0) \\ P(Y \leq y, Z \leq z, D = 1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

By the construction, the distribution for (Y, D, Z) under (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) is P , and $\tilde{q}(d^*, \tau) = y_{d^*}$ for each $d^* = 0, 1$. To show $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$, it suffices to show that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 holds for (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) . For the rest of the proof, I am going to show Assumptions 2 (i).¹⁴ By rearranging Eq. (4),

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \frac{1 - p_1}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_0, D = 0 | Z) - \frac{p_1}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_0, D = 1 | Z) \\ &\quad - \frac{p_0}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_1, D = 0 | Z) + \frac{1 - p_0}{1 - p_0 - p_1} P(Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z) \end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (10),

$$\tau = \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_0, D^* = 0 | Z) + \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_1, D^* = 1 | Z).$$

The definition of \tilde{q} and \tilde{P}^* implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^*(U_0 \leq \tau | Z) &= \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_0, D^* = 0 | Z) + \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_1, D^* = 1 | Z) = \tau \\ \tilde{P}^*(U_1 \leq \tau | Z) &= \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_0, D^* = 0 | Z) + \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y_1, D^* = 1 | Z) = \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Corollary 1

Use $(p_0, p_1) = (0, 0)$. Then (y_0, y_1) satisfies the conditions in Theorem 2.

¹⁴Assumption 1 follows from the definition of \tilde{q} . Assumption 2 (ii) follows from the definition of \tilde{P}^* . Assumption 3 follows from $\tilde{P}^*(D \neq D^* | Z, U_0, U_1, D^*) = p_{D^*}$.

Proof of Corollary 2

In this proof, assume $Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau) \leq Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau)$ without loss of generality.

First, I am going to show the “only if” part of this corollary. By Theorem 2, Eq. (4) holds for some (p_0, p_1) with $0 \leq p_0 \leq P(D = 1 | Y, Z)$ a.s. and $0 \leq p_1 \leq P(D = 0 | Y, Z)$ a.s. Using $(y_0, y_1) = (Q_{Y|Z=z_0}(\tau), Q_{Y|Z=z_1}(\tau))$, Eq. (4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z = z_0) &= p_0 P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_0) \\ -P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1, D = 0 | Z = z_1) &= -p_1 P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $p_0 \leq P(D = 1 | Y, Z)$ a.s. and $p_1 \leq P(D = 0 | Y, Z)$ a.s., it follows that $P(D = 1 | y_0 < Y \leq y_1, Z = z_0) \leq P(D = 1 | Y, Z)$ a.s. and $P(D = 0 | y_0 < Y \leq y_1, Z = z_1) \leq P(D = 0 | Y, Z)$ a.s.

Second, I am going to show the “if” part of this corollary. Define $p_0 = P(D = 1 | y_0 < Y \leq y_1, Z = z_0)$ and $p_1 = P(D = 0 | y_0 < Y \leq y_1, Z = z_1)$. Eq. (4) holds for $Z = z_0$, because

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y \leq y_D | Z = z_0) - \tau &= P(Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z = z_0) + P(Y \leq y_0, D = 0 | Z = z_0) - \tau \\ &= P(Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z = z_0) - P(Y \leq y_0, D = 1 | Z = z_0) \\ &= P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z = z_0) \\ &= p_0 P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_0) \\ &= p_0 (P(Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_0) - P(Y \leq y_0 | Z = z_0)) \\ &= p_0 (P(Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_0) - \tau) \\ &= p_1 (P(Y \leq y_0 | Z = z_0) - \tau) + p_0 (P(Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_0) - \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Eq. (4) holds for $Z = z_1$, because

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y \leq y_D | Z = z_1) - \tau &= P(Y \leq y_1, D = 1 | Z = z_1) + P(Y \leq y_0, D = 0 | Z = z_1) - \tau \\ &= P(Y \leq y_0, D = 0 | Z = z_1) - P(Y \leq y_1, D = 0 | Z = z_1) \\ &= -P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1, D = 0 | Z = z_1) \\ &= -p_1 P(y_0 < Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_1) \\ &= -p_1 (P(Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_1) - P(Y \leq y_0 | Z = z_0)) \\ &= p_1 (P(Y \leq y_0 | Z = z_1) - \tau) \\ &= p_1 (P(Y \leq y_0 | Z = z_1) - \tau) + p_0 (P(Y \leq y_1 | Z = z_1) - \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 3

Assume $\bar{d}^* = 0$ for simplicity. Note that $q(d^*, u) = Q_{Y|D^*=d^*, Z}(u)$ from Condition (iii). Take sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}(0, u) &= q\left(0, u + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1} (u - P^*(Y \leq q(1, u) | D^* = 0))\right) \\ \tilde{q}(1, u) &= q(1, u) \\ (p_0, p_1) &= (\pi_0 - \varepsilon, \pi_1). \end{aligned}$$

Condition (iv) guarantees $p_0 \geq 0$. Consider $U_0 = U_1$ and define \tilde{P}^* by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{P}^*(\tilde{q}(0, U_0) \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) &= \frac{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ \tilde{P}^*(\tilde{q}(1, U_1) \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) &= P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ \tilde{P}^*(D = 0 \mid Z, U_1, D^* = 1) &= \pi_1 \\ \tilde{P}^*(D = 1 \mid Z, U_0, D^* = 0) &= \pi_0 - \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

By Conditions (ii), $u \neq P^*(Y \leq q(1, u) \mid D^* = 0)$ and

$$\tilde{q}(0, \tau) = q\left(0, u + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}(u - P^*(Y \leq q(1, u) \mid D^* = 0))\right) \neq q(0, u)$$

as long as ε is positive. To establish the statement of this theorem, I am going to show that $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$ and that (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) is observationally equivalent to (q, P^*) .

