

Hypothesis Testing of Blip Effects in Sequential Causal Inference

Xiaoqin Wang¹ and Li Yin²

¹University of Gävle, Sweden.

²Karolinska Institutet, Sweden. Correspondence: Li.Yin@ki.se

Abstract

In this article, we study the hypothesis testing of the blip / net effects of treatments in a treatment sequence. We illustrate that the likelihood ratio test and the score test may suffer from the curse of dimensionality, the null paradox and the high-dimensional constraint on standard parameters under the null hypothesis. On the other hand, we construct the Wald test via a small number of point effects of treatments in single-point causal inference. We show that the Wald test can avoid these problems under the same assumptions as the Wald test for testing the point effect of treatment. The simulation study illustrates that the Wald test achieves the nominal level of type I error and a low level of type II error. A real medical example illustrates how to conduct the Wald test in practice.

Key words: blip effect of treatment; hypothesis testing; point effect of treatment; sequential causal inference; Wald test

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 62F03; 62F05; 62F30

1 Introduction

In many economic and medical researches, treatments are assigned in the form of a sequence to influence an outcome of interest that occurs after the last treatment of the sequence. Between treatments, there are often time-dependent covariates that may be posttreatment variables of the earlier

treatments and confounders of the subsequent treatments. The blip effect of treatment is the causal effect of the treatment on the outcome given the history of previous treatments and covariates while setting the subsequent treatments at controls (Robins, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018). It is also called the net effect of treatment (Wang and Yin, 2015). The blip effect plays a central role in sequential causal inference for the following reasons. The blip effect reveals the effect modification of covariates on the outcome, which is of considerable interest in practice (Robin, 1997; Almirall et al., 2010; Hernan and Robins, 2018). From the blip effect of treatment at a particular time, we can find the optimal treatment at that time given the previous treatments and covariates (Robin, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018). From the blip effects of all treatments in the sequence, we can obtain the causal effect of any treatment regime on the outcome and find the optimal treatment regime (Robin, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018; Wang and Yin, 2019).

When estimating the blip effects via standard parameters, two problems may occur: the curse of dimensionality and the null paradox. The curse of dimensionality implies that if a treatment sequence is long and / or the number of covariates is large, a huge number of standard parameters are needed in the estimation. The null paradox implies that even if the blip effects are all null, any unsaturated model is misspecified that imposes equalities between standard parameters. Several methods are available to address the two problems, which include the parametric model based on the well-known G -formula (Taubman et al., 2009), the marginal structural model based on the inverse probability of treatment weighting (Robins, 1999) and the doubly robust method based on the structural nested mean model (SNMM) (Robins, 1997). SNMM describes a pattern of the blip effects and is specified as a deterministic function indexed by a parameter vector of small dimension.

When testing the blip effects via standard parameters, additional problem may occur: the estimation needs to be carried out under the null hypothesis, which is expressed as a constraint among standard parameters. For a long treatment sequence and plentiful covariates, the constraint consists of many complex equations in standard parameters. This high-dimensional constraint implied by the null hypothesis, together with the curse of dimensionality and the null paradox, makes the testing problem highly difficult. Probably due to these three problems, there are few literatures on the hypothesis testing of the blip effects. To the best of our knowledge, only one attempt has been made in which the authors used the doubly robust method to model

SNMM under special circumstances, where strong assumptions are imposed on SNMM and the method (Wallace et al., 2016).

On the other hand, Wang and Yin (2019) derived the new G -formula, which identifies the blip effect via the point effects of treatments. The point effect is simply the point effect of treatment in the framework of single-point causal inference, and its estimation and hypothesis testing have been well studied (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). Hopefully, the new G -formula will help to find a workable way of testing the blip effects.

In this article, we study the hypothesis testing of blip effects. In Section 2, we describe the hypothesis and illustrate that the likelihood ratio test and the score test suffer from the curse of dimensionality, the null paradox and the high-dimensional constraint on standard parameters under the null hypothesis. In Section 3, we construct the Wald test via point effects and show that it does not necessarily suffer from these problems. In Section 4, we illustrate some finite sample properties of the Wald test by simulation. In Section 5, we illustrate the application of our method via a real medical example. In Section 6, we conclude the article with discussion.

2 Hypothesis testing of blip effects in sequential causal inference

Here we will introduce key elements of this work in Section 2.1 and review the blip effect, the point effect and the new G -formula in Section 2.2. Then we will explicate the hypothesis on the blip effects in Section 2.3 and finally illustrate with an example the problems from which the likelihood ratio test and the score test suffer.

2.1 Treatments, covariates and the outcome

Consider a set of random variables in the temporal order: $(\mathbf{X}_1, Z_1, \mathbf{X}_2, Z_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_T, Z_T, Y)$, where Z_t are the treatment variables at times $t = 1, \dots, T$, \mathbf{X}_1 is a stationary covariate vector before Z_1 , \mathbf{X}_t ($t = 2, \dots, T$) are time-dependent covariate vectors between Z_{t-1} and Z_t , and Y is the outcome of interest after the last treatment Z_T . Let $\mathbf{Z}_1^t = (Z_1, \dots, Z_t)$, $\mathbf{X}_1^t = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_t)$, and $(\mathbf{X}_1^T, \mathbf{Z}_1^T, Y) = (\mathbf{X}_1, Z_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_T, Z_T, Y)$. These variables have the realizations $(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T, y) = (\mathbf{x}_1, z_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T, z_T, y)$.

In the following, we will use $P(\cdot)$ to denote the probability distribution of discrete variables or the density distribution of continuous variables. The joint distribution of $(\mathbf{X}_1^T, \mathbf{Z}_1^T, Y)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T, y) \\ &= P(\mathbf{x}_1)P(z_1 | \mathbf{x}_1) \cdots P(\mathbf{x}_T | \mathbf{x}_1^{T-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{T-1})P(z_T | \mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^{T-1})P(y | \mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The standard parameter for the conditional distribution $P(\mathbf{x}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$ of covariate \mathbf{X}_t given the history $(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$ is the conditional mean $E(\mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$. Let $\Psi_{\mathbf{x}_t} = \{E(\mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})\}$ be the set of all these standard parameters for $P(\mathbf{x}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$ at t . The standard parameter for $P(\mathbf{z}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$ is $E(\mathbf{Z}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$. Let $\Psi_{\mathbf{z}_t} = \{E(\mathbf{Z}_t | \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})\}$. The standard parameter for $P(y | \mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$ is $\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T) = E(Y | \mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$. Let $\Psi_y = \{\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)\}$.

2.2 Blip effects, point effects and the new G -formula

Throughout the article, we assume that there is no unmeasured confounder for the assignment of treatment z_t (Robins, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018). Although the assumption is not testable, it can be satisfied in practice. The assumption is satisfied in sequential randomized experiments where z_t is randomly assigned according to a history $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$ of the earlier treatments and covariates. It is approximately satisfied in observational studies with a sufficient array \mathbf{x}_1^t of covariates.

The blip effect $\phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)$ is the causal effect of active treatment $z_t > 0$ relative to control treatment $z_t = 0$ on the outcome Y given $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$ when the subsequent treatments are set at controls, that is, $\mathbf{z}_{t+1}^T = \mathbf{0}$. Under the assumption of no unmeasured confounders, the blip effect can be expressed in terms of the standard parameters $\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$ by the well-known G -formula (Robins, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018). It can also be expressed in terms of the point effects by the new G -formula (Wang and Yin, 2019), as described below.

Let $\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t) = E(Y | \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t)$ be the conditional mean of Y given $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t)$. The point effect of treatment $z_t > 0$ is

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t) - \mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0). \quad (2)$$

Noticeably, $\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)$ is simply the point effect of treatment z_t in single-point causal inference, and its estimation and hypothesis testing have been well studied (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983).

Under the assumption of no unmeasured confounders, Wang and Yin (2019) decomposed the point effect $\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)$ of z_t into the blip effects of z_t and the subsequent treatments \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^T by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) \\ &+ \sum_{s=t+1}^T E_1\{\phi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^s, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^{s-1}; z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t\} \\ &- \sum_{s=t+1}^T E_2\{\phi(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^s, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^{s-1}; z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the conditional expectation $E_1(\cdot)$ is with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^s, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^{s-1}, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t)$ and $E_2(\cdot)$ to $P(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^s, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^{s-1}, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0)$. Noticeably at $t = T$, $\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^{T-1}; z_T) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^{T-1}; z_T)$. They also derived its converse form in which the blip effect is expressed in terms of the point effects and called the two formulas the new G -formula for the blip effect.

