

Multiply robust estimators in longitudinal studies with missing data under control-based imputation

Siyi Liu¹, Shu Yang¹, Yilong Zhang², and Guanghan (Frank) Liu²

¹Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

²Merck & Co., Inc., Kenilworth, NJ, USA

Abstract

Longitudinal studies are often subject to missing data. The recent guidance from regulatory agencies such as the ICH E9(R1) addendum addresses the importance of defining a treatment effect estimand with the consideration of intercurrent events. Jump-to-reference (J2R) is one classical control-based scenario for the treatment effect evaluation, where the participants in the treatment group after intercurrent events are assumed to have the same disease progress as those with identical covariates in the control group. We establish new estimators to assess the average treatment effect based on a proposed potential outcomes framework under J2R. Various identification formulas are constructed, motivating estimators that rely on different parts of the observed data distribution. Moreover, we obtain a novel estimator inspired by the efficient influence function, with multiple robustness in the sense that it achieves $n^{1/2}$ -consistency if any pairs of multiple nuisance functions are correctly specified, or if the nuisance functions converge at a rate not slower than $n^{-1/4}$ when using flexible modeling approaches. The finite-sample performance of the proposed estimators is validated in simulation studies and an antidepressant clinical trial.

keywords: Longitudinal clinical trial, longitudinal observational study, semiparametric theory, sensitivity analysis.

1 Introduction

Missing data are a major concern in clinical studies, especially in longitudinal settings. Participants are likely to deviate from the current treatment due to the loss of follow-ups or a shift to certain rescue therapy. To estimate the treatment effect precisely, additional assumptions for the missing components are needed. It calls for the importance of defining an estimand that can reflect the key clinical questions of interest and take into account the intercurrent events such as the discontinuation of the treatment (ICH, 2021).

Different strategies are put forward by ICH (2021) to deal with the intercurrent events. The *hypothetical* strategy commonly envisions that participants who discontinue the treatment are in compliance, i.e., they still take the assigned drug throughout the entire study period. This approach, which is connected to the unverifiable missing at random (MAR; Rubin, 1976) assumption, frequently appears in the primary analysis to evaluate the treatment efficacy. However, this hypothetical scenario may not be *realistic*, if participants lose access to the benefited test drug afterward. Under this circumstance, those individuals are more likely to resemble the observed ones with identical historical information in the control group, leading to control-based imputation (CBI; Carpenter et al., 2013). CBI uses the *treatment policy* strategy to construct a treatment effect estimand that addresses a “treatment switching” scenario for those individuals who drop out of the treated group. As CBI reveals a discrepancy in outcome profiles between observed individuals and dropouts with the same history in the treated group, a missing not at random (MNAR; Rubin, 1976) pattern is detected for the intercurrent events. Since the resulting estimand is constructed under MNAR, it is often used in sensitivity analyses (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2013; Liu and Pang, 2016; Cro et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022) to explore the robustness of results to alternative missing data assumptions against MAR. Moreover, it has been receiving growing attention in the primary analysis of clinical trials (Tan et al., 2021) and observational studies (Lee et al., 2021).

Among the proposed CBI scenarios, we focus on one specific setting called jump-to-reference (J2R; Carpenter et al., 2013) throughout the paper, which has appeared in several regulatory reports (e.g., US Food and Drug Administration, 2016). In oncology trials, J2R is widely applicable since it is common for patients to shift to standard care if they quit the test therapy due to tumor progression (Mallinckrodt et al., 2019). Its usefulness is also revealed in the clinical trials of chronic pain treatments, where the subjects who drop out because they fail to experience pain relief may resemble the remaining ones in the control group (Gewandter et al., 2020). The motivating example, which will be analyzed in Section 5, uses an antidepressant trial conducted under the Auspices of

the Drug Information Association (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014) to illustrate the usage of J2R. The trial collects the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale for 17 items (HAMD-17) scores at baseline and weeks 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 among 100 randomly assigned participants in both the control and the treatment groups. We are interested in the average treatment effect (ATE) on the HAMD-17 score regardless of the occurrence of the intercurrent events, i.e., the ATE under the *treatment policy* condition. As the test drug in this trial possesses a short-term effect, a reduced treatment effect is expected since the subjects taking the experimental drug are likely to experience no more treatment benefits after dropping out, indicating a J2R pattern. As a result, using the *treatment policy* strategy and the guidelines in ICH (2021), we define the treatment effect estimand as the mean difference of the change in the HAMD-17 score at the last time point from the baseline, assuming that the missing outcomes share the same profile as the observed ones with the identical history in the control group. The defined J2R estimand is an intent-to-treat (ITT) estimand, as it matches the goal of assessing the treatment effect in the group to which the individuals were initially assigned, regardless of the intervention (Lipkovich et al., 2020).

The likelihood-based method and multiple imputation (Rubin, 2004) are two typical parametric approaches to handle missing data (Mallinckrodt et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2022). However, they will result in a biased estimate of the ATE if any component of the likelihood function is misspecified. When the parametric modeling assumptions are untenable, semiparametric estimators based on the weighted estimating equations can be applied. Robins et al. (1994) propose a doubly robust estimator for the regression coefficients under MAR. Bang and Robins (2005) further develop a doubly robust estimator in longitudinal data with a monotone missingness pattern using sequential regressions. While the robust estimators under MAR have been well studied, they remain uncultivated in the area of longitudinal clinical studies under MNAR-related scenarios.

Towards this end, we develop a semiparametric framework to evaluate the ATE in longitudinal studies under J2R. As the estimand is defined under an envisioned scenario where the outcomes have not been observed, a potential outcomes framework is proposed to describe the counterfactuals. The assumptions regarding treatment ignorability and partial ignorability of missingness with causal consistency in the context of J2R are put forward for identification. As a stepping stone, we first consider cross-sectional studies, a special case of longitudinal studies with one follow-up time. We discover three identification formulas for the ATE, each of which invokes an estimator that relies on two of the three models:

- (a) the *propensity score*, as the model of the treatment conditional on the observed history;

- (b) the *response probability*, as the model of the response status conditional on the observed historical covariates and the treatment;
- (c) the *outcome mean*, as the model of the mean outcomes conditional on the observed historical covariates and the treatment.

The three estimators assess the ATE in distinct aspects, motivating us to construct a new estimator that combines all the modeling features. Drawing on the semiparametric theory (Bickel et al., 1993), we obtain the efficient influence function (EIF) and use it to prompt a novel estimator incorporating models (a)–(c). The proposed estimator has a remarkable property of triple robustness (Wang and Tchetgen Tchetgen, 2018; Jiang et al., 2020), in the sense that it is consistent if any two of the three models are correctly specified when using parametric models or achieves a $n^{1/2}$ -consistency if the models converge at a rate not slower than $n^{-1/4}$ when using flexible models such as semiparametric or machine learning models. Extending to longitudinal clinical studies, an additional model is needed for identification:

- (d) the *pattern mean*, as the model of the mean outcomes adjusted by the response probability conditional on the observed history and the treatment for any missingness pattern.

Even under MAR, the derivation of the EIF for longitudinal data is notoriously challenging. The complexity is escalated under J2R, where the treatment group involves additional outcome information from the control group, resulting in unexplored territory to date. Our major theoretical contribution is to obtain the EIF in longitudinal studies, which enables us to construct a multiply robust estimator with the guaranteed $n^{1/2}$ -consistency and asymptotic normality if models (a)–(d) have convergence rates not slower than $n^{-1/4}$. To mitigate the impact of extreme values in the estimator, we seek alternative formations to obtain more stabilized estimators via normalization (Lunceford and Davidian, 2004) and calibration (e.g., Hainmueller, 2012; Zhao, 2019; Lee et al., 2021). Moreover, a sequential estimation procedure that is analogous to the steps in Bang and Robins (2005) but under the more complex MNAR-related setting is provided to obtain the estimator in practice. Inspired by the semiparametric efficiency bound the estimator attains, we provide an EIF-based variance estimator.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 constructs the semiparametric framework under J2R in cross-sectional studies. Section 3 extends it to longitudinal data. Section 4 assesses the finite-sample performance of the proposed estimator via simulations. Section 5 uses antidepressant trial data to further validate the novel estimator. Conclusions and remarks are presented in Section

6. Supporting information contains technical details, additional simulation and real-data application results.

2 Cross-sectional studies

To ground ideas, we first focus on cross-sectional studies. Let A_i be the binary treatment, X_i the baseline covariates, $Y_{1,i}$ the outcome, and $R_{1,i}$ the response indicator where $R_{1,i} = 1$ indicates the outcome is observed and $R_{1,i} = 0$ otherwise, where the subscript 1 indicates the first post-baseline time point, for unit $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume $\{X_i, A_i, R_{1,i}, Y_{1,i} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are independent and identically distributed. For simplicity of notation, omit the subscript i for the subject. Let $V = (X, A, R_1 Y_1, R_1)$ be the random vector of all observed variables and follow the distribution \mathbb{P} . To define the estimand unambiguously, we extend the causal framework in Lipkovich et al. (2020) and introduce the potential outcomes framework by defining $R_1(a)$ as the potential response indicator received treatment a and $Y_1(a, r)$ as the potential outcome received treatment a with response status r . As a shorthand, we also introduce the potential outcome $Y_1(a) = Y_1\{a, R_1(a)\}$ to acknowledge the equivalence between the potential outcome with $A = a$ and the potential outcome with $A = a$ and R_1 to be the value it would have been if $A = a$ based on the composition assumption (VanderWeele and Vansteelandt, 2009).

Assumption 1 (Treatment ignorability). $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \{R_1(a), Y_1(a, r)\} \mid X$, for all a and r .

Assumption 1 is the classic treatment ignorability in observational studies (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). In randomized clinical trials, the treatment ignorability holds naturally.

Assumption 2 (Causal consistency). $R_1 = R_1(A)$, and $Y_1 = Y_1\{A, R_1(A)\}$.


Assumption 2 is the stable unit treatment value assumption proposed by Rubin (1980).

Assumption 3 (Partial ignorability of missingness). $R_1(0) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_1(0, r) \mid X$, for all r .

We distinguish Assumption 3 from the conventional MAR assumption, as it only requires conditional independence between the potential response status and the potential outcome under any response status in the control group. Since the control group in most clinical studies represents the placebo or standard care, the missingness ignorability matches the rationale that participants in this group still adhere to the assigned treatment after dropping out.

Assumption 4 (J2R for the outcome mean). $E\{Y_1(1, 0) \mid X, R_1(1) = 0\} = E\{Y_1(0) \mid X\}$.

Figure 1: The DWIG encodes causal Assumptions 1–4 and extends the single-world intervention graph (Richardson and Robins, 2013), visualizing double-world joint distributions $f\{X, A, R_1(0), Y_1(0, r_1)\}$ and $f\{X, A, R_1(1), Y_1(1, r_1)\}$. The vacancy of edges between A and the potential variables $\{R_1(a), Y_1(a, r_1)\}$ represents Assumption 1. Assumption 2 links a with $R_1(a)$ and (a, r_1) with $Y_1(a, r_1)$ to illustrate the causal consistency. The partial ignorability of missingness in the control group in Assumption 3 only connects $R_1(0)$ and $Y_1(0, r)$ through X . The side note and the additional involvement of an unmeasured confounder U that links between $R_1(1)$ and $Y_1(1, r)$ indicate Assumption 4 and reveal an MNAR pattern invoked by J2R.



Assumption 4 is vital as it specifies the outcome model under J2R. In the treated group, Assumptions 3 and 4 jointly characterize MNAR related to J2R, as the outcome distributions between observed individuals and dropouts are different based on the construction of the outcome mean. J2R is prespecified in the study protocol and belongs to a class of unverifiable assumptions on the outcome profile to target dropouts, revealing its applicability in diverse areas such as chronic diseases and oncology trials (Mallinckrodt et al., 2019). In practice, one can include the outcome predictors of the control group in the outcome model to enhance the credibility of this assumption. Meanwhile, caution should be taken. Despite the prevalence of J2R, it may not be suitable for drugs with an enduring treatment benefit.

Figure 1 visualizes the four assumptions and extends the single-world intervention graph (Richardson and Robins, 2013) to link counterfactuals with treatments. As Assumptions 3 and 4 imply differences in the distributions of the potential variables $R_1(a)$ and $Y_1(a)$ between treatments, we invent a graph containing both sets of the potential variables $\{R_1(0), Y_1(0, r_1)\}$ and $\{R_1(1), Y_1(1, r_1)\}$ and call it the double-world intervention graph (DWIG). By splitting the nodes to capture double-world distributions of the observed data, the DWIG shows different profiles for both potential variable sets and visualizes all causal assumptions.

2.1 Three identification formulas under J2R

The ATE can be expressed under the potential outcomes framework as $\tau_1^{J2R} = E\{Y_1(1) - Y_1(0)\}$. Define the propensity score as $e(X) = P(A = 1 | X)$, the response probability as $\pi_1(a, X) = P(R_1 = 1 | X, A = a)$, the outcome mean as $\mu_1^a(X) = E(Y_1 | X, R_1 = 1, A = a)$. The following theorem provides three identification formulas of the ATE.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1–4, assume there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \pi_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a , the following identification formulas hold.*

- (a) *Based on the response probability and outcome mean, $\tau_1^{J2R} = E[\pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\}]$.*
- (b) *Based on the propensity score and outcome mean, $\tau_1^{J2R} = E\left((2A - 1)\{R_1 Y_1 + (1 - R_1)\mu_1^0(X)\} / [e(X)^A \{1 - e(X)\}^{1-A}]\right)$.*
- (c) *Based on the propensity score and response probability, $\tau_1^{J2R} = E\left(AR_1 Y_1 / e(X) - (1 - A)\pi_1(1, X)R_1 Y_1 / [\{1 - e(X)\}\pi_1(0, X)]\right)$.*

Theorem 1 requires the positivity assumption of the treatment assignment (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983). It means that each participant has a nonzero probability of being assigned to the control or treatment group. When missingness is involved, a positivity assumption regarding the response probability is also imposed, indicating that each individual has a chance to be observed at the study endpoint. As the missing components follow a MAR pattern in the control group, existing results (e.g., Robins et al., 1994) can help identify $E\{Y_1(0)\}$. However, identifying $E\{Y_1(1)\}$ requires considerable effort as the component $E\{Y_1(1, 0)\}$ borrows the available information from the control group to the treated group requested by J2R, which differs from the traditional approaches where the identification only relies on the observed data in the same group, resulting in one of the main contributions in our paper.

We give some intuition about the identification formulas below. The intuition also helps when we extend our framework to the longitudinal setting. Theorem 1 (a) describes that for any subject in the target population, the individual treatment effect will be zero when missingness is involved, as J2R entails that the individual will always take the control therapy and thus have the same outcome mean regardless of the assigned treatment; if the outcome is fully observed, the individual treatment effect given the baseline covariates will be $\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)$. Taking the expectation over the response status in the treatment group results in the overall marginal treatment effect. Theorem 1 (b) creates the pseudo-observed outcome $R_1 Y_1 + (1 - R_1)\mu_1^0(X)$ from imputing the missing component by the

outcome mean under J2R. The standard inverse probability weighting (IPW; Imbens, 2004) method is then applied to adjust for the confounding effect using the propensity score. In Theorem 1 (c), the first term adjusted by $A/e(X)$ targets the participants who are still observed in the assigned treatment group, which corresponds to $E\{\pi_1(1, X)\mu_1^1(X)\}$. The second term marginalizes the multiplication between $\pi_1(1, X)$ and the IPW-based transformed outcome $(1-A)R_1Y_1/[\{1-e(X)\}\pi_1(0, X)]$, which measures the conditional control group mean $\mu_1^0(X)$, quantifies the difference between the borrowed information in the treated group from the control group and the information in the control group, and matches $E\{\pi_1(1, X)\mu_1^0(X)\}$ in Theorem 1 (a).

2.2 Estimation based on the identification formulas

We introduce additional notations for convenience. Let P_n be the empirical average, i.e., $P_n(U) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n U_i$ for any variable U . Under the parametric modeling framework, let $e(X; \alpha)$, $\mu_1^a(X; \beta)$, and $\pi_1(a, X; \gamma)$ be the working models of $e(X)$, $\mu_1^a(X)$, and $\pi_1(a, X)$, where α, β, γ are the model parameters. Suppose the model parameter estimates $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})$ converge to their probability limits $(\alpha^*, \beta^*, \gamma^*)$. Denote the true model parameters $(\alpha_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0)$ and the true models $\{e(X), \mu_1^a(X), \pi_1(a, X) : a = 0, 1\}$ for shorthand. To illustrate model specifications, we use \mathcal{M} with the subscripts “ps”, “om”, and “rp” to denote the correctly specified propensity score, outcome mean, and response probability, respectively. Under \mathcal{M}_{ps} , $e(X; \alpha^*) = e(X)$; under \mathcal{M}_{om} , $\mu_1^a(X; \beta^*) = \mu_1^a(X)$; under \mathcal{M}_{rp} , $\pi_1(a, X; \gamma^*) = \pi_1(a, X)$. We use $+$ to indicate the correct specification of more than one model and \cup to indicate that at least one model is correctly specified, e.g., $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rp+om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}}$ implies that the response probability and outcome mean are correct or the propensity score is correct. The estimators are obtained by replacing $\{e(X), \pi_1(a, X), \mu_1^a(X) : a = 0, 1\}$ with the estimated models $\{e(X; \hat{\alpha}), \pi_1(a, X; \hat{\gamma}), \mu_1^a(X; \hat{\beta}) : a = 0, 1\}$ and the expectation with the empirical average.

Example 1. The estimators motivated by the identification formulas in Theorem 1 are:

1. The response probability-outcome mean (rp-om) estimator: $\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-om}} = P_n \left[\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \left\{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right]$.

The estimator is consistent under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rp+om}}$.

2. The propensity score-outcome mean (ps-om) estimator:

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}} = P_n \left[\frac{2A - 1}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})^A \{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})\}^{1-A}} \left\{ R_1 Y_1 + (1 - R_1) \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right].$$

The estimator is consistent under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+om}}$.

3. The propensity score-response probability (ps-rp) estimator:

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}} = \text{P}_n \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} R_1 Y_1 - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} R_1 Y_1 \right\}.$$

The estimator is consistent under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+rp}}$.

The estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$ involve taking the inverse of the estimated propensity score or response probability, which may produce extreme values when they are close to 0 or 1. To mitigate the issue, we seek an alternative version of the inverse probability weighting estimators by normalizing the weights (Lunceford and Davidian, 2004). The exact forms of the normalized estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$ are given in Web Appendix C.1.

2.3 EIF and the EIF-based estimators

Based on the three different identification formulas and the motivated estimators, it is possible to combine the three sets of model components in one identification formula. In the subsection, we first compute the EIF for the ATE under J2R to get a new identification formula and then give the resulting EIF-based estimators.

Theorem 2. *Under Assumptions 1–4, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \pi_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a , the EIF for τ_1^{J2R} is*

$$\varphi_1^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P}) = \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{A-e(X)}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \tau_1^{J2R}.$$

By the fact that the mean of the EIF is zero, we can obtain another identification formula for the ATE, which motivates the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ as

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} - \frac{A-e(X; \hat{\alpha})}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{\mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} \right]$$

We provide the normalized estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}}$ to reduce the impact of extreme weights in Web Appendix C.2. We also consider employing calibration (e.g., Hainmueller, 2012; Zhao, 2019; Lee et al., 2021) to improve the covariate balance and mitigate the outliers. Using the logistic link function, we estimate the weights by solving the optimization problem $\min_{w_i \geq 0} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i - 1) \log(w_i - 1) - w_i$ subject to $\sum_{i:A_i=1} w_{a_1,i} h(X_i) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)$ to compute the weights $w_i = w_{a_1,i}$ when $A = 1$; subject to $\sum_{i:A_i=0} w_{a_0,i} h(X_i) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)$ to compute the weights $w_i = w_{a_0,i}$ when $A = 0$; and

subject to $\sum_{i:R_i=1} w_{r_1,i} h(X_i) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)$ to compute the weights $w_i = w_{r_1,i}$ when $R_1 = 1$. Here, $h(X)$ is any function of covariates. For example, one may incorporate the first two moments of the covariates to achieve a balance in both means and variances. The calibration-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$ is given in Web Appendix C.2. While $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$ enjoy superior finite-sample performance by mitigating extreme weights, the three EIF-based estimators are asymptotically equivalent with theoretical guarantees (Zhao, 2019).

Connecting with the well-known robustness results under MAR in the missing data literature (e.g., Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995; Bang and Robins, 2005), the constructed EIF-motivated estimators distinguish themselves due to the discrepancy in outcome mean profiles between observed individuals and dropouts in the treated group envisioned by J2R, which is further explained in Web Appendix E. Interestingly, they achieve better robust properties compared to the existing doubly robust estimators under MAR.

