

AUGMENTED MINIMAX LINEAR ESTIMATION

BY DAVID HIRSHBERG AND STEFAN WAGER

Stanford University

Many statistical estimands can be expressed as continuous linear functionals of a conditional expectation function. This includes the average treatment effect under unconfoundedness and generalizations for continuous-valued and personalized treatments. In this paper, we discuss a general approach to estimating such quantities: we begin with a simple plug-in estimator based on an estimate of the conditional expectation function, and then correct the plug-in estimator by subtracting a minimax linear estimate of its error. We show that our method is semiparametrically efficient under weak conditions and observe promising performance on both real and simulated data.

1. Introduction. Suppose we observe n independent and identically distributed samples $(Z_i, Y_i) \sim P$ with support in $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$, and we want to estimate a continuous linear functional of the form

$$(1) \quad \psi(m) = \mathbb{E}[h(Z_i, m)] \quad \text{at} \quad m(z) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i | Z_i = z].$$

Our main result establishes that we can build efficient estimators for a wide variety of such problems simply by subtracting from a plugin estimator $\psi(\hat{m})$ a minimax linear estimate of its error $\psi(\hat{m}) - \psi(m)$.

The following estimands from the literature on causal inference and missing data are of this type and can be estimated efficiently by our approach.

EXAMPLE 1 (Mean with Outcomes Missing at Random). We observe covariates X_i and some but not all of the corresponding outcomes Y_i^* . We write $W_i \in \{0, 1\}$ to indicate whether the outcome Y_i^* was observed, and define $Z_i = (X_i, W_i)$ and $Y_i = W_i Y_i^*$; we then estimate the linear functional $\psi(m) = \mathbb{E}[m(X_i, 1)]$ at $m(x, w) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x, W_i = w]$. This will be equal to the mean $\mathbb{E}[Y_i^*]$ if, conditional on covariates X_i , each outcome Y_i^* is independent of its nonmissingness W_i ([Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983](#)).

EXAMPLE 2 (Average Partial Effect). Letting $Z_i = (X_i, W_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$, we estimate the average of the derivative of the response surface $m(x, w)$ with respect to w , $\psi(m) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial w} \{m(X_i, w)\}_{w=W_i}\right]$. This estimand, and weighted

MSC 2010 subject classifications: 62F12

Keywords and phrases: causal inference, convex optimization, semiparametric efficiency

variants of it, quantify the average effect of a continuous treatment W_i under exogeneity (Powell, Stock and Stoker, 1989).

EXAMPLE 3 (Average Partial Effect in the Conditionally Linear Model). In the setting of the previous example, we make the additional assumption that the regression function m is conditionally linear in w , $m(x, w) = \mu(x) + w\tau(x)$. The average partial effect is then $\psi(m) = \mathbb{E}[\tau(X_i)]$.

EXAMPLE 4 (Distribution Shift). We estimate the effect of a shift in the distribution of the conditioning variable Z from one known distribution, P_0 , to another, P_1 , i.e., $\psi(m) = \int m(z)(dP_1(z) - dP_0(z))$ for $m(z) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i | Z_i = z]$. Under exogeneity assumptions, this estimand can be used to compare policies for assigning personalized treatments, and estimators for it form a key building block in methods for estimation of optimal treatment policies.

Below, we first discuss our estimator in the simple case that $h(z, m)$ in (1) does not depend on z , i.e., $h(z, m) = \psi(m)$. In this case, e.g., in Example 4, we can evaluate $\psi(m)$ without knowledge of the distribution P of z , and we say that our functional of interest $\psi(\cdot)$ is *evaluable*. From Section 1.3 on, we will address the general case where h also depends on z and so, even if we knew m a-priori, we could only approximate $\psi(m)$ with a sample average $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i, m)$.

1.1. *Estimating Evaluable Linear Functionals.* Consider the estimation of $\psi(m)$ where $\psi(\cdot)$ is an evaluable mean-square-continuous linear functional. The estimator we propose takes a plugin estimator $\psi(\hat{m})$, and then subtracts out an estimate of its error $\psi(\hat{m}) - \psi(m) = \psi(\hat{m} - m)$ obtained as a weighted average of regression residuals,

$$(2) \quad \hat{\psi} = \psi(\hat{m}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{m}(Z_i) - Y_i).$$

Our approach builds on a result of Chernozhukov et al. (2016) and Chernozhukov, Newey and Robins (2018), who show that we can use the Riesz representer for ψ to construct efficient estimators of this type.

To motivate this approach recall that, by the Riesz representation theorem, any continuous linear functional $\psi(\cdot)$ on the square integrable functions from \mathcal{Z} to \mathbb{R} has a Riesz representer $\gamma_\psi(\cdot)$, i.e., a function satisfying $\int \gamma_\psi(z)f(z)dP(z) = \psi(f)$ for all square-integrable functions f (e.g., Peypouquet, 2015, Theorem 1.4.1). Then, if we set $\hat{\gamma}_i = \gamma_\psi(Z_i)$ in (2), the second

term in the estimator acts as a correction for the error of $\psi(\hat{m})$ because

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\hat{m}) - \psi(m) &= \int \gamma_\psi(z)(\hat{m} - m)(z)dP(z) \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(\hat{m}(Z_i) - m(Z_i)) \\ (3) \quad &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(\hat{m}(Z_i) - Y_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(Y_i - m(Z_i)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, plugging the above expression into (2), we see that if we could compute our estimator with the oracle Riesz representer weights $\gamma_\psi(Z_i)$, its error would very nearly be a weighted sum of mean-zero noise $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \varepsilon_i$ where $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - m(Z_i)$. This behavior is asymptotically optimal with a great deal of generality (e.g., Newey, 1994, Proposition 4).

Our goal will be to imitate the behavior of this oracle estimator without a-priori knowledge of the Riesz representer. One possible approach is to determine the form of the Riesz representer $\gamma_\psi(\cdot)$ by solving analytically the set of equations that define it,

$$(4) \quad \int \gamma_\psi(z)f(z)dP(z) = \psi(f) \text{ for all } f \text{ satisfying } \int f(z)^2 dP(z) < \infty,$$

then estimate it and plug the resulting weights $\hat{\gamma}_i = \hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i)$ into (2). In the context of our first example, the estimation of a mean with outcomes missing, the Riesz representer is the inverse probability weight $\gamma_\psi(w, x) = w/e(x)$ where $e(x) = P[W_i = 1 \mid X_i = x]$, and this plug-in approach involves first obtaining an estimate $\hat{e}(x)$ of treatment probabilities and then weighting by its inverse. This is the well-known Augmented Inverse Probability Weighting (AIPW) estimator of Robins, Rotnitzky and Zhao (1994). Chernozhukov et al. (2018) provide general results on the efficiency of such estimators, provided $\hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i) - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)$ goes to zero fast enough in squared-error loss.

We take another approach. Considering our regression estimator \hat{m} and the design $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ to be fixed,¹ we simply choose the weights $\hat{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that make our correction term $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{m}(Z_i) - Y_i)$ a minimax linear estimator of what it is intended to correct for, $\psi(\hat{m} - m)$. To be precise, we first choose an absolutely convex set of functions \mathcal{F} which we believe should contain the regression error $\hat{m} - m$. We then choose weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ that perform best in terms of worst case mean squared error over possible regression errors $\hat{m} - m \in \mathcal{F}$ and conditional variances satisfying $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[Y_i \mid Z_i] \leq \sigma^2$. This specifies the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ as the solution to a convex optimization problem,

$$\hat{\gamma} = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ I_{\psi, \mathcal{F}}^2(\gamma) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2 \right\}, \quad I_{\psi, \mathcal{F}}(\gamma) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - \psi(f) \right\}.$$

The good properties of minimax linear estimators like this one are well known. [Donoho \(1994\)](#) and related papers ([Armstrong and Kolesár, 2018](#); [Cai and Low, 2003](#); [Donoho and Liu, 1991](#); [Ibragimov and Khas'minskii, 1985](#); [Johnstone, 2015](#); [Juditsky and Nemirovski, 2009](#)) show that when a regression function m is in a convex set \mathcal{F} and $Y_i | Z_i \sim N(0, \sigma_i^2)$, a minimax linear estimator of a linear functional $\psi(m)$ will come within a factor 1.25 of the minimax risk over all estimators. In addition to strong conceptual support, estimators of the type have been found to perform well in practice across several application areas ([Armstrong and Kolesár, 2018](#); [Imbens and Wager, 2017](#); [Zubizarreta, 2015](#)).

Methodologically, the main difference between our proposal and the references cited above is that we use the minimax linear approach to debias a plugin estimator $\psi(\hat{m})$ rather than as a stand-alone estimator. Because we ‘augment’ the minimax linear estimator by applying it after regression adjustment in the same way that the AIPW estimator augments the inverse probability weighting estimator, we refer to our approach as the Augmented Minimax Linear (AML) estimator. Our main result establishes semiparametric efficiency of the AML estimator under considerable generality.

We note that the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ that underlie minimax linear estimation can be interpreted as a penalized least-squares solution to a set of estimating equations suggested by the definition (4) of the Riesz representer γ_ψ ,

$$(5) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i f(Z_i) \approx \psi(f) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

These estimating equations generalize covariate balance conditions from the literature on the estimation of average treatment effects, and when analyzing our estimator we build on approaches used to study treatment effect estimators that use balancing weights (e.g., [Athey, Imbens and Wager, 2018](#); [Graham, Pinto and Egel, 2012](#); [Imai and Ratkovic, 2014](#); [Kallus, 2016](#); [Zubizarreta, 2015](#)); see Section 1.5 for further discussion.

The restriction of f to a strict subset \mathcal{F} of the square-integrable functions is necessary, as there are infinitely many square-integrable functions f that agree on our sample $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ and they need not even approximately agree in terms of $\psi(f)$. Our choice of this subset \mathcal{F} , a set that characterizes our uncertainty about the regression error function $\hat{m} - m$, focuses our estimated

¹If we estimate \hat{m} on an auxiliary sample, this is the case when we condition on both that sample and on $Z_1 \dots Z_n$. While it is not necessary to estimate \hat{m} on an auxiliary sample when estimating linear functionals, it can buy us some additional flexibility. We discuss this in Section 2.3.

weights $\hat{\gamma}$ on the role they play in ensuring that (5) is satisfied for this function $f = \hat{m} - m$. The size of this subset \mathcal{F} , measured by, e.g., its Rademacher complexity, determines the accuracy with which these equations (5) can be simultaneously satisfied. The smaller we can make \mathcal{F} , i.e., the better the consistency guarantees we have for \hat{m} , the more accurately we can solve (5). In practice, we may take \mathcal{F} to be a set of smooth functions, functions that are approximately sparse in some basis, functions of bounded variation, etc.

That our weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ approximately solve the estimating equations (5) does not imply that they estimate the Riesz representer $\gamma_\psi(\cdot)$ well in the mean-square sense. However, to whatever degree the oracle weights $\gamma_i = \gamma_\psi(Z_i)$ also approximately solve (5), it will imply that $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\gamma_\psi(\cdot)$ are close in the sense that

$$(6) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)] f(Z_i) \approx 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

This property holds if and only if the vector with elements $\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)$ is small or approximately orthogonal to every vector with elements $f(Z_i)$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}$. And it implies that when $\hat{m} - m \in \mathcal{F}$, our estimator (2) approximates the corresponding oracle estimator, as the difference between them is $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)] [(\hat{m} - m)(Z_i) - \varepsilon_i]$.

We state below a simple version of our main result. In essence, if an estimator \hat{m} converges to m in mean square and our regression error $\hat{m} - m$ is in a uniformly bounded Donsker class \mathcal{F} or more generally satisfies $(\hat{m} - m)/O_P(1) \in \mathcal{F}$, then our approach can be used to define an asymptotically efficient estimator.

1.2. *Definitions.* As a measure of the scale of a function f relative to an absolutely convex set \mathcal{F} , we define the *gauge* $\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \inf\{\alpha \geq 0 : f \in \alpha\mathcal{F}\}$. We will write $L_2(P)$ to refer to $\{f : \mathbb{E}[f(Z)^2] \leq 1\}$ and $L_2(P_n)$ for $\{f : n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i)^2 \leq 1\}$, so that the gauges $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}$ have their typical meanings as the root mean squared error and empirical root mean squared error. We will write $g\mathcal{F}$ to denote the class of products $\{gf : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})$ to denote the image class $\{h(\cdot, f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We will write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ to denote the closure of a subspace \mathcal{M} of the square-integrable functions and \mathcal{M}_\perp to denote its orthogonal complement, and will write $\overline{\text{span}}\mathcal{F}$ to denote the closure of $\text{span}\mathcal{F}$.

1.3. *Setting.* We observe $(Y_1, Z_1) \dots (Y_n, Z_n) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} P$ with $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and Z_i in an arbitrary set \mathcal{Z} . We assume that there is a regular conditional probability $P[Y_i \in \cdot \mid Z_i = z]$, that $m(z) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid Z_i = z]$ is in a subspace \mathcal{M} of the

square integrable functions, and that $v(z) = \text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i = z]$ is bounded. And we let \mathcal{F} be an absolutely convex set of square integrable functions believed to contain, at least up to scale, the regression error $\hat{m} - m$.

Our estimand is $\psi(m)$ for a continuous linear functional $\psi(\cdot)$ on a subspace $\mathcal{M} \cup \text{span } \mathcal{F}$ of the square integrable functions, which takes the form $\psi(m) = \mathbb{E} h(Z_i, m)$. The Riesz representation theorem guarantees the existence and uniqueness of a function $\gamma_\psi \in \overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ satisfying the set of equations $\{\mathbb{E} \gamma_\psi(Z) f(Z) = \psi(f) : f \in \overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}\}$.² We call this function the Riesz representer of ψ on the *tangent space* $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$. This generalizes our prior definition (4), coinciding when $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ is the space of square integrable functions.

THEOREM 1. *In the setting above, consider the estimator*

$$(7) \quad \hat{\psi}_{AML} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [h(Z_i, \hat{m}) - \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{m}(Z_i) - Y_i)],$$

$$(8) \quad \hat{\gamma} = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^2(\gamma) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2 \right\},$$

$$I_{h, \mathcal{F}}(\gamma) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i f(Z_i) - h(Z_i, f)] \right\},$$

for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \mathcal{F} \cap \rho_n L_2(P_n)$, $\rho_n \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfying $n^{1/2} \rho_n \rightarrow \infty$, and any finite $\sigma > 0$. If \mathcal{F} , $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}$, and $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})$ are Donsker, $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty < \infty$, and $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega_h(r) = 0$ for $\omega_h(r) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F} \cap r L_2(P)} \|h(\cdot, f)\|_{L_2(P)}$, then our weights converge to the Riesz representer of ψ on the tangent space $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$, i.e.,

$$(9) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i))^2 \rightarrow_P 0.$$

If, in addition, \hat{m} has the consistency properties

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}} &= O_P(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P_n)} = O_P(\rho_n) && \text{if } \rho_n \rightarrow 0, \\ \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}} &= o_P(1) && \text{otherwise,} \end{aligned}$$

then our estimator $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ is asymptotically linear, i.e.,

$$(11) \quad \hat{\psi}_{AML} - \psi(m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \iota(Y_i, Z_i) + o_P(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{where}$$

$$\iota(y, z) = h(z, m) - \gamma_\psi(z)(m(z) - y) - \psi(m),$$

²In this statement we implicitly work with the unique extension of the continuous functional $\psi(\cdot)$ defined on $\text{span } \mathcal{F}$ to a functional defined on its closure $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ (e.g., Lang, 1993, Theorem IV.3.1).

and therefore $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\psi}_{AML} - \psi(m))/V^{1/2} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ with $V = \mathbb{E}[\iota(Y, Z)^2]$.

Furthermore, if \mathcal{M}_\perp has a dense subset of functions that are bounded, then an estimator satisfying (11) is regular on the model class \mathcal{M} if $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$, and asymptotically efficient if and only if it is regular and $v(\cdot)\gamma_\psi(\cdot) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$.³

Theorem 1 is a straightforward consequence of a more general result, Theorem 2, that we will discuss in Section 2.1. We end this section with a few remarks on the statistical behavior of the estimator, focusing on the choices of $\hat{m}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \rho, \sigma$ that define a specific estimator $\hat{\psi}$ of this type. We defer the discussion of computational issues to Appendix D.

REMARK 1. Our approach does not require knowledge of the functional form of the Riesz representer $\gamma_\psi(\cdot)$, sparing us the trouble of solving (4) analytically.

REMARK 2. If \mathcal{F} is an absolutely convex Donsker class such that $\|m\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$, estimators \hat{m} satisfying the consistency condition (10) can be derived by penalized least squares: if λ and ν are chosen appropriately, $\hat{m} = \text{argmin} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - m(Z_i))^2 + \lambda \|m\|_{\mathcal{F}}^\nu$ will satisfy (10) for any sequence ρ_n satisfying $n^{-1/4} \leq \rho_n \leq o(1)$ (see, e.g., Lecué and Mendelson, 2018; Mendelson, 2017). For example, if we choose \mathcal{F} to be the absolutely convex hull $\{\sum_j \beta_j \phi_j : \|\beta\|_{\ell_1} \leq 1\}$ of a sequence of basis functions, the corresponding estimator \hat{m} is the lasso in this basis, and principles for choosing a good basis are well-known (Donoho, 1993). This approach is easy to implement and performs well in simulation when λ is chosen by cross-validation.

REMARK 3. We note two particular ways to define our weights in this theorem. By taking $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, we control the MSE of $\hat{\psi}$ uniformly over regression errors $\hat{m} - m$ in a class $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \mathcal{F} \cap \rho_n L_2(P_n)$. This class is well-matched to the guarantees on $\hat{m} - m$ that we get from penalized least squares approaches like the one discussed in the previous remark, i.e., tightness of $\hat{m} - m$ in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ and convergence in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ at some nontrivial rate, in the sense that these are precisely the consistency properties (10) that our theorem requires. This does, however, require us to specify ρ_n large enough that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P_n)} = O_P(\rho_n)$.

³If an estimator satisfies (11) and \mathcal{M}_\perp has a dense subset of functions that are bounded, a combination of two simple conditions implies efficiency: $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F} = \overline{\mathcal{M}}$ and $v(\cdot)\mathcal{M} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}$. The first says that we correct for all error functions $\hat{m} - m$ permitted by our assumption that $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and waste no effort on those (in \mathcal{M}_\perp) ruled out by it. The second holds when the conditional variance $v(z)$ is sufficiently simple relative to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$, e.g., when $v(z)$ is constant or when the model class \mathcal{M} is fully nonparametric in the sense that it contains an approximation to every square integrable function.

A practical alternative, which is often easier computationally, is to take $\rho_n = \infty$. This controls MSE uniformly over regression errors $\hat{m} - m$ in a larger, fixed class \mathcal{F} . In this case, our theorem requires that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow 0$. This is a stronger consistency assumption than required when $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, but for many choices of \mathcal{F} , it is only slightly stronger; via an interpolation inequality, consistency in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ will be implied by consistency in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ and tightness in a slightly stronger norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}$. This implication holds, for example, when $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}$ are the norms of two Sobolev spaces $H^s \supset H^{s'}$ (e.g., [Brezis and Mironescu, 2018](#)). In this example, if we estimate \hat{m} by penalized least squares, we need not actually use the stronger norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^{s'}}$. Penalizing by $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$ will lead to consistency in the sense $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{H^s} \rightarrow 0$ when $\|m\|_{H^{s'}} < \infty$ ([Fischer and Steinwart, 2017](#)).

REMARK 4. The choices we make for \hat{m} and \mathcal{F} correspond to assumptions about the regression function m . In addition to nonparametric assumptions like smoothness, we may make parametric or semiparametric assumptions. A semiparametric assumption distinguishes Examples 2 and 3, which consider the average partial effect for arbitrary functions $m(x, w)$ and for functions of the form $m(x, w) = \mu(x) + w\tau(x)$ respectively.

In the latter case, which we discuss in detail in Section 3, the tangent space $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ is smaller than the space of all square integrable functions, and the Riesz representer $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}$ for $\psi(\cdot)$ will be the orthogonal projection onto $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ of the Riesz representer γ_{L_2} for $\psi(\cdot)$ on the tangent space of all square-integrable functions. An important consequence is that, under our efficiency condition $v\gamma_{\psi} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}$, the optimal asymptotic variance in Example 3 is smaller than that in Example 2.⁴ This reflects the ease of estimating the average partial effect in the conditionally linear model relative to the general case.

Naturally, such an estimator will be considered superefficient if we entertain the possibility that $m(x, w)$ does not have the form $\mu(x) + w\tau(x)$, i.e., if our regularity condition $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ is not satisfied. In this case, our weights fail to adjust for the deviation $\hat{m} - m$ for some possible regression function $m \in \mathcal{M}$ in a neighborhood of \hat{m} , and any gain in efficiency possible by doing so is, in a local minimax sense, spurious. Characterization of the behavior of our estimator under this form of misspecification is important but beyond the scope of this paper.

⁴ The difference in asymptotic variance between estimators using weights converging to γ_{L_2} (Example 2) and weights converging to $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}$ (Example 3) is $\mathbb{E} v(Z)[\gamma_{L_2}^2(Z) - \gamma_{\mathcal{F}}^2(Z)] = \mathbb{E} v(Z)[\gamma_{L_2}(Z) - \gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(Z)]^2 + 2\mathbb{E} v(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(Z)[\gamma_{L_2}(Z) - \gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(Z)]$. The first term in this decomposition is positive and the second term is zero if $v\gamma_{\mathcal{F}} \in \overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$, as in this case $\mathbb{E} \gamma_{L_2}(Z)[v(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(Z)] = \psi(v(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(Z)) = \mathbb{E} \gamma_{\mathcal{F}}[v(Z)\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}]$.

REMARK 5. Our assumption that the Riesz representer γ_ψ is square integrable (equivalently that $\psi(\cdot)$ is mean-square continuous) is necessary, in the sense that if it is not, $\psi(m)$ does not have a regular estimator (Theorem 2.1 van der Vaart, 1991, see Section B.1.2 for details). If \mathcal{F} has a finite uniform entropy integral, it is also sufficient, in that Theorem 1 requires no additional conditions on γ_ψ because, under this condition on \mathcal{F} , the square integrability of γ_ψ implies our condition that $\gamma_\psi\mathcal{F}$ is Donsker (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Example 2.10.23).