2.3 Hypothesis on blip effects

Robins (Robins, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018) pointed out that in most practices, the blip effects follow a certain pattern described by SNMM

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = f(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t; \boldsymbol{\gamma}), \quad t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where $f(\cdot)$ is a deterministic function of $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t)$ indexed by a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k)'$ of small dimension called the blip effect parameter. For example, a simple dose-effect relationship of SNMM is given by $\phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \gamma z_t$, where γ is a one-dimensional vector; if there is additionally the effect modification by \mathbf{x}_t , then SNMM is described by $\phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \gamma_1 z_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2' z_t \mathbf{x}_t$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2)'$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2$ has the same dimension as \mathbf{x}_t .

In this article, we focus on a linear SNMM, namely,

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j f_j(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t), \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (4)$$

However, our method of testing $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ can be extended to the non-linear SNMM.

In sequential causal inference, it is essential to test the blip effects, or equivalently, the blip effect parameter γ due to (4). In the rest of the article, we test the hypotheses of the form

$$H_0 : \mathbf{H}\gamma - \boldsymbol{\rho} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : \mathbf{H}\gamma - \boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \mathbf{0} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{H} is a $l \times k$ matrix with $l \leq k$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is a constant l -dimensional vector.

2.4 Problems with likelihood ratio test and score test

According to the well-known G -formula (Robins, 1997; Hernan and Robins, 2018), the blip effects are functions of all standard parameters for the joint distribution (1) of the treatments, covariates and outcome. Therefore, the likelihood ratio test on γ requires estimating all standard parameters under a constraint implied by the hypothesis H_0 . The score test requires calculating the score functions for all standard parameters and evaluating these functions at the estimates of these standard parameters obtained under the null hypothesis H_0 . In the following, we illustrate three major problems of the two tests by an example.

We consider a treatment sequence of length $T = 10$, in which covariates X_t and treatments Z_t are all dichotomous. Suppose the null hypothesis H_0 is such that all blip effects are equal to one another and can be described by a blip effect parameter γ of one dimension. When testing the hypothesis by the likelihood ratio test or the score test, we need to estimate a huge amount of standard parameters: $2^{20} = 1048576$ standard parameters for the conditional distribution $P(y \mid \mathbf{x}_1^{10}, \mathbf{z}_1^{10})$, $2^{19} = 524288$ for $P(z_{10} \mid \mathbf{x}_1^{10}, \mathbf{z}_1^9)$, $2^{18} = 26144$ for $P(x_{10} \mid \mathbf{x}_1^9, \mathbf{z}_1^9)$, and $2^{17} + \dots + 2 = 262142$ for $P(\mathbf{x}_1^9, \mathbf{z}_1^9)$ (namely, the curse of dimensionality). Even under the null hypothesis, these standard parameters are essentially all different, because covariate X_t ($t = 2, \dots, 10$) is a posttreatment variable of the earlier treatments \mathbf{Z}_1^{t-1} and confounders of the subsequent treatments \mathbf{Z}_t^{10} (namely, the null paradox). The null hypothesis implies a constraint consisting of 699049 equations in these standard parameters (namely, the high-dimensional constraint on standard parameters under H_0).

In the next section, we will show that the Wald test has the flexibility of allowing for estimating and testing γ via a small number of the point effects instead of standard parameters and thus does not necessarily suffer from these three problems.

3 Wald test for blip effects

First, we will construct a model for the point effects indexed by the blip effect parameter in Section 3.1. Second, we will use the model to estimate the blip effect parameter conditional on all treatments and covariates in Section 3.2. Third, we will use the conditional estimate to obtain the marginal estimate of the blip effect parameter in Section 3.3. Then, we will use the asymptotic distribution of the marginal estimate to construct the Wald test for the blip effect parameter in Section 3.4. Finally, we introduce the practical procedure for conducting the hypothesis test.

3.1 Model for point effects

SNMM describes a pattern of the blip effects and often has a simple form in practice. To fix the idea, we assume that the blip effect of treatment z_t depends only on the last covariate \mathbf{x}_t . For instance, the blip effect of a blood pressure drug (z_t) usually depends only on the latest blood pressure and the prognosis factors (\mathbf{x}_t). In this case, SNMM (4) becomes

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j f_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t). \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, the assignment of z_t often satisfies certain conditions in practice, that is, it depends only on part of the history $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1})$. Even in observation studies, the assignment of z_t can be approximated by a number of sub randomized trials called subclasses (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). To fix the idea, we assume that it only depends on the latest covariate \mathbf{x}_t , so that

$$P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t). \quad (7)$$

We will use (6) and (7) to develop our testing method. However, our method can be applied to other SNMMs and treatment assignment conditions.

Consider the conditional mean

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = E(Y \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t), \quad (8)$$

where the expectation is with respect to the conditional probability $P(y \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$. The point effect of $z_t > 0$ in stratum \mathbf{x}_t is

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = \mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) - \mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0). \quad (9)$$

As well-known in single-point causal inference (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983), formula (7) implies

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = E\{\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\}, \quad (10)$$

where the expectation is with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$. In Supplement I of Supporting Material, we also provide a proof for (10). Noticeably, $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$ are far fewer than $\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)$.

By decomposing the point effect $\theta(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}; z_t)$ into components γ_j of the blip effect parameter $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, we obtain the model for point effects

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j c_j(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t), \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (11)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} c_j(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) &= f_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) + \sum_{s=t+1}^T E_1\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{s=t+1}^T E_2\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the expectation $E_1(\cdot)$ is with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ and $E_2(\cdot)$ to $P(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$. Noticeably at $t = T$, $c_j(\mathbf{x}_T; z_T) = f_j(\mathbf{x}_T, z_T)$. The $c_j(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$ is a sum of the contributions to component γ_j of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ from stratum (\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) versus $(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$. Given all treatments and covariates $(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, model (11) is an unsaturated model for the point effects $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$ and indexed by a k -dimensional blip effect parameter $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. In Supplement I of Supporting Material, we will provide a proof for (11) by applying (6) and (7) to the new G -formula (3).

For convenience, we use $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ to denote a vector of the point effects $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$ for different (\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) at time t . Putting all $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ together, we obtain the point effect vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_T)'$. Let $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = \{c_1(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t), \dots, c_k(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)\}$. We use \mathbf{C}_t to denote the matrix with row vectors $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ for different (\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) at time t ; Putting all \mathbf{C}_t together, we obtain the design matrix $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{C}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{C}'_T)'$. Then, model (11) can be written in the vector form as

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\gamma}. \quad (12)$$

Applying this model, we identify γ by

$$\gamma = (\mathbf{C}'\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{C})^{-1}\mathbf{C}'\Sigma^{-1}\boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (13)$$

where Σ is a positive definite matrix, which can be arbitrarily chosen such that the matrix $(\mathbf{C}'\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{C})$ is invertible.

Several statements can be made about model (11) or equivalently (12). First, the sizes of the point effect vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and the design matrix \mathbf{C} are only proportional to the length T of treatment sequence; potentially we may use (12) to estimate the blip effect parameter γ and overcome the curse of dimensionality. Second, given $(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$ and thus \mathbf{C} , model (12) is an unsaturated model for the point effect vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and indexed by a k -dimensional parameter vector $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k)'$; potentially we may use (12) to improve the estimation and overcome the null paradox. Third, the γ is the model parameter in (12); potentially we may use (12) to estimate γ under the null hypothesis H_0 , avoiding the high-dimensional constraint on standard parameters under H_0 .

