

Outlier-Resistant Estimators for Average Treatment Effect in Causal Inference

Kazuharu Harada *

Hironori Fujisawa †

April 18, 2022

Abstract

The inverse probability (IPW) and doubly robust (DR) estimators are often used to estimate the average causal effect (ATE), but are vulnerable to outliers. The IPW/DR median can be used for outlier-resistant estimation of the ATE, but the outlier resistance of the median is limited and it is not resistant enough for heavy contamination. We propose extensions of the IPW/DR estimators with density power weighting, which can eliminate the influence of outliers almost completely. The outlier resistance of the proposed estimators is evaluated through the unbiasedness of the estimating equations. Unlike the median-based methods, our estimators are resistant to outliers even under heavy contamination. Interestingly, the naive extension of the DR estimator requires bias correction to keep the double robustness even under the most tractable form of contamination. In addition, the proposed estimators are found to be highly resistant to outliers in more difficult settings where the contamination ratio depends on the covariates. The outlier resistance of our estimators from the viewpoint of the influence function is also favorable. Our theoretical results are verified via Monte Carlo simulations and real data analysis. The proposed methods were found to have more outlier resistance than the median-based methods and estimated the potential mean with a smaller error than the median-based methods.

1 Introduction

Statistical causal inference provides various estimators for causal quantities like the average treatment effect (ATE). To estimate such quantities, the propensity score is widely applied in various ways, such as stratification, matching, inverse probability weighting (IPW), and the doubly robust (DR) estimator [Robins, Rotnitzky, and Zhao, 1994, Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983, Bang and Robins, 2005]. These estimators are designed to control confounding, and they are consistent with the target quantity under some assumptions.

As discussed in the later section, the IPW and DR estimators are vulnerable to outliers since they partially use the sample mean. An outlier in a multivariate setting is classified into three types: a vertical outlier, a good leverage point, and a bad leverage point [Rousseeuw and van Zomeren, 1990]. Figure 1 illustrates the three types of outliers. Canavire-Bacarreza et al. [2021] has investigated the influence of these types of outliers on the estimators of the ATE including IPW through exhaustive Monte-Carlo simulations; they have pointed out that the vertical outliers in the outcome variable lead to a serious bias of the ATE estimation. In this paper, we are interested in reducing the bias caused by the vertical outliers.

*Tokyo Medical University, Japan. e-mail: haradak@tokyo-med.ac.jp

†The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Japan. e-mail: fujisawa@ism.ac.jp




Figure 1: Three types of outliers.

Outlier-resistant statistics have been studied for long; however, most literature does not consider a causal setting [Huber, 2004, Hampel et al., 2011, Maronna et al., 2019]. The established methods of outlier-resistant statistics are not directly applicable to causal settings. The median-based estimators are the only examples which are applicable to the estimation of the ATE under outlier contamination (Firpo, 2007; Zhang et al., 2012; Díaz, 2017; Sued, Valdora, and Yohai, 2020). It is well known that the sample median is more resistant to outliers than the sample mean, but it is still affected; in particular, when the contamination ratio is not small and the outliers lie on one side of the data-generating density, the influence becomes so large as it cannot be ignored [Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008].

In this paper, we propose extensions of the IPW and DR estimators for the mean of the potential outcome with more outlier resistance than the median-based methods. We discuss the outlier resistance of these estimators from the viewpoint of the unbiasedness of the estimating equation and influence function (IF). In most literature on outlier-resistant statistics, the contamination ratio is assumed to be small and be independent of covariates; however, we discuss the outlier resistance of the proposed estimators under more general assumptions, including the case where the contamination ratio is not small and related to covariates. Interestingly, a straight extension of the DR estimator loses the robustness to model misspecification under contamination. We also propose a bias-corrected version of the extended DR estimator, which holds the double robustness under contamination. Furthermore, the theoretical advantages of our estimators are verified through Monte-Carlo simulations and real data analysis.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the potential outcome framework for causal inference and the basic concept of outliers. In Section 3, we propose novel estimators and discuss the outlier resistance from the viewpoint of the unbiasedness of the estimating equations. In Section 4, we evaluate the outlier resistance in terms of the IF. In Section 5, we discuss asymptotic properties. Finally, in Sections 6 and 7, we present the experimental results.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Potential Outcome and Treatment Effect

Let (Y, T, X) be the observable random variables; X is the outcome, T is the treatment, and X is the confounder. We assume that Y is continuous and T is binary; it is easy to

extend T to multiple discrete treatments. We have the observations $(Y_i, T_i, X_i)_{i=1}^n$ drawn from the distribution of (Y, T, X) in an i.i.d. manner. Denote the potential outcome under $T = t$ by $Y^{(t)}$ and let $\mu^{(t)} = \mathbb{E}[Y^{(t)}]$. $Y^{(t)}$ is uniquely defined for every treatment as a random variable, namely, well-defined. Note that i.i.d. sampling and well-definedness of the potential outcome are collectively called the stable unit treatment value assumption [SUTVA; Imbens and Rubin, 2015]. The ATE is defined as $\mu^{(1)} - \mu^{(0)}$. The ATE cannot be estimated directly since we cannot observe $Y^{(1)}$ and $Y^{(0)}$ simultaneously; instead, we use the observed variables under the common assumptions [e.g. Imbens and Rubin, 2015]:

1. *Conditional Unconfoundedness*: $Y^{(t)} \perp\!\!\!\perp T|X$ for all $t \in \{0, 1\}$,
2. *Consistency*: $Y = Y^{(t)}$ if $T = t$,
3. *Positivity*: $P(T = 1|X) > c$ for some constant $c > 0$.

The ATE can be estimated from the observed variables under these assumptions, namely, identifiable. Hereafter, we assume the triple assumption holds and focus on the estimation of $\mu^{(1)}$ for simplicity. $\mu^{(0)}$ is estimated in a similar way, and the ATE is estimated by the difference between the estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$ and $\mu^{(0)}$.

We introduce three consistent estimators of the potential mean. The IPW estimator [Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983] is based on the propensity score (PS). Let $\pi(x; \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ be the PS, which models $P(T = 1|x)$. We assume the PS is correctly specified, in other words, there exists α^* such that $\pi(x; \alpha^*) = P(T = 1|x)$ for every x . The IPW estimator has several forms [Lunceford and Davidian, 2004], but we use the weighted average form: $\hat{\mu}_{IPW}^{(1)} = (\sum_{i=1}^n T_i Y_i / \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})) / (\sum_{i=1}^n T_i / \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha}))$, where $\hat{\alpha}$ is an estimate of α obtained in a consistent manner such as the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). The IPW estimator is consistent with $\mu^{(1)}$ if the PS model is correctly specified. The IPW estimator can be seen as the root of the following estimating equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (Y_i - \mu) = 0. \quad (1)$$

Outcome regression (OR) is also popular. To construct the OR estimator, we model $\mathbb{E}[Y|T = 1, X]$ by some function $m_1(X; \beta)$. Then, the OR estimator is obtained as $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n m_1(X_i; \hat{\beta})$, where $\hat{\beta}$ is a consistent estimate of β . The IPW and OR estimators are asymptotically consistent with $\mu^{(1)}$ when the model used in each estimator is correctly specified; the consistency is not assured if the model is misspecified. The DR estimator [Scharfstein, Rotnitzky, and Robins, 1999, Bang and Robins, 2005] combines the IPW and OR estimators. Since the DR estimator is consistent with $\mu^{(1)}$ if either the PS or OR model is correctly specified, it is said to be “doubly robust.” Besides, if both models are correctly specified, the DR estimator is semiparametrically efficient [Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995, Tsiatis, 2006]. Although there are many estimators equipped with double robustness, we refer the root of the following estimating equation as the DR estimator $\hat{\mu}_{DR}^{(1)}$, which is a special case of the augmented IPW estimator:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (Y_i - \mu) - \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} \{m_1(X_i; \hat{\beta}) - \mu\} \right] = 0. \quad (2)$$

2.2 IPW/DR M-estimators

Let $\sum_{i=1}^n \psi(Y_i, \theta) = 0$ be an estimating equation, where ψ is a known vector-valued map, and θ is the parameter of interest. An estimator $\hat{\theta}$ solving the estimating equation is called an M-estimator. M-estimator is a large class of estimators involving MLE, IPW, OR, and DR. If the estimating equation is unbiased, say $\mathbb{E}_\theta[\psi(Y, \theta)] = 0$, the M-estimator is consistent with the truth under some regularity conditions [e.g. Chap. 5 of Van der Vaart, 2000].

By replacing $Y_i - \mu$ in (2) with an estimating function $\psi(Y_i; \theta)$, the IPW and DR estimators can be expanded to a general M-estimator. If we are interested in the same parameter θ with respect to $Y^{(1)}$, the IPW and DR M-estimators [Tsiatis, 2006] are available:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} \psi(Y_i; \theta) = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} \psi(Y_i; \theta) - \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[\psi(Y_i; \theta) | T = 1, X_i] \right] = 0. \quad (4)$$

The conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[\psi(Y_i; \theta) | T = 1, X_i]$ is calculated using the parametric OR model $q(y | T = 1, x; \hat{\beta})$ via direct calculation or Monte-Carlo approximation [Hoshino, 2007]. When the original M-estimating equation is unbiased, the IPW/DR estimating equations are unbiased under the proper model specification. The asymptotic properties of the IPW and DR M-estimators follow from the standard theory of M-estimators.

2.3 Outlier-resistant Estimation

This section provides a brief review of the outlier-resistant estimation of the mean in a one-variable and non-causal setting. Let \tilde{g} be the density function of a random variable $Z \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that the density is contaminated as $\tilde{g}(z) = (1 - \varepsilon)f_{\mu^*}(z) + \varepsilon\delta(z)$, where f_{μ^*} is the density of Z without contamination equipped with the mean μ^* , ε is the contamination ratio, and δ is the density of outliers. Our goal is to estimate μ^* from i.i.d. observations $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\}$ drawn from \tilde{g} . If we model the contamination in this way, the sample mean converges to $(1 - \varepsilon)\mu^* + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}_\delta[Z]$; if the mean of outliers is far from μ^* , the sample mean is asymptotically biased. To deal with contamination, many types of M-estimators are applied. The unbiasedness of the estimating equation does not usually hold under contamination because

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\psi(Z, \mu^*)] = (1 - \varepsilon) \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{f_{\mu^*}}[\psi(Z, \mu^*)]}_{=0} + \varepsilon\mathbb{E}_\delta[\psi(Z, \mu^*)] \neq 0. \quad (5)$$

By designing ψ to eliminate or bound $\mathbb{E}_\delta[\psi(Z, \mu^*)]$, the influence of outliers can be reduced. Let θ_ψ^* denote a root of $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\psi(Z, \theta)] = 0$; then, the latent bias is defined as $\theta_\psi^* - \theta^*$. If δ is Dirac's delta and ε is sufficiently small, the latent bias is approximated by the IF. The IF-based discussion in Section 4 provides some insights into the outlier resistance of the estimators when the contamination ratio is small. The latent bias and M-estimators are discussed in detail elsewhere [e.g. Huber, 2004, Fujisawa, 2013, Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008].

2.4 IPW and DR Under Contamination

Next, we move to a causal setting. In this paper, we consider the vertical outliers. In other words, we assume that only the outcome Y may be contaminated, and that the

contamination does not affect the causal mechanism among (Y, T, X) . A typical example is contamination of laboratory values in medical research with foreign substances. Let $\delta_{Y|TX}$ be the conditional density of outliers given (T, X) , and let $\varepsilon_t(x)$ be the contamination ratio. Then, the contaminated conditional density given (T, X) is defined as

$$\tilde{g}_{Y|TX}(y|t, x) = (1 - \varepsilon_t(x))g_{Y|TX}(y|t, x) + \varepsilon_t(x)\delta_{Y|TX}(y|t, x), \quad (6)$$

where g without tilde denotes the density without contamination; the tilde indicates that the distribution is contaminated. For simplifying the notations, we often drop the subscripts of density functions as long as there would be no confusion and write $\delta_t(y|x) = \delta_{Y|TX}(y|t, x)$ below. The contamination ratio and their density depend on the treatment T and the confounder X . Since we estimate $\mu^{(t)}$ for each treatment separately, the dependence on T is tractable. In contrast, the dependence on X is critical in our analysis. The X -dependent contamination is referred to as heterogeneous contamination. We also discuss the special case in which ε and δ are not dependent on X , called homogeneous contamination. Note that we do not assume $\varepsilon_t(x)$ to be small enough to be negligible, except in Section 4.

We are interested in the marginal mean of $Y^{(1)}$. Let $f_{Y^{(1)}}(y; \mu^{(1)})$ be the true marginal density of $Y^{(1)}$. It is obtained by integrating X out from $g_{Y|TX}(y|T, X)$ under $T = 1$:

$$f_{Y^{(1)}}(y; \mu^{(1)}) = \int g_{Y^{(1)}|X}(y|x)g_X(x)dx = \int g_{Y|TX}(y|1, x)g_X(x)dx. \quad (7)$$

The second equality holds from the triple assumption in Section 2.1. We often write $f_{Y^{(1)}}(y; \mu^{(1)})$ as $f_1(y)$ for simplicity.

Under contamination, the IPW estimating equation is severely biased even if the true PS is obtained as $\pi(X|\alpha^*) = P(T = 1|X)$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{T}{\pi(X|\alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \right] = \mathbb{E}_g \left[\varepsilon_1(X) \mathbb{E}_{-g+\delta} \left[(Y - \mu^{(1)}) | X \right] \right] \neq 0. \quad (8)$$

It is found that the remaining term contains the expectation of Y with respect to δ , which implies the estimating equation is severely affected by outliers. The DR estimating equation is also biased. To estimate $\mu^{(1)}$ accurately, we have to remove the influence of contamination.

3 Outlier-Resistant Extensions of IPW and DR

Before we propose novel estimators, we introduce an assumption on outliers. Intuitively, we assume that the outliers are sufficiently far from the main outcome density. Figure 2 shows real examples of outliers that satisfy this assumption. It is found that these outliers are far from the main body of the density both conditionally and marginally.

To formulate this assumption, we introduce density power weighting. The density power weight is used to enhance the outlier resistance in non-causal settings [Windham, 1995, Basu et al., 1998, Jones et al., 2001, Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008]. Let $h(y; \mu)^\gamma$ ($\gamma > 0$) be a density power weight for $Y^{(1)}$, where $h(y; \mu)$ is a symmetric density function with the location parameter μ . The density $h(y; \mu^{(1)})$ is not necessarily equal to the true marginal density $f_1(y)$, but we assume that both h and the true density $f_1(y)$ are symmetric about $\mu^{(1)}$. The assumption of symmetry is common in outlier-resistant estimation, and it is a prerequisite to use the sample median as an estimator of the population mean. Any symmetric density is available for h as long as it satisfies Assumption 1 below. Typically, we assume h is Gaussian. The tuning parameter γ controls the variability of the weight; this leads to the trade-off between outlier resistance and asymptotic efficiency. Assumption 1 formally describes the assumption on outliers.




Figure 2: Real examples of outliers which satisfy Assumption 1. All datasets are included in the R package “robustbase” [Maechler et al., 2021]: airmay (left), condroz (center), education (right).

Assumption 1. Let $h(y; \mu)$ be a weighting density symmetric about μ . Then, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\xi_1(X, \gamma) = \int \delta_1(y|X) h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) dy \approx 0 \quad a.e. \quad (9)$$

Denote an arbitrary bounded function by $\phi(x)$. Assumption 1 implies

$$\nu_1(\phi) := \mathbb{E}[\phi(X) \xi_1(X, \gamma)] = \int \phi(x) \xi_1(x, \gamma) g_X(x) dx \approx 0. \quad (10)$$

In particular, let $\phi(x) = 1$; then, the outliers are marginally negligible:

$$\nu_1(1) = \mathbb{E}[\xi_1(X, \gamma)] = \int \delta_1(y) h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) dy \approx 0. \quad (11)$$

Throughout this paper, we assume that γ is sufficiently large so that Assumption 1 holds. Assumption 1 is reduced to a simpler form when $\delta_1(y|X)$ is Dirac’s delta at y_0 ; this is one of the core assumptions in Section 4.