As we will explain in the next subsection, the estimators reach $n^{1/2}$ -consistency if any two of the three models are correct when using a parametric modeling strategy, or if the convergence rate of any model is not less than $n^{-1/4}$ when using flexible models. We call this property triple robustness.

2.4 Triple robustness

We focus on investigating the asymptotic properties of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$. Theorem 3 explores the triple robustness of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ under a parametric modeling strategy on the nuisance functions.

Theorem 3. *Under Assumptions 1–4, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X; \alpha^*), e(X; \hat{\alpha}), \pi_1(a, X; \gamma^*), \pi_1(a, X; \hat{\gamma})\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a almost surely, the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ is triply robust in the sense that it is consistent for τ_1^{J2R} under $\mathcal{M}_{rp+om} \cup \mathcal{M}_{ps+om} \cup \mathcal{M}_{ps+rp}$. Moreover, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound under $\mathcal{M}_{ps+rp+om}$.*

Theorem 3 requires the true and estimated propensity scores and response probabilities bounded away from 0 and 1 to reduce the extreme values (Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995). Given that the EIF-based estimators, the estimators in Example 1, and their normalized versions are asymptotically linear, the variance estimators can be computed by nonparametric bootstrap.

When the models for the nuisance functions are difficult to obtain parametrically, one can turn to more flexible modeling strategies such as semiparametric models like generalized additive models (GAM; Hastie and Tibshirani, 2017) or machine learning models to get the estimated models $\{\hat{e}(X), \hat{\pi}_1(a, X), \hat{\mu}_1^a(X) : a = 0, 1\}$. To illustrate the convergence rate of the estimated models, denote $\|U\| = \{E(U^2)\}^{1/2}$ as the L_2 -norm of the random variable U . Suppose the convergence rates

are $\|\widehat{e}(X) - e(X)\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_e})$, $\|\widehat{\mu}_1^a(X) - \mu_1^a(X)\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_\mu})$ and $\|\widehat{\pi}_1(a, X) - \pi_1(a, X)\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_\pi})$. Denote $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ as the estimated distribution of the observed data. Theorem 4 illustrates the asymptotic distribution of the EIF-based estimator.

Theorem 4. *Under Assumptions 1–4, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \widehat{e}(X), \pi_1(a, X), \widehat{\pi}_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a almost surely, and the nuisance functions and their estimators take values in Donsker classes. Assume $\|\varphi_1^{J2R}(V; \widehat{\mathbb{P}}) - \varphi_1^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Then, $\widehat{\tau}_{tr} = \tau_1^{J2R} + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_1^{J2R}(V_i; \mathbb{P}) + \text{Rem}(\widehat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rem}(\widehat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\widehat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \widehat{\pi}_1(1, X) \widehat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\} + \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \widehat{e}(X)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\widehat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\} \widehat{\pi}_1(1, X) \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \widehat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\} + \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \widehat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{\widehat{e}(X)} \widehat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\text{Rem}(\widehat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, then $n^{1/2} (\widehat{\tau}_{tr} - \tau_1^{J2R}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{V} \{ \varphi_1^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P}) \})$, where the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\tau}_{tr}$ reaches the semiparametric efficiency bound and $\mathbb{V}(\cdot)$ represents the variance.

The requirement of Donsker classes controls the complexity of the nuisance functions and their estimators (Kennedy, 2016), which can be further relaxed using cross-fitting (Chernozhukov et al., 2018). Theorem 4 invokes the triple robustness in terms of rate convergence when using flexible models, presented by the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 4, suppose $\|\varphi_1^{J2R}(V; \widehat{\mathbb{P}}) - \varphi_1^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and further suppose that there exists $0 < M < \infty$, such that $\mathbb{P} \left(\max \left\{ |\widehat{\mu}_1^0(X)|, |\widehat{\mu}_1^1(X)|, \left| \{1 - e(X)\} / \{1 - \widehat{e}(X)\} \right| \right\} \leq M \right) = 1$, then $\widehat{\tau}_{tr} - \tau_1^{J2R} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} + n^{-c})$, where $c = \min(c_e + c_\mu, c_e + c_\pi, c_\mu + c_\pi)$.*

The additional uniformly bounded condition for the estimated outcome means and the ratio $\{1 - e(X)\} / \{1 - \widehat{e}(X)\}$, which originates from Kennedy (2016) and holds in most clinical studies, guarantees an upper bound for $\text{Rem}(\widehat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P})$. Corollary 1 provides alternative approaches to reach a $n^{1/2}$ -rate consistency of the estimator. The nuisance functions can converge at a slower rate no less than $n^{-1/4}$ using flexible models.

3 Longitudinal data with monotone missingness

Next, we focus on the longitudinal setting and introduce additional notations. Suppose the longitudinal data contain t time points. Let $Y_{s,i}$ be the outcome at time s , $H_{s-1,i} = (X_i^T, Y_{1,i}, \dots, Y_{s-1,i})^T$

be the historical information at time s for $s = 2, \dots, t$, and $H_{0,i} = X_i$. When missingness is involved, denote $R_{s,i}$ as the response indicator at time s and D_i as the dropout time. Let $R_{0,i} = 1$, indicating the baseline covariates $H_{0,i}$ are always observed. We assume a monotone missingness pattern, i.e., if the individual drops out at time s , we would expect $R_{s,i} = \dots = R_{t,i} = 0$. By monotone missingness, there exists a one-to-one relationship between the dropout time D_i and the vector of response indicators $(R_{0,i}, \dots, R_{t,i})$ as $D_i = \sum_{s=0}^t R_{s,i}$ for all i . Assume the full data $\{X_i, A_i, R_{1,i}, Y_{1,i}, \dots, R_{t,i}, Y_{t,i} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are independent and identically distributed. We omit the subscript i again for simplicity. Let $V = (X, A, R_1 Y_1, R_1, \dots, R_t Y_t, R_t)$ be the vector of all observed variables and follow the observed data distribution \mathbb{P} . Extending the potential outcomes framework, we define $R_s(a)$ as the potential response indicator if the subject received treatment a at time s , $D(a)$ as the potential dropout time if the subject received treatment a , $Y_s(a, d)$ as the potential outcome if the subject received treatment a at time s with the occurrence of dropout at time d . Similar to the cross-sectional setting, we simplify the potential outcome $Y_s\{a, D(a)\} = Y_s(a)$ using the composition assumption, which assumes that the potential outcome with $A = a$ and the potential outcome with $A = a$ and the dropout time D to be the value it would have been if $A = a$ are the same. Due to the natural constraint that future dropouts do not affect the current and past outcomes, we have $Y_s(a, t+1) = Y_s(a, s')$ for any $s < s' < t+1$ and $D(a) = \sum_{s=0}^t R_s(a)$. We extend Assumptions 1–4 to the context of longitudinal data with monotone missingness.

Assumption 5 (Treatment ignorability). $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \{R_s(a), D(a), Y_s(a, d)\} \mid X$, for all a, s and d .

Assumption 6 (Causal consistency). $R_s = R_s(A)$, $D = D(A)$, and $Y_s = Y_s\{A, D(A)\}$, for all s .

Assumption 7 (Partial ignorability of missingness). $R_s(0) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_{s'}(0, d) \mid H_{s-1}$, for all $s' \geq s$ and d .

Assumption 8 (J2R for the outcome mean). $E\{Y_s(1, d) \mid D(1) = d, H_{d-1}\} = E\{Y_s(0) \mid H_{d-1}, R_{d-1} = 1\}$, for all $s \geq d$.

In the longitudinal setting, Assumption 8 indicates a transition from the active treatment to the control group for the dropouts while preserving the historical treatment benefit. White et al. (2020) develop a similar potential outcomes framework for CBI in longitudinal clinical trials. However, their assumptions about the causal model are much stronger, as they assume a linear relationship between future and historical outcomes. Our proposed framework does not rely on any modeling assumptions and is more flexible in practice. In this section, all results degenerate to the ones in cross-sectional studies when $t = 1$.

3.1 Three identification formulas under J2R

In most longitudinal clinical studies, the endpoint of interest is the ATE measured by the mean difference at the last time point between the two groups. Therefore, the ATE can be expressed as $\tau_t^{J2R} = E\{Y_t(1) - Y_t(0)\}$. Define the propensity score $e(H_{s-1}) = P(A = 1 \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1)$, the response probability $\pi_s(a, H_{s-1}) = P(R_s = 1 \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = a)$, the longitudinal outcome mean $\mu_t^a(H_{s-1}) = E\{\mu_t^a(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = a\}$ with $\mu_t^a(H_t) = Y_t$, and the pattern mean $g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) = E\{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l)g_{s+1}^1(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, s-1$ with $g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) = E\left[\{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\}\mu_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1\right]$ if we let $\pi_{t+1}(1, H_t) = 0$. The pattern mean characterizes the weighted outcome mean in each dropout pattern under the pattern-mixture model (Little, 1993). In addition, denote $\bar{\pi}_s(a, H_{s-1}) = \prod_{k=1}^s \pi_k(a, H_{k-1})$ as the cumulative response probability for the individual observed at time s , for $s = 1, \dots, t$. The following theorem provides three identification formulas for longitudinal data with monotone missingness under J2R.

Theorem 5. *Under Assumptions 5–8, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(H_{s-1}), \pi_s(a, H_{s-1})\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all H_{s-1} and a with $s = 1, \dots, t$, the following identification formulas hold for the ATE under J2R:*

(a) *Based on the response probability and pattern mean, $\tau_t^{J2R} = E\left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \left\{\sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0)\right\}\right]$.*

(b) *Based on the propensity score and outcome mean,*

$$\tau_t^{J2R} = E\left[\frac{2A - 1}{e(H_0)^A \{1 - e(H_0)\}^{1-A}} \left\{R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1}(1 - R_s)\mu_t^0(H_{s-1})\right\}\right].$$

(c) *Based on the propensity score and response probability,*

$$\tau_t^{J2R} = E\left(\frac{A}{e(H_0)} R_t Y_t + \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(H_0)} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) - 1\right] \frac{R_t Y_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})}\right),$$

where $\delta(H_{s-1}) = \{e(H_{s-1})/e(H_0)\} / [\{1 - e(H_{s-1})\} / \{1 - e(H_0)\}]$.

3.2 Estimation based on the identification formulas

Similar to the cross-sectional setting, the estimators can be obtained by replacing the functions $\{e(H_{s-1}), \pi_s(a, H_{s-1}), \mu_t^a(H_{s-1}), g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) : l = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } s = 1, \dots, t; a = 0, 1\}$ with the estimated functions $\{\hat{e}(H_{s-1}), \hat{\pi}_s(a, H_{s-1}), \hat{\mu}_t^a(H_{s-1}), \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) : l = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } s = 1, \dots, t; a =$

$0, 1\}$ and the expectation with the empirical average. Compared to the cross-sectional case, obtaining the ATE estimator here involves fitting sequential models at each time point. However, the complex iterated form of $g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})$ is infeasible to model parametrically. We consider using more flexible models such as semiparametric or machine learning models. Denote $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ as the estimated distribution of the observed data V . Suppose the nuisance functions have convergence rates $\|\widehat{e}(H_{s-1}) - e(H_{s-1})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_e})$, $\|\widehat{\mu}_t^a(H_{s-1}) - \mu_t^a(H_{s-1})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_\mu})$, $\|\widehat{\pi}_s(a, H_{s-1}) - \pi_s(a, H_{s-1})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_\pi})$ for any H_{s-1} , and $\|\widehat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-c_g})$ for any H_{l-1} , when $l = 1, \dots, s$; $s = 1, \dots, t$ and $a = 0, 1$.

Example 2. The estimators motivated by the identification formulas in Theorem 5 are:

1. The response probability-pattern mean (rp-pm) estimator: $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}} = P_n \left[\widehat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^t \widehat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \widehat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right\} \right]$, where $\widehat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left\{ \widehat{\pi}_{l+1}(1, H_l) \widehat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1 \right\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, s-1$ and $\widehat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left[\{1 - \widehat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \widehat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right]$ if let $\widehat{\pi}_{t+1}(1, H_t) = 0$.
2. The ps-om estimator:

$$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}} = P_n \left[\frac{2A - 1}{\widehat{e}(H_0)^A \{1 - \widehat{e}(H_0)\}^{1-A}} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \widehat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right].$$

3. The ps-rp estimator:

$$\widehat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}} = P_n \left(\frac{A}{\widehat{e}(H_0)} R_t Y_t + \frac{1 - A}{1 - \widehat{e}(H_0)} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \widehat{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \widehat{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \widehat{\delta}(H_{s-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_t Y_t}{\widehat{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right),$$

$$\text{where } \widehat{\delta}(H_{s-1}) = \left\{ \widehat{e}(H_{s-1}) / \widehat{e}(H_0) \right\} / \left[\{1 - \widehat{e}(H_{s-1})\} / \{1 - \widehat{e}(H_0)\} \right].$$

The impact of the extreme propensity score and response probability weights is more pronounced in the longitudinal setting with an extended long period of follow-up. To mitigate the influence, we consider the normalized estimators $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}}$ and $\widehat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$. The estimation procedure is similar to the one in Bang and Robins (2005), which involves fitting the models recursively. The propensity score $\{e(H_{s-1}) : s = 1, \dots, t\}$ and response probability $\{\pi_s(a, H_{s-1}) : s = 1, \dots, t\}$ incorporate all the available information H_{s-1} . For the outcome mean $\{\mu_t^a(H_{s-1}) : s = 1, \dots, t\}$, we begin from the observed data at the last time point and use the predicted values to regress on the observed data recursively in backward order. For the pattern mean $\{g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) : l = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } s = 1, \dots, t\}$, the product of the predicted values $\{1 - \widehat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_t^0(H_s)$ is regressed on the historical information H_{s-1} at time s . The resulting predicted value $\widehat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1})$ multiplied by the predicted response probability $\widehat{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})$ then serves as the outcome in the model $g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-2})$ to

regress on the observed data at time $s - 1$. Note that the estimated pattern mean will have good performance only if both the response probability and the outcome mean are well-approximated.

3.3 EIF and the EIF-based estimators

Similar to cross-sectional studies, we derive the EIF for τ_t^{J2R} to motivate a new estimator.

Theorem 6. *Under Assumptions 5–8, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(H_{s-1}), \pi_s(a, H_{s-1})\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all H_{s-1} and a with $s = 1, \dots, t$, the EIF for τ_t^{J2R} is*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P}) = & \frac{A}{e(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} - \tau_t^{J2R} \\ & + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{e(H_0)} \right\} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] - \mu_t^0(H_0) \\ & + \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(H_0)} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \pi_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \delta(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Solving $\mathbb{E}\{\varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P})\} = 0$ yields another identification formula of τ_t^{J2R} and motivates the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$ by plugging in the estimated nuisance functions as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}} = & \text{P}_n \left(\frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \left[\hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] \right. \\ & \left. - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) + \frac{1 - A}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right) \end{aligned}$$

In addition, one can consider the normalized estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-N}}$ or the calibration-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}}$ to mitigate the extreme weights, as elaborated in Web Appendix C.5.

3.4 Multiple robustness

To simplify the notations, let $E_{0,l-1}(\cdot; H_s) := \mathbb{E}\{\dots \mathbb{E}(\cdot \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0) \dots \mid H_s, R_{s+1} = 1, A = 0\}$ be the function of $(l-s)$ layers conditional expectations, with the conditions beginning from $(H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0)$ to $(H_s, R_{s+1} = 1, A = 0)$, and $E_{1,s-1}(\cdot; H_0) := \mathbb{E}\{\dots \mathbb{E}(\cdot \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1) \dots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1\}$ be the function of s layers conditional expectations, with the conditions beginning from $(H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1)$ to $(H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1)$. Denote $g_{\hat{\mu},s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) = \mathbb{E}\{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) g_{\hat{\mu},s+1}^1(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, s-1$, and $g_{\hat{\mu},s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1\right]$ for $s = 1, \dots, t$, i.e., we only estimate the outcome

mean in the pattern mean model $g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})$. The asymptotic properties of $\hat{\tau}_{mr}$ are presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 7. *Under Assumptions 5–8, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(H_{s-1}), \hat{e}(H_{s-1}), \pi_s(a, H_{s-1}), \hat{\pi}_s(a, H_{s-1})\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all H_{s-1} and a with $s = 1, \dots, t$, and the nuisance functions and their estimators take values in Donsker classes. Assume $\|\varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Then, $\hat{\tau}_{mr} = \tau_t^{J2R} + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_t^{J2R}(V_i; \mathbb{P}) + \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = & \mathbb{E} \left(\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right] + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{l=s+1}^t E_{1, s-1} \left\{ E_{0, l-1} \left(\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \left[\frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s) \} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \left. \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_k(0, H_{k-1})}{\hat{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} - \{ 1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s) \} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \}; H_s \right); H_0 \right\} \\ & + \{ \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} \\ & \left. + \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t E_{0, s-1} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \}; H_0 \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $\text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, then $n^{1/2} (\hat{\tau}_{mr} - \tau_t^{J2R}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{V} \{ \varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P}) \})$, where the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\tau}_{mr}$ reaches the semiparametric efficiency bound.

The semiparametric efficiency bound prompts the EIF-based variance estimator $\hat{\mathbb{V}}(\hat{\tau}_{mr}) = n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \varphi_t^{J2R}(V_i; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \hat{\tau}_{mr} \}^2$. In practice, the Wald-type confidence interval (CI) tends to have narrower intervals which can be anti-conservative (Boos and Stefanski, 2013). Symmetric t bootstrap CI (Hall, 1988) is considered to improve the coverage. In each bootstrap iteration from $b = 1, \dots, B$, where B is the total number of bootstrap replicates, we compute $T^{*(b)} = (\hat{\tau}^{(b)} - \hat{\tau}) / \hat{\mathbb{V}}^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}^{(b)})$ to get the estimated bootstrap distribution. The 95% symmetric t bootstrap CI of τ_t^{J2R} is obtained by $(\hat{\tau} - c^* \hat{\mathbb{V}}^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}), \hat{\tau} + c^* \hat{\mathbb{V}}^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}))$, where c^* is the 95% quantile of $\{|T^{*(b)}| : b = 1, \dots, B\}$. Theorem 7 motivates the following corollary, which addresses the multiple robustness of $\hat{\tau}_{mr}$ in terms of the convergence rate under flexible modeling strategies.

Corollary 2. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 7, suppose $\|\varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \varphi_t^{J2R}(V; \mathbb{P})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and there exists $0 < M < \infty$, such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max \left\{ \left| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right|, \left| \mu_t^0(H_0) \right|, \left| \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right|, \left| \frac{\{1 - e(H_0)\} \hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)\} \delta(H_{s-1})} \right| \right\} \leq M \right) = 1$$

for $s = 1, \dots, t$, then $\hat{\tau}_{mr} - \tau_t^{J2R} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} + n^{-c})$, where $c = \min\{c_e + c_\mu, c_e + c_\pi, c_\mu + c_\pi, c_e + c_g\}$.

Similar to the cross-sectional setting, even if the nuisance functions converge at a lower rate, we can still obtain a $n^{1/2}$ -rate consistency. An additional function $\{g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) : l = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } s = 1, \dots, t\}$ is involved, whose convergence rate may be harder to control as it incorporates the estimation of both the outcome mean and response probability.


4 Simulation study

4.1 Cross-sectional setting

We first conduct the simulation in a cross-sectional setting to evaluate the finite-sample performance of the proposed estimators. Set the sample size as 500. The covariates $X \in \mathbb{R}^5$ are generated by $X_j \sim N(0.25, 1)$ for $j = 1, \dots, 4$ and $X_5 \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$. Consider a nonlinear transformation of the covariates and denote $Z_j = \{X_j^2 + 2\sin(X_j) - 1.5\}/\sqrt{2}$ for $j = 1, \dots, 4$ and $Z_5 = X_5$. We generate $A \mid X \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{e(X)\}$, where $\text{logit}\{e(X)\} = 0.1 \sum_{j=1}^4 Z_j$; $R_1 \mid (X, A = a) \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\pi_1(a, X)\}$, where $\text{logit}\{\pi_1(a, X)\} = (2a - 1) \sum_{j=1}^5 Z_j/6$; and $Y_1 \mid (X, A = a, R_1 = 1) \sim N\{\mu_1^a(X), 1\}$, where $\mu_1^a(X) = (2 + a) \sum_{j=1}^5 Z_j/6$. The true ATE $\tau_1^{J2R} = 0.0680$. To evaluate the robustness of the estimators, we consider two model specifications of the propensity score, response probability, and outcome mean. Specifically, we fit the corresponding parametric models with the covariates Z as the correctly specified models or with the covariates X as the misspecified models.