Let us look at the example of Section 2.4, where the treatment sequence is $T = 10$, treatments and covariates are all dichotomous, and the null hypothesis H_0 is such that all blip effects are equal to one another and described by a one-dimensional blip effect parameter γ . Then the point effect vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ consists of only 20 point effects $\theta(x_t; z_t = 1)$ ($t = 1, \dots, 10; x_t = 0, 1$). Applying (11) or (12), the point effect $\theta(x_t; z_t)$ decomposes into

$$\theta(x_t; z_t) = c(x_t; z_t)\gamma, \quad t = 1, \dots, 10,$$

where $c(x_t; z_t) = 1 + \sum_{s=t+1}^{10} \{P(z_s = 1 \mid x_t, z_t) - P(z_s = 1 \mid x_t, z_t = 0)\}$. Thus, the design matrix \mathbf{C} becomes a column vector of 20 elements $c(x_t; z_t = 1)$. Furthermore, the model is unsaturated for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and indexed by only one parameter γ . Meanwhile, it is also the model under H_0 . In contrast, the likelihood ratio test and the score test still suffer from the curse of dimensionality, the null paradox and the high-dimensional constraint on standard parameters under H_0 , because all the standard parameters are still involved in these tests and the time-dependent covariates are still posttreatment variables as well as confounders.

3.2 Conditional estimate of blip effect parameter given all treatments and covariates

Suppose a data of observations $(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T, y_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ from the random variables $(\mathbf{X}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{Z}_{i1}^T, Y_i)$ identically and independently distributed according to distribution (1). Then we have the following complete likelihood of the standard parameters according to (1)

$$L(\{\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T, y_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \quad (14a)$$

$$\prod_{t=1}^T \prod_{i=1}^n P(\mathbf{x}_{it} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i1}^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^{t-1}; \Psi_{\mathbf{x}_t}) P(z_{it} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i1}^t, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^{t-1}; \Psi_{z_t}) \quad (14b)$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^n P(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T; \Psi_y). \quad (14c)$$

We will estimate the blip effect parameter γ based on the conditional likelihood (14c) in this subsection and based on the complete likelihood (14a) in the next subsection.

The distribution $P(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$ of treatments and covariates is estimated by the corresponding proportion $\hat{P}(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$. Given $\{(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T)\}$, this proportion has no variability and is denoted by $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, where the subscript 'c' indicates that it is conditional on $\{(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T)\}$. Applying $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, we identify the conditional distribution $P(y \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ by

$$P_c(y \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = E_c\{P(y \mid \mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\},$$

where the expectation is with respect to $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_{t+1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^T \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ obtained from $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$. Then, we identify the mean $\mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ by

$$\mu_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = E_c(Y \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t), \quad (15)$$

where the expectation is with respect to $P_c(y \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ obtained above. According to (9), the point effect $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$ is then identified by

$$\theta_c(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = \mu_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) - \mu_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0).$$

Therefore, the point effect vector θ_t is identified by $\theta_{c,t}$ which consists of $\theta_c(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$, and θ by θ_c which consists of $\theta_{c,t}$. Furthermore, given the proportion $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, the $c_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ and thus $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, \mathbf{C}_t and \mathbf{C} are all given and

denoted by $c_{c,j}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\mathbf{c}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\mathbf{C}_{c,t}$ and \mathbf{C}_c . According to (13), the blip effect parameter γ is then identified by

$$\gamma_c = (\mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \mathbf{C}_c)^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \boldsymbol{\theta}_c, \quad (16)$$

where Σ_c is a positive definite matrix such that $(\mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \mathbf{C}_c)$ is invertible.

Based on the conditional likelihood (14c), we only need to estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_c$ to estimate γ_c . Formula (15) implies that we can estimate $\mu_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ by taking the average of y_i in stratum (\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) . Using $\hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, we obtain $\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = \hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) - \hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$ and then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t}$ for all point effects at time t . Clearly, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t}$ is unbiased. We may use standard softwares to obtain the covariance matrix $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t})$.

In Supplement I of Supporting Material, we show that for the normal outcome,

$$\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,s}; \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t}) = 0, \quad s \neq t, \quad (17)$$

which means that conditional on $\{(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T)\}$, the estimates of the point effects are not correlated at different times. For the outcome of common distributions, the mean $\mu_c(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s)$ and thus $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{c,s}$ are highly robust to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{c,t}$ at time $t > s$, so we assume (17) for non-normal outcomes in the following development. This assumption only leads to a minor loss of efficiency in a regression, see, for instance, Sen and Srivastava (1997). Furthermore, it is far weaker than those assumptions for the variance-covariance structure used in the existing estimation methods, for instance, Almirall et al. (2010), Wallace et al. (2016) and Wang and Yin (2019).

Putting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t}$ at $t = 1, \dots, T$ together, we obtain the unbiased estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ for all point effects. The conditional covariance matrix $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c)$ is then a diagonal matrix with diagonal submatrices $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t})$ at times $t = 1, \dots, T$. Let $\Sigma_c = \text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c)$. If $(\mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \mathbf{C}_c)$ is invertible, then we regress $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$ on the obtained design matrix \mathbf{C}_c according to model (12) and obtain

Proposition 1 *Based on the conditional likelihood (14c), the estimate for γ_c is*

$$\hat{\gamma}_c = (\mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \mathbf{C}_c)^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c. \quad (18)$$

Furthermore, the estimate is unbiased: $E_c(\hat{\gamma}_c) = \gamma_c$. The conditional covariance matrix is

$$\text{cov}_c(\hat{\gamma}_c) = (\mathbf{C}'_c \Sigma_c^{-1} \mathbf{C}_c)^{-1}. \quad (19)$$

Now we study the asymptotic properties of

$$\hat{\gamma}_{n,c} = (\mathbf{C}'_{n,c} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n,c}^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{n,c})^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_{n,c} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n,c}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c},$$

where n indicates the sample size. Noticeably, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,c,t}$ at time $t = 1, \dots, T$ is an estimand in single-point causal inference. The conditions for the consistency and asymptotic normality of its estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c,t}$ are well studied in single-point causal inference and satisfied in most practices, see, for instance, Fahrmeir and Tutz (1994).

If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c,t}$ is consistent, so is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c}$. Therefore $\hat{\gamma}_{n,c}$ is consistent with $\gamma_{n,c}$ given by (16). If the estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c,t}$ is asymptotically normal: $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,c,t}) \xrightarrow{d} N\{\mathbf{0}, \text{ncov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c,t})\}$, so is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c}$: $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,c}) \xrightarrow{d} N\{\mathbf{0}, \text{ncov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,c})\}$. Therefore $\hat{\gamma}_{n,c}$ is also asymptotically normal:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\gamma}_{n,c} - \gamma_{n,c}) \xrightarrow{d} N\{\mathbf{0}, \text{ncov}_c(\hat{\gamma}_{n,c})\}.$$

However, even if $\gamma_{n,c}$ may converge to γ , the asymptotic normal distribution of $\hat{\gamma}_{n,c}$ cannot be used to construct the Wald test for hypotheses on γ , because this distribution does not incorporate the variability of treatments and covariates. However, in the next subsection, we will use $\hat{\gamma}_{n,c}$ and $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\gamma}_{n,c})$ to obtain the marginal estimate of γ and its covariance matrix based on the complete likelihood (14a) incorporating the variability of treatments and covariates.

3.3 Marginal estimate of blip effect parameter

Based on the complete likelihood (14a), the estimates of $\mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $c_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, \mathbf{C}_t , \mathbf{C} , and finally γ are marginal estimates and denoted by $\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\hat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, $\hat{c}_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_t$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$, and finally $\hat{\gamma}$.

Formula (8) implies that we can obtain the estimate $\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ by taking the average of y_i in stratum (\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) . Using $\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, we obtain $\hat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) - \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$ and then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Comparing with $\hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ obtained from the previous subsection, we see $\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = \hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, both being the average of y_i in stratum (\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) . Therefore, we have $\hat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = \hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$, and then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$.

Given the proportion $\hat{P}(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, then the estimates $\hat{c}_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_t$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$ are given; here we use ' $\hat{}$ ' to emphasize that these estimates possess variabilities of treatments and covariates, namely, they have non-zero

variances. Because $\hat{P}(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T) = P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, we have $\hat{c}_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = c_{c,j}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$. Therefore, we have $\hat{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = \mathbf{c}_c(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_t = \mathbf{C}_{c,t}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}_c$.