Assumption 1’. Let $h(y; \mu)$ be a weighting density that is symmetric about μ , and assume that the density of outliers is Dirac’s delta at $y_0 (\neq \mu^{(1)})$, say $\delta_{y_0}(y)$. Then, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\int \delta_{y_0}(y) h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) dy = h(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) \approx 0. \quad (12)$$

For example, if h is a Gaussian density with mean $\mu^{(1)}$ and fixed variance, (12) tends to 0 as $|y_0| \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed $\gamma > 0$ since $h(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) \propto \exp(-\gamma(y_0 - \mu^{(1)})^2)(y_0 - \mu^{(1)})$.

3.1 IPW-type Estimator

First, we introduce an extension of the IPW estimator, called the density power inverse probability weighting (DP-IPW) estimator. The DP-IPW estimator is defined as a root of the following estimating equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} h(Y_i; \mu)^\gamma (Y_i - \mu) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Under no contamination, the DP-IPW estimating equation is unbiased.

Theorem 1. Assume that the true propensity score $\pi(X; \alpha^*)$ is given. Then, under no contamination, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{T}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \right] = 0. \quad (14)$$

Only an estimate $\pi(X; \hat{\alpha})$ is available in practice, but the asymptotic consistency of (DP-)IPW still holds if the model $\pi(X; \alpha)$ is correctly specified.

Now we consider the contaminated case. The bias of the DP-IPW estimating equation takes a different form from (8).

Theorem 2. Assume Y is contaminated as (6). Under the same assumptions as those in Theorem 1, the expectation of the DP-IPW estimating equation is expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{T}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \right] = B_1 + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1), \quad (15)$$

where $B_1 = - \int \varepsilon_1(x) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx.$

In particular, under homogeneous contamination, B_1 reduces to 0.

The DP-IPW estimating equation is still biased even if $\nu_1(\varepsilon_1)$ is small. Since we assume that $\nu_1(\varepsilon_1)$ is negligible, B_1 is dominant. However, compared to (8), the dominant bias of DP-IPW does not contain δ_1 . This implies that the bias of DP-IPW is not strongly affected by the absolute value of outliers. Under homogeneous contamination, the dominant term disappears, so the bias is negligible.

3.2 DR-type Estimator

Next, we introduce the density power doubly robust (DP-DR) estimator. The DP-DR estimator is a straight application of the DR M-estimator and defined as a root of the following estimating equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{T_i h(Y_i; \mu)^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (Y_i - \mu) - \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu)^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X] \right] = 0. \quad (16)$$

As we have discussed in Section 2.1, $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu)^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X]$ is obtained by direct calculation or Monte Carlo approximation based on the parametric OR model $\hat{q} := q(y | T = 1, X; \hat{\beta})$. In the Appendix, we present the explicit forms of $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu)^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X]$ when h and q are assumed to be Gaussian. The parameter β is usually estimated in an outlier-resistant manner: Huber regression [Huber, 2004, Chap.7], MM estimator [Yohai, 1987], density power regression [Basu et al., 1998, Kanamori and Fujisawa, 2015], and γ -regression [Fujisawa and Eguchi, 2008, Kawashima and Fujisawa, 2017], for example.

The DP-DR estimator is doubly robust under no contamination as with the general DR M-estimator.

Theorem 3. Assume either the true PS or the true OR model is given. Then, if there is no contamination, the DP-DR estimating equation is unbiased.

Now, we evaluate the bias of the DP-DR estimating equation under contamination.

Theorem 4. Assume that Y is contaminated as (6). If the true PS model is given, the expectation of the DP-DR estimating equation is expressed as

$$- \int \varepsilon_1(x) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1). \quad (17)$$

In particular, under homogeneous contamination, (17) reduces to $\nu_1(\varepsilon_1)$. If the true OR model is given, the expectation of the DP-DR estimating equation is expressed as

$$- \int \varepsilon_1(x) \frac{P(T=1|x)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1 P(T=1|\cdot)/\pi(\cdot; \alpha)). \quad (18)$$

Under homogeneous contamination, (18) becomes

$$- \varepsilon_1 \int \frac{P(T=1|x)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1 P(T=1|\cdot)/\pi(\cdot; \alpha)). \quad (19)$$

Assuming that $\pi(\cdot; \alpha)$ is bounded away from 0 and 1, we find that $P(T=1|\cdot)/\pi(\cdot; \alpha)$ is bounded. Then, from Assumption 1, $\nu_1(\varepsilon_1 P(T=1|\cdot)/\pi(\cdot; \alpha))$ is negligible. As with DP-IPW, the dominant bias is independent of δ , indicating that the influence of outliers is reduced. Unfortunately, DP-DR is still biased in the PS-incorrect and OR-correct case even under homogeneous contamination because the dominant term of (19) is not eliminated.

In the OR-correct case, the reason why DP-DR is biased under homogeneous contamination is as follows. Under Assumption 1, the expectation of the DP-DR estimating function becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T=1|X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\psi(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})|X] - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})|X] \right\} \right] \\ & \approx \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T=1|X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \left\{ (1 - \varepsilon_1) \mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})|X] - \mathbb{E}_g[\psi(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})|X] \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we denote the density power estimating function by ψ . In the last formula, it is found that the terms in the curly brackets do not cancel because the first term is reduced by $1 - \varepsilon_1$. Based on this consideration, we propose a bias-corrected version of DP-DR, called the ε DP-DR estimator. ε DP-DR is designed to cancel the dominant bias under homogeneous contamination. The ε DP-DR estimator is a root of the following estimating equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{T_i h(Y_i; \mu)^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (Y_i - \mu) - \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (1 - \hat{\varepsilon}_1) \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y; \mu)^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T=1, X] \right] = 0, \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{\varepsilon}_1$ is a consistent estimator of the expected contamination ratio $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 = \int \varepsilon_1(x) g(x) dx$. $\hat{\varepsilon}_1$ can be obtained simultaneously with the parametric OR model by the unnormalized modeling with the density power score [Kanamori and Fujisawa, 2015], for example. While DP-DR is a special case of the DR M-estimator, ε DP-DR goes beyond this framework by the bias correction. Under no contamination, the ε DP-DR estimating equation is asymptotically identical to the DP-DR estimating equation. The ε DP-DR estimating equation is also biased under heterogeneous contamination; however, the bias takes a different form.

Corollary 1. *If the true PS model is given, the expectation of the ε DP-DR estimating equation is equal to (17). If the true OR model is given, the expectation of the ε DP-DR estimating equation is expressed as*

$$\mathbb{E}_g \left[(\bar{\varepsilon}_1 - \varepsilon_1(X)) \frac{P(T=1|X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma(Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})|X] \right] + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1 P(T=1|\cdot)/\pi(\cdot; \alpha)). \quad (21)$$

The first term disappears under homogeneous contamination.

Proof. The derivation is the same as that of Theorem 4. If $\varepsilon_1(X)$ is constant ε_1 , the first term disappears because $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 = \varepsilon_1 \int g(x)dx = \varepsilon_1$. \square

Similar to (19), the second term of (21) is approximately zero if we assume that $\pi(\cdot; \alpha)$ is bounded away from 0 and 1.

Remark One may find that “ $\varepsilon(X)$ ”DP-DR would work better than ε DP-DR under heterogeneous contamination. In fact, the bias (21) will disappear if we replace $\bar{\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon(X)$. However, it is necessary to model $\varepsilon(X)$ correctly for consistent estimation of “ $\varepsilon(X)$ ”DP-DR. To the best of our knowledge, no easy method is available for this purpose.

3.3 Summary

We have proposed three types of outlier resistant semiparametric estimators: DP-IPW, DP-DR, and ε DP-DR. Table 1 shows the bias of the estimating equations under the conditions discussed above. Under heterogeneous contamination, all estimators are biased, but the biases are hardly influenced by the absolute value of outliers. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4, outliers have negligible influence if the contamination ratio is sufficiently small. ε DP-DR improves DP-DR in the OR-correct case under homogeneous contamination, but we continue to discuss DP-DR for three reasons: the contamination ratio is sometimes hard to estimate, the bias (19) is not serious if $\pi(X; \alpha)$ is close to $P(T=1|X)$, and the simulation results presented in Section 6 indicate that DP-DR remains better than the existing methods even in the OR-correct case.

Contamination	model	DP-IPW	DP-DR	ε DP-DR
No contamination	PS-correct	0	0	0
	OR-correct	-	0	0
homogeneous: ε	PS-correct	≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0
	OR-correct	-	$\approx \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\phi(X)]$	≈ 0
heterogeneous: $\varepsilon(X)$	PS-correct	$\approx \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon(X)\phi(X)]$	$\approx \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon(X)\phi(X)]$	$\approx \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon(X)\phi(X)]$
	OR-correct	-	$\approx \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon(X)\phi(X)]$	$\approx \mathbb{E}[(\bar{\varepsilon} - \varepsilon(X))\phi(X)]$

Table 1: Summary of the biases of the proposed estimating equations. The function $\phi(X)$ differs cell-by-cell. PS-correct means that the PS model is correctly specified and the OR model may not be; OR-correct means the opposite.

4 Influence-function-based Analysis of Outlier Resistance

As discussed in the previous section, the proposed estimators suffer less from outliers compared with ordinary estimators from the viewpoint of the unbiasedness of the estimating

equation. In this section, we demonstrate that they are outlier-resistant from the viewpoint of the IF.

Here, we briefly review the IF for the univariate M-estimator and expand it to evaluate our estimators. Let G be the distribution of $Z \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $T(G)$ be a functional of G , which is the parameter of interest. The IF of $T(G)$ is defined as

$$IF(z_0; G) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{T((1-\varepsilon)G + \varepsilon\Delta_{z_0}) - T(G)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \{T((1-\varepsilon)G + \varepsilon\Delta_{z_0}) - T(G)\} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}, \quad (22)$$

where Δ_{z_0} is a degenerate distribution at z_0 . We also see that the latent bias $T((1-\varepsilon)G + \varepsilon\Delta_{z_0}) - T(G)$ can be approximated by $\varepsilon IF(z_0; G)$. Therefore, the behavior of the IF approximates that of the latent bias. In the population, the M-estimator $T_M(G)$ satisfies $\int \psi(z, T_M(G)) dG(z) = 0$. Then, the IF for $T_M(G)$ is obtained by differentiating $\int \psi(z, T_M((1-\varepsilon)G + \varepsilon\Delta_{z_0})) d\{(1-\varepsilon)G + \varepsilon\Delta_{z_0}\}(z) = 0$ with respect to ε . This yields

$$IF(z_0; G) = -\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \psi(Z, \eta) \Big|_{\eta=T_M(G)} \right]^{-1} \psi(z_0, T_M(G)). \quad (23)$$

The function ψ is said to have a redescending property if $\psi(z_0, T_M(G))$ approaches zero as the outlier $|z_0|$ increases. Therefore, when ψ has the redescending property and z_0 is an outlier, the latent bias is sufficiently small. This is favorable for outlier resistance.

Since ε_1 is dependent on X , we cannot apply the IF directly to our estimators. To overcome this issue, we consider the IF with fixed covariates $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$; this approach is similar to the fixed carrier model in Hampel et al. [2011, Chap.6]. Consider the following estimating equation:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} [\psi(Y, T, X_i; \mu) | X_i] = 0. \quad (24)$$

If the fixed sample $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ consists of i.i.d. observations, then the left-hand side of (24) converges to $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\psi(Y, T, X; \mu)]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}$ denote a root of (24), and let $\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}$ be a root of $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\psi(Y, T, X; \mu)]$. Then, $\tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}$ also converges to $\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}$. Therefore, $\tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}$ shows roughly the same behavior as that of the target estimator $\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}$. The contaminated density \tilde{g} is defined as (6), and $\delta_1(y|X_i)$ is assumed to be Dirac's delta at y_0 . The IF of $T_n(\tilde{G})$ at X_i is obtained by differentiating (24) with respect to $\varepsilon_1(X_i)$ at $\varepsilon_1(X_i) = 0$.

Because of the space, we discuss only the ε DP-DR. Assume that $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_1(X_i)$, then the IF of ε DP-DR is

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \Big| X_i \right]^{-1} \left[\frac{P(T=1|X_i)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha)} h(y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)}) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{P(T=1|X_i) - \pi(X_i; \alpha)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu_n^{(1)}) | T=1, X] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In the PS-correct case, the second term in square brackets is equal to zero, and then the IF tends to zero as $|y_0| \rightarrow \infty$. In the OR-correct case, the second term does not disappear. Considering the limit of $|y_0| \rightarrow \infty$, the IF converges to

$$\frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \Big| X_i \right]^{-1} \left[\frac{P(T=1|X_i) - \pi(X_i; \alpha)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu_n^{(1)}) | T=1, X_i] \right]. \quad (26)$$

Thus, the ε DP-DR estimator has the redescending property only in the PS-correct case. In the OR-correct case, the influence cannot be eliminated, but the IF tends to a constant when $|y_0|$ tends to infinity, implying that the influence of the outlier is not serious. DP-DR has an IF similar to that of ε DP-DR, and DP-IPW has an IF similar to that of ε DP-DR whose PS is correct. The derivations of all IFs are presented in the Appendix.

Under homogeneous contamination, the ordinary IF is applicable, and we can see that the proposed estimators have the redescending property in the PS-correct case. Besides, ε DP-DR has the redescending property even in the OR-correct case; this result is consistent with Corollary 1. The IF-based analysis under homogeneous contamination is presented in the Appendix.

5 Asymptotic Properties

We discuss the asymptotic properties of the ε DP-DR estimator. For the other proposed estimators, we obtain similar results with small changes. The asymptotic properties can be obtained in a manner similar to that described in Hoshino [2007]. Assume that the PS and OR models are regular and are estimated consistently if the models are correctly specified. Furthermore, the contamination ratio ε_1 is known. Note that when the contamination ratio is consistently estimated simultaneously with the OR model by Kanamori and Fujisawa [2015], we can replace β with $(\varepsilon_1, \beta^T)^T$ in the following discussion.

We write (20) as $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\mu; \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$, and let $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i^{PS}(\alpha) = 0$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i^{OR}(\beta) = 0$ be the estimating equations for the PS and OR models, respectively. Let $\lambda = (\mu, \alpha^T, \beta^T)^T$ be the parameter vector, and let the full estimating equation be defined as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_i(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} \psi_i(\mu; \alpha, \beta) \\ s_i^{PS}(\alpha) \\ s_i^{OR}(\beta) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (27)$$

Let $\lambda^* = (\mu^*, \alpha^{*T}, \beta^{*T})^T$ be a root of (27) in population. Note that, in this section, $*$ does not necessarily mean that the model is correctly specified. With the results presented in Van der Vaart [2000, Chap.5], the following theorem holds under some regularity conditions.

Theorem 5. *Under the regularity conditions presented in the Appendix, the following asymptotic properties hold:*

$$\hat{\lambda} \xrightarrow{p} \lambda^*, \quad (28)$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)), \quad (29)$$

where $\mathbf{V}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) = \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} \mathbf{K}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \{\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^T\}^{-1}$, $\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} [\partial S_i(\lambda^*) / \partial \lambda^T]$, and $\mathbf{K}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} [S_i(\lambda^*) S_i(\lambda^*)^T]$.

By using this and applying the results presented in Section 3.2, we find that the limit μ^* is in the neighborhood of $\mu^{(1)}$.

Theorem 6. *Let $\lambda^{**} = (\mu^{(1)}, \alpha^{*T}, \beta^{*T})^T$ and assume that $\mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda)$ is nonzero within the interval $[\lambda^*, \lambda^{**}]$. Under Assumption 1 and homogeneous contamination, if either the PS or the OR model is correct, it then holds that*

$$\mu^* = \mu^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\nu_1(\phi)), \quad (30)$$

where $\phi(\cdot) = \varepsilon_1$ (constant) in the PS-correct case and $\phi(\cdot) = \varepsilon_1 P(T = 1 | \cdot) / \pi(\cdot; \alpha)$ in the OR-correct case.