We compare the estimators from Example 1 and their normalized versions with the three EIF-based estimators. The first moment of the covariates Z is incorporated in the calibration. The estimators are assessed in terms of the point estimation, coverage rates of the 95% CI, and mean CI lengths under 8 scenarios, each of which relies on whether the propensity score, response probability, or outcome mean is correctly specified. We compute the variance estimates \hat{V}_1 of the estimators by nonparametric bootstrap with $B = 100$ and use the 95% Wald-type CI as $(\hat{\tau} - 1.96\hat{V}_1^{1/2}, \hat{\tau} + 1.96\hat{V}_1^{1/2})$. Figure 2 shows the point estimation results based on 1000 Monte Carlo simulations. When three models are correctly specified, all the estimators are unbiased. For the estimators without triple robustness, they are biased when at least one of their required models is misspecified; while the three EIF-based estimators verify triple robustness since they are unbiased when any two of the three models are correct. Normalization mitigates the impact of extreme weights and results in smaller variations. Moreover, calibration produces a more steady estimator. The coverage rates and mean CI lengths are presented in Table 1, which match the observations we make from Figure 2.

Figure 2: Performance of the estimators in the cross-sectional setting under 8 different model specifications, where ps, rp, and om are shorthands for the propensity score, response probability, and outcome mean; “yes” denotes the correct model with the nonlinear covariates Z , while “no” denotes the wrong model with the linear covariates X . In the x-axis, tr, tr-N, and tr-C denote the three EIF-based estimators $\hat{\tau}_{tr}$, $\hat{\tau}_{tr-N}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{tr-C}$; psrp and psrp-N denote the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-N}$; psom and psom-N denote the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{ps-om}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-N}$; and rpom denotes the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{rp-om}$ in Example 1.



All estimators have satisfactory coverage rates when their required models are correct. Among the EIF-based estimators, the coverage rates are close to the empirical value when any two of the three models are correct, with the smallest mean CI length produced by $\hat{\tau}_{tr-C}$.

4.2 Longitudinal setting

We further evaluate the performance of the proposed estimators in longitudinal studies under J2R. Consider the data with two follow-up time points. We choose the sample size as $n = 1000$, generate the same covariates $X \in \mathbb{R}^5$, and use the same transformation on the covariates to construct $Z \in \mathbb{R}^5$ as the one in the cross-sectional setting. The treatments are generated by $A | X \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{e(X)\}$, where $\text{logit}\{e(X)\} = 0.1 \sum_{j=1}^4 Z_j$. The observed indicators and the longitudinal outcomes are generated in time order. Specifically, at the first time point, we generate $R_1 | (X, A = a) \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\pi_1(a, X)\}$, where $\text{logit}\{\pi_1(a, X)\} = 5(2a - 1) \sum_{j=1}^4 Z_j / 9$, and

Table 1: Coverage rates and mean CI lengths in the cross-sectional setting under 8 different model specifications, where PS, RP, and OM are shorthands for the propensity score, response probability, and outcome mean; “yes” denotes the correct model with the nonlinear covariates Z , while “no” denotes the wrong model with the linear covariates X .

Model specification			Coverage rate (%) (Mean CI length, %)							
PS	RP	OM	$\hat{\tau}_{tr}$	$\hat{\tau}_{tr-N}$	$\hat{\tau}_{tr-C}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-N}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-N}$	$\hat{\tau}_{rp-om}$
yes	yes	yes	94.7 (30.9)	94.7 (29.5)	94.4 (28.5)	95.7 (59.9)	95.5 (41.8)	94.9 (29.1)	94.9 (29.0)	94.3 (28.2)
yes	yes	no	95.3 (41.8)	94.8 (36.1)	94.3 (33.7)	95.7 (59.9)	95.5 (41.8)	80.6 (33.1)	80.6 (33.1)	57.6 (34.0)
yes	no	yes	94.1 (28.8)	94.1 (28.3)	94.2 (28.2)	79.7 (36.7)	80.0 (35.3)	94.9 (29.1)	94.9 (29.0)	93.5 (27.7)
no	yes	yes	94.4 (29.5)	94.4 (29.1)	94.4 (28.5)	85.8 (45.7)	86.0 (40.7)	72.8 (37.9)	72.9 (37.9)	94.3 (28.2)
yes	no	no	83.0 (32.7)	82.9 (32.3)	93.1 (33.8)	79.7 (36.7)	80.0 (35.3)	80.6 (33.1)	80.6 (33.1)	53.4 (34.1)
no	yes	no	84.1 (37.4)	83.9 (35.9)	94.3 (33.7)	85.8 (45.7)	86.0 (40.7)	53.8 (34.6)	53.8 (34.7)	57.6 (34.0)
no	no	yes	94.6 (29.2)	94.6 (29.2)	94.2 (28.2)	56.1 (38.0)	56.1 (37.4)	72.8 (37.9)	72.9 (37.9)	93.5 (27.7)
no	no	no	61.3 (35.1)	61.3 (34.9)	93.1 (33.8)	56.1 (38.0)	56.1 (37.4)	53.8 (34.7)	53.8 (34.7)	53.4 (34.1)

$Y_1 \mid (X, R_1 = 1, A = a) \sim N\{\mu_1^a(X), 1\}$, where $\mu_1^a(X) = (2 + a)\{\sum_{j=1}^4 \log(Z_j^2) + \sum_{j=1}^5 Z_j\}/6$; at the second time point, we generate $R_2 \mid (X, Y_1, R_1 = 1, A = a) \sim \text{Bernoulli}\{\pi_2(a, X, Y_1)\}$, where $\text{logit}\{\pi_2(a, X, Y_1)\} = (2a - 1)\{\sum_{j=1}^4 \log(Z_j^2) + Z_5 + 0.1Y_1\}/6$, and $Y_2 \mid (X, Y_1, R_2 = 1, A = a) \sim N\{\mu_2^a(X, Y_1), 1\}$, where $\mu_2^a(X, Y_1) = (2 + a)(\sum_{j=1}^5 Z_j + Y_1)/3$. The true ATE $\tau_2^{\text{J2R}} = 0.3198$. Since the models are infeasible to approximate parametrically, we apply GAM using smooth splines, where we incorporate the original covariates X in each nuisance function and employ calibration.

We compare the performance of the point estimation, coverage rates of the 95% CI, and mean CI lengths for the proposed estimators. For the EIF-based estimators, we compute the 95% symmetric t bootstrap CIs with a larger number of bootstrap replicates as $B = 500$. For other estimators, since multiple robustness is not guaranteed, we use nonparametric bootstrap to obtain their bootstrap percentile intervals. Figure 3 shows the point estimation results based on 1000 Monte Carlo simulations. All the EIF-based estimators are unbiased, and the one involving calibration has the smallest variation, alleviating the impact of extreme values. Other estimators suffer from different levels of bias. Table 2 supports the superiority of the EIF-based estimators in terms of coverage rates and mean CI lengths.

Figure 3: Performance of the estimators in the longitudinal setting. In the x-axis, mr, mr-N, and mr-C denote the three EIF-based estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-N}}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}}$; psrp and psrp-N denote the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$; psom and psom-N denote the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}}$; and rppm denotes the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}}$ in Example 2.




Table 2: Coverage rates and mean CI lengths in the longitudinal setting.

Estimator	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$	95.4	43.8
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-N}}$	95.2	43.7
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}}$	96.6	42.8
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$	26.7	72.0
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$	27.1	72.1
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$	93.1	51.8
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}}$	92.5	52.0
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}}$	77.2	39.5

5 Application

We apply our proposed estimators to analyze the data from the antidepressant clinical trial introduced in Section 1 under J2R. Apart from the partially observed HAMD-17 scores, a categorical variable indicating the investigation sites is observed for all individuals. For the nuisance functions involved in the proposed estimators, we fit GAM sequentially. To handle the extreme weights, calibration is applied, where we include the first two moments of the history. We compute the 95% symmetric t bootstrap CIs for the three EIF-based estimators and the 95% bootstrap percentile intervals for other estimators, with $B = 500$.

Table 3 presents the analysis results. All the estimators have similar point estimates. However, we detect a relatively obvious difference in the values between $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$, indicating the existence of extreme weights. The weight distributions in Web Appendix H validate the presence of outliers

Table 3: Analysis of the HAMD-17 data for the ATE under J2R.

Estimator	Point estimate	95% CI	CI length
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$	-1.93	(-3.63, -0.24)	3.39
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-N}}$	-1.93	(-3.62, -0.25)	3.37
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}}$	-1.71	(-3.25, -0.16)	3.09
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$	-2.05	(-4.08, -0.50)	3.57
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$	-1.61	(-3.74, -0.07)	3.67
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$	-1.74	(-3.20, -0.25)	2.95
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}}$	-1.75	(-3.18, -0.22)	2.96
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}}$	-1.78	(-3.18, -0.25)	2.93

at weeks 4, 6, and 8 in the control group. Calibration stabilizes the estimation results and leads to a smaller CI compared to the other two EIF-based estimators. Although $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}}$ have similar point estimates and narrower CIs compared to the EIF-based estimators, they rely on a good approximation of their corresponding two models, which may not be guaranteed in practice due to the lack of consistency under slow convergences of the estimated nuisance functions. The EIF-based estimators are preferred with a trade-off between bias and precision since they have a guaranteed multiple robustness in terms of rate convergence. All the resulting 95% CIs indicate a statistically significant treatment effect.

6 Conclusion

Evaluating the treatment effect under an assumed MNAR assumption has been receiving growing interest in both primary and sensitivity analyses in longitudinal studies. We propose a potential outcomes framework to describe the missing data scenario pre-specified as J2R to identify the ATE. The new estimator is constructed with the help of the EIF, combining the propensity score, response probability, outcome mean, and pattern mean. It allows flexible modeling strategies such as semi-parametric or machine learning models, with the good property of multiple robustness in that it achieves $n^{1/2}$ -consistency and asymptotic normality even when the models converge at a slower rate such as $n^{-1/4}$. The proposed estimators can be applied in a wide range of clinical studies including randomized trials and observational studies, and are extendable to other MNAR-related scenarios.

The model assumptions are relaxed in the established semiparametric framework. However, standard untestable assumptions about the missing components are imposed to identify the ATE. The assumed outcome mean for the dropouts under J2R prevents introducing external parameters and reveals its credibility for the drug with a short-term effect. Meanwhile, it may produce a conservative treatment effect evaluation if the active treatment is supposed to be superior (Liu and Pang, 2016).

Its wide applicability appeals to regulatory agencies.

Our framework relies on a monotone missingness pattern for the longitudinal data, which however may not always be the case in reality. Sun and Tchetgen Tchetgen (2018) provide an inverse probability weighting approach to deal with the MAR data with non-monotone missingness patterns. It is possible to extend our method to handle intermittent missing data using their proposed approaches. We leave it as a future research direction.

The construction of the multiply robust estimators is based on continuous longitudinal outcomes. Possibilities exist in the extension of the proposed framework to broader types of outcomes. For example, Yang et al. (2020) consider the δ -adjusted and control-based models to evaluate the treatment effect on the survival outcomes; Tang (2018) extends CBI to binary and ordinal longitudinal outcomes using sequential generalized linear models. These extensions shed light on establishing new multiply robust estimators with the use of our idea.

Acknowledgements

Yang is partially supported by the NSF SES 2242776, NIH 1R01AG066883 and 1R01ES031651.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary materials contain technical details in Sections 2–5. The R package to implement the method is available at <https://github.com/siyi48/mrJ2R>.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings in this paper are openly available in the Drug Information Association Missing Data at <https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/research/centres-projects-groups/missing-data#dia-missing-data> collected by Mallinckrodt et al. (2014).

References

Bang, H. and J. M. Robins (2005). Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics* 61, 962–973.

- Bickel, P. J., C. Klaassen, Y. Ritov, and J. Wellner (1993). *Efficient and Adaptive Inference in Semiparametric Models*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Boos, D. D. and L. A. Stefanski (2013). *Essential statistical inference: theory and methods*, Volume 120. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Carpenter, J. R., J. H. Roger, and M. G. Kenward (2013). Analysis of longitudinal trials with protocol deviation: a framework for relevant, accessible assumptions, and inference via multiple imputation. *J. Biopharm. Stat.* *23*, 1352–1371.
- Chernozhukov, V., D. Chetverikov, M. Demirer, E. Duflo, C. Hansen, W. Newey, and J. Robins (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *Economet J* *21*, C1–C68.
- Cro, S., T. P. Morris, M. G. Kenward, and J. R. Carpenter (2020). Sensitivity analysis for clinical trials with missing continuous outcome data using controlled multiple imputation: a practical guide. *Stat Med* *39*(21), 2815–2842.
- Gewandter, J. S., R. H. Dworkin, D. C. Turk, E. G. Devine, D. Hewitt, M. P. Jensen, N. P. Katz, A. A. Kirkwood, R. Malamut, J. D. Markman, et al. (2020). Improving study conduct and data quality in clinical trials of chronic pain treatments: Impact recommendations. *J Pain* *21*(9-10), 931–942.
- Hainmueller, J. (2012). Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Polit Anal* *20*(1), 25–46.
- Hall, P. (1988). On symmetric bootstrap confidence intervals. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol* *50*, 35–45.
- Hastie, T. J. and R. J. Tibshirani (2017). *Generalized additive models*. Routledge.
- ICH (2021). E9(r1) statistical principles for clinical trials: Addendum: Estimands and sensitivity analysis in clinical trials. *FDA Guidance Documents*.
- Imbens, G. W. (2004). Nonparametric estimation of average treatment effects under exogeneity: A review. *Rev Econ Stat* *86*(1), 4–29.
- Jiang, Z., S. Yang, and P. Ding (2020). Multiply robust estimation of causal effects under principal ignorability. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*.

- Kennedy, E. H. (2016). Semiparametric theory and empirical processes in causal inference. In *Statistical causal inferences and their applications in public health research*, pp. 141–167. Springer.
- Lee, D., S. Yang, L. Dong, X. Wang, D. Zeng, and J. Cai (2021). Improving trial generalizability using observational studies. *Biometrics*.
- Lee, K. J., K. M. Tilling, R. P. Cornish, R. J. Little, M. L. Bell, E. Goetghebeur, J. W. Hogan, J. R. Carpenter, et al. (2021). Framework for the treatment and reporting of missing data in observational studies: The treatment and reporting of missing data in observational studies framework. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* *134*, 79–88.
- Lipkovich, I., B. Ratitch, and C. H. Mallinckrodt (2020). Causal inference and estimands in clinical trials. *Stat. Biopharm. Res.* *12*(1), 54–67.
- Little, R. J. (1993). Pattern-mixture models for multivariate incomplete data. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.* *88*(421), 125–134.
- Liu, G. F. and L. Pang (2016). On analysis of longitudinal clinical trials with missing data using reference-based imputation. *J. Biopharm. Stat.* *26*, 924–936.
- Liu, S., S. Yang, Y. Zhang, and G. F. Liu (2022). Sensitivity analysis in longitudinal clinical trials via distributional imputation. *Stat Methods Med Res (forthcoming)*.
- Liu, S., Y. Zhang, G. T. Golm, G. F. Liu, and S. Yang (2022). Robust analyses for longitudinal clinical trials with missing and non-normal continuous outcomes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10561*.
- Lunceford, J. K. and M. Davidian (2004). Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: a comparative study. *Stat Med* *23*(19), 2937–2960.
- Mallinckrodt, C. and I. . . Lipkovich (2016). *Analyzing longitudinal clinical trial data: A practical guide*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Mallinckrodt, C., G. Molenberghs, I. Lipkovich, and B. Ratitch (2019). *Estimands, estimators and sensitivity analysis in clinical trials*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Mallinckrodt, C., J. Roger, C. Chuang-Stein, G. Molenberghs, M. O’Kelly, B. Ratitch, M. Janssens, and P. Bunouf (2014). Recent developments in the prevention and treatment of missing data. *Ther Innov Regul Sci* *48*(1), 68–80.

- Richardson, T. S. and J. M. Robins (2013). Single world intervention graphs (swigs): A unification of the counterfactual and graphical approaches to causality. *Center for the Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington Series. Working Paper 128*(30), 2013.
- Robins, J. M. and A. Rotnitzky (1995). Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models with missing data. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.* *90*, 122–129.
- Robins, J. M., A. Rotnitzky, and L. P. Zhao (1994). Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.* *89*, 846–866.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and D. B. Rubin (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* *70*(1), 41–55.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika* *63*(3), 581–592.
- Rubin, D. B. (1980). Comment on “Randomization analysis of experimental data: The Fisher randomization test”. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.* *75*, 591–593.
- Rubin, D. B. (2004). *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*, Volume 81. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sun, B. and E. J. Tchetgen Tchetgen (2018). On inverse probability weighting for nonmonotone missing at random data. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.* *113*, 369–379.
- Tan, P.-T., S. Cro, E. Van Vogt, M. Szigeti, and V. R. Cornelius (2021). A review of the use of controlled multiple imputation in randomised controlled trials with missing outcome data. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* *21*, 1–17.
- Tang, Y. (2018). Controlled pattern imputation for sensitivity analysis of longitudinal binary and ordinal outcomes with nonignorable dropout. *Stat Med* *37*, 1467–1481.
- US Food and Drug Administration (2016). Statistical review and evaluation of tresiba and ryzodeg 70/30.
- VanderWeele, T. J. and S. Vansteelandt (2009). Conceptual issues concerning mediation, interventions and composition. *Statistics and its Interface* *2*(4), 457–468
- Wang, L. and E. Tchetgen Tchetgen (2018). Bounded, efficient and multiply robust estimation of average treatment effects using instrumental variables. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol* *80*(3), 531–550.

- White, I., R. Joseph, and N. Best (2020). A causal modelling framework for reference-based imputation and tipping point analysis in clinical trials with quantitative outcome. *J. Biopharm. Stat.* 30, 334–350.
- Yang, S., Y. Zhang, G. F. Liu, and Q. Guan (2020). SMIM: a unified framework of survival sensitivity analysis using multiple imputation and martingale. *Biometrics*.
- Zhao, Q. (2019). Covariate balancing propensity score by tailored loss functions. *Ann. Stat.* 47(2), 965–993.

Supplementary Materials for "Multiply robust estimators in longitudinal studies with missing data under control-based imputation" by Liu et al.

Siyi Liu, Shu Yang, Yilong Zhang, Guanghan (Frank) Liu

The supplementary material contains technical details, additional simulation, and real-data application results. Web Appendix A provides proof for the identification formulas provided in Theorems 1 and 5. Web Appendix B presents detailed derivations of the EIFs in Theorems 2 and 6. Web Appendix C gives additional estimators and the detailed estimation steps. Web Appendix D consists of the proofs regarding multiple robustness. Web Appendix E connects the proposed multiply robust estimators with the existing results in the literature. Web Appendix F gives a sensitivity analysis framework to test the robustness of results against the partial ignorability of missingness assumption. Web Appendix G contains additional simulation results. Web Appendix H shows additional notes on the real-data application.

Web Appendix A Proof of the identification formulas

Web Appendix A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We first prove the equivalence of the three identification formulas, then prove the validity of the identification formula (a) in Theorem 1.

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} E_{1,1} &= \mathbb{E}[\pi_1(1, X)\{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\}]; \\ E_{2,1} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)}\{R_1Y_1 + (1 - R_1)\mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)}\{R_1Y_1 + (1 - R_1)\mu_1^0(X)\}\right]; \\ E_{3,1} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)}R_1Y_1 - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)}\frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)}R_1Y_1\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $E_{1,1} = E_{2,1}$ holds since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)}\{R_1Y_1 + (1 - R_1)\mu_1^0(X)\}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{E}(A | X)}{e(X)}\mathbb{E}\{R_1Y_1 + (1 - R_1)\mu_1^0(X) | X, A = 1\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}(A | X)}{e(X)}[\mathbb{E}(R_1 | X, A = 1)\mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \mathbb{E}(R_1 | X, A = 1)\}\mu_1^0(X)]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}(A | X)}{e(X)}[\pi_1(1, X)\mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\}\mu_1^0(X)]\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\pi_1(1, X)\mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\}\mu_1^0(X)], \end{aligned}$$

And similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \{R_1 Y_1 + (1-R_1) \mu_1^0(X)\} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \{R_1 \mu_1^0(X) + (1-R_1) \mu_1^0(X)\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \mu_1^0(X) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_1^0(X) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have $E_{2,1} = \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X)] - \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_1^0(X) \} = E_{1,1}$.

