

# Propensity Score Weighting Analysis of Survival Outcomes Using Pseudo-observations

Shuxi Zeng   Fan Li   Liangyuan Hu   Fan Li <sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

Survival outcomes are common in comparative effectiveness studies and require unique handling because they are usually incompletely observed due to right-censoring. A “once for all” approach for causal inference with survival outcomes constructs pseudo-observations and allows standard methods such as propensity score weighting to proceed as if the outcomes are completely observed. We propose a general class of model-free causal estimands with survival outcomes on user-specified target populations. We develop corresponding propensity score weighting estimators based on the pseudo-observations and establish their asymptotic properties. In particular, utilizing the functional delta-method and the von Mises expansion, we derive a new closed-form variance of the weighting estimator that takes into account the uncertainty due to both pseudo-observation calculation and propensity score estimation. This allows valid and computationally efficient inference without resampling. We also prove the optimal efficiency property of the overlap weights within the class of balancing weights for survival outcomes. The proposed methods are applicable to both binary and multiple treatments. Extensive simulations are conducted to explore the operating characteristics of the proposed method versus other commonly used alternatives. We apply the proposed method to compare the causal effects of three popular treatment approaches for prostate cancer patients.

**KEY WORDS:** balancing weights, causal inference, censoring, multiple treatments, overlap weights, survival analysis

---

<sup>1</sup>Shuxi Zeng is Ph.D. student, Department of Statistical Science, Duke University (email: shuxi.zeng@duke.edu); Fan Li is associate professor, Department of Statistical Science, Duke University (email: fl35@duke.edu); Liangyuan Hu is assistant professor, Department of Population Health Science and Policy, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai (email: liangyuan.hu@mountsinai.org); Fan (Frank) Li is assistant professor, Department of Biostatistics, Yale University (email: fan.f.li@yale.edu).

# 1 Introduction

Survival or time-to-event outcomes are common in comparative effectiveness research and require unique handling because they are usually incompletely observed due to right-censoring. In observational studies, a popular approach to draw causal inference with survival outcomes is to combine standard survival estimators with propensity score methods ([Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983](#)). For example, one can construct the Kaplan-Meier estimator on an inverse probability weighted sample to adjust for measured confounding ([Robins and Finkelstein, 2000](#); [Hubbard et al., 2000](#)). Another common approach combines the Cox model with inverse probability weighting (IPW) to estimate the causal hazard ratio ([Austin and Stuart, 2017](#)) or the counterfactual survival curves ([Cole and Hernán, 2004](#)); this approach was also extended to accommodate time-varying treatments via the marginal structural models ([Robins et al., 2000](#)). Coupling causal inference with the Cox model introduces two limitations. First, the Cox model assumes proportional hazards in the target population, violation to which would lead to biased causal estimates. Second, the target estimand is usually the causal hazard ratio, whose interpretation can be opaque due to the built-in selection bias ([Hernán, 2010](#)). In contrast, other estimands based on survival probability or restricted mean survival time are free of model assumptions and have natural causal interpretation ([Mao et al., 2018](#)).

To analyze observational studies with survival outcomes, an attractive alternative approach is to combine causal inference methods with the *pseudo-observations* ([Andersen et al., 2003](#)). Each pseudo-observation is constructed based on a jackknife statistic and is interpreted as the individual contribution to the target estimate from a complete sample without censoring. The pseudo-observations approach addresses censoring in a “once for all” manner and allows standard methods to proceed as if the outcomes are completely observed ([Andersen et al., 2004](#); [Klein and Andersen, 2005](#); [Klein et al., 2007](#)). To this end, one can perform direct confounding adjustment using outcome regression with the pseudo-observations and derive casual estimators with the g-formula ([Robins, 1986](#)). Another approach is to combine propensity score weighting with the pseudo-observations. For example, [Andersen et al. \(2017\)](#) considered an IPW estimator to estimate the causal risk difference and difference in restricted mean

survival time. Their approach was further extended to enable doubly robust estimation with survival and recurrent event outcomes (Wang, 2018; Su et al., 2020).

Despite its simplicity and versatility, several open questions in propensity score weighting with pseudo-observations remain to be addressed. First, pseudo-observations require computing a jackknife statistic for each unit, which poses computational challenges to resampling-based variance estimation under propensity score weighting (Andersen et al., 2017). On the other hand, failure to account for the uncertainty in estimating the propensity scores and jackknifing can lead to inaccurate and often conservative variance estimates. Second, the IPW estimator with pseudo-observations corresponds to a target population that is represented by the study sample, but the interpretation of such a population is often questionable in the case of a convenience sample (Li et al., 2019). Moreover, the inverse probability weights are prone to lack of covariate overlap and will engender causal estimates with excessive variance, even when combined with outcome regression (Mao et al., 2019). Li et al. (2018) proposed a general class of balancing weights (which includes the IPW as a special case) to define target estimands on user-specified target populations. In particular, the overlap weights emphasize a target population with the most covariate overlap and best clinical equipoise, and were theoretically shown to provide the most efficient causal contrasts. However, the theory of overlap weights so far has focused on non-censored outcomes, and its optimal variance property is unclear with survival outcomes. Third, many comparative effectiveness studies involve multiple treatments, which can exacerbate the consequence of lack of overlap when only IPW is considered (Yang et al., 2016). While the overlap weights (Li and Li, 2019) offered a promising solution to improve the bias and efficiency over IPW with non-censored outcomes, extensions to censored survival outcomes remain unexplored.

In this paper, we address all these questions. We consider a general multiple treatment setup and extend the balancing weights in Li et al. (2018) and Li and Li (2019) to analyze survival outcomes in observational studies based on the pseudo-observations. We develop new asymptotic variance expressions for causal effect estimators that properly account for the variability associated with estimating propensity scores as well as constructing pseudo-observations. Different from existing variance expressions developed for propensity score weighting estimators (Lunceford and Davidian, 2004; Mao et al.,

2018), our asymptotic variances are established additionally based on the functional delta-method and the von Mises expansion of the pseudo-observations (Graw et al., 2009; Jacobsen and Martinussen, 2016; Overgaard et al., 2017), and enable valid and fast inference without re-sampling. We also prove that the overlap weights lead to the most efficient survival causal estimators, expanding the theoretical underpinnings of overlap weights to causal survival analysis. We carry out simulations to evaluate and compare a range of commonly used weighting estimators. Finally, we apply the proposed method to estimate the causal effects of three treatments on mortality among patients with high-risk localized prostate cancer from the National Cancer Database.

## 2 Propensity score weighting with survival outcomes

### 2.1 Time-to-event outcomes, causal estimands and assumptions

We consider a sample of  $N$  units drawn from a population. Let  $Z_i \in \mathcal{J} = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ ,  $J \geq 2$  denote the assigned treatment. Each unit has a set of potential outcomes  $\{T_i(j), j \in \mathcal{J}\}$ , measuring the counterfactual survival time mapped to each treatment. We similarly define  $\{C_i(j), j \in \mathcal{J}\}$  as a set of potential censoring times. Under the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA), we have  $T_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\}T_i(j)$  and  $C_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\}C_i(j)$ . Due to right-censoring, we might only observe the lower bound of the survival time for some units. We write the observed failure time,  $\tilde{T}_i = T_i \wedge C_i$ , the censoring indicator,  $\Delta_i = \mathbf{1}\{T_i \leq C_i\}$ , and the  $p$ -dimensional time-invariant pre-treatment covariates,  $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})' \in \mathcal{X}$ . In summary, we observe the tuple  $\mathcal{O}_i = (Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i, \tilde{T}_i, \Delta_i)$  for each unit. With  $J$  treatments, we define the generalized propensity score,  $e_j(\mathbf{X}_i) = \Pr(Z_i = j | \mathbf{X}_i)$ , as the probability of receiving treatment  $j$  given baseline covariates (Imbens, 2000). Our results are presented for general, finite  $J$ , and include binary treatments as a special case when  $J = 2$ .

The causal estimands of interest are based on two typical transformations of the potential survival times: (i) the at-risk function,  $\nu_1(T_i(j); t) = \mathbf{1}\{T_i(j) \geq t\}$ , and (ii) the truncation function,  $\nu_2(T_i(j); t) = T_i(j) \wedge t$ , where  $t$  is a given time point of interest. The identity function is implied by  $\nu_2(T_i(j); \infty) = T_i(j)$ . To simplify the discussion, hereafter we use  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  to index the choice

of the transformation function  $v$ . We further define  $m_j^k(\mathbf{X}; t) = \mathbb{E}\{\nu_k(T_i(j); t) | \mathbf{X}\}$  as the conditional expectation of the transformed potential survival outcome, and the pairwise conditional causal effect at time  $t$  as  $\tau_{j,j'}^k(\mathbf{X}; t) = m_j^k(\mathbf{X}; t) - m_{j'}^k(\mathbf{X}; t)$  for  $j \neq j' \in \mathcal{J}$ . We are interested in the conditional causal effect averaged over a *target population*. Following the formulation in [Li and Li \(2019\)](#), we assume the study sample is drawn from the population with covariate density  $f(\mathbf{X})$ , and represent the target population by density  $g(\mathbf{X})$ . The ratio  $h(\mathbf{X}) = g(\mathbf{X})/f(\mathbf{X})$  is called a tilting function, which re-weights the observed sample to represent the target population. The *pairwise average causal effect* at time  $t$  on the target population is defined as

$$\tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{X}} \tau_{j,j'}^k(\mathbf{X}; t) f(\mathbf{X}) h(\mathbf{X}) \mu(d\mathbf{X})}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{X}) h(\mathbf{X}) \mu(d\mathbf{X})}, \quad \forall j \neq j' \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (1)$$

The class of estimands (1) is transitive in the sense that  $\tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) = \tau_{j,j''}^{k,h}(t) + \tau_{j'',j'}^{k,h}(t)$ . Different choices of function  $v_k$  lead to estimands on different scales. When  $k = 1$ , we refer to estimand (1) as the survival probability causal effect (SPCE). This estimand represents the causal risk difference and contrasts the potential survival probabilities at time  $t$  among the target population. When  $k = 2$ , estimand (1) is referred to as the restricted average causal effect (RACE), which compares the mean potential survival times restricted by  $t$ . When  $t = \infty$ , this estimand becomes the average survival causal effect (ASCE) comparing the unrestricted mean potential survival times. Of note, when  $J = 2$ , our pairwise estimands reduce to those introduced in [Mao et al. \(2018\)](#) for binary treatments.

To identify estimands (1), we maintain the following assumptions. For each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we assume (A1) weak unconfoundedness:  $T_i(j) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} | \mathbf{X}_i$ ; (A2) overlap:  $0 < e_j(\mathbf{X}) < 1$  for any  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}$ ; and (A3) completely independent censoring:  $\{T_i(j), Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i\} \perp\!\!\!\perp C_i(j)$ . Assumption (A1) and (A2) are the usual no unmeasured confounding and positivity conditions suitable for multiple treatments ([Imbens, 2000](#); [Yang et al., 2016](#)), and allow us to identify  $\tau_j^{k,h}(t)$  in the absence of censoring. Assumption (A3) assumes that censoring is independent of all remaining variables, and is introduced for now as a convenient technical device to establish our main results. We will relax this assumption in [Section 3](#) and [4](#) to enable identification under a weaker condition, which assumes (A4) covariate dependent censoring:  $T_i(j) \perp\!\!\!\perp C_i(j) | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i$ .

## 2.2 Balancing weights with pseudo-observations

We now introduce balancing weights to estimate the causal estimands (1). Write  $f_j(\mathbf{X}) = f(\mathbf{X}|Z = j)$  as the conditional density of covariates among treatment group  $j$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ . It is immediate that  $f_j(\mathbf{X}) \propto f(\mathbf{X})e_j(\mathbf{X})$ . For any pre-specified tilting function  $h(\mathbf{X})$ , we weight the group-specific density to the target population density using the following balancing weights, up to a proportionality constant:

$$w_j^h(\mathbf{X}) \propto \frac{g(\mathbf{X})}{f_j(\mathbf{X})} \propto \frac{f(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})}{f(\mathbf{X})e_j(\mathbf{X})} = \frac{h(\mathbf{X})}{e_j(\mathbf{X})}, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (2)$$

The set of weights  $\{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}) : j \in \mathcal{J}\}$  balance the weighted distributions of pre-treatment covariates towards the corresponding target population distribution, i.e.,  $f_j(\mathbf{X})w_j^h(\mathbf{X}) \propto g(\mathbf{X})$ , for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ .

To apply the balancing weights to survival outcomes subject to right-censoring, we first construct the pseudo-observations (Andersen et al., 2003). For a given time  $t$ , we generically define  $\theta^k(t) = \mathbb{E}\{v_k(T_i; t)\}$  as a population parameter. The pseudo-observation for each unit is written as  $\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) = N\hat{\theta}^k(t) - (N-1)\hat{\theta}_{-i}^k(t)$ , where  $\hat{\theta}^k(t)$  is the consistent estimator of  $\theta^k(t)$ , and  $\hat{\theta}_{-i}^k(t)$  is the corresponding estimator with unit  $i$  left out. For transformation  $v_k$  with  $k = 1, 2$ , we consider the Kaplan–Meier estimator to construct  $\theta^k(t)$ , given by

$$\hat{S}(t) = \prod_{\tilde{T}_i \leq t} \left\{ 1 - \frac{dN(\tilde{T}_i)}{Y(\tilde{T}_i)} \right\},$$

where  $N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{T}_i \leq t, \Delta_i = 1\}$  is the counting process for the event of interest, and  $Y(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{T}_i \geq t\}$  is the at-risk process. When the interest lies in the survival functions ( $k = 1$ ), the  $i$ th pseudo-observation is estimated by

$$\hat{\theta}_i^1(t) = N\hat{S}(t) - (N-1)\hat{S}_{-i}(t). \quad (3)$$

When the interest lies in the restricted mean survival times ( $k = 2$ ), the  $i$ th pseudo-observation is estimated by

$$\hat{\theta}_i^2(t) = N \int_0^t \hat{S}(u) du - (N-1) \int_0^t \hat{S}_{-i}(u) du = \int_0^t \hat{\theta}_i^1(u) du. \quad (4)$$

The pseudo-observation is a leave-one-out jackknife approach to address right-censoring and provides a straightforward unbiased estimator of the functional of uncensored data under the independent censoring assumption (A3). From [Graw et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Andersen et al. \(2017\)](#) and under the unconfoundedness assumption (A1), one can show that  $\mathbb{E}\{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t)|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j\} = \mathbb{E}\{v_k(T_i; t)|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j\} + o_p(1) = \mathbb{E}\{\nu_k(T_i(j); t)|\mathbf{X}_i\} + o_p(1)$ , based on which the g-formula can be used to estimate the pairwise average causal effect on the overall population ( $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ ). For the class of estimands (1), we propose the following nonparametric Hájek-type estimator:

$$\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}. \quad (5)$$

For implementation, it is crucial to normalize the weights so that the weights within each group are added up to 1, akin to the concept of stabilized weights ([Robins et al., 2000](#)).