First, I am going to show $(\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{P}^*$. The Lipschitz continuity in Condition (i) guarantees that $u \mapsto t(u)$ is a strictly increasing bijection of $[0, 1]$ into $[0, 1]$ for sufficiently small ε , where $t(u) = u + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}(u - P^*(Y \leq q(1, u) \mid D^* = 0))$. Therefore, Condition (v) implies $\tilde{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ for sufficiently small ε . To show $\tilde{P}^* \in \mathcal{P}^*$, I am going to show Assumption 2 (i).¹⁵ By the definition of \tilde{q} and independence between Z and Y given D^* ,

$$\begin{aligned}P^*(Y \leq \tilde{q}(0, \tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) &= P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Z)P^*(Y \leq \tilde{q}(0, \tau) \mid D^* = 0, Z) \\ &= P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Z)P^*(Y \leq \tilde{q}(0, \tau) \mid D^* = 0) \\ &= P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Z) \left(\tau + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}(\tau - P^*(Y \leq q(1, \tau) \mid D^* = 0)) \right) \\ &= P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Z) \left(\tau + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}(\tau - P^*(Y \leq q(1, \tau) \mid D^* = 0, Z)) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality uses $q(0, u) = Q_{Y \mid D^*=0}(u)$. By the definition of \tilde{P}^* and \tilde{q} ,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{P}^*(U \leq \tau \mid Z) &= \tilde{P}^*(U \leq \tau, D^* = 0 \mid Z) + \tilde{P}^*(U \leq \tau, D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &= \tilde{P}^*(\tilde{q}(0, U) \leq \tilde{q}(0, \tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) + \tilde{P}^*(\tilde{q}(1, U) \leq \tilde{q}(1, \tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &= \frac{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq \tilde{q}(0, \tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) \\ &\quad + P^*(Y \leq \tilde{q}(1, \tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq \tilde{q}(1, \tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) \\ &= \frac{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Z) \left(\tau + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}(\tau - P^*(Y \leq q(1, \tau) \mid D^* = 0, Z)) \right) \\ &\quad + P^*(Y \leq q(1, \tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq q(1, \tau), D^* = 0 \mid Z) \\ &= \tau P^*(D^* = 0 \mid Z) + P^*(Y \leq q(1, \tau), D^* = 1 \mid Z) \\ &= \tau,\end{aligned}$$

¹⁵Since I set $U = U_0 = U_1$, Assumption 2 (ii) holds.

where the last equality uses $q(1, u) = Q_{Y|D^*=1, Z}(u)$.

Second, I am going to show that (\tilde{q}, \tilde{P}^*) is observationally equivalent to (q, P^*) . By the definition of \tilde{P}^* ,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) &= \tilde{P}^*(\tilde{q}(1, U) \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &= P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ \tilde{P}^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) &= \tilde{P}^*(\tilde{q}(0, U) \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &= \frac{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{P}(Y \leq y, D = 0, Z \leq z) &= \tilde{P}^*(D = 0 | Z, U_0, U_1, D^* = 0) \tilde{P}(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \tilde{P}^*(D = 0 | Z, U_0, U_1, D^* = 1) \tilde{P}(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &= (1 - \pi_0 + \varepsilon) \frac{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \pi_1 P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \pi_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &= (1 - \pi_0) P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \pi_1 P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &= P^*(Y \leq y, D = 0, Z \leq z) \\ \tilde{P}(Y \leq y, D = 1, Z \leq z) &= \tilde{P}^*(D = 1 | Z, U_0, U_1, D^* = 0) \tilde{P}(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + \tilde{P}^*(D = 1 | Z, U_0, U_1, D^* = 1) \tilde{P}(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &= (\pi_0 - \varepsilon) \frac{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + (1 - \pi_1) P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + (1 - \pi_1) \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1 + \varepsilon} P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &= \pi_0 P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 0, Z \leq z) \\ &\quad + (1 - \pi_1) P^*(Y \leq y, D^* = 1, Z \leq z) \\ &= P^*(Y \leq y, D = 1, Z \leq z).\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 2

Under Assumption 4 (i),

$$\begin{aligned}f_{(D, V)|Z}(d, v) &= f_{D|D^*=1, Z}(d) f_{V|D^*=1, Z}(v) f_{D^*|Z}(1) + f_{D|D^*=0, Z}(d) f_{V|D^*=0, Z}(v) f_{D^*|Z}(0) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} f_{D|D^*=0, Z}(d) & f_{D|D^*=1, Z}(d) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{D^*|Z}(0) & 0 \\ 0 & f_{D^*|Z}(1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{V|D^*=0}(v) \\ f_{V|D^*=1}(v) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} f_{(D,V)|Z}(0, v_0) & f_{(D,V)|Z}(0, v_1) \\ f_{(D,V)|Z}(1, v_0) & f_{(D,V)|Z}(1, v_1) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \pi_0 & \pi_1 \\ \pi_0 & 1 - \pi_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{D^*|Z}(0) & 0 \\ 0 & f_{D^*|Z}(1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{V|D^*=0}(v_0) & f_{V|D^*=0}(v_1) \\ f_{V|D^*=1}(v_0) & f_{V|D^*=1}(v_1) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 4 (ii) and (iii), the above matrix for $Z = z_1$ is invertible, so