The proof of Theorem 6 and further discussions on the asymptotic variance are available in the Appendix.

6 Monte-Carlo Simulation

We conduct Monte-Carlo simulations to evaluate the performance of the proposed estimators. Our methods are compared with the naive IPW and DR estimators and some existing outlier-resistant methods (Firpo, 2007; Zhang et al., 2012; Díaz, 2017; Sued, Valdora, and Yohai, 2020). Since these methods focus on the median of the potential outcome, they are resistant to outliers at a certain level; but the median-based methods are not so resistant to heavy contamination. To the best of our knowledge, no method other than the proposed method has more outlier resistance than the median. Firpo’s IPW estimator [Firpo, 2007] is defined as

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{Firpo}} = \arg \min_{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{T_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (Y_i - \mu)(0.5 - \mathbb{I}(Y_i \leq \mu)), \quad (31)$$

where the function \mathbb{I} is an indicator function. Zhang’s IPW median [Zhang et al., 2012] is based on the IPW-empirical distribution. Firpo’s IPW and Zhang’s IPW are almost equivalent except for a slight difference in their computation. Zhang’s and Sued’s DR methods (Zhang et al., 2012; Sued, Valdora, and Yohai, 2020) estimate the empirical distribution in a doubly robust way. They incorporate an IPW-type estimator into the first term. The remaining term of Zhang’s DR is based on the Gaussian cumulative distribution function of Y given X . In contrast, Sued’s DR constructs the remaining term in a nonparametric manner. Diaz’s DR median [Díaz, 2017] is a different approach; it employs the targeted maximum likelihood estimator (TMLE) [Van Der Laan and Rubin, 2006]. We implemented our methods, Zhang’s IPW/DR, and Sued’s DR in R. For Firpo’s IPW and TMLE, we used the *causalquantile* package (<https://github.com/idiazst/causalquantile>; Updated on 31 Aug 2017).

6.1 Numerical Algorithm for the Proposed Methods

Since the proposed estimating equations cannot be solved explicitly, we develop an iterative algorithm. Various algorithms are available, but we propose a standard algorithm for M-estimators [Huber, 2004, Hampel et al., 2011]. Detailed algorithm is available in the Appendix. Hereafter, we suppose h and q are Gaussian. We also provide explicit updating formulae in this case. Note that some additional parameters of h should be estimated in a roughly unbiased and outlier-resistant way.

6.2 Simulation Model

We simulated random observations based on a simple causal setting. The confounders (X_1, X_2) were independently drawn from a Gaussian or uniform distribution with mean zero and unit variance. The treatment T was assigned along with the conditional probability $P(T = 1|X_1, X_2)$ that was defined as a sigmoid function of $0.8X_1 + 0.2X_2$. The potential outcomes $(Y^{(1)}, Y^{(0)})$ were generated according to a linear function of (X_1, X_2) with Gaussian error: $Y^{(1)} = \mu^{(1)} + 1.2X_1 + 0.3X_2 + e$ and $Y^{(0)} = \mu^{(0)} + 1.2X_1 + 0.3X_2 + e$. $\mu^{(1)}$ and $\mu^{(0)}$ were set to 3 and 0, respectively. The standard deviation (SD) of e was set to $\sqrt{0.72}$; then, $\text{SD}[Y^{(1)}] = \text{SD}[Y^{(0)}] = 1.5$. When the confounders were not Gaussian,

the potential outcomes were not Gaussian. The observed outcome Y was defined as $Y = TY^{(1)} + (1 - T)Y^{(0)}$ under no contamination. Outliers were drawn from $\mathcal{N}(\mu^{(t)} + 10\sigma^{(t)}, 1)$, with $\sigma^{(t)} = \text{SD}[Y^{(t)}] = 1.5$. For the homogeneous contamination settings, the contamination ratio was set to be a constant ε_t . For the heterogeneous contamination settings, the contamination ratio was set to be $1.5\varepsilon_t$ if $X_1 + X_2 \leq 0$ and $0.5\varepsilon_t$ if $X_1 + X_2 > 0$. The average contamination ratio is set to $\varepsilon_t \in \{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2\}$. Then, the observations of Y were randomly replaced with outliers according to the contamination ratio. The sample size was fixed to $n = 100$ throughout the Monte Carlo simulations. Furthermore, we generated datasets in which the outcome follows a symmetric and heavy-tailed distribution. We drew the error term of $Y^{(t)}$ from the standard Cauchy distribution instead of inserting outliers.

6.3 Results

First, we performed a comparative study. The potential mean $\mu^{(1)}$ was estimated using the proposed and comparative methods. In this experiment, we used all settings illustrated in the previous section. The propensity score was estimated by logistic regression. The parametric OR was conducted in two ways: Gaussian MLE with non-outliers or unnormalized Gaussian modeling (the tuning parameter was set to 0.5) [Kanamori and Fujisawa, 2015]. For the DR estimators, we investigated three patterns of model misspecification: PS-correct/OR-correct, PS-correct/OR-incorrect, and PS-incorrect/OR-correct. For the model-correct case, we included an intercept and (X_1, X_2) as covariates. For the model-incorrect case, we included only an intercept and X_2 . We performed 10,000 simulations for every setting and method. Tables 2 and 3 show the results of the comparative study when the covariates were Gaussian and the OR for the DR-type estimators was the Gaussian MLE with non-outliers. The estimation error was measured by the root mean square error (RMSE). The mean and SD of all estimates, the mean computation time, and the results for the other settings are provided in the Appendix. In Table 2, the naive IPW estimator had a significantly larger RMSE under contamination. Both the median-based methods and DP-IPW dramatically reduced the RMSE. As the contamination ratio increased, the RMSE increased. The RMSE tended to be larger for heterogeneous contamination than for homogeneous contamination. When the optimal γ was chosen, the proposed method outperformed the comparative methods and had the smallest RMSE for all settings. Looking at Table 3, the results for the DR-type estimators were similar to those for the IPW estimators. The proposed method with a proper γ outperformed the comparative methods and had the smallest RMSE in all settings. DP-DR and ε DP-DR performed similarly, although ε DP-DR was slightly superior in many settings. Among the median-based methods, TMLE performed better, but it took much more time than the other methods, including the proposed methods, and occasionally ($< 1\%$) failed to converge.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW	Naive	0.222	0.957	1.683	3.153	0.993	1.752	3.253
	median (Firpo)	0.257	0.294	0.367	0.649	0.306	0.409	0.769
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.257	0.294	0.367	0.649	0.306	0.409	0.769
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.218	0.276	0.531	2.263	0.293	0.609	2.377
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.227	0.249	0.272	0.639	0.245	0.287	0.726
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.261	0.271	0.275	0.413	0.262	0.281	0.498

Table 2: Results of the comparative study of the IPW-type estimators. Each figure is RMSE between each estimate and the true value. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.184	0.957	1.684	3.154	0.997	1.758	3.265
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.239	0.317	0.391	0.733	0.330	0.452	0.905
	median (Sued)	0.238	0.316	0.388	0.693	0.329	0.450	0.869
	median (TMLE)	0.237	0.280	0.359	0.603	0.295	0.402	0.701
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.302	0.564	2.262	0.318	0.649	2.394
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.202	0.285	0.326	0.697	0.274	0.349	0.834
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.240	0.288	0.307	0.524	0.287	0.336	0.669
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.296	0.554	2.255	0.314	0.636	2.385
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.202	0.264	0.302	0.669	0.271	0.323	0.793
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.240	0.287	0.299	0.513	0.286	0.335	0.648
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.237	0.963	1.686	3.156	1.001	1.758	3.262
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.275	0.342	0.408	0.741	0.350	0.465	0.912
	median (Sued)	0.275	0.342	0.407	0.699	0.350	0.464	0.872
	median (TMLE)	0.242	0.284	0.363	0.622	0.297	0.404	0.719
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.237	0.314	0.561	2.267	0.330	0.644	2.393
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.247	0.319	0.349	0.714	0.319	0.361	0.839
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.280	0.334	0.347	0.581	0.329	0.372	0.709
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.237	0.311	0.557	2.264	0.328	0.640	2.388
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.247	0.317	0.344	0.694	0.313	0.356	0.817
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.280	0.333	0.338	0.551	0.327	0.369	0.708
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.181	0.879	1.591	3.026	0.826	1.490	2.813
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.237	0.263	0.316	0.503	0.269	0.337	0.548
	median (Sued)	0.236	0.272	0.346	0.599	0.277	0.364	0.627
	median (TMLE)	0.234	0.260	0.309	0.478	0.265	0.328	0.522
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.182	0.192	0.345	2.057	0.191	0.299	1.681
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.199	0.206	0.218	0.366	0.203	0.209	0.283
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.230	0.232	0.239	0.273	0.230	0.233	0.242
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.182	0.193	0.381	2.207	0.194	0.335	1.839
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.199	0.203	0.208	0.376	0.203	0.212	0.318
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.230	0.230	0.231	0.243	0.231	0.237	0.260

Table 3: Results of the comparative study of the IPW-type estimators. Each figure is RMSE between each estimate and the true value. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the Gaussian MLE using non-outliers. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

Table 4 shows the RMSE of each method on the data with Cauchy error. As well as the above experiments, the proposed method performed better than the comparative methods. In this setting, we only used the unnormalized Gaussian modeling for OR for the DR-type estimators. Only in the PS-correct/OR-incorrect case, the median (TMLE) performed slightly better than the proposed method.

Next, we conduct a γ -sensitivity study. $\mu^{(1)}$ was estimated by the proposed methods with different γ s. X had a Gaussian distribution, and the contamination ratio varied in $\{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2\}$ under homogeneous contamination. For the DR-type estimators, the outcome regression was performed by the Gaussian MLE using nonoutliers. We simulated 10,000 datasets for every setting and method. Table 5 shows the results of the γ -sensitivity study. As in the comparative study, when the ratio of outliers increased, the bias increased. Larger γ resulted in increased variance. When the contamination ratio was small, it was sufficient to use a small γ such as $\gamma = 0.1$ or 0.2 to remove the adverse effect of outliers. Even in highly contaminated cases, $\gamma > 1.0$ was not needed. Comparing the estimates of DP-DR and ε DP-DR in the PS-incorrect/OR-correct case, it can be found that the DP-DR estimates were biased especially when ε was large, and contrarily, the ε DP-DR estimates were almost equal to the true value 3. This result shows that the bias correction by $1 - \hat{\varepsilon}$ worked well in our experiments.

As in many other outlier-resistant statistical methods, parameter tuning is challenging. We suggest a possible policy on this issue based on the solution paths of the proposed estimators, which is provided in the Appendix. Looking at the paths, the influence of outliers decreased as γ increased, and the paths became stable around the true value after reaching a certain γ . Thus, we suggest using the smallest γ for which the estimate is stable.

		Distribution of X	
		Gaussian	Uniform
IPW(T/-)	Naive	274.024	246.118
	median (Firpo)	0.414	0.438
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.414	0.438
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.443	0.425
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.367	0.363
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.380	0.383
DR(T/T)	Naive	275.447	247.011
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.415	0.431
	median (Sued)	0.408	0.430
	median (TMLE)	0.392	0.425
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.501	0.420
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.363	0.356
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.372	0.374
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.487	0.420
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.361	0.355
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.370	0.374
DR(T/F)	Naive	275.446	247.011
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.456	0.443
	median (Sued)	0.436	0.441
	median (TMLE)	0.394	0.427
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.514	0.431
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.404	0.369
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.418	0.389
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.503	0.430
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.399	0.368
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.412	0.388
DR(F/T)	Naive	263.629	177.037
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.390	0.429
	median (Sued)	0.373	0.400
	median (TMLE)	0.389	0.429
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.390	0.401
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.358	0.376
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.364	0.393
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.377	0.385
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.328	0.338
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.334	0.351

Table 4: Results of the comparative study using the heavy-tailed data. Each figure is RMSE between each estimate and the true value. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian or uniform distributions. The OR model for the DR-type estimators were obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

	PS/OR	ε	$\gamma = 0.0$	0.1	0.2	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0
DP-IPW	T/-	0.00	3.004 (0.22)	2.998 (0.22)	2.994 (0.22)	2.986 (0.23)	2.980 (0.26)	2.974 (0.30)	2.970 (0.34)
		0.05	3.749 (0.59)	3.030 (0.27)	2.999 (0.26)	2.987 (0.25)	2.978 (0.27)	2.970 (0.30)	2.963 (0.33)
		0.10	4.493 (0.78)	3.142 (0.51)	3.015 (0.32)	2.989 (0.27)	2.977 (0.27)	2.969 (0.30)	2.963 (0.33)
		0.20	5.983 (1.02)	4.492 (1.70)	3.536 (1.39)	3.052 (0.64)	2.990 (0.41)	2.978 (0.39)	2.971 (0.40)
DP-DR	T/T	0.00	2.999 (0.18)	2.998 (0.18)	2.997 (0.19)	2.996 (0.20)	2.992 (0.24)	2.989 (0.28)	2.985 (0.31)
		0.05	3.745 (0.60)	3.029 (0.30)	3.002 (0.27)	2.997 (0.29)	2.991 (0.29)	2.985 (0.31)	2.980 (0.34)
		0.10	4.489 (0.79)	3.140 (0.55)	3.017 (0.36)	3.000 (0.33)	2.992 (0.31)	2.986 (0.32)	2.981 (0.33)
		0.20	5.979 (1.04)	4.465 (1.72)	3.532 (1.41)	3.060 (0.69)	3.009 (0.52)	2.999 (0.51)	2.994 (0.51)
	T/F	0.00	3.004 (0.24)	2.998 (0.24)	2.994 (0.24)	2.986 (0.25)	2.979 (0.28)	2.974 (0.32)	2.968 (0.36)
		0.05	3.750 (0.60)	3.033 (0.31)	3.001 (0.29)	2.989 (0.32)	2.978 (0.33)	2.970 (0.36)	2.963 (0.39)
		0.10	4.494 (0.78)	3.150 (0.54)	3.020 (0.37)	2.992 (0.35)	2.979 (0.35)	2.970 (0.37)	2.963 (0.39)
		0.20	5.984 (1.03)	4.490 (1.71)	3.546 (1.41)	3.059 (0.71)	3.001 (0.58)	2.985 (0.55)	2.975 (0.54)
	F/T	0.00	2.999 (0.18)	2.999 (0.18)	2.999 (0.18)	3.001 (0.20)	3.005 (0.23)	3.010 (0.26)	3.014 (0.29)
		0.05	3.725 (0.50)	2.997 (0.19)	2.976 (0.19)	2.975 (0.20)	2.978 (0.23)	2.982 (0.26)	2.986 (0.29)
		0.10	4.451 (0.65)	3.051 (0.34)	2.956 (0.21)	2.950 (0.21)	2.953 (0.23)	2.956 (0.26)	2.960 (0.28)
		0.20	5.902 (0.86)	4.326 (1.57)	3.301 (1.15)	2.907 (0.35)	2.895 (0.25)	2.897 (0.26)	2.900 (0.28)
	ε DP-DR	T/T	0.00	2.999 (0.18)	2.998 (0.18)	2.997 (0.19)	2.996 (0.20)	2.992 (0.24)	2.989 (0.28)
			0.05	3.745 (0.60)	3.028 (0.29)	3.002 (0.27)	2.997 (0.26)	2.991 (0.29)	2.985 (0.31)
			0.10	4.489 (0.78)	3.138 (0.54)	3.017 (0.35)	2.999 (0.30)	2.991 (0.30)	2.985 (0.32)
			0.20	5.978 (1.03)	4.464 (1.72)	3.531 (1.40)	3.058 (0.67)	3.007 (0.51)	2.998 (0.50)
		T/F	0.00	3.004 (0.24)	2.998 (0.24)	2.994 (0.24)	2.986 (0.25)	2.979 (0.28)	2.974 (0.32)
			0.05	3.750 (0.60)	3.033 (0.31)	3.001 (0.29)	2.989 (0.32)	2.978 (0.33)	2.970 (0.36)
			0.10	4.493 (0.78)	3.149 (0.54)	3.020 (0.36)	2.992 (0.34)	2.978 (0.34)	2.970 (0.37)
			0.20	5.983 (1.02)	4.489 (1.71)	3.543 (1.40)	3.057 (0.69)	2.998 (0.55)	2.984 (0.54)
		F/T	0.00	2.999 (0.18)	2.999 (0.18)	2.999 (0.18)	3.001 (0.20)	3.005 (0.23)	3.010 (0.26)
			0.05	3.746 (0.50)	3.020 (0.19)	2.998 (0.19)	2.998 (0.20)	3.001 (0.23)	3.005 (0.26)
			0.10	4.493 (0.66)	3.108 (0.37)	3.004 (0.20)	2.998 (0.21)	3.001 (0.23)	3.004 (0.26)
			0.20	5.986 (0.87)	4.541 (1.58)	3.486 (1.24)	3.020 (0.38)	3.003 (0.24)	3.005 (0.25)

