

---

# A finite sample theorem for longitudinal causal inference with machine learning: Long term, dynamic, and mediated effects

---

**Rahul Singh**  
MIT Economics  
rahul.singh@mit.edu

## Abstract

I construct and justify confidence intervals for longitudinal causal parameters estimated with machine learning. Longitudinal parameters include long term, dynamic, and mediated effects. I provide a nonasymptotic theorem for any longitudinal causal parameter in a general class, estimated with any machine learning algorithm that satisfies a few simple conditions. The main result encompasses local parameters defined for specific demographics as well as proximal parameters defined in the presence of unobserved confounding. I prove consistency, Gaussian approximation, and semiparametric efficiency. The rate of Gaussian approximation is  $n^{-1/2}$  for global parameters, and it degrades gracefully for local parameters. I articulate a simple set of conditions to translate mean square rates into statistical inference, and verify that they hold for adversarial estimators over generic function spaces. A key feature of the main result is a new multiple robustness to ill posedness for proximal causal inference in longitudinal settings. Of independent interest, I provide what appears to be the first mean square rate for nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression.

## 1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to construct and justify confidence intervals for longitudinal causal parameters estimated with machine learning. Longitudinal causal parameters include long term, dynamic, and mediated treatment effects. The additional difficulty of longitudinal causal inference, relative to static causal inference, is dealing with variables that are observed after the intervention but before the outcome. In long term studies, these are the short term surrogate outcomes; in dynamic studies, these are the covariates collected between doses; and in mediation studies, these are the mechanisms we wish to understand.

Such variables must be integrated out according to their counterfactual distributions conditional on the intervention. As such, the counterfactual conditional distribution is an additional nuisance parameter that arises in longitudinal causal inference but does not arise in static causal inference. Explicitly or implicitly estimating the counterfactual distribution with a machine learning algorithm introduces bias that compounds and interacts with the usual bias that arises when using machine learning in static causal inference. This complex interplay makes traditional statistical inference challenging.

I present a general theorem for statistical inference over a broad class of longitudinal causal parameters and a broad class of machine learning algorithms. I provide a simple set of conditions which can be verified using mean square rates provided by statistical learning theory. Unlike previous work, I provide a finite sample analysis for any global or local longitudinal causal parameter estimated using any machine learning algorithm, subject to these simple conditions. The machine learning

algorithms may be estimating nonparametric regressions, partial means, confounding bridges (i.e. nonparametric instrumental variable regressions), or some other nonparametric quantities. As such, the theorem allows for heterogeneous treatment effects and proxy variables, which appear to be innovations. To showcase how the rate conditions are useful, I instantiate adversarial estimators over generic function spaces and verify that they satisfy the rate conditions, implying inference.

I make the following contributions.

**Statistical.** I provide a machine learning inference result for a general class of longitudinal causal parameters, allowing analysts to use machine learning and obtain confidence intervals in several longitudinal settings where they previously could not: (i) long term effects where the treatment is only observed in an experimental sample and the long term outcome is only observed in an observational sample; (ii) heterogeneous dynamic and mediated effects; and (iii) proximal longitudinal parameters. For global parameters of the full population, I prove consistency, Gaussian approximation, and semiparametric efficiency. For local parameters of specific subpopulations, I prove consistency and Gaussian approximation. The rate of convergence is  $n^{-1/2}$  for global parameters, and it degrades gracefully to nonparametric rates for local parameters. The main result is nonasymptotic, explicitly accounting for each source of error in any finite sample size. The result implies asymptotic uniform validity over large classes of models, translating into honest confidence intervals. Along the way, I provide a simple set of steps for constructing Neyman orthogonal moment functions of longitudinal causal parameters beyond the leading examples.

**Conceptual.** This paper appears to be the first to provide machine learning inference for longitudinal causal parameters in a general class with a common structure, so a conceptual contribution is to define that class. The main result unifies, refines, and extends existing machine learning inference theory that combines sample splitting with moment functions possessing the multiple robustness property, hereafter called multiply robust moments functions. I unify existing asymptotic results that are specific to particular global longitudinal parameters. General asymptotic theory with abstract conditions exists for generic global parameters (longitudinal or otherwise), which I refine to finite sample theory with simple conditions for a class of longitudinal causal parameters. The finite sample main result handles longitudinal causal parameters that may be local or proximal. It also reveals a new notion of multiple robustness to ill posedness for proximal causal inference in longitudinal settings. This insight is important because every confounding bridge is a solution to a nested ill posed inverse problem. The main result provides a single solution for longitudinal parameters that arise in statistics, epidemiology, and economics, forging connections among disparate literatures.

**Algorithmic.** To showcase how the rate conditions are practical, I propose sequential adversarial estimators and verify that the estimators satisfy the proposed rate conditions. In particular, I prove fast rates over generic function spaces that are popular in machine learning: sparse linear functions, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, and neural networks. In order to verify the proximal rate conditions, which involve nested confounding bridge functions, I prove a general mean square result for nested nonparametric instrumental variable (NPIV) regression. The nested NPIV result is of independent interest; this paper appears to be the first to propose an estimator for nested NPIV and the first to prove a nested NPIV rate. The multiple robustness to ill posedness in the proposed rate conditions partially ameliorates the compounded ill posedness of the nested NPIV estimation problem. These algorithmic techniques may be more generally useful for nonparametric models in econometrics, where NPIV frequently appears.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes related work. Section 3 articulates the general inference problem and three leading examples: long term effect, heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect, and proximal mediated effect. Section 4 introduces a general strategy to construct Neyman orthogonal moment functions. Section 5 furnishes confidence intervals. Section 6 presents the finite sample theorem as well as corollaries for each of the leading examples. Section 7 verifies the rate conditions of the finite sample theorem using adversarial estimators over generic function spaces. Section 8 concludes.

## 2 Related work

### 2.1 Semiparametric statistics

Classic semiparametric statistics studies functionals, i.e. scalar summaries, of nonparametric objects such as densities or regressions [42, 73, 15, 60, 4, 71, 3, 61]. Early work focuses on settings where the density or regression is defined over a low dimensional domain. In this work, I study a class of functionals arising in longitudinal causal inference that depend on both a density and a regression (or generalizations thereof in the proximal setting). I study the setting where the density and regression may be defined over a low, high, or infinite dimensional domain. In such case, an analyst may wish to use machine learning to estimate the density and regression, which demands a more flexible statistical theory.

In longitudinal causal inference, two balancing weights appear in the efficient influence functions and therefore the asymptotic variances of semiparametric estimators. Multiply robust estimating equations directly incorporate the density, regression, and balancing weights into estimation. The multiply robust estimating equations confer many beneficial properties. As the name suggests, they confer multiple robustness to mis-specification [72, 71]. They also confer Neyman orthogonality: the learning problem for the functional becomes orthogonal to the learning problems for the density, regression, and balancing weights [24, 23, 37]. Finally, they confer a mixed bias property, which implies multiple rate robustness: the functional has bias equal to the product of certain learning rates, so some learning rates may be slower than  $n^{-1/2}$  as long as others are faster than  $n^{-1/2}$  [76]. In this work, I prove that they confer yet another property: multiple robustness to ill posedness, generalizing the double robustness to ill posedness known in static settings [29].

Multiply robust estimating equations are, by themselves, not enough to deliver confidence intervals for functionals of machine learning estimators. In particular, if an analyst uses machine learning to estimate the density and regression, then the nonparametric function spaces may not be Donsker. Both the targeted maximum likelihood [95, 101, 54, 94, 68] and debiased machine learning [24, 23] literatures provide a solution: combine multiply robust estimating equations with sample splitting [14, 79, 52]. I prove new inferential guarantees for this meta algorithm when it is used in longitudinal causal inference. In particular, I articulate sufficient conditions for valid confidence intervals in terms of learning rates on machine learning estimators used to estimate the density, regression, and balancing weights. I provide a simple and general nonasymptotic theorem that applies to many longitudinal settings, with and without localization, with and without proxies.

### 2.2 Longitudinal causal inference and machine learning

A longitudinal causal inference problem is one in which a key variable takes place after the hypothetical intervention but before the outcome. In such case, an analyst must account for not only the hypothetical intervention but also its downstream effects; identification involves integrating out the key variable according to its hypothetical distribution conditional on the intervention. One example is long term effect: an analyst may wish to combine a short-term experimental data set with a long-term observational data set in order to evaluate the long term effect of an intervention [67, 10, 38, 21, 75, 6, 5, 74, 48]. The key variable is the surrogate short term outcome available in both data sets. Another example is dynamic treatment effect: an analyst may wish to estimate the effect of a sequence of treatments [69, 70, 41, 43, 97, 92, 7, 100, 63]. The key variable is the covariate observed between treatments, which may reflect prior treatment. Yet another example is mediation analysis: an analyst may wish to understand the mechanism through which some treatment affects some outcome [47, 8, 64, 46, 65, 89, 96, 102]. The key variable is the mediator between treatment and outcome.

In this work, I provide a general theorem for a broad class of longitudinal causal parameters, including long term, dynamic, and mediated effects, with and without localization, with and without proxies. Existing work for long term effect in the sense of [6] imposes restrictive separability and linearity conditions that are not required for identification [9]. At the time this paper was initially circulated in 2021 [84], it appears to have been the first to provide machine learning inference results for the unrestricted long term effect in the sense of [6], where treatment is only observed in the experimental sample and outcome is only observed in the observational sample. For dynamic and mediated effects, the theorem subsumes existing work on certain special cases while also providing new results for additional cases. In particular, asymptotic results for unconfounded dynamic [16, 17]

and mediated [36] effects for the full population exist (albeit without variance estimation guarantees for the latter). I provide a finite sample guarantee that encompasses semiparametric effects for the full population as well as nonparametric, heterogeneous effects for subpopulations. In addition, I study the additional complexity of proximal causal inference [57, 58, 32, 90, 99, 34], where unobserved confounding contaminates causal inference but the analyst has access to negative controls with special properties. At the time this paper was initially circulated in 2021 [84], it appears to have been the first to provide machine learning inference results for longitudinal proximal causal inference of any kind.

### 2.3 Localization and proxies

In summary, the innovations of the general result are machine learning inference for (i) long term effects when treatment is only observed in the experimental sample and outcome is only observed in the observational sample; (ii) heterogeneous dynamic and mediated effects; and (iii) proximal longitudinal parameters of any kind. Previous work on localized and proximal effects focus on the static setting. Despite the additional complexity of the longitudinal setting, I recover equally strong results. In particular, [54, 51, 13, 28, 103, 35, 31, 50, 29, 2] study static local parameters and [83, 49, 40, 29] study static proximal parameters. Like the latter, I arrive at mean square rates and projected mean square rates of confounding bridges (also called nonparametric instrumental variable regressions). Unlike previous work, I also arrive at projected mean square rates for nested confounding bridges, reflecting the longitudinal structure.

### 2.4 Adversarial estimation in causal inference

As one way to verify the proposed rate conditions for inference, I prove that they are satisfied by sequential adversarial estimators over generic function spaces. The analysis builds on foundational technical lemmas for constrained  $M$ -estimators from [37], which in turn synthesize [55, 98] for vector-valued contraction. I draw inspiration from [53, 11, 33, 56], who propose and analyze an adversarial estimator for the static nonparametric instrumental variable regression problem. By contrast, I study a new estimator for the more challenging nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression problem, which appears not to have been studied before. The results of [33] have been previously adapted for static proximal causal inference by [49, 40]; by contrast, I study longitudinal proximal causal inference. I contribute to the literature on adversarial estimation in both static [25] and dynamic [26] causal inference.

## 3 Framework

### 3.1 Longitudinal causal parameters

The general inference problem is to find a confidence interval for some longitudinal causal parameter. The causal parameter is a scalar  $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  of the form

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) \right\}, \quad \gamma_0 \in \mathbb{L}_2,$$

where  $m : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{L}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an abstract formula that depends on the causal parameter of interest.  $W \in \mathcal{W}$  is a concatenation of random variables in the model excluding the outcome  $Y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$ .  $(W_1, W_2) \subset W$  are subsets of random variables, which roughly correspond to some variables  $W_1$  observed before intervention and other variables  $W_2$  observed after intervention.  $\mathbb{L}_2$  is the space of functions of the form  $\gamma : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that are square integrable with respect to measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . Below, I instantiate this abstract formulation for the leading examples.

Note that  $\gamma_0$  may be the conditional expectation function  $\gamma_0(w) = \mathbb{E}(Y | W = w)$  or some other nonparametric quantity. For example, in proximal causal inference,  $\gamma_0$  is a function called the confounding bridge defined as the solution to a nested ill posed inverse problem [57, 58, 32]. In econometrics, such a function is called a nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression [62, 19]. I study the exactly identified case, which amounts to assuming completeness [22].

Functionals in this class have a two-stage structure: the formula  $m$  transforms the function  $\gamma_0$ , then the conditional distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$  reweights it. In particular, the reweighting is with respect to  $W_2$

conditional on  $W_1$ . The transformation  $m$  is interpretable as a counterfactual query based on some intervention, and the distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$  is interpretable as the downstream counterfactual distribution of observables conditional on this intervention.

**Remark 3.1** (Class of longitudinal causal parameters). *This paper appears to be the first to provide machine learning inference for longitudinal causal parameters in a general class with a common structure, so a conceptual contribution is to define that class. The common structure is the presence of some variables  $W_2$  that take place after the intervention but before the outcome. These variables must be integrated out according to their counterfactual distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Whereas static causal inference involves functionals of  $\gamma_0$ , longitudinal causal inference involves functionals of both  $\gamma_0$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

A localized functional  $\theta_0^{\text{lim}} \in \mathbb{R}$  is a scalar that takes the form

$$\theta_0^{\text{lim}} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \theta_{0,h}.$$

Each local parameter in the sequence takes the form

$$\theta_{0,h} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int m_h(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int \ell_h(W_\ell) m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) \right\}$$

where  $\ell_h$  is a Nadaraya Watson weighting with bandwidth  $h$  and  $W_\ell \subset W$  is the subset of random variables with which we wish to localize.  $\theta_0^{\text{lim}}$  is a nonparametric quantity. However, it can be approximated by the sequence  $(\theta_{0,h})$  indexed by  $h$ . Each  $\theta_{0,h}$  in the sequence can be analyzed like  $\theta_0$  above as long as we keep track of how certain quantities depend on  $h$  [28, 29]. By this logic, finite sample semiparametric theory for each  $\theta_{0,h}$  in the sequence extends to finite sample nonparametric theory for  $\theta_0^{\text{lim}}$  up to some approximation error. In this sense, the main result encompasses both global and local functionals. After presenting the main result, I present a corollary for the local case.

To illustrate, I consider three motivating examples: long term effect, heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect, and proximal mediation analysis. At the time this paper was circulated [84], it appears to have been the first to provide inferential theory over machine learning function spaces for each of these examples, in their full semiparametric generality. This paper allows analysts to use machine learning and obtain confidence intervals in a broad variety of longitudinal settings where they previously could not.

### 3.2 Example: Long term effect

The first example is long term effect. The goal is to combine a short-term experimental data set with a long-term observational data set in order to evaluate the long term effect of an intervention.

For illustration, consider program evaluation of Project STAR, an experiment in which kindergarteners were randomly assigned to small or large class sizes [30]. Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be baseline covariates such as age, gender, ethnicity, and free lunch status. Let  $D \in \{0, 1\}$  indicate assignment to a small class. Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  be elementary school test scores and  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$  be earnings in adulthood. An analyst may wish to measure the effect of class size  $D$  on earnings  $Y$  (a long term outcome), yet the experimental sample only includes elementary school test scores  $M$  (a short term outcome).

If the analyst has access to an additional observational sample that includes the long term outcome, then long term causal inference is still possible [6]. Specifically, assume the analyst has access to (i) an experimental sample, indicated by  $G = 0$ , where  $(D, M, X)$  are observed; and (ii) an observational sample, indicated by  $G = 1$ , where  $(M, X, Y)$  are observed. The observational sample may also be interpreted as the selected sample for which the outcome  $Y$  is revealed. The key identifying assumption is that the short term outcome is a statistical surrogate for the long term outcome.

**Example 3.1** (Long term effect). *Formally, define the long term effect  $\mathbb{E}[Y^{(d)}]$  as the counterfactual mean outcome for the full population in the thought experiment in which everyone is assigned treatment value  $D = d$ . Define the regression and the conditional distribution*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0(m, x, g) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|M = m, X = x, G = g] \\ \mathbb{P}(m|d, x, g) &= \mathbb{P}(M = m|D = d, X = x, G = g). \end{aligned}$$

Then the long term effect is

$$\text{LONG}(d) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int \gamma_0(m, X, 1) d\mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0) \right\}.$$

In summary,  $W = (D, M, X, G)$ ,  $W_1 = (D, X, G)$ , and  $W_2 = M$ . Moreover,

$$m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) = \gamma_0(m, X, 1), \quad \mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) = \mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0).$$

The long term effect defined for the experimental or observational subpopulation is similar, introducing the fixed local weighting  $\ell(G) = \mathbb{1}_{G=0}/\mathbb{P}(G=0)$  or  $\ell(G) = \mathbb{1}_{G=1}/\mathbb{P}(G=1)$ , respectively. A variation of this problem allows treatment to be observed in the observational sample, and its form is similar [5]. More generally, any missing-at-random dynamic sample selection problem has this structure [77].

Previous machine learning inference guarantees for long term effects in the sense of [6], where treatment is only observed in the experimental sample and outcome is only observed in the observational sample, rely on strong linearity and separability assumptions that are not necessary for identification [9]. Previous machine learning analysis is also asymptotic and excludes consistency of asymptotic variance estimation (which is critical for justification of confidence intervals). By contrast, I impose only causal assumptions rather than functional form assumptions; provide finite sample analysis that allows for nonparametric localization; and elucidate which conditions are required for consistent variance estimation (and hence valid confidence intervals).

### 3.3 Example: Heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect

The second example is dynamic treatment effect. The goal is to estimate the effect of a sequence of treatments rather than the effect of a one-off treatment. I consider the additional complexity of measuring heterogeneous effects with respect to an interpretable baseline characteristic.

For illustration, consider clinical evaluation of new drug administered in two injections. Let  $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be baseline covariates such as demographics, health, and health-related behaviors. Let  $D_1 \in \{0, 1\}$  indicate whether the first dose was administered. Let  $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be covariates measured between possible doses. Importantly, the health and health-related behaviors may change due to  $D_1$ . For example, an individual who received  $D_1 = 1$  may partake in riskier behaviors than an individual who received  $D_1 = 0$ . Subsequently, let  $D_2 \in \{0, 1\}$  indicate whether the second dose was administered. Finally, let  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$  be a downstream health outcome such as mortality.

An analyst may wish to measure the effect of the treatment sequence  $(d_1, d_2) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  on the health outcome  $Y$ . Moreover, the analyst may wish to measure how this effect varies with respect to age  $V \subset X_1$ , which is a continuous baseline covariate. Identification of the heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect is an extension of the classic g formula [69]. The key identifying assumption is a dynamic generalization of selection on observables: conditional on baseline covariates  $X_1$ , assignment of the first dose  $D_1$  is as good as random; conditional on baseline covariates  $X_1$ , initial dose  $D_1$ , and subsequent covariates  $X_2$  that may reflect the initial dose, assignment of the second dose  $D_2$  is as good as random.

**Example 3.2** (Heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect). *Formally, define the heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect  $\mathbb{E}[Y^{(d_1, d_2)}|V = v]$  as the counterfactual mean outcome for the subpopulation with special covariate value  $V = v$  in the thought experiment in which this subpopulation is assigned treatment sequence  $(D_1, D_2) = (d_1, d_2)$ . Define the regression and the conditional distribution*

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2] \\ \mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, x_1) &= \mathbb{P}(X_2 = x_2|D_1 = d_1, X_1 = x_1). \end{aligned}$$

Then the heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DYNAMIC}(d_1, d_2, v) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2) d\mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1) \mid V = v \right\} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \ell_h(V) \int \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2) d\mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\ell_h(V)$  is the localization around the value  $v$  with bandwidth  $h$ :

$$\ell_h(V) = \frac{1}{\omega} K\left(\frac{V-v}{h}\right), \quad \omega = \mathbb{E}\left\{K\left(\frac{V-v}{h}\right)\right\}.$$

In summary,  $W = (D_1, D_2, X_1, X_2)$ ,  $W_\ell = V$ ,  $W_1 = (D_1, X_1)$ , and  $W_2 = X_2$ . Moreover,

$$m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) = \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2), \quad \mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) = \mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1).$$

The heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect is defined with respect to some interpretable, low dimensional characteristic  $V$  such as age [1]. The same functional without the localization  $\ell_h$  is the classic dynamic treatment effect. The techniques developed in this paper also apply to other localized longitudinal settings, e.g. heterogeneous sample selection and mediation analysis as well as selected, dynamic, and mediated dose response curves [44, 39, 88, 85].

The localized dynamic treatment effect does not appear to have existing inference guarantees for machine learning. The global dynamic treatment effect does have such guarantees, however previous work is asymptotic [16, 17]. As an aside, note that the heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect problem is only truly nonparametric when  $V$  is continuous. When  $V$  is discrete, taking  $\ell_h(V) = \mathbb{1}_{V=v}/\mathbb{P}(V=v)$  simplifies to a semiparametric problem [87]; I used similar logic in Example 3.1 above with  $\ell_h(G) = \mathbb{1}_{G=1}/\mathbb{P}(G=1)$ . Unlike previous work, I provide finite sample analysis that allows for nonparametric localization.