Estimator (5) compares the weighted average pseudo-observations in each treatment group. First, without censoring, the  $i$ th pseudo-observation is simply the transformation of the observed outcome  $\nu_k(T_i; t)$ , and (5) is identical to the estimator in [Li and Li \(2019\)](#) for complete outcomes. Second, a number of weighting schemes proposed for non-censored outcomes are applicable to (5). For example, the IPW estimator considers  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$  and  $w_j^h(\mathbf{X}) = 1/e_j(\mathbf{X})$ , corresponding to a target population of the combination of all treatment groups represented by the study sample. In this case, when only  $J = 2$  treatments are present, estimator (5) reduces to the IPW estimator in [Andersen et al. \(2017\)](#). When the target population is the group receiving treatment  $l$  (similar to the average treatment effects for the treated estimand in binary treatments), the corresponding  $h(\mathbf{X}) = e_l(\mathbf{X})$  and the balancing weight is  $w_j^h = e_l(\mathbf{X})/e_j(\mathbf{X})$ . The overlap weights (OW) specify  $h(\mathbf{X}) = \{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}} e_l^{-1}(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1}$  and  $w_j^h(\mathbf{X}) = e_j(\mathbf{X}) \{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}} e_l^{-1}(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1}$ , and correspond to the target population as an intersection of all treatment groups with optimal covariate overlap ([Li and Li, 2019](#)). This overlap population mimics that enrolled in a randomized trial and emphasizes units whose treatment decisions are most ambiguous. When different groups have good covariate overlap, OW and IPW correspond to almost identical target population and estimands. The difference between OW and IPW emerges with increasing regions of poor overlap. In the case of a complete outcome, OW has been proved to give the smallest total variance

for pairwise comparisons among all balancing weights. The theory and optimality of OW, however, has not been explored with survival outcomes, and will be investigated below.

### 3 Theoretical properties

We present two main results on the theoretical properties of the proposed weighting estimator (5). The first result develops a new asymptotic variance expression for the weighted pairwise comparisons of the pseudo-observations, and the second result establishes the efficiency optimality of OW within the family of balancing weights based on the pseudo-observations.

Below we first outline the main steps of deriving the asymptotic variance. Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$  be a probability space and  $(\mathbf{D}, \|\bullet\|)$  be a Banach space for distribution functions. We assume each tuple  $\mathcal{O}_i = (Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i, \tilde{T}_i, \Delta_i)$  is an i.i.d draw from the sample space  $\mathcal{S}$  in the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ . Define the Dirac measure  $\delta_{(\bullet)} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ , we write the *empirical distribution function* as  $F_n = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\mathcal{O}_i}$  and its limit as  $F$ . Following Overgaard et al. (2017), we use functionals to represent different estimators for the transformed survival outcomes with pseudo-observations. Suppose  $\phi_k(\bullet; t) : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is the functional mapping a distribution to a real value, such as the Kaplan-Meier estimator,  $\phi_1(F_N; t) = \hat{S}(t)$ , then each pseudo-observation is represented as  $\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) = N\phi_k(F_N; t) - (N-1)\phi_k(F_N^{-i}; t)$ , where  $F_N^{-i}$  is the empirical distribution omitting  $\mathcal{O}_i$ .

To derive the asymptotic variance of estimator (5), we need to accommodate two sources of uncertainty. The first source stems from the calculation of the pseudo-observations. We consider the functional derivative of  $\phi_k(\bullet; t)$  at  $f \in \mathbf{D}$  along direction  $s \in \mathbf{D}$  as  $\phi'_{k,f}(s)$ , which is a linear and continuous functional,  $\{\phi_k(f+s; t) - \phi_k(f; t) - \phi'_{k,f}(s; t)\}^2 = o(\|s\|_{\mathbf{D}})$ . Assuming  $\phi_k(\bullet; t)$  is differentiable at the true distribution function  $F$ , we express the first-order influence function of  $\mathcal{O}_i$  for the pseudo-observation estimator  $\hat{\theta}^k(t)$  as the first-order derivative along the direction  $\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i} - F$ , denoted by  $\phi'_{k,i}(t) \triangleq \phi'_{k,F}(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i} - F; t)$ . Similarly, the second-order derivative for the functional  $\phi_k(\bullet; t)$  at  $f$  along direction  $(s, w)$  can be defined as  $\phi''_{k,F}(s, w; t)$ , and the second-order influence function for  $(\mathcal{O}_i, \mathcal{O}_j)$  is given as  $\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) \triangleq \phi''_{k,F}(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_l} - F, \delta_{\mathcal{O}_i} - F; t)$ . To characterize the variability associated with jackknif-



ing, we follow [Graw et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Jacobsen and Martinussen \(2016\)](#) to write the second-order von Mises expansion the pseudo-observations:

$$\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) = \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) + R_{N,i}, \quad (6)$$

where the first three terms dominate the asymptotic behaviour of  $\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t)$  and the remainder  $R_{N,i}$  vanishes asymptotically because  $\lim_{N \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{N} \max_i |R_{N,i}| = 0$ . The second source of uncertainty in estimator (5) comes from estimating the unknown propensity scores and hence the weights; such uncertainty is well studied in causal inference literature and is usually quantified using M-estimation (see, for example, [Lunceford and Davidian \(2004\)](#)). Typically, the unknown propensity score model is parameterized as  $e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)$ , where the finite-dimensional parameter  $\gamma$  is estimated by maximizing the multinomial likelihood.

**Theorem 1** *Under suitable regularity conditions specified in Appendix A, for  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $j, j' \in \mathcal{J}$  and all continuously differentiable tilting function  $h(\mathbf{X})$ ,*

1.  $\widehat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$  is a consistent estimator for  $\tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$ .
2.  $\sqrt{N} \left\{ \widehat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) - \tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) \right\}$  converges in distribution to a mean-zero normal random variate with variance  $\mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2 / \{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))\}^2$ , where the scaled influence function

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) = & \mathbf{I}\{Z_i = j\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) \left\{ \left( \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right) + Q_N \right\} \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{I}\{Z_i = j\} \left( \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma^T} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) \right\} \mathbf{I}_{\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$Q_N = (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) \mathbf{I}\{Z_l = j\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l)$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}$  and  $\mathbf{I}_{\gamma}$  are the score function and information matrix of  $\gamma$ , respectively.

Theorem 1 establishes consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed weighting estimator (5). In particular, the influence function  $\psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t)$  delineates two aforementioned sources of variability, with the first and second term characterizing the uncertainty due to estimating the pseudo-observations and the propensity scores, respectively. The jackknife pseudo-observation estimator for

$\hat{\theta}_i^k(t)$  includes information from the rest  $N - 1$  observations and thus is no longer independent across units. Therefore, derivation of (7) requires invoking the central limit theorem for U-statistics (cf. Chapter 12 in [Van der Vaart, 1998](#)), and leads to a second-order term,  $Q_N$ , that properly accommodates the correlation between the estimated pseudo-observations of different units. Theorem 1 immediately suggests the following consistent variance estimator for pairwise comparisons,  $\hat{\mathbb{V}}\{\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)\} = \sum_{i=1}^N \{\hat{\Psi}_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \hat{\Psi}_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\} / \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{h}(\mathbf{X}_i)^2$ , where  $\hat{\Psi}_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t)$  is defined explicitly in Appendix A. In Appendix A, we also give explicit derivations of the functional derivatives for each transformation  $\nu_k$  when the Kaplan-Meier estimator,  $\hat{S}(t)$ , is used to construct the pseudo-observations as in Section 2.2. This new closed-form estimator enables valid and fast computation of the variance of the weighting estimator (5) without resampling, a crucial advantage when the sample size is large.

Below we further provide several important technical remarks regarding Theorem 1.

**Remark 1** *Without censoring, each pseudo-observation degenerates to the observed outcome, which implies  $\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) = \theta^k(t) + \phi_{k,i}^l(t)$  and therefore  $Q_N = 0$ . In this case, formula (7) coincides with the usual influence function derived in [Li and Li \(2019\)](#) for complete outcomes.*

**Remark 2** *In the presence of censoring, we show in Appendix A that ignoring the uncertainty due to estimating pseudo-observations will, somewhat counter-intuitively, overestimate the variance of  $\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$ . This insight for weighting estimator is in parallel to [Jacobsen and Martinussen \(2016\)](#), who suggested ignoring the uncertainty due to estimating the pseudo-observations leads to conservative inference for outcome regression coefficients.*

**Remark 3** *For  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$  (and equivalently the IPW scheme), we show in Appendix A that treating the inverse probability weights as known will, also counter-intuitively, overestimate the variance for pairwise comparisons; this extends the classic results of [Hirano et al. \(2003\)](#) to multiple treatments. The implications of ignoring the uncertainty in estimating the propensity scores, however, are generally uncertain for other choice of  $h(\mathbf{X})$ , which can lead to either conservative or anti-conservative inference, as also mentioned in [Haneuse and Rotnitzky \(2013\)](#). An exception is the randomized controlled trial*

(RCT), where the propensity score to any treatment group is a constant and thus any tilting function based on the propensity scores reduces to a constant, i.e.  $h(\mathbf{X}) = \tilde{h}(e_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, e_j(\mathbf{X})) \propto 1$ . In this case, one can still estimate a “working” propensity score model and use the subsequent weighting estimator (5) to adjust for chance imbalance in covariates. Equation (7) shows that such a covariate adjustment approach in RCT leads to variance reduction for pairwise comparisons, extending the results developed in Zeng et al. (2020) to multiple treatments and censored survival outcomes.

**Remark 4** Estimator (5) and Theorem 1 can be extended to accommodate covariate dependent censoring:  $T_i(j) \perp\!\!\!\perp C_i(j) | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i$ . In this case, one can consider inverse probability of censoring weighted pseudo-observation (Robins and Finkelstein, 2000; Binder et al., 2014):

$$\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) = \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}_i; t) \mathbf{I}\{C_i \geq \tilde{T}_i \wedge t\}}{\hat{G}(\tilde{T}_i \wedge t | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i)}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{G}(u | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i)$  is a consistent estimator of the censoring survival function  $G(u | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) = \Pr(C_i \geq u | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i)$ , for example, given by the Cox proportional hazards regression. To show the consistency and asymptotic normality of the modified weighting estimator, we can similarly view (8) as a functional mapping from the empirical distribution of data to a real value (Overgaard et al., 2019) and find the corresponding functional derivatives for asymptotic expansion. Additional explanations are provided in Appendix A.

The following Theorem 2 shows that the overlap weights, similar to the case of non-censored outcomes, lead to the smallest total asymptotic variance for all pairwise comparisons based on the pseudo-observations among the family of balancing weights.

**Theorem 2** Under regularity conditions in Appendix A and assuming generalized homoscedasticity such that  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}\{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) | Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i\} = \mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t) | Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i\}$  is a constant across different levels of  $(Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$ , the harmonic mean function  $h(\mathbf{X}) = \{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}} e_l^{-1}(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1}$  leads to the smallest total asymptotic variance for pairwise comparisons among all tilting functions.

Theorem 2 generalizes the findings of Li et al. (2018) and Li and Li (2019) to provide new theoretical justification for the efficiency optimality of the overlap weights,  $w_j^h(\mathbf{X}) = e_j(\mathbf{X}) \{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}} e_l^{-1}(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1}$ ,

when applied to censored survival outcomes. Technically this result relies on a generalized homoscedasticity assumption that requires the limiting variance of the estimated pseudo-observations to be constant within the strata defined by  $(Z_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$ . This condition includes the usual homoscedasticity for conditional outcome variance as a special case in the absence of censoring. Of note, the homoscedasticity condition may not hold in practice, but has been empirically shown to be not crucial for the efficiency property of OW, as exemplified in the simulations by [Li et al. \(2018\)](#) and numerous applications. Furthermore, in [Section 4](#), we carry out extensive simulations to verify that OW leads to improved efficiency over IPW when generalized homoscedasticity is violated.

We can further augment estimator (5) by an outcome regression model of the pseudo-observations. Specifically, for any time  $t$ , we can posit treatment-specific outcome models  $m_j^k(\mathbf{X}_i; \alpha_j) = \mathbb{E}\{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j\}$ , and define an augmented weighting estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{j,j',\text{AUG}}^{k,h}(t) = & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{h}(\mathbf{X}_i) \{m_j(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\alpha}_j) - m_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\alpha}_{j'})\}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{h}(\mathbf{X}_i)} \\ & + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} \{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_j(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\alpha}_j)\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} \\ & - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\} \{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\alpha}_{j'})\} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\hat{\alpha}_j$  denotes the estimated regression parameters in the  $j$ th outcome model. Such an augmented estimator generalizes those developed in [Mao et al. \(2019\)](#) to multiple treatments and survival outcomes. When  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ , i.e. with the IPW scheme, the augmented estimator becomes the doubly-robust estimator for pairwise comparisons. When only  $J = 2$  treatments are compared, (9) reduces to the estimator of [Wang \(2018\)](#), and provides an alternative to other double-robust estimators studied in, for example, [Zhang and Schaubel \(2012\)](#), [Cai and van der Laan \(2020\)](#). For other choices of  $h(\mathbf{X})$ , the augmented estimator is not necessarily doubly robust, but may be more efficient than weighting alone as long as the outcome model is correctly specified ([Mao et al., 2019](#)). For specifying an outcome regression model, [Andersen and Pohar Perme \(2010\)](#) reviewed a set of generalized linear models appropriate for the pseudo-observations, and discussed residual-based diagnostic tools for checking model adequacy. One can follow their strategies and assume the outcome model as  $m_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \alpha_j) = g^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_i^T \alpha_j)$ , where  $g$

is a link function. Estimation of  $\alpha_j$  can proceed with standard algorithms for fitting generalized linear models. For our estimands of interest, we can choose the identity or log link for estimating the ASCE and RACE and the complementary log-log link (resembling a proportional hazards model) for the SPCE (Andersen et al., 2004; Klein et al., 2007). Compared to Theorem 1 for the weighting estimator (5), derivation of the asymptotic variance of (9) requires considering a third source of uncertainty due to estimating  $\alpha_j$  in the outcome model. We sketch the key derivation steps in Appendix A.