In the context of Example 1, in which $\gamma_\psi(x, w)$ is the inverse probability weight $w/e(x)$ for $e(x) = P[W_i = 1 \mid X_i = x]$, this means that all we require of $e(x)$ is that $\mathbb{E}\gamma_\psi^2(X_i, W_i) = \mathbb{E}1/e(X_i) < \infty$. D’Amour et al. (2017) highlights the need for a weak condition like this, showing that the usual ‘strict overlap’ condition that $e(x)$ is bounded away from zero implies strong constraints on the conditional distribution of $X_i \mid W_i$.

In simulation settings in which $\gamma_\psi(Z_i)$ is frequently large, our estimator outperforms a double robust oracle estimator that weights using the true Riesz representer γ_ψ , while a typical double robust estimator performs substantially worse than this oracle estimator. This suggests that common responses to limited overlap, like changing the estimand (e.g., Crump et al., 2009; Li, Morgan and Zaslavsky, 2018) or assuming a semiparametric model as in Remark 4, may not be needed as frequently with our approach.

REMARK 6. Although we assume no regularity conditions on the Riesz representer γ_ψ , our weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ still estimate it consistently. This is a universal consistency result, in line with well known results about k -nearest neighbors regression and related estimators (Lugosi and Zeger, 1995; Stone, 1977). Heuristically, the reason for this phenomenon is that the Riesz representer γ_ψ is the unique⁵ weighting function that sets a population-analogue of $I_{h,\mathcal{F}}$ to 0; because $\hat{\gamma}$ comes close to doing the same, it must also approximate γ_ψ . This universal consistency property is not what controls the bias of our estimator $\hat{\psi}$. In fact, the rate of convergence of $\hat{\gamma}_i$ to $\gamma_\psi(X_i)$ is in general too slow for standard arguments for plugin estimators to apply. However, it plays a key role in understanding why we get efficiency under heteroskedasticity even though we choose our weights by solving an optimization problem (8) that is not calibrated to the conditional variance structure of Y_i .

To understand this phenomenon, observe that under the conditions of Theorem 1, the conditional bias term $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i, \hat{m} - m) - \hat{\gamma}_i(\hat{m}(Z_i) -$

⁵This uniqueness is violated when the tangent space $\overline{\text{span}}\mathcal{F}$ that ψ acts on is not the space of all square integrable functions. However, the dual characterization Lemma 5 shows that our weights must converge to a function in this tangent space, and it follows that they converge to the unique Riesz representer γ_ψ on this tangent space.

$m(Z_i)$) in our error is $o_P(n^{-1/2})$. It is therefore unnecessary to make an optimal bias-variance tradeoff by this sort of calibration to get efficiency under heteroskedasticity and heteroskedasticity-robust confidence intervals; the asymptotic behavior of our estimator is determined by the asymptotic behavior of our noise term $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i$ and therefore by the limiting weights $\gamma_\psi(Z_i)$.

For the same reason, it is not necessary to know the error scale $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ to form asymptotically valid confidence intervals. We stress that this is an asymptotic statement; in finite samples, there are strong impossibility results for uniform inference that is adaptive to the scale of an unknown signal (Armstrong and Kolesár, 2018). Furthermore, in finite samples, tuning approaches that estimate and incorporate individual variances σ_i into the min-max weighting problem (8) like those discussed in Armstrong and Kolesár (2017) may offer some finite-sample improvement.

1.4. *Comparison with Double-Robust Estimation.* Perhaps the most popular existing paradigm for building asymptotically efficient estimators in our setting is via constructions that first compute stand-alone estimates $\hat{m}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_\psi(\cdot)$ for the regression function and the Riesz representer, and then plug them into the following functional form (Chernozhukov et al., 2016; Newey, 1994; Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995),

$$(12) \quad \hat{\psi}_{DR} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [h(Z_i, \hat{m}) - \hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i) (\hat{m}(Z_i) - Y_i)],$$

or an asymptotically equivalent expression (e.g., van der Laan and Rubin, 2006). This estimator has a long history in the context of many specific estimands, e.g., the aforementioned AIPW estimator for the estimation of a mean with outcomes missing at random (Cassel, Särndal and Wretman, 1976; Robins, Rotnitzky and Zhao, 1994). In recent work, Chernozhukov, Newey and Robins (2018) describe a general approach of this type, making use of a novel estimator for the Riesz representer of a functional γ_ψ in high dimensions motivated by the Dantzig selector of Candès and Tao (2007).

In considerable generality, this estimator $\hat{\psi}_{DR}$ is efficient when we use sample splitting⁶ to construct \hat{m} and these estimators satisfy

$$(13) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i) - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)] [\hat{m}(Z_i) - m(Z_i)] = o_P(n^{-1/2})$$

(Chernozhukov et al., 2018; Zheng and van der Laan, 2011). Taking the Cauchy-Schwarz bound on this bilinear form results in a well-known sufficient condition on the product of errors, $\|\hat{\gamma}_\psi - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)} \|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P_n)}$

$= o_P(n^{-1/2})$. This phenomenon, that we can trade off accuracy in how well the two nuisance functions m and γ_ψ are estimated, is called *double-robustness*.

While the estimator $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ defined in (7) shares the form of $\hat{\psi}_{DR}$, it is in no reasonable sense doubly robust. This is by design. The weights $\hat{\gamma}$ used in $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ are optimized for the task of correcting the error of the plugin estimator $\psi(\hat{m})$ when our assumptions on the regression error function $\hat{m} - m$ are correct. When this is the case and the class \mathcal{F} characterizing our uncertainty about this function is sufficiently small (e.g., Donsker), this allows us to be completely robust to the difficulty of estimating the Riesz representer γ_ψ . Our estimator will be efficient essentially because the error $\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_\psi$ will be sufficiently orthogonal to all functions $f \in \mathcal{F}$ that (13) will be satisfied uniformly over the class of possible regression error functions $\hat{m} - m \in \mathcal{F}$. As the existence of an estimator \hat{m} whose error $\hat{m} - m$ is tight in the gauge of some Donsker class \mathcal{F} is essentially equivalent to the existence of an $o_P(n^{-1/4})$ -consistent estimator of m , one way to interpret this is that our use of minimax linear weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ rather than plug-in estimates of $\gamma_\psi(Z_i)$ lets us completely eliminate the regularity requirements on the Riesz representer γ_ψ while requiring the same level of regularity on the regression function m .

On the other hand, we sacrifice robustness to the difficulty of estimating the regression function m . In terms of the regularity assumptions necessary for asymptotic efficiency, $\hat{\psi}_{DR}$ is preferable to $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ whenever estimates of γ_ψ with faster than $O_P(n^{-1/4})$ convergence are available (and vice-versa). Furthermore, for some specific choices of estimators $\hat{\gamma}_\psi$ and \hat{m} , it has been shown that the errors in estimating the nuisance parameters are sufficiently orthogonal that the rate-product bound can be relaxed (Newey and Robins, 2018). Thus, our aim is by no means to suggest that the AMLE dominates existing doubly-robust methods, but rather only to show that the approach can achieve efficiency under surprisingly general conditions.

In addition, we typically sacrifice robustness to any semiparametric or parametric assumptions we make on the form our regression function m . For example, when estimating a mean with outcomes missing at random in a high-dimensional linear model $m(x, w) = wx^T\beta$, it is natural to control error over a set \mathcal{F} of similar linear models. In this case, the Riesz representer for $\psi(\cdot)$ on the tangent space $\overline{\text{span}} \mathcal{F}$ will be not the inverse propensity weight $w/e(x)$ but its best linear approximation. This can result in greater efficiency of estimation than using the true or estimated inverse propensity

⁶In particular, this result holds if we use the cross-fitting construction of Schick (1986), where separate data folds are used to estimate the nuisance components \hat{m} and $\hat{\gamma}_\psi$ and to compute the expression (12) given those estimates.

weights but it does not correct for misspecification of the linear model as the use of inverse propensity weights would. This phenomenon is not unique to our approach, as some other methods can estimate something like a Riesz representer on a tangent space of their choosing; see, e.g., Remark 2.5 of Chernozhukov et al. (2018) or Section 3 of Robins et al. (2007).

Thus, while our estimator (7) can potentially be seen as an instance of (12) because our weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ do converge to $\gamma_\psi(Z_i)$, the way the two estimators work is very different. Convergence of our weights to the Riesz representer is slow and plays only a second-order role in our analysis. The reason our weights succeed in debiasing $\psi(\hat{m})$ is the form of the optimization problem (8), not our universal consistency result. Thus, we often find it more helpful to think of our method in the context of minimax linear estimation rather than that of doubly robust methods.

1.5. *Comparison with Minimax Linear and Balancing Estimators.* As discussed above, our approach is primarily motivated as a refinement of conditional-on-design minimax linear estimators as developed and studied by a large community over the past decades (Armstrong and Kolesár, 2018; Cai and Low, 2003; Donoho, 1994; Donoho and Liu, 1991; Ibragimov and Khas'minskii, 1985; Imbens and Wager, 2017; Johnstone, 2015; Juditsky and Nemirovski, 2009; Kallus, 2016; Zubizarreta, 2015); however, our focus is on its behavior in a random-design setting, as in the literature on semiparametrically efficient inference and local asymptotic minimaxity, including results on doubly robust methods (Athey and Wager, 2017; Belloni et al., 2017; Bickel et al., 1998; Chen, Hong and Tarozzi, 2008; Chernozhukov et al., 2018; Chernozhukov, Newey and Robins, 2018; Farrell, 2015; Hahn, 1998; Hirano, Imbens and Ridder, 2003; Mukherjee, Newey and Robins, 2017; Newey, 1994; Newey and Robins, 2018; Scharfstein, Rotnitzky and Robins, 1999; Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995; Robins et al., 2017; Van Der Laan and Dudoit, 2003; van der Laan and Rose, 2011; van der Vaart, 1991). The conceptual distinction between these two settings is strong in causal inference and missing data problems, where in the former we consider an adversary that chooses $m(\cdot)$ having observed the realized covariates and pattern of missing data, and in the latter we consider an adversary that chooses $m(\cdot)$ having observed no part of the realized data.

We are aware of three estimators that can be understood as special cases of our augmented minimax linear estimator (7). In the case of parameter estimation in high-dimensional linear models, Javanmard and Montanari (2014) propose a type of debiased lasso that combines a lasso regression adjustment with weights that debias the ℓ_1 -ball, a convex class known to

capture the error of the lasso; [Athey, Imbens and Wager \(2018\)](#) develop a related idea for average treatment effect estimation with high-dimensional linear confounding; and [Kallus \(2016, 2018\)](#) proposes analogs for treatment effect estimation and policy evaluation, a special case of [Example 4](#), that adjust for nonparametric confounding using weights that debias the unit ball of a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. The contribution of our paper relative to this line of work lies in the generality of our results, and also in characterizing the asymptotic variance of the estimator under heteroskedasticity and proving efficiency in the fixed-dimensional nonparametric setting. Given heteroskedasticity, the aforementioned papers prove \sqrt{n} -consistency but do not characterize the asymptotic variance directly in terms of the distribution of the data; instead, they express the variance in terms of the solution to an optimization problem analogous to [\(8\)](#).

In the special case of mean estimation with outcomes missing at random, the optimization problem [\(8\)](#) takes on a particularly intuitive form, with

$$(14) \quad I_{h,\mathcal{F}}(\gamma) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - W_i \gamma_i) f(X_i, 1) \right\}$$

measuring how well the γ -weighted average of f over the units with observed outcomes matches its average over everyone. In other words, the minimax linear weights enforce “balance” between these subsamples, which has been emphasized as fundamental to this problem by several authors including [Rosenbaum and Rubin \(1983\)](#) and [Hirano, Imbens and Ridder \(2003\)](#). Recently there has been considerable interest in the use of balancing weights, chosen to control $I_{h,\mathcal{F}}$ or a variant, in linear estimators and in augmented linear estimators [\(7\)](#) like those we consider here ([Athey, Imbens and Wager, 2018](#); [Chan, Yam and Zhang, 2015](#); [Graham, Pinto and Egel, 2012, 2016](#); [Hainmueller, 2012](#); [Imai and Ratkovic, 2014](#); [Kallus, 2016](#); [Ning, Peng and Imai, 2017](#); [Wang and Zubizarreta, 2017](#); [Wong and Chan, 2017](#); [Zhao, 2019](#); [Zubizarreta, 2015](#)). In addition to generalizing beyond the missing-at-random problem, our [Theorem 2](#) provides the sharpest results we are aware of for balancing-type estimators in this specific problem.

To do this, we bring together arguments from two strands of the balancing literature. The first focuses on balancing small finite-dimensional classes, and in several instances it has been shown that when tuned so that $I_{h,\mathcal{F}}(\hat{\gamma})$ is sufficiently small, the linear estimator is efficient under strong assumptions on both m and γ_ψ ([Chan, Yam and Zhang, 2015](#); [Fan et al., 2016](#); [Graham, Pinto and Egel, 2012](#); [Wang and Zubizarreta, 2017](#)). The arguments used to establish these results rely on the convergence of $\hat{\gamma}$ to γ_ψ at sufficient rate, much like those used with the estimators discussed in the pre-

vious section. The second focuses on balancing high or infinite-dimensional classes, and in several instances it has been shown that when tuned so that $I_{h,\mathcal{F}}(\hat{\gamma}) = O_P(n^{-1/2})$, a level of balance that is attainable under assumptions comparable to ours, the linear estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent and the augmented linear estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically unbiased (Athey, Imbens and Wager, 2018; Kallus, 2016; Wong and Chan, 2017). The arguments used to establish these results fundamentally rely on balance to bound the estimator's bias, and do not fully characterize the estimator's asymptotic distribution. Our argument is a refinement of this one, using balance to do the bulk of the work, but relying on the convergence of the balancing weights $\hat{\gamma}$ to γ_ψ to characterize the asymptotic distribution of our estimator and to establish asymptotic unbiasedness under weaker conditions.

2. Estimating Linear Functionals. In this section, we give a more general characterization of the behavior of our estimator. We begin by sketching our argument, which is based on a decomposition of our estimator's error into a bias-like term and a noise-like term. We consider error relative to a sample-average version of our estimand, $\tilde{\psi}(m) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i, m)$, as the difference $\psi(m) - \tilde{\psi}(m)$ is out of our hands:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\psi}_{AML} - \tilde{\psi}(m) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i, \hat{m}) - \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{m}(Z_i) - Y_i) - h(Z_i, m) \\
 (15) \quad &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{h(Z_i, \hat{m} - m) - \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{m} - m)(Z_i)}_{\text{bias}} + \underbrace{\hat{\gamma}_i (Y_i - m(Z_i))}_{\text{noise}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In Appendix A, we prove finite sample bounds on the bias term and the difference between the noise term and that of the oracle estimator with weights $\gamma_\psi(Z_i)$. Our estimator will be asymptotically linear, with the influence function of the oracle estimator, if both of these quantities are $o_p(n^{-1/2})$. We establish these bounds in three steps.

1. We bound $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2$ for $\gamma_i^* = \gamma_\psi(Z_i)$. To do this, we work with a dual characterization of our weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ as evaluations $\hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i)$ of a penalized least squares estimate of the Riesz representer γ_ψ . This characterization is established by Lemma 5.
2. We bound our bias term. It is bounded by $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} I_{h,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma})$, and as a consequence of the definition of our weights $\hat{\gamma}$ in (8),

$$(16) \quad I_{h,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2(\hat{\gamma}) \leq I_{h,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2(\gamma^*) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\gamma_i^{*2} - \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \right).$$

Empirical process techniques can be used to characterize the first term in this bound, as $I_{h, \mathcal{F}}(\gamma^*)$ is the supremum of the empirical measure indexed by the class of mean-zero functions $h_c(\cdot, \mathcal{F})$ for $h_c(z, f) = h(z, f) - \gamma_\psi(z)f(z)$. The second term can be controlled using our bound from the first step and some simple arithmetic. This, in combination with an assumed bound on $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$, implies a bound on our bias term.

3. We bound the difference between our noise term and that of the oracle estimator, $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)(Y_i - m(Z_i))$, using our result from the first step.

The first step represents the core technical contribution of our paper. Following a few definitions, we will state our main asymptotic result. Due to space considerations, all proofs are given in the appendix.

2.1. *Main results.* To characterize the size of a set \mathcal{G} , we will use its *Rademacher complexity*, $R_n(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i g(Z_i)|$ where $\epsilon_i = \pm 1$ each with probability 1/2 independently and independently of the sequence $Z_1 \dots Z_n$, as well as its L_p radius $M_p(\mathcal{G}) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g\|_{L_p(P)}$. The primary factors in our bound are the Rademacher complexity and local Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{F} , $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})$, and $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}$; ⁷ the tail behavior of the functions in \mathcal{F} ; and a measure κ of the approximability of γ_ψ by functions in \mathcal{F} . In our bound, we will write \mathcal{F}_r to denote the intersection $\mathcal{F} \cap rL_2(P)$.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that we observe iid $(Y_1, Z_1) \dots (Y_n, Z_n)$ with $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, Z_i in an arbitrary set \mathcal{Z} , and define $v(z) = \text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i = z]$. Let $\{h(z, \cdot) : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ be a family of linear functionals on a subspace \mathcal{M} of the square integrable functions on \mathcal{Z} with $\psi(\cdot) = \mathbb{E} h(Z_i, \cdot)$ continuous on \mathcal{M} . Consider the estimator $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ defined in (7) with $\sigma > 0$ and an absolutely convex set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ defined in terms of $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ that is totally bounded in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}$ and has the property that $h(Z_1, \cdot) \dots h(Z_n, \cdot)$ are continuous in $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$. Let there be nonrandom sets $\mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta$ and let γ_ψ be the Riesz representer of ψ on the span of \mathcal{F} . With probability $1 - 2\delta - \delta'(\gamma_\psi, \mathcal{F}, p)$, for any $\delta > 0$ and $p \in (2, \infty]$ and constants c_U, c_V, c_γ depending only on δ ,*

$$(17) \quad n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi)^2 \leq c_\gamma (n^{1/2} r^2 / \sigma + \kappa)^2$$

⁷In our proofs, r_Q and $r_H + r_P$ play essentially the same the role as r_Q and r_M do in [Lecué and Mendelson \(2017\)](#). Our definition of r_Q , which deviates from that in [Lecué and Mendelson \(2017\)](#), is suggested by [Mendelson \(2017\)](#).

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}_{AML} - \psi(m) &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \iota(Y_i, Z_i) + c_U \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} U + c_V \|v\|_{\infty} V, \\
\iota(y, z) &= h(z, m) - \gamma_{\psi}(z)(m(z) - y) - \psi(m), \\
|U| &\leq R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_{\psi} \mathcal{F}) \\
&\quad + \left(\sigma^{1/2} n^{-1/4} r + \sigma n^{-1/2} \kappa^{1/2} \right) \|\gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P_n)}^{1/2}, \\
|V| &\leq r^2/\sigma + n^{-1/2} \kappa, \quad \mathbb{E}[V \mid Z_1 \dots Z_n] = 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa^2 &= \inf_g \left\{ \|g - \gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \sigma^2 \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}_L}^2 / n \right\}, \\
r &= \max\{r_Q, r_H, r_P\}, \\
r_Q &= \inf \left\{ r > 0 : R_n(\mathcal{F}_r) \leq c_1(p) r \left(\frac{r}{M_p(\mathcal{F})} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \right\}, \\
r_H &= \inf \{ r > 0 : R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}_r)) \leq r^2 \}, \\
r_P &= \inf \{ r > 0 : R_n(\gamma_{\psi} \mathcal{F}_r) \leq r^2 \},
\end{aligned}$$

if $\sigma \leq \sqrt{n} \min\{r/4, 2\kappa^{-1/2} r^{3/2}\}$. Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta' &= \frac{32r}{\|\gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P)}} + 2 \exp \left\{ -c_3 n \frac{\|\gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P)}^2}{M_{\gamma_{\psi}}^2} \right\} + 2 \exp \left\{ -c_2(p) n \left(\frac{r}{M_p(\mathcal{F})} \right)^{\frac{2p}{p-2}} \right\}, \\
M_{\gamma_{\psi}} &= \inf \{ M : \mathbb{E} \gamma_{\psi}^2(Z) 1(\gamma_{\psi}^2(Z) \leq M^2) \geq (3/4) \mathbb{E} \gamma_{\psi}^2(Z) \},
\end{aligned}$$

c_3 is a universal constant, and $c_1(p)$ and $c_2(p)$ depend only on p .

In the asymptotics typically considered in nonparametric settings, in which the distribution P of our data is fixed, reading off asymptotic consequences is straightforward. If σ is constant order and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ satisfies a weak condition ensuring that $\kappa \rightarrow 0$,⁸ our estimator will be asymptotically linear so long as $r = o(n^{-1/4})$ and $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} (R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_{\psi} \mathcal{F})) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. These conditions generalize our Donskerity assumptions and our consistency assumptions from Theorem 1.

⁸It suffices that our nonrandom bounding sets $\mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}$ satisfy $\mathcal{F} \subseteq o(n^{1/2})\mathcal{F}_L$, as when this holds any function in $\text{span } \mathcal{F}$, and therefore γ_{ψ} , can be approximated arbitrarily well asymptotically by a sequence g_n with $\|g_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_L} = o(n^{1/2})$. This assumption rules out the possibility that, informally, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is so random that different realizations essentially do not span the same space. This would render the concept of a deterministic Riesz representer for ψ on ‘the span of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ ’ problematic.

2.2. *The role of the tuning parameter σ .* We generally recommend that the tuning parameter σ be chosen without consideration of sample size. The simple heuristic $\sigma^2 \approx n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i]$ arises from the minimax interpretation of our estimator, in which σ^2 is a bound on this averaged conditional variance.⁹ However, $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ is fairly robust to our choice of σ , and Theorem 2 justifies a wide range of choices.