### 3.4 Example: Proximal mediation analysis

The third example is mediation analysis. The goal of mediation analysis is to understand the mechanism through which some treatment affects some outcome. I consider the additional complexity of unobserved confounding.

For illustration, consider program evaluation of the US Job Corps, a federal job training program for disadvantaged youths [80]. Let  $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be baseline covariates such as demographics, education, and health. Let  $D \in \{0, 1\}$  indicate participation in job training. Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  be employment in the year after job training. Let  $Y \in \mathbb{R}$  be arrests by the police a few years after job training. An analyst may wish to measure the extent to which the effect of job training  $D$  on arrests  $Y$  is mediated by the mechanism of employment  $M$ . However, the analyst may worry about unobserved confounding that drives participation in job training  $D$  as well as subsequent employment  $M$  and arrests  $Y$ .

If an analyst has access to (i) negative control treatment  $Z \in \mathbb{R}$  that does not cause employment  $M$  nor arrests  $Y$ ; and (ii) negative control outcome  $V \in \mathbb{R}$  that is not caused by job training  $D$ , employment  $M$ , nor negative control treatment  $Z$ ; then mediation analysis is still possible. If the negative controls  $(Z, V)$  can detect unobserved confounding, then they can also be used to adjust for it [34].

**Example 3.3** (Proximal mediated effect). *Formally, define the mediated effect  $\mathbb{E}[Y^{(1, M^{(0)})}]$  as the counterfactual mean outcome for the full population in the thought experiment in which everyone is treated but the mediator  $M$  follows the distribution it would have followed had everyone been untreated. Define the outcome confounding bridge  $\gamma_0$  as the solution to the following integral equations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y|D=1, M=m, X=x, Z=z) &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(D, M, X, V)|D=1, M=m, X=x, Z=z\} \\ \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V)|D=0, X=x, Z=z\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_0(D, X, V)|D=0, X=x, Z=z\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define the conditional distribution  $\mathbb{P}(v|x) = \mathbb{P}(V=v|X=x)$ . Then the proximal mediated effect is

$$\text{MEDIATED} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\int \gamma_0(0, X, v) d\mathbb{P}(v|X)\right\}.$$

In summary,  $W = (D, M, X, Z, V)$ ,  $W_1 = X$ , and  $W_2 = V$ . Moreover,

$$m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) = \gamma_0(0, X, v), \quad \mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) = \mathbb{P}(v|X).$$

The framework encompasses proximal mediation analysis in the presence of unobserved confounding, as well as the more traditional mediation analysis without unobserved confounding. The techniques developed in this paper also apply to other proximal longitudinal settings, e.g. proximal dynamic treatment effect [99].

Proximal mediation analysis does not have existing inference guarantees for machine learning. The traditional mediation analysis does have such guarantees [36], however previous work is asymptotic and excludes consistency of asymptotic variance estimation (which is critical for the construction of confidence intervals). By contrast, I study the proximal setting and elucidate which conditions are required for consistent variance estimation (and hence valid confidence intervals).

## 4 Multiply robust moments

### 4.1 Moment function and orthogonality

In Section 3, I argue that long term, dynamic, and mediated effects—with and without localization, with and without proxies—are causal parameters of the form

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) \right\}, \quad \gamma_0 \in \mathbb{L}_2.$$

It turns out that all of these causal parameters have multiply robust moment functions with a common structure, which I explore in this section. Indeed, one interpretation of this section is a simple set of steps for constructing Neyman orthogonal moment functions of longitudinal causal parameters beyond the leading examples. An analyst can use these steps systematically, rather than resorting to guess-and-check.

Consider the moment function

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[\nu_0(W_1) + \alpha_0(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\} + \eta_0(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}].$$

In the statistical analysis to follow, I will consider the parametrization  $(\nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)$  across longitudinal causal parameters. I call this object the longitudinal moment function.

Let us interpret the various nuisance parameters, initially focusing on the unconfounded case for simplicity. Let

$$\delta_0(W) = m(W_1, W_2, \gamma_0), \quad \nu_0(W) = \int m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1).$$

The object  $\delta_0$  encodes the counterfactual query of interest. The object  $\nu_0$  is a reweighting of  $\delta_0$  according to the distribution  $\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1)$ , which encodes the counterfactual distribution of variables that follow the intervention. From identification alone,  $(\nu_0, \delta_0)$  are pinned down.

Plug-in estimation refers to using only the first term in the moment function:

$$\hat{\theta} = \mathbb{E}_n\{\hat{\nu}(W_1)\} = \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \int m(W_1, w_2, \hat{\gamma}) d\hat{\mathbb{Q}}(w_2|W_1) \right]$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_n[A] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [A_i]$ . Plug-in estimation is invalid if (i) either  $\hat{\gamma}$  or  $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$  is incorrectly specified; or if (ii) either  $\hat{\gamma}$  or  $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$  involves regularization that balances bias and variance.

The subsequent terms address the issues of incorrect specification and regularization bias. There are two bias correction terms, accounting for both  $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbb{Q}})$ . The former is a balancing weight  $\alpha_0$  multiplied by a “stage 1” residual  $Y - \delta_0(W)$  while the latter is another balancing weight  $\eta_0$  multiplied by a “stage 2” residual  $\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)$ . Below, I elaborate the sense in which  $(\alpha_0, \eta_0)$  may or may not be Riesz representers, departing from the static case.

What remains to show is a general strategy for constructing the balancing weights  $(\alpha_0, \eta_0)$  such that the longitudinal moment function in terms of  $(\nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)$  is Neyman orthogonal. I state four equations in the four unknowns  $(\nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$ , which pin down  $(\alpha_0, \eta_0)$ . Subsequently, I prove that these equations imply Neyman orthogonality and verify them for the leading examples.

**Assumption 4.1** (First order conditions). *Suppose that for all  $(\nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{M}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\{\nu(W) - \nu_0(W)\}\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}] &= 0 \\ \mathbb{E}[\{\delta(W) - \delta_0(W)\}\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}] &= 0 \\ \mathbb{E}[\{\alpha(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}] &= 0 \\ \mathbb{E}[\{\eta(W) - \eta_0(W)\}\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$  are the hypothesis spaces used in estimation.



It turns out that the choice of hypothesis spaces is crucial for multiple robustness and Neyman orthogonality, as I discuss below. I refer to these conditions as first order conditions because they correspond to the first order terms in a functional Taylor expansion of the longitudinal moment function. Geometrically, each condition states that a certain  $\mathbb{L}_2$  inner product is zero, i.e. that a certain functional orthogonality holds.

**Lemma 4.1** (Neyman orthogonality). *If Assumption 4.1 holds then the longitudinal moment function is Neyman orthogonal with respect to  $(\nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)$ .*

See Appendix A for the proof. Neyman orthogonality is the key condition that drives my analysis in the same spirit as [24, 23, 37, 29], who focus on static settings.

**Remark 4.1** (Constructing Neyman orthogonal moments). *In summary, an analyst may use the following set of steps to determine the Neyman orthogonal moment function for a longitudinal causal parameter. Consider the longitudinal moment function parametrized in terms of  $(\nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)$ . Both  $(\nu_0, \delta_0)$  are pinned down by identification. Then the balancing weights  $(\alpha_0, \eta_0)$  are pinned down by solving the equations in Assumption 4.1. This insight appears to be new.*

## 4.2 Examples revisited

The general theorem I propose in this paper applies to the class of longitudinal causal parameters whose longitudinal moment functions satisfy Assumption 4.1. I verify that the leading examples all belong to this class. In particular, I present the nuisance functions and verify Neyman orthogonality under appropriate restrictions on the hypothesis spaces  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ .

I build on previous work that provides multiply robust moment functions for these leading cases. Unlike previous work, I verify that the multiply robust moment functions belong to the class defined by Assumption 4.1, and subsequently provide a single theorem for the entire class. I begin with long term effect, amending the moment function from [20].<sup>1</sup>

**Proposition 4.1** (Long term effect: Neyman orthogonality). *Recall that*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0(m, x, g) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|M = m, X = x, G = g] \\ \mathbb{P}(m|d, x, g) &= \mathbb{P}(M = m|D = d, X = x, G = g),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) = \gamma_0(m, X, 1), \quad \mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) = \mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0).$$

Take

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(m, X, 1) d\mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_0(M, X, 1) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(d|M, X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ \eta_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)}.\end{aligned}$$

Denote the treatment propensity scores

$$\pi_0(d|X, G=0) = \mathbb{P}(D = d|X, G=0), \quad \rho_0(d|M, X, G=0) = \mathbb{P}(D = d|M, X, G=0)$$

and the selection propensity scores

$$\pi'_0(g|X) = \mathbb{P}(G = g|X), \quad \rho'_0(g|M, X) = \mathbb{P}(G = g|M, X).$$

With the alternative parametrization  $(\nu, \gamma, \pi, \rho, \pi', \rho')$ , which induces choices of  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ , Assumption 4.1 holds.

See Appendix A for the proof. Next, I turn to heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect. I localize the moment function from [78, 59, 7, 93].

<sup>1</sup>In [20],  $\eta_0$  appears to be missing the selection propensity score.

**Proposition 4.2** (Heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect: Neyman orthogonality). *Recall that*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0(d_1, d_2, x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2] \\ \mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, x_1) &= \mathbb{P}(X_2 = x_2|D_1 = d_1, X_1 = x_1),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) = \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2), \quad \mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) = \mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1).$$

Take

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2) d\mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \\ \eta_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)}.\end{aligned}$$

To localize, multiply each of the three terms in the moment function by  $\ell_h(V)$ . Denote the treatment propensity scores

$$\pi_0(d_1|X_1) = \mathbb{P}(D_1 = d_1|X_1), \quad \rho_0(d_2|D_1, X_1, X_2) = \mathbb{P}(D_2 = d_2|D_1, X_1, X_2).$$

With the alternative parametrization  $(\nu, \gamma, \pi, \rho)$ , which induces choices of  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ , Assumption 4.1 holds.

See Appendix A for the proof. Finally, I turn to proximal mediation analysis. In the proximal setting, where  $\gamma_0$  is a solution to an ill posed inverse problem, it turns out that  $(\nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$  are also solutions to ill posed inverse problems, echoing what is well known in the static case [81, 45]. I quote the moment function from [34].

**Proposition 4.3** (Proximal mediation analysis: Neyman orthogonality). *Recall that the outcome confounding bridges  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_0)$  are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Y|D = 1, M = m, X = x, Z = z) &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(D, M, X, V)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, Z = z\} \\ \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V)|D = 0, X = x, Z = z\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_0(D, X, V)|D = 0, X = x, Z = z\},\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{P}(v|x) = \mathbb{P}(V = v|X = x)$ , and

$$m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) = \gamma_0(0, X, v), \quad \mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1) = \mathbb{P}(v|X).$$

Further define the treatment confounding bridges  $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V)} \mid D = 0, X = x, V = v\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_0(D, X, Z)|D = 0, X = x, V = v\} \\ \mathbb{E}\left\{\beta_0(0, X, Z) \frac{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, V)} \mid D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(D, M, X, Z)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\}.\end{aligned}$$

Take

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \gamma_0(0, X, V) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_1(1, M, X, V) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z) \\ \eta_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z).\end{aligned}$$

With the alternative parametrization  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \beta_0, \beta_1)$ , which induces choices of  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ , Assumption 4.1 holds.

See Appendix A for the proof. A new insight of this work is that, for any longitudinal causal parameter,  $n^{-1/2}$  Gaussian approximation is still possible if (i) either  $\nu_0$  or  $\eta_0$ ; (ii) either  $\delta_0$  or  $\alpha_0$ ; and (iii) either  $\delta_0$  or  $\eta_0$  is the solution to a mildly (rather than severely) ill posed inverse problem. This insight is important because  $(\nu_0, \alpha_0)$  are solutions to nested integral equations, so they suffer from compounded ill posedness and are therefore more difficult problems with typically slower rates than  $(\delta_0, \eta_0)$ . In this sense, the multiply robust moment function confers multiple robustness to ill posedness.

## 5 Algorithm

The goal is general purpose learning and inference for the longitudinal causal parameter  $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Section 3 demonstrates that many such parameters  $\theta_0$  have multiply robust moment functions with nuisance parameters  $(\nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$ . In this section, I describe a meta algorithm to turn estimators  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$  into an estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  such that  $\hat{\theta}$  has a valid and practical confidence interval. This meta algorithm can be seen as an extension of classic one step corrections [66] amenable to the use of modern machine learning, and it has been termed debiased machine learning [23]. Unlike targeted minimum loss inference with a finite sample, it does not involve substitution, iteration, or bootstrapping [91, 18].

The target estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  as well as its confidence interval will depend on nuisance estimators  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$ . I refrain from instantiating these estimators until Section 7. As we will see in subsequent analysis, the general theory only requires that each nuisance estimator converges to the corresponding nuisance parameter in mean square error. The general meta algorithm is as follows.

**Algorithm 5.1** (Debiased machine learning). *Given a sample  $(Y_i, W_i)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), partition the sample into folds  $(I_\ell)$  ( $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ ). Denote by  $I_\ell^c$  the complement of  $I_\ell$ .*

1. For each fold  $\ell$ , estimate  $(\hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  from observations in  $I_\ell^c$ .
2. Estimate  $\theta_0$  as

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} [\hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i)\{Y_i - \hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i)\} + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)\{\hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i) - \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i)\}].$$

3. Estimate its  $(1 - a)100\%$  confidence interval as  $\hat{\theta} \pm c_a \hat{\sigma} n^{-1/2}$ , where  $c_a$  is the  $1 - a/2$  quantile of the standard Gaussian and

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} [\hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i)\{Y_i - \hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i)\} + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)\{\hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i) - \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i)\} - \hat{\theta}]^2.$$

Note that this procedure does not require higher order sample splitting, unlike [27, 36, 12, 16, 17]. Higher order sample splitting leads to smaller effective sample sizes for machine learning estimators, which can significantly depreciate coverage in practice.

What remains is to instantiate the nuisance estimators  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$ . In the unconfounded case, estimators  $(\hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$  are straightforward and inherit known rates from statistical learning theory. Since  $\delta_0(w) = m(w, \gamma_0)$ , a natural estimator is of the form  $\hat{\delta}(w) = m(w, \hat{\gamma})$ . Both  $\alpha_0(w)$  and  $\eta_0(w_1)$  are balancing weights, which can be estimated via explicitly estimating and inverting propensity scores. In Section 6, I reduce learning rate conditions for  $(\hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$  to learning rate conditions on  $\hat{\gamma}$  and the propensity scores, which are guaranteed by existing statistical learning theory. Their rates are also guaranteed by the adversarial estimation rate presented in Section 7.

The estimator  $\hat{\nu}$  is more subtle. Since  $\nu_0(w_1) = \int m(w, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|w_1)$  is a partial mean of  $\gamma_0$ , a natural estimator is of the form  $\hat{\nu}(w_1) = \int m(w, \hat{\gamma}) d\hat{\mathbb{Q}}(w_2|w_1)$ . [88] propose an estimator based on kernel ridge regression with a closed form solution, where  $\hat{\gamma}$  is estimated by kernel ridge regression and  $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$  is encoded as a kernel mean embedding and estimated by generalized kernel ridge regression. [17] propose an estimator based on lasso that involves further partitioning the data set and sampling. In Section 7, I propose a sequential adversarial estimator  $\hat{\nu}$  with a fast rate.

In the proximal case with unobserved confounding,  $(\hat{\delta}, \hat{\eta})$  are confounding bridges. Since a confounding bridge is effectively a nonparametric instrumental variable regression, machine learning estimators based on kernel ridge regression, lasso, and neural networks with fast projected mean square rates can be used from the statistical learning literature [86, 33]. Note that  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\alpha})$  are nested confounding bridges. [99, 34] propose parametric estimators for these quantities. How to obtain a fast projected mean square rate for a machine learning estimator of a nested instrumental variable regression appears to have been an open question in the literature. I provide an answer to this open question in Section 7.

For clarity, I restate the algorithm with localization.

**Algorithm 5.2** (Debiased machine learning: Local). *Given a sample  $(Y_i, W_i)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), partition the sample into folds  $(I_\ell)$  ( $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ ). Denote by  $I_\ell^c$  the complement of  $I_\ell$ .*

1. *For each fold  $\ell$ , estimate  $(\hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  from observations in  $I_\ell^c$ .*

2. *Estimate  $\theta_0^{\text{lim}}$  as*

$$\hat{\theta}_h = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \ell_h(W_i) [\hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i) \{Y_i - \hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i)\} + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i) \{\hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i) - \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i)\}].$$

3. *Estimate its  $(1 - a)100\%$  confidence interval as  $\hat{\theta}_h \pm c_a \hat{\sigma}_h n^{-1/2}$ , where  $c_a$  is the  $1 - a/2$  quantile of the standard Gaussian and*

$$\hat{\sigma}_h^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left( \ell_h(W_i) [\hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i) \{Y_i - \hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i)\} + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i) \{\hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i) - \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i)\}] - \hat{\theta}_h \right)^2.$$

One interpretation of Algorithm 5.2 is that I use the estimators

$$\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}(W_i) = \ell_h(W_i) \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i), \quad \hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}(W_i) = \ell_h(W_i) \hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i), \quad Y_{h,i} = \ell_h(W_i) Y_i$$

in Algorithm 5.1. Indeed, the same theorem will handle both cases. Note that I load the localization into the outcome models. This interpretation of localization departs from [28], who study the static case and load the localization into the balancing weight. My localization theory departs from previous work in this way.

## 6 Inference

### 6.1 Learning rates

I write this section at a high level of generality so it can be used by analysts working on a variety of problems in longitudinal causal inference. I consider black box estimators  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$ . Under a few simple conditions, I prove by finite sample arguments that  $\hat{\theta}$  defined by Algorithm 5.1 is consistent, and that its confidence interval is valid and semiparametrically efficient.

The result will be in terms of abstract mean square rates on the nuisances  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$ . I introduce the following additional notation for the proximal setting. Let  $(A, B)$  partition  $W$  such that the arguments of the nuisances are

$$\nu_0(A_1), \quad \delta_0(A), \quad \alpha_0(B), \quad \eta_0(B_1)$$

where  $A_1 \subset A$  and  $B_1 \subset B$  correspond to variables before treatment. In nonparametric instrumental variable regression,  $A$  corresponds to the endogenous variables and  $B$  corresponds to the instruments. In proximal causal inference,  $A$  includes the negative control outcome while  $B$  includes the negative control treatment. In the case of proximal mediation analysis,  $A_1 = (X, V)$ ,  $A = (M, X, V)$ ,  $B_1 = (D, X, Z)$  and  $B = (D, M, X, Z)$ .

**Definition 6.1** (Mean square error). *Write the mean square error  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)$  and the projected mean square error  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)$  of  $\hat{\nu}_\ell$  trained on observations indexed by  $I_\ell^c$  as*

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell) = \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{\nu}_\ell(W) - \nu_0(W)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c], \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell) = \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{E}\{\hat{\nu}_\ell(A) - \nu_0(A) \mid B, I_\ell^c\}\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c].$$

*Likewise define the mean square error and projected mean square error of  $(\hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$ .*

In the definition of mean square error,  $I_\ell^c$  plays the role of the training set and  $W$  plays the role of a test point. Subsequently, I will reduce these learning rates to the more familiar learning rates of nonparametric regression, nonparametric partial mean, and nonparametric instrumental variable regression from statistical learning theory.

Intuitively, when the components of  $(\nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$  are nonparametric regressions or partial means, their estimators will typically have fast rates of mean square error  $\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell), \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell), \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}$  between  $n^{-1/2}$  and  $n^{-1}$ .

When the components of  $(\nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$  are nonparametric confounding bridges, the mean square rates  $\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell), \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell), \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}$  are typically slower than  $n^{-1/2}$  due to ill posedness. However,  $\{\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell), \mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}$  may have a fast rate [86, 33]. In Section 7, I characterize rates for  $\{\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}$ , which correspond to the nested ill posed inverse problems.

## 6.2 Gaussian approximation

I now state the main result, which is a finite sample Gaussian approximation. Towards this end, define the oracle moment function

$$\psi_0(W) = \psi(W, \theta_0, \nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0),$$

where

$$\psi(W, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta) = \nu(W) + \alpha(W)\{Y - \delta(W)\} + \eta(W)\{\delta(W) - \nu(W)\} - \theta,$$

so that its moments are

$$0 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)\}, \quad \sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)^2\}, \quad \kappa^3 = \mathbb{E}\{|\psi_0(W)|^3\}, \quad \zeta^4 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)^4\}.$$

Write the Berry Esseen constant as  $c^{BE} = 0.4748$  [82].