Also note that $E_{1,1} = E_{3,1}$ holds since

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{3,1} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}(A | X)}{e(X)} E(R_1 | X, A = 1) E(Y_1 | X, R_1 = 1, A = 1) \right\} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}(1-A | X)}{1-e(X)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)} E(R_1 | X, A = 0) E(Y_1 | X, R_1 = 1, A = 0) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}(A | X)}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}(1-A | X)}{1-e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^0(X) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^0(X) \} = E_{1,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

We proceed to prove the validity of the identification formula (a) in Theorem 1. Denote $\tau_{1,1} = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \{1, R(1)\}]$ and $\tau_{0,1} = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \{0, R(0)\}]$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{1,1} &= \mathbb{E} [R_1(1) Y_1(1, 1) + \{1 - R_1(1)\} Y_1(1, 0)] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{R_1(1) | X\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(1, 1) | X, R_1(1) = 1\} + \mathbb{E} \{1 - R_1(1) | X\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(1, 0) | X, R_1(1) = 0\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} (R_1 | X, A = 1) \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(1, 1) | X, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1\} + \mathbb{E} (1 - R_1 | X, A = 0) \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(1, 0) | X, R_1(1) = 0\}] \\
&\quad (\text{By A1, A3}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mathbb{E} (Y_1 | X, R_1 = 1, A = 1) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mathbb{E} (Y_1 | X, A = 0) \} (\text{By A3, A4}) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) \} (\text{By A2}).
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{0,1} &= \mathbb{E} [R_1(0) Y_1(0, 1) + \{1 - R_1(0)\} Y_1(0, 0)] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{R_1(0) | X\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 1) | X, R_1(0) = 1\} + \mathbb{E} \{1 - R_1(0) | X\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 0) | X, R_1(0) = 0\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} (R_1 | X, A = 0) \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 1) | X, R_1(0) = 1, A = 0\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} (1 - R_1 | X, A = 0) \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 0) | X, R_1(0) = 0, A = 0\} \right] (\text{By A1, A3})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(0, X) \mathbb{E}(Y_1 \mid A = 0, R_1 = 1, X) + \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) \right] \text{ (By A3, A4)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(0, X) \mu_1^0(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) \right] \text{ (By A2)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combine the two parts, we have

$$\tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = \tau_{1,1} - \tau_{0,1} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^0(X) \right\} = E_{1,1}.$$

Web Appendix A.2 Proof of Theorem 5

We first prove the equivalence of the three identification formulas, then prove the validity of the identification formula (a) in Theorem 5.

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{1,t} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} \right]; \\
E_{2,t} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2A - 1}{e(H_0)^A \{1 - e(H_0)\}^{1-A}} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right]; \\
E_{3,t} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{A}{e(H_0)} R_t Y_t + \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(H_0)} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_t Y_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

To simplify the proof, we first introduce relevant lemmas.

Lemma S1. *Under MAR, the group mean can be identified using the sequential outcome means, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[Y_t\{0, D(0)\}] = \mathbb{E}\{\mu_t^0(H_0)\}$.*

Proof. Similar to the notations in the main text, we define the pattern mean in the control group as $g_{s+1}^0(H_{l-1}) = \mathbb{E}\{\pi_{l+1}(0, H_l) g_{s+1}^0(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, s-1$ with $g_{s+1}^0(H_{s-1}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0\right]$ if we let $\pi_{t+1}(0, H_t) = 0$. Based on the pattern-mixture model (PMM; Little, 1993) framework, we express the potential outcome $Y_t\{0, D(0)\}$ based on its potential dropout pattern as $Y_t\{0, D(0)\} = \sum_{s=1}^{t+1} \mathbb{I}\{D(0) = s\} Y_t(0, s)$ and compute the expectation. For any $s \in \{2, \dots, t+1\}$, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{D(0) = s\} Y_t(0, s)]$ is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}[R_1(0) \cdots R_{s-1}(0) \{1 - R_s(0)\} Y_t(0, s)] \text{ (By the definition of } D) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(R_1(0) \mid H_0) \mathbb{E}[R_2(0) \cdots R_{s-1}(0) \{1 - R_s(0)\} Y_t(0, s) \mid H_0, R_1(0) = 1])
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} (R_1(0) \mid H_0) \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \{R_2(0) \mid H_1, R_1(0) = 1\} \mathbb{E} [R_3(0) \cdots R_{s-1}(0) \{1 - R_s(0)\} Y_t(0, s) \mid H_1, R_2(0) = 1] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mid H_0, R_1(0) = 1 \right) \right\} \\
&= \cdots \text{ (keep using the iterated expectation until the condition is } (H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(0) = 1)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} (R_1(0) \mid H_0) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \cdots \mathbb{E} (\mathbb{E} (R_{s-1}(0) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-2}(0) = 1) \mathbb{E} [\{1 - R_s(0)\} Y_t(0, s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(0) = 1]) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-2}(0) = 1 \mid \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(0) = 1 \right) \right\} \Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} (R_1(0) \mid H_0) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \{R_2(0) \mid H_1, R_1(0) = 1\} \cdots \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \{R_{s-1}(0) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-2}(0) = 1\} \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{1 - R_s(0) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(0) = 1\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_t(0, s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(0) = 1\} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1}(0) = 1] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2}(0) = 1 \right) \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(0) = 1 \right\} \Big] \text{ (By A5, } R_s(0) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_t(0, s) \mid (H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(0) = 1)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} (R_1 \mid H_0, A = 0) \mathbb{E} \left(\cdots \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{R_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 0\} \mathbb{E} \{1 - R_s \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0\} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{E} (Y_t \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0\} \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 0\} \cdots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right) \right\} \text{ (By A6)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(0, H_0) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \pi_2(0, H_1) \cdots \mathbb{E} \left(\pi_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \mathbb{E} [\{1 - \pi_s(0, H_{s-1})\} \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0] \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 0 \right) \cdots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right\} \Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E} (\pi_1(0, H_0) \mathbb{E} [\cdots \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) g_s^0(H_{s-2}) \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 0\} \cdots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0]) \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(0, H_0) g_s^0(H_0)] \text{ (By the definition of the pattern mean).}
\end{aligned}$$

When $s = 1$, using the same calculation technique, we have $\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I} \{D(0) = s\} Y_t(0, s)] = \mathbb{E} [\{1 - \pi_1(0, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0)]$. Note that under MAR, $\sum_{s=1}^t \pi_1(0, H_0) g_{s+1}^0(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(0, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) = \mu_t^0(H_0)$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma S1 validates the equivalence in identifying the potential outcome mean $\mathbb{E} [Y_t\{0, D(0)\}]$ between our proposed framework under J2R and the existing methods under MAR, in the sense that one can use the sequential regression model $\mu_t^0(H_0)$ to estimate the control group mean.

Lemma S2. *The propensity score ratio $\delta(H_s)$ have the following expression:*

$$\delta(H_s) = \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \prod_{j=1}^s \frac{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)}.$$

Proof. For any $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} &= \frac{f(Y_j, A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)/f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)}{f(Y_j, A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)/f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)} \quad (\text{conditional probability}) \\
&= \frac{f(A = 1 | H_j, R_j = 1)f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)/f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)}{f(A = 0 | H_j, R_j = 1)f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)/f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)} \\
&= \frac{f(A = 1 | H_j, R_j = 1)/f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)}{f(A = 0 | H_j, R_j = 1)/f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)} \\
&= \frac{f(A = 1 | H_j, R_j = 1)/f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}{f(A = 0 | H_j, R_j = 1)/f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)} \frac{\pi_j(0, H_{j-1})}{\pi_j(1, H_{j-1})}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds since

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)}{f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1)} &= \frac{f(A = 0, R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)/f(R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}{f(A = 1, R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)/f(R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)} \\
&= \frac{f(A = 0, R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}{f(A = 1, R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)} \\
&= \frac{f(R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}{f(R_j = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)} \\
&= \frac{\pi_j(0, H_{j-1})}{\pi_j(1, H_{j-1})} \frac{f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}{f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the cumulative product for j from 1 to s , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j=1}^s \frac{f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} &= \prod_{j=1}^s \frac{f(A = 1 | H_j, R_j = 1)/f(A = 1 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)}{f(A = 0 | H_j, R_j = 1)/f(A = 0 | H_{j-1}, R_{j-1} = 1)} \frac{\pi_j(0, H_{j-1})}{\pi_j(1, H_{j-1})} \\
&= \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \frac{f(A = 1 | H_s, R_s = 1)/f(A = 1 | H_0)}{f(A = 0 | H_s, R_s = 1)/f(A = 0 | H_0)} \\
&= \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \delta(H_s),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

We proceed to prove for the equivalence of the three identification formulas. Note that $E_{1,t} = E_{2,t}$ holds since $E \left[A \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} / e(H_0) \right]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E \left[\frac{A}{e(H_0)} E \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \mid A = 1 \right\} \right] \\
&= E \left(\frac{A}{e(H_0)} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] \right) \quad (\text{follow the proof in Lemma S1}) \\
&= E \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, follow the proof in Lemma S1,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1-R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} = \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \}.$$

Then, we have $E_{2,t} = \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] = E_{1,t}$.

Also note that $E_{1,t} = E_{3,t}$ holds since for the first term in $E_{3,t}$, $\mathbb{E} \{ A R_t Y_t / e(H_0) \} = \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) \}$.

We focus on the second term and consider separate it into two components:

$$= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) \right] \frac{R_t Y_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right) - \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \frac{R_t Y_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right\}.$$

The second component can be easily obtained using the similar strategy in Lemma S1, which results in $\mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \}$. For the first components, apply Lemma S2, for $s \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) \frac{R_t Y_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) \frac{R_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \mathbb{E}(Y_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_t = 1, A = 0) \right] \\ &= \dots \text{ (keep using the iterated expectation, conditional on } H_{t-2}, \dots, H_{s-1} \text{ in backward order)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2}) \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \prod_{j=1}^{s-2} \frac{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \frac{f(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0)} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0 \right] \right) \text{ (Lemma S2)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2}) \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \prod_{j=1}^{s-2} \frac{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} g_s^1(H_{s-2}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-2}(1, H_{s-3}) \frac{R_{s-2}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-2}(0, H_{s-3})} \prod_{j=1}^{s-3} \frac{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathbb{E} \left\{ \pi_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2}) g_s^1(H_{s-2}) \frac{f(Y_{s-2} \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{s-2} \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 0)} \mid H_{s-3}, R_{s-2} = 1, A = 0 \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{s-2}(1, H_{s-3}) \frac{R_{s-2}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-2}(0, H_{s-3})} \prod_{j=1}^{s-3} \frac{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j \mid H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} g_s^1(H_{s-3}) \right\} \\ &= \dots \text{ (keep using the iterated expectation, conditional on } H_{s-4}, \dots, H_0 \text{ in backward order)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_s^1(H_0) \}. \end{aligned}$$

For $s = 1$, use the same technique and can get $\mathbb{E} [\{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0)]$. Combine those components,

we have

$$E_{3,t} = E \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] = E_{1,t}.$$

We proceed to prove the validity of the identification formula (a) in Theorem 5. Denote $\tau_{1,t} = E[Y_t\{1, D(1)\}]$ and $\tau_{0,t} = E[Y_t\{0, D(0)\}]$. For the first part of the identification formula (a) in Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{1,t} &= E \left[\sum_{s=1}^{t+1} \mathbb{I}\{D(1) = s\} Y_t(1, s) \right] \\ &= E \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{I}\{D(1) = s\} Y_t(1, s) + \mathbb{I}\{D(1) = t+1\} Y_t(1, t+1) \right] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^t E[R_1(1) \cdots R_{s-1}(1) \{1 - R_s(1)\} Y_t(1, s)] + E[R_1(1) \cdots R_t(1) Y_t(1, t+1)] \quad (\text{By the definition of } D). \end{aligned}$$

For $s \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, $E[R_1(1) \cdots R_{s-1}(1) \{1 - R_s(1)\} Y_t(1, s)]$ can be computed by iterative expectations as

$$\begin{aligned} &= E(E\{R_1(1) \mid H_0\} E[R_2(1) \cdots R_{s-1}(1) \{1 - R_s(1)\} Y_t(1, s) \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1]) \\ &= E \left\{ E\{R_1(1) \mid H_0\} E \left(E\{R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. E[R_3(1) \cdots R_{s-1}(1) \{1 - R_s(1)\} Y_t(1, s) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1] \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1 \right) \right\} \\ &= \dots \quad (\text{keep using the iterated expectation, use similar steps in the proof of Lemma S1}) \\ &= E \left\{ E\{R_1(1) \mid H_0\} E \left(E\{R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1\} \cdots E \left[E\{1 - R_s(1) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(1) = 1\} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. E\{Y_t(1, s) \mid H_{s-1}, D(1) = s\} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1}(1) = 1 \right] \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1 \right) \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ E\{R_1(1) \mid H_0\} E \left(E\{R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1\} \cdots E \left[E\{1 - R_s(1) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(1) = 1\} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1}(1) = 1 \right] \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1 \right) \right\} \quad (\text{By A8}) \\ &= E \left\{ E\{R_1(1) \mid H_0, A = 1\} E \left(E\{R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1\} \cdots E \left[E\{1 - R_s(1) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}(1) = 1, A = 1\} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1}(1) = 1, A = 1 \right] \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1 \right) \right\} \quad (\text{By A5}) \\ &= E \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) E(\pi_2(1, H_0) \cdots E[\{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1] \cdots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1) \} \end{aligned}$$

(By A7)

$$= \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_s^1(H_0) \} \quad (\text{By the definition of the pattern mean}).$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{E} \{ R_1(1) \cdots R_t(1) Y_t(1, t+1) \}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{ R_1(1) \mid H_0 \} \mathbb{E} \{ R_2(1) \cdots R_t(1) Y_t(1, t+1) \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1 \}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \{ R_1(1) \mid H_0 \} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1 \} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{E} \{ R_3(1) \cdots R_t(1) Y_t(1, t+1) \mid H_1, R_2(1) = 1 \} \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1 \right] \right) \\ &= \cdots \quad (\text{keep using the iterated expectation, use similar steps in the proof of Lemma S1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \{ R_1(1) \mid H_0 \} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \{ R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1 \} \cdots \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ R_t(1) \mid H_{t-1}, R_{t-1}(1) = 1 \} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{E} \{ Y_t(1, t+1) \mid H_{t-1}, D(1) = t+1 \} \mid H_{t-2}, R_{t-1}(1) = 1 \right] \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1 \right) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \{ R_1(1) \mid H_0, A = 1 \} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \{ R_2(1) \mid H_1, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1 \} \cdots \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ R_t(1) \mid H_{t-1}, R_{t-1}(1) = 1, A = 1 \} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{E} \{ Y_t(1, t+1) \mid H_{t-1}, D(1) = t+1, A = 1 \} \mid H_{t-2}, R_{t-1}(1) = 1, A = 1 \right] \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1 \right) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} (R_1 \mid H_0, A = 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} (R_2 \mid H_1, R_1 = 1, A = 1) \cdots \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{E} (R_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_{t-1} = 1, A = 1) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \mathbb{E} (Y_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_t = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{t-2}, R_{t-1} = 1, A = 1 \} \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1 \right] \right) \quad (\text{By A7}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} (\pi_1(1, H_0) \mathbb{E} [\pi_2(1, H_1) \cdots \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_t(1, H_{t-1}) \mu_t^1(H_{t-1}) \mid H_{t-2}, R_{t-1} = 1, A = 1 \} \cdots \mid H_0, R_1(1) = 1, A = 1]) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) \}. \end{aligned}$$

When $s = 1$, we have $\mathbb{E} [\{ 1 - R_s(1) \} Y_t(1, 1)]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{ 1 - R_1(1) \mid H_0 \} \mathbb{E} \{ Y_t(1, 1) \mid H_0, D(1) = 0 \}] &= \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{E} (1 - R_1 \mid H_0, A = 1) \mu_t^0(H_0) \} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\{ 1 - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \mu_t^0(H_0)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\tau_{1,t} = \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{ 1 - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right]$. For the second part, by Lemma S1 we know that $\tau_{0,t} = \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \}$. Combine the two parts, we have

$$\tau_t^{\text{J2R}} = \tau_{1,t} - \tau_{0,t} = \mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{ 1 - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \mu_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] = E_{1,t}.$$

Web Appendix A.3 Interpretations of Theorem 5

We give some intuition of the identification formulas in the longitudinal setting. Theorem 5 (a) describes the treatment effect in terms of the response probability and pattern mean. Under J2R, if the individual in the treatment group is not fully observed, we would expect its missing outcome will follow the same outcome model as the control group with the same missing pattern given the observed data. The treatment group mean is then expressed as the weighted sum over the missing patterns as $\mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right]$ under the PMM framework. For the control group, the group mean is $\mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \}$ under MAR.

Theorem 5 (b) describes the treatment effect as the difference in means between the treatment and control groups over the missing patterns, in terms of the propensity score and outcome mean. Similar to the cross-sectional setting, after adjusting for the covariate balance with the use of propensity score weights, the outcomes at the last time point are combinations of the observed outcomes and the conditional outcome means given the observed data, distinguished by distinct dropout patterns.

Theorem 5 (c) describes the treatment effect over the missing patterns in terms of the propensity score and response probability. The first term $AR_t Y_t / e(H_0)$ characterizes the participants who stay in the assigned treatment throughout the entire study period identified by R_t after the adjustment for the group difference by $A/e(H_0)$, which is parallel to $\mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) \}$ in Theorem 5 (a). The transformed outcome $(1 - A)R_t Y_t / [\{1 - e(H_0)\} \bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})]$ measures the outcome mean $\mu_t^0(H_0)$ given the baseline covariates, for the participants who complete the trial in the control group. Notice that

$$\delta(H_{s-1}) = \frac{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \prod_{l=1}^{s-1} \frac{f(Y_l \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_l \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0)}$$

is the cumulative product of the density ratios of the current outcome given the observed historical information, multiplied by a ratio of the cumulative response probability in the treatment and control group. Therefore, with the transformed outcome involved, the term $\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1})$ implicitly shifts the participants with the same observed information, who drop out at time s in the treatment group, to the control group, which matches $\mathbb{E} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_s^1(H_0) \}$ when $s = 2, \dots, t$ and $\mathbb{E} [\{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0)]$ when $s = 1$ after marginalizing the history. Therefore, the second term in the identification formula is equivalent to $\mathbb{E} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} g_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} \right]$ in Theorem 5 (a).

Web Appendix B Proof of the EIFs

Let $V = (X, A, R_1 Y_1, R_1, \dots, R_t Y_t, R_t)$ with $R_0 = 1$ be the vector of all observed variables with the likelihood factorized as

$$f(V) = f(X)f(A | X) \prod_{s=1}^t \{f(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A)f(R_s | H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A)\} \quad (S1)$$

We will use the semiparametric theory in Bickel et al. (1993) to derive the EIF of τ_t^{J2R} . To derive the EIFs, we consider a one-dimensional parametric submodel, $f_\theta(V)$, which contains the true model $f(V)$ at $\theta = 0$, i.e., $f_\theta(V)|_{\theta=0} = f(V)$, where θ consists of the nuisance model parameters. We use θ in the subscript to denote the quantity evaluated with respect to the submodel, e.g., $\mu_{t,\theta}^a$ is the value of μ_t^a with respect to the submodel. We use dot to denote the partial derivative with respect to θ , e.g., $\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^a = \partial \mu_t^a / \partial \theta$, and use $s(\cdot)$ to denote the score function. From formula (S1), the score function of the observed data can be decomposed as

$$s_\theta(V) = s_\theta(X) + s_\theta(A | X) + \sum_{s=1}^t \{s_\theta(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A) + s_\theta(R_s | H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A)\},$$

where $s_\theta(X) = \partial \log f_\theta(X) / \partial \theta$, $s_\theta(A | X) = \partial \log P_\theta(A | X) / \partial \theta$, $s_\theta(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A) = \partial \log f_\theta(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A) / \partial \theta$, and $s_\theta(R_s | H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A) = \partial \log P_\theta(R_s | H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A) / \partial \theta$ are the score functions corresponding to the $(2t + 2)$ components of the likelihood. Because $f_\theta(V)|_{\theta=0} = f(V)$, we can simplify $s_\theta(\cdot)|_{\theta=0}$ as $s(\cdot)$.

From the semiparametric theory, the tangent space

$$\Lambda = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus B_{3,1} \oplus B_{4,1} \oplus \dots \oplus B_{3,t} \oplus B_{4,t}$$

is the direct sum of

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \{u(X) : E\{u(X)\} = 0\}, \\ B_2 &= \{u(A, X) : E\{u(A, X) | X\} = 0\}, \\ B_{3,s} &= \{u(H_s, A) : E\{u(H_s, A) | A, H_{s-1}\} = 0\}, \\ B_{4,s} &= \{u(R_s, A, H_{s-1}) : E\{u(R_s, A, H_{s-1}) | A, H_{s-1}\} = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

for $s = 1, \dots, t$, where B_1 , B_2 , $B_{3,s}$ and $B_{4,s}$ are orthogonal to each other, and $u(\cdot)$ is some functions.