## 4 Simulation studies

We conduct simulation studies to evaluate the finite-sample performance of the propensity score weighting estimator (5), and to illustrate the efficiency property of the OW estimator.

### 4.1 Simulation design

We generate four pre-treatment covariates:  $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{1i}, X_{2i}, X_{3i}, X_{4i})^T$ , where  $(X_{1i}, X_{2i})^T$  are drawn from a mean-zero bivariate normal distribution with equal variance 2 and correlation 0.25,  $X_{3i} \sim \text{Bern}(0.5)$ , and  $X_{4i} \sim \text{Bern}(0.4 + 0.2X_{3i})$ . We consider  $J = 3$  treatment groups, with the true propensity score model given by  $\log\{e_j(\mathbf{X}_i)/e_1(\mathbf{X}_i)\} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^T \beta_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i = (1, \mathbf{X}_i^T)^T$ . We set  $\beta_1 = (0, 0, 0, 0)^T$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.2\beta_3$ ; two sets of values for  $\beta_3$  are considered: (i)  $\beta_3 = \beta_1$  and (ii)  $\beta_3 = (1.2, 1.5, 1, -1.5, -1)^T$ , which represent good and poor covariate overlap between groups, respectively. Distribution of the true generalized propensity scores under each specification is presented in Figure 4.

Two outcome models are used to generate potential survival times. Model A is a Weibull proportional hazards model with hazard rate for  $T_i(j)$  as  $\lambda_j(t|\mathbf{X}_i) = \eta\nu t^{\nu-1} \exp\{L_i(j)\}$ , and  $L_i(j) = \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = 2\}\gamma_2 + \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = 3\}\gamma_3 + \mathbf{X}_i^T \alpha$ . We specify  $\eta = 0.0001$ ,  $\nu = 3$ ,  $\alpha = (0, 2, 1.5, -1, 1)^T$ , and  $\gamma_2 = \gamma_3 = 1$ , implying worse survival experience due to treatments  $j = 2$  and  $j = 3$ . The potential survival time  $T_i(j)$  is then drawn using  $T_i(j) = \left\{ \frac{-\log(U_i)}{\eta \exp(L_i(j))} \right\}^{1/\nu}$ , where  $U_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ . Model B is an accelerated failure time model that violates the proportional hazards assumption. Specifically,  $T_i(j)$

is drawn from a log-normal distribution  $\log\{T_i(j)\} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 = 0.64)$ , with  $\mu = 3.5 - \gamma_2 \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = 2\} - \gamma_3 \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = 3\} - \mathbf{X}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ . For simplicity, we assume treatment has no causal effect on censoring time such that  $C_i(j) = C_i$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Under completely independent censoring,  $C_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, 115)$ . Under covariate-dependent censoring,  $C_i$  is generated from a Weibull survival model with hazard rate  $\lambda^c(t|\mathbf{X}_i) = \eta_c \nu_c t^{\nu_c-1} \exp(\mathbf{X}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_c = (1, 0.5, -0.5, 0.5)^T$ ,  $\eta_c = 0.0001$ ,  $\nu_c = 2.7$ . These parameters are specified so that the marginal censoring rate is roughly 50%. Of note, neither data generating process assumes generalized homoscedasticity in Theorem 2, and thus provides a fair evaluation of the efficiency property of OW in realistic settings.

Under each data generating process, we consider the OW and IPW estimators based on (5), and focus our comparison here with two standard estimators: the g-formula estimator based on the confounder-adjusted Cox model, and the IPW-Cox model (Austin and Stuart, 2017). Details of these two and other alternative estimators are included in Appendix B. While the IPW estimator (5) and the Cox model based estimators focus on the combined population with  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ , the OW estimator focuses on the overlap population with the optimal tilting function suggested in Theorem 2. When comparing treatments  $j = 2$  (or  $j = 3$ ) with  $j = 1$ , the true values of target estimands can be different between OW and the other estimators (albeit very similar under good overlap), and are computed via Monte Carlo integration. Nonetheless, when we compare treatments  $j = 2$  and  $j = 3$ , the true conditional average effect  $\tau_{2,3}^k(\mathbf{X}; t) = 0$  for all  $k$ , and thus the true estimand  $\tau_{2,3}^{k,h}(t)$  has the same value (zero) regardless of  $h(\mathbf{X})$ . This represents a natural scenario to compare the bias and efficiency between estimators without differences in true values of estimands. We vary the study sample size  $N \in \{150, 300, 450, 600, 750\}$ , and fix the evaluation point  $t = 60$  for estimating SPCE ( $k = 1$ ) and RACE ( $k = 2$ ). We consider 1000 simulations and calculate the absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and empirical coverage corresponding to each estimator. To obtain the empirical coverage for OW and IPW, we construct 95% confidence intervals (CIs) based on the consistent variance estimators suggested by Theorem 1. Bootstrap CIs are used for Cox g-formula and IPW-Cox estimators. Additional simulations comparing OW with alternative regression estimators and the augmented weighting estimators (9) can be found in Appendix C.

## 4.2 Simulation results

Under good overlap, Figure 5 presents the absolute bias, RMSE and coverage for OW, IPW estimators based on (5), Cox g-formula as well as IPW-Cox estimators, when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent. Here we focus on comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$ , and thus the true average causal effect among any target population is null. Across all three estimands (SPCE, RACE and ASCE), OW consistently outperforms IPW with a smaller absolute bias and RMSE, and closer to nominal coverage across all levels of  $N$ . Due to correctly specified outcome model, the Cox g-formula estimator is, as expected, more efficient than the weighting estimators. However, its empirical coverage is not always close to nominal, especially for estimating ASCE. The IPW-Cox estimator has the largest bias, because the proportional hazards assumption does not hold marginally among any of the target population. Figure 1 represents the counterpart of Figure 5 but under poor overlap. The IPW estimator based on (5) is susceptible to lack of overlap due to extreme inverse probability weights, resulting in extremely large bias, variance and low coverage. The bias and under-coverage remain for IPW even after trimming units with extreme propensities, i.e. with  $\max_j \{e_j(\mathbf{X}_i)\} > 0.97$  and  $\min_j \{e_j(\mathbf{X}_i)\} < 0.03$ . (Figure 6). Under poor overlap, OW is more efficient than IPW regardless of trimming, and becomes almost as efficient as the Cox g-formula estimator for estimating RACE and ASCE. Furthermore, the proposed OW interval estimator consistently carries close to nominal coverage for all three types of estimands. Figure 10 presents the counterparts of Figure 6 and Figure 1 while focusing on comparing treatments  $j = 2$  and  $j = 1$  where the true average causal effect is non-null. The patterns are similar.

In Table 1, we summarize the performance metrics for different estimators when the proportional hazards assumption is violated and/or censoring depends on covariates. Similar to Figure 1, we focus on comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  such that the true average causal effect is null among any target population. When survival outcomes are generated from model B and hence the proportional hazards assumption no longer holds, both the Cox g-formula and IPW-Cox estimators have the largest bias, especially under poor overlap. In those scenarios, OW maintains the largest efficiency, and consistently




Figure 1: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  under poor overlap, when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent.



outperforms IPW in terms of bias and variance. While the empirical coverage of IPW estimator deteriorates under poor overlap, the coverage of OW estimator is robust to lack of overlap. When censoring further depends on covariates, we modify the OW and IPW estimators using (8) where the censoring survival functions are estimated by a Cox model. With the addition of inverse probability of censoring weights, only OW maintains the smallest bias, largest efficiency and closest to nominal coverage under poor overlap across all types of estimands. Results for comparing treatments  $j = 2$  and  $j = 1$  are similar and included in Table 3.

In Appendix C, we have additionally compared OW with alternative outcome regression estimators similar to Mao et al. (2018), and the g-formula estimator based on the pseudo-observations (Andersen et al., 2017; Tanaka et al., 2020). These estimators were originally developed with binary treatments, and we adapt them in Appendix C to multiple treatments. Compared to the proposed nonparametric OW estimator (5), these regression estimators are frequently less efficient and have less than nominal coverage under poor overlap. An exception is the OW regression estimator that generalizes the work of Mao et al. (2018), which has similar performance to the OW estimator based on (5) when outcome is generated from model A. When outcome is generated from model B, the OW estimator in Mao et al. (2018) is subject to larger bias and RMSE due to incorrect proportional hazards assumption. We have also carried out additional simulations in Appendix C to examine the performance of the augmented OW and IPW estimators (9) relative to the nonparametric OW and IPW estimators (5). While including an outcome regression component can notably improve the efficiency of IPW, the efficiency gain for OW estimator due to an additional outcome model is negligible. This speaks to the appeal of the nonparametric OW estimator (5) because outcome models are almost always misspecified in practice. Finally, we replicate our simulations under a three-arm RCT similar to Zeng et al. (2020) (see Remark 3 and Appendix C for details). We confirmed that the OW and IPW estimators based on (5) are valid for covariate adjustment in RCTs and lead to substantially improved efficiency over the unadjusted comparisons of pseudo-observations in the presence of chance imbalance.

Table 1: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  under different degrees of overlap. In the “proportional hazards” scenario, the survival outcomes are generated from a Cox model (model A), and in the “non-proportional hazards” scenario, the survival outcomes are generated from an accelerated failure time model (model B). The sample size is fixed at  $N = 300$ .

		Degree of overlap		RMSE				Absolute bias				95% Coverage			
				OW	IPW	Cox	IPW-Cox	OW	IPW	Cox	IPW-Cox	OW	IPW	Cox	IPW-Cox
Model A, completely random censoring															
SPCE	Good			0.003	0.006	0.001	0.023	0.062	0.098	0.018	0.091	0.924	0.901	0.949	0.795
	Poor			0.003	0.007	0.005	0.049	0.074	0.102	0.046	0.117	0.917	0.879	0.922	0.647
RACE	Good			0.096	0.304	0.086	1.449	2.243	3.379	1.094	4.453	0.937	0.919	0.961	0.797
	Poor			0.109	0.391	0.252	3.151	2.998	3.496	2.709	6.093	0.930	0.901	0.967	0.644
ASCE	Good			0.181	0.354	0.153	2.336	2.916	4.974	1.911	8.959	0.941	0.903	0.849	0.790
	Poor			0.181	0.443	0.490	4.930	3.666	6.373	4.750	11.625	0.934	0.899	0.755	0.656
Model B, completely random censoring															
SPCE	Good			0.003	0.005	0.005	0.024	0.087	0.112	0.074	0.176	0.958	0.923	0.749	0.779
	Poor			0.005	0.008	0.016	0.081	0.097	0.118	0.150	0.222	0.941	0.921	0.770	0.712
RACE	Good			0.102	0.112	0.239	1.530	2.761	4.304	4.219	8.758	0.960	0.937	0.745	0.787
	Poor			0.105	0.299	0.947	4.646	3.627	4.669	8.653	11.275	0.936	0.929	0.742	0.709
ASCE	Good			0.129	0.443	0.468	2.382	4.238	7.174	7.354	16.583	0.958	0.959	0.846	0.777
	Poor			0.223	0.638	1.661	7.562	4.840	7.189	15.027	20.920	0.961	0.934	0.743	0.705
Model A, covariate dependent censoring															
SPCE	Good			0.002	0.005	0.003	0.038	0.052	0.082	0.047	0.121	0.917	0.889	0.921	0.741
	Poor			0.005	0.007	0.009	0.089	0.060	0.084	0.056	0.149	0.908	0.882	0.881	0.642
RACE	Good			0.048	0.154	0.117	2.201	2.773	3.838	2.801	5.382	0.938	0.926	0.908	0.763
	Poor			0.168	0.223	0.532	4.603	3.534	4.207	3.334	7.159	0.935	0.926	0.900	0.634
ASCE	Good			0.055	0.425	0.183	1.161	5.562	8.722	6.005	36.021	0.940	0.909	0.885	0.804
	Poor			0.067	0.568	1.032	11.657	9.557	9.735	7.157	43.651	0.928	0.892	0.752	0.772
Model B, covariate dependent censoring															
SPCE	Good			0.001	0.001	0.009	0.005	0.050	0.053	0.087	0.075	0.954	0.930	0.699	0.900
	Poor			0.002	0.005	0.012	0.025	0.052	0.082	0.164	0.082	0.925	0.925	0.723	0.896
RACE	Good			0.072	0.081	0.498	0.139	4.733	5.879	4.684	6.327	0.954	0.946	0.711	0.850
	Poor			0.109	0.146	0.712	1.594	6.250	7.115	9.092	7.515	0.956	0.955	0.705	0.839
ASCE	Good			0.072	0.258	0.794	0.340	4.436	5.738	7.337	7.756	0.954	0.946	0.835	0.847
	Poor			0.138	0.350	1.339	1.973	5.026	6.503	13.039	8.835	0.955	0.955	0.757	0.847

## 5 Application to National Cancer Database

We illustrate the proposed weighting estimators by comparing three treatment options for prostate cancer in an observational dataset with 44,551 high-risk, localized prostate cancer patients drawn from the National Cancer Database (NCDB). These patients were diagnosed between 2004 and 2013, and either underwent a surgical procedure – radical prostatectomy (RP), or were treated by one of two therapeutic procedures – external beam radiotherapy combined with androgen deprivation (EBRT+AD) or external beam radiotherapy plus brachytherapy with or without androgen deprivation (EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD). We focus on time to death since treatment initiation as the primary outcome, and pre-treatment confounders include age, clinical T stage, Charlson-Deyo score, biopsy Gleason score, prostate-specific antigen (PSA), year of diagnosis, insurance status, median income level, education, race, and ethnicity. A total of 2,434 patients died during the study period with their survival outcome observed, while other patients have right-censored outcomes. The median and maximum follow-up time is 21 and 115 months, respectively.