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} f_{(D,V)|Z=z_0}(0, v_0) & f_{(D,V)|Z=z_0}(0, v_1) \\ f_{(D,V)|Z=z_0}(1, v_0) & f_{(D,V)|Z=z_0}(1, v_1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{(D,V)|Z=z_1}(0, v_0) & f_{(D,V)|Z=z_1}(0, v_1) \\ f_{(D,V)|Z=z_1}(1, v_0) & f_{(D,V)|Z=z_1}(1, v_1) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \pi_0 & \pi_1 \\ \pi_0 & 1 - \pi_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_{D^*|Z=z_0}(0)/f_{D^*|Z=z_1}(0) & 0 \\ 0 & f_{D^*|Z=z_0}(1)/f_{D^*|Z=z_1}(1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \pi_0 & \pi_1 \\ \pi_0 & 1 - \pi_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 4 (iv), the eigenvalue decomposition of the above matrix is uniquely determined, so (π_0, π_1) is point-identified. Since

$$f_{(Y,D)|Z}(y, d) = f_{D|Y=y, D^*=1, Z}(d) f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}(y, 1) + f_{D|Y=y, D^*=0, Z}(d) f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}(y, 0)$$

Assumption 3 implies

$$\begin{aligned} f_{(Y,D)|Z}(y, 0) &= \pi_0 f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}(y, 1) + (1 - \pi_0) f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}(y, 0) \\ f_{(Y,D)|Z}(y, 1) &= (1 - \pi_1) f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}(y, 1) + \pi_1 f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}(y, 0), \end{aligned}$$

so that $f_{(Y, D^*)|Z}$ is point identified.

Proof of Lemma 3

It follows from Theorem 2 of Chernozhukov and Hansen (2013).

Proof of Theorem 4

It follows from Lemmas 2 and 3.

Proof of Lemma 4

Since

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(Y - \alpha_0 D^* \leq X' \beta_0 + 0 \cdot Z \mid X, Z) &= Pr(Y \leq \alpha_0 D^* + X' \beta_0 \mid X, Z) \\ &= Pr(q(D^*, X, U) \leq q(D^*, X, \tau) \mid X, Z) \\ &= Pr(U \leq \tau \mid X, Z) \\ &= \tau, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$0 \in \arg \min_{\gamma} \left(\min_{\beta} E[\rho_{\tau}(Y - \alpha_0 D^* - W' \theta)] \right),$$

where this derivation comes from Chernozhukov and Hansen (2008, p.383). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 D^* - W'\theta)] &= (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - D^*)] \\
&\quad + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)D^*] \\
&= (1 - \pi_1)E[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - D)] \\
&\quad - \pi_1 E[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)D] \\
&\quad - \pi_0 E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(1 - D)] \\
&\quad + (1 - \pi_0)E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)D] \\
&= E[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - D)] \\
&\quad + E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(D - \pi_0)] \\
&= E[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - E[D | Y, X, Z])] \\
&\quad + E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(E[D | Y, X, Z] - \pi_0)],
\end{aligned}$$

because

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 - \pi_0 & \pi_1 \\ \pi_0 & 1 - \pi_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \pi_1 & -\pi_1 \\ -\pi_0 & 1 - \pi_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It shows that

$$0 \in \arg \min_{\gamma} \left(\min_{\beta} E[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))] + E[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)] \right).$$

Note that $\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0 = (\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+$ and $1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z) = (1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))_+$, because

$$E[D | Y, X, Z] = \pi_0 + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[D^* | Y, X, Z] \geq \pi_0$$

and

$$1 - E[D | Y, X, Z] = \pi_1 + (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[1 - D^* | Y, X, Z] \geq \pi_1.$$

Proof of Theorem 5

By Lemma 10 and 14 below, $P(T(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) \leq cv) \rightarrow 1 - \text{size}_2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the statement of the theorem follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\alpha_0 \in CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)) &\geq P(\{\alpha_0 \in CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)\} \cap \{(\pi_0, \pi_1) \in CI_1\}) \\
&\geq P(\{T(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) \leq cv\} \cap \{(\pi_0, \pi_1) \in CI_1\}) \\
&\geq P(T(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) \leq cv) - P((\pi_0, \pi_1) \notin CI_1)
\end{aligned}$$

and then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\alpha_0 \in CI_\alpha(\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)) \geq 1 - (\text{size}_1 + \text{size}_2)$.

In the following proof, I assume $1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) \geq 0$ and $\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0 \geq 0$ without loss of generality,

because $E[D^* | Y, X, Z]$ is bounded away from zero and one, and then

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) &= 1 - \pi_1 - \nu(Y, X, Z) - (\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu(Y, X, Z)) \\
&= (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[1 - D^* | Y, X, Z] - (\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu(Y, X, Z)) \\
&> 0 \\
\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0 &= \nu(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0 + (\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu(Y, X, Z)) \\
&= (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E[D^* | Y, X, Z] + (\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu(Y, X, Z)) \\
&> 0
\end{aligned}$$

with probability approaching one.