The EIF for τ_t^{J2R} , denoted by $\varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbb{P}) \in \Lambda$, must satisfy

$$\dot{\tau}_{t,\theta}^{\text{J2R}}|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E}\{\varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbb{P})s(V)\}.$$

We will derive the EIFs in both cross-sectional and longitudinal settings. To simplify the proof, we first provide some lemmas with their proofs.

Lemma S3. *For any function $u(V)$ that does not depend on θ , $\partial \mathbb{E}_\theta \{u(V)\} / \partial \theta|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E} \{u(V)s(V)\}$.*

Proof. By the definition

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_\theta \{u(V)\}}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \int u(V) f_\theta(V) d\nu(V) \Big|_{\theta=0} \\ &= \int u(V) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_\theta(V) \Big|_{\theta=0} f(V) d\nu(V) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{u(V)s(V)\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma S4. *For $s = 1, \dots, t$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\pi}_{s,\theta}(1, H_{s-1}) \Big|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{R_s - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right], \\ \dot{\pi}_{s,\theta}(0, H_{s-1}) \Big|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \{R_s - \pi_s(0, H_{s-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\pi}_{s,\theta}(1, H_{s-1}) \Big|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta (R_s \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1) \Big|_{\theta=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{R_s s(R_s \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1\} \text{ (by Lemma S3)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\{R_s - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} s(R_s \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{R_s - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} s(R_s \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1}, A) \mid H_{s-1} \right] \text{ (by Bayes' rule)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{R_s - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds since $B_{3,s'}, B_{4,s'}$ for $s' > s$ are orthogonal to the spaces $B_1, B_2, B_{3,1}, B_{4,1}, \dots, B_{3,s}, B_{4,s}$.

Similarly, we can prove the result for $\dot{\pi}_{s,\theta}(0, H_{s-1}) \Big|_{\theta=0}$. □

Lemma S5. For $s = 1, \dots, t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^1(H_{t-1})|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(1, H_{t-1})} \{Y_t - \mu_t^1(H_{t-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{t-1} \right], \\ \dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=s}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{\mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{S2})$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^1(H_{t-1})|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta(Y_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_t = 1, A = 1)|_{\theta=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{Y_t s(Y_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_t = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{t-1}, R_t = 1, A = 1\} \quad (\text{by Lemma S3}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(1, H_{t-1})} Y_t s(Y_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_t = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{t-1} \right\} \quad (\text{by Bayes' rule}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(1, H_{t-1})} \{Y_t - \mu_t^1(H_{t-1})\} s(Y_t \mid H_{t-1}, R_t, A) \mid H_{t-1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(1, H_{t-1})} \{Y_t - \mu_t^1(H_{t-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{t-1} \right].\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds by the orthogonality of the spaces.

For the condition involves $A = 0$, we prove it by induction in backward order since it involves iteratively taking the derivative with respect to θ .

For $s = t$, we can obtain $\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_{t-1})|_{\theta=0}$ using the similar procedure as the one involves $A = 1$, and get

$$\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_{t-1})|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_t}{\bar{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \{Y_t - \mu_t^0(H_{t-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{t-1} \right],$$

which matches the right hand side of Equation (S2) when $s = t$.

Suppose Equation (S2) holds at time $(s+1)$ when $s < t$, i.e.,

$$\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_s)|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{\mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1})\} s(V) \mid H_s \right].$$

Then for the time point s , based on the sequential expression of $\mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) = \mathbb{E}\{\mu_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_s)|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} |_{\theta=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{ \dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_s)|_{\theta=0} \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) s(Y_t \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \} \quad (\text{by chain rule}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{\mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1})\} s(V) \mid H_s \right] \mid H_{s-1} \right)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} s(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s, A) | H_{s-1} \right) \text{ (by Bayes' rule)} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} s(V) | H_{s-1} \right] \text{ (by double expectation)} \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} s(V) | H_{s-1} \right) \text{ (by orthogonality)} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=s}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} s(V) | H_{s-1} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Denote the marginal mean for the longitudinal outcomes at the last time point in the control group as $\tau_{0,t}$, i.e., $\tau_{0,t} = \mathbb{E}[Y_t^{\text{J2R}}\{0, D(0)\}]$. Under J2R, the missing values in the control group is MAR. The following lemma provides the EIF for the control group mean $\tau_{0,t}$ under MAR.

Lemma S6. *Under MAR, the EIF for $\tau_{0,t}$ is*

$$\varphi_{0,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) = \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{s=1}^t \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} + \mu_t^0(H_0) - \tau_{0,t}.$$

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 5, $\tau_{0,t} = \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\tau}_{0,t,\theta}|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \} |_{\theta=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \{ \dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_0) |_{\theta=0} \} + \mathbb{E} \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) s(H_0) \} \text{ (by chain rule)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} s(V) | H_0 \right] \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} [\{ \mu_t^0(H_0) - \tau_{0,t} \} s(V)] \text{ (by Lemma S5 and orthogonality)} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{k=1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} + \mu_t^0(H_0) - \tau_{0,t} \right] s(V) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the proof is completed by the definition of the EIF as $\dot{\tau}_{0,t,\theta}|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E} \{ \varphi_{0,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) s(V) \}$. \square

To proceed the proof in the longitudinal setting, we give the following lemma for $\dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_{l-1})|_{\theta=0}$ when $l = 1, \dots, s-1$ and $s = 1, \dots, t$.

Lemma S7. *For any $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, when $l = 1, \dots, s-1$, we have*

$$\dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_{l-1})|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_l}{\bar{\pi}_l(1, H_{l-1})} [R_s \{1 - R_{s+1}\} \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})] \right) \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \prod_{j=l+1}^s \pi_j(0, H_{j-1}) \frac{f(Y_{j-1} | H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{j-1} | H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)} D_{s+1} \Big) s(V) | H_{l-1} \Big\}, \\
\dot{g}_{s+1, \theta}^1(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{ (1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) \} + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} D_{s+1} \right] s(V) | H_{s-1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where for the simplicity of notations, we denote

$$D_{s+1} := \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \frac{f(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0)} \left[\sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} \right],$$

and let $D_{t+1} = 0$.

Proof. We first compute $\dot{g}_{s+1, \theta}^1(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0}$, and use the iterated relationship $g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) = \mathbb{E}\{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) g_{s+1}^1(H_l) | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\}$ for $l = 1, \dots, s-1$ and proceed by induction in backward order beginning from $l = s-1$ to get $\dot{g}_{s+1, \theta}^1(H_{l-1})|_{\theta=0}$. For $\dot{g}_{s+1, \theta}^1(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{g}_{s+1, \theta}^1(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right] |_{\theta=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[-\dot{\pi}_{s+1, \theta}(1, H_s) |_{\theta=0} \mu_t^0(H_s) | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \dot{\mu}_{t, \theta}^0(H_s) |_{\theta=0} | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) s(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1) | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(-\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{R_{s+1} - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) s(V) | H_s \right] | H_{s-1} \right) \text{ (Lemma S4)} \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. s(V) | H_s \right] | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right) \text{ (Lemma S5)} \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) s(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s, A) | H_{s-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{R_{s+1} - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) s(V) | H_{s-1} \right] \text{ (by double expectation)} \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. s(V) | H_s \right] \frac{f(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_s | H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0)} | H_{s-1} \right) \text{ (by definition of expectation)} \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) \} s(V) | H_{s-1} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{R_{s+1} - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \mu_t^0(H_s) s(V) | H_{s-1} \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} D_{s+1} s(V) | H_{s-1} \right\} \text{ (by double expectation)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \{\mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right],$$

which completes the proof of the first part regarding $\dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0}$.

For the second part of the proof, we derive it by induction backward starting from $l = s - 1$. For $l = s - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_{s-2})|_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1] |_{\theta=0} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\dot{\pi}_{s,\theta}(1, H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0} g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} [\pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) \dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_{s-1})|_{\theta=0} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} [\pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) s(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{R_s - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right] \mid H_{s-2} \right) \quad (\text{Lemma S4}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right] \mid H_{s-2} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) D_{s+1} s(V) \mid H_{s-1} \right\} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) s(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1}, A) \mid H_{s-2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{R_s - \pi_s(1, H_{s-1})\} g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) s(V) \mid H_{s-2} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})} \pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-2} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) \frac{f(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0)} D_{s+1} s(V) \mid H_{s-2} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{\pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-1}) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-2})\} s(V) \mid H_{s-2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{s-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})} \{R_s (1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{s-2})\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \pi_s(1, H_{s-1}) \frac{f(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{s-1} \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0)} D_{s+1} \right] s(V) \mid H_{s-2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

matches the right hand side when $l = s - 1$. Suppose the equality holds for $(l + 1)$ when $l < s - 2$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_l)|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_{l+1}}{\bar{\pi}_{l+1}(1, H_l)} \{R_s (1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_l)\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \prod_{j=l+2}^s \pi_j(0, H_{j-1}) \frac{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)} D_{s+1} s(V) \mid H_l \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then for l , we apply chain rule on the iterated formula:

$$\dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_{l-1})|_{\theta=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta \{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) g_{s+1}^1(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\} |_{\theta=0}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}\{\dot{\pi}_{l+1,\theta}(1, H_l)|_{\theta=0} g_{s+1}^1(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\} \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) \dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_l)|_{\theta=0} \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\} \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) g_{s+1}^1(H_l) s(Y_l \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_l}{\bar{\pi}_l(1, H_{l-1})} \{R_{l+1} - \pi_{l+1}(1, H_l)\} g_{s+1}^1(H_l) s(V) \mid H_{l-1}\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_l}{\bar{\pi}_l(1, H_{l-1})} \{R_s(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_l)\} s(V) \mid H_{l-1}\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) \prod_{j=l+2}^s \pi_j(0, H_{j-1}) \frac{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. D_{s+1} s(V) \mid H_l\right\} \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_l}{\bar{\pi}_l(1, H_{s-1})} \{\pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) g_{s+1}^1(H_l) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{l-1}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_l}{\bar{\pi}_l(1, H_{l-1})} \{R_s(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{l-1}\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \pi_{l+1}(1, H_l) \prod_{j=l+2}^s \pi_j(0, H_{j-1}) \frac{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. D_{s+1} s(V) \mid H_l\right\} \frac{f(Y_{l-1} \mid H_{l-2}, R_{l-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{l-1} \mid H_{l-2}, R_{l-1} = 1, A = 0)} \mid H_{l-1}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_l}{\bar{\pi}_l(1, H_{l-1})} \{R_s(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1})\} s(V) \mid H_{l-1}\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \prod_{j=l+1}^s \pi_j(0, H_{j-1}) \frac{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)} D_{s+1} s(V) \mid H_{l-1}\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

completes the proof. \square

From Lemma S7, we proceed to obtain $\partial \mathbb{E}_\theta \{\pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0)\} / \partial \theta|_{\theta=0}$ in the following lemma.

Lemma S8. *For any $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_\theta \{\pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0)\}}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=0} = \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \{R_s(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0)\} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) W_{s+1} + \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0)\right] s(V)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

where $W_{s+1} = \sum_{k=s+1}^t R_k \{\mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1})\} / \bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})$ and $W_{t+1} = 0$.

Proof. Lemma S7 implies that when $l = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_0)|_{\theta=0} &= \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(1, H_0)} \{R_s(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - g_{s+1}^1(H_0)\} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \prod_{j=2}^s \pi_j(0, H_{j-1}) \frac{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{j-1} \mid H_{j-2}, R_{j-1} = 1, A = 0)} D_{s+1}\right] s(V) \mid H_0\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have $\partial E_\theta \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \} / \partial \theta|_{\theta=0}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= E \{ \dot{\pi}_{1,\theta}(1, H_0) |_{\theta=0} g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \} + E \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) \dot{g}_{s+1,\theta}^1(H_0) |_{\theta=0} \} \\
&\quad + E \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) s(H_0) \} \\
&= E \left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \{ R_s(1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1}) \{ 1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s) \} W_{s+1} \prod_{j=1}^s \frac{f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0)} \right] s(V) \right) \\
&\quad + E \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) s(V) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\delta(H_s) = \prod_{j=1}^s \{ f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 1) / f(Y_j | H_{j-1}, R_j = 1, A = 0) \} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) / \bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})$ by Lemma S2, which completes the proof. \square

Web Appendix B.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We compute the EIF by rewriting the identification formula in Theorem 1 (a) as $\tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = \tau_{1,1} - \tau_{0,1}$, where $\tau_{1,1} = E [\pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X)]$ and $\tau_{0,1} = E \{ \mu_1^0(X) \}$ based on the proof in Web Appendix A.1. By Lemma S6,

$$\varphi_{0,1}(V; \mathbb{P}) = \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X)} \{ Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X) \} + \mu_1^0(X) - \tau_{0,1}.$$

We proceed to compute $\dot{\tau}_{1,1,\theta} |_{\theta=0}$. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\tau}_{1,1,\theta} |_{\theta=0} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} E_\theta [\pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X)] |_{\theta=0} \\
&= E \{ \dot{\pi}_{1,\theta}(1, X) |_{\theta=0} \mu_1^1(X) + \pi_1(1, X) \dot{\mu}_{1,\theta}^1(X) |_{\theta=0} + \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) s(X) \} \\
&\quad + E [-\dot{\pi}_{1,\theta}(1, X) |_{\theta=0} \mu_1^0(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \dot{\mu}_{1,\theta}^0(X) |_{\theta=0} + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) s(X)] \\
&= E \left(E \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \{ R_1 - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} s(V) | X \right] \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma S4}) \\
&\quad + E \left(E \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(1, X)} \pi_1(1, X) \{ Y_1 - \mu_1^1(X) \} s(V) | X \right] \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma S5}) \\
&\quad + E \left(E \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X)} \{ 1 - \pi_1(1, X) \} \{ Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X) \} s(V) | X \right] \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma S5}) \\
&\quad + E ([\pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) - \tau_{1,1}] s(V)) \quad (\text{by orthogonality}) \\
&= E \left(\left[\frac{A}{e(X)} R_1 + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X)} \{ 1 - \pi_1(1, X) \} \right] \{ Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X) \} s(V) \right) \\
&\quad + E \left(\left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) \} - \frac{A}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, H_0) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} - \tau_{1,1} \right] s(V) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can get $\varphi_{1,1}(V; \mathbb{P})$ based on the definition of the EIF as $\dot{\tau}_{1,1,\theta}|_{\theta=0} = E\{\varphi_{1,1}(V; \mathbb{P})s(V)\}$.

The EIF of τ_1^{J2R} can then be obtained:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_1^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbb{P}) &= \varphi_{1,1}(V; \mathbb{P}) - \varphi_{0,1}(V; \mathbb{P}) \\ &= \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} R_1 + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X)} \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \right] \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} \\ &\quad + \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) \} - \frac{A}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, H_0) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} - \tau_{1,1} \\ &\quad - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X)} \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \mu_1^0(X) + \tau_{0,1} \\ &= \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{e(X)} \right\} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}}.\end{aligned}$$

Web Appendix B.2 Proof of Theorem 6

We compute the EIF based on the identification formula in Theorem 5 (a) as $\tau_t^{\text{J2R}} = \tau_{1,t} - \tau_{0,t}$, where $\tau_{1,t} = E \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right]$ and $\tau_{0,t} = E \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) \}$ based on the proof in Web Appendix A.2. By Lemma S6, we can obtain $\varphi_{0,t}(V; \mathbb{P})$. We only need to calculate the EIF for $\tau_{1,t}$. Note that for any $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $\partial E_\theta \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \} / \partial \theta|_{\theta=0}$ is obtained by Lemma S8. The part $\partial E_\theta \{ [1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)] \mu_t^0(H_0) \} / \partial \theta|_{\theta=0}$ can be derived using chain rule and Lemmas S4 and S5 as

$$\begin{aligned}\left. \frac{E_\theta \{ [1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)] \mu_t^0(H_0) \}}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=0} &= E \{ -\dot{\pi}_{1,\theta}(1, H_0)|_{\theta=0} \mu_t^0(H_0) \} + E \{ [1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)] \dot{\mu}_{t,\theta}^0(H_0)|_{\theta=0} \} \\ &\quad + E \{ [1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)] \mu_t^0(H_0) s(H_0) \} \\ &= E \left(\left[-\frac{A}{e(X)} \{ R_1 - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \mu_t^0(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] s(V) \right) \\ &\quad + E \{ [1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)] \varphi_{0,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) s(V) \}.\end{aligned}$$

Combine all terms together and by the definition of the EIF, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{1,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) &= \frac{A}{e(X)} \sum_{s=0}^t R_s (1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - \frac{A}{e(X)} \sum_{s=1}^t \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) W_{s+1} \text{ (since } D_{t+1} = 0) \\ &\quad + \pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \varphi_{0,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) + \mu_t^0(H_0) - \tau_{1,t}.\end{aligned}$$

Apply Lemma S6, the EIF $\varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbb{P})$ of τ_t^{J2R} is

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbb{P}) &= \varphi_{1,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) - \varphi_{0,t}(V; \mathbb{P}) \\
&= \frac{A}{e(X)} \sum_{s=0}^t R_s (1 - R_{s+1}) \mu_t^0(H_s) - \frac{A}{e(X)} \sum_{s=1}^t \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) W_{s+1} \\
&\quad + \pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \varphi_{0,t}(V; P) + \mu_t^0(H_0) - \tau_t^{\text{J2R}} \\
&= \frac{A}{e(X)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} - \tau_t^{\text{J2R}} \\
&\quad + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{e(X)} \right\} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] - \mu_t^0(H_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) W_{s+1} + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} W_1 - W_1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Simplify the last term, note that $\sum_{s=1}^t \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) W_{s+1} + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} W_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) \sum_{k=s+1}^t \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(0, H_s)\} \delta(H_s) \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} \quad (\text{change the order of } k \text{ and } s) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_{s=1}^k \bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \pi_s(0, H_{s-1})\} \delta(H_{s-1}) \frac{R_k}{\bar{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_k) - \mu_t^0(H_{k-1}) \} \quad (\text{change } s \text{ to } s+1) \\
&= \sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \pi_k(0, H_{k-1})\} \delta(H_{k-1}) \right] \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \quad (\text{interchange } k \text{ and } s).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the last term becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \pi_k(0, H_{k-1})\} \delta(H_{k-1}) \right] \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} - W_1 \right) \\
&= \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \pi_k(0, H_{k-1})\} \delta(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the EIF $\varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbb{P})$ of τ_t^{J2R}

$$= \frac{A}{e(X)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} - \tau_t^{\text{J2R}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{e(X)} \right\} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t g_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \mu_t^0(H_0) \right] - \mu_t^0(H_0) \\
& + \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \pi_k(0, H_{k-1})\} \delta(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \mu_t^0(H_s) - \mu_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which matches the expression given in Theorem 6.

Web Appendix C Estimation

Web Appendix C.1 Normalized estimators motivated from Theorem 1

We give the normalized version of the ps-om and ps-rp estimators in cross-sectional studies below.

Example 3. The normalized version of the ps-om and ps-rp estimators are as follows:

1. The normalized ps-om estimator:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}} = & P_n \left[\frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \left\{ R_1 Y_1 + (1 - R_1) \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right] / P_n \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\} \\
& - P_n \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \left\{ R_1 Y_1 + (1 - R_1) \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right] / P_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The normalized estimator is consistent under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+om}}$.

2. The normalized ps-rp estimator:

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}} = P_n \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} R_1 Y_1 \right\} / P_n \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\} - P_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} R_1 Y_1 \right\} / P_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\}.$$

The normalized estimator is consistent under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+rp}}$.

Web Appendix C.2 EIF-based estimators motivated from Theorem 2

We provide the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ and its normalized estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}}$ in the cross-sectional studies as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} = & \mathbb{P}_n \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\} R_1 \left\{ Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{A-e(X; \hat{\alpha})}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \left\{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}} &= \mathbb{P}_n \left(\frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \left[R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right] \right) / \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n \left[\frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} \right] / \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{R_1}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}_n \left[\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

One can conduct calibration to further reduce the impact of the outliers as introduced in the main text. The calibration-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$ is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}} &= \mathbb{P}_n \left(A w_{a_1} \left[R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right] \right) / \mathbb{P}_n (A w_{a_1}) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n \left[(1-A) R_1 w_{a_0} w_{r_1} \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} \right] / \mathbb{P}_n \{ (1-A) R_1 w_{a_0} w_{r_1} \} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n \left[\pi_1(1, X_i; \hat{\gamma}) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Web Appendix C.3 Normalized estimators motivated from Theorem 5

We give the normalized version of the ps-om and ps-rp estimators in the longitudinal setting below.