We used a multinomial logistic model to estimate the generalized propensity scores, and visualized the distribution of estimated scores in Figure 12. We model age and PSA by natural splines as in Ennis et al. (2018), and keep linear terms for all other covariates. We found good overlap across groups regarding the propensity of receiving EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD, but a slight lack of overlap regarding the propensity of receiving RP and EBRT+AD. We checked the weighted covariate balance under IPW and OW based on the maximum pairwise absolute standardized difference (MPASD) criteria, and present the balance statistics in Table 5. The MPASD for the  $p$ th covariate is defined as  $\max_{j < j'} \{|\bar{X}_{p,j} - \bar{X}_{p,j'}|/S_p\}$ , where  $\bar{X}_{p,j} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} X_{i,p} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)$  is the weighted covariate mean in group  $j$ , and  $S_p^2 = J^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J S_{p,j}^2$  is the unweighted sample variance averaged across all groups. Both IPW and OW improved covariate balance, with OW leading to consistently smaller MPASD, whose value is below the usual 0.1 threshold for all covariates.

Figure 2 presents the estimated causal survival curves for each treatment,  $\mathbb{E}\{h(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{1}\{T_i(j) \geq t\}\} / \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}))$ , along with the 95% confidence bands in the combined population (corresponding to IPW) and the over-

lap population (corresponding to OW). We chose 220 grid points equally spaced by half a month for this evaluation. The estimated causal survival curves among the two target populations are generally similar, which is expected given there is only a slight lack of overlap. The surgical treatment, RP, shows the largest survival benefit, followed by the radiotherapeutic treatment, EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD, while EBRT+AD results in the worst survival outcomes during the first 80 months or so. Importantly, the estimated causal survival curves for the RP and EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD crossed after month 80, suggesting potential violations to the proportional hazards assumption commonly assumed in survival analysis. Figure 3a and 3b further characterized the the SPCE and RACE as a function of time  $t$  with the associated 95% confidence bands. Evidently, the SPCE results confirmed the largest causal survival benefit due to RP, followed by EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD. The associated confidence band of SPCE from OW is narrower than that from IPW and frequently excludes zero. While the analysis of the pairwise RACE yielded similar findings, the efficiency of OW over IPW became more relevant when comparing RP and EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD. Specifically, the confidence band of RACE from OW excludes zero until month 80, while the confidence band of RACE from IPW straddles zero across the entire follow-up period. This analysis shed new light on the significant causal survival benefit of RP over EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD at the 0.05 level in terms of the restricted mean survival time, which was not identified in previous analysis.

In Table 2, we also reported the SPCE and RACE using the IPW and OW estimators, as well as the Cox g-formula and IPW-Cox estimators at  $t = 60$  months, i.e. the 80th quantile of the follow-up time. All methods conclude that RP leads to significantly lower mortality rate at 60 months than EBRT+AD. Compared to IPW, OW provides similar point estimates and no larger variance estimates. Consistently with Figure 3b, the smaller variance estimate due to OW (compared to IPW) leads to a change in conclusion when comparing EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD versus RP in terms of RACE at the 0.05 level and confirms the significant treatment benefit of RP. The Cox g-formula and IPW-Cox estimators sometimes provide considerably different results than weighting estimators based on (5), as they assumed proportional hazards which may not hold (the estimated causal survival curves crossed in Figure 2). Overall, we found that, compared to RP, the two radiotherapeutic treatments led to a shorter restricted mean survival time (1.2 months shorter with EBRT+AD and 0.5 month shorter with EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD) up to five years




Figure 2: Survival curves of the three treatments of prostate cancer (Section 5) estimated from the pseudo-observations-based weighting estimator, using IPW (left) and OW (right).


after treatment. The 5-year survival probability is also 6.7% lower under EBRT+AD and 3.1% lower under EBRT+brachy $\pm$ AD compared to RP.

## 6 Discussion


We proposed a class of propensity score weighting estimators for survival outcomes based on the pseudo-observations. These estimators are applicable to several different target populations, survival causal estimands, as well as binary and multiple treatments. We also extended our estimators to accommodate covariate-dependent censoring and augmentation with additional outcome models. Our estimators include the IPW estimator of [Andersen et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Wang \(2018\)](#) as special cases. The pseudo-observation approach addresses censoring in a “once for all” manner and thus allows analysts to carry out causal inference with survival outcomes by directly applying methods developed for non-censored outcomes. Previous studies rely on bootstrapping for variance estimation of similar weighting estimators, which is computationally intensive when combined with the jackknife pseudo-observations.

Table 2: Pairwise treatment effect estimates of the three treatments of prostate cancer (Section 5) using four methods, on the scale of restricted average causal effect (RACE) and survival probability causal effect (SPCE) at 60 months/5 years post-treatment.

Method	Estimate	Standard error	95% Confidence interval	p-value
EBRT-AD vs. RP comparison				
<i>Restricted average causal effect</i>				
OW	-1.277	0.150	(-1.524, -1.031)	0.000
IPW	-0.917	0.264	(-1.351, -0.484)	0.001
COX	-1.342	0.126	(-1.549, -1.136)	0.000
MSM	-0.931	0.220	(-1.294, -0.568)	0.000
<i>Survival probability causal effect</i>				
OW	-0.062	0.009	(-0.076, -0.048)	0.000
IPW	-0.067	0.009	(-0.083, -0.052)	0.000
COX	-0.059	0.006	(-0.068, -0.050)	0.000
MSM	-0.039	0.010	(-0.056, -0.023)	0.000
EBRT+brachy±AD vs. RP comparison				
<i>Restricted average causal effect</i>				
OW	-0.562	0.236	(-0.950, -0.174)	0.017
IPW	-0.309	0.331	(-0.855, 0.236)	0.350
COX	-0.802	0.214	(-1.155, -0.450)	0.000
MSM	-0.363	0.317	(-0.885, 0.158)	0.252
<i>Survival probability causal effect</i>				
OW	-0.032	0.013	(-0.054, -0.010)	0.016
IPW	-0.031	0.013	(-0.053, -0.009)	0.021
COX	-0.036	0.009	(-0.051, -0.020)	0.000
MSM	-0.015	0.014	(-0.038, 0.007)	0.256
EBRT+brachy±AD vs. EBRT+AD comparison				
<i>Restricted average causal effect</i>				
OW	0.715	0.240	(0.321, 1.109)	0.003
IPW	0.710	0.242	(0.195, 1.021)	0.015
COX	0.540	0.216	(0.184, 0.896)	0.012
MSM	0.568	0.246	(0.163, 0.973)	0.021
<i>Survival probability causal effect</i>				
OW	0.030	0.014	(0.006, 0.053)	0.036
IPW	0.036	0.014	(0.013, 0.059)	0.011
COX	0.024	0.009	(0.008, 0.039)	0.013
MSM	0.024	0.010	(0.007, 0.041)	0.021



(a) Estimated survival probability as a function of time  $t$  in three treatment groups.



(b) Estimated restricted mean survival time as a function of time  $t$  in three treatment groups.

Figure 3: Point estimates and 95% confidence bands of SPCE and RACE as a function of time from the pseudo-observations-based IPW and OW estimator in the prostate cancer application in Section 5.

By establishing the asymptotic properties of our estimators, we obtain a new closed-form variance estimator that takes into account of the uncertainty due to both pseudo-observations calculation and propensity score estimation; this allows valid and fast inference in large observational data. Within the family of balancing weights, we further established the optimal efficiency property of the overlap weights, expanding the theory of overlap weights to censored survival outcomes. Our extensive simulations and data application confirm the substantial efficiency improvement from using overlap weights compared to the inverse probability weights.

The proposed weighting estimators will be extended in several directions. First, subgroup analysis is

commonly used to study heterogeneous treatment effects (Dong et al., 2020). It is straightforward to extend the pseudo-observation approach to the subgroup propensity score weighting estimators developed in Yang et al. (2020). Second, in comparative effectiveness research, patients often receive treatments at multiple time points with time-dependent confounding. The standard approach is to couple a marginal structural Cox model with inverse probability weights to study the causal effect of treatment regimens for survival among the combined population (Robins et al., 2000). It would be interesting to extend the class of weighting estimators (5) to accommodate time-dependent confounding and censoring, and further develop the theory of OW in longitudinal observational studies. Finally, Wallace and Moodie (2015) studied OW in constructing the optimal dynamic treatment regimen (DTR) under an additive structural mean model, and demonstrated the efficiency gain over IPW via simulations. Their approach has recently been extended to an additive structural survival model (Simoneau et al., 2020). We conjecture that the pseudo-observation approach combined with OW can be a useful alternative to Simoneau et al. (2020) in identifying survival DTR under the dynamic weighted ordinary least squares framework.

## References

- Andersen, P. K., Hansen, M. G., and Klein, J. P. (2004), “Regression analysis of restricted mean survival time based on pseudo-observations,” *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 10, 335–350.
- Andersen, P. K., Klein, J. P., and Rosthøj, S. (2003), “Generalised linear models for correlated pseudo-observations, with applications to multi-state models,” *Biometrika*, 90, 15–27.
- Andersen, P. K. and Pohar Perme, M. (2010), “Pseudo-observations in survival analysis,” *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 19, 71–99.
- Andersen, P. K., Syriopoulou, E., and Parner, E. T. (2017), “Causal inference in survival analysis using pseudo-observations,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 36, 2669–2681.
- Austin, P. C. and Stuart, E. A. (2017), “The performance of inverse probability of treatment weighting and full matching on the propensity score in the presence of model misspecification when estimating



- the effect of treatment on survival outcomes,” *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 26, 1654–1670.
- Binder, N., Gerds, T. A., and Andersen, P. K. (2014), “Pseudo-observations for competing risks with covariate dependent censoring,” *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 20, 303–315.
- Cai, W. and van der Laan, M. J. (2020), “One-step targeted maximum likelihood estimation for time-to-event outcomes,” *Biometrics*, 76, 722–733.
- Cole, S. R. and Hernán, M. A. (2004), “Adjusted survival curves with inverse probability weights,” *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 75, 45–49.
- Dong, J., Zhang, J. L., Zeng, S., and Li, F. (2020), “Subgroup balancing propensity score,” *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 29, 659–676.
- Dudley, R. M. and Norvaiša, R. (1999), *Differentiability of six operators on nonsmooth functions and  $p$ -variation*, *Lecture Notes in Math*, 1703, Springer, Berlin.
- Ennis, R. D., Hu, L., Ryemon, S. N., Lin, J., and Mazumdar, M. (2018), “Brachytherapy-based radiotherapy and radical prostatectomy are associated with similar survival in high-risk localized prostate cancer,” *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 36, 1192–1198.
- Graw, F., Gerds, T. A., and Schumacher, M. (2009), “On pseudo-values for regression analysis in competing risks models,” *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 15, 241–255.
- Haneuse, S. and Rotnitzky, A. (2013), “Estimation of the effect of interventions that modify the received treatment,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 32, 5260–5277.
- Hernán, M. A. (2010), “The hazards of hazard ratios,” *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 21, 13.
- Hirano, K., Imbens, G., and Ridder, G. (2003), “Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score,” *Econometrica*, 71, 1161–1189.

- Hubbard, A. E., Van Der Laan, M. J., and Robins, J. M. (2000), “Nonparametric locally efficient estimation of the treatment specific survival distribution with right censored data and covariates in observational studies,” in *Statistical Models in Epidemiology, the Environment, and Clinical Trials*, Springer, 135–177.
- Imbens, G. W. (2000), “The role of the propensity score in estimating dose-response functions,” *Biometrika*, 87, 706–710.
- Jacobsen, M. and Martinussen, T. (2016), “A note on the large sample properties of estimators based on generalized linear models for correlated pseudo-observations,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 43, 845–862.
- James, L. F. et al. (1997), “A study of a class of weighted bootstraps for censored data,” *Annals of Statistics*, 25, 1595–1621.
- Klein, J. P. and Andersen, P. K. (2005), “Regression modeling of competing risks data based on pseudovalues of the cumulative incidence function,” *Biometrics*, 61, 223–229.
- Klein, J. P., Logan, B., Harhoff, M., and Andersen, P. K. (2007), “Analyzing survival curves at a fixed point in time,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 26, 4505–4519.
- Lehmann, E. L. and Casella, G. (2006), *Theory of point estimation*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Li, F. and Li, F. (2019), “Propensity score weighting for causal inference with multiple treatments,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 13, 2389–2415.
- 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.
- Li, F., Thomas, L. E., and Li, F. (2019), “Addressing extreme propensity scores via the overlap weights,” *American journal of Epidemiology*, 188, 250–257.
- Lunceford, J. K. and Davidian, M. (2004), “Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: a comparative study,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 23, 2937–2960.

- Mao, H., Li, L., and Greene, T. (2019), “Propensity score weighting analysis and treatment effect discovery,” *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 28, 2439–2454.
- Mao, H., Li, L., Yang, W., and Shen, Y. (2018), “On the propensity score weighting analysis with survival outcome: Estimands, estimation, and inference,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 37, 3745–3763.
- Overgaard, M., Parner, E. T., and Pedersen, J. (2019), “Pseudo-observations under covariate-dependent censoring,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 202, 112–122.
- Overgaard, M., Parner, E. T., Pedersen, J., et al. (2017), “Asymptotic theory of generalized estimating equations based on jack-knife pseudo-observations,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 45, 1988–2015.
- Robins, J. (1986), “A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect,” *Mathematical modelling*, 7, 1393–1512.
- Robins, J. M. and Finkelstein, D. M. (2000), “Correcting for noncompliance and dependent censoring in an AIDS clinical trial with inverse probability of censoring weighted (IPCW) log-rank tests,” *Biometrics*, 56, 779–788.
- Robins, J. M., Hernan, M. A., and Brumback, B. (2000), “Marginal Structural Models and Causal Inference in Epidemiology,” *Epidemiology*, 11, 550–560.
- 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.
- Simoneau, G., Moodie, E. E., Nijjar, J. S., Platt, R. W., Investigators, S. E. R. A. I. C., et al. (2020), “Estimating optimal dynamic treatment regimes with survival outcomes,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115, 1531–1539.
- Su, C.-L., Platt, R. W., and Plante, J.-F. (2020), “Causal inference for recurrent event data using pseudo-observations,” *Biostatistics*.