Lemma 6.

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\bar{Q}_n(\theta) - \bar{Q}_0(\theta)| = o_p(1).$$

where $\bar{Q}_n(\theta) = Q_n(\theta; \alpha_0, \pi_0, \pi_1)$ and $\bar{Q}_0(\theta) = Q_0(\theta; \alpha_0, \pi_0, \pi_1)$.

Proof. I am going to check the conditions in Newey and McFadden (1994, Lemma 2.9). Since Θ is compact and \bar{Q}_0 is continuous, I am going to show $\bar{Q}_n(\theta) = \bar{Q}_0(\theta) + o_p(1)$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$ and $|\bar{Q}_n(\tilde{\theta}) - \bar{Q}_n(\theta)| \leq 2E_n[\|W\|] \cdot \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta\|$ for every $\tilde{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta$. In this proof, I use

$$\bar{Q}_n^*(\theta) = E_n[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))_+] + E_n[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+].$$

The pointwise convergence of $\bar{Q}_n(\theta)$ to $\bar{Q}_0(\theta)$ is shown by demonstrating $\bar{Q}_n(\theta) - \bar{Q}_n^*(\theta) = o_p(1)$ and $\bar{Q}_n^*(\theta) - \bar{Q}_0(\theta) = o_p(1)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{Q}_n(\theta) - \bar{Q}_n^*(\theta)| &\leq E_n[\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)|\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)|] \\
&\quad + E_n[\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)|\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)|] \\
&\leq \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| (E_n[|\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)| + |\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)|]),
\end{aligned}$$

Assumption 10 (ii) implies $\bar{Q}_n(\theta) - \bar{Q}_n^*(\theta) = o_p(1)$. Moreover, $\bar{Q}_n^*(\theta) - \bar{Q}_0(\theta) = \bar{Q}_n^*(\theta) - E[\bar{Q}_n^*(\theta)] = o_p(1)$ is shown by checking the second moment of $\bar{Q}_n^*(\theta)$: $E[\bar{Q}_n^*(\theta)^2] = O(1/n)$ follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left[(\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - D) + \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(D - \pi_0))^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq E \left[(\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - D))^2 \right]^{1/2} + E \left[(\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(D - \pi_0))^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq E \left[(Y - W'\theta)^2 \right]^{1/2} + E \left[(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq 2E \left[Y^2 \right]^{1/2} + \alpha_0 + 2E \left[(W'\theta)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq 2E \left[Y^2 \right]^{1/2} + \alpha_0 + 2E \left[\|W\|^2 \right]^{1/2} \|\theta\| \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

The in-probability Lipschitz condition is shown as follows. Since

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta) - \rho_\tau(Y - W'\tilde{\theta})| &\leq |W'(\tilde{\theta} - \theta)| \leq \|W\| \cdot \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta\| \\ |\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta) - \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\tilde{\theta})| &\leq \|W\| \cdot \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta\|, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{Q}_n(\tilde{\theta}) - \bar{Q}_n(\theta)| &\leq E_n \left[|\rho_\tau(Y - W'\tilde{\theta}) - \rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)| \right] + E_n \left[|\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\tilde{\theta}) - \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)| \right] \\ &\leq E_n \left[\|W\| \cdot \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta\| \right] + E_n \left[\|W\| \cdot \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta\| \right] \\ &\leq 2E_n \left[\|W\| \cdot \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta\| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7. $\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0 = o_p(1)$, where $\hat{\theta}_0 = \hat{\theta}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)$.

Proof. I am going to check the conditions in Newey and McFadden (1994, Theorem 2.1) to establish the consistency. Since Θ is compact, \bar{Q}_0 is continuous, and Lemma 6 establishes the uniform convergence of $\bar{Q}_n(\theta)$, I am going to show that \bar{Q}_0 is uniquely minimized at θ_0 . As in the proof of Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_0(\theta) &= E [\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta)(1 - \pi_1 - D) + \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta)(D - \pi_0)] \\ &= (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1)E [\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 D^* - W'\theta)] \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \bar{Q}_0(\theta) &= (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} E [\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 D^* - W'\theta)] = (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1) E [(F_{Y - \alpha_0 D^* | X, Z}(W'\theta) - \tau)W] \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta \partial \theta'} \bar{Q}_0(\theta) &= (1 - \pi_0 - \pi_1) E [f_{Y - \alpha_0 D^* | X, Z}(W'\theta)WW'], \end{aligned}$$

it follows that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \bar{Q}_0(\theta_0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta \partial \theta'} \bar{Q}_0(\theta)$ is positive semidefinite everywhere and positive definite at θ_0 . Therefore, \bar{Q}_0 is uniquely minimized at θ_0 . □

Lemma 8. $E_n [\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W] = E_n [s_0] + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $s_0 = \xi_0(\nu_0)W + E [W\Xi_0(\delta_0)] \psi_\delta$.