Table 5: Results of γ -sensitivity study. Each figure displays the mean (SD) of 10,000 simulations for each setting. In the second column, "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

7 Real Data Analysis

In this section, we demonstrate the estimation of the ATE on a real dataset. We use the data of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data I Epidemiologic Follow-up Study (NHEFS). The NHEFS is a national longitudinal study that was performed by U.S. public agencies. We use the processed dataset available online [Hernán and Robins, 2020, <https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/miguel-hernan/causal-inference-book/>]. The NHEFS dataset contains 1,566 observations of smokers who were enrolled in the study in 1971–75. By the follow-up visit in 1982, 403 (25.7%) participants had quit smoking. The study goal was to evaluate the treatment effect of smoking cessation ($T = 1$) on weight gain (Y). Other than the treatment and outcome, several baseline variables were collected, including sex, age, race, education level, intensity and duration of smoking, physical activity in daily life, recreational exercise, and baseline weight. We used all of them to control for confounding in a similar manner to that of Hernán and Robins [2020]. We included linear and quadratic terms for all continuous covariates (age, intensity and duration of smoking, and baseline weight) and dummy terms for the discrete covariates. The propensity score was estimated by logistic regression, and outcome regression was performed by unnormalized Gaussian modeling (the tuning parameter was set to 0.2). The original dataset does not contain obvious outliers; then, we randomly replaced 10% observations with outliers drawn from $\mathcal{N}(100, 5^2)$. Then, we estimated $\mu^{(1)}$, $\mu^{(0)}$ and the ATE by the same methods in the Monte Carlo simulations. This process was repeated 10,000 times, and we summarized the results in Table 6. For reference, we estimated every target quantity using the naive IPW/DR using the original data.

For the IPW-type estimators, the median-based methods gave larger estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$ and $\mu^{(0)}$ than those in the case of IPW (no outliers). In particular, $\mu^{(0)}$ was estimated to be much larger. As a result, when using the median-based methods, the ATE was estimated to be smaller than that in the case of IPW (no outliers). By contrast, DP-IPW overestimated $\mu^{(1)}$ with $\gamma = 0.05$ and underestimated $\mu^{(1)}$ with $\gamma \geq 0.10$. It overestimated $\mu^{(0)}$ compared to the case of IPW (no outliers), and this tendency was strengthened by increasing γ . However, because the extent of overestimation of $\mu^{(0)}$ was smaller than that in the case of median-based methods, the estimate of the ATE by DP-IPW was closer to that obtained using IPW (no outliers) than by using the median-based methods. The DR-type estimators showed similar results. The median-based methods overestimated $\mu^{(1)}$ and $\mu^{(0)}$. DP-DR and ε DP-DR underestimated $\mu^{(1)}$ and overestimated $\mu^{(0)}$. The ATE was estimated better by DP-DR and ε DP-DR than by the median-based methods. DP-DR and ε DP-DR had the same tendency of estimation bias and γ ; a larger γ value increased the bias.

	Target Quantities		
	$\mu^{(1)}$	$\mu^{(0)}$	ATE
IPW (no outliers)	5.221 (-)	1.780 (-)	3.441 (-)
IPW	14.718 (1.57)	11.607 (0.87)	3.111 (1.78)
median (Firpo)	5.439 (0.21)	2.753 (0.10)	2.686 (0.24)
median (Zhang-IPW)	5.439 (0.21)	2.753 (0.10)	2.686 (0.24)
DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.05$)	5.597 (0.30)	1.851 (0.07)	3.746 (0.31)
DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.10$)	5.157 (0.15)	1.819 (0.07)	3.338 (0.17)
DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.20$)	5.089 (0.15)	1.875 (0.06)	3.215 (0.16)
DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.50$)	4.949 (0.15)	2.007 (0.06)	2.941 (0.16)
DR (no outliers)	5.136 (-)	1.772 (-)	3.364 (-)
DR	14.574 (1.57)	11.589 (0.90)	2.985 (1.81)
median (Zhang-DR)	5.352 (0.20)	2.743 (0.10)	2.609 (0.22)
median (Sued)	5.353 (0.20)	2.744 (0.10)	2.609 (0.23)
median (TMLE)	5.363 (0.21)	2.739 (0.10)	2.624 (0.23)
DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.05$)	5.478 (0.27)	1.842 (0.07)	3.636 (0.28)
DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.10$)	5.057 (0.16)	1.810 (0.07)	3.248 (0.17)
DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.20$)	4.983 (0.16)	1.865 (0.06)	3.119 (0.17)
DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.50$)	4.834 (0.16)	1.997 (0.06)	2.837 (0.17)
ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.05$)	5.574 (0.29)	1.851 (0.07)	3.723 (0.30)
ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.10$)	5.148 (0.15)	1.819 (0.07)	3.330 (0.17)
ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.20$)	5.080 (0.15)	1.874 (0.06)	3.206 (0.17)
ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.50$)	4.937 (0.15)	2.007 (0.06)	2.930 (0.16)

Table 6: Results of the NHEFS data analysis. Mean and SD are computed on 2,000 bootstrap samples.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 17K00065.

References

- James M Robins, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Lue Ping Zhao. Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866, 1994.
- Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- Heejung Bang and James M Robins. Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics*, 61(4):962–973, 2005.
- Peter J Rousseeuw and Bert C van Zomeren. Unmasking multivariate outliers and leverage points. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 85(411):633–639, September 1990.
- Gustavo Canavire-Bacarreza, Luis Castro Peñarrieta, and Darwin Ugarte Ontiveros. Outliers in Semi-Parametric estimation of treatment effects. *Econometrics*, 9(2):19, April 2021.
- Peter J Huber. *Robust statistics*, volume 523. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- Frank R Hampel, Elvezio M Ronchetti, Peter J Rousseeuw, and Werner A Stahel. *Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions*, volume 196. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- Ricardo A Maronna, R Douglas Martin, Victor J Yohai, and Matías Salibián-Barrera. *Robust statistics: theory and methods (with R)*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- Sergio Firpo. Efficient semiparametric estimation of quantile treatment effects. *Econometrica*, 75(1):259–276, 2007.
- Zhiwei Zhang, Zhen Chen, James F Troendle, and Jun Zhang. Causal inference on quantiles with an obstetric application. *Biometrics*, 68(3):697–706, 2012.
- Iván Díaz. Efficient estimation of quantiles in missing data models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 190:39–51, 2017.
- Mariela Sued, Marina Valdora, and Víctor Yohai. Robust doubly protected estimators for quantiles with missing data. *TEST*, 63(3):819–843, 2020.
- Hironori Fujisawa and Shinto Eguchi. Robust parameter estimation with a small bias against heavy contamination. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 99(9):2053–2081, 2008.
- Guido W Imbens and Donald B Rubin. *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, April 2015.
- Jared K Lunceford and Marie Davidian. Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: a comparative study. *Statistics in medicine*, 23(19):2937–2960, 2004.
- Daniel O Scharfstein, Andrea Rotnitzky, and James M Robins. Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1096–1120, 1999.

- James M Robins and Andrea Rotnitzky. Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models with missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429):122–129, 1995.
- Anastasios Tsiatis. *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*. Springer New York, June 2006.
- Aad W Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- Takahiro Hoshino. Doubly robust-type estimation for covariate adjustment in latent variable modeling. *Psychometrika*, 72(4):535–549, 2007.
- Hironori Fujisawa. Normalized estimating equation for robust parameter estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:1587–1606, 2013.
- Martin Maechler, Peter Rousseeuw, Christophe Croux, Valentin Todorov, Andreas Ruckstuhl, Matias Salibian-Barrera, Tobias Verbeke, Manuel Koller, Eduardo LT Conceicao, and Maria Anna di Palma. *robustbase: Basic Robust Statistics*, 2021. R package version 0.93.9.
- Michael P Windham. Robustifying model fitting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 599–609, 1995.
- Ayanendranath Basu, Ian R Harris, Nils L Hjort, and MC Jones. Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence. *Biometrika*, 85(3):549–559, 1998.
- MC Jones, Nils Lid Hjort, Ian R Harris, and Ayanendranath Basu. A comparison of related density-based minimum divergence estimators. *Biometrika*, 88(3):865–873, 2001.
- Victor J Yohai. High breakdown-point and high efficiency robust estimates for regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 642–656, 1987.
- Takafumi Kanamori and Hironori Fujisawa. Robust estimation under heavy contamination using unnormalized models. *Biometrika*, 102(3):559–572, 2015.
- Takayuki Kawashima and Hironori Fujisawa. Robust and sparse regression via γ -divergence. *Entropy*, 19(11):608, 2017.
- Mark J Van Der Laan and Daniel Rubin. Targeted maximum likelihood learning. *The international journal of biostatistics*, 2(1), 2006.
- Miguel A Hernán and James M Robins. *Causal inference: what if*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2020.

Appendix A Proofs for Unbiasedness of Estimating Equations

Appendix A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T=1|X)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_g \left[h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \middle| T=1, X \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{f_1} \left[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \right]\end{aligned}$$

The third equality holds from the causal consistency and the conditional unconfoundedness. Since $h(y; \mu^{(1)})$ and $f_1(y)$ are symmetric about $\mu^{(1)}$, this expectation is equal to zero:

$$\mathbb{E}_{f_1} \left[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \right] = \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) f_1(y) dy = 0.$$

□

Appendix A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\mathbb{E}_{\hat{g}} \left[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= \int \left\{ (1 - \varepsilon_1(x)) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy + \varepsilon_1(x) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) \delta_1(y|x) dy \right\} g(x) dx \\ &= \int (1 - \varepsilon_1(x)) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1) \tag{A1} \\ &= - \int \varepsilon_1(x) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1). \tag{A2}\end{aligned}$$

If $\varepsilon_1(x) = \varepsilon_1$, the first term disappears:

$$-\varepsilon_1 \iint h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) g(x) dy dx = -\varepsilon_1 \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) f_1(y) dy = 0.$$

□

Appendix A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. First, we assume that the true PS is given.

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} \left[h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) \middle| T=1, X \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} \left[h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) \middle| T=1, X \right] \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[- \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \middle| X \right] \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} \left[h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) \middle| T=1, X \right] \right] \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

Next, we assume that the true OR model is given.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y; \mu)^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{T}{\pi(X; \alpha)} h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \middle| X \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{T}{\pi(X; \alpha)} - 1 \middle| X \right] \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} - 1 \right) \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g [\mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X]] \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the DP-DR estimating equation has double robustness under no contamination. \square

Appendix A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. If the true PS model is given, the DP-DR estimating equation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X] \middle| X \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) \middle| X \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \middle| X \right] \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}} [h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X]}_{=0} \right] \\
&= - \int \varepsilon_1(x) \int h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1). \tag{A3}
\end{aligned}$$

If the contamination ratio is independent of X , it holds that

$$- \varepsilon_1 \iint h(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu^{(1)}) g(y|x) dy g(x) dx = 0,$$

which is the same result as the DP-IPW estimating equation.

If the true OR model is given, the DP-DR estimating equation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g \left[h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu) | T = 1, X \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g \left[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu) | X \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \left((1 - \varepsilon_1(X)) \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] + \varepsilon_1(X) \mathbb{E}_\delta [h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} - 1 \right) \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[-\varepsilon_1(X) \frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] + \nu_1(\varepsilon_1(\cdot) P(T = 1 | \cdot) / \pi(\cdot; \alpha)).
\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

When the contamination ratio is independent of X , the first term becomes

$$-\varepsilon_1 \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g [h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] \tag{A5}$$

Thus, we have Theorem 4. \square

Appendix B Derivation of Influence functions in Section 4

Appendix B.1 DP-IPW

Let $\tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}$ denote the root of the DP-IPW estimating equation under contamination.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1(X_i)} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} (Y - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) \middle| X_i \right] \right\} \bigg|_{\varepsilon_1(X_i)=0} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1(X_i)} \iint \frac{t}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} h(y; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) \{ (1 - \varepsilon_1(X_i)) g(y | X_i) + \varepsilon_1(X_i) \delta_{y_0}(y) \} g(t | X_i) dy dt \bigg|_{\varepsilon_1(X_i)=0} \\
&= \iint \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \bigg|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} g(y | X_i) g(t | X_i) dy dt \cdot IF(y_0) \\
&\quad + \iint \frac{t}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} h(y; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \mu_n^{(1)}) \delta_{y_0}(y) g(t | X_i) dy dt \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \bigg|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \middle| X_i \right] \cdot IF_{DP-IPW}(y_0) + h(y_0; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)})
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \bigg|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \middle| X_i \right]$ is invertible, we obtain the IF as

$$- \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \bigg|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \middle| X_i \right]^{-1} h(y_0; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)}). \tag{A6}$$

Appendix B.2 DP-DR

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1(X_i)} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} (Y - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) \middle| X_i \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{T - \pi(X_i; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} \middle| X_i \right] \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) | X_i] \right\} \Big|_{\varepsilon_1(X_i)=0} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1(X_i)} \left\{ \iiint \frac{t}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} h(y; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) \{ (1 - \varepsilon_1(X_i))g(y|X_i) + \varepsilon_1(X_i)\delta_{y_0}(y) \} g(t|X_i) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{t - \pi(X_i; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) | X_i] g(t|X_i) dy dt \right\} \Big|_{\varepsilon_1(X_i)=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \middle| X_i \right] \cdot IF(y_0) + \frac{P(T=1|X_i)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} h(y_0; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)}) \\
&\quad - \frac{P(T=1|X_i) - \pi(X_i; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu_n^{(1)}) | X_i]
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain the IF as

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \middle| X_i \right]^{-1} \left\{ \frac{P(T=1|X_i)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha)} h(y_0; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{P(T=1|X_i) - \pi(X_i; \alpha)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu_n^{(1)}) | X_i] \right\}. \tag{A7}
\end{aligned}$$

Appendix B.3 ε DP-DR

Suppose the expected contamination ratio is correctly specified as $\bar{\varepsilon}_1 = (1 - \sum \varepsilon_1(X_i))/n$.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1(X_i)} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} (Y - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) \middle| X_i \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_1(X_i) \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{T - \pi(X_i; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} \middle| X_i \right] \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) | X_i] \right\} \Big|_{\varepsilon_1(X_i)=0} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1(X_i)} \left\{ \iiint \frac{t}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} h(y; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) \{ (1 - \varepsilon_1(X_i))g(y|X_i) + \varepsilon_1(X_i)\delta_{y_0}(y) \} g(t|X_i) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_1(X_i) \right) \frac{t - \pi(X_i; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}_n^{(1)}) | X_i] g(t|X_i) dy dt \right\} \Big|_{\varepsilon_1(X_i)=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \mu} \Big|_{\mu=\mu_n^{(1)}} \middle| X_i \right] \cdot IF(y_0) + \frac{P(T=1|X_i)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} h(y_0; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu_n^{(1)}) \\
&\quad - \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{P(T=1|X_i) - \pi(X_i; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X_i; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu_n^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu_n^{(1)}) | X_i]
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain (4.25).