- Tanaka, S., Brookhart, M. A., and Fine, J. P. (2020), “G-estimation of structural nested mean models for competing risks data using pseudo-observations,” *Biostatistics*, 21, 860–875.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (1998), *Asymptotic statistics. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probablistic Mathematics*, volume 3, Cambridge university press.
- Wallace, M. P. and Moodie, E. E. (2015), “Doubly-robust dynamic treatment regimen estimation via weighted least squares,” *Biometrics*, 71, 636–644.
- Wang, J. (2018), “A simple, doubly robust, efficient estimator for survival functions using pseudo observations,” *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 17, 38–48.
- Yang, S., Imbens, G. W., Cui, Z., Faries, D. E., and Kadziola, Z. (2016), “Propensity score matching and subclassification in observational studies with multi-level treatments,” *Biometrics*, 72, 1055–1065.
- Yang, S., Lorenzi, E., Papadogeorgou, G., Wojdyla, D. M., Li, F., and Thomas, L. E. (2020), “Propensity Score Weighting for Causal Subgroup Analysis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02121*.
- Zeng, S., Li, F., Wang, R., and Li, F. (2020), “Propensity score weighting for covariate adjustment in randomized clinical trials,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 40, 842–858.
- Zhang, M. and Schaubel, D. E. (2012), “Double-robust semiparametric estimator for differences in restricted mean lifetimes in observational studies,” *Biometrics*, 68, 999–1009.

## Appendix

### A Proof of theoretical properties

**Proof of Theorem 1** (i) We first list the regularity assumptions needed for Theorem 1.

- (R1) We only consider time point  $t < \bar{t}$  such that  $G(\bar{t}) > \epsilon > 0$ , where  $G$  is the survival function for the censoring time  $C_i$ . Namely, any time point of interest has a strictly positive probability of not being censored.

- (R2) The generalized propensity score model (GPS),  $e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)$ , satisfies the regularity conditions specified in Theorem 5.1 of [Lehmann and Casella \(2006\)](#).

Next, we establish the consistency of estimator (5) in the main text. Let  $D_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}\{D_{ij} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)\}}{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))} + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\{D_{ij} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) | \mathbf{X}_i\}]}{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))} + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}\{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \mathbb{E}(v_k(T_i; t) | \mathbf{X}_i, D_{ij} = 1)\}}{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))} + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}\{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \mathbb{E}(v_k(T_i(j); t) | \mathbf{X}_i)\}}{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))} + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}\{h(\mathbf{X}_i) \mathbb{E}(v_k(T_i(j); t) | \mathbf{X}_i)\}}{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))} + o_p(1) = m_j^{k,h}(t) + o_p(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the fact that  $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \mathbf{X}_i, D_{ij} = 1) = \mathbb{E}(v_k(T_i; t) | \mathbf{X}_i, D_{ij} = 1) + o_p(1)$  ([Graw et al., 2009](#); [Jacobsen and Martinussen, 2016](#)) and the fourth equality follows from the unconfoundedness assumption (A1). Therefore, we can show that,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} \xrightarrow{p} m_j^{k,h}(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t) = \tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t),$$

and thus prove the consistency of the weighting estimator (5).

(ii) Below we derive the asymptotic variance of estimator (5) using the von Mises expansion on the pseudo-observations ([Jacobsen and Martinussen, 2016](#); [Overgaard et al., 2017](#)). Recall that estimator (5) is of the following form:

$$\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} = \hat{m}_j^{k,h}(t) - \hat{m}_{j'}^{k,h}(t).$$

We can write the treatment-specific average potential outcome  $\hat{m}_j^{k,h}(t)$  as the solution to the following estimating equation,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) - \hat{m}_j^{k,h}(t)\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) = 0.$$

A first-order Taylor expansion at the true value of  $(m_j^{k,h}(t), \gamma)$  yields,

$$\sqrt{N}\{\widehat{m}_j^{k,h}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)\} = \bar{\omega}^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \sqrt{N}(\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma) + o_p(1),$$

where  $\bar{\omega} = \mathbb{E}(D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)) = \mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_j &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ D_{ij} (\theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ D_{ij} (\theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ D_{ij} (\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \right\} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

The first line applies the centering property (equation 3.24 in [Overgaard et al. \(2017\)](#)) of the second order derivative  $\mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t)|\mathcal{O}_i\} = 0$ . The second line of the transformation for  $\mathbf{H}_j$  follows from Von-Mises expansion of the pseudo-observations (equation (6) in the main text). Under the standard regularity conditions in [Lehmann and Casella \(2006\)](#), we have,

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\gamma} - \gamma) = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} + o_p(1).$$

Then we have

$$\sqrt{N}\{\widehat{m}_j^{k,h}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)\} = \bar{\omega}^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ D_{ij} (\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \right\} + o_p(1).$$

Applying the von Mises expansion of the pseudo-observations as in [Jacobsen and Martinussen \(2016\)](#) and [Overgaard et al. \(2017\)](#), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{N}\{\widehat{m}_j^{k,h}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)\} \\ &= \bar{\omega}^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ D_{ij} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \right\} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similar expansions also apply to  $\widehat{m}_{j'}^{k,h}(t)$ , and thus we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{N}\{\widehat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) - \tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)\} = \bar{\omega}^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (\psi_{ij} - \psi_{ij'}) + o_p(1), \\ &\psi_{ij} = D_{ij} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the  $i$ th estimated pseudo-observation depends on the observed outcomes for the rest of sample. Due to the correlation between the estimated pseudo-observations, the usual Central Limit Theorem does not directly apply. Instead we reorganize the above expression into a sum of U-statistics of order 2 as follows,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (\psi_{ij} - \psi_{ij'}) = \frac{N}{\binom{N}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{l < i} \frac{1}{2} g_{il},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_{il} = & D_{ij} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_i(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\gamma \gamma_i \\ & - D_{ij'} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_i(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_{j'}^T \mathbf{I}_\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\gamma \gamma_i \\ & + D_{lj} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_l(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\gamma \gamma_l \\ & - D_{lj'} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_l(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_{j'}^T \mathbf{I}_\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\gamma \gamma_l \\ & + \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) \left\{ D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) - D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + D_{lj} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma) - D_{lj'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 12.3 in [Van der Vaart \(1998\)](#), we can show that the asymptotic variance of  $\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$  is,

$$\sqrt{N} \{ \hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) - \tau_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) \} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), \quad \sigma^2 = \bar{\omega}^{-2} \mathbb{E}(g_{il} g_{im}),$$

where  $\mathbb{E}(g_{il} g_{im}) = \mathbb{V}\{\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\} = \mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2$ , and the scaled influence function for treatment  $j$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) = & D_{ij} \left\{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \right\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \\ & + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\gamma \gamma_i. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have proved that the asymptotic variance of estimator (5) is  $\mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2 / \{\mathbb{E}(h(\mathbf{X}_i))\}^2$ .

**Explicit formulas for the functional derivatives** We provide the explicit expression for the functional derivative  $\phi'_{k,i}(t)$  and  $\phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)$  when the pseudo-observations are computed based on Kaplan-Meier estimator. We define three counting process in  $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , that is, for each unit  $i$ :  $Y_i(s) = \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{T}_i \geq s\}$ ,  $N_{i,0}(s) = \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{T}_i \leq s, \Delta_i = 0\}$ ,  $N_{i,1}(s) = \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{T}_i \leq s, \Delta_i = 1\}$ . Let  $\tilde{F}_N = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i, N_{i,0}, N_{i,1})$

be a vector of three step functions and its limit  $\tilde{F} = (H, H_0, H_1) \in \mathcal{E}^3$ , where  $H(s) = \Pr(\tilde{T}_i \geq s)$ ,  $H_0(s) = \Pr(\tilde{T}_i \leq s, \Delta_i = 0)$ ,  $H_1(s) = \Pr(\tilde{T}_i \leq s, \Delta_i = 1)$  are the population analog of  $(Y_i(s), N_{i,0}(s), N_{i,1}(s))$ . Notice that for a given element in  $\mathbf{D}$ , the space of distribution, there is a unique image in  $\mathcal{E}^3$ . For example,  $\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i}$  is mapped to  $(Y_i, N_{i,0}, N_{i,1})$ ,  $F$  is mapped to  $\tilde{F}$ , and  $F_N$  is mapped to  $\tilde{F}_N$ .

We then introduce the Nelson-Aalen functional  $\rho : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  at a fixed time point  $t$  as,

$$\rho(d; t) = \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}\{h_* > 0\}}{h_*(s)} dh_1(s), \quad \tilde{h} = (h_*, h_0, h_1) \in \mathcal{E}^3 \text{ is the unique image of } d \in \mathbf{D}$$

and the version using  $F$  and  $F_N$  as input,

$$\rho(F; t) = \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}\{H(s) > 0\}}{H(s)} dH_1(s) = \Lambda_1(t), \quad \rho(F_N; t) = \int_0^t \frac{\mathbf{1}\{Y(s) > 0\}}{Y(s)} dN_1(s) = \hat{\Lambda}_1(t),$$

where  $Y(s) = \sum_i Y_i(s)$ ,  $N_1(s) = \sum_i N_{i,1}(s)$ . Also  $\rho(F_N)$  actually corresponds to the Nelson-Aalen estimator of the cumulative hazard  $\Lambda_1(t)$ . Its first and second order derivative evaluated at  $F$  along the direction of sample  $i, l$  is given by [James et al. \(1997\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \rho'_i(t) &= \int_0^t \frac{1}{H(s)} dM_{i,1}(s), \\ \rho''_{i,l}(t) &= \int_0^t \frac{H(s) - Y_l(s)}{H(s)^2} dM_{i,1}(s) + \int_0^t \frac{H(s) - Y_i(s)}{H(s)^2} dM_{l,1}(s), \end{aligned}$$

where  $M_{i,1}(s) = N_{i,1}(s) - \int_0^s Y_i(u) d\Lambda_1(u)$  is a locally square integrable martingale for the counting process  $N_{i,1}(s)$ . The Kaplan-Meier estimator can then be represented as  $\hat{S}(t) = \phi_1(F_N; t)$ , where  $\phi_1(d; t)$  is defined as,

$$\phi_1(d; t) = \prod_0^t (1 - \rho(d; ds)), \quad d \in \mathbf{D}$$

where  $\prod_0^{(\cdot)}$  is the product integral operator. Next, we fix the evaluation time point for the Kaplan-Meier functional and calculate its derivative along the direction of sample  $i$  at  $F$ ,

$$\phi'_{1,i}(t) = -S(t)\rho'_i(t)$$



Similarly, we can take the second order derivative along the direction of sample  $(i, l)$  at  $F$ ,

$$\phi''_{1,(i,l)}(t) = -S(t) \left\{ \rho''_{(i,l)}(t) - \rho'_i(t)\rho'_l(t) + \mathbf{1}\{i = l\} \int_0^t \frac{1}{H^2(s)} dN_{i,1}(s) \right\}.$$

Now we have the expression for  $\phi'_{1,i}(t), \phi''_{1,(i,l)}(t)$ . Notice that the functional for the restricted mean survival time is the integral of the Kaplan-Meier functional,

$$\phi_2(d; t) = \int_0^t \phi_1(d; u) du, \quad d \in \mathbf{D}.$$

Then the functional derivative are given by,

$$\phi'_{2,i}(t) = \int_0^s \phi'_{1,i}(s) ds, \quad \phi''_{2,(i,l)}(t) = \int_0^s \phi''_{1,(i,l)}(s) ds.$$

Notice that the above equality holds only if  $\phi_1(d; t)$  is differentiable at any order in the  $p$ -variation setting (Dudley and Norvaiša, 1999) and its composition with the integration operator is also differentiable at any order, which is indeed the case for the Kaplan-Meier functional (Overgaard et al., 2017).

**Proof of Remark 1:** Without censoring, each pseudo-observation becomes  $\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) = \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) = v_k(T_i; t)$  and  $Q_N = 0$ . Plugging these into the formula of the asymptotic variance in Theorem 1, we obtain the asymptotic variance derived in Li and Li (2019), replacing  $Y_i$  with  $v_k(T_i; t)$ .

**Proof of Remark 2:** In this part, we prove that ignoring the “correlation term” between the pseudo-observations of different units will over-estimate the variance of the weighting estimator.

Treating each pseudo-observation as an “observed response variable” and ignoring the uncertainty associated with jackknifing will induce the following asymptotic variance,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{*2} &= \bar{\omega}^{-2} \mathbb{E}[D_{ij} \{ \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \\ &\quad - D_{ij'} \{ \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t) \} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_{j'}^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}]^2 \\ &= \bar{\omega}^{-2} \mathbb{E}[D_{ij} \{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_j^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \\ &\quad - D_{ij'} \{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t) \} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) + \mathbf{H}_{j'}^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}]^2 \\ &= \bar{\omega}^{-2} \mathbb{E}\{ \Psi_j^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t) \}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 2 in [Graw et al. \(2009\)](#). We wish to show that,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2 \geq \mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2,$$

and hence  $\sigma^{*2} \geq \sigma^2$ . Notice that,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_i &\triangleq \Psi_j^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t), \psi_i \triangleq \Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t) \\ \psi_i &= \eta_i + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) [D_{lj} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l, \gamma) - D_{lj'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l, \gamma)] \end{aligned}$$

Next, we plug the exact formula of  $\phi'_{k,i}(t)$  and  $\phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)$  into the above equation, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\{\eta_i(\psi_i - \eta_i)\} \\ &= -S^2(t) \mathbb{E} \left[ \{D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma) - D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma)\} \int_0^t \frac{1}{H(s)} dM(s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\{ \int_0^t \int_0^s \frac{1}{H(u)} dM(u) d\mu(s) - \int_0^t \left(1 - \frac{Y(s)}{H(s)}\right) d\mu(s) \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $M(s) = N_1(s) - \int_0^s Y(t) d\Lambda_1(t)$ ,  $d\mu(s) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma) - D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma)}{H(s)} dM_{i,1}(s) \right\}$ . With the results established in the proof of Theorem 2 in [Jacobsen and Martinussen \(2016\)](#) (equation (22) in their Appendix, treating  $D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma) - D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma)$  as the “ $A(Z)$ ” in the equation), we can further simplify the above expression to,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\eta_i(\psi_i - \eta_i)\} = -S^2(t) \int_0^t \int_0^t \int_0^{s \wedge u} \frac{\lambda_c(v)}{H(v)} dv d\mu(u) d\mu(s),$$

where  $\lambda_c(t)$  is the hazard function for the censoring time. Also, similar to equation (16) in the Appendix of [Jacobsen and Martinussen \(2016\)](#), we can show that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\psi_i - \eta_i\}^2 &= S^2(t) \int_0^t \int_0^t \int_0^{s \wedge u} \frac{\lambda_c(v)}{H(v)} dv d\mu(u) d\mu(s) \\ &= -\mathbb{E}\{\eta_i(\psi_i - \eta_i)\} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above results, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2 &= \mathbb{E}\{\psi_i\}^2 = \mathbb{E}\{\eta_i + \psi_i - \eta_i\}^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\eta_i\}^2 + \mathbb{E}\{\psi_i - \eta_i\}^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\{\eta_i(\psi_i - \eta_i)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2 - \mathbb{E}\{\psi_i - \eta_i\}^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\{\Psi_j^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t) - \Psi_{j'}^*(\mathcal{O}_i; t)\}^2
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of this remark.