Let $\Sigma_t = E\{\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t})\}$ with respect to the probability $P(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$. Then an estimate of Σ_t is $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t})$: $\hat{\Sigma}_t = \text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t})$. Take Σ as a diagonal matrix with diagonal submatrices Σ_t at times $t = 1, \dots, T$. Recalling that Σ_c is the diagonal matrix with diagonal submatrices $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{c,t})$ at times $t = 1, \dots, T$, we have that an estimate of Σ is Σ_c : $\hat{\Sigma} = \Sigma_c$.

Now from (13) and (18), we see $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c$, implying that the marginal estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is equal to the conditional estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_c$. However, the marginal covariance matrix $\text{cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$ which incorporates the variability of $\{(\mathbf{X}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{Z}_{i1}^T)\}$ is not equal to the conditional covariance matrix $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c)$ which is condition on $\{(\mathbf{X}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{Z}_{i1}^T)\}$ and does not have such a variability.

Summarizing the above observations and applying Proposition 1, we obtain

Proposition 2 *Based on the complete likelihood (14a), the marginal estimate of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\hat{\mathbf{C}}' \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}' \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_c$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}_c$, and $\hat{\Sigma} = \Sigma_c$, which are based on the conditional likelihood (14c) and given in the previous subsection. However, the marginal estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is biased with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$: $E(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) \neq \boldsymbol{\gamma}$. The marginal covariance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is equal to

$$\text{cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = E\{\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c)\} + \text{cov}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_c),$$

in which $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c)$ is given by (19) and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_c$ by (16).

Proof: The bias is due to the Jensen's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{(\hat{\mathbf{C}}' \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}' \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\} \\ & \neq [\{E(\hat{\mathbf{C}})\}' \{E(\hat{\Sigma})\}^{-1} E(\hat{\mathbf{C}})]^{-1} \{E(\hat{\mathbf{C}})\}' \{E(\hat{\Sigma})\}^{-1} E(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}). \end{aligned}$$

By the law of total covariance, we can decompose the marginal covariance matrix $\text{cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$ into two terms. The first term is the mean of the conditional covariance matrix $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$. Due to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c$, we have $\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = \text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c)$ given by (19). Thus the first term is $E\{\text{cov}_c(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c)\}$. The second term is the covariance matrix of the conditional mean of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$. Due to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c$, the conditional mean of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is equal to the conditional mean of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_c$, which is equal

to γ_c given by (16). Thus, the second term is $\text{cov}(\gamma_c)$. Putting the two terms together, we obtain the formula for $\text{cov}(\hat{\gamma})$ in the proposition.

The bias of $\hat{\gamma}$ is small and can be ignored in practical situations, where \mathbf{C} usually varies slowly with $(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$. The small bias will also be illustrated by simulation in Section 4. To estimate the marginal covariance matrix $\text{cov}(\hat{\gamma})$ in practice, we can apply the bootstrap method to formula (20).

Now we study the asymptotic properties of

$$\hat{\gamma}_n = (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n' \hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n' \hat{\Sigma}_n^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n,$$

where n indicates the sample size. Noticeably, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{n,t}$, $\Sigma_{n,t}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{n,t}$ at time $t = 1, \dots, T$ are the estimands in single-point causal inference. The conditions for the consistency and asymptotic normality of their estimates are well studied in single-point causal inference and satisfied in most practices, see, for instance, Fahrmeir and Tutz (1994).

If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,t}$ is consistent at each time $t = 1, \dots, T$, so is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$. If $n\hat{\Sigma}_{n,t}$ is consistent, so is $n\hat{\Sigma}_n$. If $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n,t}$ is consistent, so is $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n$. Therefore $\hat{\gamma}_n$ is consistent with

$$\gamma = (\mathbf{C}' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{C}' \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\theta}.$$

Furthermore, if $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n,t}$ is asymptotically normal at each time $t = 1, \dots, T$:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n,t} - \mathbf{C}_t) \xrightarrow{d} N[\mathbf{0}, n\text{cov}\{\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n,t}\}],$$

then $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n$ is asymptotically normal:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n - \mathbf{C}) \xrightarrow{d} N[\mathbf{0}, n\text{cov}\{\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n\}].$$

If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,t}$ is asymptotically normal:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,t} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \xrightarrow{d} N[\mathbf{0}, n\text{cov}\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,t}\}],$$

then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ is also asymptotically normal:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} N[\mathbf{0}, n\text{cov}\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n\}].$$

Because $\hat{\gamma}_n$ is a smooth function of $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n$, $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, also noticing that $n\hat{\Sigma}_n$ and $\{\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n'(n\hat{\Sigma}_n)^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n\}$ are invertible by study design, we have that $\hat{\gamma}_n$ is asymptotically normal:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\gamma}_n - \gamma) \xrightarrow{d} N\{\mathbf{0}, n\text{cov}(\hat{\gamma}_n)\}. \quad (21)$$

Noticeably, the assumptions above on $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{n,t}$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n,t}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{n,t}$ may be weakened for the consistency and asymptotic normality of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, because there are far more point effects from a treatment sequence than from a single-point treatment. More point effects imply more information about $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Although it is of considerable interest particularly for a long treatment sequence, the issue is beyond the scope of this article and will not be further investigated here.

3.4 Wald test

Recall the hypothesis (5), that is,

$$H_0 : \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \boldsymbol{\rho} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \mathbf{0},$$

where \mathbf{H} is a $l \times k$ matrix with $l \leq k$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is a constant l -dimensional vector. Applying the marginal estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ and its covariance matrix $\text{cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}})$ given by Proposition 2 in the previous subsection, we obtain the Wald statistic for the hypothesis as

$$W = (\mathbf{H}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \boldsymbol{\rho})' \{ \mathbf{H} \text{cov}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) \mathbf{H}' \}^{-1} (\mathbf{H}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \boldsymbol{\rho}). \quad (22)$$

Theorem 1 *Suppose that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ is asymptotically normal, namely, formula (21) is true. Then under the null hypothesis H_0 , the Wald statistic W has a limiting χ_l^2 distribution with l degrees of freedom. Under the alternative hypothesis H_1 , the W has a limiting noncentral $\chi_{l,\lambda}^2$ distribution with l degrees of freedom and the noncentrality parameter λ arising from $\mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \mathbf{0}$.*

For a given significance level α , the null hypothesis is rejected if W exceeds the upper $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ quantile of the χ_l^2 distribution.

The obtained Wald test has the following advantages over the likelihood ratio test and the score test.

Remark 1 *First, the blip effect parameter $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is estimated via a small number of point effects $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$, so the curse of dimensionality does not necessarily occur. Second, model (12) is an unsaturated model for these point effects, so the null paradox does not necessarily occur. Third, model (12) allows for estimating $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ under the null hypothesis, so a high-dimensional constraint on standard parameters has been avoided.*

3.5 Procedure of conducting Wald test

In practice, we can conduct the Wald test in the following four stages. In the first stage, we find the treatment assignment condition and conduct initial assessment of the point effects and SNMM. In the second stage, we decompose the point effects into the blip effects to obtain a model for the point effects, as described in Section 3.1. In the third stage, we apply the model to estimate the blip effect parameter, as described in Section 3.2. In the fourth stage, we apply the bootstrap method to the third stage to estimate the marginal covariance matrix for the blip effect parameter, as described in Section 3.3, calculate the Wald statistic and conduct the hypothesis test as described in Section 3.4. This procedure will be illustrated by a simulation study in Section 4 and a real medical study in Section 5.

4 Simulation study

The treatment sequence has a length of $T = 3$. The treatment variables are dichotomous with $Z_t = 0, 1$ ($t = 1, 2, 3$). For simplicity, we do not include the stationary covariate X_1 in the simulation. The time-dependent covariates are polytomous with $X_t = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ($t = 2, 3$). After the last treatment Z_3 , there is an outcome variable Y of interest. A summary of the variables is $(Z_1, X_2, Z_2, X_3, Z_3, Y)$ in the temporal order, with their realizations $(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3, z_3, y)$. Conditional on $(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3, z_3)$, the outcome Y follows the normal, Bernoulli or Poisson distribution.