To consider the impact of σ , we look at the role it plays in the dual of (8), which we use to characterize our weights. In Appendix A.1, we show that our weights can be characterized as $\hat{\gamma}_i = \hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i)$ where¹⁰

$$\hat{\gamma}_\psi = \underset{g}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \|g - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)}^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [h(Z_i, g) - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)g(Z_i)] + \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2 \right\}.$$

This is a penalized least squares problem for estimating γ_ψ , as the second term is a mean zero empirical process. From this perspective, taking σ to be of constant order is regularizing very weakly, and we can improve the rate of convergence of $\hat{\gamma}_\psi$ by increasing σ . On the other hand, consideration of the primal (8) shows that this comes at a cost in terms of the maximal conditional bias $I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma})$, and if we have confidence that $\hat{m} - m$ is in a small class $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, we can decrease σ so that $I_{h, \mathcal{F}}(\hat{\gamma})$ and therefore our bias is zero or nearly zero. Recalling our discussion in Section 1.4, our choice of σ essentially trades off between two properties of the error $\hat{\gamma}_\psi - \gamma_\psi$: its degree of orthogonality to the specific functions in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, and its degree of ‘orthogonality’ to all square integrable functions, i.e., its magnitude $\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)}$.

When we choose σ proportional to \sqrt{nr} , $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ is essentially a standard doubly robust estimator. With this tuning, if $\|\gamma_\psi\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$, our weights converge to γ_ψ in empirical mean square at the rate r . This will typically be the minimax rate for estimating γ_ψ satisfying $\|\gamma_\psi\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$ (see Appendix B.2). The asymptotic linearity of $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ may then follow from the rate-product condition $\|\hat{\gamma}_\psi - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)} \|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P_n)} = o_P(n^{-1/2})$, which is a sufficient condition when we use sample splitting to fit \hat{m} .¹¹ However, to improve our rate of convergence, we sacrifice orthogonality of $\hat{\gamma}_\psi - \gamma_\psi$ to possible realizations of $\hat{m} - m$ in \mathcal{F} . This makes our estimator sensitive to the rate of convergence of $\hat{m} - m$. Our bound on $|U|$ in (18) is consequently large.

⁹In our minimax framework in Section 1.1, we also assume that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq 1$. If we instead believe that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \approx \alpha$, our heuristic suggests $\sigma^2 \approx \alpha^2 n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i]$.

¹⁰This optimization problem appears to require knowledge of γ_ψ . However, expanding the first term reveals that it depends on γ_ψ only through a constant $\|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)}^2$.

¹¹It is common to use sample splitting to fit $\hat{\gamma}_\psi$ as well. Our bound (17) does not justify this, as it concerns empirical mean squared error on the sample used to estimate

2.3. *Flexible regression adjustments and cross-fitting.* In some applications, we may want to base our regression adjustment on flexible, adaptive methods like boosting, random forests, or neural networks. In this case, it may be hard to argue that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = O_P(1)$ because \hat{m} itself is irregular. And the violation of this assumption may result in bias. For example, when we take $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ to be a class of smooth functions, the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ that we use in $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ will control its bias only when $\hat{m} - m$ is smooth. In this sense, a nonsmooth estimator \hat{m} is incompatible with this smooth class $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. This problem is easy to fix, as we can ensure compatibility for any estimator \hat{m} simply by including it in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. A natural approach is to choose a class \mathcal{F}' intended to capture m , and let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ be $\text{absconv}(\hat{m} - \mathcal{F}') \cap \rho_n L_2(P_n)$ where absconv is the absolutely convex hull. For this class, $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq \max\{\|m\|_{\mathcal{F}'}, \rho_n^{-1} \|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P_n)}\}$.

This approach violates the assumptions of Theorem 2, as $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ so-defined is a function of $Y_1 \dots Y_n$. One consequence is that the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ would be dependent on Y , and the ‘noise term’ in (15) would have nonzero mean. We can sidestep this problem by cross-fitting (Schick, 1986), i.e., fitting \hat{m} using a subsample of our observations, and defining $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ in terms of it on the remaining observations. We will call the former sample the *auxiliary sample* and the latter the *estimation sample*. Asymptotic linearity can be established by Theorem 2, applied conditionally on the auxiliary sample. We get efficiency, under the conditions stated in Theorem 1, by averaging over multiple splits of the sample.

One limitation of this construction is that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \not\rightarrow 0$, so we must have $U = o_P(n^{-1/2})$ in Theorem 2. This requires that $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}) = o(n^{-1/2})$. If $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ and $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'$ are Donsker, this will hold if and typically only if we take $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ (see e.g., van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Section 2.1.2). The corollary below shows that when we define $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in this way, we get an asymptotically linear estimator essentially whenever $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P)} = O_P(\rho_n)$ and $\|m\|_{\mathcal{F}'} < \infty$ for Donsker \mathcal{F}' , $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$, and $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'$.

We can generalize this construction by training multiple candidate estimators $\hat{m}_1 \dots \hat{m}_k$ on the auxiliary sample and, for \mathcal{E} spanned by these candidates, defining $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \text{absconv}(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{F}') \cap \rho_n L_2(P_n)$. We then define $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ using an estimator \hat{m} chosen from \mathcal{E} , e.g., by minimizing empirical mean squared error or a targeted loss function (see e.g., Juditsky and Nemirovski, 2000; Van Der Laan and Dudoit, 2003). In addition to allowing irregular regression estimators \hat{m} , this approach offers robustness to the irregularity of the regression function m itself; $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ is small when m is approximated

$\hat{\gamma}_\psi$. However, in the course of our proof in Appendix A, we show that with this tuning, $\hat{\gamma}_\psi$ converges to γ_ψ in mean square at the rate r , which is sufficient.

well by a function in \mathcal{F}' or in \mathcal{E} . Under ideal conditions, as in Example 1 if γ_ψ is bounded, our corollary justifies the use of $k = o(\min\{\sqrt{n}, \rho_n^{-2}\})$ candidates.

Candidates $\hat{m}_1 \dots \hat{m}_k$ need not be good estimators of m individually. We may benefit, for example, from including indicators for strata of an estimate of γ_ψ , motivated by the idea of propensity score stratification in causal inference (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1984).

COROLLARY 3. *Suppose that we observe iid $(Y_1, Z_1) \dots (Y_n, Z_n)$ with $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, Z_i in an arbitrary set \mathcal{Z} , and $\text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i]$ bounded. Let $\{h(z, \cdot) : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ be a family of linear functionals on a subspace \mathcal{M} of the square integrable functions on \mathcal{Z} , with $\psi(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}h(Z_i, \cdot)$ continuous on \mathcal{M} , and let γ_ψ be the Riesz representer for ψ on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be an absolutely convex set, $\mathcal{E}_n \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be finite-dimensional, and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \text{absconv}(\mathcal{E}_n - \mathcal{F}') \cap \rho_n L_2(P_n)$. Then $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$, as defined in (7), satisfies*

$$\hat{\psi}_{AML} - \psi(m) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \iota(Y_i, Z_i) + o_P(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{where}$$

$$\iota(y, z) = h(z, m) - \gamma_\psi(z)(m(z) - y) - \psi(m)$$

if $h(Z_1, \cdot) \dots h(Z_n, \cdot)$ are continuous in $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}$ for all n ; $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{E}_n - \mathcal{F}'} = O_P(1)$; $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{L_2(P_n)} = O_P(\rho_n)$; \mathcal{F}' , $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'$, and $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ are Donsker; $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}' \cup \mathcal{E}_n} \|f\|_\infty = O(1)$; and $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \omega_{\mathcal{F}'}(r) = 0$, $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_n \omega_{\mathcal{E}_n}(r) = 0$, and $\dim(\mathcal{E}_n) \omega_{\mathcal{E}_n}^2(\max\{\rho_n, n^{-1/4}\}) \rightarrow 0$ for the modulus of continuity $\omega_{\mathcal{G}}(r) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{G} \cap L_2(P)} \max\{\|h(\cdot, f)\|_{L_2(P)}, \|\gamma_\psi f\|_{L_2(P)}\}$.

3. Estimating the Average Partial Effect with a Conditionally Linear Outcome Model. As a concrete instance of our approach, we consider the problem of estimating an average partial effect, assuming a conditionally linear treatment effect model. A statistician observes features $X \in \mathcal{X}$, a treatment dose $W \in \mathbb{R}$, and an outcome $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ and wants to estimate ψ , where

$$(19) \quad \psi = \mathbb{E}[\tau(X)] \quad \text{assuming} \quad \mathbb{E}[Y | X = x, W = w] = \mu(x) + w\tau(x).$$

By Theorem 1, our AML estimator will be efficient for ψ under regularity conditions when $\text{Var}[Y_i | X_i, W_i] = \sigma^2(X_i)$ is only a function of X_i .

In the classical case of an unconfounded binary treatment, the model (19) is general and the estimand ψ corresponds to the average treatment effect (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Imbens and Rubin, 2015). At the other extreme, if W is real valued but $\tau(x) = \tau$ is constrained not to depend on

x , then (19) reduces to the partially linear model as studied by [Robinson \(1988\)](#). The specific model (19) has recently been studied by [Athey, Tibshirani and Wager \(2019\)](#), [Graham and Pinto \(2018\)](#), and [Zhao, Small and Ertefaie \(2017\)](#). We consider the motivation for (19) further in Section 4 in the context a real-world application; here, we focus on estimating ψ in this model.

Both $\mu(\cdot)$ and $\tau(\cdot)$ in the model (19) are assumed to have finite gauge with respect to an absolutely convex class \mathcal{M} , and we define

$$(20) \quad \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}} = \left\{ m : m(x, w) = \mu(x) + w\tau(x), \|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}}^2 + \|\tau\|_{\mathcal{M}}^2 \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Then we can define a minimax linear estimator conditional on X and W , $\hat{\psi}_{MLIN} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i Y_i$ with $\hat{\gamma}$ minimizing

$$(21) \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i \mu(X_i) \right]^2 + \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{M}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_i \hat{\gamma}_i - 1) \tau(X_i) \right]^2 + \frac{\sigma^2 \|\gamma\|^2}{n^2}.$$

Given any estimators $\hat{\mu}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\tau}(\cdot)$, we can define an augmented minimax linear estimator

$$(22) \quad \hat{\psi}_{AML} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\tau}(X_i) - \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{\mu}(X_i) + W_i \hat{\tau}(X_i) - Y_i)).$$

And as the Riesz representer can be shown to have the form $\gamma_{\psi}(x, w) = (w - e(x))/v_w(x)$ with $e(x) = \mathbb{E}[W | X = x]$ and $v_w(x) = \text{Var}[W | X = x]$, we also consider as a baseline the following natural doubly robust estimator based on plug-in estimates of these quantities,¹²

$$(23) \quad \hat{\psi}_{DR} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{\tau}(X_i) - \left(\frac{W_i - \hat{e}(X_i)}{\hat{v}_w(X_i)} \right) (\hat{\mu}(X_i) + W_i \hat{\tau}(X_i) - Y_i) \right).$$

Below, we numerically compare the relative merits of minimax linear, augmented minimax linear, and plug-in doubly robust estimation of the average partial effect.

¹²For example, a random forest version of this estimator is available in the `grf` package of [Athey, Tibshirani and Wager \(2019\)](#). In the binary treatment assignment case $W_i \in \{0, 1\}$, we know that $v_w(x) = e(x)(1 - e(x))$; and if we set $\hat{v}_w(x) = \hat{e}(x)(1 - \hat{e}(x))$, then the estimator in (23) is equivalent to the augmented inverse-propensity weighted estimator of [Robins, Rotnitzky and Zhao \(1994\)](#). For more general W_i , however, $v_w(x)$ is not necessarily determined by $e(x)$ and so we need to estimate it separately.

3.1. *A Simulation Study.* To better understand the merits of different approaches to average partial effect estimation, we conduct a simulation study. In this simulation study, we draw data from four different families of data-generating distributions, and vary the sample size n , the ambient dimension d , and the signal dimension k within setups. The signals $\mu(x) + w\tau(x)$ are non-linear in x (generally with interactions), and we estimate them by a cross-fit cross-validated lasso on a Hermite polynomial basis expansion $\phi(x)$. We use minimax weights for the model class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ where \mathcal{M} is the absolutely convex hull of the polynomial basis functions ϕ_1, ϕ_2, \dots

Due to space constraints, a comprehensive description of the simulation study, including data-generating distributions and a detailed specification of the methods used, is deferred to Appendix C. As baselines, we consider the **plug-in doubly robust estimator** defined in (23), where $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{v}_w(\cdot)$ are estimated via a separate cross-fit lasso on our polynomial basis $\phi(x)$, as well as an **oracle doubly robust estimator** that uses the same functional form (23) but with oracle values of $e(X_i)$ and $v_w(X_i)$.

We compare these baselines to an **augmented minimax linear estimator** (AML) that combines this regression adjustment with minimax linear weights as in (22), as well as an **augmented minimax linear estimator over an extended class** (AML+), a variant that uses the same functional form but with the minimax linear weights for an extended class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$ that includes a set of estimated functions. We detail the construction of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$ in Appendix C. All methods are implemented in the R package `amlinear`, and replication files are available at <https://github.com/davidahirshberg/amlinear>. We computed minimax linear weights via the cone solver ECOS (Domahidi, Chu and Boyd, 2013), available in R via the package CVXR (Fu et al., 2017). When needed, we run penalized regression using the R package `glmnet` (Friedman, Hastie and Tibshirani, 2010).

3.2. *Results.* We first compare our augmented minimax linear estimators with the corresponding minimax linear estimators. Figure 1 compares the resulting mean-squared errors for ψ across several variants of the simulation design (the exact parameters used are the same as those used in Table 1). The left panel shows results where the weights are minimax over $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$, while the right panel has minimax weights over $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$.

Overall, we see that the augmented minimax linear estimator is sometimes comparable to the minimax linear one and sometimes substantially better. Thus, while results of Donoho (1994) and Armstrong and Kolesár (2018) imply that the augmented estimator can be little better than the minimax linear estimator for a convex signal class \mathcal{F} in terms of its behav-




Fig 1: Comparing augmented minimax linear estimation with minimax linear estimation. The solid line $y = x$ indicates equivalent performance and the dotted lines indicate improvements of 50%, 100%, 150%, etc. in root mean squared error.

ior at a few specific signals $m \in \mathcal{F}$, this does not appear representative of behavior in general. Furthermore, as the bias of our augmented estimator is bounded as a proportion of $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ rather than $\|m\|_{\mathcal{F}}$, our approach offers a natural way to accommodate signals in some non-convex signal classes: those for which, for some choice of \hat{m} , the regression error function $\hat{m} - m$ is well-characterized in terms of some strong norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. This is the case, for example, when estimating a vector of regression coefficients β by the lasso: $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{\ell_1}$ will be small either if β is sparse or if $\|\beta\|_{\ell_1}$ is small (e.g. [Lecué and Mendelson, 2018](#)). This phenomenon offers some explanation for the good behavior we observe empirically, as the functions $\mu(x) = \phi(x)^T \beta_{\mu}$ and $\tau(x) = \phi(x)^T \beta_{\tau}$ defining our signal $m(x, w) = \mu(x) + w\tau(x)$ have some degree of sparsity and $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{M}}^2 = \|\hat{\beta}_{\mu} - \beta_{\mu}\|_{\ell_1}^2 + \|\hat{\beta}_{\tau} - \beta_{\tau}\|_{\ell_1}^2$.

In [Table 1](#), we compare augmented minimax linear estimation with doubly robust estimators, both using an estimated and an oracle Riesz representer. In terms of mean-squared error, our simple AML estimator already performs well relative to the main baseline (i.e., plug-in doubly robust estimation), and the AML+ estimator does better yet. Perhaps more surprisingly, our methods sometimes also beat the doubly robust oracle, achieving comparable control of bias with a substantial decrease in variance. This reduction in variance arises from shrinkage due to the penalty term in [\(8\)](#). It costs us

	method			double rob. plugin			augm. minimax			augm. minimax+			double rob. oracle		
	n	p	k	rmse	bias	covg	rmse	bias	covg	rmse	bias	covg	rmse	bias	covg
setup 1	600	6	3	0.13	0.03	0.98	0.14	0.03	0.98	0.13	0.00	0.98	0.18	-0.01	0.96
	600	6	4	0.16	0.06	0.92	0.16	0.04	0.94	0.15	0.03	0.93	0.21	0.00	0.92
	600	12	3	0.22	0.09	0.78	0.18	-0.00	0.87	0.17	0.05	0.90	0.27	-0.04	0.90
	600	12	4	0.21	0.14	0.78	0.15	0.01	0.94	0.17	0.09	0.90	0.23	-0.03	0.93
	1200	6	3	0.10	0.03	0.94	0.11	0.06	0.92	0.10	0.02	0.96	0.12	0.00	0.98
	1200	6	4	0.11	0.03	0.94	0.11	0.05	0.92	0.10	0.02	0.96	0.13	0.00	0.94
	1200	12	3	0.11	0.02	0.90	0.10	0.01	0.95	0.10	0.02	0.94	0.14	0.00	0.94
	1200	12	4	0.15	0.06	0.86	0.11	0.00	0.92	0.12	0.04	0.90	0.16	-0.00	0.94
setup 2	600	6	1	0.15	0.12	0.52	0.11	0.09	0.74	0.08	0.02	0.94	0.09	0.00	0.92
	600	6	2	0.23	0.22	0.08	0.21	0.20	0.04	0.09	0.07	0.85	0.10	0.00	0.94
	600	12	1	0.16	0.14	0.44	0.12	0.11	0.62	0.08	0.03	0.93	0.08	0.00	0.98
	600	12	2	0.27	0.26	0.02	0.25	0.24	0.00	0.11	0.09	0.76	0.10	0.01	0.95
	1200	6	1	0.12	0.11	0.30	0.09	0.08	0.52	0.05	0.01	0.95	0.06	-0.00	0.96
	1200	6	2	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.20	0.19	0.00	0.06	0.04	0.90	0.06	-0.00	0.96
	1200	12	1	0.12	0.11	0.31	0.10	0.09	0.48	0.05	0.01	0.96	0.06	-0.00	0.98
	1200	12	2	0.22	0.22	0.00	0.21	0.20	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.86	0.07	0.00	0.94
setup 3	600	6	3	0.23	0.23	0.04	0.14	0.13	0.44	0.11	0.09	0.72	0.08	-0.00	0.96
	600	6	4	0.20	0.20	0.12	0.13	0.11	0.54	0.10	0.09	0.72	0.07	-0.00	0.96
	600	12	3	0.25	0.24	0.03	0.21	0.20	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.70	0.08	-0.01	0.95
	600	12	4	0.21	0.20	0.09	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.11	0.10	0.72	0.08	-0.01	0.94
	1200	6	3	0.20	0.19	0.01	0.10	0.09	0.55	0.07	0.05	0.78	0.05	-0.01	0.97
	1200	6	4	0.18	0.18	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.68	0.06	0.05	0.85	0.05	-0.01	0.96
	1200	12	3	0.23	0.22	0.00	0.16	0.15	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.76	0.05	-0.00	0.96
	1200	12	4	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.70	0.05	0.00	0.94
setup 4	600	6	4	0.22	0.16	0.84	0.16	-0.03	0.94	0.11	-0.02	1.00	0.16	0.03	0.94
	600	6	5	0.20	0.14	0.88	0.15	-0.05	0.93	0.11	-0.02	1.00	0.15	0.00	0.93
	600	12	4	0.23	0.15	0.86	0.18	-0.09	0.88	0.14	-0.04	0.96	0.17	-0.01	0.91
	600	12	5	0.24	0.17	0.82	0.19	-0.09	0.89	0.13	-0.05	0.97	0.17	-0.01	0.94
	1200	6	4	0.13	0.09	0.90	0.10	-0.03	0.94	0.07	-0.01	1.00	0.10	0.00	0.96
	1200	6	5	0.14	0.08	0.91	0.11	-0.05	0.94	0.08	-0.01	1.00	0.11	0.00	0.94
	1200	12	4	0.14	0.08	0.88	0.13	-0.07	0.88	0.08	-0.02	0.98	0.11	-0.00	0.94
	1200	12	5	0.14	0.09	0.87	0.13	-0.07	0.90	0.08	-0.02	1.00	0.11	-0.00	0.96

TABLE 1

Performance of 4 methods described in Section C.2 on the simulation designs from Section C.1. We report root-mean squared error, bias, and coverage of 95% confidence intervals averaged over 200 simulation replications.

little bias then because, although the oracle weights must be large to control bias for all square integrable regression errors $\hat{m} - m$ (i.e., to solve (4)), large weights are not necessary to control bias for $\hat{m} - m$ in \mathcal{F} (i.e., to solve (5)).

In terms of coverage, some of our simulation designs are extremely difficult and all non-oracle estimators have substantial relative bias. However, in settings 1 and 4, the asymptotics appear to be kicking in and our estimators get close to nominal coverage.

4. The Effect of Lottery Winnings on Earnings. To test the behavior of our method in practice, we revisit a study of [Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote \(2001\)](#) on the effect of lottery winnings on long-term earnings. It is of considerably policy interest to understand how people react to reliable sources of unearned income; such questions come up, for example, in discussing how universal basic income would affect employment. In an attempt to get some insight about this effect, [Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote \(2001\)](#) study a sample of people who won a major lottery whose prize is paid out in installments over 20 years. The authors then ask how \$1 in yearly lottery income affects the earnings of the winner.

To do so, the authors consider $n = 194$ people who all won the lottery, but got prizes of different sizes (\$1,000–\$100,000 per year).¹³ They effectively use a causal model $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(w) \mid X_i = x] = m(x) + \tau w$ for observations $Y_i = Y_i(W_i)$ of the average yearly earnings in the 6 years following winning W_i in yearly lottery payoff, where X_i denotes a set of $p = 12$ pre-win covariates (year won, number of tickets bought, age at win, gender, education, whether employed at time of win, earnings in 6 years prior to win). Here $Y_i(w)$ represents the average yearly earnings that would have occurred had, possibly contrary to fact, unit i won a prize paying w dollars annually (e.g., [Imbens and Rubin, 2015](#)). The authors also consider several other model specifications.

As discussed at length by [Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote \(2001\)](#), although the lottery winnings were presumably randomly assigned, we cannot assume exogeneity of the form $W_i \perp \{Y_i(w) : w \in \mathbb{R}\}$ because of survey non-response. The data was collected by mailing out surveys to lottery winners asking about their earnings, etc., so there may have been selection effects in who responded to the survey. A response rate of 42% was observed, and older people with big winnings appear to have been relatively more likely to respond than young people with big winnings. For this reason, the authors only assume exogeneity conditionally on the covariates, i.e., $W_i \perp \{Y_i(w) : w \in \mathbb{R}\} \mid X_i$, which suffices to establish that the aforementioned causal model is identified as a regression model $m(x) + \tau w = \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mid X_i = x, W_i = w]$.