Appendix C Influence Functions Under Homogeneous Contamination

Under homogeneous contamination, we can apply the ordinary IF analysis. By differentiating the estimating equations with respect to ε_1 at $\varepsilon_1 = 0$, we obtain the following results.

Appendix C.1 DP-IPW

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}) \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon_1=0} \\
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \iiint \frac{th(y; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(x; \alpha^*)} (y - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}) \{ (1 - \varepsilon_1)g(y|t, x) + \varepsilon_1 \delta_{y_0}(y|x) \} g(t|x)g(x) dy dt dx \Big|_{\varepsilon_1=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right] \cdot IF(y_0) + \iiint \frac{th(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(x; \alpha^*)} (y - \mu^{(1)}) \delta_{y_0}(y|x) g(t|x)g(x) dy dt dx \\
IF(y_0) &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right]^{-1} h(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) \tag{A8}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, DP-IPW has a redescending property under homogeneous contamination.

Appendix C.2 DP-DR

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (Y - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})|X] \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon_1=0} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \iiint \left(\frac{th(y; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(x; \alpha)} (y - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}) - \frac{t - \pi(x; \alpha)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})|x] \right) \\
&\quad \times \{ (1 - \varepsilon_1)g(y|t, x) + \varepsilon_1 \delta_{y_0}(y|x) \} g(t|x)g(x) dy dt dx \Big|_{\varepsilon_1=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right] \cdot IF(y_0) + \iiint \left(\frac{th(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(x; \alpha)} (y - \mu^{(1)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{t - \pi(x; \alpha)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})|x] \right) \delta_{y_0}(y|x) g(t|x)g(x) dy dt dx \\
IF(y_0) &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right]^{-1} \iint \left(\frac{th(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(x; \alpha)} (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{t - \pi(x; \alpha)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})|x] \right) g(t|x)g(x) dt dx \tag{A9}
\end{aligned}$$

If the true PS model is given, this IF reduces to

$$IF(y_0) = \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right]^{-1} h(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) \tag{A10}$$

If the true OR model is given, this IF reduces to

$$IF(y_0) = \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right]^{-1} \int \frac{P(T=1|x)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} h(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) \\ - \frac{P(T=1|x) - \pi(x; \alpha)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_g[h(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})|x] g(x) dx \quad (\text{A11})$$

Thus, DP-DR has a redescending property under homogeneous contamination in the PS-correct case.

Appendix C.3 ε DP-DR

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{Th(Y; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (Y - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha)}{\pi(X; \alpha)} (1 - \varepsilon_1) \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(1)})|X] \right] \Big|_{\varepsilon_1=0} \\ = \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right] \cdot IF(y_0) \\ + \iiint \left(\frac{th(y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(x; \alpha)} (y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{t - \pi(x; \alpha)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})|x] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{t - \pi(x; \alpha)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{q}}[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})|x] \right) \delta_{y_0}(y|x) g(t|x) g(x) dy dt dx \\ IF(y_0) = \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \varepsilon_1} \Big|_{\mu=\mu^{(1)}} \right]^{-1} \int \frac{P(T=1|x)}{\pi(x; \alpha)} h(y_0; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (y_0 - \mu^{(1)}) g(x) dx \quad (\text{A12})$$

Thus, under homogeneous contamination, ε DP-DR has a redescending property in either the PS-correct case or the OR-correct case.

Appendix D Further Discussion on Asymptotic Properties

Appendix D.1 Regularity Conditions for Theorem 5

Detailed discussion is available in Chapter 5 of Van der Vaart (2000), for example.

- (a) The function $S(\lambda)$ is twice continuously differentiable with respect to λ .
- (b) There exists a root λ^* of $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[S(\lambda)] = 0$.
- (c) $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\|S(\lambda^*)\|^2] < \infty$.
- (d) $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}}[\partial S(\lambda^*)/\partial \lambda^T]$ exists and is nonsingular.
- (e) The second-order differentials of $S(\lambda)$ with respect to μ are dominated by a fixed integrable function h in a neighborhood of λ^* .

Appendix D.2 Proof of Theorem 6

Under homogeneous contamination, we see that simpler properties hold. The matrix $\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)$ is partitioned as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \psi_i(\mu^*; \alpha^*, \beta^*) \right] & \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha^T} \psi_i(\mu^*; \alpha^*, \beta^*) \right] & \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} \psi_i(\mu^*; \alpha^*, \beta^*) \right] \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha^T} s_i^{PS}(\alpha^*) \right] & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} s_i^{OR}(\beta^*) \right] \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{J}_{12}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{J}_{13}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{22}^g(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{33}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

If it is nonsingular, the inverse is obtained as

$$\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} & -\mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{12}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \mathbf{J}_{22}^g(\lambda^*)^{-1} & -\mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_{13}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \mathbf{J}_{33}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{22}^g(\lambda^*)^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{33}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\cdot)$ is a scalar value.

Then, Theorem 5 is proved as follows.

Proof. By Taylor's theorem, the expectation of the estimating equation (5.26) is expressed as

$$0 = \mathbb{E}[S_i(\lambda^*)] = \mathbb{E}[S_i(\lambda^{**})] + \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^\dagger)(\lambda^* - \lambda^{**}),$$

where λ^\dagger is an intermediate value between λ^{**} and λ^* . Since $\mathbb{E}[s_i^{PS}(\alpha^*)] = \mathbb{E}[s_i^{OR}(\beta^*)] = 0$ and $(\lambda^* - \lambda^{**}) = (\mu^* - \mu^{(1)}, \mathbf{0}^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$, only the first element is meaningful:

$$0 = \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mu^{(1)}; \alpha^*, \beta^*)] + \mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^\dagger)(\mu^* - \mu^{(1)}).$$

Then, since $\mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^\dagger)$ is non-zero, the latent bias of μ^* reduces to

$$\mu^* - \mu^{(1)} = -\mathbf{J}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^\dagger)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mu^{(1)}; \alpha^*, \beta^*)]. \quad (\text{A13})$$

From Corollary 1, if either the PS or the OR model is correct, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mu^{(1)}; \alpha^*, \beta^*)] = \nu_1(\phi).$$

Upon substituting it into (A13), the statement holds. \square

Appendix D.3 Further Discussion on Asymptotic Variance

Considering the structure of the full estimating equation, the asymptotic variance can be expressed in a more explicit form. The discussion about the asymptotic variance is provided in the next section.

The matrix $\mathbf{K}_{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*)$ is also partitioned as

$$\mathbf{K}_{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K}_{11}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{K}_{12}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{K}_{13}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \\ \mathbf{K}_{12}^{\tilde{g}^T}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{K}_{22}^g(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{K}_{23}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \\ \mathbf{K}_{13}^{\tilde{g}^T}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{K}_{23}^{\tilde{g}^T}(\lambda^*) & \mathbf{K}_{33}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The asymptotic variance is also affected by outliers. However, under Assumption 1, the asymptotic variance can be approximated by the asymptotic variance under no contamination and contamination ratio ε_1 .

Theorem A7. Besides to Assumption 1, assume that $\mathbf{J}_{1m}^\delta(\lambda^{**}) \approx \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{1m}^\delta(\lambda^{**}) \approx \mathbf{0}$ holds for $m = 1, 2, 3$. Then, under homogeneous contamination,

$$\mathbf{V}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \approx \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon_1)}\mathbf{K}_{11}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{K}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{K}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**}) \\ \mathbf{K}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**})^T & \mathbf{K}_{22}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{K}_{23}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) \\ \mathbf{K}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**})^T & \mathbf{K}_{23}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**})^T & \mathbf{K}_{33}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) \end{pmatrix} \{\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**})^T\}^{-1},$$

where

$$\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_{11}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{J}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{J}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**}) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{22}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{33}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

If both the PS and the OR models are correct, the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\mu}$ has a simpler expression. From a similar discussion to Section 3, the following lemma holds:

Lemma A1. If the PS model is correct, $\mathbf{J}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**}) = \mathbf{0}$. If the OR model is correct, $\mathbf{J}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**}) = \mathbf{0}$.

Using Lemma A1, we can see the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\mu}$ is simply expressed.

Theorem A8. Under the same assumptions of Theorem A7, if the PS and the OR models are both correct, then

$$\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{g}}(\mu^*) \approx \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon_1} \mathbf{J}_{11}^g(\lambda^{**})^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{11}^g(\lambda^{**}) \{\mathbf{J}_{11}^g(\lambda^{**})^T\}^{-1}.$$

Proof. By applying Lemma A1 to Theorem A7, the statement holds. \square

This implies that the ε DP-DR appropriately ignores outliers.

Appendix D.3.1 Proof of Theorem A7

If either the PS or the OR model is correct, we can say $\mu^* \approx \mu^{(1)}$. Note that the PS model is not related to the contamination distribution δ , and the contamination on the OR model cannot be removed in general. From the assumptions,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) &\approx \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{J}_{11}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{J}_{12}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{J}_{13}^g \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{22}^g & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{33}^{\tilde{g}} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1\mathbf{J}_{11}^\delta & \varepsilon_1\mathbf{J}_{12}^\delta & \varepsilon_1\mathbf{J}_{13}^\delta \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\approx \begin{pmatrix} (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{J}_{11}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{J}_{12}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{J}_{13}^g \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{22}^g & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_{33}^{\tilde{g}} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1-\varepsilon_1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_\alpha & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_\beta \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{K}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) &\approx \mathbf{K}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**}) \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{11}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{12}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{13}^g \\ (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{12}^{g^T} & \mathbf{K}_{22}^g & \mathbf{K}_{23}^g \\ (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{13}^{g^T} & \mathbf{K}_{23}^{g^T} & \mathbf{K}_{33}^g \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1\mathbf{K}_{11}^{\delta} & \varepsilon_1\mathbf{K}_{12}^{\delta} & \varepsilon_1\mathbf{K}_{13}^{\delta^T} \\ \varepsilon_1\mathbf{K}_{12}^{\delta^T} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \varepsilon_1\mathbf{K}_{13}^{\delta^T} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \\
&\approx \begin{pmatrix} (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{11}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{12}^g & (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{13}^g \\ (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{12}^{g^T} & \mathbf{K}_{22}^g & \mathbf{K}_{23}^g \\ (1-\varepsilon_1)\mathbf{K}_{13}^{g^T} & \mathbf{K}_{23}^{g^T} & \mathbf{K}_{33}^g \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

The input (λ^{**}) is dropped for notation simplicity. Thus, we have

$$\mathbf{V}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^*) \approx \mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon_1)}\mathbf{K}_{11}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{K}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{K}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**}) \\ \mathbf{K}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**})^T & \mathbf{K}_{22}^g(\lambda^{**}) & \mathbf{K}_{23}^g(\lambda^{**}) \\ \mathbf{K}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**})^T & \mathbf{K}_{23}^g(\lambda^{**})^T & \mathbf{K}_{33}^g(\lambda^{**}) \end{pmatrix} \{\mathbf{J}^{\tilde{g}}(\lambda^{**})^T\}^{-1},$$

The proof is complete.

Appendix D.3.2 Proof of Lemma A1

Proof. In the PS correct case,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{J}_{13}^g(\lambda^{**}) &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} \left\{ \frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_{q^*}[h(Y, \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) | T = 1, X] \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{P(T = 1 | X) - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} \mathbb{E}_{q^*}[h(Y, \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y - \mu^{(1)}) | T = 1, X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \right] \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{E}_{q^*} denotes the expectation with respect to $q(y | T = 1, x; \beta^*)$. In the OR correct case,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{J}_{12}^g(\lambda^{**}) &= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha^T} \left\{ \frac{Th(Y; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} (Y - \mu^{(1)}) - \frac{T - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha^T} \left(\frac{P(T = 1 | X)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} - \frac{P(T = 1 | X) - \pi(X; \alpha^*)}{\pi(X; \alpha^*)} \right) \mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) | X] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_g \left[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma (Y^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}) \right] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Appendix E Details of Numerical Algorithm

Appendix E.1 General Form

Because the proposed estimating equations cannot be solved explicitly, we use an iterative algorithm. Various algorithms are available; however, we propose a standard algorithm for

M-estimators. The algorithm for the DP-IPW estimator is given by the following updates:

$$\hat{\mu}^{[a+1]} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^{[a]} Y_i \right\} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^{[a]} \right\}^{-1}, \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$w_i^{[a+1]} = \frac{T_i h(Y_i; \hat{\mu}^{[a+1]})^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (\text{A15})$$

We recommend obtaining the initial values $(\mu^{[0]}, w_i^{[0]})$ in an outlier-resistant manner. For example, $\mu^{[0]}$ can be obtained by the IPW median (Firpo, 2007; Zhang et al. 2012), and $w_i^{[0]}$ is obtained using (A15). If the weighting density is indexed by other parameters, it must be estimated in advance or be updated simultaneously to μ and w . In the next section, we present an algorithm in which we assume that h is Gaussian.

The (ε) DP-DR estimator is obtained in a similar manner. Let $h(\cdot; \mu^{(1)})$ be fixed and solve the estimating equation of ε DP-DR with respect to μ :

$$\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{T_i h(Y_i; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma Y_i}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (1 - \hat{\varepsilon}) m_{1, \mu^{(1)}}(X_i; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$\times \left\{ \frac{T_i h(Y_i; \mu^{(1)})^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (1 - \hat{\varepsilon}) m_{0, \mu^{(1)}}(X_i; \hat{\beta}) \right\}^{-1}, \quad (\text{A17})$$

where $m_{0, \mu^{(1)}}(X_i; \hat{\beta}) = \mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu)^\gamma | X]$ and $m_{1, \mu^{(1)}}(X_i; \hat{\beta}) = \mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu)^\gamma Y^{(1)} | X]$. Then, the following algorithm is obtained:

$$\hat{\mu}^{[a+1]} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i}^{[a]} Y_i - w_{2,i} \hat{m}_{1, \mu^{[a]}}(X_i; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n w_{1,i}^{[a]} - w_{2,i} \hat{m}_{0, \mu^{[a]}}(X_i; \hat{\beta}) \right\}^{-1}, \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$w_{1,i}^{[a+1]} = \frac{T_i h(Y_i; \hat{\mu}^{[a+1]})^\gamma}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}, \quad w_{2,i} = \frac{T_i - \pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})}{\pi(X_i; \hat{\alpha})} (1 - \hat{\varepsilon}_1) \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (\text{A19})$$

Note that it is not necessary to update $w_{2,i}$ once it is computed. The initial values should be obtained in an outlier-resistant manner, as in DP-IPW. Recall that $\hat{m}_{1, \mu}$ and $\hat{m}_{0, \mu}$ are the estimates for the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu)^\gamma Y^{(1)} | X]$ and $\mathbb{E}_g[h(Y^{(1)}; \mu)^\gamma | X]$ given μ . These updates can be obtained from the estimated conditional density $q(y|X; \hat{\beta})$ through Monte-Carlo approximation (Hoshino, 2007) or direct calculations.

Appendix E.2 Gaussian Weight

When the weighting density h is assumed to be Gaussian, some value must be assigned to the standard deviation σ . Under contamination, we suggest that σ is estimated in an outlier-resistant manner, such as by using the normalized median absolute deviation (MADN). MADN is an unbiased estimator for the standard deviation of a Gaussian random variable. For DP-IPW, we can obtain σ by the following updating formula:

$$\hat{\sigma}^{[a+1]} = \text{IPW-MADN}(\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n, \hat{\mu}^{[a+1]}). \quad (\text{A20})$$

The IPW-MADN is defined as

$$\text{IPW-MADN}(\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n, \mu) = 1.483 \cdot \text{IPW-median}(\{|Y_i - \mu|\}_{i=1}^n), \quad (\text{A21})$$

where 1.483 is a normalization constant.