**Proof of Remark 3:** Treating the generalized propensity score as known will remove the term  $\mathbf{H}_{j'}^T \mathbf{I} \gamma \gamma \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i}$  in  $\Psi_j(\mathcal{O}_i; t)$ . When  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$  or equivalently under the IPW scheme, the asymptotic variance based on the known or fixed GPS in estimator (5),  $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ , becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\sigma}^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ D_{ij} \{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t) \} e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} - D_{ij'} \{ \theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t) \} e_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) \{ D_{lj} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} - D_{lj'} e_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \} \right]^2.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the asymptotic variance taking account of uncertainty in estimating the generalized propensity scores can be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2 &= \tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'})^T \mathbf{I} \gamma \gamma^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ D_{ij} (\theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \right\} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i} - \left\{ D_{ij'} (\theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t)) e_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj'} e_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \right\} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i} \right] + (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'})^T \mathbf{I} \gamma \gamma (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'}) \\
&= \tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'})^T \mathbf{I} \gamma \gamma^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ D_{ij} (\theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \{ \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i} - D_{ij'} (\theta_k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_{j'}^{k,h}(t)) e_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \{ \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj'} e_{j'}(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma, i} \right] + (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'})^T \mathbf{I} \gamma \gamma (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'}) \\
&= \tilde{\sigma}^2 + 2I + II,
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied the facts that  $E(\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}^T) = \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}$ . The score function  $\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}$  can be expressed as,

$$D_{ij} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} = D_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^J \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} e_k(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \right\} D_{ik} / e_k(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) = \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \right\} D_{ij} / e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma).$$

On the other hand, when  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ , we have,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \{e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1}\} = -e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) = -D_{ij} e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}.$$

Notice that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} | \mathcal{O}_i, \mathbf{X}_l\}\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \mathbb{E}\{D_{lj} | \mathbf{X}_l\} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) | \mathcal{O}_i, \mathbf{X}_l\}\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) | \mathcal{O}_i, \mathbf{X}_l\}\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}\} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \mathbb{E}\{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) | \mathcal{O}_i\}\} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from the weak unconfoundness assumption (A1), namely,  $\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t)$  is a function of  $\tilde{T}_l(j), \Delta_l(j)$  which independent of  $D_{lj}$  given  $\mathbf{X}_l$ . With the above equality, we can show,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left\{ D_{ij} (\theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{l \neq i} \{\phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t) D_{lj} e_j(\mathbf{X}_l; \gamma)^{-1}\} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{D_{ij} (\theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) e_j(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\gamma,i}\} \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \left\{ (\theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) - m_j^{k,h}(t)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i, \gamma) \right\} = -\mathbf{H}_j \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have  $2I = -2II$ , and  $\sigma^2 - \tilde{\sigma}^2 = -(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'})^T \mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma} (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}_{j'}) \leq 0$  since  $\mathbf{I}_{\gamma\gamma}$  is semi-positive definite. As such, we have proved Remark 3.

**Proof of Remark 4:** First we will prove the consistency of estimator (5) in the main text under co-variate dependent (conditional independent) censoring specified in Assumption (A4). We define the functional  $G$  by

$$G(f; s | X, Z) = \prod_0^{s^-} (1 - \Lambda(f; du | X, Z)), \quad f \in \mathbf{D}$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the Nelson-Aalen functional for the cumulative hazard of censoring time  $C_i$ . And we define functional  $v$  as the  $v_k(f; t) = v_k(\tilde{T}; t)\mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}$ , for  $f \in \mathbf{D}$ . Hence, we can view (5) using (8) in the main text as a functional from  $\mathbf{D}$  to  $\mathcal{R}$ , which is given by,

$$\Theta_k(f) = \int \frac{v_k(f; t)}{G(f; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)} df.$$

According to Overgaard et al. (2019), functional  $\Theta_k$  is measurable mapping and 2-times continuously differentiable with a Lipschitz continuous second-order derivative in a neighborhood of  $F$ . Assuming the censoring survival function  $G$  is consistently estimated, say, by a Cox proportional hazards model, we can establish a similar property as in the completely random censoring case that (Theorem 2 in Overgaard et al. (2019)),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\hat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}_i; t)\mathbf{1}\{C_i \geq \tilde{T}_i \wedge t\}}{G(\tilde{T}_i \wedge t | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i)} | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i \right\} + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(v_k(\tilde{T}_i; t) | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) G(\tilde{T}_i \wedge t | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i)}{G(\tilde{T}_i \wedge t | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i)} + o_p(1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(v_k(\tilde{T}_i; t) | \mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can show the consistency of estimator (5) based on (8) in the main text follows the exact same procedure as in the proof for Theorem 1 (i).

Moreover, the asymptotic normality of estimator (5) using (8) follows the same proof in Theorem 2 (ii) where we replace the derivative  $\phi'_{k,i}(t)$  and  $\phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)$  with the one corresponding to the functional  $\Theta_k$ . We omit the detailed steps for brevity, but present the specific forms of the functional derivatives. The first-order derivative of  $\Theta_k$  at  $F$  along the direction of sample  $i$  is given by,

$$\Theta'_{k,i} = \int \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}; t)\mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}}{G(F; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)} d\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i} - \int \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}; t)\mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}}{G(F; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)^2} G'_F(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i}; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z) dF.$$

Note that  $G'_F(g; s | \mathbf{X}, Z)$  is the derivative of functional  $G$  at  $F$  along direction  $g$ , which is,

$$G'_F(g; s | \mathbf{X}, Z) = -G(F; s | \mathbf{X}, Z) \int_0^{s^-} \frac{1}{1 - d\Lambda(F; u | \mathbf{X}, Z)} \Lambda'_F(g; du | \mathbf{X}, Z),$$

where  $\Lambda'_F(g; du | \mathbf{X}, Z)$  is the functional derivative of the cumulative hazard evaluated at  $F$  along direction  $g$ . For example, if the censoring survival function is estimated by Cox proportional hazards model,

the above functional derivative can be obtained by viewing it as a solution to a set of estimating equations for the Cox model and employing the implicit function theorem. Detailed derivation is provided in the proof of Proposition 2 in [Overgaard et al. \(2019\)](#). The second order derivative of  $\Theta_k$  at  $F$  along the direction of sample  $i, l$  is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta''_{k,(i,l)} = & - \int \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}; t) \mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}}{G(F; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)^2} G'_F(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i}; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z) d\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i} \\ & - \int \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}; t) \mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}}{G(F; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)^2} G'_F(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_l}; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z) d\delta_{\mathcal{O}_l} \\ & + 2 \int \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}; t) \mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}}{G(F; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)^3} G'_F(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i}; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z) G'_F(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_l}; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z) dF \\ & - \int \frac{v_k(\tilde{T}; t) \mathbf{1}\{C \geq \tilde{T} \wedge t\}}{G(F; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z)^2} G''_F(\delta_{\mathcal{O}_i}, \delta_{\mathcal{O}_l}; \tilde{T} \wedge t | \mathbf{X}, Z) dF.\end{aligned}$$

The second-order derivative of  $G$  at  $F$  along the direction of  $(g, h)$  is,

$$\begin{aligned}G''_F(g, h; s | \mathbf{X}, Z) = & G(F; s | \mathbf{X}, Z) \int_0^{s^-} \frac{1}{1 - d\Lambda(F; u | \mathbf{X}, Z)} \Lambda'_F(g; du | \mathbf{X}, Z) \\ & \times \int_0^{s^-} \frac{1}{1 - d\Lambda(F; u | \mathbf{X}, Z)} \Lambda'_F(h; du | \mathbf{X}, Z) \\ & - G(F; s | \mathbf{X}, Z) \int_0^s \frac{d\Lambda'(g; | \mathbf{X}, Z) d\Lambda'(h; | \mathbf{X}, Z)}{(1 - d\Lambda(F; u | \mathbf{X}, Z))^2} \\ & - G(F; s | \mathbf{X}, Z) \int_0^{s^-} \frac{\Lambda''_F(g, h; du | \mathbf{X}, Z)}{1 - d\Lambda(F; u | \mathbf{X}, Z)}.\end{aligned}$$

The second-order derivative of the cumulative hazard for using the proportional hazard model,  $\Lambda''_F(g, h; du | \mathbf{X}, Z)$  is given in the Section 3 of the Appendix of [Overgaard et al. \(2019\)](#).

**Proof of Theorem 2** We proceed under the regularity conditions specified in the proof of Theorem 1.

Let  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^J$  and define,

$$\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{c}; t)^{k,h} = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)} \right\}.$$

It is easy to show that when  $c_j = 1, c_{j'} = -1, c_{j''} = 0, j'' \neq j, j'$ , we have  $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{c}; t)^{k,h} = \hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$ . Conditional on the collection of design points  $\underline{\mathbf{Z}} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_N\}$  and  $\underline{\mathbf{X}} = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N\}$ , the asymptotic

variance of  $\widehat{\tau}(\mathbf{c}; t)^{k,h}$  is,

$$\begin{aligned}
N \mathbb{V}(\widehat{\tau}(\mathbf{c}; t)^{k,h} | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}) &= N \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \mathbb{V}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l)}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2} \right] \\
&\quad + N \sum_{j \neq j'} c_j c_{j'} \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj'} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l)}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\} \{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}} \\
&= A + B + C
\end{aligned}$$

First, we consider the asymptotic behaviour of term C. Notice that with von Mises expansion (equation (6) in the main text),

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= \text{Cov} \left\{ \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{m \neq i} \phi''_{k,(m,i)}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,l}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{n \neq l} \phi''_{k,(n,l)} | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}} \right\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}) \\
&= \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi'_{k,l}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{n \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(n,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{m \neq i} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,l}(t), \phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \text{Cov} \left\{ \sum_{m \neq i} \phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t), \sum_{n \neq l} \phi''_{k,(n,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}} \right\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

We view  $\phi'_{k,i}(t)$  as a function of  $(\widetilde{T}_i(j), \Delta_i(j))$  and  $\phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)$  as function of  $(\widetilde{T}_i(j), \Delta_i(j), \widetilde{T}_l(j'), \Delta_l(j'))$  (since we have  $D_{ij} D_{lj'}$  as the multiplier). Due to the independence between  $(\widetilde{T}_i(j), \Delta_i(j))$  and  $(\widetilde{T}_l(j'), \Delta_l(j'))$  given  $\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}$ , we can reduce the following covariance into zero,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi'_{k,l}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= 0, \text{ when } i \neq l, \\
\text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(n,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= 0, \text{ when } i \neq n, \\
\text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,l}(t), \phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= 0, \text{ when } l \neq m, \\
\text{Cov}\{\phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi''_{k,(n,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= 0, \text{ when } m \neq n.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,l}(t), \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \sum_{m \neq i, m \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi''_{k,(m,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) \xrightarrow{p} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}(D_{ij}|\mathbf{X})/e_j(\mathbf{X}) h(\mathbf{X}) f(\mathbf{X}) \mu(d\mathbf{X}) \triangleq C_h,$$

Then term  $C$  is asymptotically equals to,

$$\begin{aligned} &N \sum_{j \neq j'} c_j c_{j'} \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj'} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l)}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\} \{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}} \\ &= \sum_{j \neq j'} c_j c_{j'} \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj'} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l)/N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\} \{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\}} \\ &= \sum_{j \neq j'} c_j c_{j'} \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj'} \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l)/N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\} \{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \neq j'} c_j c_{j'} \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj'} \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,l}(t), \phi''_{k,(l,i)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l)/N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\} \{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \neq j'} c_j c_{j'} \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj'} \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \sum_{m \neq i, m \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi''_{k,(m,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_l)/N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\} \{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij'} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i)/N\}} + o_p(1) \\ &= o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider term  $B$ . Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi'_{k,l}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{n \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(n,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{m \neq i} \text{Cov}\{\phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi'_{k,l}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \sum_{m \neq i, n \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi''_{k,(n,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,l}(t), \phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \sum_{m \neq i, m \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi''_{k,(m,l)}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$



Then the term  $B$  asymptotically equals,

$$\begin{aligned}
& N \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj} \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_l^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l)}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj} \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t), \phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l) / N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / N\}^2} \\
&+ \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj} \frac{1}{N-1} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,l}(t), \phi''_{k,(i,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l) / N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / N\}^2} \\
&+ \frac{\sum_{i \neq l} D_{ij} D_{lj} \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \sum_{m \neq i, m \neq l} \text{Cov}\{\phi'_{k,(m,i)}(t), \phi''_{k,(m,l)}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_l) / N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / N\}^2} + o_p(1) = o_p(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, for term  $A$ , Note that we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= \text{Cov}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t), \widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} = \text{Cov}\left\{\theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{m \neq i} \phi''_{k,(m,i)}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \theta^k(t) + \phi'_{k,i}(t) + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{m \neq i} \phi''_{k,(m,i)} | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\right\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}) \\
&= \mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \sum_{m \neq i} \text{Cov}\{\phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t)^2 | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} + o_p(N^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Further observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& N \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \mathbb{V}\{\widehat{\theta}_i^k(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2 / N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / N\}^2} \\
&+ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \sum_{m \neq i} \text{Cov}\{\phi''_{k,(m,i)}(t)^2 | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2 / (N(N-1)^2)}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / N\}^2} + o_p(1) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2 / N}{\{\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) / N\}^2} + o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N D_{ij} \mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} \{w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)\}^2 / N \xrightarrow{p} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \{\mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t) | \underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} / e_j(\mathbf{X})\} h(\mathbf{X})^2 f(\mathbf{X}) \mu(d\mathbf{X}).$$