Suppose SNMM of the following form. At $t = 1$, there is only one blip effect of $z_1 = 1$: $\phi(z_1 = 1) = \gamma_1$. At $t = 2$, there are four blip effects of $z_2 = 1$ depending only on $x_2 = 0, 1, 2, 3$: $\phi(z_1, x_2 = j; z_2 = 1) = \gamma_{2j}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. At $t = 3$, there are four blip effects of $z_3 = 1$ depending only on $x_3 = 0, 1, 2, 3$: $\phi(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3 = j; z_3 = 1) = \gamma_{3j}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Then for this SNMM, we have the blip effect parameter $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_{20}, \gamma_{21}, \gamma_{22}, \gamma_{23}, \gamma_{30}, \gamma_{31}, \gamma_{32}, \gamma_{33})'$. Denote the true value of γ by $\gamma_0 = (\gamma_{1,0}, \gamma_{20,0}, \gamma_{21,0}, \gamma_{22,0}, \gamma_{23,0}, \gamma_{30,0}, \gamma_{31,0}, \gamma_{32,0}, \gamma_{33,0})'$. For normal outcome, we set the true value $\gamma_0 = (2, 3, -4, -4, 3, 3, -4, -4, 3)'$; for dichotomous outcome, $\gamma_0 = (-0.2, 0.1, -0.15, -0.15, 0.1, 0.1, -0.15, -0.15, 0.1)'$; for Poisson outcome, $\gamma_0 = (2, 4, -3, -3, 4, 4, -3, -3, 4)'$.

The treatment assignment satisfies (7), that is, the assignment of z_2 depends only on x_2 and that of z_3 only on x_3 . Then, we have a total of nine

point effects: one $\theta(z_1 = 1)$ of $z_1 = 1$ at time $t = 1$, four $\theta(x_2; z_2 = 1)$ of $z_2 = 1$ with $x_2 = 0, 1, 2, 3$ at $t = 2$, and four $\theta(x_3; z_3 = 1)$ of $z_3 = 1$ with $x_3 = 0, 1, 2, 3$ at $t = 3$. In Supplement II of Supporting Material, we construct the data-generating mechanism that corresponds to the treatment assignment condition and the blip effect parameter above.

We test 10 hypotheses labeled by A through J . The null hypothesis A_0 : $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{1,0}$; the first alternative A_1 : $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{1,0} + c$; the second alternative A_2 : $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{1,0} + 2c$; where $c = 1$ for the normal and Poisson outcomes and $c = 0.1$ for the dichotomous outcome. B_0 through E_0 : $\gamma_{2j} = \gamma_{2j,0}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, respectively; B_1 through E_1 : $\gamma_{2j} = \gamma_{2j,0} + c$; B_2 through E_2 : $\gamma_{2j} = \gamma_{2j,0} + 2c$. F_0 through I_0 : $\gamma_{3j} = \gamma_{3j,0}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, respectively; F_1 through I_1 : $\gamma_{3j} = \gamma_{3j,0} + c$; F_2 through I_2 : $\gamma_{3j} = \gamma_{3j,0} + 2c$. In particular, we also test the equalities between the blip effects at times $t = 2, 3$, that is, J_0 : $\gamma_{2j} = \gamma_{3j}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$; J_1 : $\gamma_{2j} = \gamma_{3j} + c$; J_2 : $\gamma_{2j} = \gamma_{3j} + 2c$.

The sample sizes are chosen as 1000, 2000 and 3000, such that the point effects are estimable. For every sample size, 1000 data sets are generated to simulate the type I and II errors of each outcome type. The covariance matrix for the blip effect parameter is estimated by using the basic bootstrap method with only 500 replications due to our limited computing power. In Supplement II of Supporting Material, we describe the simulation study in detail. The relevant SAS codes used for the simulation are given in Data and Codes of the article.

Table 1 presents the type I and II error rates of hypothesis A through J at the significance level of 0.05. From rate0 of the null hypothesis in the table, we see that the Wald test nearly achieves the nominal level of type I error, despite a crude bootstrap method for the covariance matrix of the blip effect parameter. From rate1 of the first alternative hypothesis and rate2 of the second alternative hypothesis, we see that the type II error decreases with an increasing sample size and an increasing difference between the alternative and null hypotheses. Comparing columns A – E with F – I , we find that the Wald test possesses no less powers for the blip effects of the earlier treatments ($z_1 = 1$ and $z_2 = 1$) than the later treatment ($z_3 = 1$). Considering the small difference between the null and alternative hypotheses (1 or 2 for the normal and Poisson outcomes and 0.1 or 0.2 for the dichotomous outcome), the Wald test is powerful in testing the blip effects.

Table 2 presents the estimate and its variance for the blip effect parameter obtained under no constraint or under the null hypothesis J_0 . For the sake of space, we use only one sample size of 1000. From this table, we see that

the bias of the estimated blip effect parameter is negligible. We also see a considerable reduction in variance under the null hypothesis J_0 compared to no constraint.

5 Medical example

In Sweden, patients usually seek medical help at hospitals near their residential areas. When cancer is diagnosed, they may stay at the diagnosing hospital or transfer to another hospital for treatment. The hospital diagnosing the cancer is called home hospital while the one treating the cancer is called treating hospital. The performance of the home and treating hospitals is of considerable interest to patients, doctors and public health agencies.

Here, we study which types of the home and treating hospitals, large versus small, perform better on cancer survival, where the type is determined by the number of patients received there. The data contains the information of 1070 stomach cancer patients from a clinical study during a period between 1988 and 1995 in hospitals located in central and northern Sweden. Stomach cancer is highly malignant with bad prognosis and its one-year survival is a good measure of the performance of both home and treating hospital types.

The home hospital is the treatment variable Z_1 at time $t = 1$: $z_1 = 1$ for large type and $z_1 = 0$ for small type. The treating hospital is Z_2 at $t = 2$: $z_2 = 1$ for large type and $z_2 = 0$ for small type. The outcome of a patient is Y : $y = 1$ for a successful one-year survival and $y = 0$ otherwise. The following stationary covariates before Z_1 were measured: gender (X_{11}), geographic area (X_{12}) and age (X_{13}). Gender was $x_{11} = 1$ for male and $x_{11} = 0$ for female. Geographic area was categorized into urban ($x_{12} = 1$) versus rural ($x_{12} = 0$). Age was a continuous variable. The time-dependent covariate between Z_1 and Z_2 was cancer stage (X_2), which was categorized into the advanced stage ($x_2 = 1$) and the early stage ($x_2 = 0$). The data is given in Data and Codes of the article together with the SAS code for the analysis. In the following, we will test if the blip effects of $z_1 = 1$ and $z_2 = 1$ are zeros respectively.

Due to a long-term social welfare system and relatively uniform culture in the country, the assumption of no unmeasured confounders is approximately true for home hospital Z_1 , at least after conditioning on (x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}) according to the medical experts. Similarly, the assumption is also approximately true for treating hospital Z_2 conditional on $(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2)$.

In the first stage, we conduct initial assessment of the point effects and SNMM by modeling the means $\mu(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1)$ and $\mu(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2, z_2)$ in combination with the subject matter knowledge. It is difficult to specify the distribution $P(y \mid x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1)$ due to influences of X_2 and Z_2 , so we use the usual quasi likelihood approach to modeling $\mu(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1)$, see, for instance, Fahrmeir and Tutz (1994). The distribution $P(y \mid x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2, z_2)$ is binomial, which is used to model $\mu(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2, z_2)$. By the usual significance test at the significance level of 0.1, we model $\mu(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1)$, exclude the non-significant variables X_{12} , and obtain

$$\mu(x_{11}, x_{13}, z_1) = \beta_0 + x_{11}\beta_1 + x_{13}\beta_2 + z_1\theta_1, \quad (23)$$

where $\theta_1 = \theta(x_{11}, x_{13}; z_1 = 1)$ is the point effect of $z_1 = 1$, which is the same for all (x_{11}, x_{13}) . We also model $\mu(x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2, z_2)$, exclude the non-significant variables X_{12} , X_{13} , and obtain

$$\begin{cases} \mu(x_{11}, z_1, x_2 = 0, z_2) = \beta_3 + x_{11}\beta_4 + z_1\beta_5 + z_2\theta_{20}, \\ \mu(x_{11}, z_1, x_2 = 1, z_2) = \beta_6 + x_{11}\beta_7 + z_1\beta_8 + z_2\theta_{21}, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where $\theta_{20} = \theta(x_{11}, z_1, x_2 = 0; z_2 = 1)$ is the point effect of $z_2 = 1$ when $x_2 = 0$ and $\theta_{21} = \theta(x_{11}, z_1, x_2 = 1; z_2 = 1)$ is the point effect of $z_2 = 1$ when $x_2 = 1$, which are the same for all (x_{11}, z_1) . Combining with the subject knowledge from medical experts, we set an initial SNMM as

$$\begin{cases} \phi(x_{11}, x_{13}; z_1 = 1) = \gamma_1, \\ \phi(x_{11}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2 = 0; z_2 = 1) = \gamma_{20}, \\ \phi(x_{11}, x_{13}, z_1, x_2 = 1; z_2 = 1) = \gamma_{21}. \end{cases}$$

Here, we have the blip effect parameter $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_{20}, \gamma_{21})'$.