Similarly, σ of the (ε) DP-DR estimator under Gaussian weight is obtained by

$$\hat{\sigma}^{[a+1]} = \text{DR-MADN}(\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n, \hat{\mu}^{[a+1]}). \quad (\text{A22})$$

The DR-MADN is obtained by using the DR-median, which is discussed in Section 7.

$$\text{DR-MADN}(\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n, \mu) = 1.483 \cdot \text{DR-median}(\{|Y_i - \mu|\}_{i=1}^n). \quad (\text{A23})$$

Further, the updates of $\hat{m}_{1,\mu}$ and $\hat{m}_{0,\mu}$ are expressed explicitly when $q(y|X; \hat{\beta})$ is assumed to be the conditional Gaussian distribution given X . Let $u(X) = \mathbb{E}_q[Y|X]$ and $v^2(X) = \text{Var}_q[Y|X]$. Then, we obtain

$$m_{0,\mu^{[a]}}(X) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \frac{(\sigma^{[a]^2})^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{[a]^2} + \gamma v^2(X)}} \cdot \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma(\mu^{[a]} - u(X))}{2(\sigma^{[a]^2} + \gamma v^2(X))} \right\}, \quad (\text{A24})$$

$$m_{1,\mu^{[a]}}(X) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \frac{(\sigma^{[a]^2})^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{[a]^2} + \gamma v^2(X)}} \cdot \frac{u(X)\sigma^{[a]^2} + \gamma\mu^{[a]}v^2(X)}{\sigma^{[a]^2} + \gamma v^2(X)} \cdot \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma(\mu^{[a]} - u(X))}{2(\sigma^{[a]^2} + \gamma v^2(X))} \right\}. \quad (\text{A25})$$

Notably, the conditional variance can be easily estimated because many general outlier-resistant methods can be applied for this purpose.

Appendix F Solution Paths of γ -sensitivity Study




Figure A1: Solution paths of the first 100 simulations. The x-axis represents the tuning parameter γ and the y-axis, the estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$.

Appendix G Remaining Results of Monte-Carlo Simulation

Remaining results of the Monte-Carlo Simulation are presented in the following pages.

- Tables S1 and S2: Gaussian covariates and Gaussian MLE on non-outliers. The RMSE is presented in Tables 2 and 3 in the main text.
- Tables S3 to S5: Gaussian covariates and unnormalized Gaussian modeling.
- Tables S6 to S8: Uniform covariates and Gaussian MLE on non-outliers.
- Tables S9 to S11: Uniform covariates and unnormalized Gaussian modeling.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	3.004 (0.22)	3.749 (0.59)	4.493 (0.78)	5.983 (1.02)	3.766 (0.63)	4.536 (0.84)	6.070 (1.08)
	median (Firpo)	2.990 (0.26)	3.091 (0.28)	3.205 (0.30)	3.490 (0.43)	3.116 (0.28)	3.259 (0.32)	3.605 (0.47)
	median (Zhang-IPW)	2.990 (0.26)	3.091 (0.28)	3.205 (0.30)	3.490 (0.43)	3.116 (0.28)	3.259 (0.32)	3.605 (0.47)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.22)	3.030 (0.27)	3.142 (0.51)	4.492 (1.70)	3.056 (0.29)	3.209 (0.57)	4.620 (1.74)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.986 (0.23)	2.987 (0.25)	2.989 (0.27)	3.052 (0.64)	3.011 (0.24)	3.042 (0.28)	3.173 (0.70)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.980 (0.26)	2.978 (0.27)	2.977 (0.27)	2.990 (0.41)	3.003 (0.26)	3.033 (0.28)	3.114 (0.48)
DR(T/T)	Naive	2.999 (0.18)	3.745 (0.60)	4.489 (0.79)	5.979 (1.04)	3.762 (0.64)	4.533 (0.86)	6.069 (1.12)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.994 (0.24)	3.096 (0.30)	3.210 (0.33)	3.499 (0.54)	3.121 (0.31)	3.264 (0.37)	3.620 (0.66)
	median (Sued)	2.994 (0.24)	3.096 (0.30)	3.209 (0.33)	3.496 (0.48)	3.121 (0.31)	3.264 (0.36)	3.616 (0.61)
	median (TMLE)	2.994 (0.24)	3.095 (0.26)	3.208 (0.29)	3.479 (0.37)	3.120 (0.27)	3.260 (0.31)	3.587 (0.38)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.18)	3.029 (0.30)	3.140 (0.55)	4.465 (1.72)	3.054 (0.31)	3.207 (0.62)	4.604 (1.78)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.996 (0.20)	2.997 (0.29)	3.000 (0.33)	3.060 (0.69)	3.022 (0.27)	3.053 (0.34)	3.195 (0.81)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.992 (0.24)	2.991 (0.29)	2.992 (0.31)	3.009 (0.52)	3.017 (0.29)	3.047 (0.33)	3.137 (0.66)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.18)	3.028 (0.29)	3.138 (0.54)	4.464 (1.72)	3.054 (0.31)	3.204 (0.60)	4.604 (1.77)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.996 (0.20)	2.997 (0.26)	2.999 (0.30)	3.058 (0.67)	3.022 (0.27)	3.052 (0.32)	3.190 (0.77)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.992 (0.24)	2.991 (0.29)	2.991 (0.30)	3.007 (0.51)	3.017 (0.29)	3.047 (0.33)	3.134 (0.63)
	Naive	3.004 (0.24)	3.750 (0.60)	4.494 (0.78)	5.984 (1.03)	3.767 (0.64)	4.537 (0.85)	6.073 (1.09)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.990 (0.27)	3.092 (0.33)	3.208 (0.35)	3.499 (0.55)	3.118 (0.33)	3.262 (0.38)	3.623 (0.67)
DR(T/F)	median (Sued)	2.989 (0.27)	3.091 (0.33)	3.206 (0.35)	3.493 (0.50)	3.117 (0.33)	3.261 (0.38)	3.616 (0.62)
	median (TMLE)	2.999 (0.24)	3.100 (0.27)	3.214 (0.29)	3.496 (0.38)	3.125 (0.27)	3.267 (0.30)	3.607 (0.39)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.24)	3.033 (0.31)	3.150 (0.54)	4.490 (1.71)	3.060 (0.32)	3.218 (0.61)	4.624 (1.76)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.986 (0.25)	2.989 (0.32)	2.992 (0.35)	3.059 (0.71)	3.014 (0.32)	3.044 (0.36)	3.196 (0.82)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.979 (0.28)	2.978 (0.33)	2.979 (0.35)	3.001 (0.58)	3.004 (0.33)	3.035 (0.37)	3.133 (0.70)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.24)	3.033 (0.31)	3.149 (0.54)	4.489 (1.71)	3.059 (0.32)	3.218 (0.60)	4.623 (1.75)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.986 (0.25)	2.989 (0.32)	2.992 (0.34)	3.057 (0.69)	3.013 (0.31)	3.044 (0.35)	3.192 (0.79)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.979 (0.28)	2.978 (0.33)	2.978 (0.34)	2.998 (0.55)	3.004 (0.33)	3.035 (0.37)	3.132 (0.70)
	Naive	2.999 (0.18)	3.725 (0.50)	4.451 (0.65)	5.902 (0.86)	3.667 (0.49)	4.341 (0.65)	5.685 (0.84)
	median (Zhang-DR)	3.003 (0.24)	3.081 (0.25)	3.169 (0.27)	3.388 (0.32)	3.096 (0.25)	3.200 (0.27)	3.445 (0.32)
	median (Sued)	2.999 (0.24)	3.101 (0.25)	3.213 (0.27)	3.494 (0.34)	3.111 (0.25)	3.237 (0.28)	3.532 (0.33)
	median (TMLE)	3.003 (0.23)	3.079 (0.25)	3.164 (0.26)	3.368 (0.30)	3.093 (0.25)	3.194 (0.26)	3.424 (0.30)
DR(F/T)	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.18)	2.997 (0.19)	3.051 (0.34)	4.326 (1.57)	3.018 (0.19)	3.077 (0.29)	4.000 (1.35)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	3.001 (0.20)	2.975 (0.20)	2.950 (0.21)	2.907 (0.35)	3.000 (0.20)	3.000 (0.21)	3.008 (0.28)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	3.005 (0.23)	2.978 (0.23)	2.953 (0.23)	2.895 (0.25)	3.004 (0.23)	3.006 (0.23)	3.008 (0.24)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.18)	3.020 (0.19)	3.108 (0.37)	4.541 (1.58)	3.040 (0.19)	3.131 (0.31)	4.209 (1.39)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	3.001 (0.20)	2.998 (0.20)	2.998 (0.21)	3.020 (0.38)	3.022 (0.20)	3.048 (0.21)	3.117 (0.30)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	3.005 (0.23)	3.001 (0.23)	3.001 (0.23)	3.003 (0.24)	3.027 (0.23)	3.054 (0.23)	3.116 (0.23)

Table A1: Mean and SD of 10,000 simulated estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the Gaussian MLE using non-outliers. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.009	0.010	0.012	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.012
	median (Firpo)	2.019	2.035	2.052	2.040	2.049	2.049	2.044
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.153	0.166	0.165	0.162	0.194	0.195	0.203
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	33.713	44.646	62.069	80.462	44.256	60.934	78.925
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	48.822	50.308	48.108	46.894	49.748	48.500	47.246
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	65.508	64.401	62.285	55.019	63.856	61.479	54.070
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.014	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.014	0.020	0.014
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.416	0.417	0.422	0.412	0.406	0.424	0.416
	median (Sued)	1.720	1.893	1.689	1.825	1.806	1.710	1.723
	median (TMLE)	1067.234	1050.107	1021.848	1010.238	1046.995	1015.752	1000.908
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	20.316	55.933	131.469	209.206	57.353	141.999	202.042
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	54.524	47.142	47.741	39.424	50.581	43.799	37.860
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	83.912	81.759	74.653	58.289	78.730	73.391	60.144
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	19.997	59.061	132.762	212.343	57.435	137.271	205.093
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	54.806	50.210	44.774	39.729	50.144	46.977	37.970
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	84.375	79.237	73.203	56.916	78.328	76.474	60.338
	Naive	0.014	0.015	0.013	0.014	0.016	0.013	0.014
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.337	0.370	0.358	0.354	0.375	0.371	0.364
DR(T/F)	median (Sued)	1.646	1.829	1.705	1.754	1.753	1.893	3.771
	median (TMLE)	999.657	991.569	983.834	991.174	997.403	994.754	991.656
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	18.851	63.892	137.795	198.849	57.978	138.945	195.932
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	52.547	49.129	45.949	40.204	53.554	47.560	39.319
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	80.465	81.757	72.929	60.123	79.196	73.844	56.672
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	18.603	59.010	133.449	203.896	60.482	138.275	190.823
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	52.892	53.978	49.416	39.773	53.920	49.583	37.347
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	80.870	81.030	73.614	59.259	78.651	72.015	59.778
	Naive	0.013	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.014	0.015	0.015
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.399	0.417	0.415	2.122	0.428	0.419	0.440
	median (Sued)	1.607	1.876	1.766	1.766	1.751	1.902	1.836
	median (TMLE)	951.348	975.007	970.882	986.397	970.804	979.606	988.658
DR(F/T)	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	20.537	58.989	143.063	218.114	54.900	123.918	248.367
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	52.096	54.095	45.947	39.811	56.126	48.108	40.617
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	85.026	84.556	74.602	59.838	84.897	80.306	65.958
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	20.352	60.387	147.921	201.602	54.002	131.749	226.009
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	52.473	50.362	47.613	41.028	51.504	45.609	41.540
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	85.557	83.889	75.631	64.173	84.836	77.640	64.876

Table A2: Mean computation time (ms) of 10,000 simulations. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the Gaussian MLE using non-outliers. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.222	0.957	1.683	3.153	0.993	1.752	3.253
	median (Firpo)	0.257	0.294	0.367	0.649	0.306	0.409	0.769
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.257	0.294	0.367	0.649	0.306	0.409	0.769
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.218	0.276	0.531	2.263	0.293	0.609	2.377
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.227	0.249	0.272	0.639	0.245	0.287	0.726
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.261	0.271	0.275	0.413	0.262	0.281	0.498
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.185	0.957	1.683	3.154	0.997	1.758	3.265
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.242	0.317	0.391	0.733	0.330	0.452	0.905
	median (Sued)	0.241	0.316	0.388	0.692	0.328	0.450	0.866
	median (TMLE)	0.237	0.280	0.359	0.600	0.295	0.401	0.696
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.301	0.563	2.262	0.317	0.649	2.395
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.202	0.290	0.326	0.692	0.274	0.349	0.839
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.239	0.287	0.307	0.530	0.287	0.335	0.669
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.294	0.550	2.256	0.312	0.637	2.388
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.202	0.263	0.301	0.659	0.269	0.321	0.800
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.239	0.287	0.298	0.515	0.286	0.334	0.648
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.239	0.963	1.685	3.155	1.001	1.757	3.260
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.277	0.344	0.409	0.743	0.351	0.466	0.911
	median (Sued)	0.275	0.343	0.407	0.700	0.351	0.465	0.871
	median (TMLE)	0.242	0.285	0.364	0.624	0.297	0.406	0.725
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.240	0.315	0.563	2.267	0.331	0.645	2.391
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.251	0.322	0.353	0.720	0.321	0.365	0.840
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.284	0.337	0.349	0.588	0.332	0.380	0.709
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.240	0.312	0.558	2.263	0.329	0.640	2.387
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.250	0.318	0.345	0.696	0.315	0.358	0.812
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.282	0.335	0.344	0.555	0.326	0.372	0.698
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.182	0.880	1.592	3.026	0.827	1.490	2.814
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.237	0.262	0.313	0.499	0.267	0.333	0.543
	median (Sued)	0.236	0.272	0.346	0.600	0.278	0.364	0.627
	median (TMLE)	0.235	0.259	0.306	0.470	0.264	0.324	0.513
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.193	0.346	2.063	0.192	0.302	1.687
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.200	0.209	0.221	0.365	0.205	0.211	0.282
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.230	0.234	0.242	0.278	0.231	0.234	0.244
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.195	0.396	2.227	0.196	0.345	1.843
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.199	0.204	0.208	0.401	0.204	0.211	0.323
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.230	0.230	0.231	0.246	0.231	0.235	0.255