Proof. By Assumption 10 (iii)-(iv),

$$\begin{aligned} E_n [\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W] &= E_n [\xi_0(\nu_0)W] + E_n [W\Xi_0(\delta_0)] (\hat{\delta} - \delta_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= E_n [\xi_0(\nu_0)W] + E [W\Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n [\psi_\delta] + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 9. *Define*

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_0(\boldsymbol{\tau}) &= f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau})(1 - \pi_1 - D) \\
&\quad + f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau})(D - \pi_0) \\
g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu) &= (\rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta_0))(1 - \pi_1 - \nu(Y, X, Z))_+ \\
&\quad + (\rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0))(\nu(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+ \\
r_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}) &= nE_n[g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu})] - \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\tau}'E[\lambda_0(0)WW']\boldsymbol{\tau} + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'E_n[\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W].
\end{aligned}$$

Then $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} |r_n(\boldsymbol{\tau})| = o_p(1)$.

Proof. If I can show $r_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = o_p(1)$ pointwise in $\boldsymbol{\tau}$, I can apply the convexity lemma in Pollard (1991) to $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mapsto nE_n[g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu})] + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'E_n[\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W]$, and then $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} |r_n(\boldsymbol{\tau})| = o_p(1)$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $r_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = o_p(1)$ pointwise in $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\lambda_0(0)WW'] &= E[f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)(1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))WW'] \\
&\quad + E[f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0)(\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)WW'] \\
&= E[f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)(1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))_+WW'] \\
&\quad + E[f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0)(\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+WW'],
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses the law of iterated expectation, and the second equality uses $(1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))_+ = 1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)$ and $(\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+ = \nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\tau}} E[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)] \right|_{\boldsymbol{\tau}=0} &= -n^{1/2}E[\xi_0(\nu_0)W] = 0 \\
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\tau} \partial \boldsymbol{\tau}'} E[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)] &= E[\lambda_0(\boldsymbol{\tau})WW'] = E[\lambda_0(0)WW'] + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

and then $E[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)] = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\tau}'E[\lambda_0(0)WW']\boldsymbol{\tau} + o(1)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_n(\boldsymbol{\tau}) &= nE_n[g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu})] - nE[g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)] + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'E_n[\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W] + o(1) \\
&= E_n[n g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W] - E_n[n g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W] \\
&\quad + E_n[n g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W] - E[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)] + o(1) \\
&= E_n[n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W] \\
&\quad + (E_n - E)[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W] + o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $E[\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W] = 0$.

First, I am going to show the L^1 convergence of $E_n[n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W]$ to zero. By the definitions of $g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu)$ and $\xi_0(\nu)$, I can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
&n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W \\
&= n \times \text{term}_1 \times ((1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+ - (1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))) \\
&\quad + n \times \text{term}_2 \times ((\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+ - (\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{term}_1 &= \rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \rho_\tau(Y - W'\theta_0) \\
&\quad + (\tau - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\})n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau} \\
\text{term}_2 &= \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \rho_\tau(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0) \\
&\quad + (\tau - 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\})n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}.
\end{aligned}$$

The two terms, term_1 and term_2 , can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\text{term}_1| &= \left| 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau} \leq 0\} \right| \left| Y - W'\theta_0 - n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau} \right| \\
&\leq 1\{|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} \left(|Y - W'\theta_0| + |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}| \right) \\
&\leq 1\{|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} \times 2|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}| \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

$$|\text{term}_2| \leq 1\{|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} \times 2|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|, \tag{12}$$

where the first equality follows from calculations based on the definition of ρ_τ . As long as $1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) \geq 0$ and $\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0 \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+ - (1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))| &= |(1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z)) - (1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z))| \\
&= |\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\leq \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+ - (\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)| &= |(\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0) - (\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)| \\
&= |\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\leq \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)|. \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

Now I can bound $E [\|E_n [n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W] \|]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E [\|E_n [n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W] \|] \\
&\leq E [E_n [\|n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W \|]] \\
&= E [\|n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0)) \| \|W\|] \\
&\leq 2nE[1\{|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}| \|W\|] \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| \\
&\quad + 2nE[1\{|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}| \|W\|] \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)|
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|f_{Y|X,Z}| \leq C$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[1\{|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\}|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|] \\
&= E[E[1\{|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} | X, Z]|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|] \\
&= E\left[\int_{W'\theta_0 - |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|}^{W'\theta_0 + |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|} f_{Y|X,Z}(y)dy |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|\right] \\
&\leq E[2C|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}||n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|] \\
&= 2Cn^{-1}E[|W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2\|W\|]
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[1\{|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\}|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|] \\
&= E[E[1\{|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} | X, Z]|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|] \\
&= E\left[\int_{\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0 - |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|}^{\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0 + |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|} f_{Y|X,Z}(y)dy |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|\right] \\
&\leq E[2C|n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}||n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\|W\|] \\
&= 2Cn^{-1}E[|W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2\|W\|],
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[|n(g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \hat{\nu}) - g(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0)) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\xi_0(\hat{\nu}) - \xi_0(\nu_0))|\|W\|\right] \\
&\leq 8CE[|W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2\|W\|] \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| \\
&= o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, I am going to show the L^2 convergence of $(E_n - E)[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W]$. Using the bounds in Eq. (11)-(14), I have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[(ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W)^2]^{1/2} \\
&\leq nE[|\text{term}_1|^2 \times ((1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z))_+ - (1 - \pi_1 - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)))^2]^{1/2} \\
&\quad + nE[|\text{term}_2|^2 \times ((\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0)_+ - (\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0))^2]^{1/2} \\
&\leq 4nE[1\{|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} \times |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2]^{1/2} \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| \\
&\quad + 4nE[1\{|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|\} \times |n^{-1/2}W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2]^{1/2} \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| \\
&\leq 8n^{1/2}E[|W'\boldsymbol{\tau}|^2]^{1/2} \sup_{(y,x,z)} |\hat{\nu}(y, x, z) - \nu_0(y, x, z)| \\
&= o(n^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

and then $E[((E_n - E)[ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W])^2] = n^{-1}E[(ng(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \nu_0) + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\xi_0(\nu_0)W)^2] = o(1)$. \square

Lemma 10.