Here, we examine the robustness of the conclusions of [Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote \(2001\)](#) to potential effect heterogeneity. Instead of assuming that the slope τ in this model is a constant, we let it vary with x and seek to estimate $\psi = \mathbb{E}[\tau(X)]$; this corresponds exactly to an average partial effect in the conditionally linear model, which we studied in Section 3. In our

¹³The paper also considers some people who won very large prizes (more than \$100k per year) and some who won smaller prizes (not paid in installments); however, we restrict our analysis to the smaller sample of people who won prizes paid out in installments worth \$1k–\$100k per year.

estimand	estimator	estimate	std. err
partial effect	OLS without controls	-0.176	0.039
partial effect	OLS with controls	-0.106	0.032
partial effect	residual-on-residual OLS	-0.110	0.032
avg. partial effect	plugin Riesz weighting	-0.175	—
avg. partial effect	doubly robust plugin	-0.108	0.042
avg. partial effect	minimax linear weighting	-0.074	—
avg. partial effect	augm. minimax linear	-0.091	0.044
avg. partial effect	minimax linear+ weighting	-0.083	—
avg. partial effect	augm. minimax linear+	-0.097	0.045

TABLE 2

Various estimates, estimators, and estimands for the effect of unearned income on earnings, using the dataset of [Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote \(2001\)](#). The first 3 methods are justified under the assumption of no heterogeneity in $\tau(x)$ (i.e., $\tau(x) = \tau$), and estimate τ , while the latter 6 allow for heterogeneity and estimate $\mathbb{E}[\tau(X)]$.

comparison, we consider 3 estimators that implicitly assume constant slope and estimate τ , and 6 that allow $\tau(x)$ to vary and estimate $\mathbb{E}[\tau(X)]$.

Among methods that assume constant slope, the first runs ordinary least squares for Y_i on W_i , ignoring potential confounding due to non-response. The second, which most closely resembles the method used by [Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote \(2001\)](#), controls for the X_i using ordinary least squares, i.e., it regresses Y_i on (X_i, W_i) and considers the coefficient on W_i . The third uses the method of [Robinson \(1988\)](#) with cross-fitting as in [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018\)](#): it first estimates the marginal effect of X_i on W_i and Y_i via a non-parametric adjustment and then regresses residuals $Y_i - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}[Y_i | X_i]$ on $W_i - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}[W_i | X_i]$. In each case, we report robust standard errors obtained via the R-package `sandwich` ([Zeileis, 2004](#)).

The 6 methods that allow for treatment effect heterogeneity correspond to the 5 methods discussed in Section 3, along with a pure weighting estimator using the estimated Riesz representer, $\hat{\psi} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_{\psi}(X_i) Y_i$, with the same choice of $\hat{\gamma}_{\psi}(\cdot)$ as used in (23). For all non-parametric regression adjustments, we run penalized regression as in Section 3, on a basis obtained by taking order-3 Hermite interactions of the 10 continuous features, and then creating full interactions with the two binary variables (gender and employment), resulting in a total of 1140 basis elements. For AML+, we include in the balanced class propensity strata of widths 0.05, 0.1, and 0.2.

Table 2 reports results using the 9 estimators described above, along with standard error estimates. We do not report standard errors for the 3 pure weighting methods, as these may not be asymptotically unbiased and so confidence intervals should also account for bias. The reported estimates are unitless; in other words, the majority of the estimators suggest that survey

respondents on average respond to a \$1 increase in unearned yearly income by reducing their yearly earnings by roughly \$0.10.

Substantively, it appears reassuring that most point estimates are consistent with each other, whether or not they allow for heterogeneity in $\tau(x)$. The only two divergent estimators are the one that doesn't control for confounding at all, and the one that uses pure plug-in weighting (which may simply be unstable here). From a methodological perspective, it is encouraging that our method (and here, also the plug-in doubly robust method) can rigorously account for potential heterogeneity in $\tau(x)$ without excessively inflating uncertainty.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful for stimulating discussions with Timothy Armstrong, Guido Imbens, Whitney Newey, Jamie Robins, Florian Stebbeg, and José Zubizarreta, as well as for comments from seminar participants at several venues. We also thank Guido Imbens for sharing the lottery data with us. We initiated this research while D.H. was a PhD candidate at Columbia University and S.W. was visiting Columbia as a postdoctoral research scientist.

References.

- ARGYRIOU, A. and DINUZZO, F. (2014). A unifying view of representer theorems. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* 748–756.
- ARMSTRONG, T. B. and KOLESÁR, M. (2017). Finite-Sample Optimal Estimation and Inference on Average Treatment Effects Under Unconfoundedness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.04594*.
- ARMSTRONG, T. B. and KOLESÁR, M. (2018). Optimal inference in a class of regression models. *Econometrica* **86** 655–683.
- ATHEY, S., IMBENS, G. W. and WAGER, S. (2018). Approximate residual balancing: Debiased inference of average treatment effects in high dimensions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **80** 597–623.
- ATHEY, S., TIBSHIRANI, J. and WAGER, S. (2019). Generalized random forests. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 1148–1178.
- ATHEY, S. and WAGER, S. (2017). Efficient policy learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.02896*.
- BARTLETT, P. L., BOUSQUET, O. and MENDELSON, S. (2005). Local rademacher complexities. *The Annals of Statistics* **33** 1497–1537.
- BELLONI, A., CHERNOZHUKOV, V., FERNÁNDEZ-VAL, I. and HANSEN, C. (2017). Program Evaluation and Causal Inference With High-Dimensional Data. *Econometrica* **85** 233–298.
- BICKEL, P., KLAASSEN, C., RITOV, Y. and WELLNER, J. (1998). *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*. Springer-Verlag.
- BOYD, S. and VANDENBERGHE, L. (2004). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press.
- BREIMAN, L., FRIEDMAN, J., STONE, C. J. and OLSHEN, R. A. (1984). *Classification and Regression Trees*. CRC press.

- BREZIS, H. and MIRONESCU, P. (2018). Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequalities and non-inequalities: The full story. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire* **35** 1355–1376. Elsevier.
- CAI, T. T. and LOW, M. G. (2003). A note on nonparametric estimation of linear functionals. *Annals of Statistics* 1140–1153.
- CANDÈS, E. and TAO, T. (2007). The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n . *The Annals of Statistics* 2313–2351.
- CASSEL, C. M., SÄRNDAL, C. E. and WRETMAN, J. H. (1976). Some results on generalized difference estimation and generalized regression estimation for finite populations. *Biometrika* **63** 615–620.
- CHAN, K. C. G., YAM, S. C. P. and ZHANG, Z. (2015). Globally efficient non-parametric inference of average treatment effects by empirical balancing calibration weighting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*.
- CHEN, X., HONG, H. and TAROZZI, A. (2008). Semiparametric Efficiency in GMM Models with Auxiliary Data. *The Annals of Statistics* 808–843.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., NEWEY, W. and ROBINS, J. (2018). Double/De-Biased Machine Learning Using Regularized Riesz Representers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.08667*.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., ESCANCIANO, J. C., ICHIMURA, H. and NEWEY, W. K. (2016). Locally robust semiparametric estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00033*.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D., DEMIRER, M., DUFLO, E., HANSEN, C., NEWEY, W. and ROBINS, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal* **21** C1–C68.
- CRUMP, R. K., HOTZ, V. J., IMBENS, G. W. and MITNIK, O. A. (2009). Dealing with limited overlap in estimation of average treatment effects. *Biometrika* asn055.
- D'AMOUR, A., DING, P., FELLER, A., LEI, L. and SEKHON, J. (2017). Overlap in Observational Studies with High-Dimensional Covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.02582*.
- DOMAHIDI, A., CHU, E. and BOYD, S. (2013). ECOS: An SOCP solver for embedded systems. In *European Control Conference (ECC)* 3071–3076.
- DONOHO, D. L. (1993). Unconditional bases are optimal bases for data compression and for statistical estimation. *Applied and computational harmonic analysis* **1** 100–115.
- DONOHO, D. L. (1994). Statistical estimation and optimal recovery. *The Annals of Statistics* 238–270.
- DONOHO, D. L. and LIU, R. C. (1991). Geometrizing rates of convergence, III. *The Annals of Statistics* 668–701.
- FAN, J., IMAI, K., LIU, H., NING, Y. and YANG, X. (2016). Improving covariate balancing propensity score: A doubly robust and efficient approach Technical Report, Tech. rep., Princeton University.
- FARRELL, M. H. (2015). Robust inference on average treatment effects with possibly more covariates than observations. *Journal of Econometrics* **189** 1–23.
- FISCHER, S. and STEINWART, I. (2017). Sobolev norm learning rates for regularized least-squares algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07254*.
- FRIEDMAN, J., HASTIE, T. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software* **33** 1.
- FU, A., NARASIMHAN, B., DIAMOND, S. and MILLER, J. (2017). CVXR: Disciplined Convex Optimization R package version 0.94-4.
- GRAHAM, B., PINTO, C. and EGEL, D. (2012). Inverse probability tilting for moment condition models with missing data. *Review of Economic Studies* 1053–1079.
- GRAHAM, B. S., PINTO, C. C. D. X. and EGEL, D. (2016). Efficient estimation of data combination models by the method of auxiliary-to-study tilting (AST). *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **34** 288–301.

- GRAHAM, B. S. and PINTO, C. C. D. X. (2018). Semiparametrically efficient estimation of the average linear regression function Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- GYÖRFI, L., KOHLER, M., KRZYŻAK, A. and WALK, H. (2006). *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- HAHN, J. (1998). On the role of the propensity score in efficient semiparametric estimation of average treatment effects. *Econometrica* **66** 315–331.
- HAINMUELLER, J. (2012). Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies. *Political Analysis* **20** 25–46.
- HIRANO, K., IMBENS, G. W. and RIDDER, G. (2003). Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica* **71** 1161–1189.
- IBRAGIMOV, I. A. and KHAS’MINSKII, R. Z. (1985). On nonparametric estimation of the value of a linear functional in Gaussian white noise. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **29** 18–32.
- IMAI, K. and RATKOVIC, M. (2014). Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **76** 243–263.
- IMBENS, G. W. (2000). The role of the propensity score in estimating dose-response functions. *Biometrika* **87** 706–710.
- IMBENS, G. W., RUBIN, D. B. and SACERDOTE, B. I. (2001). Estimating the effect of unearned income on labor earnings, savings, and consumption: Evidence from a survey of lottery players. *American Economic Review* **91** 778–794.
- IMBENS, G. W. and RUBIN, D. B. (2015). *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- IMBENS, G. and WAGER, S. (2017). Optimized Regression Discontinuity Designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.01677*.
- JAVANMARD, A. and MONTANARI, A. (2014). Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **15** 2869–2909.
- JOHNSTONE, I. M. (2015). Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models. *Manuscript*.
- JUDITSKY, A. and NEMIROVSKI, A. (2000). Functional aggregation for nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **28** 681–712.
- JUDITSKY, A. B. and NEMIROVSKI, A. S. (2009). Nonparametric estimation by convex programming. *The Annals of Statistics* **37** 2278–2300.
- KALLUS, N. (2016). Generalized Optimal Matching Methods for Causal Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.08321*.
- KALLUS, N. (2018). Balanced policy evaluation and learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 8909–8920.
- KOLTCHINSKII, V. (2006). Local Rademacher complexities and oracle inequalities in risk minimization. *The Annals of Statistics* **34** 2593–2656.
- LANG, S. (1993). *Real and functional analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- LECUÉ, G. and MENDELSON, S. (2017). Regularization and the small-ball method II: complexity dependent error rates. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **18** 1–48.
- LECUÉ, G. and MENDELSON, S. (2018). Regularization and the small-ball method I: sparse recovery. *The Annals of Statistics* **46** 611–641.
- LEDoux, M. and TALAGRAND, M. (2013). *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- LI, F., MORGAN, K. L. and ZASLAVSKY, A. M. (2018). Balancing covariates via propensity score weighting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113** 390–400.

- LUGOSI, G. and ZEGER, K. (1995). Nonparametric estimation via empirical risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **41** 677–687.
- MENDELSON, S. (2017). Extending the small-ball method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00843*.
- MUKHERJEE, R., NEWEY, W. K. and ROBINS, J. M. (2017). Semiparametric Efficient Empirical Higher Order Influence Function Estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07577*.
- NEWEY, W. K. (1994). The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica* **62** 1349–1382.
- NEWEY, W. K. and ROBINS, J. R. (2018). Cross-fitting and fast remainder rates for semiparametric estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09138*.
- NIE, X. and WAGER, S. (2017). Learning Objectives for Treatment Effect Estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.04912*.
- NING, Y., PENG, S. and IMAI, K. (2017). High dimensional propensity score estimation via covariate balancing.
- PEYPOUQUET, J. (2015). *Convex Optimization in Normed Spaces: Theory, Methods and Examples*. Springer.
- POWELL, J. L., STOCK, J. H. and STOKER, T. M. (1989). Semiparametric estimation of index coefficients. *Econometrica* 1403–1430.
- ROBINS, J. M., ROTNITZKY, A. and ZHAO, L. P. (1994). Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **89** 846–866.
- ROBINS, J. and ROTNITZKY, A. (1995). Semiparametric Efficiency in Multivariate Regression Models with Missing Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **90** 122–129.
- ROBINS, J., SUED, M., LEI-GOMEZ, Q. and ROTNITZKY, A. (2007). Comment: Performance of Double-Robust Estimators When “Inverse Probability” Weights Are Highly Variable. *Statistical Science* **22** 544–559.
- ROBINS, J. M., LI, L., MUKHERJEE, R., TCHETGEN, E. T. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2017). Minimax estimation of a functional on a structured high-dimensional model. *The Annals of Statistics* **45** 1951–1987.
- ROBINSON, P. M. (1988). Root-N-consistent semiparametric regression. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 931–954.
- ROSENBAUM, P. R. and RUBIN, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* **70** 41–55.
- ROSENBAUM, P. R. and RUBIN, D. B. (1984). Reducing bias in observational studies using subclassification on the propensity score. *Journal of the American statistical Association* **79** 516–524.
- SCHARFSTEIN, D. O., ROTNITZKY, A. and ROBINS, J. M. (1999). Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **94** 1096–1120.
- SCHICK, A. (1986). On asymptotically efficient estimation in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics* 1139–1151.
- SCHÖLKOPF, B., HERBRICH, R. and SMOLA, A. J. (2001). A generalized representer theorem. In *International conference on computational learning theory* 416–426. Springer.
- STONE, C. J. (1977). Consistent nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 595–620.
- TIBSHIRANI, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 267–288.
- TIKHOMIROV, V. (1993). ε -entropy and ε -capacity of sets in functional spaces. In *Selected works of AN Kolmogorov* 86–170. Springer.

- TSIATIS, A. (2007). *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- VAN DER LAAN, M. J. and DUDOIT, S. (2003). Unified cross-validation methodology for selection among estimators and a general cross-validated adaptive epsilon-net estimator: Finite sample oracle inequalities and examples.
- VAN DER LAAN, M. J. and ROSE, S. (2011). *Targeted learning: causal inference for observational and experimental data*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- VAN DER LAAN, M. J. and RUBIN, D. (2006). Targeted Maximum Likelihood Learning. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* **2** 1–40.
- VAN DER VAART, A. (1991). On differentiable functionals. *The Annals of Statistics* 178–204.
- VAN DER VAART, A. (1994). Bracketing smooth functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **52** 93–105.
- VAN DER VAART, A. (2002). Semiparametric Statistics. In *Lectures on Probability Theory (St. Flour, 1999)*. Springer.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and WELLNER, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer.
- WANG, Y. and ZUBIZARRETA, J. R. (2017). Approximate Balancing Weights: Characterizations from a Shrinkage Estimation Perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00998*.
- WONG, R. K. and CHAN, K. C. G. (2017). Kernel-based covariate functional balancing for observational studies. *Biometrika* **105** 199–213.
- ZEILEIS, A. (2004). Econometric Computing with HC and HAC Covariance Matrix Estimators. *Journal of Statistical Software* **11** 1–17.
- ZHAO, Q. (2019). Covariate balancing propensity score by tailored loss functions. *The Annals of Statistics* **47** 965–993.
- ZHAO, Q., SMALL, D. S. and ERTEFAIE, A. (2017). Selective inference for effect modification via the lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08020*.
- ZHENG, W. and VAN DER LAAN, M. J. (2011). Cross-validated targeted minimum-loss-based estimation. In *Targeted Learning* 459–474. Springer.
- ZUBIZARRETA, J. R. (2015). Stable Weights that Balance Covariates for Estimation with Incomplete Outcome Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110** 910–922.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF FINITE SAMPLE RESULTS

In this section, we prove the finite sample bounds on which Theorem 2 is based. Our first step, which we carry out in Sections A.1-A.3, is to prove Lemma 4 below. Here and throughout the appendix we will write $P_n f$ and Pf for averages of the function f over the empirical and population distributions of Z respectively in accordance with convention in the empirical process literature (see e.g. van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996). As a slight abuse of notation, we also write P_n to indicate a sample average in other contexts.

LEMMA 4. *Suppose that we observe iid $(Y_1, Z_1) \dots (Y_n, Z_n)$ with $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, Z_i in an arbitrary set \mathcal{Z} , and define $v(z) = \text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i = z]$. Let $\{h(z, \cdot) : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ be a family of linear functionals on a subspace \mathcal{M} of the square integrable functions on \mathcal{Z} with $\psi(\cdot) = Ph(Z_i, \cdot)$ continuous on \mathcal{M} . Consider the estimator $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ defined in (7) with $\sigma > 0$ and an absolutely convex set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ defined in terms of $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ that is either the unit ball of a reflexive space or totally bounded in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}$, and with the property that the functionals $f \rightarrow h(z, f)$ and $f \rightarrow f(z)$ are continuous in $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ for $z \in \{Z_1 \dots Z_n\}$. Let γ_ψ and \tilde{g} be any two functions on \mathcal{Z} and define $\kappa = \|\gamma_\psi - \tilde{g}\|_{L_2(P)}$. On an event of probability at least $1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 \delta_j$,*

1. *The weights $\hat{\gamma}$ defined in (7) satisfy $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i))^2 \leq s_\gamma^2$,*

$$s_\gamma = (2\eta_M/\sigma)n^{1/2}r^2 + \sqrt{P_n(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 + \sigma^2\|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/n}$$

where with probability $1 - \delta_1$, for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $s \in [0, 1/\alpha]$,

$$P_n(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq \eta_Q P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \quad \text{if } P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq r^2/2,$$

$$(24) \quad |P_n h(\cdot, f - s\tilde{g}) - \gamma_\psi \cdot (f - s\tilde{g})| \leq \eta_M r^2 \quad \text{if } P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \leq r^2,$$

and α and σ must satisfy

$$\alpha = (2\eta_M/\sigma^2)nr^2 + (\sqrt{n}/\sigma)\sqrt{P_n(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 + \sigma^2\|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/n},$$

$$\sigma \leq \sqrt{n/2} \min\left\{\eta_Q^{1/2}r, \eta_M^{1/2}\kappa^{-1/2}r^{3/2}\right\}.$$

2. *Our maximal bias term satisfies the bound*

$$(25) \quad I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq R_{\mathcal{H}} + 2^{1/2}\sigma\|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)}^{1/2}n^{-1/2}s_\gamma^{1/2},$$

where with probability $1 - \delta_2$, $P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f \leq R_{\mathcal{H}}$ for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$.

3. *The difference between our noise term and that of the oracle estimator satisfies*

$$(26) \quad \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi)(Y_i - m(Z_i)) \right| \leq \delta_3^{-1/2} \|v\|_\infty^{1/2} n^{-1/2} s_\gamma.$$

A.1. Consistency of the Minimax Linear Weights. To show that our weights converge to the $\hat{\gamma}$, we will first characterize them as $\hat{\gamma}_i = \hat{g}(X_i)$ for a least squares estimator \hat{g} of the Riesz representer γ_ψ . This least squares problem is the dual of the problem (7) solved by our weights $\hat{\gamma}$.

A.1.1. *Dual Characterization as a Least Squares Problem.*

LEMMA 5. *Let \mathcal{G} be an absolutely convex set and the space $(\text{span } \mathcal{G}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}})$ be a reflexive vector space. Let a linear functional $L(f)$ and the point evaluation functionals $\delta_z(f) := f(z)$ for all $z \in Z_1 \dots Z_n$ be continuous in $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{G}}$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n} \ell_{n,\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) &= \sup_{g \in \text{span } \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{G}}(g) && \text{where} \\ \ell_{n,\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) &= P_n \gamma_i^2 + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{G}} [L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i)]^2 && \text{will be called the primal and} \\ \mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{G}}(g) &= -\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2 - P_n g(Z_i)^2 + 2L(g) && \text{will be called the dual.} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the primal has a unique minimum at $\hat{\gamma}$ irrespective of the reflexivity of our space, the dual has a potentially non-unique maximum at \hat{g} , and for any \hat{g} at which the dual maximum is attained, $\hat{\gamma}_i = \hat{g}(Z_i)$.

This result is proven by working with a constrained optimization problem equivalent to the primal. After introducing a Lagrange multiplier for the constraint, the resulting saddle point problem is reduced to maximization of $\mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{G}}$ by explicitly solving for γ and our Lagrange multiplier as functions of \hat{g} .

In our estimator (7), we use the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ that minimize $(\sigma^2/n)\ell_{n,\mathcal{G}}$ where $L(f) = P_n h(Z_i, f)$ and $\mathcal{G} = \sigma^{-1} n^{1/2} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, so we may characterize our weights via the function \hat{g} that maximizes $\mathbb{M}_{n,\lambda \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ for $\lambda = \sigma^{-1} n^{1/2}$. There is one remaining assumption that we make in this lemma but not in Lemma 4: the assumption that the space $(\text{span } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}})$ is reflexive. We will assume this holds for now, as it lets us simplify exposition but does not materially affect the final result. Later, we will derive a bound without this assumption by application of this lemma to a sequence finite-dimensional and therefore reflexive approximations to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$.