Table A3: Results of the comparative study. Each figure is RMSE between each method and the true value. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	3.004 (0.22)	3.749 (0.59)	4.493 (0.78)	5.983 (1.02)	3.766 (0.63)	4.536 (0.84)	6.070 (1.08)
	median (Firpo)	2.990 (0.26)	3.091 (0.28)	3.205 (0.30)	3.490 (0.43)	3.116 (0.28)	3.259 (0.32)	3.605 (0.47)
	median (Zhang-IPW)	2.990 (0.26)	3.091 (0.28)	3.205 (0.30)	3.490 (0.43)	3.116 (0.28)	3.259 (0.32)	3.605 (0.47)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.22)	3.030 (0.27)	3.142 (0.51)	4.492 (1.70)	3.056 (0.29)	3.209 (0.57)	4.620 (1.74)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.986 (0.23)	2.987 (0.25)	2.989 (0.27)	3.052 (0.64)	3.011 (0.24)	3.042 (0.28)	3.173 (0.70)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.980 (0.26)	2.978 (0.27)	2.977 (0.27)	2.990 (0.41)	3.003 (0.26)	3.033 (0.28)	3.114 (0.48)
DR(T/T)	Naive	2.999 (0.18)	3.745 (0.60)	4.489 (0.79)	5.979 (1.04)	3.762 (0.64)	4.533 (0.86)	6.069 (1.11)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.994 (0.24)	3.096 (0.30)	3.210 (0.33)	3.500 (0.54)	3.121 (0.31)	3.265 (0.37)	3.620 (0.66)
	median (Sued)	2.994 (0.24)	3.096 (0.30)	3.209 (0.33)	3.495 (0.48)	3.121 (0.31)	3.265 (0.36)	3.616 (0.61)
	median (TMLE)	2.995 (0.24)	3.094 (0.26)	3.208 (0.29)	3.476 (0.36)	3.120 (0.27)	3.260 (0.31)	3.583 (0.38)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.18)	3.029 (0.30)	3.140 (0.55)	4.466 (1.72)	3.054 (0.31)	3.207 (0.62)	4.605 (1.78)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.996 (0.20)	2.998 (0.29)	3.000 (0.33)	3.060 (0.69)	3.022 (0.27)	3.053 (0.34)	3.197 (0.82)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.993 (0.24)	2.991 (0.29)	2.992 (0.31)	3.010 (0.53)	3.017 (0.29)	3.047 (0.33)	3.137 (0.66)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.18)	3.028 (0.29)	3.137 (0.53)	4.466 (1.72)	3.054 (0.31)	3.205 (0.60)	4.607 (1.77)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.996 (0.20)	2.997 (0.26)	2.999 (0.30)	3.057 (0.66)	3.022 (0.27)	3.052 (0.32)	3.192 (0.78)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.993 (0.24)	2.991 (0.29)	2.991 (0.30)	3.008 (0.52)	3.017 (0.29)	3.047 (0.33)	3.134 (0.63)
	Naive	3.002 (0.24)	3.748 (0.61)	4.492 (0.78)	5.982 (1.03)	3.766 (0.64)	4.536 (0.85)	6.071 (1.09)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.988 (0.28)	3.090 (0.33)	3.206 (0.35)	3.497 (0.55)	3.116 (0.33)	3.260 (0.39)	3.621 (0.67)
DR(T/F)	median (Sued)	2.988 (0.28)	3.090 (0.33)	3.205 (0.35)	3.491 (0.50)	3.116 (0.33)	3.259 (0.39)	3.615 (0.62)
	median (TMLE)	3.000 (0.24)	3.101 (0.27)	3.216 (0.29)	3.499 (0.37)	3.126 (0.27)	3.268 (0.30)	3.610 (0.39)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.996 (0.24)	3.032 (0.31)	3.149 (0.54)	4.490 (1.71)	3.058 (0.33)	3.217 (0.61)	4.621 (1.76)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.984 (0.25)	2.987 (0.32)	2.990 (0.35)	3.058 (0.72)	3.012 (0.32)	3.042 (0.36)	3.194 (0.82)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.977 (0.28)	2.976 (0.34)	2.976 (0.35)	2.999 (0.59)	3.002 (0.33)	3.033 (0.38)	3.130 (0.70)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.996 (0.24)	3.032 (0.31)	3.149 (0.54)	4.488 (1.71)	3.058 (0.32)	3.216 (0.60)	4.621 (1.75)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.984 (0.25)	2.987 (0.32)	2.990 (0.34)	3.056 (0.69)	3.011 (0.31)	3.042 (0.36)	3.190 (0.79)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.977 (0.28)	2.976 (0.33)	2.977 (0.34)	2.997 (0.55)	3.001 (0.33)	3.033 (0.37)	3.130 (0.69)
	Naive	2.999 (0.18)	3.726 (0.50)	4.451 (0.65)	5.902 (0.86)	3.667 (0.49)	4.341 (0.65)	5.685 (0.84)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.997 (0.24)	3.074 (0.25)	3.162 (0.27)	3.380 (0.32)	3.088 (0.25)	3.193 (0.27)	3.438 (0.32)
	median (Sued)	2.999 (0.24)	3.101 (0.25)	3.214 (0.27)	3.495 (0.34)	3.112 (0.25)	3.238 (0.28)	3.532 (0.33)
	median (TMLE)	2.997 (0.24)	3.072 (0.25)	3.157 (0.26)	3.358 (0.30)	3.086 (0.25)	3.186 (0.27)	3.414 (0.30)
DR(F/T)	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.998 (0.18)	2.996 (0.19)	3.051 (0.34)	4.333 (1.57)	3.016 (0.19)	3.077 (0.29)	4.007 (1.35)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.995 (0.20)	2.970 (0.21)	2.944 (0.21)	2.901 (0.35)	2.994 (0.20)	2.995 (0.21)	3.003 (0.28)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.996 (0.23)	2.969 (0.23)	2.943 (0.24)	2.885 (0.25)	2.994 (0.23)	2.996 (0.23)	2.999 (0.24)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.002 (0.18)	3.023 (0.19)	3.115 (0.38)	4.556 (1.59)	3.040 (0.19)	3.130 (0.32)	4.201 (1.40)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.999 (0.20)	2.996 (0.20)	2.997 (0.21)	3.024 (0.40)	3.017 (0.20)	3.040 (0.21)	3.104 (0.31)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	3.000 (0.23)	2.996 (0.23)	2.996 (0.23)	3.000 (0.25)	3.018 (0.23)	3.043 (0.23)	3.098 (0.24)

Table A4: Mean and SD of 10,000 simulated estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.008	0.011	0.009	0.010	0.009	0.008	0.006
	median (Firpo)	2.028	2.038	2.009	1.992	1.591	1.604	1.610
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.164	0.184	0.159	0.167	0.172	0.166	0.168
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	33.735	44.282	60.503	79.176	39.488	54.135	70.099
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	48.650	49.775	47.834	46.162	43.983	43.577	41.231
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	65.725	64.715	61.072	53.993	56.336	54.092	48.227
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.028	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.014	0.017	0.015
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.412	0.442	0.429	0.435	0.359	0.371	0.370
	median (Sued)	1.736	1.806	1.758	1.836	1.579	1.624	1.605
	median (TMLE)	1055.657	1033.144	1008.369	993.124	943.045	934.975	921.709
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	18.983	57.100	136.473	211.645	52.968	125.900	186.668
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	56.355	48.725	48.968	39.064	43.681	43.085	36.285
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	87.300	82.622	74.404	62.842	73.313	69.041	55.489
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	19.912	56.479	135.810	216.944	51.907	128.889	187.006
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	57.311	52.397	50.270	39.846	44.903	46.369	35.150
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	86.517	79.409	74.941	60.813	73.977	68.664	54.090
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.016	0.016	0.029	0.017	0.013	0.012	0.014
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.339	0.368	0.362	0.366	0.312	0.312	0.319
	median (Sued)	1.689	1.873	3.724	3.779	1.445	1.501	1.683
	median (TMLE)	981.209	994.937	968.273	974.131	887.897	895.797	915.279
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	18.828	59.230	132.483	197.779	53.452	124.888	179.470
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	55.630	51.825	46.049	36.762	48.728	44.227	36.664
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	81.111	80.063	71.932	58.312	70.519	67.554	54.077
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	18.391	60.712	130.125	199.546	54.833	126.829	180.125
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	56.661	52.369	47.067	40.297	49.611	42.699	37.208
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	83.076	80.920	73.754	62.673	71.937	67.024	56.490
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.013	0.016	0.014	0.015	0.014	0.016	0.014
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.404	2.159	0.415	0.423	0.372	0.363	0.369
	median (Sued)	1.652	1.849	1.657	1.781	1.505	1.487	1.564
	median (TMLE)	940.593	961.615	929.511	967.157	861.292	867.211	893.940
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	19.768	63.865	144.046	222.438	50.837	116.164	225.446
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	51.923	49.406	49.673	42.449	45.033	45.493	36.107
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	90.062	85.686	74.602	64.006	76.707	72.257	57.556
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	19.023	63.164	147.321	202.361	50.513	115.868	210.642
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	57.110	50.739	46.918	42.489	47.041	43.003	36.828
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	87.439	87.305	75.546	62.424	76.284	69.237	58.958

Table A5: Mean computation time (ms) of 10,000 simulations. The covariates X were generated from Gaussian distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.197	0.952	1.711	3.174	1.000	1.762	3.269
	median (Firpo)	0.278	0.319	0.407	0.705	0.334	0.447	0.785
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.278	0.319	0.407	0.705	0.334	0.447	0.785
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.199	0.230	0.567	2.329	0.253	0.609	2.429
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.223	0.230	0.239	0.703	0.230	0.247	0.690
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.273	0.273	0.273	0.432	0.272	0.279	0.394
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.182	0.948	1.711	3.176	1.000	1.766	3.275
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.265	0.308	0.404	0.732	0.327	0.446	0.800
	median (Sued)	0.264	0.308	0.402	0.704	0.327	0.445	0.786
	median (TMLE)	0.263	0.308	0.401	0.664	0.326	0.442	0.768
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.184	0.219	0.582	2.332	0.254	0.624	2.438
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.208	0.216	0.243	0.745	0.218	0.246	0.726
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.257	0.258	0.260	0.498	0.259	0.272	0.480
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.184	0.218	0.579	2.330	0.251	0.618	2.435
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.208	0.216	0.241	0.730	0.218	0.245	0.710
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.257	0.258	0.260	0.481	0.260	0.266	0.437
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.202	0.954	1.715	3.179	1.004	1.767	3.276
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.285	0.324	0.413	0.738	0.340	0.453	0.806
	median (Sued)	0.285	0.325	0.412	0.710	0.340	0.453	0.792
	median (TMLE)	0.267	0.313	0.406	0.682	0.331	0.448	0.786
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.204	0.235	0.579	2.332	0.261	0.625	2.436
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.229	0.235	0.257	0.752	0.236	0.268	0.754
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.279	0.279	0.280	0.514	0.279	0.287	0.487
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.204	0.234	0.577	2.329	0.262	0.623	2.433
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.229	0.235	0.256	0.742	0.235	0.266	0.743
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.279	0.279	0.279	0.500	0.278	0.286	0.476
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.180	0.887	1.611	3.037	0.832	1.488	2.805
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.259	0.288	0.349	0.544	0.295	0.365	0.591
	median (Sued)	0.259	0.299	0.387	0.658	0.306	0.399	0.683
	median (TMLE)	0.256	0.282	0.338	0.508	0.289	0.354	0.554
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.195	0.381	2.121	0.196	0.315	1.734
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.206	0.216	0.229	0.467	0.213	0.219	0.292
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.247	0.251	0.259	0.301	0.249	0.251	0.258
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.183	0.198	0.426	2.273	0.202	0.358	1.888
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.206	0.212	0.217	0.491	0.212	0.220	0.318
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.247	0.247	0.247	0.264	0.248	0.253	0.278

Table A6: Results of the comparative study. Each figure is RMSE between each method and the true value. The covariates X were generated from uniform distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the Gaussian MLE using non-outliers. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	3.003 (0.20)	3.759 (0.57)	4.521 (0.79)	6.004 (1.02)	3.783 (0.62)	4.556 (0.83)	6.090 (1.07)
	median (Firpo)	2.985 (0.28)	3.099 (0.30)	3.233 (0.33)	3.541 (0.45)	3.130 (0.31)	3.292 (0.34)	3.666 (0.42)
	median (Zhang-IPW)	2.985 (0.28)	3.099 (0.30)	3.233 (0.33)	3.541 (0.45)	3.130 (0.31)	3.292 (0.34)	3.666 (0.42)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.000 (0.20)	3.038 (0.23)	3.186 (0.54)	4.590 (1.70)	3.066 (0.24)	3.241 (0.56)	4.713 (1.72)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.991 (0.22)	2.990 (0.23)	2.994 (0.24)	3.075 (0.70)	3.017 (0.23)	3.048 (0.24)	3.185 (0.66)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.979 (0.27)	2.978 (0.27)	2.982 (0.27)	2.998 (0.43)	3.009 (0.27)	3.043 (0.28)	3.123 (0.37)
DR(T/T)	Naive	3.001 (0.18)	3.757 (0.57)	4.519 (0.79)	6.003 (1.03)	3.781 (0.62)	4.555 (0.84)	6.090 (1.08)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.990 (0.27)	3.104 (0.29)	3.237 (0.33)	3.547 (0.49)	3.135 (0.30)	3.295 (0.33)	3.669 (0.44)
	median (Sued)	2.990 (0.26)	3.103 (0.29)	3.237 (0.32)	3.544 (0.45)	3.135 (0.30)	3.295 (0.33)	3.668 (0.41)
	median (TMLE)	2.991 (0.26)	3.104 (0.29)	3.236 (0.32)	3.530 (0.40)	3.134 (0.30)	3.292 (0.33)	3.652 (0.41)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.18)	3.035 (0.22)	3.185 (0.55)	4.582 (1.71)	3.064 (0.25)	3.238 (0.58)	4.704 (1.74)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.995 (0.21)	2.992 (0.22)	2.997 (0.24)	3.083 (0.74)	3.020 (0.22)	3.051 (0.24)	3.190 (0.70)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.988 (0.26)	2.985 (0.26)	2.988 (0.26)	3.008 (0.50)	3.016 (0.26)	3.049 (0.27)	3.136 (0.46)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.18)	3.035 (0.22)	3.184 (0.55)	4.582 (1.71)	3.064 (0.24)	3.237 (0.57)	4.706 (1.74)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.995 (0.21)	2.992 (0.22)	2.996 (0.24)	3.081 (0.73)	3.020 (0.22)	3.051 (0.24)	3.188 (0.68)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.988 (0.26)	2.985 (0.26)	2.988 (0.26)	3.005 (0.48)	3.015 (0.26)	3.049 (0.26)	3.132 (0.42)
	Naive	3.005 (0.20)	3.762 (0.57)	4.524 (0.79)	6.008 (1.03)	3.786 (0.62)	4.560 (0.83)	6.095 (1.07)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.987 (0.28)	3.103 (0.31)	3.237 (0.34)	3.550 (0.49)	3.134 (0.31)	3.296 (0.34)	3.673 (0.44)
DR(T/F)	median (Sued)	2.987 (0.28)	3.102 (0.31)	3.236 (0.34)	3.544 (0.46)	3.133 (0.31)	3.295 (0.34)	3.670 (0.42)
	median (TMLE)	2.996 (0.27)	3.110 (0.29)	3.243 (0.33)	3.547 (0.41)	3.140 (0.30)	3.300 (0.33)	3.671 (0.41)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.003 (0.20)	3.042 (0.23)	3.192 (0.55)	4.590 (1.71)	3.070 (0.25)	3.249 (0.57)	4.714 (1.73)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.994 (0.23)	2.993 (0.23)	2.997 (0.26)	3.090 (0.75)	3.020 (0.23)	3.053 (0.26)	3.204 (0.73)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.982 (0.28)	2.981 (0.28)	2.985 (0.28)	3.008 (0.51)	3.011 (0.28)	3.046 (0.28)	3.136 (0.47)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.003 (0.20)	3.042 (0.23)	3.191 (0.54)	4.587 (1.70)	3.070 (0.25)	3.248 (0.57)	4.713 (1.73)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.994 (0.23)	2.992 (0.23)	2.997 (0.26)	3.087 (0.74)	3.020 (0.23)	3.052 (0.26)	3.201 (0.72)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.982 (0.28)	2.980 (0.28)	2.984 (0.28)	3.006 (0.50)	3.011 (0.28)	3.046 (0.28)	3.134 (0.46)
	Naive	3.000 (0.18)	3.737 (0.49)	4.469 (0.66)	5.911 (0.87)	3.676 (0.49)	4.344 (0.64)	5.676 (0.84)
	median (Zhang-DR)	3.005 (0.26)	3.088 (0.27)	3.187 (0.29)	3.417 (0.35)	3.104 (0.28)	3.217 (0.29)	3.482 (0.34)
	median (Sued)	2.999 (0.26)	3.113 (0.28)	3.243 (0.30)	3.546 (0.37)	3.125 (0.28)	3.264 (0.30)	3.587 (0.35)
	median (TMLE)	3.004 (0.26)	3.085 (0.27)	3.180 (0.29)	3.391 (0.32)	3.101 (0.27)	3.210 (0.29)	3.454 (0.32)
DR(F/T)	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.000 (0.18)	3.007 (0.20)	3.088 (0.37)	4.422 (1.57)	3.027 (0.19)	3.104 (0.30)	4.082 (1.36)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	3.000 (0.21)	2.970 (0.21)	2.943 (0.22)	2.907 (0.46)	2.997 (0.21)	2.996 (0.22)	2.999 (0.29)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	3.003 (0.25)	2.970 (0.25)	2.939 (0.25)	2.868 (0.27)	2.999 (0.25)	2.998 (0.25)	2.994 (0.26)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.000 (0.18)	3.032 (0.20)	3.150 (0.40)	4.641 (1.57)	3.052 (0.20)	3.162 (0.32)	4.286 (1.38)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	3.000 (0.21)	2.997 (0.21)	2.999 (0.22)	3.036 (0.49)	3.024 (0.21)	3.052 (0.21)	3.121 (0.29)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	3.003 (0.25)	2.999 (0.25)	3.001 (0.25)	3.000 (0.26)	3.029 (0.25)	3.060 (0.25)	3.125 (0.25)