Therefore, assuming the generalized homoscedasticity condition such that  $\mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t)|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} = \mathbb{V}\{\phi'_{k,i}(t)|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i\} = v$ , the conditional asymptotic variance of  $\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{c}; t)^{k,h}$  is,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \mathbb{V}\{\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{c}; t)^{k,h}|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}\} &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 \{v/e_j(\mathbf{X})\} h(\mathbf{X})^2 f(\mathbf{X}) \mu(d\mathbf{X}) / C_h^2 \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{h^2(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 / e_j(\mathbf{X})\}}{C_h^2} v \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{h^2(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 / e_j(\mathbf{X})\}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}[h(\mathbf{X})]^2} v \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{h^2(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 / e_j(\mathbf{X})\}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{h^2(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 / e_j(\mathbf{X})\} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{(\sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 / e_j(\mathbf{X}))^{-1}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the equality is attained when  $h(\mathbf{X}) \propto \{\sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 / e_j(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1}$ . Consequently, the sum of the asymptotic variance of all pairwise comparisons is,

$$\sum_{j < j'} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \mathbb{V}(\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}(t)^{k,h}|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}}) = (J-1) \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{h^2(\mathbf{X})/e_j(\mathbf{X})\}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}[h(\mathbf{X})]^2} v$$

We consider the variance of  $\hat{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}; t)^{k,h}$  where  $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = (1, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . We can show that,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \hat{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}; t)^{k,h} = \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}\{h^2(\mathbf{X})/e_j(\mathbf{X})\}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{X}}[h(\mathbf{X})]^2} v$$

Therefore,  $\sum_{j < j'} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \mathbb{V}(\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}(t)^{k,h}|\underline{\mathbf{X}}, \underline{\mathbf{Z}})$  attains its minimum when  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \hat{\tau}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}; t)^{k,h}$  are minimized. Notice that  $c_j^2 = 1$  in  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$ . Hence, when  $h(\mathbf{X}) \propto \{\sum_{j=1}^J 1/e_j(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1}$ , the sum of the conditional asymptotic variance of all pairwise comparison is minimized, which completes the proof of Theorem 2.

**Details on augmented weighting estimator** In this part, we provide the outline on how to derive the variance estimator of the augmented weighting estimator using the pseudo-observations. Suppose the estimated parameter of the outcome model  $\hat{\alpha}_j$  are the MLEs that solve the score functions  $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} S_j(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\theta}_i^k; \alpha_j) = 0$ , then we can express the augmented weighting estimator based on the solution

$(\hat{\nu}_0, \hat{\nu}_j, \hat{\nu}_{j'}, \hat{\alpha}_1^T, \hat{\alpha}_2^T, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_J^T, \hat{\gamma})^T$  to the following estimation equations  $\sum_{i=1}^N U_i = 0$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N U_i(\hat{\nu}_0, \hat{\nu}_j, \hat{\nu}_{j'}, \hat{\alpha}_1^T, \hat{\alpha}_2^T, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_J^T, \hat{\gamma}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \begin{bmatrix} h(\mathbf{X}_i; \gamma) \{m_j^k(\mathbf{X}_i; \alpha_j) - m_{j'}^k(\mathbf{X}_i; \alpha_j) - \nu_0\} \\ \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} \{\hat{\theta}_i^k - m_j^k(\mathbf{X}_i; \alpha_j) - \nu_j\} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\} \{\hat{\theta}_i^k - m_{j'}^k(\mathbf{X}_i; \alpha_{j'}) - \nu_{j'}\} w_{j'}^h(\mathbf{X}_i) \\ \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = 1\} S_1(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\theta}_i^k; \alpha_1) \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = J\} S_J(\mathbf{X}_i, \hat{\theta}_i^k; \alpha_J) \\ \mathbf{S}\gamma(\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i; \gamma) \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

The augmented weighting estimator is  $\hat{\nu}_0 + \hat{\nu}_j - \hat{\nu}_{j'}$ . The corresponding variance estimator can be obtained by applying Theorem 3.4 in [Overgaard et al. \(2017\)](#), which offers the asymptotic variance of the estimated parameters based on the estimating equations involving the pseudo-observations.

## B Details on simulation design

Figure 4 illustrates the distribution of the true generalized propensity score (GPS) in the simulations that represent (i) a three-arm randomized controlled trial (RCT), (ii) observational study with relatively good covariate overlap between groups, and (iii) observational study with poor covariate overlap between groups. In the simulated RCT, the propensity for being assigned to three arms are the same (1/3) for each unit. In the simulated observational study, the GPS for three arms differ; the distributions of the GPS to each arm exhibit a larger difference when overlap is poor.

Below, we describe the details of the alternative estimators considered in the simulation studies.

1. Cox model with g-formula (Cox): We fit the Cox proportional hazard model with the hazard rate

$$\lambda(t|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i),$$

$$\lambda(t|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) = \lambda_0(t) \exp \left( \mathbf{X}_i \alpha^T + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \gamma_j \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} \right).$$

Based on the estimated hazard rate, we can calculate the conditional survival probability function

$$\hat{S}(t|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) \text{ and estimate } \hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t) \text{ when } h(\mathbf{X}) = 1 \text{ with the usual g-formula,}$$




Figure 4: Generalized propensity score distribution under different overlap conditions across three arms in the simulation studies. First row: randomized controlled trials (RCT); second row: observational study with relatively good covariate overlap; third row: observational study with poor covariate overlap.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^1(t) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \hat{S}(t|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j) - \hat{S}(t|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j') \right\}, \\ \hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^2(t) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \left\{ \hat{S}(u|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j) - \hat{S}(u|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j') \right\} du.\end{aligned}$$

2. Cox with IPW (IPW-Cox): We first fit a multinomial logistic regression model for the GPS and construct the IPW, i.e. we assign stabilized weights  $w_{ij} = \Pr(Z_i = j) / \Pr(Z_i = j|\mathbf{X}_i)$  for each unit. Next, we fit a Cox proportional hazard model on the weighted sample with a hazard rate,

$$\lambda(t|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) = \lambda_0(t) \exp \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \gamma_j \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} \right).$$

We then calculate the survival probability  $\hat{S}(t|Z_i)$  specific to each arm and estimate  $\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$  when  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$  using,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^1(t) &= \hat{S}(t|Z_i = j) - \hat{S}(t|Z_i = j'), \\ \hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^2(t) &= \int_0^t \left\{ \hat{S}(u|Z_i = j) - \hat{S}(u|Z_i = j') \right\} du.\end{aligned}$$

3. Trimmed IPW-PO (T-IPW): this is the propensity score weighting estimator (5) with  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ , but applied after trimming units with  $\max_j \{e_j(\mathbf{X}_i)\} > 0.97$  and  $\min_j \{e_j(\mathbf{X}_i)\} < 0.03$ . We select this threshold so that the proportion of the sample being trimmed does not exceed 20%.
4. Unadjusted estimator based on the pseudo-observations (PO-UNADJ): we take the mean difference of the pseudo-observations between two arms. This estimator is only unbiased for estimating the average causal effect under RCT. In observational studies, its bias quantifies the degree of unconfounding.

$$\tau_{j,j'}^k(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\}} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\theta}_i^k(t) \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j'\}}.$$

5. Regression model using the pseudo-observations with the g-formula (PO-G): we fit the following

regression model for the pseudo-observations on  $\mathbf{X}_i$  and  $Z_i$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(\hat{\theta}_i^k(t)|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) = g^{-1} \left( \mathbf{X}_i \alpha^T + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \gamma_j \mathbf{1}\{Z_i = j\} \right),$$

where  $g(\cdot)$  is the link function (we use log-link for RACE/ASCE and complementary log-log link for SPCE, and construct the estimator for  $\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^{k,h}(t)$  with  $h(\mathbf{X}) = 1$  using the g-formula,

$$\hat{\tau}_{j,j'}^k(t) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\theta}_i^k(t)|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\theta}_i^k(t)|\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i = j')\}.$$

6. Augmented weighting estimator (AIPW, OW): we use equation (9) in the main text with IPW or OW.
7. Propensity score weighted Cox model estimator in [Mao et al. \(2018\)](#) (IPW-MAO, OW-MAO): we employ the estimator proposed in [Mao et al. \(2018\)](#) combining IPW or OW in fitting the Cox model with the weighted likelihood,

$$l_i = \sum_{j=1}^J D_{ij} w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i) \left( \Delta_i \mathbf{U}(\tilde{T}_i)^T \mathbf{a}_j - \int_0^{\tilde{T}_i} \exp(\mathbf{U}(t)^T \mathbf{a}_j) dt \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{U}(t) = (\zeta(t)^T, \lambda(t)^T)^T$  are the known truncated power basis function of degree  $L$  with  $K$  knots.  $\zeta(t) = (1, 2, \dots, t^L)^T$ ,  $\lambda(t) = (\lambda_1^L(t), \lambda_2^L(t), \dots, \lambda_K^L(t))^T$ . We place the “ $w_i''$ ” in the equation (9) of [Mao et al. \(2018\)](#) with  $w_j^h(\mathbf{X}_i)$  to accommodate the multi-arm scenario. We estimate the survival function in each arm  $\hat{S}_j(t)$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  separately using the same procedure in [Mao et al. \(2018\)](#),

$$\hat{S}_j(t) = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \mathbf{U}(s)^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}_j ds \right\}.$$

## C Additional simulation results

**Additional comparisons under poor covariate overlap** Figure 5 shows the comparison of different estimators in the simulated data with good covariate overlap between treatment arms. The OW estimator achieves lower bias and RMSE compared with other estimators in most cases (except that the adjusted




Figure 5: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  under good overlap, when the survival outcomes are generated from Model A and censoring is completely independent.

Cox outcome model has smaller RMSE when the outcome model is correctly specified). Moreover, coverage of the 95% confidence interval of the OW estimator is close to the nominal level while the other estimators can exhibit poor coverage especially in estimating the ASCE.

**Comparison with trimmed IPW** In Figure 6, we compare the performance of the trimmed IPW estimator (T-IPW) with other estimators under poor overlap. Firstly, we notice that T-IPW substantially reduces RMSE and absolute bias compared to the un-trimmed IPW estimator in Figure 1 of the main text. Moreover, coverage rate of T-IPW estimator become closer to the nominal level. Nonetheless, T-IPW is still consistently more biased and less efficient than OW.





Figure 6: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  under poor overlap, when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent. Additional comparison with T-IPW.




**Comparison with regression on pseudo-observations** Figure 7 shows the comparison with the estimators using regression on the pseudo-observations. When there is good overlap, the regression adjusted estimator (PO-G) achieves a similar RMSE and bias to the IPW estimator and is slightly better when estimating ASCE. However, PO-G has larger bias and RMSE compared OW across all scenarios. The coverage of PO-G is poor compared with the weighting estimators, which might be due to misspecification of the regression models. Performance of PO-G deteriorates when the covariate overlap is poor, leading to larger bias and RMSE, and lower coverage rate.

**Comparison with augmented weighting estimator** In Figure 8, we compare the proposed estimators with two augmented weighting estimators, augmented IPW (AIPW) and augmented OW (AOW), under good and poor overlap, respectively. The AOW achieves a lower bias and RMSE than the AIPW. Compared with the IPW estimator, the AIPW estimator has substantially smaller bias and higher efficiency. The improvement due to augmenting IPW estimator with an outcome model is more pronounced under poor overlap. On the other hand, AOW and OW are nearly indistinguishable, regardless of the degree of overlap.




(a) Comparison under good overlap




(b) Comparison under poor overlap

Figure 7: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  comparison, when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent. Additional comparison with PO-G.



(a) Comparison under good overlap




(b) Comparison under poor overlap


Figure 8: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$ , when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent. Additional comparison with augmented weighting estimators.

**Comparison with the estimators in Mao et al. (2018)** Figure 9 compares our estimators with the estimators proposed in Mao et al. (2018) (their original estimators were extended to accommodate multiple

treatments) in the simulations. The OW estimator based on pseudo-observations usually has smaller bias than OW-MAO, while OW-MAO can have slightly smaller RMSE due to the almost correct outcome model specification, except for the estimation on ASCE. The IPW-MAO estimator has a smaller bias and RMSE than the IPW estimator but is not comparable to the OW estimator in all cases. However, the coverage of both estimators, especially the IPW-MAO, is lower than the nominal level. The under-coverage can be substantial under poor overlap or when the target estimand is the ASCE. We also replicate the simulations when the outcome is generated from model B. In this case, the proportional hazards assumption in the OW-MAO and IPW-MAO estimators fails to hold, and the performance of these estimators quickly deteriorate, while the performance of the OW estimator based on pseudo-observations remains almost unaffected. These additional results are omitted for brevity.




(a) Comparison under good overlap




(b) Comparison under poor overlap

Figure 9: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$ , when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent, including IPW-MAO, OW-MAO.

**Simulation results with non-zero treatment effect** Figure 10 draws the comparison among estimators when the true treatment effect is not zero ( $j = 1, j' = 2$ ). For a fair comparison, we scale the bias and RMSE by the absolute value of the true estimand  $\tau_{1,2}(t)^{k,h}$  for different choices of  $h(\mathbf{X})$ . The pattern under good or poor overlap is similar to the counterpart with zero treatment effect. OW has the smallest bias across all scenarios. OW also has the smallest RMSE except when comparing with a correctly specified Cox g-formula estimator for estimating SPCE. Additionally, we find that the coverage rate of the Cox and IPW-Cox estimator using the bootstrap method is surprisingly low for ASCE, which is similar to our findings under zero treatment effect. In Table 3, we report the performance of different estimators under covariate dependent censoring or when the proportional hazards assumption is violated. The pattern is similar to Table 1 in the main text with OW performing the best under covariate dependent censoring or with the violation of proportional hazards assumption. The coverage rate for OW estimator is occasionally below the nominal level (but is still closest to nominal among its competitors) for estimating ASCE under covariate dependent censoring since the presentation in Table 3 assumes a limited sample size  $N = 300$ . The coverage rate of OW further improves when  $N$  further increases (results not shown).