In the second stage, we decompose the point effects into the blip effects. The point effect θ_1 of $z_1 = 1$ is a sum of contributions from home hospital $z_1 = 1$ and treating hospital $z_2 = 1$. Because Z_2 is the last treatment variable, the point effect of $z_2 = 1$ is equal to the blip effect of $z_2 = 1$, that is, $\theta_{20} = \gamma_{20}$ and $\theta_{21} = \gamma_{21}$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{cases} \theta_1 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_{20}c_{20} + \gamma_{21}c_{21}, \\ \theta_{20} = \gamma_{20}, \\ \theta_{21} = \gamma_{21}, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where $c_{20} = P(x_2 = 0, z_2 = 1 \mid z_1 = 1) - P(x_2 = 0, z_2 = 1 \mid z_1 = 0)$ and $c_{21} = P(x_2 = 1, z_2 = 1 \mid z_1 = 1) - P(x_2 = 1, z_2 = 1 \mid z_1 = 0)$.

In the third stage, we estimate the blip effect parameter $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_{20}, \gamma_{21})'$. The parameters $\theta_{c,1}$, $\theta_{c,20}$ and $\theta_{c,21}$ are estimated by applying models (23) and (24), where as in the earlier sections, the subscript c is added to all parameters indicating that they are identified conditional on treatments and covariates. The estimation is based on the binomial distribution $P(y \mid x_{11}, z_1, x_2, z_2)$ for both (23) and (24) and is implemented by keeping the dispersion parameter unchanged, that is, equal to one.

The probabilities $P(x_2, z_2 \mid z_1)$ are estimated by the corresponding proportions $\hat{P}(x_2, z_2 \mid z_1)$, so we obtain $c_{c,20}$ and $c_{c,21}$. By regression $\hat{\theta}_{c,1}$, $\hat{\theta}_{c,20}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{c,21}$ on one, $c_{c,20}$ and $c_{c,21}$ according to (25), we obtain the estimates $\hat{\gamma}_{c,1}$, $\hat{\gamma}_{c,20}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{c,21}$. According to Proposition 2, these estimates are respectively equal to $\hat{\gamma}_1$, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$, which are based on the complete likelihood of all treatments, covariates and outcomes.

In the fourth stage, we apply the bootstrap method to the third stage above to obtain the marginal covariance matrix of $\hat{\gamma}_1$, $\hat{\gamma}_{20}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{21}$. Then we apply (22) to calculate the Wald statistics for three hypotheses, (1) $\gamma_1 = 0$ against $\gamma_1 \neq 0$, (2) $\gamma_{20} = 0$ against $\gamma_{20} \neq 0$, and (3) $\gamma_{21} = 0$ against $\gamma_{21} \neq 0$. Finally we apply Theorem 1 to test these hypotheses.

In Table 3, we present the estimates of these blip effects as well as the 95% CI and the p-values for testing the three hypotheses. For comparison, we also present the results about the point effects. Most interestingly, from the blip effect γ_1 , we see that the small home hospital might perform better than the large home hospital, indicating that the early diagnosis of stomach cancer depends more on the short waiting queue and awareness typically at small home hospitals than on the advanced technology at large home hospitals. However, from the point effect θ_1 , we see that the large and small home hospital might perform equally well, and this is misleading, because the point effect is a sum of contributions from the home and the treating hospitals.

6 Conclusion

Due to the great need in medical and economic researches, sequential causal inference is one of the most active areas in statistics (Hernan and Robins, 2018; An and Ding, 2018). In recent years, considerable progress has been made in developing various estimation methods (Hernan and Robins, 2018; An and Ding, 2018). Despite a huge volume of the literature on method-

ology, however, there are few applications of sequential causal inference in real medical and economic researches. In sharp contrast, single-point causal inference plays a central role in many of these researches.

One possible reason is that some statistical tools are yet to be developed, for instance, the hypothesis testing of the blip effects, which helps to find a pattern for the blip effects (namely, the structural nested mean model). In this article, we found that the hypothesis test on the blip effects can be conducted via the point effects of treatments in the sequence. Using the fact that the point effect is simply the point effect of treatment in single-point causal inference, we have extended the Wald test from single-point causal inference to sequential causal inference. Our method does not need more assumptions than single-point causal inference and therefore should have a broad applicability. It is also easy to implement in practice, as illustrated in the medical example of this article.

Due to the scope of this article, we only considered the hypothesis testing for three basic outcome types, the normal, dichotomous and Poisson outcomes. We also restricted to additive point effects and additive blip effects. On the other hand, methods are available for testing non-additive point effects of the outcome of various types in single-point causal inference. We believe that our testing method can be extended to more complex settings in the context of a treatment sequence.

Supporting Material

The material contains two supplements: Supplement I for proofs of formulas (10), (11) and (17) and Supplement II for a description of the simulation study in Section 4.

References

- [1] Almirall, D., Hane, T.T. and Murphy, S.A. (2010). Structural Nested Mean Models for Assessing Time-Varying Effect Moderation. *Biometrics*, 66, 131–139.
- [2] An, W. and Ding, Y. (2018). The Landscape of Causal Inference: Perspective From Citation Network Analysis. *The American Statistician*, 72, 265–277.

- [3] Fahrmeir, L. and Tutz, G. (1994). *Multivariate statistical modeling based on generalized linear models*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [4] Hernan, M.A. and Robins, J.M. (2018). *Causal Inference*. CRC press, Boca Raton.
- [5] Robins, J.M. (1997). Causal inference from complex longitudinal data. In *Latent variable modeling and applications to causality, Lecture notes in Statistics (120)*, (Ed. M. Berkane), pp. 69–117. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- [6] Robins, J.M. (1999). Association, causation, and marginal structural models. *Synthese*, 121, 151–179.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Sen, A. and Srivastava, M, (2002). *Regression analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [9] Taubman, S.L., Robins, J.M., Mittleman, M.A. and Hernn, M.A. (2009). Intervening on risk factors for coronary heart disease: an application of the parametric g-formula. *International journal of epidemiology*, 38, 1599–1611.
- [10] Wallace, M.P., Moodie, E.E.M. and Stephens, D.A. (2016). Model assessment in dynamic treatment regime estimation via doubly robustness. *Biometrics*, 72, 855–864.
- [11] Wang, X. and Yin, L. (2015). Identifying and estimating net effects of treatments in sequential causal inference. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9, 1608-1643.
- [12] Wang, X. and Yin, L. (2019). New g-formula for the sequential causal effect and blip effect of treatment in sequential causal inference. To appear in *Annals of Statistics* (article ID: AOS1795). Main text: <http://hig.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1294432/FULLTEXT01.pdf> Supplementary materials: <http://hig.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1294432/FULLTEXT02.pdf>

Supplement I: proofs of (10), (11) and (17)

Proof of formula (10): Please notice that formula (7) implies

$$P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t) = P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0).$$

Averaging (2), that is,

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t) - \mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0),$$

with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$, we obtain

$$E\{\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\} =$$

$$E\{\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\} - E\{\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0\},$$

where the last expectation is noticeably with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$. On the other hand, we have $E\{\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\} = \mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$ and $E\{\mu(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0\} = \mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$. Therefore, we have

$$E\{\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\} = \mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) - \mu(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0),$$

which is equal to $\theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)$ according to (9). This proves (10).