Table A7: Mean and SD of 10,000 simulated estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$. The covariates X were generated from uniform distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the Gaussian MLE using non-outliers. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.006	0.008	0.008	0.010	0.009	0.008	0.011
	median (Firpo)	1.624	1.554	1.598	1.596	1.640	1.599	1.595
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.144	0.155	0.146	0.149	0.163	0.166	0.166
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	28.899	40.705	57.891	72.877	41.438	58.884	72.039
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	41.124	43.104	41.639	40.541	43.319	42.599	40.527
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	58.435	57.102	56.009	48.982	57.823	54.624	48.146
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.013	0.017	0.014	0.014	0.011	0.013	0.012
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.354	0.380	0.429	0.452	0.391	0.387	0.388
	median (Sued)	1.470	1.427	1.650	1.733	1.660	1.535	1.645
	median (TMLE)	1019.177	987.574	1046.361	1019.792	1012.613	973.752	953.734
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	14.030	65.830	156.014	221.084	65.235	150.543	206.717
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	42.618	39.445	42.180	33.461	39.311	39.022	30.945
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	80.107	73.122	75.633	54.222	74.230	66.690	52.706
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	13.830	61.746	159.505	222.713	64.413	146.996	203.859
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	42.832	43.615	42.286	36.057	43.612	37.242	31.352
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	80.584	75.842	71.612	55.196	77.477	64.020	52.287
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.011	0.013	0.018	0.014	0.013	0.013	0.018
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.298	2.320	0.365	0.371	0.316	0.320	0.334
	median (Sued)	1.497	4.069	1.717	1.870	1.548	1.509	1.679
	median (TMLE)	908.448	921.784	963.501	973.878	904.782	896.085	914.020
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	12.200	61.403	166.398	223.529	62.714	154.528	201.548
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	42.066	38.529	41.758	32.706	40.717	34.629	31.154
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	76.853	73.440	75.127	59.673	74.651	63.882	52.368
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	12.005	64.193	164.242	216.765	61.661	152.694	206.549
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	42.311	40.010	39.141	34.312	40.385	37.031	31.584
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	77.362	74.394	73.187	54.911	75.535	67.096	51.224
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.014	0.014	0.017	0.017	0.012	0.013	0.011
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.368	0.431	0.412	0.431	0.390	0.379	2.279
	median (Sued)	1.586	3.853	1.855	1.805	1.589	1.626	4.012
	median (TMLE)	896.351	970.473	976.782	987.069	909.770	907.980	930.365
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	13.761	74.393	177.183	239.704	60.244	143.986	246.342
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	44.319	46.824	40.203	37.486	42.798	40.716	34.311
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	85.614	85.866	75.166	60.665	80.635	71.475	59.946
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	13.569	72.655	175.524	216.075	58.960	144.481	227.731
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	44.594	50.019	45.107	37.493	41.513	42.198	33.163
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	85.994	84.480	77.364	62.210	80.407	74.459	57.817

Table A8: Mean computation time (ms) of 10,000 simulations. The covariates X were generated from uniform distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the Gaussian MLE over non-outliers. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.197	0.952	1.711	3.174	1.000	1.762	3.269
	median (Firpo)	0.278	0.319	0.407	0.705	0.334	0.447	0.785
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.278	0.319	0.407	0.705	0.334	0.447	0.785
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.199	0.230	0.567	2.329	0.253	0.609	2.429
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.223	0.230	0.239	0.703	0.230	0.247	0.690
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.273	0.273	0.273	0.432	0.272	0.279	0.394
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.182	0.948	1.711	3.176	1.000	1.766	3.275
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.265	0.309	0.404	0.732	0.328	0.446	0.799
	median (Sued)	0.264	0.308	0.403	0.705	0.327	0.445	0.785
	median (TMLE)	0.263	0.307	0.402	0.659	0.327	0.443	0.761
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.184	0.219	0.583	2.333	0.254	0.623	2.439
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.208	0.216	0.243	0.746	0.218	0.246	0.726
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.257	0.258	0.260	0.504	0.259	0.272	0.480
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.184	0.218	0.578	2.329	0.251	0.618	2.434
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.208	0.216	0.241	0.726	0.218	0.245	0.708
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.257	0.258	0.260	0.482	0.260	0.266	0.434
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.203	0.954	1.714	3.178	1.003	1.767	3.275
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.285	0.325	0.413	0.725	0.341	0.453	0.806
	median (Sued)	0.284	0.324	0.412	0.710	0.340	0.453	0.792
	median (TMLE)	0.266	0.313	0.408	0.697	0.331	0.449	0.787
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.205	0.236	0.580	2.330	0.262	0.625	2.437
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.230	0.236	0.258	0.750	0.237	0.269	0.755
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.280	0.280	0.281	0.501	0.279	0.288	0.489
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.205	0.235	0.577	2.328	0.261	0.622	2.434
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.230	0.236	0.256	0.738	0.236	0.267	0.743
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.280	0.279	0.280	0.488	0.279	0.287	0.475
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.182	0.887	1.611	3.037	0.832	1.488	2.805
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.260	0.285	0.344	0.535	0.292	0.359	0.582
	median (Sued)	0.259	0.300	0.388	0.658	0.306	0.399	0.683
	median (TMLE)	0.258	0.280	0.333	0.498	0.287	0.348	0.543
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.185	0.197	0.385	2.128	0.197	0.319	1.741
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.208	0.219	0.233	0.474	0.215	0.221	0.290
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.249	0.254	0.265	0.304	0.251	0.253	0.261
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	0.185	0.202	0.449	2.294	0.204	0.368	1.897
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	0.207	0.212	0.217	0.516	0.213	0.220	0.320
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	0.248	0.247	0.247	0.267	0.248	0.251	0.272

Table A9: Results of the comparative study. Each figure is RMSE between each method and the true value. The covariates X were generated from uniform distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	3.003 (0.20)	3.759 (0.57)	4.521 (0.79)	6.004 (1.02)	3.783 (0.62)	4.556 (0.83)	6.090 (1.07)
	median (Firpo)	2.985 (0.28)	3.099 (0.30)	3.233 (0.33)	3.541 (0.45)	3.130 (0.31)	3.292 (0.34)	3.666 (0.42)
	median (Zhang-IPW)	2.985 (0.28)	3.099 (0.30)	3.233 (0.33)	3.541 (0.45)	3.130 (0.31)	3.292 (0.34)	3.666 (0.42)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.000 (0.20)	3.038 (0.23)	3.186 (0.54)	4.590 (1.70)	3.066 (0.24)	3.241 (0.56)	4.713 (1.72)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.991 (0.22)	2.990 (0.23)	2.994 (0.24)	3.075 (0.70)	3.017 (0.23)	3.048 (0.24)	3.185 (0.66)
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.979 (0.27)	2.978 (0.27)	2.982 (0.27)	2.998 (0.43)	3.009 (0.27)	3.043 (0.28)	3.123 (0.37)
DR(T/T)	Naive	3.001 (0.18)	3.757 (0.57)	4.519 (0.79)	6.003 (1.03)	3.781 (0.62)	4.555 (0.84)	6.090 (1.08)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.990 (0.27)	3.104 (0.29)	3.238 (0.33)	3.548 (0.49)	3.135 (0.30)	3.295 (0.33)	3.668 (0.44)
	median (Sued)	2.990 (0.26)	3.104 (0.29)	3.237 (0.33)	3.544 (0.45)	3.135 (0.30)	3.295 (0.33)	3.667 (0.41)
	median (TMLE)	2.991 (0.26)	3.104 (0.29)	3.236 (0.33)	3.527 (0.40)	3.134 (0.30)	3.292 (0.33)	3.647 (0.40)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.18)	3.035 (0.22)	3.185 (0.55)	4.582 (1.71)	3.064 (0.25)	3.238 (0.58)	4.706 (1.74)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.995 (0.21)	2.992 (0.22)	2.996 (0.24)	3.083 (0.74)	3.020 (0.22)	3.051 (0.24)	3.190 (0.70)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.988 (0.26)	2.985 (0.26)	2.988 (0.26)	3.009 (0.50)	3.016 (0.26)	3.049 (0.27)	3.136 (0.46)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.18)	3.035 (0.22)	3.184 (0.55)	4.581 (1.71)	3.064 (0.24)	3.238 (0.57)	4.705 (1.74)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.995 (0.21)	2.992 (0.22)	2.996 (0.24)	3.080 (0.72)	3.020 (0.22)	3.051 (0.24)	3.187 (0.68)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.988 (0.26)	2.985 (0.26)	2.988 (0.26)	3.006 (0.48)	3.016 (0.26)	3.049 (0.26)	3.132 (0.41)
	Naive	3.005 (0.20)	3.761 (0.57)	4.523 (0.79)	6.007 (1.03)	3.785 (0.62)	4.559 (0.83)	6.094 (1.07)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.986 (0.29)	3.101 (0.31)	3.237 (0.34)	3.547 (0.48)	3.133 (0.31)	3.295 (0.34)	3.672 (0.44)
DR(T/F)	median (Sued)	2.987 (0.28)	3.101 (0.31)	3.236 (0.34)	3.544 (0.46)	3.133 (0.31)	3.295 (0.34)	3.670 (0.42)
	median (TMLE)	2.997 (0.27)	3.111 (0.29)	3.245 (0.33)	3.550 (0.43)	3.141 (0.30)	3.302 (0.33)	3.672 (0.41)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.002 (0.21)	3.041 (0.23)	3.192 (0.55)	4.588 (1.71)	3.070 (0.25)	3.248 (0.57)	4.715 (1.73)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.993 (0.23)	2.992 (0.24)	2.997 (0.26)	3.088 (0.74)	3.019 (0.24)	3.052 (0.26)	3.202 (0.73)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.981 (0.28)	2.980 (0.28)	2.984 (0.28)	3.007 (0.50)	3.010 (0.28)	3.045 (0.28)	3.134 (0.47)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.002 (0.20)	3.041 (0.23)	3.191 (0.54)	4.588 (1.70)	3.069 (0.25)	3.247 (0.57)	4.714 (1.73)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.993 (0.23)	2.992 (0.24)	2.997 (0.26)	3.085 (0.73)	3.019 (0.24)	3.052 (0.26)	3.200 (0.72)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.981 (0.28)	2.980 (0.28)	2.983 (0.28)	3.005 (0.49)	3.010 (0.28)	3.045 (0.28)	3.133 (0.46)
	Naive	3.000 (0.18)	3.737 (0.49)	4.469 (0.66)	5.911 (0.87)	3.676 (0.49)	4.344 (0.64)	5.676 (0.84)
	median (Zhang-DR)	2.997 (0.26)	3.079 (0.27)	3.177 (0.29)	3.405 (0.35)	3.095 (0.28)	3.207 (0.29)	3.471 (0.34)
	median (Sued)	3.000 (0.26)	3.113 (0.28)	3.244 (0.30)	3.547 (0.37)	3.125 (0.28)	3.265 (0.30)	3.587 (0.35)
	median (TMLE)	2.996 (0.26)	3.076 (0.27)	3.170 (0.29)	3.378 (0.32)	3.092 (0.27)	3.200 (0.29)	3.440 (0.32)
DR(F/T)	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	2.999 (0.19)	3.006 (0.20)	3.088 (0.38)	4.435 (1.57)	3.026 (0.20)	3.104 (0.30)	4.092 (1.36)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.993 (0.21)	2.964 (0.22)	2.936 (0.22)	2.901 (0.46)	2.990 (0.21)	2.990 (0.22)	2.993 (0.29)
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.991 (0.25)	2.957 (0.25)	2.927 (0.25)	2.856 (0.27)	2.987 (0.25)	2.986 (0.25)	2.982 (0.26)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	3.003 (0.18)	3.035 (0.20)	3.160 (0.42)	4.658 (1.58)	3.051 (0.20)	3.160 (0.33)	4.284 (1.40)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	2.998 (0.21)	2.995 (0.21)	2.997 (0.22)	3.041 (0.51)	3.017 (0.21)	3.042 (0.22)	3.105 (0.30)
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	2.996 (0.25)	2.992 (0.25)	2.994 (0.25)	2.996 (0.27)	3.017 (0.25)	3.044 (0.25)	3.102 (0.25)

Table A10: Mean and SD of 10,000 simulated estimates of $\mu^{(1)}$. The covariates X were generated from uniform distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.

		No contam.	Homogeneous			Heterogeneous		
			$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$	$\varepsilon = 0.05$	$\varepsilon = 0.10$	$\varepsilon = 0.20$
IPW(T/-)	Naive	0.012	0.009	0.011	0.008	0.009	0.008	0.008
	median (Firpo)	2.061	2.018	2.001	2.014	1.593	1.588	1.591
	median (Zhang-IPW)	0.159	0.158	0.155	0.174	0.160	0.162	0.162
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.1$)	32.502	46.715	64.496	80.991	41.595	58.327	72.898
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 0.5$)	45.786	48.372	46.799	45.370	43.191	41.859	40.298
	DP-IPW ($\gamma = 1.0$)	67.400	64.207	61.061	54.756	57.049	54.186	47.922
DR(T/T)	Naive	0.020	0.017	0.015	0.014	0.015	0.014	0.016
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.426	0.435	0.413	0.432	0.371	0.372	0.372
	median (Sued)	1.769	1.883	1.684	1.763	1.524	1.521	1.567
	median (TMLE)	1120.595	1076.392	1039.786	1029.243	991.954	961.859	947.842
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	15.718	71.203	165.047	228.545	66.563	152.820	207.025
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	50.227	46.273	41.325	36.313	43.227	37.408	29.929
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	92.921	85.411	73.518	56.090	74.702	65.099	53.264
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	15.929	72.355	166.803	229.476	66.591	151.084	203.590
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	50.950	46.989	43.582	33.812	45.355	37.982	32.001
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	93.544	82.191	72.519	58.983	74.507	67.979	54.172
DR(T/F)	Naive	0.015	0.014	0.014	0.017	0.012	0.013	0.012
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.344	0.369	0.379	0.348	0.310	0.316	0.313
	median (Sued)	1.674	1.913	1.710	1.805	1.645	1.543	1.579
	median (TMLE)	1004.081	999.738	972.337	971.670	918.025	905.992	907.104
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	13.940	71.371	157.230	220.831	63.078	148.782	198.135
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	46.461	45.985	38.650	34.250	40.784	36.915	30.849
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	82.531	80.473	72.655	57.973	74.487	64.093	50.140
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	13.889	68.556	163.008	221.689	63.626	148.044	204.685
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	46.726	44.754	39.936	35.078	40.930	37.054	29.266
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	83.223	81.341	72.481	56.218	73.313	64.716	49.878
DR(F/T)	Naive	0.013	0.014	0.014	0.018	0.012	0.017	0.012
	median (Zhang-DR)	0.411	0.429	0.435	0.435	0.383	0.366	0.374
	median (Sued)	1.719	1.848	1.776	1.807	1.503	1.684	1.580
	median (TMLE)	974.546	977.795	969.097	988.810	892.363	913.748	924.284
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	16.894	76.806	185.199	241.377	61.562	142.078	254.437
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	56.429	50.977	44.908	40.217	46.906	41.295	34.944
	DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	92.542	89.220	78.322	64.042	80.361	74.055	58.842
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.1$)	17.194	76.893	177.770	220.029	61.670	147.734	233.473
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 0.5$)	55.339	51.744	45.734	37.134	46.247	41.614	32.412
	ε DP-DR ($\gamma = 1.0$)	93.373	88.307	80.103	64.488	80.508	74.952	61.334

Table A11: Mean computation time (ms) of 10,000 simulations. The covariates X were generated from uniform distributions, and the outcome regression was obtained by the unnormalized Gaussian modeling. The characters "T" and "F" denote the correct and the incorrect modeling, respectively.