To show that maximizing $\mathbb{M}_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ is a penalized least squares problem for estimation of γ_ψ , we consider the penalized excess loss $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) := \mathbb{M}_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) - \mathbb{M}_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g)$ relative to an approximation \tilde{g} of the Riesz representer γ_ψ . This is minimized and no larger than zero at \hat{g} . We work an approximation because we are not assuming that $\|\gamma_\psi\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ is small or even finite, so the excess loss relative to γ_ψ may be uninformative. Via simple algebra,¹⁴

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) &= P_n(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 - 2P_n h_c(\cdot, g - \tilde{g}) + \|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/\lambda^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}), \\ h_c(z, g) &= h(z, g) - \gamma_\psi(z)g(z), \\ R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) &= P_n(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 + \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/\lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here h_c is a centered variant of h , as the Riesz representer γ_ψ satisfies $P\gamma_\psi(Z)g(Z) = Ph(Z, g)$ for all g spanned by $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus, our excess loss is in the typical form for penalized least squares: it is a sum of the empirical mean squared error, a centered empirical process term, and a difference in penalties $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/\lambda^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. If we take $\tilde{g} = \gamma_\psi$, it will look more familiar, as the difference in penalties reduces to $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/\lambda^2 - \|\gamma_\psi\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/\lambda^2$ and our empirical process is evaluated at the error function $g - \gamma_\psi$ as it usually is. However, working with $\tilde{g} \neq \gamma_\psi$ requires only small modifications of standard arguments for bounding the error of penalized least squares estimators.

A.1.2. Consistency of the Dual Solution. From this point, our argument will be fairly standard, and we will base our presentation on that in [Lecué and Mendelson \(2017\)](#). Our core approach will be to lower bound $P_n(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 - 2|P_n h_c(\cdot, g - \tilde{g})|$ as a proportion of $P(g - \tilde{g})^2$. We will first state a purely deterministic result in terms of several uniform-over- $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ bounds: a lower bound on the ratio of the empirical and population MSE and an upper bound on our empirical process term. We prove this lemma at the end of this section.

LEMMA 6. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ be a class of functions mapping $\text{support}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is star-shaped around zero, define $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}$ as in (27) with $\|\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} < \kappa$, and suppose that for all f with $\|f\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq 1$ and $s \in [0, 1/\alpha]$,*

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} P_n(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 &\geq \eta_Q P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \quad \text{if } P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq (cr)^2, \\ |P_n h_c(\cdot, f - s\tilde{g})| &\leq \eta_M r^2 \quad \text{if } P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \leq r^2 \end{aligned}$$

¹⁴ $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) = P_n(g^2 - \tilde{g}^2) - 2P_n[h(\cdot, g) - h(\cdot, \tilde{g})] + (\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2 - \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2)/\lambda^2$
 $= P_n[(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 - (\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 + 2\gamma_\psi(g - \tilde{g})] - 2P_n[h(\cdot, g - \tilde{g})] + (\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2 - \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2)/\lambda^2.$

for

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} c^2 &= 1 - 2\kappa/(\alpha r), \\ \alpha &> \max\left\{2\kappa/r + 2\eta_M/\eta_Q, \eta_M\lambda^2r^2 + \sqrt{(\eta_M\lambda^2r^2)^2 + \lambda^2R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) > 0$ if $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \alpha$, if $P(g - \tilde{g})^2 > \max\{(\alpha r)^2, R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})/(c^2\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha)\}$, or if $P(g - \tilde{g})^2 \leq (\alpha r)^2$ and $P_n(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 > 2\eta_M\alpha r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$.

Because $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(\hat{g}) \leq 0$, our lemma implies bounds on $\hat{g} - \gamma_\psi$. When $(\alpha r)^2 \geq R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})/(c^2\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha)$, we need only entertain the possibility that $P(\hat{g} - \tilde{g})^2 \leq (\alpha r)^2$, and in this case our lemma gives a simple bound on $P_n(\hat{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2$. In the following corollary, we state such a bound, which holds for a range of tuning parameters λ that includes most practical choices.

COROLLARY 7. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ be a class of functions mapping $\text{support}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is star-shaped around zero, define $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}$ as in (27) with*

$$\|\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} < \kappa, \quad \lambda \geq 2^{1/2} \max\left\{\eta_Q^{-1/2}r^{-1}, \eta_M^{-1/2}\kappa^{1/2}r^{-3/2}\right\},$$

and let (28) be satisfied with $c^2 = 1/2$ for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $s \in [0, 1/\alpha]$, $\alpha = 2\eta_M\lambda^2r^2 + \lambda R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g})$. Then for \hat{g} satisfying $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(\hat{g}) \leq 0$,

$$\|\hat{g} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)} \leq 2\eta_M\lambda r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g}).$$

This gets us nearly to our goal. But this shows convergence of the solution \hat{g} to our dual problem to the Riesz representer γ_ψ , whereas we want convergence of the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ minimizing $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ to γ_ψ . By Lemma 5, this is equivalent when $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is reflexive. The following lemma, proven via a finite dimensional approximation argument, shows that reflexiveness is not necessary.

LEMMA 8. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 5 excepting reflexiveness, the assumptions of Corollary 7, and the additional assumption that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is totally bounded in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$, the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ minimizing the primal $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ satisfy*

$$P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i))^2 \leq (2\eta_M\lambda r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g}))^2.$$

The first claim of Lemma 4 follows by substituting $\sigma^{-1}n^{1/2}$ for λ , as this is the value of λ used in (7). We conclude our proof of this claim proving the lemmas from this section.

PROOF OF LEMMA 5. Because $\ell_{n,\mathcal{F}}$ and $-\mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}$ are proper, strongly convex, and continuous functions on reflexive spaces they have unique minima at some vector $\hat{\gamma}$ and function \hat{g} respectively (Peypouquet, 2015, Corollary 2.20).

We first transform our primal into an equivalent constrained problem and then, by introducing a Lagrange multiplier, a saddle point problem.

$$\begin{aligned}
(30) \quad & \inf_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n} \ell_{n,\mathcal{F}}(\gamma) \\
& = \inf \{ P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 : (\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}, \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i)) \leq t \} \\
(31) \quad & = \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t).
\end{aligned}$$

Assume we can reorder the the infimum over (γ, t) and the suprema over λ and f in (31), so it is equal to

$$(32) \quad \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t).$$

We will justify this later, after we simplify this expression by minimizing

$$P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t)$$

with respect to (γ, t) for fixed (λ, f) . The expression is convex and differentiable in (γ, t) and attains its infimum at $\gamma_i = \lambda f(Z_i)$ and $t = \lambda$, which can be seen from the first order optimality conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t) = \frac{2}{n} \gamma_i - \frac{2}{n} \lambda f(Z_i), \\
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t) = 2t - 2\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these values shows that (32) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} P_n (\lambda f(Z_i))^2 + \lambda^2 + 2L(\lambda f) - 2P_n (\lambda f(Z_i))^2 - 2\lambda^2 \\
& = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} -\lambda^2 - P_n g(Z_i)^2 + 2L(g) \quad \text{where } g = \lambda f.
\end{aligned}$$

Reparameterizing in terms of g , the constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to $g \in \lambda \mathcal{F}$, and the supremum of the expression above over λ is attained at $\lambda = \inf \{ \lambda : g \in \lambda \mathcal{F} \} = \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. Substituting this value of λ results in the expression $\sup_g \mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g)$, and we've established that this supremum is attained at \hat{g} . Retracing our steps, (32) is equal to $\mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}(\hat{g})$.

We conclude by establishing the equality of (31) and (32). We begin with the constrained problem (30) equivalent to (31). This is a finite dimensional convex optimization problem, and the Slater condition holds, i.e., the constraint $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i)) \leq t$ is satisfiable with strict inequality by taking t sufficiently large, so we have strong Lagrange duality (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Section 5.2.3). That is, the Lagrange multiplier problem (31) is equal to its dual

$$\sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t)$$

and furthermore there exists λ^* such that is equal to

$$\inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t).$$

This saddle point problem is convex and continuous in (γ, t) and concave in f , so the Kneser-Kuhn minimax theorem (Johnstone, 2015, Theorem A.1) implies that if we restrict our infimum to a compact convex set \mathcal{C} , reordering the infimum and supremum does not change the value, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t) \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{C}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t). \end{aligned}$$

Our final step in showing equality of (31) and (32) is to show that the restriction to \mathcal{C} can be dropped on each side of this equality without changing the value, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t) \\ (33) \quad &= \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{C}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t) \\ (34) \quad &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality (33) follows because the function of (γ, t) which takes the value

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n \gamma_i^2 + t^2 + 2\lambda^* (L(f) - P_n \gamma_i f(Z_i) - t)$$

is finite at $\gamma = 0$ and goes to infinity as $\|\gamma\|$ does, so its infimum must occur on some bounded set \mathcal{C}' . The second equality (34) follows because taking the unconstrained minimum results in the previously discussed problem (32), and we've shown that this problem has a solution (γ^*, t^*) with $\gamma_i^* = \hat{g}(Z_i)$, $t^* = \|\hat{g}\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. Therefore, for any compact convex superset \mathcal{C} of $\mathcal{C}' \cup \{(\gamma^*, t^*)\}$, both equalities (33) and (34) are satisfied. This completes our proof. \square

We will now prove Lemma 6 with the aid of the following scaling result.

LEMMA 9. *If, for a linear functional L , a set \mathcal{F} , and a norm $\|\cdot\|$, $L(f) \leq \eta r^2$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\|f\| \leq r$, then $L(f) \leq (\eta/\alpha) \max\{\|f\|, \alpha r\}^2$ for all $f \in \alpha\mathcal{F}$.*

PROOF. First, observe that any function $f \in \alpha\mathcal{F}$ with $\|f\| \leq \alpha r$ can be written as $\alpha f'$ for $f' \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\|f'\| \leq r$. Then, because $L(f) = \alpha L(f')$, our assumed bound implies that $L(f) \leq \eta \alpha r^2 = (\eta/\alpha)(\alpha r)^2$. Now consider a function $f \in \alpha\mathcal{F}$ with $\|f\| \geq \alpha r$ and a rescaled version $f' = \alpha r f / \|f\|$, which satisfies the conditions $f' \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\|f'\| \leq r$. $L(f') \leq (\eta/\alpha)(\alpha r)^2$, so $L(f) = L(f')\|f\|/(\alpha r) \leq (\eta/\alpha)(\alpha r)\|f\| \leq (\eta/\alpha)\|f\|^2$. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 6. Given our assumed bounds, if $\|f\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq \alpha$, $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (35) \quad & P_n(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq \eta_Q P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \\
 & \text{when } P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq (c\alpha r)^2 \\
 & |P_n h_c(\cdot, f - s\tilde{g})| \leq (\eta_M/\alpha) P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \\
 & \text{when } P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \geq (\alpha r)^2 \\
 & |P_n h_c(\cdot, f - s\tilde{g})| \leq \eta_M \alpha r^2 \\
 & \text{when } P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \leq (\alpha r)^2
 \end{aligned}$$

The first of these is an immediate consequence of the invariance of the ratio $P_n f^2 / P f^2$ to scaling and the second and third follow from Lemma 9. Furthermore, combining the first bound with the ratio bound $P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 / P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \geq c^2$ for $P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \geq (\alpha r)^2$ shows that if $\|f\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq \alpha$, $s \in [0, 1]$, and $P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \geq (\alpha r)^2$,

$$(36) \quad P_n(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq \eta_Q P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq c^2 \eta_Q P(f - s\tilde{g})^2,$$

To prove this ratio bound, observe that via the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 - P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \\
&= P[(f - s\gamma_\psi) - (f - s\tilde{g})]^2 + 2P(f - s\tilde{g})[(f - s\gamma_\psi) - (f - s\tilde{g})] \\
&= s^2P(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 + 2sP(f - s\tilde{g})(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi) \\
&\geq -2\kappa\sqrt{P(f - s\tilde{g})^2}
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2/P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 &= 1 + (P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 - P(f - s\tilde{g})^2)/P(f - s\tilde{g})^2 \\
&\geq 1 - 2\kappa/\sqrt{P(f - s\tilde{g})^2} \\
&\geq 1 - 2\kappa/(\alpha r) = c^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We will now prove our claims using our bounds (35) and (36). We begin by showing that $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) > 0$ for all g with $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \alpha$. We work with

$$\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) = P_n(g - s\gamma_\psi)^2 - 2|P_n h_c(\cdot, g - s\tilde{g})| + \|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/\lambda^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}).$$

Because $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) \geq \check{\mathcal{L}}(g, 1)$, it is sufficient to show that $\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) > 0$ for all (g, s) with $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \alpha$ and $s \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, it is sufficient to show that $\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) > 0$ for all (g, s) with $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \alpha$ and $s \in [0, 1]$ by a simple scaling argument: $\check{\mathcal{L}}(tg, ts) \geq t^2\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s)$ for $t \geq 1$, and every pair (g', s') with $\|g'\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \geq \alpha$ and $s' \in [0, 1]$ can be expressed as (tg, ts) with $t \geq 1$, $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \alpha$, $s \in [0, 1]$.

We will now show that $\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) > 0$ for all (g, s) with $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \alpha$ and $s \in [0, 1]$. If $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \alpha$ and $P(g - s\tilde{g})^2 \geq (\alpha r)^2$, then by (35) and (36), $\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) \geq (c^2\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha)P(g - s\tilde{g})^2 + \alpha^2/\lambda^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. If instead $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \alpha$ and $P(g - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \leq (\alpha r)^2$, then by (35), $\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) \geq -2\eta_M\alpha r^2 + \alpha^2/\lambda^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. Thus, $\check{\mathcal{L}}(g, s) > 0$ for all g with $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \alpha$ and $s \in [0, 1]$ so long as α exceeds both $2\eta_M/(c^2\eta_Q)$ and the positive root of $-2\eta_M\alpha r^2 + \alpha^2/\lambda^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. Expanding $c^2 = 1 - 2\kappa/(\alpha r)$ in the first condition yields the equivalent condition $(1 - 2\kappa/(\alpha r))\alpha \geq 2\eta_M/\eta_Q$, which is satisfied so long as α exceeds $2\kappa/r + 2\eta_M/\eta_Q$.

We complete our proof by considering g with $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq \alpha$. If $g \in \alpha\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $P(g - \tilde{g})^2 \geq (\alpha r)^2$, then by (35) and (36), $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) \geq (c^2\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha)P(g - \tilde{g})^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. Otherwise, by (35), $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) \geq P_n(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 - 2\eta_M\alpha r^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. Thus, $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) > 0$ if $P(g - \tilde{g})^2 > \max\{(\alpha r)^2, R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})/(c^2\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha)\}$ or if $P(g - \tilde{g})^2 \leq (\alpha r)^2$ and $P_n(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 > 2\eta_M\alpha r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. \square

PROOF OF COROLLARY 7. Let $\alpha = 2\eta_M\lambda^2 r^2 + \lambda R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g})$. Under our conditions on λ , $\alpha \geq 2\eta_M\lambda^2 r^2 \geq 4 \max\{\eta_M/\eta_Q, \kappa r^{-1}\}$, so (29) is satisfied

with $c^2 \geq 1/2$. Thus, as (28) is satisfied for $c^2 > 1/2$ if it is satisfied for $c^2 = 1/2$, the conditions of Lemma 6 are satisfied with our choice of α . When $(\alpha r)^2 \geq R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})/(c^2\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha)$, Lemma 6 implies that $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}}(g) > 0$ whenever $P(g - \tilde{g})^2 > (\alpha r)^2$, and this condition is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq [(1 - 2\kappa/(\alpha r))\eta_Q - 2\eta_M/\alpha] (\alpha r)^2 - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) \\ &= \eta_Q r^2 \alpha^2 - 2(\eta_Q \kappa r + \eta_M r^2) \alpha - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}). \end{aligned}$$

This holds for α greater than or equal to the positive root of this polynomial,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\eta_Q \kappa r + \eta_M r^2 + \sqrt{(\eta_Q \kappa r + \eta_M r^2)^2 + \eta_Q r^2 R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})}}{\eta_Q r^2} \\ &\leq \frac{2(\eta_Q \kappa r + \eta_M r^2) + \sqrt{\eta_Q r^2 R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})}}{\eta_Q r^2} \\ &= \frac{2\kappa}{r} + \frac{2\eta_M}{\eta_Q} + \frac{R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g})}{\eta_Q^{1/2} r}. \end{aligned}$$

Our chosen α exceeds this threshold, as $2\eta_M \lambda^2 r^2$ is greater than or equal to the first two terms in the expression above and $\lambda R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g})$ exceeds the last. It follows that $P(\hat{g} - \tilde{g})^2 \leq (\alpha r)^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} P_n(\hat{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 &\leq 2\eta_M \alpha r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) \\ &= 4\eta_M^2 \lambda^2 r^4 + 2\eta_M \lambda r^2 R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g}) + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) \\ &\leq (2\eta_M \lambda r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{1/2}(\tilde{g}))^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF LEMMA 8. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau$ be the absolutely convex hull of the centers of a finite internal τ -cover of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in the norm $\max\{\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}\}$. The space normed by $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}$ is finite-dimensional and therefore reflexive (e.g., [Peypouquet, 2015](#), Theorem 1.24), so via Lemma 5, the weights $\hat{\gamma}_\tau$ minimizing $\ell_{n,\lambda\mathcal{F}_\tau}$ satisfy $\hat{\gamma}_{i,\tau} = \hat{g}_\tau(Z_i)$ where $\hat{g}_\tau(Z_i)$ maximizes $M_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}$. We will compare this solution to an approximate maximizer \hat{g} of $M_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$.

We've assumed that the conditions of Corollary 7 are satisfied for $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g},\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ defined in terms of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Because $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, (28) is satisfied for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau$ when it is for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, so the conditions of Corollary 7 are also satisfied for $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}_\tau,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}$ defined in terms of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau$ and any \tilde{g}_τ with $\|\tilde{g}_\tau - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} < \kappa$. Thus,

$$P_n(\hat{\gamma}_{i,\tau} - \gamma_\psi)^2 = P_n(\hat{g}_\tau - \gamma_\psi)^2 \leq \left(2\eta_M \lambda r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}(\tilde{g}_\tau)\right)^2$$

We will now show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an approximation \tilde{g}_τ such that $\|\tilde{g}_\tau - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \|\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} + \epsilon$ and $R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}(\tilde{g}_\tau) \leq R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) + \epsilon$. This will imply that $\|\tilde{g}_\tau - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} < \kappa$, so the bound above holds, and also that this bound is arbitrarily close to the square of $2\eta_M\lambda r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g})$. We take \tilde{g}_τ to be the center of the ball that contains \tilde{g} in a $\|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ -scaled version of our τ -cover, so we have the properties

$$\|\tilde{g}_\tau\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau} \leq \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}, \quad \|\tilde{g}_\tau - \tilde{g}\|_{L_2(P_n)} \leq \tau\|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}, \quad \|\tilde{g}_\tau - \tilde{g}\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \tau\|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}.$$

By the triangle inequality, $\|\tilde{g}_\tau - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \|\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} + \|\tilde{g}_\tau - \tilde{g}\|_{L_2(P)}$, and our third property implies that the latter term in this bound can taken to be arbitrarily small by choosing small enough τ . Furthermore,

$$R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}(\tilde{g}_\tau) - R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}) \leq |P_n(\tilde{g}_\tau - \gamma_\psi)^2 - P_n(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2| + \lambda^{-2} \left(\|\tilde{g}_\tau\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}^2 - \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2 \right).$$

Our first property ensures that the last term in this difference is zero or negative, and our second that the first term in the difference above is arbitrarily small.

We will complete our proof by showing that the minimizer $\hat{\gamma}$ of $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ is arbitrarily close to $\hat{\gamma}_\tau$. To do this, we use the $2/n$ -strong convexity of $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$, $P_n(\hat{\gamma}_{\tau,i} - \hat{\gamma}_i)^2 \leq \ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\tau) - \ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma})$. In order to get a useful upper bound on the right side in the expression above, we exploit the similarity of $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ and $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}$, $\ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}(\hat{\gamma}_\tau) \leq \ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}) \leq \ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\tau)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\tau) - \ell_{n,\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau}(\hat{\gamma}_\tau) &= \lambda \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} [P_n h(Z_i, f) - \hat{\gamma}_{\tau,i} f(Z_i)]^2 \\ &\quad - \lambda \sup_{f' \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau} [P_n h(Z_i, f') - \hat{\gamma}_{\tau,i} f'(Z_i)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Given any sequence f_n in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ along which the first term converges to its supremum, there is a corresponding sequence $f_{n,\tau} \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\tau$ such that the value of $P_n h(Z_i, f) - \hat{\gamma}_{\tau,i} f(Z_i)$ at $f = f_n$ and $f = f_{n,\tau}$ can be made arbitrarily close by choice of τ , so this difference shinks to zero with τ . Thus, we've established that $P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi)^2 \leq (2\eta_M\lambda r^2 + R_{\lambda\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\tilde{g}))^2 + \epsilon$ for arbitrarily small ϵ , and it follows that this must hold for $\epsilon = 0$ as well. \square

A.2. Bounding the bias term. In this section, we will use our probability $1 - \delta_1$ bound $P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi)^2 \leq s_\gamma^2$ to control the quantity $I_{h,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma})$. Recall from our sketch that

$$I_{h,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq I_{h,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\gamma^*)^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_\psi(Z_i)^2 - \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \quad \text{where } \gamma_i^* = \gamma_\psi(Z_i).$$

By assumption, $R_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ bounds the first term on the right with probability $1 - \delta_2$. To bound the second, we use the elementary identity $a^2 - b^2 = 2a(a - b) - (a - b)^2$. Using this and Cauchy-Schwartz,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{\psi}(Z_i)^2 - \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \leq 2 \|\gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P_n)} \|\gamma_{\psi} - \hat{\gamma}\|_{L_2(P_n)} \leq 2 \|\gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P_n)} s_{\gamma}.$$

Thus, using the elementary inequality $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$,

$$I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq R_{\mathcal{H}} + 2^{1/2} \sigma \|\gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P_n)}^{1/2} n^{-1/2} s_{\gamma}^{1/2}.$$

A.3. Convergence of the noise term. In this section, we will use our bound $P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_{\psi})^2 \leq s_{\gamma}^2$ to bound the difference between our noise term and the iid sum $P_n \gamma_{\psi}(Z_i) \varepsilon_i$, $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - m(Z_i)$. Because $\hat{\gamma}$ is a function of $Z_1 \dots Z_n$, we can apply Chebyshev's inequality conditionally on $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ to the difference between our noise term and this sum. With conditional probability $1 - \delta_3$,

$$|P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_{\psi}(Z_i)) \varepsilon_i| \leq \delta_3^{-1/2} n^{-1/2} \sqrt{P_n[\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_{\psi}(Z_i)]^2 v(Z_i)}.$$

If we instead do this with an indicator for an event \mathcal{A} on which $\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P_n)} \leq s_{\gamma}$, we get the bound

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{\mathcal{A}} |P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_{\psi}(Z_i)) \varepsilon_i| &\leq 1_{\mathcal{A}} \delta_3^{-1/2} n^{-1/2} \|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_{\psi}\|_{L_2(P_n)} \|v\|_{\infty}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \delta_3^{-1/2} n^{-1/2} \|v\|_{\infty}^{1/2} s_{\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

This last bound does not depend on $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ and therefore holds unconditionally. Thus, all of the claims of Lemma 4 hold with probability $1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 \delta_j$, on the intersection of the probability $1 - \delta_1 - \delta_2$ event that we work on in the previous section, and the probability $1 - \delta_3$ event that the bound above holds. This completes our proof of Lemma 4.