**Theorem 6.1** (Finite sample Gaussian approximation). *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and*

1. *Bounded residual variances:  $\mathbb{E}\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 \mid W\} \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 \mid W_1\} \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$ ;*
2. *Bounded balancing weights:  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}$  and  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}$ .*

Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon$ ,

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} - \Phi(z) \right| \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\kappa}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-1/2} + \frac{\Delta}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} + \epsilon,$$

where  $\Phi(z)$  is the standard Gaussian cumulative distribution function and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = & \frac{7L}{2\epsilon\sigma} \left[ (1 + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ & \left. + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If in addition

3. *Censored balancing weight estimators:  $\|\hat{\alpha}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}'$  and  $\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}'$ ,*

then the same result holds updating  $\Delta$  to be

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = & \frac{4L}{\epsilon^{1/2}\sigma} \left[ (1 + \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}' + \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ & \left. + \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2L^{1/2}\sigma} \left[ \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ & + \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\ & \left. + \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For local functionals, further suppose approximation error of size  $\Delta_h = n^{1/2}\sigma^{-1}|\theta_{0,h} - \theta_0^{\text{lim}}|$ . Then the same result holds replacing  $(\hat{\theta}, \theta_0, \Delta)$  with  $(\hat{\theta}_h, \theta_0^{\text{lim}}, \Delta + \Delta_h)$ .

See Appendix D for the proof. Theorem 6.1 is a finite sample Gaussian approximation for debiased machine learning with black box nuisance estimators  $(\hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$ . Examining the right hand side, we see that the bound degrades gracefully if the parameters  $(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\eta})$  diverge relative to  $n$  and the learning rates. Note that  $(\bar{\alpha}', \bar{\eta}')$  are bounds on the chosen estimators  $(\hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  that can be imposed by censoring extreme evaluations.

Theorem 6.1 is a finite sample refinement of the asymptotic black box result in [24, 23] for generic global parameters. Unlike previous work, it handles the local case and articulates new product rate conditions for longitudinal causal inference. In particular, the product rate conditions confer multiple robustness to ill posedness in longitudinal causal inference, which appears to be a new concept. This concept generalizes the double robustness to ill posedness documented by [29] in static causal inference.

In the bound  $\Delta$ , the expression  $\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}$ , together with the two other similar expressions, confers multiple rate robustness: one of the learning rates may be slow, as long as the other is sufficiently fast to compensate. The expression  $\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}$  is straightforward to bound in the unconfounded case, where  $(\hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  can be reduced to nonparametric regressions and therefore  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)$  or  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)$  typically has a fast rate. However, the expression may diverge in the proximal case, where  $(\hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  are nonparametric confounding bridges and therefore both rates may be slow due to ill posedness.

The refined bound provides an alternative path to Gaussian approximation, replacing  $\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}$  with the minimum of  $\{nP(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}$  and  $\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}$ . This alternative path confers multiple robustness to ill posedness. In particular, the projected mean square error  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)$  can have a fast rate even when the mean square error  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)$  has a slow rate because its definition sidesteps ill posedness. Moreover, the analyst only needs  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)$  fast enough to compensate for the ill posedness encoded in  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)$ , or  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)$  fast enough to compensate for the ill posedness encoded in  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)$ . Multiple robustness to ill posedness is crucial for proximal causal inference in longitudinal settings, where every single one of the nonparametric quantities  $(\hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  is ill posed.

Examining the left hand side of Theorem 6.1, we see that the neighborhood of Gaussian approximation scales as  $\sigma n^{-1/2}$ . Therefore if  $\sigma$  is a constant, then the rate of convergence is  $n^{-1/2}$ , i.e. the parametric rate. Below, I prove that  $\sigma$  is constant for global functionals. If instead  $\sigma$  is a diverging sequence, then the rate of convergence degrades gracefully to nonparametric rates. Below, I prove that  $\sigma$  diverges at the rate  $h^{-1/2}$  for local functionals, where  $h$  is the bandwidth that indexes the approximating sequence.

### 6.3 Variance estimation and confidence interval

In the left hand side of Theorem 6.1, the finite sample Gaussian approximation is in terms of the true asymptotic variance  $\sigma^2$ . To construct valid a confidence interval, I must prove that its estimator  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  is consistent. I now provide a guarantee for the estimator  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  given in Algorithm 5.1.

**Theorem 6.2** (Finite sample variance estimation). *Suppose that*

1. *Bounded residual variances:  $\mathbb{E}[\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 | W] \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 | W_1] \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$ ;*
2. *Censored balancing weight estimators:  $\|\hat{\alpha}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}'$  and  $\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}'$ .*

*Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon'$ ,*

$$|\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \Delta' + 2(\Delta')^{1/2}\{(\Delta'')^{1/2} + \sigma\} + \Delta'',$$

*where*

$$\Delta' = 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{84L}{\epsilon'} \left[ \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell) + \{(\bar{\alpha}')^2 + (\bar{\eta}')^2\} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell) + \{(\bar{\eta}')^2 + \bar{\sigma}_1^2\} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) + \bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \right]$$

$$\Delta'' = \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon'} \right)^{1/2} \zeta^2 n^{-1/2}.$$

See Appendix E for the proof. Theorem 6.2 is a finite sample variance estimation guarantee. Examining the right hand side, we see that it degrades gracefully if the parameters  $(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2)$  diverge relative to  $n$  and the learning rates. Together, Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 immediately imply simple and interpretable conditions for validity of the proposed confidence interval, which I now summarize.

**Corollary 6.1** (Confidence interval). *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and*

1. *Bounded residual variances:*  $\mathbb{E}[\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 \mid W] \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 \mid W_1] \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$ ;
2. *Bounded balancing weights:*  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}$  and  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}$ ;
3. *Censored balancing weight estimators:*  $\|\hat{\alpha}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}'$  and  $\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}'$ .

Next assume the regularity condition on moments

$$\left\{ (\xi/\sigma)^3 + \zeta^2 \right\} n^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally assume the learning rate conditions

1.  $(1 + \bar{\eta}/\sigma + \bar{\eta}'/\sigma) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
2.  $(\bar{\alpha}/\sigma + \bar{\alpha}' + \bar{\eta}/\sigma + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
3.  $(\bar{\eta}' + \bar{\sigma}_1) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
4.  $\bar{\sigma}_2 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
5.  $[\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}]/\sigma \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .
6.  $[\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}]/\sigma \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .
7.  $[\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}]/\sigma \xrightarrow{P} 0$ .

Then the estimator  $\hat{\theta}$  given in Algorithm 5.1 is consistent and asymptotically Gaussian, and the confidence interval given in Algorithm 5.1 includes  $\theta_0$  with probability approaching the nominal level. Formally,

$$\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0, \quad \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sigma}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad \mathbb{P}\left\{\theta_0 \in \left(\hat{\theta} \pm c_a \hat{\sigma} n^{-1/2}\right)\right\} \rightarrow 1 - a.$$

For local functionals, further suppose  $\Delta_h \rightarrow 0$ . Then the same result holds replacing  $(\hat{\theta}, \theta_0)$  with  $(\hat{\theta}_h, \theta_0^{\text{lim}})$ .

See Appendix F for the proof.

## 6.4 Local parameters

I revisit the local parameters to clarify how the main result encompasses this case. I emphasize which quantities are diverging sequences for local functionals by indexing with the bandwidth  $h$ . Denote the localized moment function

$$\psi_h(W, \theta_h, \nu_h, \delta_h, \alpha, \eta) = \nu_h(W) + \alpha(W)\{Y_h - \delta_h(W)\} + \eta(W)\{\delta_h(W) - \nu_h(W)\} - \theta_h$$

where

$$\nu_h(W) = \ell_h(W_\ell)\nu(W), \quad \delta_h(W) = \ell_h(W_\ell)\delta(W), \quad Y_h = \ell_h(W_\ell)Y.$$

To use the main result, an analyst must reduce the mean square rate for the localized nuisances  $(\hat{\nu}_h, \hat{\delta}_h)$  to the mean square rate for the global nuisances  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta})$ . Intuitively, we expect the former to be slower than the latter.

Observe that the moments of the localized moment function are

$$0 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_{0,h}(W)\}, \quad \sigma_h^2 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_{0,h}(W)^2\}, \quad \kappa_h^3 = \mathbb{E}\{|\psi_{0,h}(W)|^3\}, \quad \zeta_h^4 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_{0,h}(W)^4\}.$$

The moments  $(\sigma_h, \kappa_h, \zeta_h)$  are indexed by  $h$ , so a complete analysis must also characterize how these parameters diverge as bandwidth  $h$  vanishes. Doing so will verify the regularity condition on moments and also pin down the nonparametric rate of Gaussian approximation  $\sigma_h n^{-1/2}$ .

Finally, the residual variances must also be updated. With localization, they become

$$\mathbb{E}[\{Y_h - \delta_{0,h}(W)\}^2 | W] \leq \bar{\sigma}_{1,h}^2, \quad \mathbb{E}[\{\delta_{0,h}(W) - \nu_{0,h}(W_1)\}^2 | W_1] \leq \bar{\sigma}_{2,h}^2.$$

A complete analysis must also characterize how these parameters diverge as bandwidth  $h$  vanishes.

**Theorem 6.3** (Characterization of key quantities for local functionals). *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Suppose bounded balancing weight, residual variance, density, derivative, and kernel conditions defined in Appendix G hold. Then for local functionals*

$$\kappa_h/\sigma_h \lesssim h^{-1/6}, \quad \sigma_h \asymp h^{-1/2}, \quad \kappa_h \lesssim h^{-2/3}, \quad \zeta_h \lesssim h^{-3/4},$$

and

$$\bar{\sigma}_{1,h} \lesssim h^{-1}\bar{\sigma}_1, \quad \bar{\sigma}_{2,h} \lesssim h^{-1}\bar{\sigma}_2, \quad \Delta_h \lesssim n^{1/2}h^{s+1/2},$$

where  $s$  is the order of differentiability defined in Appendix G. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \quad \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell), \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell).$$

See Appendix G for the proof. Combining Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 6.1 gives the following corollary for local functionals.

**Corollary 6.2** (Confidence interval: Local). *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and*

1. *Bounded (global) residual variances:  $\mathbb{E}[\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 | W] \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 | W_1] \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$ ;*
2. *Bounded balancing weights:  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}$  and  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}$ ;*
3. *Censored balancing weight estimators:  $\|\hat{\alpha}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}'$  and  $\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}'$ ;*

as well as the conditions of Theorem 6.3. Next assume the regularity conditions on bandwidth

$$n^{-1/2}h^{-3/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad n^{1/2}h^{s+1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Finally assume the learning rate conditions

1.  $(h^{-1} + h^{-1/2}\bar{\eta} + h^{-1/2}\bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
2.  $(h^{-1/2}\bar{\alpha} + h^{-1}\bar{\alpha}' + h^{-1/2}\bar{\eta} + h^{-1}\bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
3.  $(\bar{\eta}' + h^{-1}\bar{\sigma}_1)\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
4.  $h^{-1}\bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
5.  $h^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
6.  $h^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;
7.  $h^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ;

Then the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_h$  given in Algorithm 5.2 is consistent and asymptotically Gaussian, and the confidence interval given in Algorithm 5.2 includes  $\theta_0^{\text{lim}}$  with probability approaching the nominal level. Formally,

$$\hat{\theta}_h \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0^{\text{lim}}, \quad \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sigma_h}(\hat{\theta}_h - \theta_0^{\text{lim}}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad \mathbb{P}\left\{\theta_0^{\text{lim}} \in \left(\hat{\theta}_h \pm c_a \hat{\sigma}_h n^{-1/2}\right)\right\} \rightarrow 1 - a.$$



## 6.5 Examples revisited

Finally, I revisit the leading examples. I present simple, interpretable conditions to verify Corollary 6.1 for Examples 3.1 and 3.3, and to verify Corollary 6.2 for Example 3.2. Specifically, I focus on bounding balancing weights  $(\alpha_0, \eta_0)$  and reducing mean square rates of  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\delta}, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\eta})$  to rates that are readily available from statistical learning theory. The (global) residual variance bound is already an interpretable condition, and the censoring of balancing weights can be imposed by the analyst.

The regularity conditions for long term effect amount to bounding the treatment and selection propensity scores (as well as their estimators) away from zero and one.

**Proposition 6.1** (Long term effect: Key quantities). *Recall the treatment propensity scores*

$$\pi_0(d|X, G = 0) = \mathbb{P}(D = d|X, G = 0), \quad \rho_0(d|M, X, G = 0) = \mathbb{P}(D = d|M, X, G = 0)$$

and the selection propensity scores

$$\pi'_0(g|X) = \mathbb{P}(G = g|X), \quad \rho'_0(g|M, X) = \mathbb{P}(G = g|M, X).$$

Assume

1. Treatment and selection propensities are bounded away from zero and one;
2. Treatment and selection propensity estimators are bounded away from zero and one.

Then

1.  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$  and  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$
2.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\gamma}_\ell)$
3.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\pi}_\ell) + \mathcal{R}(\hat{\pi}'_\ell) + \mathcal{R}(\hat{\rho}_\ell) + \mathcal{R}(\hat{\rho}'_\ell)$
4.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\pi}_\ell) + \mathcal{R}(\hat{\pi}'_\ell)$ .

See Appendix F for the proof. Similarly, the regularity conditions for heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect amount to bounding the treatment propensity scores (as well as their estimators) away from zero and one. I also assume that a certain conditional density ratio is bounded.

**Proposition 6.2** (Heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect: Key quantities). *Recall the treatment propensity scores*

$$\pi_0(d_1|X_1) = \mathbb{P}(D_1 = d_1|X_1), \quad \rho_0(d_2|D_1, X_1, X_2) = \mathbb{P}(D_2 = d_2|D_1, X_1, X_2).$$

Assume

1. Treatment propensities are bounded away from zero and one;
2. Treatment propensity estimators are bounded away from zero and one;
3. The density ratio  $\mathbb{P}(X_2|d'_1, X_1)/\mathbb{P}(X_2|d_1, X_1)$  is bounded above.

Then

1.  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$  and  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$
2.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\gamma}_\ell)$
3.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\pi}_\ell) + \mathcal{R}(\hat{\rho}_\ell)$
4.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\pi}_\ell)$ .

See Appendix F for the proof. In the same vein, the regularity conditions for proximal mediation analysis amount to bounding the treatment propensity scores (as well as their estimators) away from zero and one, and also assuming that treatment confounding bridges are bounded.

**Proposition 6.3** (Proximal mediation analysis: Key quantities). *Define the treatment propensity scores*

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_0(D = d|X, Z) &= \mathbb{P}(D = d|X, Z), & \rho_0(D = d|M, X, Z) &= \mathbb{P}(D = d|M, X, Z) \\ \pi'_0(D = d|X, V) &= \mathbb{P}(D = d|X, V), & \rho'_0(D = d|M, X, V) &= \mathbb{P}(D = d|M, X, V) \\ \tilde{\pi}_0(D = d|X, V, Z) &= \mathbb{P}(D = d|X, V, Z), & \tilde{\rho}_0(D = d|M, X, V, Z) &= \mathbb{P}(D = d|M, X, V, Z).\end{aligned}$$

*Recall the treatment confounding bridges*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V)} \mid D = 0, X = x, V = v\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_0(D, X, Z)|D = 0, X = x, V = v\} \\ \mathbb{E}\left\{\beta_0(0, X, Z) \frac{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, V)} \mid D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(D, M, X, Z)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\}.\end{aligned}$$

*Assume*

1. *Treatment propensity scores are bounded away from zero and one;*
2. *Treatment confounding bridges  $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$  are bounded above.*

*Then*

1.  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$  and  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$
2.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\gamma}_{0,\ell})$
3.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\gamma}_{1,\ell})$
4.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\beta}_{1,\ell})$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{P}(\hat{\beta}_{1,\ell})$
5.  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{R}(\hat{\beta}_{0,\ell})$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \lesssim \mathcal{P}(\hat{\beta}_{0,\ell})$ .

See Appendix F for the proof. Across examples, these regularity conditions are mild and interpretable to the analyst.

## 7 Verifying rate conditions

### 7.1 Nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression

So far, I have refrained from instantiating specific estimators; the results hold for generic machine learning estimators. In the unconfounded case, the rate condition for the partial mean estimator  $\hat{\nu}$  is non-standard in the statistical learning literature. In the proximal case, the rate conditions for the nested confounding bride estimators  $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{\alpha})$  appear to be open questions.

In this section, I argue that in both the unconfounded and proximal cases, all of the quantities  $(\nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$  may be viewed as special cases of the same object: a nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression. As such, it suffices to propose and analyze a general estimator for nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression.

The nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression problem can be stated as follows. The goal is to estimate the function  $h_0$  that solves

$$\mathbb{E}[g_0(\tilde{M})|\tilde{Z}] = \mathbb{E}[h_0(\tilde{X})|\tilde{Z}].$$

where  $g_0$  is some preliminary function that must be estimated. The function  $g_0$  may or may not be a nonparametric instrumental variable regression in its own right; in this sense the abstract formulation is quite general. The classic nonparametric instrumental variable regression problem is recovered by taking  $g_0(\tilde{M}) = \tilde{Y}$  which is directly observed. Using operator notation,  $Tg_0 = Th_0$  where  $T$  is a conditional expectation operator.

## 7.2 Examples revisited

I explicitly frame the partial means and nested confounding bridges as special cases of the nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression. I begin with partial means.

**Proposition 7.1** (Long term effect: Nested NPIV). *Recall that*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0(m, x, g) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|M = m, X = x, G = g] \\ \nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(m, X, 1)d\mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0).\end{aligned}$$

$\nu_0$  may be viewed as a special case of nested NPIV  $h_0$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\gamma_0(M, X, G = 1)|D = d, X = x, G = 0] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_0(X)|D = d, X = x, G = 0].$$

Even with localization, the same framing is relevant.

**Proposition 7.2** (Heterogeneous dynamic treatment effect: Nested NPIV). *Recall that*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0(d_1, d_2, x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2] \\ \nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2)d\mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1)\end{aligned}$$

$\nu_0$  may be viewed as a special case of nested NPIV  $h_0$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[\gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2)|D_1 = d_1, X_1 = x_1] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_0(X_1)|D_1 = d_1, X_1 = x_1].$$

Finally, I turn to a proximal example. Each confounding bridge may be viewed as a nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression.

**Proposition 7.3** (Proximal mediation analysis: Nested NPIV). *Recall that the outcome confounding bridges  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_0)$  are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Y|D = 1, M = m, X = x, Z = z) &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(D, M, X, V)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, Z = z\} \\ \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V)|D = 0, X = x, Z = z\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_0(D, X, V)|D = 0, X = x, Z = z\},\end{aligned}$$

and the treatment confounding bridges  $(\beta_0, \beta_1)$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V)} \mid D = 0, X = x, V = v\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_0(D, X, Z)|D = 0, X = x, V = v\} \\ \mathbb{E}\left\{\beta_0(0, X, Z)\frac{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, V)} \mid D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(D, M, X, Z)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\}.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \beta_0, \beta_1)$  are all nested NPIVs as  $h_0$  above. Subsequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \gamma_0(0, X, V) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_1(1, M, X, V) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z) \\ \eta_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z).\end{aligned}$$

## 7.3 Generic estimator and rate

For the generic nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression, I propose a sequential adversarial estimator, directly generalizing the static adversarial estimator of [33].

**Algorithm 7.1** (Adversarial nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression). *Consider the estimator*

$$\hat{h} = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{g}(\tilde{M}) - h(\tilde{X})\}f(\tilde{Z})] - \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E}_n[f(\tilde{Z})^2] \right) + \mu \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$$

where  $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{G}$  is a preliminary estimator of  $g_0$ .  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$  are generic function spaces.  $(\lambda, \mu)$  are regularization hyperparameters.  $(U, \delta)$  are theoretical quantities defined below.

Intuitively, the test functions  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  attempt to violate the empirical moment condition, while the estimator  $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{H}$  attempts to satisfy it, subject to regularization. I state the abstract result below. I use the following notation for balls in the function spaces  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ :

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \{h \in \mathcal{H} : \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq B\}, \quad \mathcal{G}_C = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : \|g\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \leq C\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{3U} = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \leq 3U\}.$$

To lighten notation, in what follows, I use  $\|\cdot\|_2$  to mean the population  $\mathbb{L}_2$  norm and  $\|\cdot\|_{2,n}$  its empirical counterpart.

**Theorem 7.1** (Nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression rate). *Suppose that*

1. *Reasonable test functions:  $\mathcal{F}$  is symmetric and star-convex.*
2. *Rich test functions: Let  $h_* \in \mathcal{H}_B$  be a benchmark hypothesis independent of the samples. Suppose that there exist  $(L, \eta_n)$  such that*

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{L^2\|h-h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}} \|f - T(h - h_*)\|_2 \leq \eta_n.$$

3. *Bounded ranges:  $\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{G}_C$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_{3U}$  have uniformly bounded ranges in  $[-1, 1]$ . This requirement is how  $(B, C, U)$  are defined.*
4. *Limited complexity: the following balls of functions have critical radii bounded by  $\delta_n$* 
  - (a) *star* $(\mathcal{F}_{3U})$
  - (b) *star* $(\mathcal{G} - g_0)$
  - (c)  $\mathcal{Q}_{B, L^2 B}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{B, U} &= \{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \mapsto r\{h(\tilde{x}) - h_*(\tilde{x})\}f_h^U(\tilde{z}) : h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad h - h_* \in \mathcal{H}_B, \quad r \in [0, 1]\} \\ f_h^U &= \operatorname{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}_U} \|f - T(h - h_*)\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

5. *Favorable regularization:*

- (a)  $\delta = \delta_n + c_0\{\ln(c_1/\zeta)/n\}^{1/2}$  where  $(c_0, c_1)$  are universal constants;
- (b)  $\lambda \geq \delta^2/U$ ;
- (c)  $\mu \geq 2\lambda(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2)$ .