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) = \sqrt{n}E[\lambda_0(0)WW']^{-1}E_n[s_0] + o_p(1)$$

and therefore $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) \rightarrow_d N(0, \Omega_0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Omega_0 = E[\lambda_0(0)WW']^{-1}E[s_0s_0']E[\lambda_0(0)WW']^{-1}$.

Proof. Define $\eta_n = \sqrt{n}E[\lambda_0(0)WW']^{-1}E_n[s_0]$. It suffices to show $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) = \eta_n + o_p(1)$. By Lemma 8, $\eta_n = \sqrt{n}E[\lambda_0(0)WW']^{-1}E_n[\xi_0(\hat{\nu})W] + o_p(1)$. Using the definition of $r_n(\cdot)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{2}\eta_n'E[\lambda_0(0)WW']\eta_n + r_n(\eta_n) &= nE_n[g(\eta_n, \hat{\nu})] \\
&\geq nE_n[g(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0), \hat{\nu})] \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) - \eta_n)'E[\lambda_0(0)WW'](\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) - \eta_n) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\eta_n'E[\lambda_0(0)WW']\eta_n + r_n(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) - \eta_n\|^2 \text{eig}_{\min}(E[\lambda_0(0)WW']) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\eta_n'E[\lambda_0(0)WW']\eta_n + r_n(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) = \arg \min_{\tau} E_n[g(\tau, \hat{\nu})]$ and $\text{eig}_{\min}(E[\lambda_0(0)WW'])$ is the minimum eigenvalue of $E[\lambda_0(0)WW']$. Therefore,

$$r_n(\eta_n) - r_n(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) - \eta_n\|^2 \text{eig}_{\min}(E[\lambda_0(0)WW']),$$

so that Lemma 9 implies $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) - \eta_n = o_p(1)$. □

Lemma 11.

$$Pr(|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) = o(1)$$

$$Pr(|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) = o(1).$$

Proof. This lemma follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr(|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) \\
&= Pr(\|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \leq n^{-1/2} \log(n), |Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) \\
&\quad + Pr(\|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| > n^{-1/2} \log(n), |Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) \\
&\leq Pr(\|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \leq n^{-1/2} \log(n)) \\
&\quad + Pr(|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq n^{-1/2} \log(n) \|W\|) \\
&= o(1) \\
&Pr(|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) \\
&= Pr(\|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \leq n^{-1/2} \log(n), |Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) \\
&\quad + Pr(\|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| > n^{-1/2} \log(n), |Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|) \\
&\leq Pr(\|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \leq n^{-1/2} \log(n)) \\
&\quad + Pr(|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq n^{-1/2} \log(n) \|W\|) \\
&= o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the $o(1)$ terms come from Lemme 10 and Assumption 12 (iii). □

Lemma 12. $E_n[\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)'] = E[s_0 s_0'] + o_p(1)$.

Proof. The weak law of large numbers implies $E_n[s_0 s_0'] = E[s_0 s_0'] + o_p(1)$, and then it suffices to show

$$E_n[\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) \hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)' - s_0 s_0'] = o_p(1).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0 &= (\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W + E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right] \widehat{\psi}_\delta \\ &\quad + (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] \widehat{\psi}_\delta + E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] (\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} E_n[\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) \hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)' - s_0 s_0'] &= E_n[(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0)(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0)'] \\ &\quad + E_n[s_0(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0)'] + E_n[(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0) s_0'], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &E_n[(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0)(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0)'] \\ &= E_n[(\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W W' (\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] \\ &\quad + E_n[(\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right]' \\ &\quad + E_n[(\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + E_n[(\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W (\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W' (\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] \\ &\quad + E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right]' \\ &\quad + E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta (\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W' (\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] \\ &\quad + (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right]' \\ &\quad + (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta (\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta) W' (\hat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] \\ &\quad + E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta) \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] E_n \left[W(\hat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right]' \\ &\quad + E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta) \widehat{\psi}_\delta'] (E_n - E) [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\ &\quad + E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)] E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta) (\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] E [W \Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
E_n[(\hat{s}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - s_0)s_0'] &= E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))WW'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] \\
&+ E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W\psi_\delta']E[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\
&+ E_n\left[W(\widehat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0))\right]E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] \\
&+ E_n\left[W(\widehat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0))\right]E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \psi_\delta']E[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\
&+ (E_n - E)[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] \\
&+ (E_n - E)[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \psi_\delta']E[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]' \\
&+ E[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)W'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] \\
&+ E[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)\psi_\delta']E[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)]'.
\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
(E_n - E)[W\Xi_0(\delta_0)] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W\psi_\delta'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))WW'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))WW'(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W\widehat{\psi}_\delta'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n\left[W(\widehat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0))\right]' &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W'(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)W'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)W'(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)(\widehat{\psi}_\delta - \psi_\delta)'] &= o_p(1) \\
E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] &= O_p(1) \\
E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \psi_\delta'] &= O_p(1) \\
E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta W'\xi_0(\nu_0)'] &= O_p(1) \\
E_n[\widehat{\psi}_\delta \psi_\delta'] &= O_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality comes from the weak law of large numbers, and the other equalities come from a combination of Assumption 10 (iv)-(vii) the following equalities:

$$E[\|\xi_0(\nu_0)W\|^2] < \infty \tag{15}$$

$$E[\|(\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0))W\|^2] = o(1) \tag{16}$$

$$E\left[W(\widehat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0))\right] = o_p(1). \tag{17}$$

Note that Eq. (15) follows from $|\xi_0(\nu_0)| \leq 2$ and $E[\|W\|^2] < \infty$.

First, I am going to show Eq. (16). Since

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0)| &\leq |(1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\})| \times |1 - \pi_1 - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\quad + |\tau - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\}| \times |\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\quad + |1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\}| \times |\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \pi_0| \\
&\quad + |\tau - 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\}| \times |\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\leq |(1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\})| \\
&\quad + |\nu_0(Y, X, Z) - \hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\quad + |1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\}| \\
&\quad + |\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)| \\
&\leq 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|\} \\
&\quad + 1\{Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0 \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|\} \\
&\quad + 2|\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)|,
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
E[|\widehat{\xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \xi_0(\nu_0)|^2]^{1/2} &\leq Pr(|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|\})^{1/4} E[\|W\|^4]^{1/4} \\
&\quad + Pr(|Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|\})^{1/4} E[\|W\|^4]^{1/4} \\
&\quad + 2E[|\hat{\nu}(Y, X, Z) - \nu_0(Y, X, Z)|^4]^{1/4} E[\|W\|^4]^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 10 (ii) and Lemma 11, Eq. (16) holds.

Next, I am going to show Eq. (17). Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0) &= 1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta}} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right) \\
&\quad + \left(1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \\
&\quad - 1\{Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta}} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right) \\
&\quad - \left(1\{Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - \alpha - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z),
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[\left\| W(\widehat{\Xi}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \Xi_0(\delta_0)) \right\| \right] \\
& \leq E \left[\left\| W \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right) \right\| \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left\| \left(1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \right) W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right\| \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left\| W \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right) \right\| \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left\| \left(1\{Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - \alpha - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \right) W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right\| \right] \\
& = 2E \left[\left\| W \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right) \right\| \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left(1\{Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \right) \right]^{1/2} E \left[\left\| W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right\|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
& \quad + E \left[\left(1\{Y - \alpha - W'\hat{\theta}_0 \leq 0\} - 1\{Y - \alpha - W'\theta_0 \leq 0\} \right) \right]^{1/2} E \left[\left\| W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right\|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
& \leq 2E \left[\left\| W \left(\widehat{\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right) \right\| \right] \\
& \quad + Pr(|Y - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|)^{1/2} E \left[\left\| W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right\|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
& \quad + Pr(|Y - \alpha - W'\theta_0| \leq \|(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)\| \|W\|)^{1/2} E \left[\left\| W \frac{\partial}{\partial \delta'} \nu_\delta(Y, X, Z) \right\|^2 \right]^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 11 and Assumption 10 (vi)-(vii), Eq. (17) holds. \square

Lemma 13. $E_n[\hat{\lambda}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)WW'] = E[\lambda_0(0)WW'] + o_p(1)$.

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\|\lambda_0(0)WW'\|^2] & \leq E[\|\lambda_0(0)\|^2 \cdot \|W\|^4] \\
& = E[\|f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)(1 - \pi_1 - D) + f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0)(D - \pi_0)\|^2 \cdot \|W\|^4] \\
& \leq E[(\|f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)\| + \|f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0)\|)^2 \cdot \|W\|^4] \\
& \leq 4C^2 E[\|W\|^4] \\
& < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

the weak law of large numbers implies $E_n[\lambda_0(0)WW'] = E[\lambda_0(0)WW'] + o_p(1)$. It suffices to show that

$E_n[\hat{\lambda}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)WW'] = E_n[\lambda_0(0)WW'] + o_p(1)$. Using the mean value expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\lambda}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \lambda_0(0) &= \left(K_h^{(1)}(\tilde{V})(1 - \pi_1 - D) + K_h^{(1)}(\tilde{V} - \alpha_0)(D - \pi_0) \right) W'(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) \\ &\quad + (K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0))(1 - \pi_1 - D) \\ &\quad + (K_h(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0))(D - \pi_0),\end{aligned}$$