A.4. A more concrete bound. In this section, we will use Lemma 4 to prove a less abstract bound. To do this, we will find concrete expressions for r , η_Q , η_M , and $\bar{R}(\tilde{g}) = P_n(\tilde{g} - \gamma_{\psi})^2 + \sigma^2 \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2/n$ satisfying the conditions assumed in Lemma 4. We will work with a pair of nonrandom sets $\mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}$ that satisfy $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta$.

We choose a deterministic approximation \tilde{g} to γ_{ψ} . For any function \tilde{g} , with probability $1 - \delta - \delta'$ by the union bound and Markov's inequality,

$$\bar{R}(\tilde{g}) \leq P_n(\tilde{g} - \gamma_{\psi})^2 + \sigma^2 \|\tilde{g}\|_{\mathcal{F}_L}^2/n < P(\tilde{g} - \gamma_{\psi})^2/\delta' + \sigma^2 \|\tilde{g}\|_{\mathcal{F}_L}^2/n.$$

Thus, we can choose \tilde{g} satisfying, with probability $1 - \delta - \delta'$,

$$(37) \quad \bar{R}(\tilde{g}) \leq \kappa^2/\delta', \quad \kappa^2 = \inf_g P(\tilde{g} - \gamma_\psi)^2 + \delta' \sigma^2 \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}_L}/n.$$

We will now characterize r , η_Q , and η_M . We will first find a lower bound of the form $P_n(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq \eta_Q P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2$ for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, $s \in [0, 1/\alpha]$ with $P(f - s\gamma_\psi)^2 \geq r^2$. The following lemma, based on Mendelson (2017, Corollary 3.6), establishes such a bound for a class \mathcal{F} satisfying $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P|f|^p < \infty$. If the functions $f \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfy stronger assumptions on their tails, e.g., a subgaussian tail bound, the first condition in (38) can be weakened significantly (see e.g., Mendelson, 2017).

LEMMA 10. *Let $\mathcal{F}^* = \{f - s\gamma_\psi : f, s \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \times \mathbb{R}\}$ for a random set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ which, for some nonrandom set \mathcal{F} , satisfies $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with probability $1 - \delta$. With probability $1 - \delta - \delta' - 2 \exp\{-c_3 n \xi^2 P\gamma_\psi^2 / M_{\gamma_\psi}^2\} - 2 \exp\{-c_2(\xi, p)n(r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{2p/(p-2)}\}$,*

$$P_n f^2 \geq \eta_Q P f^2 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{F}^* \quad \text{with } P f^2 \geq r^2$$

for $\eta_Q = (1 - \xi)/2 - 2\eta$ and r satisfying

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} R_n(\mathcal{F} \cap c_0(\xi)rL_2(P)) &\leq c_1(\xi, p)r(r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}, \quad p > 2, \\ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F} \cap rL_2(P)} (P - P_n)\gamma_\psi f &\leq \eta \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} r \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \delta', \\ M_{\gamma_\psi} &= \inf\{M : P\gamma_\psi^2 1(\gamma_\psi^2 \leq M^2) \geq (1 - \xi/2)P\gamma_\psi^2\}, \\ M_p(\mathcal{F}) &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{L_p(P)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 \dots c_3$ are constants depending only on their arguments.

We conclude by finding a bound of the form $|P_n h(\cdot, f - s\tilde{g}) - \gamma_\psi \cdot (f - s\tilde{g})| \leq \eta_M r^2$ for all $f, s \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \times [0, 1/\alpha]$ with $P f^2 \leq r^2$. Because $\alpha > \|\tilde{g}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ in Lemma 4, such $f - s\tilde{g}$ are in the set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} - \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq 2\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus, it suffices to find η_M, r satisfying $|P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f| \leq \eta_M r^2$ for all $f \in 2\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with $P f^2 \leq r^2$, or equivalently $|P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f| \leq \eta_M r^2/2$ for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with $P f^2 \leq r^2/4$. We summarize our results in the following less abstract version of Lemma 4, using Lemma 10 with $\xi = 1/2$ and $\eta = 1/16$ and therefore $\eta_Q = 1/8$.

THEOREM 11. *Suppose that we observe iid $(Y_1, Z_1) \dots (Y_n, Z_n)$ with $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, Z_i in an arbitrary set \mathcal{Z} , and define $v(z) = \text{Var}[Y_i | Z_i = z]$. Let $\{h(z, \cdot) : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ be a family of linear functionals on a subspace \mathcal{M} of the square integrable functions on \mathcal{Z} with $\psi(\cdot) = Ph(Z_i, \cdot)$ continuous on \mathcal{M} . Consider the estimator $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ defined in (7) with $\sigma > 0$ and an absolutely convex*

set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ defined in terms of $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ that is either the unit ball of a reflexive space or totally bounded in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}$, and with the property that the functionals $f \rightarrow h(z, f)$ and $f \rightarrow f(z)$ are continuous in $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ for $z \in \{Z_1 \dots Z_n\}$. Let there exist nonrandom sets $\mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta_1$, let γ_ψ be any function on \mathcal{Z} , and suppose that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_n(\mathcal{F} \cap c_0 r L_2(P)) &\leq c_1(p) r (r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}, \quad p > 2 \\
\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F} \cap r L_2(P)} (P - P_n) \gamma_\psi f &\leq \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} r / 16 && \text{w.p. } 1 - \delta_2, \\
\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F} \cap (r/2) L_2(P)} |P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f| &\leq \eta_M r^2 / 2 && \text{w.p. } 1 - \delta_3, \\
\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f &\leq R_{\mathcal{H}} && \text{w.p. } 1 - \delta_4, \\
(39) \quad \sigma &\leq \sqrt{n} \min \left\{ r/4, 2^{-1/2} \eta_M^{1/2} \kappa^{-1/2} r^{3/2} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa^2 &= \inf_g P(g - \gamma_\psi)^2 + \delta_5 \sigma^2 \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}_L}^2 / n, \\
M_{\gamma_\psi} &= \inf \{ M : P \gamma_\psi^2 1(\gamma_\psi^2 \leq M^2) \geq (3/4) P \gamma_\psi^2 \}, \\
M_p(\mathcal{F}) &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{L_p(P)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, with probability

$$1 - \sum_{j=1}^6 \delta_j - 2 \exp\{-c_3 n P \gamma_\psi^2 / M_{\gamma_\psi}^2\} - 2 \exp\{-c_2(p) n (r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{2p/(p-2)}\},$$

1. The weights $\hat{\gamma}$ defined in (7) satisfy

$$(40) \quad n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i))^2 \leq s_\gamma^2 \quad \text{for } s_\gamma = (2\eta_M/\sigma) n^{1/2} r^2 + \delta_5^{-1/2} \kappa.$$

2. Our maximal bias term satisfies the bound

$$(41) \quad I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}) \leq R_{\mathcal{H}} + 2^{1/2} \sigma \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)}^{1/2} n^{-1/2} s_\gamma^{1/2},$$

3. The difference between our noise term and that of the oracle estimator satisfies

$$(42) \quad \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi)(Y_i - m(Z_i)) \right| \leq \delta_6^{-1/2} \|v\|_\infty^{1/2} n^{-1/2} s_\gamma.$$

Here $c_0 \dots c_3$ are constants depending only on their arguments.

We conclude this section by proving Lemma 10.

PROOF OF LEMMA 10. We will work with the decomposition $f = \Pi f + \Pi^\perp f$ where Π and Π^\perp are the orthogonal projection onto the span of γ_ψ and onto its orthogonal complement respectively. In terms of this decomposition,

$$P_n f^2 = P_n(\Pi f)^2 + P_n(\Pi^\perp f)^2 + 2P_n(\Pi f)(\Pi^\perp f), \quad P f^2 = P(\Pi f)^2 + P(\Pi^\perp f)^2.$$

We will prove our lower bound for $\eta_Q = (1 - \xi)/2 - 2\eta$ by showing that for all $f \in \mathcal{F}^*$ with $P(\Pi^\perp f)^2 \geq r^2/2$,

$$(43) \quad P_n(\Pi f)^2 \geq (1 - \xi)P(\Pi f)^2$$

$$(44) \quad P_n(\Pi^\perp f)^2 \geq (1 - \xi)P(\Pi^\perp f)^2,$$

$$(45) \quad -P_n(\Pi f)(\Pi^\perp f) \leq \eta P f^2.$$

When this holds, each $f \in \mathcal{F}^*$ with $P f^2 \geq r^2$ satisfies either $P(\Pi f)^2 \geq P f^2/2$ and therefore $P_n(\Pi f)^2 \geq (1 - \xi)P f^2/2$ or $P(\Pi^\perp f)^2 \geq P f^2/2$ and therefore $P_n(\Pi^\perp f)^2 \geq (1 - \xi)P f^2/2$. Thus, $P_n f^2 \geq (1 - \xi)P f^2/2 - 2\eta P f^2$ as claimed. We will now complete our proof by showing that (43)-(45) hold with high probability.

Because Πf is proportional to γ_ψ , (43) is equivalent to the claim $P_n \gamma_\psi^2 \geq (1 - \xi)P \gamma_\psi^2$. Letting $M_{\gamma_\psi} = \inf\{M : P \gamma_\psi^2 1(\gamma_\psi^2 \leq M^2) \geq (1 - \xi/2)P \gamma_\psi^2\}$,

$$P_n \gamma_\psi^2 \geq P_n \gamma_\psi^2 1(\gamma_\psi^2 \leq M_{\gamma_\psi}^2) \geq (1 - \xi/2)P \gamma_\psi^2 1(\gamma_\psi^2 \leq M_{\gamma_\psi}^2) \geq (1 - \xi)P \gamma_\psi^2,$$

where by Bernstein's inequality, the second comparison holds with probability $1 - 2 \exp\{-c_3 n \xi^2 P \gamma_\psi^2 / M_{\gamma_\psi}^2\}$ (Mendelson, 2017, Proof of Lemma 2.3).

Because $\Pi^\perp f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}^*$, (44) is implied by the claim $P_n f \geq (1 - \xi)P f^2$ for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with $P f^2 \geq r^2/2$. If $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ for some nonrandom set \mathcal{F} with probability δ , this bound holds for r satisfying $R_n(\mathcal{F} \cap c_0(\xi)r L_2(P)) \leq c_1(\xi, p)r(r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}$ with probability $1 - \delta - 2 \exp\{-c_2(\xi, p)n(r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{2p/(p-2)}\}$ (Mendelson, 2017, Corollary 3.6).

Finally, to prove (45), observe that $P_n(\Pi f)(\Pi^\perp f)/P f^2 = P_n(\Pi f')(\Pi^\perp f')/r^2$ for $f' = (r/\|f\|_{L_2(P)})f$, and that $f' \in \mathcal{F}^*$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}^*$ with $P f^2 \geq r^2$. Thus,

$$\sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}^* : P f^2 \geq r^2\}} -P_n(\Pi f)(\Pi^\perp f)/P f^2 \leq \sup_{\{f \in \mathcal{F}^* : P f^2 = r^2\}} -P_n(\Pi f)(\Pi^\perp f)/r^2.$$

Furthermore, writing $\mathcal{F}_r^* = \{f \in \mathcal{F}^* : Pf^2 \leq r\}$ and $\gamma' = \gamma_\psi / \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r^*} -P_n(\Pi f)(\Pi^\perp f) &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r^*} -P_n(P\gamma' f)\gamma'(\Pi^\perp f) \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r^*} P\gamma' f \cdot \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r^*} -P_n\gamma'(\Pi^\perp f) \\ &\leq r \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}: Pf^2 \leq r^2} (P - P_n)\gamma' f. \end{aligned}$$

In the first line above we simply write the projection $\Pi f = (P\gamma' f)\gamma'$ explicitly, and to derive the third from the second we observe that $P\gamma'(\Pi^\perp f) = 0$ and that we can bound the supremum of $(P - P_n)\gamma' f$ over $f \in \Pi^\perp \mathcal{F}_r^*$ by that supremum over f in the larger set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_r = \{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}} : Pf^2 \leq r^2\}$. Thus, (45) holds if $(P - P_n)\gamma_\psi f \leq \eta \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} r$ for all $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with $Pf^2 \leq r^2$. Combining this with our previous results yields the claimed bound. \square

APPENDIX B: ASYMPTOTICS

In this section, we will examine the asymptotic consequences of Theorem 11. Our first step is a proof of Theorem 2. To keep our assumptions as simple as possible, we use Markov's inequality to replace the 'with probability $1 - \delta$ ' statements of (39) with statements about expectations. This leads to constant factors with strong dependence on δ . If the functions $f \in \mathcal{F}$ are bounded, this can be substantially improved using variants of Talagrand's inequality (e.g., Bartlett, Bousquet and Mendelson, 2005, Theorem 2.1). Throughout the section, we will write \mathcal{F}_r to denote $\mathcal{F} \cap rL_2(P)$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. We will first derive the conditions (39) of Theorem 11 from those of Theorem 2. Via Markov's inequality, it suffices to establish the sufficient conditions

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{c_0 r}) &\leq c_1 r (r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}, \\ \delta_2^{-1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} |(P - P_n)\gamma_\psi f| &\leq \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} r/16, \\ \delta_3^{-1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} |P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f| &\leq \eta M r^2/2, \\ \delta_4^{-1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f| &\leq R_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $Ph(\cdot, f) = P\gamma_\psi f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} |P_n h(\cdot, f) - \gamma_\psi f| &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} |(P_n - P)h(\cdot, f) - (P_n - P)\gamma_\psi f| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} |(P_n - P)h(\cdot, f)| + \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_r} |(P_n - P)\gamma_\psi f|. \end{aligned}$$

Via this bound and the symmetrization inequality $\mathbb{E} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |(P_n - P)g| \leq 2R_n(\mathcal{G})$ (e.g., [van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#), Lemma 2.3.1), the conditions above hold if

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{c_0 r}) &\leq c_1 r (r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}, \\ 2\delta_2^{-1} R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}_r) &\leq \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} r / 16, \\ 2\delta_3^{-1} [R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}_r)) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}_r)] &\leq \eta_M r^2 / 2, \\ 2\delta_4^{-1} [R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F})] &\leq R_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\eta_M = 8/\delta_3$, the first and third conditions above follow from the assumptions of [Theorem 2](#). The second is also implied by our assumption $R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}_r) \leq r^2$ so long as $r \leq \delta_2 \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} / 32$, and we will let $R_{\mathcal{H}} = 2\delta_4^{-1} [R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F})]$ to ensure the satisfaction of the fourth. Finally, note that while the definition of κ in [Theorem 2](#) and [Theorem 11](#) differ, the former bounds the latter. In summary, under the assumptions of [Theorem 2](#),

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \hat{\gamma}_\psi(Z_i))^2 &\leq s_\gamma^2 \quad \text{for } s_\gamma = 16\delta_3^{-1} \sigma^{-1} n^{1/2} r^2 + \delta_5^{-1/2} \kappa \\ I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}) &\leq 2\delta_4^{-1} [R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F})] + 2^{1/2} \sigma \|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P_n)}^{1/2} n^{-1/2} s_\gamma^{1/2} \\ \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi)(Y_i - m(Z_i)) \right| &\leq \delta_6^{-1/2} \|v\|_\infty^{1/2} n^{-1/2} s_\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

with probability

$$1 - \delta_1 - \frac{32r}{\|\gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)}} - \sum_{j=3}^6 \delta_j - 2 \exp \left\{ -c_3 n \frac{P\gamma_\psi^2}{M_{\gamma_\psi}^2} \right\} - 2 \exp \left\{ -c_2 n \left(\frac{r}{M_p(\mathcal{F})} \right)^{2p/(p-2)} \right\}.$$

if $\sigma \leq \sqrt{n} \min\{r/4, 2\delta_3^{-1/2} \kappa^{-1/2} r^{3/2}\}$. We simplify our conditions by observing that $\mathcal{F}_{c_0 r} \subseteq \max\{c_0, 1\} \mathcal{F}_r$, so $R_n(\mathcal{F}_{c_0 r}) \leq c_1 r (r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}$ if $R_n(\mathcal{F}_r) \leq c'_1 r (r/M_p(\mathcal{F}))^{p/(p-2)}$ for $c'_1 = c_1 / \max\{c_0, 1\}$.

Now referring to our error decomposition [\(15\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}(m) - \psi(m) - P_n \iota(Y_i, Z_i) &= P_n [h(Z_i, \hat{m} - m) - \hat{\gamma}_i(\hat{m} - m)] \\ &\quad + P_n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i))(Y_i - m(Z_i)). \end{aligned}$$

We can express the first term on the right side as $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} U$ with $U = P_n h(Z_i, f) - \hat{\gamma}_i f(Z_i)$ and $f = (\hat{m} - m) / \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ and the second term as $\|v\|_\infty^{1/2} V$ for $V = P_n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i)) \varepsilon_i / \|v\|_\infty^{1/2}$. The claimed bounds on U and V follow from [\(46\)](#) with $\delta_1 = \delta$ and $\sum_{j=3}^6 \delta_j = \delta$. \square

We will now prove our simple asymptotic result, Theorem 1, as a consequence of Theorem 2. We will use the following lemma, which implies that if \mathcal{F} is Donsker, then for any $\eta > 0$, $\inf\{r > 0 : R_n(\mathcal{F}_r) \leq \eta r^2\} = o(n^{-1/4})$.

LEMMA 12. *Let $\tau_n(r)$ be a sequence of positive functions, each increasing in r , and satisfying $\tau_n(s_n) = o(n^{-1/2})$ for all positive sequences $s_n \rightarrow 0$. For any η , there exists a positive sequence r_n satisfying $r_n = o(n^{-1/4})$ and $\tau_n(r_n) \leq \eta r_n^2$.*

PROOF. Let $r_n = \sqrt{\tau_n(n^{-1/4})/\eta}$. Then $r_n = o(n^{-1/4})$ and $\tau(r_n) \leq \eta r_n^2 = \tau(n^{-1/4})$ for n sufficiently large that $r_n \leq n^{-1/4}$. If necessary, increase finitely many elements of r_n to ensure that this condition is satisfied for all n . \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. We will prove asymptotic linearity (11) here, deferring our claims about regularity and efficiency to Section B.1 below. If, for any $\delta > 0$, the bounds of Theorem 2 hold with $\delta' \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have the characterization

$$\hat{\psi}_{AML} - \psi(m) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \iota(Y_i, Z_i) = O_P(\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} U + V).$$

Thus, our task is showing that under the assumptions of Theorem 1, this happens, and that furthermore $\kappa \rightarrow 0$, $r = o(n^{-1/4})$, and $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F})$ is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ if $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ in Theorem 1 and $O_p(n^{-1/2})$ if $\rho_n \not\rightarrow 0$. This is sufficient, as our consistency assumption (10) from Theorem 1 requires that $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = O_p(1)$ if $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$ and $o_p(1)$ otherwise, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\psi}_{AML} - \psi(m) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \iota(Y_i, Z_i) \\ &= O_P(\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} [R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}) + o(n^{-1/2})] + o_P(n^{-1/2})) \\ &= o_P(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

We also claim that the weights $\hat{\gamma}_i$ estimate γ_ψ consistently in Theorem 1, and our bound on $P_n(\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_\psi(Z_i))^2$ from Theorem 2 implies this when $r = o(n^{-1/4})$ and $\kappa \rightarrow 0$.

We now turn to the task of proving these bounds. We will begin by showing that a pair of nonrandom function classes $\mathcal{F}_L, \mathcal{F}$ satisfy $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta$ as required by Theorem 2. When we do this, we will run into conflict between Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 on the meaning of \mathcal{F} . Here we will write \mathcal{F}' for the Donsker class that is called \mathcal{F} in Theorem 1, so in our notation $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho_n L_2(P_n)$, or more simply $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho L_2(P_n)$.

We define $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{1/2}\rho')L_2(P)$ and $\mathcal{F}_L = (\rho/\rho')(\mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{-1/2}\rho')L_2(P))$ with $\rho' = \max\{\rho, \rho_\star\}$. Here ρ_\star satisfies $\rho_\star^2 \geq 40MR_n(\mathcal{F}'_{\rho_\star}) + 52M^2 \log(2/\delta)/n$ for $M = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}'} \|f\|_\infty$. We use this definition because

$$\mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{-1/2}\rho_\star)L_2(P) \subseteq \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho_\star L_2(P_n) \subseteq \mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{1/2}\rho_\star)L_2(P_n) \quad \text{with prob. } 1 - \delta$$

as a consequence of [Bartlett, Bousquet and Mendelson \(2005, Corollary 2.2 and Lemma 3.6\)](#). Thus, $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{1/2}\rho')L_2(P) \supseteq \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho' L_2(P_n) \supseteq \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho L_2(P_n); \\ \mathcal{F}_L &= (\rho/\rho')(\mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{-1/2}\rho')L_2(P)) \subseteq (\rho/\rho')(\mathcal{F}' \cap \rho' L_2(P_n)) \subseteq \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho L_2(P_n). \end{aligned}$$

We will now show that $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. Because \mathcal{F}' is Donsker, $R_n(\mathcal{F}'_{r_n}) = o(n^{1/2})$ when $r_n \rightarrow 0$ (e.g., [Ledoux and Talagrand, 2013, Theorem 14.6](#)) and therefore $\sqrt{n}[20R_n(\mathcal{F}'_{r_n}) + 26M \log(2/\delta)/n] \rightarrow 0$. By [Lemma 12](#) it follows we can take $\rho_\star = o(n^{-1/4})$. Thus, $\rho'/\rho = o(n^{1/4})$, as $\rho^{-1} = o(n^{1/2})$ by assumption and either $\rho' = \rho$ or $\rho' = o(n^{-1/4})$. As $\mathcal{F}_L = (\rho/\rho')(\mathcal{F}' \cap (2^{-1/2}\rho')L_2(P))$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_L} &\leq \max\left\{(\rho'/\rho)\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}, 2^{1/2}\rho^{-1}\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}\right\} \\ &\leq o\left(n^{1/4} \max\left\{n^{1/4}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}, n^{1/2}\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}\right\}\right) \\ &\leq O(s_n n^{1/2}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}) \quad \text{for } s_n \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\text{span } \mathcal{F}'$ is dense in its closure, there exists a sequence $g_j \in \text{span } \mathcal{F}'$ converging to γ_ψ , and it follows that there exists a convergent subsequence g_{j_n} with $\|g_{j_n}\|_{\mathcal{F}'} = o(s_n^{-1})$. Consequently, $\|g_{j_n}\|_{\mathcal{F}_L} = o(n^{1/2})$ and that $\kappa^2 \leq \|g_{j_n} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \sigma^2 \|g_{j_n}\|_{\mathcal{F}_L}^2/n = o(1)$.