Example 4. The normalized version of the ps-om and ps-rp estimators are as follows:

1. The normalized ps-om estimator:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}} &= \mathbb{P}_n \left[\frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right] / \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n \left[\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right] / \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

2. The normalized ps-rp estimator:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}} &= \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} R_t Y_t \right\} / \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n \left(\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \hat{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{s-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_t Y_t}{\hat{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right) \\
&\quad / \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{R_t}{\hat{\pi}_t(0, H_{t-1})} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Web Appendix C.4 Estimation procedure in the longitudinal setting

We consider the case when $t = 2$, and give detailed steps to estimate $\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}}$, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$ as an example for a straightforward illustration. Extend the estimation procedure to the setting when $t > 2$

is straightforward. Based on Example 2 (a) in the main text,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}} = P_n \Big\{ & \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \Big(\hat{E} \left\{ \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \hat{\mu}_2^1(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \right\} \\ & + \hat{E} \left[\{1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1)\} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \right] - \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0) \right) \Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

The steps of estimating the rp-pm estimator when $t = 2$ are summarized as follows:

Step 1. For subjects with $R_2 = 1$, obtain the fitted outcome mean $\hat{\mu}_2^a(H_1)$ for $a = 0, 1$.

Step 2. For subjects with $R_1 = 1$, obtain the following estimated nuisance functions:

- (a) The estimated pattern mean $\hat{g}_2^1(H_0), \hat{g}_3^1(H_0)$: Fit $g_2^1(H_0) = E \left[\{1 - \pi_2(1, H_1)\} \mu_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \right]$ and $g_3^1(H_0) = E \left\{ \pi_2(1, H_1) \mu_2^1(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \right\}$ using the predicted values $\{1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1)\} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1)$ and $\hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \hat{\mu}_2^1(H_1)$ against H_0 in the group with $R_1 = 1$ and $A = 1$, respectively.
- (b) The estimated response probability $\hat{\pi}_2(a, H_1)$.
- (c) The estimated outcome mean $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0)$: Fit $\mu_2^0(H_0) = E \left\{ \mu_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right\}$ using the predicted values $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1)$ against H_0 in the group with $R_1 = 1$ and $A = 0$.

Step 3. For all the subjects, obtain the estimated response probability $\hat{\pi}_1(a, H_1)$.

Step 4. Get $\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-pm}}$ by the empirical average.

Based on Example 2 (b) in the main text,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}} = P_n \left[\frac{2A - 1}{\hat{e}(X)^A \{1 - \hat{e}(X)\}^{1-A}} \left\{ R_2 Y_2 + R_1 (1 - R_2) \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) + (1 - R_1) \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0) \right\} \right].$$

The steps of estimating the ps-om estimator are as follows:

Step 1. For subjects with $R_2 = 1$, obtain the fitted outcome mean model $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1)$.

Step 2. For subjects with $R_1 = 1$, obtain the fitted outcome mean model $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0)$, by fitting $\mu_2^0(H_0) = E \left\{ \mu_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right\}$ using the predicted values $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1)$ against H_0 in the group with $R_1 = 1$ and $A = 0$.

Step 3. For all the subjects, obtain the fitted propensity score model $\hat{e}(X)$.

Step 4. Get $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$ by the empirical average.

Based on Example 2 (c) in the main text,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}} = P_n \left(\frac{A}{\hat{e}(X)} R_2 Y_2 + \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(X)} \left[\hat{\pi}_1(0, H_0) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1)\} \hat{\delta}(H_1) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \right] \frac{R_2 Y_2}{\hat{\pi}_2(0, H_1)} \right).$$

The steps of estimating the ps-rp estimator are as follows:

Step 1. For subjects with $R_1 = 1$, obtain the following models:

- (a) The fitted propensity score model $\hat{e}(H_1)$.
- (b) The fitted response probability model $\hat{\pi}_2(a, H_1)$.

Step 2. For all the subjects, obtain the following models:

- (a) The fitted propensity score model $\hat{e}(X)$.
- (b) The fitted response probability model $\hat{\pi}_1(a, H_0)$.

Step 4. Obtain $\hat{\delta}(H_1) = \{\hat{e}(H_1)/\hat{e}(H_0)\} / [\{1 - \hat{e}(H_1)\} / \{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)\}]$ for the subjects with $R_1 = 1$, and get $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$ by the empirical average.

Web Appendix C.5 Multiply robust estimators motivated from Theorem 6

From the EIF, one can motivated new estimators of τ_t^{J2R} . We present the expression of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$ below.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}} = P_n & \left(\frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right. \\ & + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \left[\hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \\ & \left. + \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we provide the normalized version of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$ as follows. The normalized estimator is less influenced by the extreme weights compared to $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-N}} = P_n & \left(\frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] \right) / P_n \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \\ & + P_n \left\{ \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{s=1}^t P_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left(\left[\sum_{k=1}^s \hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \frac{R_s}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right) \right\} / P_n \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{R_s}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\}.$$

In addition, one can conduct calibration to further reduce the impact of the outliers. The calibration-based estimator expresses as follows.

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}} = P_n \left(Aw_{a_1} \left[R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^t \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] \right) / P_n(Aw_{a_1}) \\ + P_n \left\{ \pi_1(1, H_0; \hat{\gamma}) \sum_{s=1}^t \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0; \hat{\gamma}) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right\} \\ + P_n \left\{ (1-A) R_s w_{a_0} w_{r_1} \cdots w_{r_s} \left(\left[\sum_{k=1}^s \hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right) \right\} / P_n \{ (1-A) R_s w_{a_0} w_{r_1} \cdots w_{r_s} \}.$$

We present the detailed estimation steps for the calibration-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}}$ when $t = 2$ below for illustration.

Step 1. For subjects with $R_2 = 1$, obtain the fitted outcome mean models $\hat{\mu}_2^a(H_1)$ for $a = 0, 1$.

Step 2. For subjects with $R_1 = 1$, obtain the following quantities:

- (a) The fitted propensity score model $\hat{e}(H_1)$.
- (b) The fitted response probability model $\hat{\pi}_2(a, H_1)$.
- (c) The fitted outcome mean model $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0)$, by fitting $\mu_2^0(H_0) = E \{ \mu_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \}$ using the predicted values $\hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0)$ against H_0 in the group with $R_1 = 1$ and $A = 0$.
- (d) The fitted models $\hat{g}_2^1(H_0), \hat{g}_3^1(H_0)$: Fit $g_2^1(H_0) = E \{ \pi_2(1, H_1) \mu_2^1(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \}$ and $g_3^1(H_0) = E \{ [1 - \pi_2(1, H_1)] \mu_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \}$ using the predicted values $\hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \hat{\mu}_2^1(H_1)$ and $\{1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1)\} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1)$ against H_0 in the group with $R_1 = 1$ and $A = 1$, respectively.
- (e) The calibration weights w_{r_2} associated with the response indicator R_2 : Solve the optimization problem (1) subject to $\sum_{i: R_{2,i}=1} w_{r_2,i} h(X_i) = \sum_{i: R_{1,i}=1} h(X_i) / (\sum_{i=1}^n R_{1,i})$.

Step 3. For all the subjects, obtain the following models:

- (a) The fitted propensity score model $\hat{e}(H_0)$ and the ratio $\hat{\delta}(H_1)$ for the subjects with $R_1 = 1$.
- (b) The fitted response probability model $\hat{\pi}_1(a, H_0)$.
- (c) The calibration weights w_{r_1} associated with the response indicator R_1 : Solve the optimization problem (1) subject to $\sum_{i:R_{1,i}=1} w_{r_1,i} h(X_i) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)$.
- (d) The calibration weights w_{a_1}, w_{a_0} associated with the treatment: Solve the optimization problem (1) subject to $\sum_{i:A_i=1} w_{a_1,i} h(X_i) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)$ to get w_{a_1} ; subject to $\sum_{i:A_i=0} w_{a_0,i} h(X_i) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i)$ to get w_{a_0} .

Step 4. Get the calibration-based estimator as

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}} = & \text{P}_n \left[Aw_{a_1} \left(R_2 Y_2 + R_1 (1 - R_2) \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) + (1 - R_1) \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0) \right. \right. \\
& - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{\text{E}} \{ \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \hat{\mu}_2^1(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \} \\
& - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{\text{E}} [\{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1] \\
& \left. \left. - \{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0) \right) \right] / \text{P}_n (Aw_{a_1}) \\
& + \text{P}_n \left(\hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{\text{E}} \{ \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \hat{\mu}_2^1(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \} \right. \\
& \left. + \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{\text{E}} [\{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1] - \{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \} \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0) \right) \\
& + \text{P}_n \left[(1 - A) R_2 w_{a_0} w_{r_1} w_{r_2} \left[\hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_2(1, H_1) \} \hat{\delta}(H_1) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \right] \{ Y_2 - \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) \} \right] / \{ \text{P}_n (1 - A) R_2 w_{a_0} w_{r_1} w_{r_2} \} \\
& - \text{P}_n [(1 - A) R_1 w_{a_0} w_{r_1} \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \{ \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_1) - \hat{\mu}_2^0(H_0) \}] / \text{P}_n \{ (1 - A) R_1 w_{a_0} w_{r_1} \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Web Appendix D Proof of the multiple robustness

We prove the multiple robustness and semiparametric efficiency of the EIF-based estimators. For the cross-sectional data, we prove the triple robustness in two aspects: consistency when using parametric models and rate convergence when using flexible models. For the longitudinal outcomes, we focus on the multiple robustness in terms of the rate convergence. Throughout the section, we use the estimators motivated by Theorems 2 and 6 for illustration, which is asymptotically equivalent to the corresponding normalized and calibration-based estimators.

Web Appendix D.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of the triple robustness: Suppose the model estimators $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^T$ converges to $\theta^* = (\alpha^*, \beta^*, \gamma^*)^T$ in the sense that $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| = o_p(1)$, where at least one component of $\hat{\theta}$ needs to converge to the true value. As the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$, we would expect $\hat{\tau}_{tr}$ converges to

$$E \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)\} \right] \quad (S3)$$

$$- E \left[\frac{A - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \quad (S4)$$

Rearrange (S3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)\} \right] \\ = & E \left[\frac{E(A | X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} E(R_1 | X, A=1) \{E(Y_1 | X, R_1=1, A=1) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)\} \right] \\ & - E \left[\frac{E(1-A | X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} E(R_1 | X, A=0) \{E(Y_1 | X, R_1=1, A=0) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)\} \right] \\ = & E \left[\frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ = & E \left[\pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} + \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} + \pi_1(1, X) \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right\} \right] \\ & - E \left[\frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ = & \tau_1^{CR} + E \left[\pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} + \pi_1(1, X) \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right\} \right] \\ & - E \left[\left\{ \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X) \right\} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Rearrange (S4), we have $E \left[\frac{A-e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right]$

$$= E \left[\frac{e(X) - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right].$$

Combine the two parts together, (S3)+(S4)

$$\begin{aligned} & = \tau_1^{CR} + E \left[\pi_1(1, X) \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \mu_1^1(X) + \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} \mu_1^0(X) \right] \\ & + E \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) \right] \\ & - E \left[\left\{ \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X) + \frac{e(X) - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \right\} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right] \\ = & \tau_1^{CR} + E \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right\} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the bias of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ converges to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \quad (\text{S5})$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \quad (\text{S6})$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right\} \right] \quad (\text{S7})$$

Note that (S5) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}}$, (S6) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{rp}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{om}}$, (S7) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}}$. Thus, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ is consistent for τ_1^{J2R} under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{rp}}$. The triple robustness holds.

Proof of the semiparametric efficiency: We follow the proof in Kennedy (2016). To simplify the notations, denote $\mathbb{P}\{N(V; \theta_0)\} = \tau_1^{\text{J2R}}$, where

$$N(V; \theta_0) = \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{A - e(X)}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \}.$$

Then $\mathbb{P}\{N(V; \theta^*)\} = \mathbb{P}\{N(V; \theta_0)\} = \tau^{\text{J2R}}$. Consider the decomposition

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} - \tau^{\text{J2R}} = (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) N(V; \hat{\theta}) - \mathbb{P} \{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Using empirical process theory, if the nuisance functions take values in Donsker classes, and satisfy the positivity assumption, i.e., there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < e(X) < 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\pi_1(0, X) > \varepsilon$ for all X , then $N(V; \hat{\theta})$ takes values in Donsker classes, and the first term can be written as

$$(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) N(V; \hat{\theta}) = (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) N(V; \theta_0) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

For the second term $\mathbb{P} \{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \}$, by computing the expectations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \} &= \mathbb{P} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{P} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{P} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Under the positivity assumptions, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality ($P(fg) \leq \|f\|\|g\|$) and obtain an upper bound for the second term as

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left\{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\right\} &\leq \left\| \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\| \\
&+ \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right\| \\
&+ \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\| \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\} \left\{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\} \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ 1 - \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\| \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\| \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\} \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq M \left\| \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\| + \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\| \right\} \\
&+ M \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\| + \left\| 1 - \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\| \right\} \\
&+ M \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\| + \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \right\| \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by the triangle inequality and Holder's inequality, and the last inequality holds by Cauchy-Schwarz. Under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+rp+om}}$, we would expect $P\left\{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\right\} = O_P(n^{-1/2}) \cdot o_P(1) = o_P(n^{-1/2})$. Therefore, the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ satisfies $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = (P_n - P)N(V; \theta_0) + o_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ and its influence function $N(V; \theta_0) + \tau_1^{\text{J2R}}$, which is the same as the EIF in Theorem 2 and completes the proof.

Web Appendix D.2 Proof of Theorem 4 and Corollary 1

Proof of Theorem 4: When using flexible models, we let θ consist of all the nuisance functions $\{e(X), \pi_1(a, X), \mu_1^a(X) : a = 0, 1\}$, and $\hat{\theta}$ be its limit. We use the same notations in Web Appendix D.1, and consider the same decomposition as formula (S8). Using empirical process theory, if the nuisance functions take values in Donsker classes, and satisfy the positivity assumption, i.e., there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < e(X) < 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\pi_1(0, X) > \varepsilon$ for all X , then $N(V; \hat{\theta})$ takes values in Donsker classes,

and the first term can be written as

$$(\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P})N(V; \hat{\theta}) = (\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P})N(V; \theta_0) + o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

For the second term $\mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\}$, by computing the expectations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\} &= \mathbf{P} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\} \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\} \right] = \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}, \mathbf{P}) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = (\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P})N(V; \theta_0) + \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}, \mathbf{P}) + o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathbf{P}_n \{ \varphi_1^{\text{J2R}}(V_i; \mathbf{P}) \} + \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}, \mathbf{P}) + o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. If $\text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbf{P}}, \mathbf{P}) = o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, then $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi^{\text{J2R}}(V_i; \mathbf{P}) + o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. Apply central limit theorem and we complete the proof.

Proof of Corollary 1: For the remainder term, based on the uniform bounded condition, apply Cauchy-Schwarz and Holder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\} &\leq M \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\| + \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| \right\} \\ &\quad + M \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\| + \left\| 1 - \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\| \right\} \\ &\quad + M \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| + \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

With the convergence rate $\|\hat{e}(X) - e(X)\| = o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-c_e})$, $\|\hat{\mu}_1^a(X) - \mu_1^a(X)\| = o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-c_\mu})$, $\|\hat{\pi}_1(a, X) - \pi_1(a, X)\| = o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-c_\pi})$, and by Theorem 4 based on the central limit theorem, we have $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = O_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-1/2} + n^{-c})$, where $c = \min(r_e + r_\pi, r_e + r_\mu, r_\pi + r_\mu)$, which completes the proof.

Web Appendix D.3 Proof of Theorem 7 and Corollary 2

Proof of Theorem 7: When using flexible models, we let θ consist of all the nuisance functions $\{e(H_{s-1}), \pi_s(a, H_{s-1}), \mu_t^a(H_{s-1}), g_{s+1}^1(H_{l-1}) : l = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } s = 1, \dots, t; a = 0, 1\}$, and $\hat{\theta}$ be its limit. We use the same notations in Web Appendix D.1, and denote $N(V; \theta) := \varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V; \mathbf{P}) + \tau_t^{\text{J2R}}$. Consider the same decomposition as formula (S8).

Using empirical process theory, if the nuisance functions take values in Donsker classes, and

satisfy the positivity assumption, i.e., there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(H_{s-1}), \hat{e}(H_{s-1})\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\{\pi_s(0, H_{s-1}), \hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})\} > \varepsilon$ for all H_{s-1} when $s = 1, \dots, t$, then $N(V; \hat{\theta})$ takes values in Donsker classes, and the first term can be written as

$$(\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P}) N(V; \hat{\theta}) = (\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P}) N(V; \theta_0) + o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

For the second term $\mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\}$, we proceed by deriving the expectations of $N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)$. Note that $\mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta})\}$ equals to

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left\{ R_t Y_t + \sum_{s=1}^t R_{s-1} (1 - R_s) \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\} \right. \quad (\text{S9})$$

$$\left. + \left\{ 1 - \frac{A}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \left[\hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right. \quad (\text{S10})$$

$$\left. + \frac{1 - A}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \left[\sum_{k=1}^s \hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right) \right\}. \quad (\text{S11})$$

By iterated expectations, the first term (S9) and the second term (S10) equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] \right. \\ & \left. + \left\{ 1 - \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \left[\hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right), \end{aligned}$$

using the notations in the main text.

For the third term (S11), for $s = 1, \dots, t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left(\frac{1 - A}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_s}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0 \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left(\frac{1 - A}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \left[\mathbf{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{R_{s-1}}{\hat{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \frac{\pi_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \mid H_{s-1}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

And for $k = 1, \dots, s$, apply iterated expectations to the above formula and use the notation in the

main text, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_k}{\hat{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \prod_{l=k+1}^s \frac{R_l}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_k}{\hat{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \right. \\
& \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\pi_{k+1}(0, H_k)}{\hat{\pi}_{k+1}(0, H_k)} \dots \right. \\
& \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\pi_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] \mid H_{s-2}, R_{s-1} = 1, A = 0 \right) \\
& \quad \left. \dots \mid H_{k-1}, R_k = 1, A = 0 \right\} \Bigg] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - 1 \right] \frac{R_{k-1}}{\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})} \right. \\
& \quad \left. E_{0,s-2} \left(\prod_{l=k}^s \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] ; H_{k-1} \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Continue the calculation, the above formula becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[R_{k-1} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \hat{\delta}(H_{k-1}) - \frac{R_{k-1}}{\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})} \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. E_{0,s-2} \left(\prod_{l=k}^s \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] ; H_{k-1} \right) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} R_{k-1} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} \delta(H_{k-1}) G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \right] \tag{S12}
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{R_{k-1}}{\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \right\} \tag{S13}$$

if we denote

$$G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) = E_{0,s-2} \left(\prod_{l=k}^s \pi_l(0, H_{l-1}) \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right] / \hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1}) ; H_{k-1} \right)$$

to indicate the involvement of the estimated nuisance function $\hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1})$ and $\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})$ for $l = k, \dots, s$.