Proof of formula (11): Please notice that for any function $f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s)$ of (\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) , the expectation $E\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t\}$ with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^s, \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^s \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t)$ is equal to $E\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t\}$ with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^t)$. Now inserting SNMM (6) into the new G -formula (3), we obtain

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j c_j(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t), \quad t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_j(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) &= f_j(\mathbf{x}_t, z_t) \\ &+ \sum_{s=t+1}^T E_1\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t\} \end{aligned}$$

$$- \sum_{s=t+1}^T E_2\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0\},$$

where the conditional expectation $E_1(\cdot)$ is with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t)$ and $E_2(\cdot)$ to $P(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0)$.

Now, we average both sides of the equality with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$. According to (10), the average of the left side is equal to

$$E\{\theta(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\} = \theta(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t).$$

The average of $E_1\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t\}$ is equal to $E_1\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\}$. Due to (7), the average of $E_2\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0\}$ is equal to the average of $E_2\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0\}$ with respect to $P(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0)$, which is equal to $E_2\{f_j(\mathbf{x}_s, z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t = 0\}$. Putting these terms together, we obtain (11).

Proof of formula (17): A special case of the point effect when z_s is dichotomous has been proved by Wang and Yin (2019). Here we extend the proof to the point effect when z_s is discrete or continuous. Conditional on $\{(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T)\}$, the point effect of treatment $z_s > 0$ in stratum $(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1})$ is

$$\theta_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s) = \mu_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}, z_s) - \mu_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}, z_s = 0).$$

We need the following lemma to prove (17).

Lemma *Supposing the same variance σ^2 for the outcome Y given any $(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$, then the conditional covariance between the estimated point effects at different times is equal to zero, that is,*

$$\text{cov}_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s); \hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)\} = 0, \quad s \neq t.$$

Proof: Without a loss of generality, we assume $s < t$. Let S be the stratum of observations satisfying $(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^s, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^{s-1}, z_{is}) = (\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}, z_s)$; S_0 for $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0)$; S_1 for $(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t > 0)$; and $S_2 = S \setminus (S_0 \cup S_1)$. Noticeably, S_0 and S_1 are disjoint, and S either contains both S_0 and S_1 or contains neither. If S contains neither S_0 nor S_1 , then the lemma is true. Therefore we only prove the lemma when S contains both S_0 and S_1 . Let $n(\cdot)$ be the number of observations in a stratum. Then, $n(S) = n(S_0) + n(S_1) + n(S_2)$. Rewrite $\mu_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}, z_s) = \mu(S)$, $\mu_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t = 0) = \mu(S_0)$, $\mu_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, z_t > 0) = \mu(S_1)$. Additionally, denote the mean of the outcome Y in S_2 by $\mu(S_2)$. Then, the mean $\mu(S)$ is equal to

$$\mu(S) = \frac{n(S_0)}{n(S)}\mu(S_0) + \frac{n(S_1)}{n(S)}\mu(S_1) + \frac{n(S_2)}{n(S)}\mu(S_2)$$

and the estimate of $\mu(S)$ is

$$\hat{\mu}(S) = \frac{n(S_0)}{n(S)}\hat{\mu}(S_0) + \frac{n(S_1)}{n(S)}\hat{\mu}(S_1) + \frac{n(S_2)}{n(S)}\hat{\mu}(S_2).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}(S) - \mu(S) &= \frac{n(S_0)}{n(S)}\{\hat{\mu}(S_0) - \mu(S_0)\} + \frac{n(S_1)}{n(S)}\{\hat{\mu}(S_1) - \mu(S_1)\} \\ &\quad + \frac{n(S_2)}{n(S)}\{\hat{\mu}(S_2) - \mu(S_2)\}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have $\theta_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \mu(S_1) - \mu(S_0)$ and thus

$$\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) - \theta_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) = \{\hat{\mu}(S_1) - \mu(S_1)\} - \{\hat{\mu}(S_0) - \mu(S_0)\}.$$

Recalling that S_0 , S_1 and S_2 are disjoint, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{cov}_c\{\hat{\mu}(S), \hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)\} \\ &= E_c \left[\{\hat{\mu}(S) - \mu(S)\} \{\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) - \theta_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)\} \right] \\ &= \frac{n(S_1)}{n(S)} E_c \{\hat{\mu}(S_1) - \mu(S_1)\}^2 - \frac{n(S_0)}{n(S)} E_c \{\hat{\mu}(S_0) - \mu(S_0)\}^2,\end{aligned}$$

which is equal to

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{n(S)} - \frac{\sigma^2}{n(S)} = 0$$

according to the assumption of the same variance σ^2 for Y given any $(\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_1^T)$. Therefore, we have

$$\text{cov}_c\{\hat{\mu}(S), \hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)\} = 0,$$

which is true for all $\hat{\mu}(S) = \hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s)$. Noticeably, $\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s) = \hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s) - \hat{\mu}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s = 0)$; therefore, we have

$$\text{cov}_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s), \hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t)\} = 0, \quad s < t,$$

which proves the lemma.

Now according to (10), conditional on $\{(\mathbf{x}_{i1}^T, \mathbf{z}_{i1}^T)\}$, we have

$$\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_s; z_s) = E_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^s, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1}; z_s) \mid \mathbf{x}_s, z_s\},$$

where the expectation is with respect to $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^{s-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{s-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_s, z_s)$, and

$$\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t) = E_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_1^t, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}; z_t) \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t\},$$

where the expectation is with respect to $P_c(\mathbf{x}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1} \mid \mathbf{x}_t, z_t)$. These expressions together with the lemma above imply

$$\text{cov}_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_s; z_s); \hat{\theta}_c(\mathbf{x}_t; z_t)\} = 0, \quad s \neq t,$$

which in turn implies (17).

Supplement II: Simulation Study in Section 4

Here, we provide details about the simulation study. In Section II.1, we describe the testing procedure in the simulation study. In Section II.2, we apply the procedure to the simulation. In Section II.3, we construct the standard parameters, which generates the data. The relevant SAS codes used for the simulation are included in Data and Codes of the article.

II.1 Testing procedure in simulation

In this simulation, SNMM is known and so is the treatment assignment condition. Hence we start from the second stage of the testing procedure described in Section 3.5. In the second stage, we apply model (11) to decompose the point effects into the blip effects and obtain the following formulas (26a), (26b) and (26c):

$$\theta(z_1 = 1) = \gamma_1 + \sum_{t=2}^3 \sum_{i=0}^3 \gamma_{ti} c_{ti}, \quad (26a)$$

where $c_{ti} = P(x_t = i, z_t = 1 \mid z_1 = 1) - P(x_t = i, z_t = 1 \mid z_1 = 0)$;

$$\theta(x_2 = j; z_2 = 1) = \gamma_{2j} + \sum_{i=0}^3 \gamma_{3i} c_{3i}(x_2 = j), \quad (26b)$$

where $c_{3i}(x_2 = j) = P(x_3 = i, z_3 = 1 \mid x_2 = j, z_2 = 1) - P(x_3 = i, z_3 = 1 \mid x_2 = j, z_2 = 0)$;

$$\theta(x_3 = j; z_3 = 1) = \gamma_{3j}. \quad (26c)$$

In the third stage, we estimate the blip effect parameter $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_{20}, \gamma_{21}, \gamma_{22}, \gamma_{23}, \gamma_{30}, \gamma_{31}, \gamma_{32}, \gamma_{33})'$. Let $n(x_t, z_t)$ be the number of observations in stratum (x_t, z_t) , and $I(x_t, z_t)$ be the set of all indexes i such that $(x_{it}, z_{it}) = (x_t, z_t)$. For the normal outcome, we have

$$\hat{\theta}_c(x_t; z_t = 1) = \frac{\sum_{i \in I(x_t, z_t=1)} y_i}{n(x_t, z_t = 1)} - \frac{\sum_{i \in I(x_t, z_t=0)} y_i}{n(x_t, z_t = 0)},$$

$$\text{var}_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(x_t; z_t = 1)\} = \frac{\sigma^2}{n(x_t, z_t = 1)} + \frac{\sigma^2}{n(x_t, z_t = 0)},$$

where σ^2 is the conditional variance of Y given $(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3, z_3)$. For the dichotomous and Poisson outcomes, we use standard softwares to obtain $\hat{\theta}_c(x_t; z_t = 1)$ and $\text{var}_c\{\hat{\theta}_c(x_t; z_t = 1)\}$.