We will now show that $r = o(n^{-1/4})$, considering r_Q , r_M , and r_P in turn. Because $\mathcal{F}_r \subseteq \mathcal{F}'_r$ where \mathcal{F}' is Donsker, $R_n(\mathcal{F}_{r_n}) = o(n^{1/2})$ when $r_n \rightarrow 0$. By [Lemma 12](#), it follows that $r_Q = \inf\{r > 0 : R_n(\mathcal{F}_r) \leq c_1 r^2/M_\infty(\mathcal{F})\}$ is $o(n^{-1/4})$. A variation of this argument works for r_H . It is based on the inclusion $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}_r) \subseteq h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}'_r) \subseteq h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}') \cap \omega_h(r)L_2(P)$ where $\omega_h(r) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}'_r} \|h(\cdot, f)\|_{L_2(P)}$. By assumption, $\omega_h(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, and because $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ is Donsker, $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}') \cap \omega_h(r)L_2(P)) = o(n^{1/2})$ when $\omega_h(r) \rightarrow 0$. It follows that $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}_{r_n})) \leq R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}') \cap \omega_h(r_n)L_2(P)) = o(n^{-1/2})$ and, by [Lemma 12](#), that $r_M = o(n^{-1/4})$. The argument that $r_P = o(n^{-1/4})$ is analogous, with $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'$ and $\omega_\gamma(r) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}'_r} \|\gamma_\psi f\|_{L_2(P)}$ substituted for $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ and ω_h ; $\omega_\gamma(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ by Hölder's inequality because $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}'} \|f\|_\infty < \infty$.

Having established this characterization of κ and r , it follows that any constant σ satisfies the requirements of [Theorem 2](#) asymptotically and that

$\delta' \rightarrow 0$. All that remains is to show that $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) + R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F})$ is $O(n^{-1/2})$ and, if $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, that it is $o(n^{1/2})$. Because $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}) \subseteq h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ and $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F} \subseteq \gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'$ and $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ and $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'$ are Donsker, $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})) = O(n^{-1/2})$ and $R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}) = O(n^{-1/2})$. Furthermore, if $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, we have $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}' \cap \rho'_n L_2(P)$ for $\rho'_n \rightarrow 0$, and we've shown in the previous paragraph that $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}'_{r_n})) = o(n^{-1/2})$ and $R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'_{r_n}) = o(n^{-1/2})$ when $r_n \rightarrow 0$, so this sum will be $o(n^{-1/2})$. This completes our proof. \square

We conclude this section by proving Corollary 3, a variant of Theorem 1 for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ defined as the absolutely convex hull of $\mathcal{E}_n - \mathcal{F}'$ for a finite-dimensional set \mathcal{E}_n and a Donsker class \mathcal{F}' intersected with a ball $\rho_n L_2(P_n)$ with $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$. This is used in Section 2.3 to justify the inclusion in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of a number of functions estimated on an auxiliary sample.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 3. Following our proof of Theorem 1, it suffices to show that for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $\mathcal{F}_L, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta$, $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_L} = o(n^{1/2})\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}$, r_Q, r_H , and r_P defined in Theorem 2 are $o(n^{-1/4})$, and $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}))$ and $R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F})$ are $o(n^{-1/2})$.

Let Δ to be the absolutely convex hull of $\mathcal{E}_n - \mathcal{F}'$, and take $\mathcal{F} = \Delta_{2^{1/2}\rho'}$ and $\mathcal{F}_L = (\rho/\rho')\Delta_{2^{-1/2}\rho'}$ for $\rho' = \max\{\rho, \rho_\star\}$ and ρ_\star satisfying $\rho_\star^2 \geq 40MR_n(\Delta_{\rho_\star}) + 52M^2 \log(2/\delta)/n$ with $M = \sup_{\delta \in \Delta} \|\delta\|_\infty$. As in the proof of Theorem 1, we have $\mathcal{F}_L \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with probability $1 - \delta$.

We bound $R_n(\Delta_r)$ by decomposing each $\delta \in \Delta$ into its orthogonal projection $\Pi\delta$ on the span of \mathcal{E} and its projection $\Pi^\perp\delta$ onto its orthogonal complement. Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(\Delta_r) &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{\delta \in \Delta \cap rL_2(P)} P_n \epsilon_i \delta \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\delta \in \Delta \cap rL_2(P)} P_n \epsilon_i \Pi \delta + \mathbb{E} \sup_{\delta \in \Delta \cap rL_2(P)} P_n \epsilon_i \Pi^\perp \delta \end{aligned}$$

Because $\Pi^\perp\delta \in \mathcal{F}'$ for all $\delta \in \Delta$ and $\|\Pi^\perp\delta\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \|\delta\|_{L_2(P)}$, the second term is bounded by $R_n(\mathcal{F}'_r)$. And because $\Pi\delta \in \text{span } \mathcal{E}$, the first is bounded by $R_n(\text{span } \mathcal{E} \cap rL_2(P))$, which is no larger than $r\sqrt{K/n}$ when \mathcal{E} is spanned by K elements (e.g., Koltchinskii, 2006, Example 1). It follows that $R_n(\Delta_r) \leq R_n(\mathcal{F}'_r) + r\sqrt{K/n}$. Similarly decomposing $h(\cdot, \delta)$ and $\gamma_\psi \delta$ in terms of their orthogonal projections on the span of $h(\cdot, \mathcal{E})$ and $\gamma_\psi \mathcal{E}$ respectively,

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} R_n(h(\cdot, \Delta_r)) &\leq R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}'_r)) + \omega_{h, \mathcal{E}}(r)\sqrt{K/n}, \\ R_n(\gamma_\psi \Delta_r) &\leq R_n(\gamma_\psi \mathcal{F}'_r) + \omega_{\gamma, \mathcal{E}}(r)\sqrt{K/n}. \end{aligned}$$

In this, $\omega_{h,\mathcal{G}}(r)$ and $\omega_{\gamma,\mathcal{G}}(r)$ are the moduli of continuity $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{G} \cap rL_2(P)} \|h(\cdot, f)\|_{L_2(P)}$ and $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{G} \cap rL_2(P)} \|\gamma\psi f\|_{L_2(P)}$ respectively.

We will now show that we can take $\rho_\star = o(n^{-1/4})$. $M = \sup_{\delta \in \Delta} \|\delta\|_\infty$ is bounded by $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}'} \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \|e\|_\infty$, so it is $O(1)$ under our assumptions. Furthermore, $R_n(\mathcal{F}_{r_n}) = o(n^{-1/2})$ for $r_n \rightarrow 0$ because \mathcal{F}' is Donsker (e.g., [Ledoux and Talagrand, 2013](#), Theorem 14.6). Thus, Lemma 12 establishes that $40MR_n(\mathcal{F}'_{\rho_\star}) + 52M^2 \log(2/\delta)/n \leq \rho_\star^2/2$ for $\rho_\star = o(n^{-1/4})$. It follows that when $\rho_\star \sqrt{K/n} \leq \rho_\star^2/2$, i.e. when $K \leq n\rho_\star^2/4$, $\rho_\star^2 \geq 40MR_n(\Delta_{\rho_\star}) + 52M^2 \log(2/\delta)/n = 40MR_n(\mathcal{F}'_{\rho_\star}) + r\sqrt{K/n} + 52M^2 \log(2/\delta)/n$ as required. And as in the proof of Theorem 1, this implies $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_L} = o(n^{1/2})\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}'}$.

We will now show that $r = o(n^{-1/4})$, considering r_Q , r_M , and r_P in turn. Our argument from the previous paragraph, with different constants, establishes this for r_Q . A variation on this argument works for r_H . It is based on the inclusion $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}_r) \subseteq h(\cdot, \Delta) \cap \omega_{h,\Delta}(r)L_2(P)$ where, by the triangle inequality, the modulus of continuity $\omega_{h,\Delta}(r)$ of h on Δ is bounded by the sum $\omega_{h,\mathcal{F}'}(r) + \omega_{h,\mathcal{E}}(r)$ of the moduli of continuity of h on \mathcal{F}' and \mathcal{E} . By assumption, these bounds will go to zero as r does. Because $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}')$ is Donsker, $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}') \cap \omega_{h,\Delta}(r_n))$ is $o(n^{-1/2})$ when r_n and therefore $\omega_{h,\Delta}(r_n)$ goes to zero, and as $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}'_{r_n}) \subseteq h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}') \cap \omega_{h,\Delta}(r_n)$, it follows that $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}'_{r_n}))$ is $o(n^{-1/2})$ as well. Then by Lemma 12, $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}'_{r_H})) \leq r_H^2/2$ for $r_H = o(n^{-1/4})$. Finally, via (47), $R_n(h(\cdot, \Delta_{r_H})) \leq r_H^2/2 + r_H\sqrt{K/n}$, which is less than r_H^2 when $K \leq nr_H^2/4$. The same argument applies to r_P , substituting the map $f \rightarrow \gamma\psi f$ in place of $f \rightarrow h(\cdot, f)$.

The final step of our argument is to show that $R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}))$ and $R_n(\gamma\psi\mathcal{F})$ are $o(n^{-1/2})$. Recall our definition $\mathcal{F} = \Delta \cap \sqrt{2}\rho'L_2(P)$. By (47), $R_n(h(\cdot, \Delta \cap \sqrt{2}\rho'L_2(P))) \leq R_n(h(\cdot, \mathcal{F}' \cap \sqrt{2}\rho'L_2(P))) + \omega_{h,\mathcal{E}}(\sqrt{2}\rho')\sqrt{K/n}$, and because $\rho' \rightarrow 0$, the first term in this bound is $o(n^{-1/2})$. The second term is $o(n^{-1/2})$ if $K\omega_{h,\mathcal{E}}^2(\sqrt{2}\rho') \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, $R_n(\gamma\psi\Delta \cap \sqrt{2}\rho'L_2(P))$ is $o(n^{-1/2})$ if $K\omega_{\gamma,\mathcal{E}}^2(\sqrt{2}\rho') \rightarrow 0$.

We can simplify these conditions on K by using two properties of the moduli of continuity $\omega_{h,\mathcal{E}}$ and $\omega_{\gamma,\mathcal{E}}$: $\omega(x) \leq \omega(y)$ for $x \leq y$ (increasingness) and $\omega(\alpha x) \leq \alpha\omega(x)$ for $\alpha \geq 1$ (sublinearity). Increasingness is clear from their definition, and sublinearity follows from the linearity of $f \rightarrow h(\cdot, f)$ and $f \rightarrow \gamma\psi f$: $\omega_{h,\mathcal{E}}(\alpha r) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha r}} \|h(\cdot, f)\| \leq \sup_{f \in \alpha(\mathcal{E}_r)} \|h(\cdot, f)\| = \alpha\omega_{h,\mathcal{E}_r}$ and similarly for $\omega_{\gamma,\mathcal{E}}$. As a consequence of the sublinearity of each modulus ω , $K\omega^2(\sqrt{2}\rho') \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $K\omega^2(\rho') \rightarrow 0$, and because $\rho' = \max\{\rho, \rho_\star\}$ for $\rho_\star = o(n^{-1/4})$, increasingness implies that $K\omega^2(\rho') \rightarrow 0$ if $K\omega^2(\max\{\rho, n^{-1/4}\}) \rightarrow 0$. Finally, via sublinearity, $\omega(1) \leq \max\{\rho, n^{-1/4}\}^{-1}$ $\omega(\max\{\rho, n^{-1/4}\})$, and consequently $n^{-1/2} = O(\omega^2(\max\{\rho, n^{-1/4}\}))$. Thus,

our conditions $K \leq nr^2/4$ for $r \in \{r_*, r_Q, r_H, r_P\}$ are implied by the conditions $K\omega_{h,\varepsilon}^2(\max\{\rho, n^{-1/4}\}) \rightarrow 0$ and $K\omega_{\gamma,\varepsilon}^2(\max\{\rho, n^{-1/4}\}) \rightarrow 0$. \square

B.1. Regularity and Efficiency. In this section, we will prove the claims about regularity and efficiency in Theorem 1. We express our estimand as a functional $\chi(P)$ of the distribution of the observed data, defined by $\chi(P) = \psi_P(m_P)$ for $\psi_P(m) = \mathbb{E}_P h(Z, m)$ and $m_P(z) = E_P[Y | Z = z]$. The first step of our proof is characterizing the tangent space of distributions we consider, i.e., the set of probability measures P with $m_P \in \mathcal{M}$. Having done this, we calculate the derivative $\dot{\chi}_P$ of χ at P on this tangent space. An estimator for a differentiable functional $\chi(P)$ with influence function $\iota(y, z)$ is regular iff $\mathbb{E} \iota(y, z)g(y, z) = \dot{\chi}_P(s)$ for all scores g in the tangent space and asymptotically efficient iff it is regular and $\iota(y, z)$ is in the closure of the tangent space (van der Vaart, 2002, Section 1.2 and Example 4.6).

B.1.1. The tangent space. We will show that the tangent space at P to the set of all models P' with regression functions $m_{P'} \in \mathcal{M}$ is

$$\mathcal{T} = \{g(y, z) : \mathbb{E}_P[g(Y, Z)] = 0, \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) | Z = z] \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

To show that \mathcal{T} is contained in the tangent space, we construct a parametric submodel for each score $g \in \mathcal{T}$. To show that \mathcal{T} contains the tangent space, we will show that the score g of every one-dimensional parametric submodel P_t is in \mathcal{T} .

Containment of \mathcal{T} in the tangent space. To show that each element of \mathcal{T} is the score of a one-dimensional parametric submodel, we use a tilting construction (see e.g., Tsiatis, 2007, Section 4.5). Factor P into the product of a regular conditional distribution $P(\cdot | Z = z)$ on Y and a marginal P^M on Z . Define a submodel P_t with $\mathbb{E}_{P_t}[Y | Z = z] = m_P(z) + tm'(z)$ for $m' \in \mathcal{M}$ by choosing a bounded function $k(x)$ satisfying $k(0) = k'(0) = 1$, e.g., $k(x) = 2(1 + e^{-2x})^{-1}$ (van der Vaart, 2002, Example 1.12), and taking

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} dP_t(\cdot | Z = z)/dP(\cdot | Z = z) &= \frac{k(c_t(z)y + tb(y, z))}{\mathbb{E}_P[k(c_t(Z)Y + tb(Y, Z)) | Z = z]}, \\ dP_t^M/dP^M &= k(ta(z)), \end{aligned}$$

for a, b, c_t satisfying $\mathbb{E}_P[a(Z)] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}_P[b(Y, Z) | Z] = 0$, and

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_P[Yk(c_t(Z)Y + tb(Y, Z)) | Z = z]}{\mathbb{E}_P[k(c_t(Z)Y + tb(Y, Z)) | Z = z]} = m_P(z) + tm'(z).$$

For $t = 0$, this last condition is satisfied with $c_t(z) = 0$, and we will use the implicit function theorem to characterize a function $c_t(z)$ satisfying this condition for t in a neighborhood of zero. This requires that the function

$$f(t, c) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_P[Yk(cY + tb(Y, Z)) \mid Z = z]}{\mathbb{E}_P[k(cY + tb(Y, Z)) \mid Z = z]} - m_P(z) + tm'(z)$$

be continuously differentiable and that its derivative with respect to c be nonzero at $t = 0$, and it implies that the solution c_t is continuously differentiable with $c'_t(z) = -(\partial f / \partial t)(t, c_t(z)) / (\partial f / \partial c)(t, c_t(z))$. These conditions are satisfied, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial f / \partial t)(t, c) \big|_{t=0} &= \mathbb{E}_P[Yb(Y, Z) \mid Z = z] - \mathbb{E}_P[Y \mid Z = z] \mathbb{E}_P[b(Y, Z) \mid Z = z] - m'(z) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[Yb(Y, Z) \mid Z = z] - m'(z), \\ (\partial f / \partial c)(t, c) \big|_{t=0} &= \mathbb{E}_P[Y^2 \mid Z = z] - (\mathbb{E}_P[Y \mid Z = z])^2 \\ &= \text{var}_P[Y \mid Z = z], \\ c'_0(z) &= (m'(z) - \mathbb{E}_P[Yb(Y, Z) \mid Z = z]) / \text{var}_P[Y \mid Z = z]. \end{aligned}$$

This yields a valid submodel, as our densities are nonnegative and integrate to one, and by construction $\mathbb{E}_{P_t}[Y \mid Z = z] \in \mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, the score of the submodel is

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \big|_{t=0} \log (dP_t(\cdot \mid Z) / dP(\cdot \mid Z) \cdot dP_t^M / dP^M) \\ &= a(Z) + (d/dt) \big|_{t=0} (c_t(Z)Y + tb(Y, Z) - \log E_P[(c_t(Z)Y + tb(Y, Z)) \mid Z]) \\ &= a(Z) + c'_0(Z)Y + b(Y, Z) - E_P[c'_0(Z)Y + b(Y, Z) \mid Z] \\ &= a(Z) + (b(Y, Z) - \mathbb{E}[b(Y, Z) \mid Z]) \\ &+ ((Y - m_P(Z)) / \text{var}_P[Y \mid Z])(m'(Z) - \mathbb{E}_P[Yb(Y, Z) \mid Z]) \end{aligned}$$

using the expression for c'_0 above, as this pointwise derivative is also a derivative in the required mean-square sense via [van der Vaart \(2002, Lemma 1.8\)](#). Any score $g \in \mathcal{T}$ can be represented in this way: $g \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) \mid Z] = \mathbb{E}[Y(g(Y, Z) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y, Z) \mid Z])] = m'(Z)$ for $m' \in \mathcal{M}$, so taking $a(Z) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y, Z) \mid Z]$ and $b(Y, Z) = g(Y, Z) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y, Z) \mid Z]$ yields a submodel with the score $a(Z) + b(Y, Z) = g(Y, Z)$.

Containment of the tangent space in \mathcal{T} . The condition $\mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) \mid Z = z] \in \mathcal{M}$ is equivalent to the condition $\mathbb{E}_P[f(Z) \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) \mid Z]] = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{M}_\perp$, the $L_2(P)$ -orthogonal complement of \mathcal{M} . Furthermore, for all bounded f , this is equivalent to the condition $\mathbb{E}_P[f(Z)(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z)] = 0$. Now suppose that this condition holds for all bounded

f and recall that we've assumed that \mathcal{M}_\perp has a $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ -dense bounded subset. Each unbounded $f \in \mathcal{M}_\perp$ is the limit of a bounded sequence $f_j \in \mathcal{M}_\perp$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}_P[f_j(Z) \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) | Z]] = 0$, and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\mathbb{E}_P[(f(Z) - f_j(Z)) \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) | Z]] \rightarrow 0$ and therefore $\mathbb{E}_P[f(Z) \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) | Z]] = 0$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}_P[f(Z)(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z)] = 0$ for all bounded $f \in \mathcal{M}_\perp$.

We will show that this holds. For a sequence $t_n \rightarrow 0$, let p_n and p be densities of P_{t_n} and P with respect to a σ -finite dominating measure μ . Because g is the score of P_t , $t_n^{-1}(\sqrt{p_n} - \sqrt{p})$ converges to $(1/2)g\sqrt{p}$ in $L_2(\mu)$, and it follows that $\sqrt{p_n} \rightarrow \sqrt{p}$ in $L_2(\mu)$ and consequently that $t_n^{-1}(\sqrt{p_n} - \sqrt{p})(\sqrt{p_n} + \sqrt{p}) \rightarrow (1/2)g\sqrt{p} \cdot 2\sqrt{p} = gp$ in $L_1(\mu)$. Thus, for any bounded function $b(y, z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int b(y, z) t_n^{-1} (\sqrt{p_{t_n}} - \sqrt{p}) (\sqrt{p_{t_n}} + \sqrt{p}) d\mu \\ & \rightarrow \int b(y, z) gp = \mathbb{E}_P[b(Y, Z)g(Y, Z)] \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $b_j(y, z) = (y - m_P(z))f(z)1(|y - m_P(z)| \leq j)$, for any fixed n , by dominated convergence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int b_j(y, z) t_n^{-1} (\sqrt{p_{t_n}} - \sqrt{p}) (\sqrt{p_{t_n}} + \sqrt{p}) d\mu \\ & \rightarrow t_n^{-1} \left(\int (y - m_P(z))f(z)p_{t_n} d\mu + \int (y - m_P(z))f(z)p d\mu \right) = 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Here the integrals in the limit are zero because $\mathbb{E}_{P_t}[f(Z)(Y - m_P(Z))] = \mathbb{E}_{P_t}[f(Z)(m_{P_t} - m_P)(Z)]$ and $m_{P_t} - m_P$ is in \mathcal{M} and therefore orthogonal to f for all t in any submodel P_t . Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}_P[b_j(Y, Z)g(Y, Z)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_P[f(Z)(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z)]$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ by dominated convergence. Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}_P[f(Z)(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z)] = 0 + \delta_j + \delta_{j,n}$ for δ_j and $\delta_{j,n}$ that become arbitrarily small as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed j respectively, and it follows that $\mathbb{E}_P[f(Z)(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z)] = 0$. This completes our proof that \mathcal{T} is our tangent space.