6. *Initial estimation quality:  $\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq \sqrt{C}$ , where  $C$  is the constant defined above*

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2, \|T(h_0 - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ &= O \left\{ \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2 + \frac{\|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2}{\delta} + \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2}{\delta} + \delta + \eta_n + \frac{\lambda}{\delta} \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) + \frac{\mu}{\delta} \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If in addition

1. *Vanishing regularization:  $\lambda, \mu = O(\delta^2)$*
2. *Vanishing approximation error:  $\|T(h_* - h_0)\|_2 \leq \delta$*

Then w.p.  $1 - 4\zeta$ :

$$\|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2, \|T(h_0 - \hat{h})\|_2 = O \left\{ \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2}{\delta} + \eta_n + \delta \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \right\}.$$

See Appendix K for the proof. The key assumption is limited complexity: the critical radii of the three function balls are bounded by  $\delta_n \leq \delta$ . The final rates are in terms of this critical radius bound  $\delta$ , the initial estimation rate  $\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2$ , and the approximation error  $\eta_n$ . See e.g. [33] for instantiations of  $\delta_n$  for popular settings in machine learning such as sparse linear spaces, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, and neural networks.

Perhaps the most challenging function ball to interpret is  $\mathcal{Q}_{B,L^2B}$ . Note that, if  $T(h - h_*) \in \mathcal{F}_U$  then  $f_h^U = T(h - h_*)$  so

$$\mathcal{Q}_{B,U} = \{(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \mapsto r\{h(\tilde{x}) - h_*(\tilde{x})\}T(h - h_*)(\tilde{z}) : h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad h - h_* \in \mathcal{H}_B, \quad r \in [0, 1]\}$$

This function ball essentially consists of products between increments in  $\mathcal{H}$  and their projections. To relate this general result to the analysis in the previous sections, I match symbols.

**Corollary 7.1** (Matching symbols). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 7.1 hold. Then w.p.  $1 - 4\zeta$ ,*

$$\{\mathcal{P}(\hat{h})\}^{1/2} = O\left\{\frac{\mathcal{R}(\hat{g})}{\delta} + \eta_n + \delta \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)\right\}.$$

Finally note that  $\mathcal{R}(\hat{h})$  can be bounded by  $\mathcal{P}(\hat{h})$  times a measure of ill posedness. Therefore Corollary 7.1 can be combined with Propositions 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 to verify the conditions of Corollaries 6.1 and 6.2.

## 8 Conclusion

I propose a simple, general, and finite sample theorem to justify confidence intervals for longitudinal causal parameters estimated with machine learning. The longitudinal causal parameters may be local or proximal. As a contribution to the long term effect literature, I provide machine learning inference for the setting where the treatment is only observed in an experimental sample and the outcome is only observed in an observational sample. As a contribution to the dynamic treatment effect and mediation analysis literatures, I provide machine learning inference with heterogeneity. As a contribution to the proximal causal inference literature, I uncover a new multiple robustness to ill posedness for longitudinal settings, which is crucial since every confounding bridge is a solution to an ill posed inverse problem, and some confounding bridges are solutions to nested ill posed inverse problems. I verify the rate conditions using adversarial estimators of nested nonparametric instrumental variable regression, which may be of independent interest.

## References

- [1] Jason Abrevaya, Yu-Chin Hsu, and Robert P Lieli. Estimating conditional average treatment effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 33(4):485–505, 2015.
- [2] Anish Agarwal and Rahul Singh. Causal inference with corrupted data: Measurement error, missing values, discretization, and differential privacy. *arXiv:2107.02780*, 2021.
- [3] Chunrong Ai and Xiaohong Chen. Efficient estimation of models with conditional moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Econometrica*, 71(6):1795–1843, 2003.
- [4] Donald WK Andrews. Asymptotics for semiparametric econometric models via stochastic equicontinuity. *Econometrica*, pages 43–72, 1994.
- [5] Susan Athey, Raj Chetty, and Guido Imbens. Combining experimental and observational data to estimate treatment effects on long term outcomes. *arXiv:2006.09676*, 2020.
- [6] Susan Athey, Raj Chetty, Guido Imbens, and Hyunseung Kang. Estimating treatment effects using multiple surrogates: The role of the surrogate score and the surrogate index. *arXiv:1603.09326*, 2020.
- [7] Heejung Bang and James M Robins. Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics*, 61(4):962–973, 2005.
- [8] Reuben M Baron and David A Kenny. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6):1173, 1986.
- [9] Keith Battocchi, Eleanor Dillon, Maggie Hei, Greg Lewis, Miruna Oprescu, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Estimating the long-term effects of novel treatments. *arXiv:2103.08390*, 2021.
- [10] Colin B Begg and Denis HY Leung. On the use of surrogate end points in randomized trials. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 163(1):15–28, 2000.

- [11] Andrew Bennett, Nathan Kallus, and Tobias Schnabel. Deep generalized method of moments for instrumental variable analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3559–3569, 2019.
- [12] Michela Bia, Martin Huber, and Lukáš Lafférs. Double machine learning for sample selection models. *arXiv:2012.00745*, 2020.
- [13] Aurelien F Bibaut and Mark J van der Laan. Data-adaptive smoothing for optimal-rate estimation of possibly non-regular parameters. *arXiv:1706.07408*, 2017.
- [14] Peter J Bickel. On adaptive estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 647–671, 1982.
- [15] Peter J Bickel, Chris AJ Klaassen, Ya’acov Ritov, and Jon A Wellner. *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*, volume 4. Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore, 1993.
- [16] Hugo Bodory, Martin Huber, and Lukáš Lafférs. Evaluating (weighted) dynamic treatment effects by double machine learning. *arXiv:2012.00370*, 2020.
- [17] Jelena Bradic, Weijie Ji, and Yuqian Zhang. High-dimensional inference for dynamic treatment effects. *arXiv:2110.04924*, 2021.
- [18] Weixin Cai and Mark van der Laan. Nonparametric bootstrap inference for the targeted highly adaptive least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) estimator. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 16(2), 2020.
- [19] Marine Carrasco, Jean-Pierre Florens, and Eric Renault. Linear inverse problems in structural econometrics estimation based on spectral decomposition and regularization. *Handbook of Econometrics*, 6:5633–5751, 2007.
- [20] Jiafeng Chen and David M Ritzwoller. Semiparametric estimation of long-term treatment effects. *arXiv:2107.14405*, 2021.
- [21] Xiaohong Chen, Han Hong, and Alessandro Tarozi. Semiparametric efficiency in GMM models with auxiliary data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(2):808–843, 2008.
- [22] Xiaohong Chen and Andres Santos. Overidentification in regular models. *Econometrica*, 86(5):1771–1817, 2018.
- [23] Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68, 2018.
- [24] Victor Chernozhukov, Juan Carlos Escanciano, Hidehiko Ichimura, Whitney K Newey, and James M Robins. Locally robust semiparametric estimation. *arXiv:1608.00033*, 2016.
- [25] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney Newey, Rahul Singh, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Adversarial estimation of Riesz representers. *arXiv:2101.00009*, 2020.
- [26] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney Newey, Rahul Singh, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Automatic debiased machine learning for dynamic treatment effects and general nested functionals. *arXiv:2203.13887*, 2022.
- [27] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney K Newey, and Rahul Singh. Automatic debiased machine learning of causal and structural effects. *arXiv:1809.05224*, 2018.
- [28] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney K Newey, and Rahul Singh. De-biased machine learning of global and local parameters using regularized Riesz representers. *arXiv:1802.08667*, 2018.
- [29] Victor Chernozhukov, Whitney K Newey, and Rahul Singh. A simple and general debiased machine learning theorem with finite sample guarantees. *arXiv:2105.15197*, 2021.
- [30] Raj Chetty, John N Friedman, Nathaniel Hilger, Emmanuel Saez, Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach, and Danny Yagan. How does your kindergarten classroom affect your earnings? evidence from project star. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(4):1593–1660, 2011.
- [31] Kyle Colangelo and Ying-Ying Lee. Double debiased machine learning nonparametric inference with continuous treatments. *arXiv:2004.03036*, 2020.
- [32] Ben Deaner. Proxy controls and panel data. *arXiv:1810.00283*, 2018.
- [33] Nishanth Dikkala, Greg Lewis, Lester Mackey, and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Minimax estimation of conditional moment models. *arXiv:2006.07201*, 2020.

- [34] Oliver Dukes, Ilya Shpitser, and Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen. Proximal mediation analysis. *arXiv:2109.11904*, 2021.
- [35] Qingliang Fan, Yu-Chin Hsu, Robert P Lieli, and Yichong Zhang. Estimation of conditional average treatment effects with high-dimensional data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, pages 1–15, 2020.
- [36] Helmut Farbmacher, Martin Huber, Henrika Langen, and Martin Spindler. Causal mediation analysis with double machine learning. *arXiv:2002.12710*, 2020.
- [37] Dylan J Foster and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Orthogonal statistical learning. *arXiv:1901.09036*, 2019.
- [38] Constantine E Frangakis and Donald B Rubin. Principal stratification in causal inference. *Biometrics*, 58(1):21–29, 2002.
- [39] AmirEmad Ghassami, Numair Sani, Yizhen Xu, and Ilya Shpitser. Multiply robust causal mediation analysis with continuous treatments. *arXiv:2105.09254*, 2021.
- [40] AmirEmad Ghassami, Andrew Ying, Ilya Shpitser, and Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen. Minimax kernel machine learning for a class of doubly robust functionals. *arXiv:2104.02929*, 2021.
- [41] Richard D Gill and James M Robins. Causal inference for complex longitudinal data: The continuous case. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1785–1811, 2001.
- [42] Rafail Z Hasminskii and Ildar A Ibragimov. On the nonparametric estimation of functionals. In *Proceedings of the Second Prague Symposium on Asymptotic Statistics*, 1979.
- [43] Miguel A Hernán, Babette Brumback, and James M Robins. Marginal structural models to estimate the joint causal effect of nonrandomized treatments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(454):440–448, 2001.
- [44] Martin Huber, Yu-Chin Hsu, Ying-Ying Lee, and Loyal Lettry. Direct and indirect effects of continuous treatments based on generalized propensity score weighting. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2020.
- [45] Hidehiko Ichimura and Whitney K Newey. The influence function of semiparametric estimators. *arXiv:1508.01378*, 2021.
- [46] Kosuke Imai, Luke Keele, and Teppei Yamamoto. Identification, inference and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science*, pages 51–71, 2010.
- [47] Charles M Judd and David A Kenny. Process analysis: Estimating mediation in treatment evaluations. *Evaluation Review*, 5(5):602–619, 1981.
- [48] Nathan Kallus and Xiaojie Mao. On the role of surrogates in the efficient estimation of treatment effects with limited outcome data. *arXiv:2003.12408*, 2020.
- [49] Nathan Kallus, Xiaojie Mao, and Masatoshi Uehara. Causal inference under unmeasured confounding with negative controls: A minimax learning approach. *arXiv:2103.14029*, 2021.
- [50] Edward H Kennedy. Optimal doubly robust estimation of heterogeneous causal effects. *arXiv:2004.14497*, 2020.
- [51] Edward H Kennedy, Zongming Ma, Matthew D McHugh, and Dylan S Small. Nonparametric methods for doubly robust estimation of continuous treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(4):1229, 2017.
- [52] Chris AJ Klaassen. Consistent estimation of the influence function of locally asymptotically linear estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1548–1562, 1987.
- [53] Greg Lewis and Vasilis Syrgkanis. Adversarial generalized method of moments, 2018.
- [54] Alexander R Luedtke and Mark J Van Der Laan. Statistical inference for the mean outcome under a possibly non-unique optimal treatment strategy. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):713, 2016.
- [55] Andreas Maurer. A vector-contraction inequality for rademacher complexities. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 3–17. Springer, 2016.
- [56] Jonas Metzger. Adversarial estimators. *arXiv:2204.10495*, 2022.
- [57] Wang Miao, Zhi Geng, and Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen. Identifying causal effects with proxy variables of an unmeasured confounder. *Biometrika*, 105(4):987–993, 2018.

- [58] Wang Miao and Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen. A confounding bridge approach for double negative control inference on causal effects. *arXiv:1808.04945*, 2018.
- [59] Susan A Murphy, Mark J van der Laan, James M Robins, and Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. Marginal mean models for dynamic regimes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(456):1410–1423, 2001.
- [60] Whitney K Newey. The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica*, pages 1349–1382, 1994.
- [61] Whitney K Newey, Fushing Hsieh, and James M Robins. Twicing kernels and a small bias property of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica*, 72(3):947–962, 2004.
- [62] Whitney K Newey and James L Powell. Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, 71(5):1565–1578, 2003.
- [63] Liliana Orellana, Andrea Rotnitzky, and James M Robins. Dynamic regime marginal structural mean models for estimation of optimal dynamic treatment regimes, part i: main content. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 6(2), 2010.
- [64] Judea Pearl. Direct and indirect effects. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, page 411–420, 2001.
- [65] Maya L Petersen, Sandra E Sinisi, and Mark J van der Laan. Estimation of direct causal effects. *Epidemiology*, pages 276–284, 2006.
- [66] Johann Pfanzagl. Lecture notes in statistics. *Contributions to a General Asymptotic Statistical Theory*, 13, 1982.
- [67] Ross L Prentice. Surrogate endpoints in clinical trials: definition and operational criteria. *Statistics in Medicine*, 8(4):431–440, 1989.
- [68] Hongxiang Qiu, Alex Luedtke, and Marco Carone. Universal sieve-based strategies for efficient estimation using machine learning tools. *Bernoulli*, 27(4):2300–2336, 2021.
- [69] James Robins. A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical Modelling*, 7(9-12):1393–1512, 1986.
- [70] James M Robins. Marginal structural models versus structural nested models as tools for causal inference. In *Statistical Models in Epidemiology, the Environment, and Clinical Trials*, pages 95–133. Springer, 2000.
- [71] James M Robins and Andrea Rotnitzky. Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models with missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429):122–129, 1995.
- [72] James M Robins, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Lue Ping Zhao. Analysis of semiparametric regression models for repeated outcomes in the presence of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429):106–121, 1995.
- [73] Peter M Robinson. Root-n-consistent semiparametric regression. *Econometrica*, pages 931–954, 1988.
- [74] Evan Rosenman, Guillaume Basse, Art Owen, and Michael Baiocchi. Combining observational and experimental datasets using shrinkage estimators. *arXiv:2002.06708*, 2020.
- [75] Evan Rosenman, Art B Owen, Michael Baiocchi, and Hailey Banack. Propensity score methods for merging observational and experimental datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07863*, 2018.
- [76] Andrea Rotnitzky, Ezequiel Smucler, and James M Robins. Characterization of parameters with a mixed bias property. *Biometrika*, 108(1):231–238, 2021.
- [77] Donald B Rubin. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592, 1976.
- [78] Daniel O Scharfstein, Andrea Rotnitzky, and James M Robins. Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1096–1120, 1999.
- [79] Anton Schick. On asymptotically efficient estimation in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 14(3):1139–1151, 1986.



- [80] Peter Z Schochet, John Burghardt, and Sheena McConnell. Does Job Corps work? Impact findings from the National Job Corps study. *American Economic Review*, 98(5):1864–86, 2008.
- [81] Thomas A Severini and Gautam Tripathi. Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2):491–498, 2012.
- [82] Irina Shevtsova. On the absolute constants in the Berry-Esseen type inequalities for identically distributed summands. *arXiv:1111.6554*, 2011.
- [83] Rahul Singh. Kernel methods for unobserved confounding: Negative controls, proxies, and instruments. *arXiv:2012.10315*, 2020.
- [84] Rahul Singh. A finite sample theorem for longitudinal causal inference with machine learning: Long term, dynamic, and mediated effects. *arXiv:2112.14249*, 2021.
- [85] Rahul Singh. Generalized kernel ridge regression for causal inference with missing-at-random sample selection. *arXiv:2111.05277*, 2021.
- [86] Rahul Singh, Maneesh Sahani, and Arthur Gretton. Kernel instrumental variable regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4595–4607, 2019.
- [87] Rahul Singh, Liyuan Xu, and Arthur Gretton. Generalized kernel ridge regression for non-parametric dose response curves and semiparametric treatment effects. *arXiv:2010.04855*, 2020.
- [88] Rahul Singh, Liyuan Xu, and Arthur Gretton. Kernel methods for multistage causal inference: Mediation analysis and dynamic treatment effects. *arXiv:2111.03950*, 2021.
- [89] Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen and Ilya Shpitser. Semiparametric theory for causal mediation analysis: Efficiency bounds, multiple robustness, and sensitivity analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1816, 2012.
- [90] Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen, Andrew Ying, Yifan Cui, Xu Shi, and Wang Miao. An introduction to proximal causal learning. *arXiv:2009.10982*, 2020.
- [91] Mark van der Laan. Finite sample inference for targeted learning. *arXiv:1708.09502*, 2017.
- [92] Mark J van der Laan, Maya L Petersen, and Marshall M Joffe. History-adjusted marginal structural models and statically-optimal dynamic treatment regimens. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 1(1), 2005.
- [93] Mark J Van der Laan and Sherri Rose. *Targeted Learning: Causal Inference for Observational and Experimental Data*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [94] Mark J van der Laan and Sherri Rose. *Targeted Learning in Data Science*. Springer, 2018.
- [95] Mark J Van Der Laan and Daniel Rubin. Targeted maximum likelihood learning. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 2(1), 2006.
- [96] Tyler VanderWeele. *Explanation in Causal Inference: Methods for Mediation and Interaction*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
- [97] Stijn Vansteelandt and Els Goetghebeur. Causal inference with generalized structural mean models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65(4):817–835, 2003.
- [98] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [99] Andrew Ying, Wang Miao, Xu Shi, and Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen. Proximal causal inference for complex longitudinal studies. *arXiv:2109.07030*, 2021.
- [100] Zhuo Yu and Mark van der Laan. Double robust estimation in longitudinal marginal structural models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 136(3):1061–1089, 2006.
- [101] Wenjing Zheng and Mark J van der Laan. Cross-validated targeted minimum-loss-based estimation. In *Targeted Learning*, pages 459–474. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [102] Wenjing Zheng and Mark J van der Laan. Targeted maximum likelihood estimation of natural direct effects. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 8(1):1–40, 2012.
- [103] Michael Zimmert and Michael Lechner. Nonparametric estimation of causal heterogeneity under high-dimensional confounding. *arXiv:1908.08779*, 2019.

## A First order conditions

### A.1 Gateaux differentiation

Define the notation

$$\psi_0(w) = \psi(w, \theta_0, \nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0)$$

where

$$\psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta) = \nu(w) + \alpha(w)\{y - \delta(w)\} + \eta(w)\{\delta(w) - \nu(w)\} - \theta$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_0 &= \mathbb{E}[\nu_0(W)] \\ \nu_0(W) &= \int m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{P}(w_2|W_1) \\ \delta_0(W) &= m(W_1, W_2, \gamma_0).\end{aligned}$$

The objects  $(\alpha_0, \eta_0)$  are appropriate balancing weights.

For readability, I introduce the following notation for Gateaux differentiation.

**Definition A.1** (Gateaux derivative). *Let  $s(w), t(w), u(w), v(w)$  be functions and let  $\tau, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}$  be scalars. The Gateaux derivative of  $\psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)$  with respect to its argument  $\nu$  in the direction  $s$  is*

$$\{\partial_\nu \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(s) = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \psi(w, \theta, \nu + \tau s, \delta, \alpha, \eta) \right|_{\tau=0}.$$

The cross derivative of  $\psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)$  with respect to its arguments  $(\nu, \delta)$  in the directions  $(s, t)$  is

$$\{\partial_{\nu, \delta}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(s, t) = \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau \partial \zeta} \psi(w, \theta, \nu + \tau s, \delta + \zeta t, \alpha, \eta) \right|_{\tau=0, \zeta=0}.$$

**Proposition A.1** (Calculation of derivatives).

$$\begin{aligned}\{\partial_\nu \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(s) &= s(w) - \eta(w)s(w) \\ &= s(w)\{1 - \eta(w)\}; \\ \{\partial_\delta \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(t) &= -\alpha(w)t(w) + \eta(w)t(w) \\ &= t(w)\{\eta(w) - \alpha(w)\}; \\ \{\partial_\alpha \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(u) &= u(w)\{y - \delta(w)\}; \\ \{\partial_\eta \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(v) &= v(w)\{\delta(w) - \nu(w)\}; \\ \{\partial_{\nu, \delta}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(s, t) &= 0 \\ \{\partial_{\nu, \alpha}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(s, u) &= 0 \\ \{\partial_{\nu, \eta}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(s, v) &= -v(w)s(w) \\ \{\partial_{\delta, \alpha}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(t, u) &= -u(w)t(w) \\ \{\partial_{\delta, \eta}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(t, v) &= v(w)t(w) \\ \{\partial_{\alpha, \eta}^2 \psi(w, \theta, \nu, \delta, \alpha, \eta)\}(u, v) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Immediate by the definition of Gateaux differentiation. □

By using the multiply robust moment function, I have the following helpful property.