For the first term (S12), by Bayes' rule,

$$\delta(H_{s-1}) = \frac{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(1, H_{s-2})}{\bar{\pi}_{s-1}(0, H_{s-2})} \prod_{l=1}^{s-1} \frac{f(Y_l \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_l \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0)}.$$

Take iterated expectations conditional on the historical information, it equals to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{R_{k-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})} \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{f(y_l | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1)}{f(y_l | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0)} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{R_{k-1}}{\bar{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})} \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \prod_{l=1}^{k-2} \frac{f(Y_l | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_l | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} \frac{f(Y_{k-1} | H_{k-2}, R_{k-1} = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_{k-1} | H_{k-2}, R_{k-1} = 1, A = 0)} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \mid H_{k-2}, R_{k-1} = 1, A = 0 \right] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{R_{k-2}}{\bar{\pi}_{k-2}(0, H_{k-1})} \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \prod_{l=1}^{k-2} \frac{f(Y_l | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 1)}{f(Y_l | H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \mid H_{k-2}, R_{k-1} = 1, A = 1 \right] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\dots \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \mid H_{k-2}, R_{k-1} = 1, A = 1 \right] \dots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \right) \\
&:= E_{1,k-2} \left[\frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}); H_0 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term (S13), again by iterated expectations,

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\dots \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})}{\hat{\pi}_{k-1}(0, H_{k-2})} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}) \mid H_{k-2}, R_{k-1} = 1, A = 0 \right\} \dots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right] \\
&= E_{0,0} \left\{ \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_0) \right\} \quad (\text{by the definition of } G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_0)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$, the multiply robust estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}}$ converges to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \left[\pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] \right. \\
& \quad + \left\{ 1 - \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \sum_{s=1}^t \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^s E_{1,k-2} \left[\bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}); H_0 \right] - G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_0) \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Rearrange the terms, we can get the formula for $\mathbb{P} \left\{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \right\}$ as

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) + \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) + \pi_1(1, H_0) \mu_t^0(H_0) \\
& + \left\{ 1 - \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \left[\sum_{s=1}^t \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right] - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \\
& + \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \sum_{s=1}^t \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^s E_{1,k-2} \left[\bar{\pi}_{k-1}(1, H_{k-2}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_k(1, H_{k-1})\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{k-1})}{\delta(H_{k-1})} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_{k-1}); H_0 \right] - G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_0) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the terms related to $g_{t+1}^1(H_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) + \left\{ 1 - \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For the terms with s layers of expectations and the condition $A = 1$ for $s = 1, \dots, t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\{ 1 - \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) + \sum_{l=s}^t E_{1,s-1} \left[\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_s)}{\delta(H_s)} G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, l}(H_s); H_0 \right] \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \} \right. \\
& \quad + \sum_{l=s}^t \mathbb{E} \left[\dots \mathbb{E} \left(\dots \mathbb{E} \left(\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \left[\frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_s)}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. - \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \} \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \right) \dots \mid H_s, R_{s+1} = 1, A = 0 \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 1 \right\} \dots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 1 \right] \Bigg] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \} \right. \\
& \quad + \sum_{l=s}^t E_{1,s-1} \left\{ E_{0,l-1} \left(\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \left[\frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_s)}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. - \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \}; H_s \right); H_0 \right\} \Bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

For the rest terms with the condition $A = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \pi_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) + \pi_1(1, H_0) \mu_t^0(H_0) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\{ 1 - \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0)\} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - 1\} \frac{\pi_1(0, H_0)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, H_0)} \sum_{s=1}^t G_{\hat{\mu}, \hat{\pi}, s-2}(H_0) \Big] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} + \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \{ \mu_t^0(H_0) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \frac{\pi_1(0, H_0)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, H_0)} \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{l=2}^s \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \right] \dots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right) \right\} \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} + \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} \left(\dots \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} \mid H_{s-1}, R_s = 1, A = 0 \right] \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \dots \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \right) \right\} \right] \Big] \quad \left(\text{since } \mu_t^0(H_0) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) = \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \mid H_0, R_1 = 1, A = 0 \} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Summarize $\mathbb{P} \{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \}$, which is the remainder term $\text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\} \left[\sum_{s=2}^t \{ \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \} \right] \right] \quad (\text{S14})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{l=s+1}^t E_{1, s-1} \left\{ E_{0, l-1} \left(\bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \left[\frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \{ 1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s) \} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_k(0, H_{k-1})}{\hat{\pi}_k(0, H_{k-1})} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. - \{ 1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s) \} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \} ; H_s \right) ; H_0 \right\} \quad (\text{S15})
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \{ \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \} \left\{ \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\} \quad (\text{S16})$$

$$+ \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \left(\sum_{s=1}^t E_{0, s-1} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\} \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \} ; H_0 \right] \right), \quad (\text{S17})$$

which matches the remainder term in Theorem 7.

Therefore, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}} - \tau_t^{\text{J2R}} = (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) N(V; \theta_0) + \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \mathbb{P}_n \{ \varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V_i; \mathbb{P}) \} + \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. If $\text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, then $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr}} - \tau_t^{\text{J2R}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_t^{\text{J2R}}(V_i; \mathbb{P}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. Apply the central limit theorem and we complete the proof.

Proof of Corollary 2: For the remainder term, based on the uniform bounded condition, we proceed to apply Cauchy-Schwarz and Holder's inequality to obtain the upper bound for each component.

For the first term that corresponds to (S14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{t+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \right\| \\
&+ \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left[\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \left\{ \left\| \pi_1(1, H_0) g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right\| \right\} \right] \\
&\leq \left\| \pi_1(1, H_0) \right\|_\infty \cdot \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| g_{t+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \right\| + \left\| \pi_1(1, H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \right\| \right\} \\
&+ \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left[\sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \left\{ \left\| g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right\| + \left\| \pi_1(1, H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \right\| \right\} \right] \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| g_{t+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{g}_{t+1}^1(H_0) \right\| + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \left\| g_{\hat{\mu}, s+1}^1(H_0) - \hat{g}_{s+1}^1(H_0) \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (t-1) \left\| \pi_1(1, H_0) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) \right\| \right\} \text{ (since } \pi_1(1, H_0) \leq 1 \text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by Holder's inequality and triangle inequality. Based on the derived upper bound, the bound of this term is $O_P(n^{-\min(c_e+c_\pi, c_e+c_g)})$.

For the second term that corresponds to (S15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{l=s+1}^t \left[\left\| \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \right\| \cdot \left\| \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \right\| \cdot \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \right\| \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{s=2}^t \sum_{l=s+1}^t \left[\left\| \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} - \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \right\| \right] \text{ (since } \bar{\pi}_s(1, H_{s-1}) \leq 1 \text{)} \\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{l=s+1}^t \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \right\| \cdot \\
&\quad \left[\left\| \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} \right\|_\infty \cdot \left\| \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} - \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left\| 1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s) \right\|_\infty \cdot \left\| \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} - 1 \right\| \right] \\
&\leq M \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{l=s+1}^t \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_l) \mid H_{l-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{l-1}) \right\| \cdot \\
&\quad \left[\left\| \{1 - \hat{\pi}_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \prod_{k=s+1}^l \frac{\pi_l(0, H_{l-1})}{\hat{\pi}_l(0, H_{l-1})} - \{1 - \pi_{s+1}(1, H_s)\} \right\| + \left\| \frac{1-e(H_0)}{1-\hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\hat{\delta}(H_{s-1})}{\delta(H_{s-1})} - 1 \right\| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The second and the third inequalities hold by Holder's inequality and triangle inequality. The term is $O_P(n^{-\min(c_e+c_\mu, c_\mu+c_\pi)})$.

For the third term that corresponds to (S16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \right\| \cdot \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} \right\|_\infty \left\| \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left\| \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \right\} \\
&\leq M \left\| \hat{\pi}_1(1, H_0) - \pi_1(1, H_0) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_0) - \mu_t^0(H_0) \right\| + \left\| \frac{e(H_0)}{\hat{e}(H_0)} - 1 \right\| \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by Holder's inequality and triangle inequality. The term is $o_P(n^{-\min(c_e+c_\pi, c_\mu+c_\pi)})$.

For the fourth term that corresponds to (S17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^t \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\| \cdot \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\| \\
&\leq \sum_{s=1}^t \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left\| \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \right\|_\infty \cdot \left\| 1 - \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\| \right\} \\
&\leq M \sum_{s=1}^t \left\| E \{ \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_s) \mid H_{s-1}, R_l = 1, A = 0 \} - \hat{\mu}_t^0(H_{s-1}) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(H_0)}{1 - \hat{e}(H_0)} \right\| + \left\| 1 - \frac{\bar{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})}{\hat{\pi}_s(0, H_{s-1})} \right\| \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The term is $o_P(n^{-\min(c_e+c_\mu, c_\mu+c_\pi)})$. Therefore, based on Theorem 7 and apply central limit theorem, we have $\hat{\tau}_{mr} - \tau_t^{J2R} = O_P \left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} + n^{-c} \right)$, where $c = \min(c_e + c_\mu, c_e + c_\pi, c_\mu + c_\pi, c_\pi + c_g)$, which completes the proof.

Web Appendix E Connections to the conventional augmented inverse propensity weighted estimator

We try to connect the proposed multiply robust estimators with the augmented inverse propensity weighted (AIPW; Robins et al., 1994) estimators in the existing missing data literature (e.g., Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995; Bang and Robins, 2005). Under the cross-sectional setting, we use the identification formula in Theorem 1 as a starting point to construct the AIPW estimator. Extending to longitudinal settings follows a similar idea.

Since the identification formula in Theorem 1 (b) depends on two of the three models, we can

apply the standard AIPW technique to obtain a doubly robust estimator in the AIPW form as

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}} = \text{P}_n \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} - \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta}) \} \right].$$

The following theorem indicates that it is doubly robust in the sense that it is consistent under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{rp+om}}$ when using parametric modeling strategy to estimate the nuisance functions.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1-4, suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X; \alpha^*), e(X; \hat{\alpha}), \pi_1(a, X; \gamma^*), \pi_1(a, X; \hat{\gamma})\}$ for all X and a almost surely, the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}}$ is doubly robust in the sense that it is consistent for τ_1^{J2R} under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{rp+om}}$.*

Proof. Suppose the model estimators $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^T$ converges to $\theta^* = (\alpha^*, \beta^*, \gamma^*)^T$ in the sense that $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| = o_p(1)$, where at least one component of $\hat{\theta}$ needs to converge to the true value. As the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$, we would expect $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}}$ converges to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)\} \right] - \text{E} \left[\frac{A - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ &= \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} - \text{E} [\pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \}] \\ &+ \text{E} \left[\frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) + \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] - \text{E} \left[\frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ &- \text{E} \left[\frac{e(X) - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ &= \text{E} \left[\frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} \right] - \text{E} [\pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \}] \\ &+ \text{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] - \text{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ &- \text{E} \left[\frac{e(X) - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ &= \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} + \text{E} \left(\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} [\pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X) \} - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} + \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)] \right) \\ &- \text{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \pi_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From the expression of the asymptotic bias, the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}}$ is consistent for τ_1^{J2R} under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{rp+om}}$. \square

When using flexible modeling strategies to approximate the nuisance functions, a standard AIPW estimator has the form

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}} = \text{P}_n \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}(X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X)\} - \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \{ \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right]$$

and enjoys the property of rate-double robustness, in the sense that it reaches $n^{1/2}$ -consistency if any nuisance functions converge at a rate no less than $n^{-1/4}$, as illustrated in Corollary S1.

Corollary S1. *Under the assumptions in Corollary 1, $\hat{\tau}_{ps-rpom} - \tau_1^{J2R} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} + n^{-c})$, where $c = \min(c_e + c_\mu, c_e + c_\pi)$.*

Proof. We again follow the proof in Kennedy (2016). To simplify the notations, denote $P\{N(V; \theta_0)\} = \tau_1^{J2R}$, where

$$N(V; \theta_0) = \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{A-e(X)}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\}.$$

Then $P\{N(V; \theta^*)\} = P\{N(V; \theta_0)\} = \tau_1^{J2R}$. Consider the decomposition

$$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rpom} - \tau_1^{J2R} = (P_n - P)N(V; \hat{\theta}) - P\{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\}.$$

Using empirical process theory, if the nuisance functions take values in Donsker classes, and satisfy the positivity assumption, i.e., there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \pi_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X , then $N(V; \hat{\theta})$ takes values in Donsker classes, and the first term can be written as

$$(P_n - P)N(V; \hat{\theta}) = (P_n - P)N(V; \theta_0) + o_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

For the second term $P\{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\}$, by computing the expectations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\} &= P\left(\left\{\frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1\right\} [\pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \{\hat{\mu}_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X)\}]\right) \\ &\quad + P\left[\left\{\frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1\right\} \{\mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X)\}\right] - P\left[\left\{\frac{1-e(X)}{1-\hat{e}(X)} - 1\right\} \pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X)\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Under the positivity assumptions, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality ($P(fg) \leq \|f\| \|g\|$) and obtain an upper bound for the second term as

$$\begin{aligned} P\{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\} &\leq \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{1-e(X)}{1-\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X)\} \right\| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\|_\infty \\
&+ \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \\
&+ \left\| \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\} \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq M \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\| + \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| + \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \right\} \\
&+ M \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \cdot \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by the triangle inequality and Holder's inequality, and the last inequality holds by Cauchy-Schwarz. We have $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} + n^{-c})$, where $c = \min(c_e + c_\mu, c_e + c_\pi)$ \square

The triply robust estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$ consists of all the components in the AIPW estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rpom}}$, while at the same time including extra augmented terms to guarantee triple robustness in the sense that it achieves $n^{1/2}$ -consistency if any two of the three nuisance models are correct when using the parametric modeling strategy or if the nuisance functions converge at a rate no less than $n^{-1/4}$ when using the flexible modeling strategy. Those additional augmented terms in the triply robust estimator constitute one of the major contributions of the paper.

Web Appendix F Sensitivity analysis on the partial ignorability of missingness assumption

In the main text, we impose the partial ignorability of missingness assumption on the missing components in the control group for the treatment effect identification under J2R. While it may not be realistic in practice, sensitivity analyses can be conducted to assess the robustness of the ATE estimation against this assumption. In this section, we provide a way to conduct the sensitivity analysis against Assumption 3 under the PMM framework in cross-sectional studies. Extending to longitudinal studies follows the same logic.

Using the idea of delta-adjustment (Mallinckrodt and Lipkovich, 2016), we modify the missingness ignorability assumption (Assumption 3) by introducing a sensitivity parameter δ in the outcome mean

in the control group as Assumption 3'. In this way, the discrepancy in the outcome mean among the observed and missing individuals indicates an MNAR pattern in the control group due to the dependence between the response status and the outcome. With the lack of MAR in the control group, the outcome mean $E\{Y_1(0) \mid X\}$ in Assumption 4 cannot be identified solely based on the observed individuals. Therefore, we replace it with $E\{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X\}$ by using the non-dropouts in the control group to characterize the outcome mean of dropouts in the treated group and adjust the original Assumptions 3 and 4 as follows.

Assumption 3' (Delta-adjustment in the control group). $E\{Y_1(0, 0) \mid X\} = E\{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X\} + \delta$.

Assumption 3' depicts an MNAR pattern for the missing components in the control group. The sensitivity parameter δ controls the degree of the deviation from the observed outcome mean, thus indicating a difference in outcome distributions between the observed and missing individuals when $\delta \neq 0$. Compared with Assumption 3, where we directly assume the conditional independence between the response status and the outcome to characterize the MAR assumption under general CBI models, Assumption 3' only specifies the outcome mean $E\{Y_1(0, 0) \mid X\}$ that is needed for the ATE identification. If other types of treatment effect estimands are considered, e.g., the risk difference or the quantile treatment effect, one can alternatively use delta adjustment on the observed distribution $f\{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X\}$ to describe the unobserved distribution $f\{Y_1(0, 0) \mid X\}$ and conduct sensitivity analyses.

Assumption 4' (J2R for the outcome mean in the treated group). $E\{Y_1(1, 0) \mid X, R_1(1) = 0\} = E\{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X\}$.

We replace the outcome mean $E\{Y_1(0) \mid X\}$ in the original Assumption 4 with $E\{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X\}$ in Assumption 4' for the sensitivity analysis, since now the dropouts in the treated group are expected to share the same outcome mean as the observed subjects in the control group given the same history.

Note that when $\delta = 0$, Assumptions 3' and 4' do not correspond to Assumptions 3 and 4, as Assumption 3 imposes a distributional assumption on the outcomes in the control group instead of an outcome mean profile. Assumption 3 is created to resemble the conventional MAR assumption, yet a relaxed version with only the specification of the outcome mean can also result in the same ATE identification and estimation. Under the sensitivity analysis, we still use the ITT estimand and define the ATE as $\tau_1^{\text{J2R}'} = E[Y_1\{1, R_1(1)\}] - E[Y_1\{0, R_1(0)\}] = E\{Y_1(1) - Y_1(0)\}$. Similar to Theorem 1 in the main paper, three identification formulas of $\tau_1^{\text{J2R}'}$ can be accomplished in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3', and 4', assume there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \pi_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a , the following identification formulas hold.

1. Based on the response probability and outcome mean,

$$\tau_1^{J2R'} = \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta].$$

2. Based on the propensity score and outcome mean,

$$\tau_1^{J2R'} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2A - 1}{e(X)^A \{1 - e(X)\}^{1-A}} \{R_1 Y_1 + (1 - R_1) \mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} (1 - R_1) \delta \right].$$

3. Based on the propensity score and response probability,

$$\tau_1^{J2R'} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A}{e(X)} R_1 Y_1 - \frac{(1 - A) R_1}{\{1 - e(X)\} \pi_1(0, X)} \pi_1(1, X) Y_1 - \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta \right].$$

Proof. We follow the same proof in Web Appendix A.1 to get the identification formulas for the ATE. Compared with Theorem 1, an additional term that involves the sensitivity parameter δ is contained in each identification formula. The identification of $\tau_{1,1} = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \{1, R_1(1)\}]$ remains unchanged since the specification of the outcome mean $\mathbb{E}\{Y_1(1, 0) \mid X, R_1(1) = 0\}$ stays the same by Assumption 4'. Therefore, we proceed to identify $\mathbb{E}[Y_1 \{0, R_1(0)\}]$. Following the same step of identifying $\mathbb{E}[Y_1 \{0, R_1(0)\}]$ in Web Appendix A.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{0,1} &= \mathbb{E} [R_1(0) Y_1(0, 1) + \{1 - R_1(0)\} Y_1(0, 0)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} \{R_1(0) \mid X\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X, R_1(0) = 1\} + \mathbb{E} \{1 - R_1(0) \mid X\} \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 0) \mid X, R_1(0) = 0\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} (R_1 \mid X, A = 0) \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 1) \mid X, R_1(0) = 1, A = 0\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} (1 - R_1 \mid X, A = 0) \mathbb{E} \{Y_1(0, 0) \mid X, R_1(0) = 0, A = 0\}] \text{ (By A1, A3)} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(0, X) \mathbb{E} (Y_1 \mid A = 0, R_1 = 1, X) + \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \{\mathbb{E} (Y_1 \mid A = 0, R_1 = 1, X) + \delta\}] \text{ (By A2', A3, A4')} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(0, X) \mu_1^0(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \{\mu_1^0(X) + \delta\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mu_1^0(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the identification of τ corresponds to

$$\tau_1^{J2R'} = \tau_{1,1} - \tau_{0,1} = \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) + \{1 - \pi_1(1, X)\} \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X) - \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta]$$

$$= \mathbb{E} [\pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta],$$

which matches the identification formula in Theorem 2 (a).

We then need to show $\mathbb{E} [\{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta] = \mathbb{E} [(1 - A)(1 - R_1)\delta / \{1 - e(X)\}]$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} (1 - R_1) \delta \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} (1 - R_1) \mid X, A \right\} \delta \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}(A \mid X)}{1 - e(X)} \{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \delta], \end{aligned}$$

which complete the proof. \square

When $\delta = 0$, Theorem 2 degenerates to Theorem 1. One can plug in the nuisance function estimators to get the conventional and stabilized versions of the ATE estimators. Similarly, we derive the EIF under the sensitivity analysis to motivate the EIF-based estimator as follows.

Theorem 3. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3', and 4', suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \pi_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a , the EIF for $\tau_1^{J2R'}$ is*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1^{J2R'}(V; \mathbb{P}) &= \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{A - e(X)}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\} \\ &\quad + \left[\{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} \{R_1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \right] \delta - \tau_1^{J2R'}. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the fact that the mean of the EIF is zero, we can obtain another identification formula for the ATE under the sensitivity analysis, which motivates the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}'_{tr}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}'_{tr} &= \mathbb{P}_n \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma})}{\pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} - \frac{A - e(X; \hat{\alpha})}{e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \pi_1(1, X; \hat{\gamma}) \{\mu_1^1(X; \hat{\beta}) - \mu_1^0(X; \hat{\beta})\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{1 - \pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})\} \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X; \hat{\alpha})} \{R_1 - \pi_1(0, X; \hat{\gamma})\} \delta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

One can also apply normalization or calibration to obtain more stabilized estimators.

Next, we investigate the asymptotic properties of the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}'_{tr}$. Theorem 4 verifies the robustness when using parametric models to approximate the nuisance functions.

Theorem 4. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3', and 4', suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X; \alpha^*), e(X; \hat{\alpha}), \pi_1(a, X; \gamma^*), \pi_1(a, X; \hat{\gamma})\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a almost surely, the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{tr}$ is triply robust*

in the sense that it is consistent for $\tau_1^{J2R'}$ under $\mathcal{M}_{rp+om} \cup \mathcal{M}_{ps+om} \cup \mathcal{M}_{ps+rp}$. Moreover, $\hat{\tau}'_{tr}$ achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound under $\mathcal{M}_{ps+rp+om}$.