B.1.2. The Pathwise Derivative of χ , Regularity, and Efficiency. We will calculate the derivative of our functional $\chi(P)$ on the tangent space \mathcal{T} . As discussed above, for any score $g \in \mathcal{T}$, there is a submodel P_t of the form defined in (48), with regression function $m_{P_t}(z) = m_P(z) + tm'(z)$ for $m' \in \mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, its score satisfies $m'(z) = \mathbb{E}[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) | Z = z]$. The form of our path makes it easy to calculate the derivative of $\chi(P_t)$,

as $\chi(P_t)$ depends only on m_{P_t} and the marginal distribution of Z . Letting $a(z) = \mathbb{E}_P[g(Y, Z) \mid Z = z]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial/\partial t) \big|_{t=0} \chi(P_t) &= (\partial/\partial t) \big|_{t=0} \mathbb{E}_{P_t}[h(Z, m_{P_t})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[(\partial/\partial t) \big|_{t=0} k(ta(Z))h(Z, m_P + tm')] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[a(Z)h(Z, m_P)] + \mathbb{E}_P[h(Z, m')]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we rely on dominated convergence to interchange integration and differentiation. Dominatedness follows, via the mean value theorem, from the boundedness of $k'(\cdot)$ and the square integrability of $a(z)$, $h(z, m)$, and $h(z, m')$.

The first term above is equal to $\mathbb{E}_P[g(Z)h(Z, m_P)]$, which we can write more canonically as $\mathbb{E}_P[g(Z)(h(Z, m_P) - \psi_P(m_P))]$ because $\mathbb{E}_P[g(Z)] = 0$. Furthermore, if γ_ψ is the Riesz representer for $\psi_P(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}_P[h(Z, \cdot)]$ on a superset of \mathcal{M} , we can write the second term as $\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma_\psi(Z)m'(Z)] = \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma_\psi(Z) \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))g(Y, Z) \mid Z]]$. Thus, $\iota(y, z) = h(z, m_P) - \psi_P(m_P) + \gamma_\psi(z)(y - m_P(z))$ is an influence function, as $\mathbb{E}_P[\iota(Y, Z)g(Y, Z)] = (\partial/\partial t) \big|_{t=0} \chi(P_t)$. This establishes our regularity claim.

Furthermore, ι is in the closure of the tangent space \mathcal{T} , and therefore the efficient influence function, if and only if $\mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))\iota(Y, Z) \mid Z = z]$ is in the closure of \mathcal{M} . As $\mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))\iota(Y, Z) \mid Z = z] = \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))^2 \mid Z = z]\gamma_\psi(z)$, this happens if and only if $v\gamma_\psi$ is in the closure of \mathcal{M} for $v(z) = \mathbb{E}_P[(Y - m_P(Z))^2 \mid Z = z]$. This completes our proof.

Note that if ψ_P is not continuous, χ is not differentiable: for a submodel P_t with constant marginal distribution on Z , $t^{-1}(\chi(P_t) - \chi(P)) = \psi_P(m')$, which is bounded for all $m' \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if ψ_P is continuous. Thus, as the existence of a regular estimator for $\chi(P)$ implies the differentiability of χ (van der Vaart, 1991, Theorem 2.1), it implies the continuity of ψ_P .

B.2. Estimating γ_ψ at the optimal rate. Here we consider the optimality of the rate $\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_\psi\|_{L_2(P)} = O_P(r)$ discussed in Section 2.2. We use the notation of Theorem 2.

If \mathcal{F} is a class of uniformly bounded functions with empirical metric entropy $\log N(\mathcal{F}; L_2(P_n); \epsilon) = O(\epsilon^{-2\rho})$ for $\rho > 1$, it can be shown that $r_Q = O(n^{-1/(2+2\rho)})$ (see e.g., Koltchinskii, 2006, Equation 2.4). Furthermore, if γ_ψ is bounded and the map $f \rightarrow h(\cdot, f)$ is well-behaved, $\gamma_\psi\mathcal{F}$ and $h(\cdot, \mathcal{F})$ will satisfy the same entropy bound, and r will have this rate as well. For \mathcal{F} equal to the unit ball of a Hölder space $C^s([0, 1]^d)$ of order $s > d/2$, we have such entropy bound with $\rho = d/(2s)$ (Tikhomirov, 1993; van der Vaart, 1994), and we get the well-known minimax rate $n^{-1/(2+d/s)}$ for estimating

a function f with $\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$ from direct observations of $f(Z_i) + \xi_i$ with gaussian noise ξ_i (e.g., Györfi et al., 2006, Theorem 3.2).

While the general problem of estimating a Riesz representer is nonstandard, one point of reference is Example 1, in which $f \rightarrow h(\cdot, f)$ is well-behaved and $\gamma_\psi(x, w) = w/e(x)$ for $e(x) = \mathbb{E}[W_i \mid X_i = x]$. If $e(x)$ is bounded away from zero, γ_ψ and $e(x)$ are estimable at the same rate, and in the case that $\|e\|_{C^s([0,1]^d)} < \infty$, the minimax rate for estimating the directly observed function $e(x)$ is $n^{-1/(2+d/s)}$. In this example, when $s > d/2$, our estimator $\hat{\gamma}_\psi$ for $\mathcal{F} = \{wg : \|g\|_{C^s([0,1]^d)} \leq 1\}$ attains the minimax rate, as $\|\gamma_\psi\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$ and \mathcal{F} has metric entropy comparable to that of the unit ball of our Hölder space.

APPENDIX C: SIMULATION STUDY: DETAILS

C.1. Simulation Design. In all our simulations, we start by generating data (X_i, Y_i, W_i) , such that the expectation of Y_i and W_i has a non-linear dependence on a low-dimensional set of covariates X_i . We then fit our signal of interest using a sparse linear combination of transformations $\phi_j(X_i)$ of the original features X_i . We considered data-generating distributions of the form

$$X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d \times d}), \quad W_i \mid X_i \sim \mathcal{L}_{X_i}, \quad Y_i \mid X_i, W_i = \mathcal{N}(b(X_i) + W_i\tau(X_i), 1),$$

for different choices of dimension d , treatment assignment distribution \mathcal{L}_{X_i} , baseline main effect $\mu(\cdot)$ and treatment effect function $\tau(\cdot)$. We considered the following 4 setups, each of which depends on a sparsity level k that controls the complexity of the signal.

1. Beta-distributed treatment, $W_i \mid X_i \sim B(\alpha(X_i), 1 - \alpha(X_i))$, with $\zeta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k x_j / \sqrt{k}$, $\eta(x) = \text{sign}(\zeta(x))\zeta^2(x)$, $\alpha(x) = \max\{0.05, \min\{0.95, 1/(1 + \exp[-\eta(x)])\}\}$, $\mu(x) = \eta(x) + 0.2(\alpha(x) - 0.5)$, and $\tau(x) = -0.2$.
2. Scaled Gaussian treatment, $W_i \mid X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\lambda(X_i), \lambda^2(X_i))$, with $\eta(x) = 2^{k-1} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j$, $\mu(x) = \text{sign}(\eta(x))\sqrt{|\eta(x)|}$, $\lambda(x) = 0.1 \text{sign}(\mu(x)) + \mu(x)$, and $\tau(x) = \max\{x_1 + x_2, 0\}/2$.
3. Poisson treatment, $W_i \mid X_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda(X_i))$, with $\tau(x) = k^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k \cos(\pi x_j/3)$, $\lambda(x) = 0.2 + \tau^2(x)$, and $\mu(x) = 4d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d x_j + 2\lambda(x)$.
4. Log-normal treatment, $\log(W_i) \mid X_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\lambda(X_i), 1/3^2)$, with $\zeta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^k x_j / \sqrt{k}$, $\mu(x) = \max\{0, 2\zeta(x)\}$, $\lambda(x) = 1/(1 + \exp[-\text{sign}(\zeta(x))\zeta^2(x)])$, and $\tau(x) = \sin(2\pi x_1)$.

C.2. Methods under Comparison. We first consider two variants of the **minimax linear** estimator. The simpler option is minimax over the

class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ described in (20) where \mathcal{M} is defined in terms of a basis expansion $\phi(x)$ of our covariates,

$$(49) \quad \mathcal{M} = \left\{ f(x) : f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \beta_j \phi_j(x), \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\beta_j| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Throughout, we use a basis sequence $\phi_j = a_j \phi'_j$, where ϕ'_j are d -dimensional interactions of standardized Hermite polynomials that are orthonormal with respect to the standard Gaussian distribution. The sequence of weights $\{a_j\}$ varies with order k of the polynomial ϕ_j ; $a_j = 1/(k\sqrt{n_{k,d}})$ where $n_{k,d}$ is the number of terms of order k . Observe that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = 1$ and therefore, for standard normal X , $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \phi_j(X)^2 = 1$. It follows that if the density of X with respect to Gaussian measure is bounded, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \phi_j(X)^2 < \infty$, and so \mathcal{M} is Donsker. When W_i is bounded, this implies that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is also Donsker; see, e.g., [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996, Section 2.13.2 and Section 2.10\)](#).

Then, motivated by popular idea of propensity-stratified estimation in the causal inference literature ([Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1984](#)), we consider minimax linear estimation over the expanded class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$ where \mathcal{M}_+ extends \mathcal{M} by adding to our basis expansion $\phi(x)$ the following random basis functions:

- Multi-scale strata of the estimated average treatment intensity $\hat{e}(X_i)$ (we balanced over histogram bins of length 0.05, 0.1, and 0.2),
- Basis elements obtained by depth-3 recursive dyadic partitioning (i.e., pick a feature, split along its median, and recurse), and
- Leaves generated by a regression tree on the W_i ([Breiman et al., 1984](#)).

The idea behind using this expanded class is that we may be able to improve the practical performance of the method by opportunistically adding a small number of basis functions that help mitigate bias in case of misspecification (i.e., when μ and τ do not have finite gauge $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}}$). The motivation for focusing on transformations of $\hat{e}(X_i)$ is that accurately stratifying on $e(X_i)$ would suffice to eliminate all confounding in the model (19).¹⁵ Because $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$ is a function of $Z_1 \dots Z_n$ for $Z_i = (X_i, W_i)$, it is not necessary to use a cross-fitting scheme like the one described in Section 2.3.¹⁶ With both $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$, we take $\sigma^2 = 1$ in (21).

¹⁵In the case of binary treatments W_i , this corresponds to the classical result of [Rosenbaum and Rubin \(1983\)](#), who showed that the propensity score is a balancing score. With non-binary treatments, $\mathbb{E}[W_i | X_i]$ is not in general a balancing score ([Imbens, 2000](#)); however, it is a balancing score for our specific model (19).

¹⁶Theorem 2 gives bounds for the augmented minimax linear estimator based on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$ that depend on the complexity of a class \mathcal{F} that satisfies $\mathcal{F} \supset \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}_+}$ with high probability, e.g., one including indicators for strata of all functions in \mathcal{M} and the leaves of low-depth trees partitioning the covariates.

The remaining methods we consider all combine a regression adjustment $(\hat{\mu}(x), \hat{\tau}(x))$ with various weighting schemes. To get such regression adjustments, we first fit the marginal response function $r(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i | X_i = x]$ and $e(x)$ via a cross-validated lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) on the basis $\phi(x)$. We then fit $\tau(x)$ via the R -lasso method proposed by Nie and Wager (2017), again on $\phi(x)$, and finally set $\hat{\mu}(x) = \hat{r}(x) - \hat{\tau}(x)\hat{e}(x)$. As discussed in Nie and Wager (2017), this method is appropriate when the treatment effect function $\tau(x)$ is simpler than $r(x)$ and $e(x)$, and allows for faster rates of convergence on $\tau(x)$ than the other regression components whenever the nuisance components can be estimated at $o_p(n^{-1/4})$ rates in root-mean squared error. We use the same regression adjustment for all methods. Note that we only use the basis $\phi(x)$ for this regression; we do not use the random basis functions that we used to define \mathcal{M}_+ .

Ten-fold cross-fitting is used throughout: where $\hat{\tau}(X_i)$ and $\hat{\mu}(X_i)$ appear in (22) and (23), we use estimators $\hat{\tau}^{(-i)}$ and $\hat{\mu}^{(-i)}$ trained on the folds that do not include unit i . This reduces dependence on (Y_i, X_i, W_i) and therefore mitigates potential own-observation bias in $\hat{\psi}_{DR}$ (see e.g., Chernozhukov et al., 2018). However, we do get some dependence through the estimates of \hat{r} and \hat{e} used to train $\hat{\tau}$ and through lasso tuning parameters, which are chosen once for all i by cross-validation. This dependence can be eliminated using a computationally demanding nested sample splitting scheme; we follow the `grf` package of Athey, Tibshirani and Wager (2019) in using the following simplified scheme.

1. Partition the indices $1 \dots n$ into $K = 10$ folds of equal size, associating each index with a fold $f_i \in 1 \dots K$.
2. For each fold $j \in 1 \dots K$, train \hat{r}_{j, λ_r} and \hat{e}_{j, λ_e} on observations for $\{i : f_i \neq j\}$ for fixed values λ_r, λ_e of the lasso penalty parameter. Choose values $\hat{\lambda}_r, \hat{\lambda}_e$ by cross-validation, solving

$$\hat{\lambda}_r = \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda_r} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{r}_{f_i, \lambda_r}(X_i))^2, \quad \hat{\lambda}_e = \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda_e} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_i - \hat{e}_{f_i, \lambda_e}(X_i))^2.$$

3. For each fold $j \in 1 \dots K$, train $\hat{\tau}_{j, \lambda_\tau}(x) = \phi(x)^T \hat{\beta}_j$ for fixed λ_τ by

$$\hat{\beta}_j = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tau} \sum_{i: f_i \neq j} (Y_i - \hat{r}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_r}(X_i) - (W_i - \hat{e}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_e}(X_i))\phi(X_i)^T \beta_j)^2 + \lambda_\tau \|\beta_j\|_{\ell_1}.$$

Choose a value $\hat{\lambda}_\tau$ by cross-validation, solving

$$\hat{\lambda}_\tau = \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{r}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_r}(X_i) - (W_i - \hat{e}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_e}(X_i))\hat{\tau}_{f_i, \lambda_\tau}(X_i))^2.$$

4. Define $\hat{\tau}^{(-i)} = \hat{\tau}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_\tau}$ and $\hat{\mu}^{(-i)} = \hat{\tau}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_\tau}(x) - \hat{\tau}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_\tau}(x) \hat{e}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_e}(x)$.

The estimator of $v_w(x) = \text{Var}[W | X = x]$ used in the plugin double robust method is via cross-fit lasso regressing $(W_i - \hat{e}_{f_i, \hat{\lambda}_e}(X_i))^2$ on $\phi(X_i)$.

Our theoretical results for $\hat{\psi}_{AML}$ do not justify the use of this cross-fitting scheme, as $\hat{m}^{(-i)}(x, w) = \hat{\mu}^{(-i)}(x) + w\hat{\tau}^{(-i)}(x)$ is a function of the fold indicator f_i as well as x, w , and for this reason $\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} = \infty$. This does not, however, seem to cause problems in our simulations.

APPENDIX D: COMPUTING THE WEIGHTS

The optimization problem (8) that defines our weights $\hat{\gamma}$,

$$\hat{\gamma} = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2(\gamma) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2, \quad I_{h, \mathcal{F}}(\gamma) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i f(Z_i) - h(Z_i, f)].$$

is strongly convex and not extremely high dimensional, so it is often fairly tractable. However, because the objective function involves a supremum over a set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, it is helpful to reformulate the problem for implementation. We will discuss the case that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is the absolutely convex hull $\text{absconv}\{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots\}$. We will assume, in addition, that we have decay in ϕ_j and $h(\cdot, \phi_j)$ that justifies working with a finite dimensional approximation to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, the absolutely convex hull $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p$ of the first p basis functions. When we do this, our optimization problem above can be expressed as a finite-dimensional quadratic program,

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{(t, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}}{\text{argmin}} \quad t^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2 && \text{subject to} \\ & \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i \phi_j(Z_i) - h(Z_i, \phi_j)] \right| \leq t && \text{for } j \in 1 \dots p, \end{aligned}$$

as Hölder's inequality is sharp on ℓ_1 , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\gamma) &= \sup_{\|\beta\|_{\ell_1} \leq 1} \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i \phi_j(Z_i) - h(Z_i, \phi_j)] \right) \\ &= \max_{j \leq p} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i \phi_j(Z_i) - h(Z_i, \phi_j)] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Our implementation of the average partial effect estimator described in Section 3.1, included in the R package `amlinear`, uses a variant of this for-

mulation appropriate to the class \mathcal{F}_M (20):

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{(t_\mu, t_\tau, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad t_\mu^2 + t_\tau^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2 && \text{subject to} \\ & \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \phi_j(Z_i) \right| \leq t_\mu && \text{for } j \in 1 \dots p, \\ & \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_i \gamma_i - 1) \phi_j(Z_i) \right| \leq t_\tau && \text{for } j \in 1 \dots p. \end{aligned}$$

Finite-dimensional approximation. To determine the number of basis functions we need to include in $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p$, we consider the conditional bias term in (15). For any weights γ , it is bounded by

$$\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\gamma) = \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \left[I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\gamma) + I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\gamma) - I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\gamma) \right].$$

In particular, for

$$\hat{\gamma} = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2(\gamma) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2, \quad \hat{\gamma}_p = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}^2(\gamma) + \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \|\gamma\|^2,$$

we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\hat{\gamma}_p) + \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \left(I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_p) - I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\hat{\gamma}_p) \right) \\ & \leq \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}) + \|\hat{m} - m\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \left(I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_p) - I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\hat{\gamma}_p) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The excess that results from the use of $\hat{\gamma}_p$ instead of $\hat{\gamma}$ is bounded by the latter term. In this term, the difference $I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_p) - I_{h, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}(\hat{\gamma}_p)$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \inf_{f' \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p} \left(\|\hat{\gamma}_p\| \|f - f'\|_{L_2(P_n)} + \|h(\cdot, f - f')\|_{L_2(P_n)} \right) \\ & \leq \|\hat{\gamma}_p\| \sup_{j > p} \|\phi_j\|_{L_2(P_n)} + \sup_{j > p} \|h(\cdot, \phi_j)\|_{L_2(P_n)}, \end{aligned}$$

so we choose p to control these suprema. To ensure that this excess is negligible relative to variance, so our estimator is asymptotically linear under the assumptions of Theorem 1, these suprema must be $o_P(n^{-1/2})$.

D.1. A dual approach. In Section 2.3, we describe an approach that incorporates a regression function \hat{m} trained on an auxiliary sample into $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$, which is defined as $\operatorname{absconv}(\hat{m} - \mathcal{F}') \cap \rho L_2(P_n)$ for a set \mathcal{F}' which we will take

to be $\text{absconv}\{\phi_1 \dots \phi_p\}$. This is simply $\text{absconv}(\{\tilde{\phi}_1 \dots \tilde{\phi}_p\}) \cap \rho L_2(P_n)$ for $\tilde{\phi}_j = \hat{m} - \phi_j$. Because of the intersection with $\rho L_2(P_n)$, the approach above will not work, as Hölder's inequality will not be sharp. It is more natural to use the dual characterization of $\hat{\gamma}$ given by Lemma 5,

$$\hat{\gamma}_i = \hat{g}(Z_i) \quad \text{for} \quad \hat{g} = \underset{g}{\operatorname{argmin}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(Z_i)^2 - 2h(Z_i, g)] + \sigma^2 n^{-1} \|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p}^2,$$

i.e., $\hat{\gamma}_i = \tilde{\phi}(Z_i)^T \hat{\beta}$ for

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \beta^T \Phi \beta - 2h^T \beta + \sigma^2 n^{-1} \max\{\|\beta\|_{\ell_1}^2, \rho^{-2} \beta^T \Phi \beta\},$$

$$\Phi = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\phi}(Z_i) \tilde{\phi}(Z_i)^T, \quad h_j = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i, \tilde{\phi}_j).$$

We can solve this by splitting β into positive and negative parts, which gives an equivalent second order cone program: $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}^+ - \hat{\beta}^-$ where the latter solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{(s, t, \beta^+, \beta^-) \in \mathbb{R}^{2p+2}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad s - 2(h \quad -h) \begin{pmatrix} \beta^+ \\ \beta^- \end{pmatrix} + \sigma^2 n^{-1} t \quad \text{subject to} \\ & \beta^+, \beta^- \geq 0, \\ & \begin{pmatrix} \beta^+ \\ \beta^- \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} \Phi & -\Phi \\ -\Phi & \Phi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta^+ \\ \beta^- \end{pmatrix} \leq s, \\ & \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^+ + \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^- \right)^2 \leq t, \\ & \rho^{-2} s \leq t. \end{aligned}$$

D.2. Computation in Hilbert Spaces. The approaches discussed above rely on finite-dimensional approximation and efficient solvers for quadratic and second order cone programs. In contrast, when $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is the unit ball of a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space, we can often solve the dual

$$\hat{g} = \underset{g}{\operatorname{argmin}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(Z_i)^2 - 2h(Z_i, g)] + \sigma^2 n^{-1} \|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^2$$

without approximation by solving a $n \times n$ linear system. In particular, if $h(Z_i, g)$ is a function of $g(Z_i)$, a well-known Representer theorem states that the solution to this problem has the form $\hat{g}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\alpha}_j K(Z_j, z)$, where $K(z', z)$ is the kernel associated with our space ([Schölkopf](#), [Herbrich](#)

and Smola, 2001). When \hat{g} is known to have this form, we can calculate $\hat{\alpha}$ by substituting $g(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j K(Z_j, z)$ into our dual problem above and solving the resulting unconstrained quadratic optimization problem over α ,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha} \alpha^T \bar{K} \alpha - 2\bar{h}^T \alpha + \sigma^2 n^{-1} \alpha^T G \alpha, \\ \bar{K}_{ij} &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n K(Z_i, Z_k) K(Z_j, Z_k), \\ \bar{h}_i &= n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n h(Z_k, K(Z_i, \cdot)), \\ G_{ij} &= K(Z_i, Z_j).\end{aligned}$$

This approach works in Example 1, as $h(Z_i, g)$ has the required form, and variations apply in our other examples, as similar representer theorems hold under appropriate conditions (see e.g. Argyriou and Dinuzzo, 2014).

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
390 SERRA MALL
STANFORD, CA-94305, USA
E-MAIL: davidahirshberg@stanford.edu

STANFORD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
655 KNIGHT WAY
STANFORD, CA-94305, USA
E-MAIL: swager@stanford.edu