**Proposition A.2** (Mean derivatives). *For any  $(s, t, u, v)$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{\partial_\nu \psi_0(W)\}(s) &= \mathbb{E}[s(W)\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}] \\ \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\delta \psi_0(W)\}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}] \\ \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\alpha \psi_0(W)\}(u) &= \mathbb{E}[u(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}] \\ \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\eta \psi_0(W)\}(v) &= \mathbb{E}[v(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}].\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Immediate from Proposition A.1. □

## A.2 Neyman orthogonality

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Let

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \nu - \nu_0 \\ t &= \delta - \delta_0 \\ u &= \alpha - \alpha_0 \\ v &= \eta - \eta_0. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition A.2, it is sufficient to show

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\nu \psi_0(W)\}(s) &= \mathbb{E}[s(W)\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}] = 0 \\ \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\gamma \psi_0(W)\}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}] = 0 \\ \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\alpha \psi_0(W)\}(u) &= \mathbb{E}[\{\alpha(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}] = 0 \\ \mathbb{E}\{\partial_\eta \psi_0(W)\}(v) &= \mathbb{E}[\{\eta(W) - \eta_0(W)\}\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0(m, x, g) &= \mathbb{E}[Y|M = m, X = x, G = g] \\ \mathbb{P}(m|d, x, g) &= \mathbb{P}(M = m|D = d, X = x, G = g) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(m, X, 1) d\mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_0(M, X, 1) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(d|M, X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ \eta_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)}. \end{aligned}$$

I proceed in steps.

1. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[s(W)\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}\left[s(X) \left\{1 - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)}\right\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[s(X) \left\{1 - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \middle| X\right]\right\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \middle| X\right] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}|X]}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(d, G=0|X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

2. Write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[t(M, X)\{\eta_0(D, X, G) - \alpha_0(D, M, X, G)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[t(M, X)\mathbb{E}[\{\eta_0(D, X, G) - \alpha_0(D, M, X, G)\} | M, X]]. \end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the first term in the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\eta_0(D, X, G) | M, X] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \middle| M, X \right] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d} | M, X]}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(d, G=0 | M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d, G=0 | X)}.\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the second term in the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\alpha_0(D, M, X, G) | M, X] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(d|M, X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \middle| M, X \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(d|M, X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \middle| M, X, G=1 \right] \mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(d|M, X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0) \mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(d, G=0 | M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d, G=0 | X)}.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the first and second term are equal.

3. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[u(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}[u(W)\{\gamma_0 - \delta_0(W)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\rho'(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\rho(d|M, X, G=0) \rho'(G=0|M, X)}{\pi(d|X, G=0) \pi'(G=0|X)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\rho'_0(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\rho_0(d|M, X, G=0) \rho'_0(G=0|M, X)}{\pi_0(d|X, G=0) \pi'_0(G=0|X)} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \{\gamma_0 - \delta_0(W)\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ \frac{1}{\rho'(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\rho(d|M, X, G=0) \rho'(G=0|M, X)}{\pi(d|X, G=0) \pi'(G=0|X)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{\rho'_0(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\rho_0(d|M, X, G=0) \rho'_0(G=0|M, X)}{\pi_0(d|X, G=0) \pi'_0(G=0|X)} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{G=1}\{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} | M, X] \right).\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{G=1}\{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} | M, X] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{G=1}\{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} | M, X, G=1] \mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma_0(M, X, G) - \gamma_0(M, X, 1)\} | M, X, G=1] \mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

4. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\pi(d|X, G=0) \pi'(G=0|X)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\pi_0(d|X, G=0) \pi'_0(G=0|X)} \right\} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(d|X, G=0) \pi'(G=0|X)} - \frac{1}{\pi_0(d|X, G=0) \pi'_0(G=0|X)} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} | X] \right).\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} | X] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{G=0} \mathbb{1}_{D=d} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} | D = d, X, G = 0] \mathbb{P}(D = d, G = 0 | X) \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\{\gamma_0(M, X, 1) - \nu_0(X)\} | D = d, X, G = 0] \mathbb{P}(D = d, G = 0 | X) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_0(d_1, d_2, x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y | D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2] \\
\mathbb{P}(x_2 | d_1, x_1) &= \mathbb{P}(X_2 = x_2 | D_1 = d_1, X_1 = x_1)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2) d\mathbb{P}(x_2 | d_1, X_1) \\
\delta_0(W) &= \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2) \\
\alpha_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2 | d_1, X_1, X_2)} \\
\eta_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

I proceed in steps.

1. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[s(W)\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ s(X_1) \left\{ 1 - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ s(X_1) \left\{ 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} | X_1 \right] \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} | X_1 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} | D_1 = d_1, X_1 \right] \mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} | D_1 = d_1, X_1 \right] \mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1) \\
&= 1.
\end{aligned}$$

2. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ t(X_1, X_2) \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2 | d_1, X_1, X_2)} \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ t(X_1, X_2) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2 | d_1, X_1, X_2)} \right\} | X_1, X_2 \right] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the first term in the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} | X_1, X_2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)} | D_1 = d_1, X_1, X_2 \right] \mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1, X_2) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1, X_2)}{\mathbb{P}(d_1 | X_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the second term in the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \middle| X_1, X_2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \middle| D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1, X_2 \right] \mathbb{P}(d_1, d_2|X_1, X_2) \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(d_1, d_2|X_1, X_2)}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)\mathbb{P}(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the first and second term are equal.

3. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[u(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\rho(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\rho_0(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \right\} \{Y - \delta_0(W)\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\rho(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\rho_0(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \right\} \{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(d_1|X_1)} \frac{1}{\rho(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} - \frac{1}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)} \frac{1}{\rho_0(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2} \{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} | X_1, X_2] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2} \{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} | X_1, X_2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2} \{\gamma_0(W) - \delta_0(W)\} | D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1, X_2] \mathbb{P}(d_1, d_2|X_1, X_2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2) - \delta_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2)\} | D_1 = d_1, D_2 = d_2, X_1, X_2] \mathbb{P}(d_1, d_2|X_1, X_2) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

4. Write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[v(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi(d_1|X_1)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)} \right\} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi(d_1|X_1)} - \frac{1}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)} \right\} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} | X_1] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} | X_1] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\} | D_1 = d_1, X_1] \mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2) - \nu_0(X_1)\} | D_1 = d_1, X_1] \mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 4.3.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(Y|D = 1, M = m, X = x, Z = z) = \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(D, M, X, V)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, Z = z\} \\
& \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V)|D = 0, X = x, Z = z\} = \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_0(D, X, V)|D = 0, X = x, Z = z\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V)} \middle| D = 0, X = x, V = v \right\} = \mathbb{E}\{\beta_0(D, X, Z)|D = 0, X = x, V = v\} \\
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \beta_0(0, X, Z) \frac{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, V)} \middle| D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(D, M, X, Z)|D = 1, M = m, X = x, V = v\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Take

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \gamma_0(0, X, V) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_1(1, M, X, V) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z) \\ \eta_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z).\end{aligned}$$

I proceed in steps.

1. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[s(W)\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}[s(X, V)\{1 - \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[s(X, V)\{1 - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)|X, V]\}].\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)|X, V] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)|D = 0, X, V]\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\beta_0(0, X, Z)|D = 0, X, V]\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V)}|D = 0, X, V\right]\mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, V).\end{aligned}$$

2. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}[t(M, X, V)\{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[t(M, X, V)\mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\}|M, X, V]].\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the first term in the inner expectation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)|M, X, V] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)|D = 0, M, X, V]\mathbb{P}(D = 0|M, X, V) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\beta_0(0, X, Z)|D = 0, M, X, V]\mathbb{P}(D = 0|M, X, V).\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the second term in the inner expectation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)|M, X, V] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)|D = 1, M, X, V]\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, V) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)|D = 1, M, X, V]\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, V).\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the first and second term are equal.

3. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[u(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\}\{Y - \gamma_1(W)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\}\{\mathbb{E}[Y|D, M, X, Z] - \gamma_1(W)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\{\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\{\mathbb{E}[Y|D, M, X, Z] - \gamma_1(W)\}|M, X, Z]\right).\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\{\mathbb{E}[Y|D, M, X, Z] - \gamma_1(W)\}|M, X, Z] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\{\mathbb{E}[Y|D, M, X, Z] - \gamma_1(W)\}|D = 1, M, X, Z]\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, Z) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{E}[Y|D, M, X, Z] - \gamma_1(W)\}|D = 1, M, X, Z]\mathbb{P}(D = 1|M, X, Z) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

4. Write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}] &= \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta(0, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)\}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V) - \gamma_0(0, X, V)\}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\{\beta(0, X, Z) - \beta_0(0, X, Z)\} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V) - \gamma_0(0, X, V)\}|X, Z]\right).\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V) - \gamma_0(0, X, V)\}|X, Z] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V) - \gamma_0(0, X, V)\}|D = 0, X, Z] \mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, Z) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V) - \gamma_0(0, X, V)\}|D = 0, X, Z] \mathbb{P}(D = 0|X, Z) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## B Taylor expansion

Train  $(\hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)$  on observations in  $I_\ell^c$ . Let  $n_\ell = |I_\ell| = n/L$  be the number of observations in  $I_\ell$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{E}_\ell(\cdot) = n_\ell^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_\ell}(\cdot)$  the average over observations in  $I_\ell$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{E}_n(\cdot) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n(\cdot)$  the average over all observations in the sample.

**Definition B.1** (Foldwise target and oracle).

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\theta}_\ell &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[\hat{\nu}_\ell(W) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W)\{Y - \hat{\delta}_\ell(W)\} + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W)\{\hat{\delta}_\ell(W) - \hat{\nu}_\ell(W)\}]; \\
\bar{\theta}_\ell &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[\nu_0(W) + \alpha_0(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\} + \eta_0(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}].
\end{aligned}$$

**Proposition B.1** (Taylor expansion). *Let*

$$\begin{aligned}
s &= \hat{\nu}_\ell - \nu_0 \\
t &= \hat{\delta}_\ell - \delta_0 \\
u &= \hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha_0 \\
v &= \hat{\eta}_\ell - \eta_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Then  $n_\ell^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_\ell - \bar{\theta}_\ell) = \sum_{j=1}^7 \Delta_{j\ell}$  where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{1\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_\ell[s(W)\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}]; \\
\Delta_{2\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_\ell[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}]; \\
\Delta_{3\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_\ell[u(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}]; \\
\Delta_{4\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_\ell[v(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}]; \\
\Delta_{5\ell} &= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{-s(W)v(W)\}; \\
\Delta_{6\ell} &= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{-t(W)u(W)\}; \\
\Delta_{7\ell} &= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{t(W)v(W)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* An exact Taylor expansion gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& \psi(w, \theta_0, \hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell) - \psi_0(w) \\
&= \{\partial_\nu \psi_0(w)\}(s) + \{\partial_\delta \psi_0(w)\}(t) + \{\partial_\alpha \psi_0(w)\}(u) + \{\partial_\eta \psi_0(w)\}(v) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \{\partial_{\nu, \delta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(s, t) + \frac{1}{2} \{\partial_{\nu, \alpha}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(s, u) + \frac{1}{2} \{\partial_{\nu, \eta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(s, v) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \{\partial_{\delta, \alpha}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(t, u) + \frac{1}{2} \{\partial_{\delta, \eta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(t, v) + \frac{1}{2} \{\partial_{\alpha, \eta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(u, v).
\end{aligned}$$

Averaging over observations in  $I_\ell$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\theta}_\ell - \bar{\theta}_\ell &= \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\psi(W, \theta_0, \hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell)\} - \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\psi_0(W)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_\nu \psi_0(w)\}(s) + \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_\delta \psi_0(w)\}(t) + \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_\alpha \psi_0(w)\}(u) + \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_\eta \psi_0(w)\}(v) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_{\nu, \delta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(s, t) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_{\nu, \alpha}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(s, u) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_{\nu, \eta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(s, v) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_{\delta, \alpha}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(t, u) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_{\delta, \eta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(t, v) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\partial_{\alpha, \eta}^2 \psi_0(w)\}(u, v).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally appeal to Proposition A.1. □



## C Residuals

### C.1 Direct path

**Proposition C.1** (Residuals). *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds and*

1.  $\mathbb{E}[\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 | W] \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$
2.  $\mathbb{E}[\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 | W_1] \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$
3.  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}$
4.  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}$ .

Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon/L$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_{1\ell}| &\leq t_1 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (1 + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{2\ell}| &\leq t_2 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{3\ell}| &\leq t_3 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{4\ell}| &\leq t_4 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{5\ell}| &\leq t_5 = \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
|\Delta_{6\ell}| &\leq t_6 = \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
|\Delta_{7\ell}| &\leq t_7 = \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps.

1. Markov inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{1\ell}| > t_1) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1\ell}^2)}{t_1^2}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{2\ell}| > t_2) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{2\ell}^2)}{t_2^2}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{3\ell}| > t_3) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{3\ell}^2)}{t_3^2}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{4\ell}| > t_4) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{4\ell}^2)}{t_4^2}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{5\ell}| > t_5) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{5\ell}|)}{t_5} \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{6\ell}| > t_6) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{6\ell}|)}{t_6} \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{7\ell}| > t_7) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{7\ell}|)}{t_7}.
\end{aligned}$$

2. Law of iterated expectations implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c)\}; \\
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{2\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{2\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c)\}; \\
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{3\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{3\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c)\}; \\
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{4\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{4\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c)\}; \\
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{5\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{5\ell}| \mid I_\ell^c)\}; \\
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{6\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{6\ell}| \mid I_\ell^c)\}; \\
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{7\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{7\ell}| \mid I_\ell^c)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

3. Bounding conditional moments.

Conditional on  $I_\ell^c$ ,  $(s, t, u, v)$  are nonrandom. Moreover, observations within fold  $I_\ell$  are independent and identically distributed. Hence by Assumption 4.1 and assumption of finite  $\bar{\eta}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{1\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}\left([n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell\{s(W) - s(W)\eta_0(W)\}]^2 \mid I_\ell^c\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \{s(W_i) - s(W_i)\eta_0(W_i)\}\{s(W_j) - s(W_j)\eta_0(W_j)\} \mid I_\ell^c\right] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}\{\{s(W_i) - s(W_i)\eta_0(W_i)\}\{s(W_j) - s(W_j)\eta_0(W_j)\} \mid I_\ell^c\} \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}\{\{s(W_i) - s(W_i)\eta_0(W_i)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[s(W)^2\{1 - \eta_0(W)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&\leq (1 + \bar{\eta})^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly by Assumption 4.1 and assumption of finite  $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\eta})$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{2\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}\left\{(n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[t(W)\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}])^2 \mid I_\ell^c\right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} t(W_i)\{\eta_0(W_i) - \alpha_0(W_i)\}t(W_j)\{\eta_0(W_j) - \alpha_0(W_j)\} \mid I_\ell^c\right] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}[t(W_i)\{\eta_0(W_i) - \alpha_0(W_i)\}t(W_j)\{\eta_0(W_j) - \alpha_0(W_j)\} \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}[t(W_i)^2\{\eta_0(W_i) - \alpha_0(W_i)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[t(W)^2\{\eta_0(W) - \alpha_0(W)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&\leq (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly by Assumption 4.1 and assumption of finite  $\bar{\sigma}_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{3\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}\left\{(n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[u(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}])^2 \mid I_\ell^c\right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} u(W_i)\{Y_i - \delta_0(W_i)\}u(W_j)\{Y_j - \delta_0(W_j)\} \mid I_\ell^c\right] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}[u(W_i)\{Y_i - \delta_0(W_i)\}u(W_j)\{Y_j - \delta_0(W_j)\} \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}[u(W_i)^2\{Y_i - \delta_0(W_i)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[u(W)^2\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&\leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly by Assumption 4.1 and assumption of finite  $\bar{\sigma}_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{4\ell}^2 | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ (n_\ell^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_\ell[v(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}])^2 | I_\ell^c \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} v(W_i)\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\}v(W_j)\{\delta_0(W_j) - \nu_0(W_j)\} | I_\ell^c \right] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E} [v(W_i)\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\}v(W_j)\{\delta_0(W_j) - \nu_0(W_j)\} | I_\ell^c] \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E} [v(W_i)^2\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\}^2 | I_\ell^c] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[v(W)^2\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}^2 | I_\ell^c] \\
&\leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

Next I turn to the product terms. By Cauchy Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{5\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}\{|-s(W)v(W)| | I_\ell^c\} \\
&\leq \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} [\mathbb{E}\{s(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} [\mathbb{E}\{v(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{6\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}\{|-t(W)u(W)| | I_\ell^c\} \\
&\leq \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} [\mathbb{E}\{t(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} [\mathbb{E}\{u(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{7\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}\{|-t(W)v(W)| | I_\ell^c\} \\
&\leq \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} [\mathbb{E}\{t(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} [\mathbb{E}\{v(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{n_\ell^{1/2}}{2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

4. Collecting results gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{1\ell}| > t_1) &\leq \frac{(1 + \bar{\eta})^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)}{t_1^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{2\ell}| > t_2) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)}{t_2^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{3\ell}| > t_3) &\leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_1^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)}{t_3^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{4\ell}| > t_4) &\leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)}{t_4^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{5\ell}| > t_5) &\leq \frac{n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}}{2t_5} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{6\ell}| > t_6) &\leq \frac{n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}}{2t_6} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}; \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{7\ell}| > t_7) &\leq \frac{n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}}{2t_7} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore with probability  $1 - \epsilon/L$ , the following inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_{1\ell}| \leq t_1 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (1 + \bar{\eta}) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{2\ell}| \leq t_2 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta}) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{3\ell}| \leq t_3 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_1 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{4\ell}| \leq t_4 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_2 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{5\ell}| \leq t_5 &= \frac{7L}{2\epsilon} n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{6\ell}| \leq t_6 &= \frac{7L}{2\epsilon} n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{7\ell}| \leq t_7 &= \frac{7L}{2\epsilon} n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally recall  $n_\ell = n/L$ .

□

## C.2 Alternative path

**Proposition C.2** (Residuals: Alternative path). *Suppose that*

1.  $\mathbb{E}\{\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 \mid W\} \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$
2.  $\mathbb{E}\{\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 \mid W_1\} \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$
3.  $\|\alpha_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}$
4.  $\|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}$
5.  $\|\hat{\alpha}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}'$
6.  $\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}'$ .

Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon/L$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_{1\ell}| &\leq t_1 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (1 + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{2\ell}| &\leq t_2 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{3\ell}| &\leq t_3 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_{4\ell}| &\leq t_4 = \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
|\Delta_5| &\leq t_5 = \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \\
|\Delta_6| &\leq t_6 = \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \\
|\Delta_7| &\leq t_7 = \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}].
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* See Proposition C.1 for  $(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4)$ . I focus on the alternative bound for  $(t_5, t_6, t_7)$ .