(a) Comparison under good overlap



(b) Comparison under poor overlap

Figure 10: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing treatment  $j = 1$  versus  $j = 2$ , when survival outcomes are generated from model A and censoring is completely independent.

Table 3: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing treatment  $j = 1$  versus  $j = 2$  under different degrees of overlap. In the “proportional hazards” scenario, the survival outcomes are generated from a Cox model (model A), and in the “non-proportional hazards” scenario, the survival outcomes are generated from an accelerated failure time model (model B). The sample size is fixed at  $N = 300$ .

Degree of overlap		RMSE				Absolute bias				95% Coverage			
		OW	IPW	Cox	Cox-IPW	OW	IPW	Cox	Cox-IPW	OW	IPW	Cox	Cox-IPW
Model A, completely random censoring													
SPCE	Good	0.003	0.008	0.002	0.032	0.068	0.096	0.020	0.098	0.930	0.897	0.941	0.769
	Poor	0.004	0.008	0.003	0.078	0.083	0.100	0.048	0.145	0.917	0.892	0.942	0.569
RACE	Good	0.062	0.528	0.119	1.598	1.456	3.169	1.144	4.689	0.937	0.910	0.924	0.792
	Poor	0.071	1.378	0.140	4.049	1.953	3.722	2.762	7.213	0.937	0.897	0.918	0.597
ASCE	Good	1.398	3.629	10.979	3.362	6.792	6.065	5.927	9.107	0.960	0.895	0.052	0.722
	Poor	2.432	5.782	21.485	3.726	9.413	6.663	12.852	12.540	0.888	0.890	0.008	0.666
Model B, completely random censoring													
SPCE	Good	0.004	0.007	0.007	0.049	0.072	0.105	0.079	0.181	0.943	0.936	0.753	0.784
	Poor	0.004	0.027	0.021	0.130	0.086	0.125	0.198	0.250	0.942	0.933	0.730	0.656
RACE	Good	0.089	0.184	0.702	1.740	2.667	4.256	4.366	8.605	0.956	0.928	0.743	0.789
	Poor	0.112	1.035	1.883	5.573	2.948	5.224	10.762	11.610	0.939	0.928	0.734	0.686
ASCE	Good	2.730	6.266	9.288	7.313	7.832	9.237	12.051	17.280	0.930	0.893	0.531	0.799
	Poor	3.549	8.221	19.251	8.771	8.595	9.271	26.296	19.850	0.862	0.860	0.477	0.628
Model A, covariate dependent censoring													
SPCE	Good	0.002	0.001	0.004	0.081	0.056	0.085	0.055	0.146	0.953	0.927	0.908	0.708
	Poor	0.005	0.009	0.006	0.144	0.069	0.086	0.060	0.194	0.957	0.895	0.907	0.539
RACE	Good	0.115	0.112	0.296	3.387	2.185	3.778	3.104	6.118	0.954	0.931	0.907	0.746
	Poor	0.204	0.217	0.300	6.250	2.505	4.481	3.407	8.536	0.956	0.930	0.883	0.567
ASCE	Good	0.723	2.298	21.155	12.682	10.300	8.797	12.718	47.799	0.948	0.942	0.653	0.765
	Poor	0.989	4.029	21.787	26.463	16.998	10.508	12.859	48.089	0.955	0.926	0.635	0.599
Model B, covariate dependent censoring													
SPCE	Good	0.020	0.037	0.001	0.028	0.066	0.085	0.091	0.110	0.727	0.730	0.709	0.866
	Poor	0.028	0.062	0.018	0.036	0.084	0.105	0.241	0.161	0.685	0.690	0.711	0.840
RACE	Good	0.703	1.122	0.451	0.829	5.329	7.251	4.807	7.489	0.934	0.933	0.726	0.848
	Poor	1.129	2.086	0.585	3.511	6.286	9.705	11.919	10.292	0.929	0.929	0.711	0.798
ASCE	Good	4.688	9.188	11.283	10.353	11.343	12.044	13.293	14.549	0.759	0.719	0.528	0.666
	Poor	6.111	15.091	19.178	12.482	12.905	13.497	27.745	15.250	0.755	0.703	0.526	0.531



**Results with for simulated RCT** In Figure 11, we present the results in the simulations when  $e_j(\mathbf{X}) = 1/3$  for all  $\mathbf{X}$ , namely in a three-arm RCT. The bias and RMSE of different “covariate-adjusted” estimators perform similar and are usually more efficient than the unadjusted estimator based on psuedo-observations (PO-UNADJ); in particular, the correctly specified Cox g-formula estimator achieves the smallest RMSE. Furthermore, we observe that the weighting estimators using IPW and OW show a similar bias yet a lower RMSE compared to the PO-UNADJ. Compared to IPW, OW has a smaller RMSE especially when estimating RACE and ASCE. This demonstrates the efficiency gain from covariates adjustment through weighting in RCT, similar to the findings in (Zeng et al., 2020) but under the censored outcome scenario. Moreover, all estimators include the simple PO-UNADJ achieve the coverage rates close to the nominal level.

On the other hand, when the survival outcomes are generated from model B under the RCT configuration, Table 4 shows that the OW estimator can lead to substantially smaller RMSE than the Cox g-formula and COX-IPW estimators and maintain nominal coverage throughout. This is because the proportional hazards assumption does not hold under data generating model B, and violations of this assumption can lead to efficiency loss even when the treatment is completely randomized. The two Cox-model based estimators are also prone to notable under-coverage in this scenario. Throughout, the OW estimator frequently improves the efficiency over the unadjusted estimator, and performs consistently better than IPW in terms of both bias and RMSE. This observation echoes the findings in Zeng et al. (2020), and supports estimator (5) in the main text as covariate-adjusted estimators for analyzing RCTs.




Figure 11: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  in the simulate RCT, when the survival outcomes are generated from Model A and censoring is completely independent. It also shows additional comparison with PO-G and PO-UNADJ.

Table 4: Absolute bias, root mean squared error (RMSE) and coverage of the 95% confidence interval for comparing treatment  $j = 2$  versus  $j = 3$  in simulated RCT. In the “proportional hazards” scenario, the survival outcomes are generated from a Cox model (model A), and in the “non-proportional hazards” scenario, the survival outcomes are generated from an accelerated failure time model (model B). The sample size is fixed at  $N = 300$ .

	RMSE					Absolute bias					95% Coverage				
	OW	IPW	Cox	Cox-IPW	UNADJ	OW	IPW	Cox	Cox-IPW	UNADJ	OW	IPW	Cox	Cox-IPW	UNADJ
Model A, completely random censoring															
SPCE	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.002	0.052	0.052	0.011	0.029	0.065	0.944	0.945	0.960	0.960	0.945
RACE	0.056	0.057	0.047	0.137	0.138	1.570	1.550	0.651	1.413	2.651	0.945	0.953	0.941	0.970	0.954
ASCE	0.096	0.176	0.090	0.269	0.193	2.174	2.917	1.139	2.766	4.592	0.957	0.958	0.937	0.968	0.938
Model B, completely random censoring															
SPCE	0.002	0.005	0.002	0.006	0.004	0.069	0.069	0.042	0.081	0.074	0.946	0.947	0.759	0.840	0.952
RACE	0.072	0.101	0.137	0.314	0.064	2.432	2.418	2.400	4.096	3.062	0.955	0.957	0.758	0.836	0.937
ASCE	0.107	0.223	0.244	0.605	0.095	3.455	4.229	4.173	7.600	5.074	0.943	0.958	0.941	0.835	0.934
Model A, covariate dependent censoring															
SPCE	0.001	0.005	0.001	0.000	0.002	0.044	0.044	0.039	0.039	0.059	0.953	0.955	0.912	0.965	0.943
RACE	0.003	0.027	0.065	0.022	0.100	2.257	2.248	2.315	1.717	2.995	0.948	0.949	0.922	0.968	0.958
ASCE	0.007	0.187	0.163	0.188	0.366	2.716	6.887	4.899	10.564	11.279	0.952	0.951	0.955	0.979	0.949
Model B, covariate dependent censoring															
SPCE	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.002	0.037	0.037	0.055	0.059	0.043	0.949	0.948	0.706	0.904	0.896
RACE	0.005	0.068	0.064	0.136	0.106	4.700	4.671	2.944	5.310	4.371	0.951	0.953	0.722	0.856	0.959
ASCE	0.002	0.080	0.166	0.268	0.105	3.523	4.391	4.761	6.548	4.375	0.951	0.949	0.936	0.856	0.960

## D Additional information on the application

Table 5 reports summary statistics of the covariates in the application on prostate cancer (Section 5) before and after weighting adjustment. The  $\text{MPASD}^{\text{IPW}}$  and  $\text{MPASD}^{\text{OW}}$  is smaller than the unadjusted difference  $\text{MPASD}^{\text{UNADJ}}$ . Figure 12 illustrates the distributions of the estimated generalized propensity scores in the three treatments; it indicates a good covariate overlap between the groups.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of the baseline covariates in the comparative effectiveness study on prostate cancer described in Section 5 and maximized pairwise absolute standardized difference (MPASD) of each covariate across three arms before and after weighting.

	Overall	RP	EBRT+AD	EBRT+brachy±AD	MPASD <sup>UNADJ</sup>	MPASD <sup>IPW</sup>	MPASD <sup>OW</sup>
No (%)	44551(100)	26474 (59.42)	15435 (34.65)	2642(5.93)			
Continuous covariates, mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis).							
Age	65.32 (8.19)	62.61 (7.02)	69.66 (8.19)	67.15 (7.72)	0.919	0.105	0.096
PSA	201.89 (223.42)	189.20 (214.84)	225.77 (238.08)	189.577 (207.46)	0.166	0.055	0.029
Categorical covariates, number of units in each class.							
Race							
Black	7127	3632	3000	495	0.151	0.032	0.036
Other	1524	903	522	99	0.020	0.012	0.004
Spanish or Hispanic	1963	1135	703	125	0.021	0.020	0.013
Insure type							
Not insured	986	555	402	29	0.110	0.004	0.009
Private insurance	19522	14608	3925	989	0.629	0.014	0.015
Medicaid	1284	598	612	74	0.100	0.030	0.033
Medicare	1026	436	553	37	0.149	0.013	0.006
Government	482	235	211	36	0.044	0.020	0.006
Income level (\$)							
<30000	5533	2954	2234	345	0.099	0.034	0.018
30000-34999	7628	4330	2858	440	0.057	0.024	0.013
35000-45999	12436	7317	4458	661	0.087	0.003	0.009
Education level							
>29	6776	3719	2651	406	0.086	0.024	0.021
20-28.9	9707	5461	3690	556	0.079	0.005	0.004
14-19.9	10706	6299	3806	601	0.045	0.014	0.005
Charlson Comorbidity Index							
1	7008	4575	2101	332	0.134	0.002	0.011
≥ 2	1211	631	517	63	0.060	0.003	0.003
Gleason score							
≤ 6	3493	2769	553	171	0.274	0.030	0.007
7	9347	5964	2837	546	0.103	0.023	0.016
9	11781	6130	4968	683	0.204	0.012	0.007
10	932	348	532	52	0.144	0.008	0.004
Clinical T stage							
≤ cT3	5723	2785	2529	409	0.169	0.008	0.025
Year of diagnosis							
2004-2007	330	127	167	36	0.090	0.012	0.013
2008-2010	11582	6665	4082	835	0.144	0.009	0.005




Figure 12: Marginal distributions of the estimated generalized propensity scores for three arms from a multinomial logistic regression in the prostate cancer application.

## E Details for reproducing the results

In this appendix, we include the details to reproduce all the results reported in the paper. Please download the codebase from [https://github.com/zengshx777/OW\\_Survival\\_CodeBase](https://github.com/zengshx777/OW_Survival_CodeBase).

### R Scripts in folder **estimators**

<code>fast_pseudo_calculation.R</code>	Function for calculating pseudo-observations, which is faster than Rpackage <b>pseudo</b> .
<code>PSW_pseudo.R</code>	Function for IPW-PO and OW-PO.
<code>cox_model.R</code>	Function for estimator Cox and Cox-IPW.
<code>pseudo_G.R</code>	Function for PO-UNADJ and PO-G.
<code>Mao_Method_func.R</code>	Function for estimators in <a href="#">Mao et al. (2018)</a> .
<code>AIPW_pseudo.R</code>	Function for AIPW and AOW.

### R Scripts in folder **simulation**

<code>simu_main.R</code>	Main script for running simulations.
<code>simu_utils.R</code>	Utility function for simulations.
<code>simu_data_gen.R</code>	Utility function for generating simulated data.
<code>simu_exe.sh</code>	Bash script to run simulations in all settings.

### R Scripts in folder **data\_application**

<code>data_preprocessing.R</code>	Data pre-processing for application.
<code>data_application.R</code>	Analysis function for data application.

To run the simulations in the paper, you can run the following command and set `simulation` as the working directory.:

```
git clone https://github.com/zengshx777/OW_Survival_CodeBase
```

```
R CMD BATCH --vanilla '--args dependent.censoring=F multi.arm=T
```

```
prop.hazard=F good_overlap=1 sample_size=150' simu_main.R R1.out
```

where `dependent.censoring` controls whether the censoring is independent of the covariates; `multi.arm` controls the number of arms in the data (T for  $J = 3$ , F for  $J = 2$ ); `prop.hazard` controls whether the proportional hazard assumption is correct; `good_overlap` control the overlap conditions (1 for RCT, 2 for observational study with good overlap, 3 for observational study with poor overlap); `sample_size` controls the sample size. One simple way to run many simulations in different settings in parallel is to run the `simu_exe.sh` directly (you can customize the scenario in this file). The current `simu_main.R` will run all estimators mentioned in the paper by default, which might be time-consuming. You can comment out certain estimators to speed up.

The results will be saved in the folder `simulation_results`. To output similar Figures and Tables as in the paper, please refer to the scripts in folder `output_utils`.

The NCDB data used in the case study is publicly available upon request to and approval of the NCDB Participant User File application.