The probabilities in (26a), (26b) and (26c) are estimated by the corresponding proportions, which in turn lead to evaluation of $c_{c,2i}$, $c_{c,3i}$, and $c_{c,3i}(x_2)$, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We estimate γ_c by regressing the obtained $\hat{\theta}_c(z_1 = 1)$ on one, $c_{c,2i}$ and $c_{c,3i}$ based on (26a); $\hat{\theta}_c(x_2; z_2 = 1)$ on one and $c_{c,3i}(x_2)$ based on (26b); and $\hat{\theta}_c(x_3; z_3 = 1)$ on one based on (26c). According to Proposition 2, the obtained conditional estimate $\hat{\gamma}_c$ is equal to the marginal estimate $\hat{\gamma}$.

In the fourth stage, we estimate the marginal covariance matrix $\text{cov}(\hat{\gamma})$ by applying the bootstrap method to the third stage above. With $\text{cov}(\hat{\gamma})$ as well as $\hat{\gamma}$, we apply (22) to calculate the Wald statistics for hypothesis A through J . With the obtained Wald statistic, we test the hypothesis at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ according to Theorem 1.

II.2 Application of testing procedure to simulation

Three data-generating mechanisms are constructed for normal, dichotomous and Poisson outcomes using the standard parameters obtained in the next section. The sample sizes are chosen as 1000, 2000 and 3000, such that the point effects are estimable. For every sample size, 1000 data sets are generated of each outcome type.

We apply the procedure described in the previous subsection to each of these 1000 data sets and check if the type I and II errors occur for hypothesis A through J . The covariance matrix for the blip effects is estimated by using the bootstrap method with only 500 replications due to our limited computing power.

From these 1000 data sets, we obtain the type I and II error rates, which are presented in Table 1. In Table 2, we present the estimate and its variance for the blip effect under no constraint or under the null hypothesis J_0 : $(\gamma_{20}, \gamma_{21}, \gamma_{22}, \gamma_{23}) = (\gamma_{30}, \gamma_{31}, \gamma_{32}, \gamma_{33})$.

II.3 Construction of standard parameters for normal, dichotomous and Poisson outcomes

The probabilities of treatments and covariates are the same for the three outcome types and presented in Table II.1. Here, we will use the point effects of treatments, the point effects of covariates and the grand mean to construct the standard parameters for the conditional distribution of the outcome given all treatments and covariates. These standard parameters yield true values

of the blip effects in the simulation (Wang and Yin, 2015).

As described in Section 4, we have the following blip effects. At $t = 1$, there is only one blip effect of $z_1 = 1$: $\phi(z_1 = 1) = \gamma_1$. At $t = 2$, there are four blip effects of $z_2 = 1$ depending only on $x_2 = 0, 1, 2, 3$: $\phi(z_1, x_2 = j; z_1 = 1) = \gamma_{2j}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. At $t = 3$, there are four blip effects of $z_3 = 1$ depending only on $x_3 = 0, 1, 2, 3$: $\phi(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3 = j; z_3 = 1) = \gamma_{3j}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Inserting these blip effects into the new G -formula (3), we obtain the formula for calculating the point effect of treatment

$$\begin{cases} \theta(z_1 = 1) = \gamma_1 + \sum_{t=2}^3 \sum_{i=0}^3 \gamma_{ti} P(x_t = i, z_t = 1 \mid z_1 = 1) \\ \quad - \sum_{t=2}^3 \sum_{i=0}^3 \gamma_{ti} P(x_t = i, z_t = 1 \mid z_1 = 0), \\ \theta(z_1, x_2 = j; z_2 = 1) = \gamma_{2j} + \sum_{i=0}^3 \gamma_{3i} P(x_3 = i, z_3 = 1 \mid z_1, x_2 = j, z_2 = 1) \\ \quad - \sum_{i=0}^3 \gamma_{3i} P(x_3 = i, z_3 = 1 \mid z_1, x_2 = j, z_2 = 0), \\ \theta(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3 = j; z_3 = 1) = \gamma_{3j}. \end{cases}$$

Using the true values of the blip effects and the probabilities of treatments and covariates given in Table II1, we calculate these point effects of the treatments.

The point effect of covariate $x_2 > 0$ is $\zeta(z_1; x_2) = \mu(z_1, x_2) - \mu(z_1, x_2 = 0)$, where $\mu(z_1, x_2) = E(Y \mid z_1, x_2)$. The point effect of covariate $x_3 > 0$ is $\zeta(z_1, x_2, z_2; x_3) = \mu(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3) - \mu(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3 = 0)$, where $\mu(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3) = E(Y \mid z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3)$. The grand mean is $\mu = E(Y)$. According to the new G -formula (3) or its inverse form (Wang and Yin, 2019), the blip effects are only functions of the point effects of treatments; therefore, the point effects $\zeta(z_1; x_2)$ and $\zeta(z_1, x_2, z_2; x_3)$ and the grand mean can be arbitrarily chosen to yield the same blip effects. However, the choice should allow for an appropriate mean of the distribution, e.g., the mean must have a range of $(0, 1)$ for a dichotomous outcome.

For the normal distribution, we choose the point effects of covariates

$$\zeta(z_1; x_2) = \begin{cases} 10 + 5z_1, & x_2 = 1 \\ 12 + 5z_1, & x_2 = 2 \\ 13 + 5z_1, & x_2 = 3 \end{cases}$$

for $z_1 = 0, 1$, and

$$\zeta(z_1, x_2, z_2; x_3) = \begin{cases} 10 - 5z_1 - 2z_2 + 3x_2, & x_3 = 1 \\ 12 - 5z_1 - 2z_2 + 3x_2, & x_3 = 2 \\ 10 - 5z_1 - 3z_2 + 3x_2, & x_3 = 3 \end{cases}$$

for $z_1 = 0, 1$, $z_2 = 0, 1$ and $x_2 = 0, 1, 2, 3$ respectively. We choose the grand mean as $\mu = -5$.

For the dichotomous outcome, we choose the point effects of covariates

$$\zeta(z_1; x_2) = \begin{cases} 0.1z_1, & x_2 = 1 \\ 0.1z_1, & x_2 = 2 \\ 0.1z_1, & x_2 = 3 \end{cases}$$

for $z_1 = 0, 1$, and

$$\zeta(z_1, x_2, z_2; x_3) = \begin{cases} -0.1z_2, & x_3 = 1 \\ -0.1z_2, & x_3 = 2 \\ -0.1z_2, & x_3 = 3 \end{cases}$$

for $z_1 = 0, 1$, $z_2 = 0, 1$ and $x_2 = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We choose the grand mean as $\mu = 0.55$.

For the Poisson outcome, we choose the same point effects of covariates as those for the dichotomous outcome. As for the grand mean, we choose $\mu = 20$.

Finally, we use the obtained $\theta(\mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^t; z_t)$, $\zeta(\mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^{t-1}; x_t)$ and μ to construct the standard parameter $\mu(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3, z_3)$ by applying formula (16) of Wang and Yin (2015), that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(z_1, x_2, z_2, x_3, z_3) = & - \sum_{t=1}^3 \theta(\mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^t; z_t^* = 1) \{P(z_t^* = 1 \mid \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^t) - I(z_t)\} \\ & - \sum_{t=2}^3 \left\{ \sum_{x_t^* > 0} \zeta(\mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^{t-1}; x_t^*) P(x_t^* \mid \mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^{t-1}) - \zeta(\mathbf{z}_1^{t-1}, \mathbf{x}_2^{t-1}; x_t) \right\} + \mu, \end{aligned}$$

where $I(z_t)$ equals one when $z_t = 1$ and zero otherwise. The obtained standard parameters are presented in Tables *II2-II4* for the normal, Bernoulli and Poisson distributions respectively.