### 1. Decomposition.

Write

$$\begin{aligned}
2\Delta_{5\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell\{-s(W)v(W)\} = \Delta_{5'\ell} + \Delta_{5''\ell} \\
2\Delta_{6\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell\{-t(W)u(W)\} = \Delta_{6'\ell} + \Delta_{6''\ell} \\
2\Delta_{7\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell\{t(W)v(W)\} = \Delta_{7'\ell} + \Delta_{7''\ell}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{5'\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[-s(W)v(W) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\}]; \\
\Delta_{5''\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\{-s(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\} \\
\Delta_{6'\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[-t(W)u(W) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W)u(W) \mid I_\ell^c\}]; \\
\Delta_{6''\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\{-t(W)u(W) \mid I_\ell^c\} \\
\Delta_{7'\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[t(W)v(W) - \mathbb{E}\{t(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\}]; \\
\Delta_{7''\ell} &= n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}\{t(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\}.
\end{aligned}$$

### 2. Former term.

By Markov inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{5'\ell}| > t) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{5'\ell}^2)}{t^2} \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{6'\ell}| > t) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{6'\ell}^2)}{t^2} \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{7'\ell}| > t) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{7'\ell}^2)}{t^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Law of iterated expectations implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{5'\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{5'\ell}^2 | I_\ell^c)\} \\ \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{6'\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{6'\ell}^2 | I_\ell^c)\} \\ \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{7'\ell}^2) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{7'\ell}^2 | I_\ell^c)\}.\end{aligned}$$

I bound the conditional moment. Conditional on  $I_\ell^c$ ,  $(s, t, u, v)$  are nonrandom. Moreover, observations within fold  $I_\ell$  are independent and identically distributed. Since each summand in  $\Delta_{j'\ell}$  ( $j = 5, 6, 7$ ) has conditional mean zero by construction, and since  $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}', \bar{\eta}, \bar{\eta}')$  are finite by hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{5'\ell}^2 | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\left(n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[-s(W)v(W) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W)v(W) | I_\ell^c\}]\right)^2 | I_\ell^c\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} [-s(W_i)v(W_i) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W_i)v(W_i) | I_\ell^c\}][-s(W_j)v(W_j) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W_j)v(W_j) | I_\ell^c\}] | I_\ell^c\right) \\ &= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}([ -s(W_i)v(W_i) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W_i)v(W_i) | I_\ell^c\} ][ -s(W_j)v(W_j) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W_j)v(W_j) | I_\ell^c\} ] | I_\ell^c) \\ &= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}([ -s(W_i)v(W_i) + \mathbb{E}\{s(W_i)v(W_i) | I_\ell^c\} ]^2 | I_\ell^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}([s(W)v(W) - \mathbb{E}\{s(W)v(W) | I_\ell^c\}]^2 | I_\ell^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\{s(W)^2 v(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\} \\ &\leq (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell).\end{aligned}$$

Likewise

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{6'\ell}^2 | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\left(n_\ell^{1/2}\mathbb{E}_\ell[-t(W)u(W) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W)u(W) | I_\ell^c\}]\right)^2 | I_\ell^c\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} [-t(W_i)u(W_i) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W_i)u(W_i) | I_\ell^c\}][ -t(W_j)u(W_j) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W_j)u(W_j) | I_\ell^c\} ] | I_\ell^c\right) \\ &= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}([ -t(W_i)u(W_i) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W_i)u(W_i) | I_\ell^c\} ][ -t(W_j)u(W_j) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W_j)u(W_j) | I_\ell^c\} ] | I_\ell^c) \\ &= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E}([ -t(W_i)u(W_i) + \mathbb{E}\{t(W_i)u(W_i) | I_\ell^c\} ]^2 | I_\ell^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}([t(W)u(W) - \mathbb{E}\{t(W)u(W) | I_\ell^c\}]^2 | I_\ell^c) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\{t(W)^2 u(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\} \\ &\leq (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell).\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{7'\ell}^2 \mid I_\ell^c) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left( n_\ell^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_\ell [t(W)v(W) - \mathbb{E}\{t(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\}] \right)^2 \mid I_\ell^c \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} [t(W_i)v(W_i) - \mathbb{E}\{u(W_i)v(W_i) \mid I_\ell^c\}] [t(W_j)v(W_j) - \mathbb{E}\{u(W_j)v(W_j) \mid I_\ell^c\}] \mid I_\ell^c \right) \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i,j \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E} ([t(W_i)v(W_i) - \mathbb{E}\{u(W_i)v(W_i) \mid I_\ell^c\}] [t(W_j)v(W_j) - \mathbb{E}\{u(W_j)v(W_j) \mid I_\ell^c\}] \mid I_\ell^c) \\
&= \frac{n_\ell}{n_\ell^2} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \mathbb{E} ([t(W_i)v(W_i) - \mathbb{E}\{t(W_i)v(W_i) \mid I_\ell^c\}]^2 \mid I_\ell^c) \\
&= \mathbb{E}([t(W)v(W) - \mathbb{E}\{t(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\}]^2 \mid I_\ell^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\{t(W)^2 v(W)^2 \mid I_\ell^c\} \\
&\leq (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell).
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting results gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{5'\ell}| > t) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)}{t^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L} \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{6'\ell}| > t) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)}{t^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L} \\
\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{7'\ell}| > t) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)}{t^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{7L}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore with probability  $1 - 3\epsilon/(7L)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_{5'\ell}| \leq t &= \left( \frac{7L}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
|\Delta_{6'\ell}| \leq t &= \left( \frac{7L}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
|\Delta_{7'\ell}| \leq t &= \left( \frac{7L}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

### 3. Latter term.

Specializing to nonparametric confounding bridges,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\{-s(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{-s(A_1) \mid B_1, I_\ell^c\} v(B_1) \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&\leq \{\mathbb{E}([\mathbb{E}\{s(A_1) \mid B_1, I_\ell^c\}]^2 \mid I_\ell^c)\}^{1/2} [\mathbb{E}\{v(B_1)^2 \mid I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} \\
&= \{\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Delta_{5''\ell} \leq n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} = L^{-1/2} \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.$$

Likewise

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\{-s(W)v(W) \mid I_\ell^c\} &= \mathbb{E}[-s(A_1) \mathbb{E}\{v(B_1) \mid A_1, I_\ell^c\} \mid I_\ell^c] \\
&\leq [\mathbb{E}\{s(A_1)^2 \mid I_\ell^c\}]^{1/2} \{\mathbb{E}([\mathbb{E}\{v(B_1) \mid A_1, I_\ell^c\}]^2 \mid I_\ell^c)\}^{1/2} \\
&= \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Delta_{5''\ell} \leq n_\ell^{1/2} \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \{\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} = L^{-1/2} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}.$$

The same argument holds for  $(\Delta_{6''\ell}, \Delta_{7''\ell})$ .

#### 4. Combining terms.

With probability  $1 - 3\epsilon/(7L)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_5| \leq t_5 &= \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2} [\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \\
|\Delta_6| \leq t_6 &= \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2} [\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \\
|\Delta_7| \leq t_7 &= \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2} [\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}].
\end{aligned}$$

□

## D Gaussian approximation

### D.1 Direct path

**Definition D.1** (Overall target and oracle). *Define*

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \hat{\theta}_\ell, \quad \bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \bar{\theta}_\ell.$$

**Proposition D.1** (Oracle approximation). *Suppose the conditions of Proposition C.1 hold. Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon$*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} |\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}| &\leq \Delta \\
\Delta &= \frac{7L}{2\epsilon\sigma} \left[ (1 + \bar{\eta}) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta}) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_1 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_2 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps.

#### 1. Decomposition.

By Proposition B.1, write

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{1/2}(\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}) &= \frac{n^{1/2}}{n_\ell^{1/2}} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L n_\ell^{1/2} (\hat{\theta}_\ell - \bar{\theta}_\ell) \\
&= L^{1/2} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^3 \Delta_{j\ell}.
\end{aligned}$$

#### 2. Union bound.

Define the events

$$\mathcal{E}_\ell = \{\text{for all } j \in \{1, \dots, 7\}, |\Delta_{j\ell}| \leq t_j\}, \quad \mathcal{E} = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^L \mathcal{E}_\ell, \quad \mathcal{E}^c = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^L \mathcal{E}_\ell^c.$$

Hence by the union bound and Proposition C.1,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\ell^c) \leq L \frac{\epsilon}{L} = \epsilon.$$



### 3. Collecting results.

Therefore with probability  $1 - \epsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/2}|\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}| &\leq L^{1/2} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^7 |\Delta_{jk}| \\ &\leq L^{1/2} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^7 t_j \\ &= L^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^7 t_j. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, I simplify  $\{t_j\}$ . Note that  $7^{1/2} < 7/2$  and that for  $\epsilon \leq 1$ ,  $\epsilon^{-1/2} \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ . In summary

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (1 + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \leq \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} (1 + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\ t_2 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \leq \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\ t_3 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \leq \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\ t_4 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \leq \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\ t_5 &= \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\ t_6 &= \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\ t_7 &= \frac{7L^{1/2}}{2\epsilon} \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

## D.2 Alternative path

**Proposition D.2** (Oracle approximation: Alternative path). *Suppose the conditions of Proposition C.2 hold. Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon$*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma}|\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}| &\leq \Delta \\ \Delta &= \frac{4L}{\epsilon^{1/2}\sigma} \left[ (1 + \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}' + \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2L^{1/2}\sigma} \left[ \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* As in Proposition D.1, Propositions B.1 and C.2 imply that with probability  $1 - \epsilon$

$$n^{1/2}|\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}| \leq L^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^3 t_j.$$

Recall  $\{t_j\}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
t_1 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (1 + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
t_2 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta})\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
t_3 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_1\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
t_4 &= \left(\frac{7L}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} \bar{\sigma}_2\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}; \\
t_5 &= \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \\
t_6 &= \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2}] \\
t_7 &= \left(\frac{7L}{4\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}')\{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad + (4L)^{-1/2}[\{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2}].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally note  $7^{1/2} + (7/4)^{1/2} < 4$  when combining terms from  $(t_1, t_2)$  and  $(t_5, t_6, t_7)$ .  $\square$

### D.3 Main result

**Lemma D.1** (Berry Esseen Theorem [82]). *Suppose  $(Z_i)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) are independent and identically distributed random variables with  $\mathbb{E}(Z_i) = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(Z_i^2) = \sigma^2$ , and  $\mathbb{E}(|Z_i|^3) = \xi^3$ . Then*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}_n(Z_i) \leq z \right\} - \Phi(z) \right| \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

where  $c^{BE} = 0.4748$  and  $\Phi(z)$  is the standard Gaussian cumulative distribution function.

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* I confirm that the steps of [29, Theorem 1] generalize to the longitudinal setting.

Fix  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ . First, I show that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} - \Phi(z) \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\Delta}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} + \epsilon,$$

where  $\Delta$  is defined in Propositions D.1 and D.2. I proceed in steps.

#### 1. High probability bound.

By Propositions D.1 and D.2, with probability  $1 - \epsilon$ ,

$$\frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \hat{\theta}) \leq \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} |\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}| \leq \Delta.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z + \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \hat{\theta}) \right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z + \Delta \right\} + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

2. Mean value theorem.

Let  $\phi(z)$  be the standard Gaussian probability density function. There exists some  $z'$  such that

$$\Phi(z + \Delta) - \Phi(z) = \phi(z') \cdot \Delta \leq \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

3. Berry Esseen theorem.

Observe that

$$\bar{\theta} - \theta_0 = \mathbb{E}_n[\nu_0(W) + \alpha_0(W)\{Y - \delta_0(W)\} + \eta_0(W)\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}] - \theta_0 = \mathbb{E}_n[\psi_0(W)].$$

Therefore taking  $Z_i = \psi_0(W_i)$  in Lemma D.1,

$$\sup_{z''} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z'' \right\} - \Phi(z'') \right| \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence by the high probability bound and mean value theorem steps above, taking  $z'' = z + \Delta$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} - \Phi(z) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z + \Delta \right\} - \Phi(z) + \epsilon \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z + \Delta \right\} - \Phi(z + \Delta) + \Phi(z + \Delta) - \Phi(z) + \epsilon \\ & \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Next, I show that

$$\Phi(z) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\Delta}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} + \epsilon,$$

where  $\Delta$  is defined in Propositions D.1 and D.2. I proceed in steps.

1. High probability bound.

By Propositions D.1 and D.2, with probability  $1 - \epsilon$ ,

$$\frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}) \leq \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} |\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}| \leq \Delta$$

hence

$$z - \Delta \leq z - \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}).$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z - \Delta \right\} & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z - \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \bar{\theta}) \right\} + \epsilon \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

2. Mean value theorem.

There exists some  $z'$  such that

$$\Phi(z) - \Phi(z - \Delta) = \phi(z') \cdot \Delta \leq \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

### 3. Berry Esseen theorem.

As argued above,

$$\sup_{z''} \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z'' \right\} - \Phi(z'') \right| \leq c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence by the mean value theorem and high probability bound steps above, taking  $z'' = z - \Delta$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(z) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z \right\} \\ & \leq \Phi(z) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z - \Delta \right\} + \epsilon \\ & = \Phi(z) - \Phi(z - \Delta) + \Phi(z - \Delta) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{n^{1/2}}{\sigma} (\bar{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq z - \Delta \right\} + \epsilon \\ & \leq \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + c^{BE} \left( \frac{\xi}{\sigma} \right)^3 n^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

## E Variance estimation

### E.1 Error from nuisances

Recall that  $\mathbb{E}_\ell(\cdot) = n_\ell^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} (\cdot)$  means the average over observations in  $I_\ell$  and  $\mathbb{E}_n(\cdot) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\cdot)$  means the average over all observations in the sample.

**Definition E.1** (Shorter notation). For  $i \in I_\ell$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0(W_i) &= \psi(W_i, \theta_0, \nu_0, \delta_0, \alpha_0, \eta_0); \\ \hat{\psi}(W_i) &= \psi(W_i, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\nu}_\ell, \hat{\delta}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\eta}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition E.1** (Foldwise second moment).

$$\mathbb{E}_\ell[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] \leq 7 \left\{ (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \sum_{j=8}^{13} \Delta_{j\ell} \right\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{8\ell} &= \mathbb{E}_\ell\{s(W_i)^2\}; \\ \Delta_{9\ell} &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[u(W_i)^2\{Y - \delta_0(W_i)\}^2]; \\ \Delta_{10\ell} &= \mathbb{E}_\ell[v(W_i)^2\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\}^2]; \\ \Delta_{11\ell} &= \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i)^2 t(W_i)^2\}; \\ \Delta_{12\ell} &= \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)^2 t(W_i)^2\}; \\ \Delta_{13\ell} &= \mathbb{E}_\ell\{\hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)^2 u(W_i)^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}(W_i) - \psi_0(W_i) &= \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i)\{Y_i - \hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i)\} + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)\{\hat{\delta}_\ell(W_i) - \hat{\nu}_\ell(W_i)\} - \hat{\theta} \\ &\quad - [\nu_0(W) + \alpha_0(W_i)\{Y_i - \delta_0(W_i)\} + \eta_0(W_i)\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\} - \theta_0] \\ &\quad \pm \hat{\alpha}_\ell\{Y - \delta_0(W_i)\} \pm \hat{\eta}_\ell\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\} \\ &= (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}) + s(W_i) + u(W_i)\{Y - \delta_0(W_i)\} + v(W_i)\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\} \\ &\quad - \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i)t(W_i) + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)t(W_i) - \hat{\eta}(W_i)u(W_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\hat{\psi}(W_i) - \psi_0(W_i)\}^2 \\ & \leq 7[(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta})^2 + s(W_i)^2 + u(W_i)^2\{Y - \delta_0(W_i)\}^2 + v(W_i)^2\{\delta_0(W_i) - \nu_0(W_i)\}^2 \\ & \quad + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(W_i)^2 t(W_i)^2 + \hat{\eta}_\ell(W_i)^2 t(W_i)^2 + \hat{\eta}(W_i)^2 u(W_i)^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally take  $\mathbb{E}_\ell(\cdot)$  of both sides. □

**Proposition E.2 (Residuals).** *Suppose that*

1.  $\mathbb{E}[\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 | W] \leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2$
2.  $\mathbb{E}[\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 | W_1] \leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2$
3.  $\|\hat{\alpha}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha}'$
4.  $\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}'$ .

Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon'/(2L)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{8\ell}| &\leq t_8 = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{9\ell}| &\leq t_9 = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} \bar{\sigma}_1^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{10\ell}| &\leq t_{10} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} \bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{11\ell}| &\leq t_{11} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} (\bar{\alpha}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{12\ell}| &\leq t_{12} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} (\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{13\ell}| &\leq t_{13} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} (\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps analogous to Proposition C.1.

1. Markov inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{8\ell}| > t_8) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{8\ell}|)}{t_8}; \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{9\ell}| > t_9) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{9\ell}|)}{t_9}; \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{10\ell}| > t_{10}) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{10\ell}|)}{t_{10}}; \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{11\ell}| > t_{11}) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{11\ell}|)}{t_{11}}; \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{12\ell}| > t_{12}) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{12\ell}|)}{t_{12}}; \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{13\ell}| > t_{13}) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{13\ell}|)}{t_{13}}. \end{aligned}$$

2. Law of iterated expectations implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{8\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{8\ell}| | I_\ell^c)\}; \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{9\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{9\ell}| | I_\ell^c)\}; \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{10\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{10\ell}| | I_\ell^c)\}; \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{11\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{11\ell}| | I_\ell^c)\}; \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{12\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{12\ell}| | I_\ell^c)\}; \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{13\ell}|) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{13\ell}| | I_\ell^c)\}. \end{aligned}$$

### 3. Bounding conditional moments.

Conditional on  $I_\ell^c$ ,  $(s, t, u, v)$  are nonrandom. Moreover, observations within fold  $I_\ell$  are independent and identically distributed. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{8\ell}| | I_\ell^c) = \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{8\ell} | I_\ell^c) = \mathbb{E}\{s(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\} = \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell).$$

Similarly, by assumption of finite  $(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{9\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{9\ell} | I_\ell^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[u(W)^2 \{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 | I_\ell^c] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{u(W)^2 \mathbb{E}[\{Y - \delta_0(W)\}^2 | W, I_\ell^c] | I_\ell^c\} \\ &\leq \bar{\sigma}_1^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell); \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{10\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{10\ell} | I_\ell^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[v(W)^2 \{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W)\}^2 | I_\ell^c] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{v(W_1)^2 \mathbb{E}[\{\delta_0(W) - \nu_0(W_1)\}^2 | W_1, I_\ell^c] | I_\ell^c\} \\ &\leq \bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by assumption of finite  $(\bar{\alpha}', \bar{\eta}')$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{11\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{11\ell} | I_\ell^c) = \mathbb{E}\{\hat{\alpha}_\ell(W)^2 t(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\} \leq (\bar{\alpha}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell); \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{12\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{12\ell} | I_\ell^c) = \mathbb{E}\{\hat{\eta}_\ell(W)^2 t(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\} \leq (\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell); \\ \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_{13\ell}| | I_\ell^c) &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{13\ell} | I_\ell^c) = \mathbb{E}\{\hat{\eta}_\ell(W)^2 u(W)^2 | I_\ell^c\} \leq (\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

### 4. Collecting results gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{8\ell}| > t_8) &\leq \frac{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)}{t_8} = \frac{\epsilon'}{12L} \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{9\ell}| > t_9) &\leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_1^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)}{t_9} = \frac{\epsilon'}{12L} \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{10\ell}| > t_{10}) &\leq \frac{\bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)}{t_{10}} = \frac{\epsilon'}{12L} \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{11\ell}| > t_{11}) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\alpha}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)}{t_{11}} = \frac{\epsilon'}{12L} \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{12\ell}| > t_{12}) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)}{t_{12}} = \frac{\epsilon'}{12L} \\ \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{13\ell}| > t_{13}) &\leq \frac{(\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)}{t_{13}} = \frac{\epsilon'}{12L}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore with probability  $1 - \epsilon'/(2L)$ , the following inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{8\ell}| &\leq t_8 = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{9\ell}| &\leq t_9 = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} \bar{\sigma}_1^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{10\ell}| &\leq t_{10} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} \bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{11\ell}| &\leq t_{11} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} (\bar{\alpha}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{12\ell}| &\leq t_{12} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} (\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell); \\ |\Delta_{13\ell}| &\leq t_{13} = \frac{12L}{\epsilon'} (\bar{\eta}')^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition E.3** (Oracle approximation). *Suppose the conditions of Proposition E.2 hold. Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon'/2$*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] &\leq \Delta' \\ \Delta' &= 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{84L}{\epsilon'} \left[ \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell) + \{(\hat{\alpha}')^2 + (\hat{\eta}')^2\} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell) + \{(\hat{\eta}')^2 + \hat{\sigma}_1^2\} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) + \hat{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps analogous to Proposition D.1.

1. Decomposition.

By Proposition E.1

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E}_\ell[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] \\ &\leq 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{7}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=8}^{13} \Delta_{j\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

2. Union bound.

Define the events

$$\mathcal{E}'_\ell = \{\text{for all } j \in \{8, \dots, 13\}, |\Delta_{j\ell}| \leq t_j\}, \quad \mathcal{E}' = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^L \mathcal{E}'_\ell, \quad (\mathcal{E}')^c = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^L (\mathcal{E}'_\ell)^c.$$

Hence by the union bound and Proposition E.2,

$$\mathbb{P}\{(\mathcal{E}')^c\} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{P}\{(\mathcal{E}'_\ell)^c\} \leq L \frac{\epsilon'}{2L} = \frac{\epsilon'}{2}.$$

3. Collecting results.

Therefore with probability  $1 - \epsilon'/2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] &\leq 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{7}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=8}^{13} |\Delta_{j\ell}| \\ &\leq 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{7}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=8}^{13} t_j \\ &= 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + 7 \sum_{j=8}^{13} t_j. \end{aligned}$$

□

## E.2 Error from averaging

**Proposition E.4** (Markov inequality). *Recall  $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)^2\}$  and  $\zeta^4 = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)^4\}$ . Suppose  $\zeta < \infty$ . Then with probability  $1 - \epsilon'/2$*

$$|\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} - \sigma^2| \leq \Delta'' = \left(\frac{2}{\epsilon'}\right)^{1/2} \frac{\zeta^2}{n^{1/2}}.$$

*Proof.* I confirm that [29, Proposition 11] generalizes to the longitudinal setting.

Let

$$A = \psi_0(W)^2, \quad \bar{A} = \mathbb{E}_n(A).$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}(\bar{A}) = \mathbb{E}(A) = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)^2\} = \sigma^2, \quad \text{var}(\bar{A}) = \frac{\text{var}(A)}{n} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(A^2)}{n} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\psi_0(W)^4\}}{n} = \frac{\zeta^4}{n}.$$

By Markov inequality

$$\mathbb{P}[|\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} - \sigma^2| > t] = \mathbb{P}\{|\bar{A} - \mathbb{E}(\bar{A})| > t\} \leq \frac{\text{var}(\bar{A})}{t^2} \leq \frac{\zeta^4}{nt^2}.$$

Solving,

$$\frac{\zeta^4}{nt^2} = \frac{\epsilon'}{2} \iff t = \left(\frac{2}{\epsilon'}\right)^{1/2} \frac{\zeta^2}{n^{1/2}}.$$

□

### E.3 Main result

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* I confirm that the steps of [29, Theorem 3] generalize to the longitudinal setting.