where $K_h(t) = K(t/h)/h$, and \tilde{V} is a value between $Y - W'\hat{\theta}_0$ and $Y - W'\theta_0$. Using the above mean value expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|E_n[\hat{\lambda}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1)WW'] - E_n[\lambda_0(0)WW']\| \\ &= \|E_n[(\hat{\lambda}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) - \lambda_0(0))WW']\| \\ &\leq \left\| E_n \left[\left(K_h^{(1)}(\tilde{V})(1 - \pi_1 - D) + K_h^{(1)}(\tilde{V} - \alpha_0)(D - \pi_0) \right) W'(\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0)WW' \right] \right\| \\ &\quad + \|E_n[(K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0))(1 - \pi_1 - D)WW']\| \\ &\quad + \|E_n[(K_h(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0))(D - \pi_0)WW']\| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_v |K_h^{(1)}(v)| \cdot \left\| (\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0) \right\| \cdot E_n[\|W\|^3] \\ &\quad + \|E_n[(K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0))(1 - \pi_1 - D)WW']\| \\ &\quad + \|E_n[(K_h(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0))(D - \pi_0)WW']\| \\ &\leq O_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &\quad + \|E_n[(K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0))(1 - \pi_1 - D)WW']\| \\ &\quad + \|E_n[(K_h(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0))(D - \pi_0)WW']\|.\end{aligned}$$

Since each entry in WW' has a finite variance, it suffices to show that

$$E_n[(K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0))(1 - \pi_1 - D)\omega] = o_p(1) \quad (18)$$

$$E_n[(K_h(Y - \alpha_0 - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(\alpha_0 + W'\theta_0))(D - \pi_0)\omega] = o_p(1) \quad (19)$$

for a random variable ω such that ω is a function of (D, Z, X) and $E[\omega^2] < \infty$. I am going to show (18) for the rest of the proof, and the proof for (19) is similar. The mean of the left-hand side of (18) is $O(h)$,

because

$$\begin{aligned}
& |E[(K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)) \omega]| \\
&= |E[E[(K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)) \omega \mid X, Z, D]]| \\
&= |E[(E[K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) \mid X, Z, D] - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)) \omega]| \\
&= |E[\left(\int K_h(y - W'\theta_0) f_{Y|X,Z,D}(y) dy - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)\right) \omega]| \\
&= |E[\left(\int K(v) f_{Y|X,Z,D}(W'\theta_0 + vh) dv - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)\right) \omega]| \\
&= |E[\int K(v) (f_{Y|X,Z,D}(W'\theta_0 + vh) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)) dv \omega]| \\
&\leq E[\int |K(v)| |f_{Y|X,Z,D}(W'\theta_0 + vh) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)| dv |\omega|] \\
&\leq E[\int |K(v)| C|v|h dv |\omega|] \\
&= ChE[|\omega|] \int |K(v)v| dv \\
&= O(h).
\end{aligned}$$

The variance of the left-hand side of (18) is $O((nh)^{-1})$, because

$$\begin{aligned}
E[((K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) - f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)) \omega)^2] &\leq E[K_h(Y - W'\theta_0)^2 \omega^2] \\
&\quad + E[f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)^2 \omega^2] \\
&\quad - 2E[K_h(Y - W'\theta_0) f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0) \omega] \\
&\leq E[\int K_h(y - W'\theta_0)^2 f_{Y|X,Z,D}(y) dy \omega^2] \\
&\quad + E[f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0)^2 \omega^2] \\
&\quad - 2E[\int K_h(y - W'\theta_0) f_{Y|X,Z,D}(y) dy f_{Y|D,Z,X}(W'\theta_0) \omega] \\
&\leq Ch^{-1} \int K(v)^2 dv E[\omega^2] + C^2 E[\omega^2] + 2C^2 E[|\omega|] \\
&= O(h^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 14. $\hat{\Omega}(\alpha_0; \pi_0, \pi_1) = \Omega_0 + o_p(1)$.

Proof. Since $E[\lambda_0(0)WW'] = E[f_{Y-\alpha_0 D^*|Z,X}(W'\theta_0)WW']$ is invertible, the statement of this lemma follows from Lemmas 12 and 13. □

C Additional simulation results

In this section, I provide additional simulation results in the simulation designs in Section 6.2. The proposed inference method uses the Bonferroni size correction for the parameters (π_0, π_1) . To evaluate the conservatism from the Bonferroni correction, I compare the proposed inference method and the infeasible method with

knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$. The infeasible inference method is based on the true parameter (π_0, π_1) , and uses $T(\alpha; \pi_0, \pi_1)$ and cv in Section 5 with $size_2 = 5\%$.

For all the simulation designs, the proposed method rejects the alternatives less often than the infeasible method. The power comparisons are different between the alternatives larger and smaller than α_0 . On one hand, the power of the proposed method for the alternative smaller than α_0 is comparable to that of the infeasible method. On the other hand, the powers are significantly different for the alternative larger α_0 . I conjecture that the value of (p_0, p_1) might not be relevant to reject the alternative smaller than α_0 , because, as in Section 3, it is possible to get a lower bound for α_0 without using the variable D .




Figure 12: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (—) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 13: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.1$ and $\pi_1 = 0$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 14: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0$ and $\pi_1 = 0.1$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 15: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.2$ and $\pi_1 = 0$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 16: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0.1$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 17: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0$ and $\pi_1 = 0.2$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 18: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.2$ and $\pi_1 = 0.1$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 19: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = 0.1$ and $\pi_1 = 0.2$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.




Figure 20: Coverage frequency with $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 0.2$. The dash-dot (—.) curve represents the proposed inference method, and the dashed (---) curve represents the infeasible inference method with knowing $(p_0, p_1) = (\pi_0, \pi_1)$.

This figure "fig_emp.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1612.08288v3>