Proof. Suppose the model estimators $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma})^T$ converges to $\theta^* = (\alpha^*, \beta^*, \gamma^*)^T$ in the sense that $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\| = o_p(1)$, where at least one component of $\hat{\theta}$ needs to converge to the true value. As the sample size $n \rightarrow \infty$, we would expect $\hat{\tau}'_{tr}$ converges to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{A}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*)\} \right] \\ & - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{A - e(X; \alpha^*)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \right\} - \frac{1-A}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \{ R_1 - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \} \right] \delta \end{aligned} \quad (S18)$$

The first two terms are the same as formulas (S3) and (S4) in Web Appendix D.1. Therefore, we focus on formula (S18) and rearrange the term as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \right\} - \frac{\mathbb{E}(1-A | X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \{ \mathbb{E}(R_1 | X, A=1) - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \} \right] \delta \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \right\} - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \{ \pi_1(0, X) - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \} \right] \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the three parts together, (S3) + (S4) + (S18)

$$\begin{aligned} & = \tau_1^{J2R'} + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right\} \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \right\} \{ \pi_1(0, X) - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \} \right] \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the bias of $\hat{\tau}'_{tr}$ converges to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \mu_1^1(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \quad (S19)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X) \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*)}{\pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*)} \right\} \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \} \right] \quad (S20)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \pi_1(1, X; \gamma^*) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{e(X; \alpha^*)} \mu_1^0(X; \beta^*) \right\} \right] \quad (S21)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1-e(X)}{1-e(X; \alpha^*)} \right\} \{ \pi_1(0, X) - \pi_1(0, X; \gamma^*) \} \right] \delta \quad (S22)$$

Note that (S19) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}}$, (S20) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{rp}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{om}}$, (S21) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}}$, and (S22) = 0 under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}}$. Thus, $\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}}$ is consistent for $\tau_1^{\text{J2R}'}$ under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rp}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{om}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\text{ps}+\text{rp}}$. The triple robustness holds. \square

When using flexible models to approximate nuisance functions, Theorem 5 uncovers the asymptotic property of the EIF-based estimator and invokes the triple robustness in terms of rate convergence in Corollary S2.

Theorem 5. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3', and 4', suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < \{e(X), \hat{e}(X), \pi_1(a, X), \hat{\pi}_1(a, X)\} < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all X and a almost surely, and the nuisance functions and their estimators take value in Donsker classes. Assume $\|\varphi_1^{\text{J2R}'}(V; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \varphi_1^{\text{J2R}'}(V; \mathbb{P})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Then, $\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}} = \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'} + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_1^{\text{J2R}'}(V; \mathbb{P}) + \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\} + \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\} \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\} + \left\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\} \right. \\ & \left. + \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\} \left\{ \pi_1(0, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(0, X) \right\} \delta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\text{Rem}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$, then $n^{1/2} \left(\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \mathbb{V} \left\{ \varphi_1^{\text{J2R}'}(V; \mathbb{P}) \right\} \right)$, where the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}}$ reaches the semiparametric efficiency bound.

Corollary S2. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 5, suppose $\|\varphi_1^{\text{J2R}'}(V; \hat{\mathbb{P}}) - \varphi_1^{\text{J2R}'}(V; \mathbb{P})\| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and further suppose that there exists $0 < M < \infty$, such that $\mathbb{P} \left(\max \left\{ |\hat{\mu}_1^0(X)|, |\hat{\mu}_1^1(X)|, \left| \{1 - e(X)\} / \{1 - \hat{e}(X)\} \right|, \delta \right\} \leq M \right) = 1$, then $\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2} + n^{-c})$, where $c = \min(c_e + c_{\mu}, c_e + c_{\pi}, c_{\mu} + c_{\pi})$.*

Proof. We again follow the proof in Kennedy (2016). To simplify the notations, denote $\mathbb{P} \{N(V; \theta_0)\} = \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} N(V; \theta_0) = & \left\{ \frac{A}{e(X)} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} \frac{\pi_1(1, X)}{\pi_1(0, X)} \right\} R_1 \{Y_1 - \mu_1^0(X)\} - \frac{A - e(X)}{e(X)} \pi_1(1, X) \{\mu_1^1(X) - \mu_1^0(X)\} \\ & + \left[\{1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e(X)} \{R_1 - \pi_1(0, X)\} \right] \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathbb{P} \{N(V; \theta^*)\} = \mathbb{P} \{N(V; \theta_0)\} = \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'}$. Consider the decomposition

$$\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'} = (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) N(V; \hat{\theta}) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \right\}. \quad (\text{S23})$$

Using empirical process theory, if the nuisance functions take values in Donsker classes, and satisfy the

positivity assumption, i.e., there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $\varepsilon < e(X) < 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\pi_1(a, X) > \varepsilon$ for all X , then $N(V; \hat{\theta})$ takes values in Donsker classes, and the first term can be written as

$$(\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P}) N(V; \hat{\theta}) = (\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{P}) N(V; \theta_0) + o_{\mathbf{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

For the second term $\mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\}$, by computing the expectations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\} &= \mathbf{P} \left[\left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\} \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left[\{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \} \left\{ \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left[\left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\} \{ \pi_1(0, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(0, X) \} \right] \delta \end{aligned}$$

Under the positivity assumptions, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality ($\mathbf{P}(fg) \leq \|f\| \|g\|$) and obtain a upper bound for the second term as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*)\} &\leq \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\| \cdot \left\| \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(0, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(0, X) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \pi_1(1, X) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \left\| \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \left\| \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\} \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \left\| \left\{ 1 - \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\} \{ \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| \cdot \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \{ \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \} \left\{ \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\} \right\|_1 \cdot \left\| \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\|_{\infty} \\ &\quad + \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(0, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(0, X) \right\| |\delta| \\ &\leq M \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \mu_1^1(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^1(X) \right\| + \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| \right\} \\ &\quad + M \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\| + \left\| 1 - \frac{\pi_1(0, X)}{\hat{\pi}_1(0, X)} \right\| \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + M \left\| \pi_1(1, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(1, X) \right\| \cdot \left\{ \left\| \frac{e(X)}{\hat{e}(X)} - 1 \right\| + \left\| \mu_1^0(X) - \hat{\mu}_1^0(X) \right\| \right\} \\
& + M \left\| 1 - \frac{1 - e(X)}{1 - \hat{e}(X)} \right\| \cdot \left\| \pi_1(0, X) - \hat{\pi}_1(0, X) \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by the triangle inequality and Holder's inequality, and the last inequality holds by Cauchy-Schwarz. Under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+rp+om}}$, we would expect $P \left\{ N(V; \hat{\theta}) - N(V; \theta^*) \right\} = O_P(n^{-1/2}) \cdot o_P(1) = o_P(n^{-1/2})$. Therefore, the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}}$ satisfies $\hat{\tau}'_{\text{tr}} - \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'} = (P_n - P) N(V; \theta_0) + o_P(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ and its influence function $N(V; \theta_0) + \tau_1^{\text{J2R}'}$, which is the same as the EIF in Theorem 3 and completes the proof of Theorem 5 and Corollary S2. \square

Web Appendix G Additional results from simulation

Web Appendix G.1 Cross-sectional setting

Web Table 1 shows the simulation results of the eight estimators for single-time-point outcomes under 8 different model specifications in terms of the bias and the Monte Carlo standard deviation (denoted as SD) based on 1000 simulated datasets. The proposed triply robust estimators are unbiased if any two of the three models are correct. The calibration-based estimator has the smallest variation among the three triply robust estimators. Under the correct specification of all the models, the calibration-based triply robust estimator has a comparable SD compared to $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-om}}$.

Web Table 1: Point estimation in the cross-sectional setting under 8 different model specifications.

Correct specification			Estimators								
PS	RP	OM		$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-N}}$	$\hat{\tau}_{\text{rp-om}}$
yes	yes	yes	Bias (%)	-0.04	-0.05	-0.15	-0.21	0.00	-0.10	-0.09	-0.15
			SD (%)	7.40	7.33	7.10	11.68	10.38	7.10	7.09	7.03
yes	yes	no	Bias (%)	0.59	0.67	-0.22	-0.21	0.00	9.29	9.29	15.60
			SD (%)	9.53	9.22	8.59	11.68	10.38	8.09	8.09	8.70
yes	no	yes	Bias (%)	-0.11	-0.11	-0.32	9.23	9.22	-0.10	-0.09	-2.28
			SD (%)	7.24	7.24	7.08	8.70	8.65	7.10	7.09	6.91
no	yes	yes	Bias (%)	-0.08	-0.09	-0.15	7.85	7.89	12.75	12.72	-0.15
			SD (%)	7.25	7.24	7.10	10.34	10.01	9.85	9.84	7.03
yes	no	no	Bias (%)	8.16	8.11	3.05	9.23	9.22	9.29	9.29	16.35
			SD (%)	8.16	8.14	8.43	8.70	8.65	8.09	8.09	8.65
no	yes	no	Bias (%)	8.30	8.31	-0.22	7.85	7.89	16.56	16.56	15.60
			SD (%)	9.18	9.10	8.59	10.34	10.01	8.71	8.72	8.70
no	no	yes	Bias (%)	0.06	0.05	-0.32	16.33	16.31	12.75	12.72	-2.28
			SD (%)	7.39	6.39	7.08	9.34	9.32	9.85	9.84	6.91
no	no	no	Bias (%)	14.87	14.86	3.05	16.33	16.31	16.56	16.56	16.35
			SD (%)	8.83	8.83	8.43	9.34	9.32	8.71	8.72	8.65

We compare three types of CIs, including the Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by nonparametric bootstrap, the Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by the asymptotic theory as $\hat{V}(\hat{\tau}) = n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \varphi_1^{\text{J2R}}(V_i; \hat{P}) - \hat{\tau} \right\}^2$, and the symmetric t bootstrap CI as $(\hat{\tau} - c^* \hat{V}^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}), \hat{\tau} +$

Web Table 2: Comparison among the three types of CIs of the EIF-based estimators in the cross-sectional setting under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+rp+om}}$.

Estimator	Wald-type CI by nonparametric bootstrap		Wald-type CI by asymptotic theory		Symmetric t bootstrap CI	
	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$	95.2	29.82	94.2	27.80	94.9	29.88
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}}$	95.2	29.11	93.9	27.72	95.0	29.44
$\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$	95.0	28.53	93.0	26.04	95.2	28.28


$c^* \hat{\mathbb{V}}^{1/2}(\hat{\tau})$, with c^* as the 95% quantile of $\{ |(\hat{\tau}^{(b)} - \hat{\tau}) / \hat{\mathbb{V}}^{1/2}(\hat{\tau}^{(b)})| : b = 1, \dots, B \}$. Note that the CI comparison is only conducted for the three EIF-based estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr}}$, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-N}}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$ under the scenario where all the three models are correctly specified, since Theorem 3 entails that the EIF-based estimators achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound under $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ps+rp+om}}$. Given that bootstrap is now used to obtain the CIs, we set the number of bootstrap replicates to $B = 500$. Web Table 2 presents the coverage rate and the mean CI length for the three types of CIs. The Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by the asymptotic theory produces an anti-conservative coverage rate and the smallest mean CI length, while the Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by nonparametric bootstrap and the symmetric t bootstrap CI produce comparable coverage rates and mean CI lengths for each EIF-based estimator. As obtaining the Wald-type CI with the nonparametric bootstrap variance estimator does not involve the calculation of the bootstrap CI, which saves computation time, we recommend using it in the cross-sectional setting.

To explore the effect of calibration on the proposed estimators, we additionally incorporate two simple estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-C}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-C}}$, where we use calibration to obtain the propensity score and response probability weights. Web Figure 1 and Web Table 3 present the corresponding simulation results. While calibration fails to improve the performance of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-om-C}}$ as the true propensity score weights are not extreme under this simulation setting, it reveals a significant improvement in the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-C}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$, since combining the propensity score and response probability weights together is more likely to generate extreme values. Among the three calibration-based estimators, the EIF-based estimator $\hat{\tau}_{\text{tr-C}}$ has the most satisfying performance with the greatest precision and robustness.

Web Appendix G.2 Longitudinal setting

We use the original covariates X_1, \dots, X_5 in GAM to approximate each nuisance function separately in each group. For calibration, we incorporate the first two moments of the transformed covariates Z and all the interactions to calibrate the propensity score weights, and use the first two moments of the historical information and all the interactions to calibrate the response probability weights

Web Figure 1: Performance of the estimators in the cross-sectional setting under 8 different model specifications, where ps, rp, and om are shorthands for the propensity score, response probability, and outcome mean. In the x-axis, tr, tr-N, and tr-C denote the three EIF-based estimators $\hat{\tau}_{tr}$, $\hat{\tau}_{tr-N}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{tr-C}$; psrp, psrp-N, and psrp-C denote the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp}$, $\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-N}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-C}$; psom, psom-N, and psom-C denote the estimators $\hat{\tau}_{ps-om}$, $\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-N}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-C}$; and rpom denotes the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{rp-om}$ in Example 1.



Web Table 3: Coverage rates and mean CI lengths in the cross-sectional setting under 8 different model specifications, where PS, RP, and OM are shorthands for the propensity score, response probability, and outcome mean.

Model specification			Coverage rate (%) (Mean CI length, %)									
PS	RP	OM	$\hat{\tau}_{tr}$	$\hat{\tau}_{tr-N}$	$\hat{\tau}_{tr-C}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-N}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-C}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-N}$	$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-C}$	$\hat{\tau}_{rp-om}$
yes	yes	yes	94.7 (30.9)	94.7 (29.5)	94.4 (28.5)	95.7 (59.9)	95.5 (41.8)	93.4 (39.9)	94.9 (29.1)	94.9 (29.0)	95.0 (52.3)	94.3 (28.2)
yes	yes	no	95.3 (41.8)	94.8 (36.1)	94.3 (33.7)	95.7 (59.9)	95.5 (41.8)	93.4 (39.9)	80.6 (33.1)	80.6 (33.1)	81.4 (49.3)	57.6 (34.0)
yes	no	yes	94.1 (28.8)	94.1 (28.3)	94.2 (28.2)	79.7 (36.7)	80.0 (35.3)	93.8 (41.4)	94.9 (29.1)	94.9 (29.0)	95.0 (52.3)	93.5 (27.7)
no	yes	yes	94.4 (29.5)	94.4 (29.1)	94.4 (28.5)	85.8 (45.7)	86.0 (40.7)	93.4 (39.9)	72.8 (37.9)	72.9 (37.9)	95.0 (52.3)	94.3 (28.2)
yes	no	no	83.0 (32.7)	82.9 (32.3)	93.1 (33.8)	79.7 (36.7)	80.0 (35.3)	93.8 (41.4)	80.6 (33.1)	80.6 (33.1)	81.4 (49.3)	53.4 (34.1)
no	yes	no	84.1 (37.4)	83.9 (35.9)	94.3 (33.7)	85.8 (45.7)	86.0 (40.7)	93.4 (39.9)	53.8 (34.6)	53.8 (34.7)	81.4 (49.3)	57.6 (34.0)
no	no	yes	94.6 (29.2)	94.6 (29.2)	94.2 (28.2)	56.1 (38.0)	56.1 (37.4)	93.8 (41.4)	72.8 (37.9)	72.9 (37.9)	95.0 (52.3)	93.5 (27.7)
no	no	no	61.3 (35.1)	61.3 (34.9)	93.1 (33.8)	56.1 (38.0)	56.1 (37.4)	93.8 (41.4)	53.8 (34.7)	53.8 (34.7)	81.4 (49.3)	53.4 (34.1)

Web Table 4: Simulation results of the estimators in the longitudinal setting.

Estimator	Bias (%)	SD (%)	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)
$\hat{\tau}_{mr}$	4.54	10.35	95.40	43.76
$\hat{\tau}_{mr-N}$	4.59	10.37	95.20	43.73
$\hat{\tau}_{mr-C}$	3.36	9.94	96.60	42.77
$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp}$	44.55	15.18	26.70	72.04
$\hat{\tau}_{ps-rp-N}$	44.56	15.26	27.10	72.13
$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om}$	17.31	12.03	93.10	51.47
$\hat{\tau}_{ps-om-N}$	17.56	12.08	92.50	52.02
$\hat{\tau}_{rp-pm}$	-13.14	8.57	77.20	39.50

sequentially.

Web Table 4 shows the simulation results of the eight estimators for longitudinal outcomes under J2R in detail. The SD in the table refers to the Monte Carlo standard deviation. From the table, the multiply robust estimators are unbiased, while other estimators suffer from larger deviations from the true value. Applying calibration tends to improve efficiency, as we observe a smaller Monte Carlo variation compared to the other two multiply robust estimators.

Similar to the cross-sectional setting, we compare three types of CIs of the EIF-based estimators, including the Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by nonparametric bootstrap, the Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by asymptotic theory, and the symmetric t bootstrap CI in Web Table 5, with the number of bootstrap replicates $B = 500$. While applying nonparametric bootstrap produces a slightly conservative Wald-type CI with a wider CI length, the anti-conservative issue of Wald-type CI with the variance estimated by the asymptotic theory is more pronounced in the longitudinal setting, resulting in low coverage rates and smaller mean CI lengths. Using symmetric t

Web Table 5: Comparison among the three types of CIs of the EIF-based estimators in the longitudinal setting.

Estimator	Wald-type CI by nonparametric bootstrap		Wald-type CI by asymptotic theory		Symmetric t bootstrap CI	
	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)	Coverage rate (%)	Mean CI length (%)
$\hat{\tau}_{mr}$	96.3	45.76	83.7	31.08	95.4	43.76
$\hat{\tau}_{mr-N}$	96.2	45.90	84.1	31.61	95.2	43.73
$\hat{\tau}_{mr-C}$	98.3	48.70	82.9	28.36	96.6	42.77


bootstrap CI eases those issues and leads to satisfying coverage rates and mean CI lengths. Therefore, we recommend the use of symmetric t bootstrap CI in the longitudinal setting to obtain reasonable CIs for the multiply robust estimators.

Web Appendix H Additional results from application

The antidepressant clinical trial data is available on <https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/research/centres-projects-groups/missing-data#dia-missing-data> prepared by Mallinckrodt et al. (2014). The longitudinal outcomes in the data suffer from missingness at weeks 2, 4, 6, and 8. All the missingness in the control group follows a monotone missingness pattern, while 1 participant in the treatment group has intermittent missing data. We first delete three individuals with the unobserved investigation site numbers, and one individual with intermittent missing data for simplicity, since our proposed framework is only valid under a monotone missingness pattern. After data preprocessing, 39 participants in the control group and 30 participants in the treatment group suffered from monotone missingness. We fit models of the propensity score, response probability and outcome mean sequentially in backward order, starting from the last time point. For outcome mean models, we regress the observed outcome Y_4 at the last time point on the historical information H_3 in the group with $A = a$ to get $\hat{\mu}_4^a(H_3)$, and then regress the predicted value $\hat{\mu}_4^a(H_s)$ at time s on the historical information H_{s-1} using the subset of the data with $(R_{s-1} = 1, A = a)$ to get $\mu_4^a(H_{s-1})$ for $s = 1, \dots, 3$, recursively. For response probability, we fit the observed indicator R_s with the incorporation of the historical information H_{s-1} on the data with $(R_{s-1} = 1, A = a)$ to get $\hat{\pi}_s(a, H_{s-1})$ for $s = 1, \dots, 4$ sequentially. For propensity score models, the treatment indicator A is regressed on H_{s-1} using the subset of the data with $R_{s-1} = 1$ to get $\hat{e}(H_{s-1})$. For the pattern mean models $\{g_{s+1}^l(H_{l-1}) : l = 1, \dots, s \text{ and } s = 1, \dots, 4\}$ that rely on both the response probability and outcome mean models, we regress the predicted value on the historical information H_{s-1} on the subset of the data with $(R_{s-1} = 1, A = 1)$.

The distributions of the normalized estimated weights involved in the multiply robust estimators are visualized in Web Figure 2 (type = “original”). The weights that correspond to weeks 4 ($A = 0$

Web Figure 2: Weight distributions of the HAMD-17 data



and $R_2 = 1$), 6 ($A = 0$ and $R_3 = 1$) and 8 ($A = 0$ and $R_4 = 1$) suffer from extreme outliers. The existence of outliers explains a distinct difference in the point estimation of $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\text{ps-rp-N}}$ in Table 3 in the main text. Therefore, we consider using calibration to mitigate the impact. The distributions of calibrated weights are also presented in Figure 2. As shown by the figure, calibration tends to scatter the concentrated estimated weights when no outstanding outliers exist in the original weights, for weights when $A = 1$ and ($A = 0, R_1 = 1$). However, it stabilizes the extreme weights at weeks 4, 6, and 8, which explains the narrower CI produced by $\hat{\tau}_{\text{mr-C}}$ compared to the other two multiply robust estimators.