#### 1. Decomposition of variance estimator.

Write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}^2 &= \mathbb{E}_n\{\hat{\psi}(W)^2\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W) + \psi_0(W)\}^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] + 2\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}\psi_0(W)] + \mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 - \mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} = \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] + 2\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}\psi_0(W)].$$

#### 2. Decomposition of difference.

Next write

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2 = [\hat{\sigma}^2 - \mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\}] + [\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} - \sigma^2].$$

Focusing on the former term

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 - \mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} = \mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2] + 2\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}\psi_0(W)].$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}\psi_0(W)] \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2]\right)^{1/2} \left[\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\}\right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2]\right)^{1/2} \left[|\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} - \sigma^2| + \sigma^2\right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2]\right)^{1/2} \left(\left[|\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} - \sigma^2|\right]^{1/2} + \sigma\right). \end{aligned}$$

#### 3. High probability events.

From the previous step, we see that to control  $|\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2|$ , it is sufficient to control two expressions:  $\mathbb{E}_n[\{\hat{\psi}(W) - \psi_0(W)\}^2]$  and  $|\mathbb{E}_n\{\psi_0(W)^2\} - \sigma^2|$ . These are controlled in Propositions E.3 and E.4, respectively. Therefore with probability  $1 - \epsilon'$ ,

$$|\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \Delta' + 2(\Delta')^{1/2}\{(\Delta'')^{1/2} + \sigma\} + \Delta''.$$

□



## F Confidence interval

### F.1 Main result

*Proof of Corollary 6.1.* Recall the following definitions from Propositions D.1, D.2, and E.3.

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \frac{7L}{2\epsilon\sigma} \left[ (1 + \bar{\eta}) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\eta}) \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_1 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_2 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right]; \\ \Delta &= \frac{4L}{\epsilon^{1/2}\sigma} \left[ (1 + \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + (\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\alpha}' + \bar{\eta} + \bar{\eta}') \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \bar{\sigma}_1 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} + \bar{\sigma}_2 \{\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2L^{1/2}\sigma} \left[ \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{n\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \wedge \{n\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell)\mathcal{P}(\hat{\eta}_\ell)\}^{1/2} \right]; \\ \Delta' &= 7(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)^2 + \frac{84L}{\epsilon'} \left[ \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell) + \{(\bar{\alpha}')^2 + (\bar{\eta}')^2\} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell) + \{(\bar{\eta}')^2 + \bar{\sigma}_1^2\} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\alpha}_\ell) + \bar{\sigma}_2^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\eta}_\ell) \right].\end{aligned}$$

Immediately from  $\Delta$  in Theorem 6.1,  $\hat{\theta} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \theta_0 \in \left( \hat{\theta} \pm \frac{\sigma}{n^{1/2}} \right) \right\} = 1 - a.$$

For the desired result, it is sufficient that  $\hat{\sigma}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \sigma^2$ , which follows from  $\Delta'$  and  $\Delta''$  in Theorem 6.2.  $\square$

### F.2 Examples revisited

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* Recall

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(m, X, 1) d\mathbb{P}(m|d, X, 0) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_0(M, X, 1) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(d|M, X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|M, X)}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)} \\ \eta_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\mathbb{P}(d|X, G=0)\mathbb{P}(G=0|X)}.\end{aligned}$$

The balancing weight bounds are immediate. I turn to the learning rates.

To begin, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[t(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(M, X, 1) - \gamma_0(M, X, 1)\}^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\mathbb{P}(G=1|M, X)} \{\gamma(M, X, G) - \gamma_0(M, X, G)\}^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(M, X, G) - \gamma_0(M, X, G)\}^2].\end{aligned}$$

Next, write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\pi(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=0}\mathbb{1}_{D=d}}{\pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'_0(G=0|X)} \right\}^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \{\pi(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X) - \pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'_0(G=0|X)\}^2 \right].\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \pi(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X) - \pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'_0(G=0|X) \right\}^2 \right] \\
& \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \pi(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X) - \pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X) \right\}^2 \right] \\
& + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X) - \pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'_0(G=0|X) \right\}^2 \right] \\
& \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \pi(d|X, G=0) - \pi_0(d|X, G=0) \right\}^2 \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \pi'(G=0|X) - \pi'_0(G=0|X) \right\}^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[u(W)^2] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\rho'(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\rho(d|M, X, G=0)\rho'(G=0|M, X)}{\pi(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X)} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{G=1}}{\rho'_0(G=1|M, X)} \frac{\rho_0(d|M, X, G=0)\rho'_0(G=0|M, X)}{\pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'_0(G=0|X)} \right\}^2 \right] \\
& \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \rho(d|M, X, G=0)\rho'(G=0|M, X)\rho'_0(G=1|M, X)\pi_0(d|X, G=0)\pi'_0(G=0|X) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \rho_0(d|M, X, G=0)\rho'_0(G=0|M, X)\rho'(G=1|M, X)\pi(d|X, G=0)\pi'(G=0|X) \right\}^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

A similar triangle inequality bounds the ultimate expression. □

*Proof of Proposition 6.2.* Recall

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_0(W) &= \int \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, x_2) d\mathbb{P}(x_2|d_1, X_1) \\
\delta_0(W) &= \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2) \\
\alpha_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} \\
\eta_0(W) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The balancing weight bounds are immediate. I turn to the learning rates.

To begin, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[t(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2) - \gamma_0(d_1, d_2, X_1, X_2)\}^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1} \mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\mathbb{P}(d_1, d_2|X_1, X_2)} \{\gamma(D_1, D_2, X_1, X_2) - \gamma_0(D_1, D_2, X_1, X_2)\}^2 \right] \\
&\lesssim \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(D_1, D_2, X_1, X_2) - \gamma_0(D_1, D_2, X_1, X_2)\}^2]
\end{aligned}$$

where the final line uses the facts

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(d_1, d_2|X_1, X_2) &= \mathbb{P}(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1, X_2) \\
\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1, X_2) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_2|d_1, X_1)\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1)}{\mathbb{P}(X_2|d_1, X_1)\mathbb{P}(d_1|X_1) + \mathbb{P}(X_2|d'_1, X_1)\mathbb{P}(d'_1|X_1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[v(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi(d_1|X_1)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)} \right\}^2 \right] \\
&\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \pi(d_1|X_1) - \pi_0(d_1|X_1) \right\}^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[u(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi(d_1|X_1)}\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\rho(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_1=d_1}}{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)}\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D_2=d_2}}{\rho_0(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)}\right\}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\pi_0(d_1|X_1)\rho_0(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2) - \pi(d_1|X_1)\rho(d_2|d_1, X_1, X_2)\right\}^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

A similar triangle inequality bounds the ultimate expression.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.3.* Recall

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(W) &= \gamma_0(0, X, V) \\ \delta_0(W) &= \gamma_1(1, M, X, V) \\ \alpha_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z) \\ \eta_0(W) &= \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Y|D=1, M=m, X=x, Z=z) &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(D, M, X, V)|D=1, M=m, X=x, Z=z\} \\ \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_1(1, M, X, V)|D=0, X=x, Z=z\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\gamma_0(D, X, V)|D=0, X=x, Z=z\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|X, V)} \mid D=0, X=x, V=v\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_0(D, X, Z)|D=0, X=x, V=v\} \\ \mathbb{E}\left\{\beta_0(0, X, Z)\frac{\mathbb{P}(D=0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V)} \mid D=1, M=m, X=x, V=v\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\beta_1(D, M, X, Z)|D=1, M=m, X=x, V=v\}.\end{aligned}$$

The balancing weight bounds are immediate. I turn to the learning rates.

To begin, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[s(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(0, X, V) - \gamma_0(0, X, V)\}^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|X, V)}\{\gamma(D, X, V) - \gamma_0(D, X, V)\}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(D, X, V) - \gamma_0(D, X, V)\}^2].\end{aligned}$$

Next, write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[t(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(1, M, X, V) - \gamma_1(1, M, X, V)\}^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D=1}}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V)}\{\gamma(D, M, X, V) - \gamma_1(D, M, X, V)\}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[\{\gamma(D, M, X, V) - \gamma_1(D, M, X, V)\}^2].\end{aligned}$$

Next, write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[v(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta(0, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)\}^2\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\{\beta(0, X, Z) - \beta_0(0, X, Z)\}^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|X, Z)}\{\beta(D, X, Z) - \beta_0(D, X, Z)\}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\{\beta(D, X, Z) - \beta_0(D, X, Z)\}^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Finally, write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[u(W)^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\{\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\}^2\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\{\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(1, M, X, Z)\}^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D=1}}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, Z)}\{\beta(D, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(D, M, X, Z)\}^2\right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\{\beta(D, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(D, M, X, Z)\}^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, I turn to the projected learning rates. I wish to find bounds on

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{E}[\nu(X, V) - \nu_0(X, V)|D, X, Z]\}^2] \\ & \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{E}[\delta(M, X, V) - \delta_0(M, X, V)|D, M, X, Z]\}^2] \\ & \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{E}[\alpha(D, M, X, Z) - \alpha_0(D, M, X, Z)|M, X, V]\}^2] \\ & \mathbb{E}[\{\mathbb{E}[\eta(D, X, Z) - \eta_0(D, X, Z)|M, X, V]\}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the inner expectation of the third quantity

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\alpha(D, M, X, Z) - \alpha_0(D, M, X, Z)|M, X, V] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=1}\beta_1(1, M, X, Z)|M, X, V] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[\beta(1, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(1, M, X, Z)|M, X, V] \\ & = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D=1}}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V, Z)} \{\beta(D, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(D, M, X, Z)\}|M, X, V\right] \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\beta(D, M, X, Z) - \beta_1(D, M, X, Z)|M, X, V] \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D=1|M, X, V, Z)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(Z|D=1, M, X, V)}.$$

Focusing on the inner expectation of the fourth quantity

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\eta(D, X, Z) - \eta_0(D, X, Z)|M, X, V] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta(0, X, Z) - \mathbb{1}_{D=0}\beta_0(0, X, Z)|M, X, V] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[\beta(0, X, Z) - \beta_0(0, X, Z)|M, X, V] \\ & = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{D=0}}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|M, X, V)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(D=0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|M, X, V, Z)} \{\beta(D, X, Z) - \beta_0(D, X, Z)\}|M, X, V\right] \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\beta(D, X, Z) - \beta_0(D, X, Z)|M, X, V] \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(D=0|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(D=0|M, X, V, Z)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z|M, X, V)}{\mathbb{P}(Z|D=0, M, X, V)}.$$

□

## G Localization

### G.1 Main result

For readability, I restate the main result I wish to prove. Suppose that the global residual variances are finite. Suppose bounded balancing weight, residual, density, derivative, and kernel conditions hold. Then for local functionals

$$\kappa_h/\sigma_h \lesssim h^{-1/6}, \quad \sigma_h \asymp h^{-1/2}, \quad \kappa_h \lesssim h^{-2/3}, \quad \zeta_h \lesssim h^{-3/4}$$

and

$$\bar{\sigma}_{1,h} \lesssim h^{-1}\bar{\sigma}_1, \quad \bar{\sigma}_{2,h} \lesssim h^{-1}\bar{\sigma}_2, \quad \Delta_h \lesssim n^{1/2}h^{s+1/2}$$

where  $s$  is the order of differentiability. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_\ell), \quad \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_\ell), \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2}\mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_\ell).$$

### G.2 Oracle moments

I denote a local functional

$$\theta_{0,h} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\int m_h(W, \gamma_0)d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1)\right\} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\int \ell_h(W_\ell)m(W, \gamma_0)d\mathbb{Q}(w_2|W_1)\right\}.$$

To lighten notation, I write  $\ell = \ell_h$  and  $V = W_\ell$ . I also suppress the arguments of functions and define

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 &= \nu_0 - \mathbb{E}[\nu_0] \\ U_1 &= Y - \delta_0 \\ U_2 &= \delta_0 - \nu_0 \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\psi_{0,h} = \ell \cdot (U_0 + \alpha_0 U_1 + \eta_0 U_2).$$

Finally, I lighten notation by defining

$$\|W\|_{\mathbb{P},q} = \{\mathbb{E}(W^q)\}^{1/q}.$$

**Lemma G.1** (Oracle moments for local functionals). *Suppose there exist*

$$(\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \underline{\eta}, \bar{\eta}, \underline{\sigma}_0, \bar{\sigma}_0, \underline{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_1, \underline{\sigma}_2, \bar{\sigma}_2, \underline{f}, \bar{f}, \underline{f}', \bar{f}', h_0)$$

*bounded away from zero and above such that the following conditions hold.*

1. *Control of balancing weights.*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha} &\leq \|\alpha_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\alpha} \\ \underline{\eta} &\leq \|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \bar{\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

2. *Control of residual moments. For  $q \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\sigma}_0 &\leq \|U_0 V\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \leq \bar{\sigma}_0 \\ \underline{\sigma}_1 &\leq \|U_1 W\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \leq \bar{\sigma}_1 \\ \underline{\sigma}_2 &\leq \|U_2 W_1\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \leq \bar{\sigma}_2. \end{aligned}$$

3. *Bounded density. The density  $f_V$  obeys, for all  $v' \in N_{h_0}(v) = \{v' : |v' - v| \leq h\}$ ,*

$$\underline{f} \leq f_V(v') \leq \bar{f}, \quad |\partial f_V(v')| \leq \bar{f}'.$$

*Then finite sample bounds given in the proof hold. In summary,*

$$\frac{\kappa_h}{\sigma_h} \lesssim h^{-1/6}, \quad \sigma_h \asymp h^{-1/2}, \quad \kappa_h \lesssim h^{-2/3}, \quad \zeta_h \lesssim h^{-3/4}.$$

*Proof.* I extend [28, Lemma 3.4]. I proceed in steps.

1. *Moment bounds.*

Write

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_h^2 &= \mathbb{E}\{\psi_{0,h}^2\} = \mathbb{E}[\ell^2 \cdot (U_0^2 + \alpha_0^2 U_1^2 + \eta_0^2 U_2^2 + 2\alpha_0 U_0 U_1 + 2\eta_0 U_0 U_2 + 2\alpha_0 \eta_0 U_1 U_2)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\ell^2 \cdot (U_0^2 + \alpha_0^2 U_1^2 + \eta_0^2 U_2^2)] \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality is implied by Assumption 4.1. In particular, I use

$$\mathbb{E}\{[\alpha(W) - \alpha_0(W)]U_1\} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}\{[\eta(W) - \eta_0(W)]U_2\} = 0.$$

Hence

$$(\underline{\sigma}_0^2 + \underline{\alpha}^2 \underline{\sigma}_1^2 + \underline{\eta}^2 \underline{\sigma}_2^2) \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq \sigma_h^2 \leq (\bar{\sigma}_0^2 + \bar{\alpha}^2 \bar{\sigma}_1^2 + \bar{\eta}^2 \bar{\sigma}_2^2) \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},2}.$$

Moreover,

$$\|\psi_{0,h}\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \leq (\bar{\sigma}_0 + \bar{\alpha} \bar{\sigma}_1 + \bar{\eta} \bar{\sigma}_2) \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q}.$$

In summary,

$$\|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \lesssim \sigma_h \lesssim \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},2}, \quad \|\psi_{0,h}\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \lesssim \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q}.$$

## 2. Taylor expansion.

Consider the change of variables  $u = (v' - v)/h$  so that  $du = h^{-1}dv'$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q}^q \omega^q &= \|\ell\omega\|_{\mathbb{P},q}^q \\ &= \left\| h^{-1}K\left(\frac{V-v}{h}\right) \right\|_{\mathbb{P},q}^q \\ &= \int h^{-q} \left| K\left(\frac{v'-v}{h}\right) \right|^q f_V(v') dv' \\ &= \int h^{-(q-1)} |K(u)|^q f_V(v-uh) du. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$h^{-(q-1)/q} \underline{f}^{1/q} \left( \int |K|^q \right)^{1/q} \leq \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \omega \leq h^{-(q-1)/q} \bar{f}^{1/q} \left( \int |K|^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

Further, I have that

$$\omega = \int h^{-1}K\left(\frac{v'-v}{h}\right) f_V(v') dv' = \int K(u) f_V(v-uh) du.$$

Note that

$$\int K(u) f_V(v-0u) du = \int K(u) f_V(v) du = f_V(v).$$

Using the Taylor expansion in  $h$  around  $h = 0$  and the Holder inequality, there exist some  $\tilde{h} \in [0, h]$  such that

$$|\omega - f_V(v)| = \left| h \int K(u) \partial_v f_V(v - u\tilde{h}) u du \right| \leq h \bar{f}' \int |u| |K(u)| du.$$

Hence there exists some  $h_1 \in (h, h_0)$  depending only on  $(K, \bar{f}', \underline{f}, \bar{f})$  such that

$$\underline{f}/2 \leq \omega \leq 2\bar{f}.$$

In summary,

$$h^{-(q-1)/q} \underline{f}^{1/q} \left( \int |K|^q \right)^{1/q} \frac{1}{2\bar{f}} \leq \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \leq h^{-(q-1)/q} \bar{f}^{1/q} \left( \int |K|^q \right)^{1/q} \frac{2}{\underline{f}}$$

which implies

$$h^{-(q-1)/q} \lesssim \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \lesssim h^{-(q-1)/q}.$$

## 3. Collecting results.

In summary, for all  $h < h_1$

$$\sigma_h \asymp \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},2}, \quad \|\psi_{0,h}\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \lesssim \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q}, \quad \|\ell\|_{\mathbb{P},q} \asymp h^{-(q-1)/q}.$$

□

### G.3 Residual variances and learning rates

**Lemma G.2** (Residual variance for local functionals). *Suppose there exist*

$$(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2, \underline{f}, \bar{f}, \bar{f}', h_0, \bar{K})$$

*bounded away from zero and above such that the following conditions hold.*

1. *Bounded residual variance:*

$$\|U_1|W\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq \bar{\sigma}_1, \quad \|U_2|W_1\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq \bar{\sigma}_2.$$

2. *Bounded density*: the density  $f_V$  obeys, for all  $v' \in N_{h_0}(v)$ ,
- $$0 < \underline{f} \leq f_V(v') \leq \bar{f}, \quad |\partial f_V(v')| \leq \bar{f}'.$$

3. *Bounded kernel*:  $|K(u)| \leq \bar{K}$ .

Then the finite sample bound given in the proof holds. In summary,

$$\bar{\sigma}_{h,1} \lesssim h^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_1, \quad \bar{\sigma}_{h,2} \lesssim h^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_2.$$

*Proof.* Write

$$\bar{\sigma}_{1,h} = \|\ell \cdot U_1 | W\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq \|\ell\|_{\infty} \|U_1 | W\|_{\mathbb{P},2}.$$

By the proof of Lemma G.1,

$$\|\ell\|_{\infty} = \left\| \frac{1}{h\omega} K\left(\frac{v' - v}{h}\right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq \bar{K} \frac{1}{h\omega} \leq \bar{K} \frac{2}{h\underline{f}}.$$

Therefore

$$\bar{\sigma}_{1,h} \leq \bar{K} \frac{2}{h\underline{f}} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_h \lesssim h^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_1.$$

The argument for  $\bar{\sigma}_{2,h}$  is identical.  $\square$

A natural choice of estimator  $\hat{\nu}_h$  for  $\nu_{0,h}$  is the localization  $\ell_h$  times an estimator  $\hat{\nu}$  for  $\nu_0$ . I prove that this choice allows an analyst to translate global nuisance parameter rates into local nuisance parameter rates under mild regularity conditions.

**Lemma G.3** (Translating global rates to local rates). *Suppose the conditions of Lemma G.2 hold. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell}), \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell}), \quad \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell}), \quad \mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell,h}) \lesssim h^{-2} \mathcal{P}(\hat{\delta}_{\ell}).$$

*Proof.* I generalize [29, Lemma 10]. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}) &= \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{\nu}_{\ell,h}(W) - \nu_{0,h}(W)\}^2 | I_{\ell}^c] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{\ell_h(W_i) \hat{\nu}_{\ell}(W) - \ell_h(W_i) \nu_0(W)\}^2 | I_{\ell}^c] \\ &\leq \|\ell_h\|_{\infty}^2 \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{\nu}_{\ell}(W) - \nu_0(W)\}^2 | I_{\ell}^c] \\ &= \|\ell_h\|_{\infty}^2 \mathcal{R}(\hat{\nu}_{\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally recall from the proof of Lemma G.2 that  $\|\ell_h\|_{\infty} \lesssim h^{-1}$ . The remaining results are identical.  $\square$

#### G.4 Approximation error

Finally, I characterize the finite sample approximation error  $\Delta_h = n^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} |\theta_{0,h} - \theta_0^{\text{lim}}|$  where  $\theta_0^{\text{lim}} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \theta_{0,h}$ .  $\Delta_h$  is bias from using a semiparametric sequence to approximate a nonparametric quantity.

I define

$$m(v) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int m(W_1, w_2, \gamma_0) d\mathbb{Q}(w_2 | W_1) \mid V = v \right]$$

to lighten notation.

**Lemma G.4** (Approximation error from localization [28]). *Suppose there exist constants  $(h_0, s, \bar{g}_s, \bar{f}_s, \underline{f}, \bar{g})$  bounded away from zero and above such that the following conditions hold.*

1. *Differentiability*: on  $N_{h_0}(v) = \{v' : |v' - v| \leq h\}$ ,  $m(v')$  and  $f_V(v')$  are differentiable to the integer order  $d$ .
2. *Bounded derivatives*: let  $s = d \wedge o$  where  $o$  is the order of the kernel  $K$ . Let  $\partial_v^s$  denote the  $s$  order derivative  $\partial^s / (\partial v)^s$ . Assume

$$\sup_{v' \in N_{h_0}(v)} \|\partial_v^s(m(v') f_V(v'))\|_{op} \leq \bar{g}_s, \quad \sup_{v' \in N_{h_0}(v)} \|\partial_v^s f_V(v')\|_{op} \leq \bar{f}_s, \quad \inf_{v' \in N_{h_0}(v)} f_V(v') \geq \underline{f}.$$

3. *Bounded conditional formula:*  $m(v)f_V(v) \leq \bar{g}$ .

Then there exist constants  $(C, h_1)$  depending only on  $(h_0, K, s, \bar{g}_s, \bar{f}_s, \underline{f}, \bar{g})$  such that for all  $h_1 \in (h, h_0)$ ,  $|\theta_{0,h} - \theta_0^{\text{lim}}| \leq Ch^s$ . In summary,

$$\Delta_h \lesssim n^{1/2}h^{s+1/2}.$$

## H Adversarial estimation lemmas

### H.1 Notation

To lighten notation, I suppress the tildes.

Consider the notation

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(f, g, h) &= \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - h(X)\}f(Z)] \\ \Psi_n(f, g, h) &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - h(X)\}f(Z)].\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(f, g_0, h) &= \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{g_0(M) - h(X)|Z\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{h_0(X) - h(X)|Z\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[T(h_0 - h)(Z)f(Z)]\end{aligned}$$

Further define

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^\lambda(f, g, h) &= \Psi(f, g, h) - \lambda \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right) \\ \Psi_n^\lambda(f, g, h) &= \Psi_n(f, g, h) - \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right)\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\hat{h} = \underset{h \in \mathcal{H}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h) + \mu \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$$

### H.2 Test function

**Lemma H.1** (Test function). *If  $f_h$  satisfies  $\|f_h - T(h_* - h)\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ , then*

$$\frac{\Psi(f, g, h) - \Psi(f, g, h_*)}{\|f_h\|_2} \geq \|f_h\|_2 - \epsilon \geq \|T(h_* - h)\|_2 - 2\epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Write

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(f, g, h) - \Psi(f, g, h_*) &= \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - h(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{h_*(M) - h(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h_*(M) - h(X)|Z\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[T(h_* - h)(Z)f(Z)]\end{aligned}$$

Hence if  $f_h^* = T(h_* - h)$  then

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(f_h, g, h) - \Psi(f_h, g, h_*) &= \mathbb{E}[T(h_* - h)(Z)f_h(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f_h^*(Z)f_h(Z)] \\ &= \|f_h\|_2^2 + \mathbb{E}[f_h(Z)\{f_h^*(Z) - f_h(Z)\}]\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathbb{E}[f_h(Z)\{f_h^*(Z) - f_h(Z)\}] &\leq |\mathbb{E}[f_h(Z)\{f_h^*(Z) - f_h(Z)\}]| \\ &\leq \|f_h\|_2 \|f_h^* - f_h\|_2 \\ &\leq \epsilon \|f_h\|_2.\end{aligned}$$



Therefore

$$\Psi(f, g, h) - \Psi(f, g, h_*) = \|f_h\|_2^2 - (-\mathbb{E}[f_h(Z)\{f_h^*(Z) - f_h(Z)\}]) \geq \|f_h\|_2^2 - \epsilon \|f_h\|_2$$

Moreover,

$$\|f_h\|_2 \geq \|f_h^*\|_2 - \|f_h^* - f_h\|_2 \geq \|f_h^*\|_2 - \epsilon.$$

In summary

$$\frac{\Psi(f, g, h) - \Psi(f, g, h_*)}{\|f_h\|_2} \geq \|f_h\|_2 - \epsilon \geq \|f_h^*\|_2 - 2\epsilon.$$

□

### H.3 Regularization

**Lemma H.2** (Relating empirical and population regularization; eq. 16 and 17 of [33]). *w.p.  $1 - \zeta$ ,*

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \left| \|f\|_{2,n}^2 - \|f\|_2^2 \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_2^2 + \delta^2 \max\left(1, \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{3U}\right)$$

and

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \geq \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 - U.$$

### H.4 Lipschitz bound

**Lemma H.3** (Lipschitz bound; Lemma 8 of [37]). *Consider a function class  $\mathcal{F}$  of functions of the form  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\infty,2} \leq 1$ . Pick any  $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ . Assume that the loss  $\ell$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz in its first argument with respect to  $\ell_2$  norm. Let*

$$Z_n(r) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}: \|f - f^*\|_{2,2} \leq r} |\mathbb{E}_n[\ell\{f(X), Z\} - \ell\{f^*(X), Z\}] - \mathbb{E}[\ell\{f(X), Z\} - \ell\{f^*(X), Z\}]|.$$

Then for each  $r \geq \delta_n$ , where  $\delta_n$  is the critical radius of  $\text{star}(\mathcal{F} - f^*)$ , *w.p.*

$$1 - c_1 \exp\left(-\frac{c_2 n u^2}{L^2 r^2 + 2Lu}\right),$$

we have that

$$Z_n(r) \leq 16Ldr\delta_n + u.$$

**Corollary H.1** (Simplification). *Suppose the conditions of Lemma H.3 hold. Then w.p.  $1 - \zeta$*

$$Z_n(r) \leq 16Ldr\delta_n + 2\frac{L}{c_2} \frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n} + \frac{Lr}{\sqrt{c_2}} \sqrt{\frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n}}$$

Moreover if  $\delta = \delta_n + c_0 \{\ln(c_1/\zeta)/n\}^{1/2}$  then

$$Z_n(r) \leq 17Ld(r\delta + \delta^2).$$

*Proof.* In Lemma H.3, set

$$\zeta = c_1 \exp\left(-\frac{c_2 n u^2}{L^2 r^2 + 2Lu}\right).$$

Hence

$$\ln(c_1/\zeta) = \frac{c_2 n u^2}{L^2 r^2 + 2Lu} \iff c_2 n u^2 = (L^2 r^2 + 2Lu) \ln(c_1/\zeta) \iff u^2 = (Lr^2 + 2u) \frac{L}{c_2} \frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n}.$$

To lighten notation, let  $w = \frac{L}{c_2} \frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n}$ . Solving

$$(1)u^2 + (-2w)u + (-Lr^2w) = 0$$

gives

$$u = \frac{-(-2w) \pm \sqrt{(-2w)^2 - 4 \cdot 1 \cdot (-Lr^2w)}}{2 \cdot 1} = w \pm \sqrt{w^2 + Lr^2w} \leq 2\frac{L}{c_2} \frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n} + \frac{Lr}{\sqrt{c_2}} \sqrt{\frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n}}.$$

In summary, setting  $c_0 = 1/\sqrt{c_2}$

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_n(r) &\leq 16Ldr\delta_n + 2\frac{L}{c_2}\frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n} + \frac{Lr}{\sqrt{c_2}}\sqrt{\frac{\ln(c_1/\zeta)}{n}} \\
&\leq 16Ldr\delta + 2L\delta^2 + Lr\delta \\
&\leq 17Ldr\delta + 2L\delta^2 \\
&\leq 17Ld(r\delta + \delta^2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma H.4** (Lipschitz bound; Lemma 11 of [37]). *Consider a function class  $\mathcal{F}$  of functions of the form  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ . Pick any  $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$ . Assume that the loss  $\ell$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz in its first argument with respect to  $\ell_2$  norm. Then taking  $\delta_n$  to be the critical radius of  $\text{star}(\mathcal{F} - f^*)$ , w.p.*

$$1 - c_5 \exp(-c_6 n \delta_n^2),$$

we have that

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad |\mathbb{E}_n[\ell\{f(X), Z\} - \ell\{f^*(X), Z\}] - \mathbb{E}[\ell\{f(X), Z\} - \ell\{f^*(X), Z\}]| \leq 18L\delta_n(\|f - f^*\|_2 + \delta_n).$$

**Corollary H.2** (Simplification). *Suppose the conditions of Lemma H.3 hold and  $\delta = \delta_n + c_0\{\ln(c_1/\zeta)/n\}^{1/2}$ . Then w.p.  $1 - \zeta$*

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad |\mathbb{E}_n[\ell\{f(X), Z\} - \ell\{f^*(X), Z\}] - \mathbb{E}[\ell\{f(X), Z\} - \ell\{f^*(X), Z\}]| \leq 18L\delta(\|f - f^*\|_2 + \delta).$$

*Proof.* In Lemma H.4, set

$$\zeta = c_5 \exp(-c_6 n \delta_n^2).$$

Hence

$$\ln(c_5/\zeta) = c_6 n \delta_n^2 \iff \delta_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_6}} \sqrt{\frac{\ln(c_5/\zeta)}{n}} \leq \delta.$$

setting  $c_0 = 1/\sqrt{c_6}$  and  $c_1 = c_5$ .

□

## I Empirical loss upper bound

I turn to

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{\Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \text{centering}\} \leq \text{UB}$$

### I.1 Decomposition

**Lemma I.1** (Decomposition).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps.

#### 1. Optimality

By definition of  $\hat{h}$ ,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)$$

I derive a lower bound for the LHS.

## 2. Lower bound for LHS

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n^\lambda(f, g, h) &= \Psi_n(f, g, h) - \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \\
\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\geq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\quad + \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the final term, note that by symmetry of  $\mathcal{F}$ , the regularization, and the fact that each summand is of the form  $\{g(m) - h(x)\}f(z)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} &= \inf_{f \in -\mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ -\Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&= -\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&= -\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \}
\end{aligned}$$

In summary

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) \geq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \}$$

## 3. Collecting results

I have shown, using the lower bound and the optimization

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \} \\
&\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) \\
&\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

□

## I.2 Lipschitz bound

The sketch is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n(f, g, h_*) &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M) + g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] + \mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\Psi_n(f, g, h_*) - \Psi(f, g, h_*)| \\
&\leq |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \\
&\quad + |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]|
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma I.2.** w.p.  $1 - \zeta$ ,

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \forall g - g_0 \in \mathcal{G}, \quad |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \leq \epsilon_1$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_1 &= 51 \max\left(\frac{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}}, 1\right) \|f\|_2 \delta \\
&\quad + 51 \max\left(\frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}}, 1\right) \|g - g_0\|_2 \delta \\
&\quad + 51 \max\left(\frac{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}}, 1\right) \max\left(\frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}}, 1\right) \delta^2
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps

### 1. Matching symbols

To begin, write

$$\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] = \mathbb{E}_n[\ell(f, \tilde{g}) - \ell(0, 0)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(f, \tilde{g}) - \ell(0, 0)]$$

where

$$\ell(f, \tilde{g}) = f\tilde{g}, \quad \tilde{g} = g - g_0, \quad (f^*, \tilde{g}^*) = (0, 0).$$

In particular,  $\ell(0, \tilde{g}) = 0$  so, as desired,

$$\ell(f, \tilde{g}) - \ell(0, 0) = \ell(f, \tilde{g}) = f\tilde{g} = f(g - g_0)$$

### 2. Lipschitz continuity

The function  $\ell$  is 2-Lipschitz w.r.t.  $(f, \tilde{g})$  since its gradient w.r.t. these components is  $(\tilde{g}, f)$ .

This vector has  $\ell_2$  norm bounded by 2 since

$$\|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \quad \|\tilde{g}\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \quad f \in \mathcal{F}_{3U}, \quad \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}_C.$$

Therefore by Corollary H.1, w.p.  $1 - \zeta$

$$Z_n(r) \leq 17Ld(r\delta + \delta^2), \quad L = 2, \quad d = 2, \quad r = \|(f, \tilde{g}) - (0, 0)\|_2 \leq \|f\|_2 + \|\tilde{g}\|_2.$$

i.e.

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{3U}, \forall g - g_0 \in \mathcal{G}_C,$$

$$|\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \leq 51(\|f\|_2 \delta + \|g - g_0\|_2 \delta + \delta^2)$$

### 3. Extrapolation outside the ball

Consider a function  $f$  such that  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \sqrt{3U}$ . Then the inequality holds replacing  $f$  with

$$\frac{\sqrt{3U}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}} f:$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{3U}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}} |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \leq 51 \left( \frac{\sqrt{3U}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}} \|f\|_2 \delta + \|g - g_0\|_2 \delta + \delta^2 \right)$$

Multiplying both sides,

$$|\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \leq 51 \left( \|f\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \|g - g_0\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \delta^2 \right)$$

Consider the case when  $\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}} \geq \sqrt{C}$ . Then the inequality holds replacing  $g - g_0$  with  $\frac{\sqrt{C}}{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}(g - g_0)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}} |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \\ & \leq 51 \left( \|f\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}} \|g - g_0\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \delta^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \\ & \leq 51 \left( \frac{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} \|f\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \|g - g_0\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|g - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \delta^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma I.3.** *w.p.*  $1 - \zeta$ ,

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]| \leq \epsilon_2$$

where

$$\epsilon_2 = 17\chi \|f\|_2 \delta + 17\chi \max\left(1, \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}}\right) \delta^2$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps

### 1. Matching symbols

To begin, write

$$\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] = \mathbb{E}_n[\ell(f) - \ell(0)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(f) - \ell(0)]$$

where

$$\ell(f) = f(g_0 - h_*), \quad f^* = 0.$$

In particular,  $\ell(0) = 0$  so, as desired,

$$\ell(f) - \ell(0) = \ell(f) = f(g_0 - h_*)$$

### 2. Lipschitz continuity

The function  $\ell$  is  $(\|g_0\|_{\infty} + \|h_*\|_{\infty})$ -Lipschitz w.r.t.  $f$  since its gradient w.r.t. this components is  $(g_0 - h_*)$ . Therefore by Corollary H.1, *w.p.*  $1 - \zeta$

$$Z_n(r) \leq 17Ld(r\delta + \delta^2), \quad L = (\|g_0\|_{\infty} + \|h_*\|_{\infty}), \quad d = 1, \quad r = \|f - 0\|_2 = \|f\|_2.$$

To lighten notation, write  $\chi = \|g_0\|_{\infty} + \|h_*\|_{\infty}$ . Then

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}_{3U},$$

$$|\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]| \leq 17\chi(\|f\|_2 \delta + \delta^2)$$

### 3. Extrapolation outside the ball

Consider a function  $f$  such that  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \sqrt{3U}$ . Then the inequality holds replacing  $f$  with  $\frac{\sqrt{3U}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}f$ :

$$\frac{\sqrt{3U}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}} |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]| \leq 17\chi \left( \frac{\sqrt{3U}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}} \|f\|_2 \delta + \delta^2 \right)$$

Multiplying both sides,

$$|\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]| \leq 17\chi \left( \|f\|_2 \delta + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \delta^2 \right)$$

□

**Lemma I.4** (Relating empirical and population loss). *w.p.*  $1 - 2\zeta$ ,

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad |\Psi_n(f, g, h_*) - \Psi(f, g, h_*)| \leq \epsilon = \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_n(f, g, h_*) &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M) + g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] + \mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Psi_n(f, g, h_*) - \Psi(f, g, h_*)| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}_n[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)]| \end{aligned}$$

The result is then immediate from Lemmas I.2 and I.3. □

**Lemma I.5** (High probability bound). *Suppose*

$$\frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} \leq 1, \quad \lambda \geq \delta^2/U.$$

*Then w.p.*  $1 - 3\zeta$ ,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2)$$

*Proof.* Appealing to Lemmas H.2 and I.4

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \lambda \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) + \lambda U \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 - \lambda \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) + \lambda U \right\} \\ &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) + \lambda U \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Recall from Lemmas I.2 and I.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1 &\leq 51 \left( \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} + 1 \right) \|f\|_2 \delta \\ &\quad + 51 \left( \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} + 1 \right) \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 \delta \\ &\quad + 51 \left( \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} + 1 \right) \left( \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} + 1 \right) \delta^2 \\ \epsilon_2 &\leq 17\chi \|f\|_2 \delta + 17\chi \left( 1 + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{3U}} \right) \delta^2 \end{aligned}$$

Grouping terms within the brackets,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right) + \lambda U \\
&= \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U \\
&+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3U}} \left\{ 51 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta \left( 51 \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} + 51 + 17\chi \right) \right\} \delta \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\lambda 2}{2 \cdot 3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \\
&+ \left\{ 51 \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} + 51 + 17\chi \right\} \delta \|f\|_2 - \frac{\lambda U}{2 \delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \\
&+ \delta \left\{ 51 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta \left( 51 + 51 \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} + 17\chi \right) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose the sample size is sufficiently large that the preliminary estimator satisfies  $\frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{C}} \leq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right) + \lambda U \\
&= \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U \\
&+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3U}} \{ 51 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta (102 + 17\chi) \} \delta \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\lambda 2}{2 \cdot 3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \\
&+ \{ 102 + 17\chi \} \delta \|f\|_2 - \frac{\lambda U}{2 \delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \\
&+ \delta \{ 51 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta (102 + 17\chi) \}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for  $a, b > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (a \|f\| - b \|f\|^2) \leq \frac{a^2}{4b}$$

Therefore when  $\lambda \geq \delta^2/U$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3U}} \{ 51 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta (102 + 17\chi) \} \delta \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\lambda 2}{2 \cdot 3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \right] \\
&\leq \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{3U}} \{ 51 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta (102 + 17\chi) \} \delta \right)^2 \cdot \left( \frac{\lambda 2}{2 \cdot 3} \right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\
&= \frac{\delta^2}{3U} 2 \{ 51^2 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 (102 + 17\chi)^2 \} \cdot \frac{3}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{3} 2 \{ 51^2 \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 (102 + 17\chi)^2 \} \cdot 3 \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\
&= O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2).
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ \{ 102 + 17\chi \} \delta \|f\|_2 - \frac{\lambda U}{2 \delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\leq (\{ 102 + 17\chi \} \delta)^2 \cdot \left( \frac{\lambda U}{2 \delta^2} \right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\
&= \delta^2 \{ 102 + 17\chi \}^2 \frac{2\delta^2}{\lambda U} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\
&\leq \delta^2 \{ 102 + 17\chi \}^2 \cdot \frac{2}{4} \\
&= O(\delta^2).
\end{aligned}$$

In summary

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3U}} \{51\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta(102 + 17\chi)\} \delta \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \\
&\quad + \{102 + 17\chi\} \delta \|f\|_2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \\
&\quad \left. + \delta \{51\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta(102 + 17\chi)\} \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U \\
&\quad + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3U}} \{51\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta(102 + 17\chi)\} \delta \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ \{102 + 17\chi\} \delta \|f\|_2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \delta \{51\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta(102 + 17\chi)\} \\
&\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U \\
&\quad + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2) \\
&\quad + O(\delta^2) \\
&\quad + O(\delta\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \delta^2) \\
&= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally note that

$$\delta\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 \leq \max(\delta^2, \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2) \leq \delta^2 + \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2$$

□

### I.3 Collecting results

**Lemma I.6** (Collecting results). *w.p.*  $1 - 3\zeta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + 2\lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma I.1

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma I.5,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi_n^\lambda(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2).$$

□

## J Empirical loss lower bound

I turn to

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \text{centering} \} \geq \text{LB}$$



## J.1 Decomposition

Let

$$f_h = \arg \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{L^2 \|h-h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}} \|f - T(h_* - h)\|_2.$$

By hypothesis,

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \|f_h - T(h_* - h)\|_2 \leq \eta_n.$$

**Lemma J.1** (Decomposition).

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \} \\ & \geq r \{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \} - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U \end{aligned}$$

where  $r$  is defined below.

*Proof.* I proceed in steps

### 1. Evaluation

Suppose  $\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \geq \delta$ . Let  $r = \frac{\delta}{2\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2} \in [0, 1/2]$ . Since  $f_{\hat{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{L^2 \|h-h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is star-convex,  $r f_{\hat{h}} \in \mathcal{F}_{L^2 \|h-h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}$ . Therefore the supremum is lower bounded by the evaluation at  $r f_{\hat{h}}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \} \\ & \geq r \{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \} - 2\lambda r^2 \left( \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{2,n}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

### 2. Regularization

By Lemma H.2, w.p.  $1 - \zeta$ ,

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \left| \|f\|_{2,n}^2 - \|f\|_2^2 \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_2^2 + \delta^2 \max \left( 1, \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{3U} \right).$$

which implies

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \leq 2\|f\|_2^2 + \delta^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{3U} \right).$$

Recall  $\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \leq L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$  and  $r^2 = \frac{\delta^2}{4\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{1}{4}$  since  $\delta \leq \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2$ . Collecting these results,

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 \left( \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{2,n}^2 \right) & \leq \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + r^2 \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{2,n}^2 \\ & \leq \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + r^2 \frac{U}{\delta^2} \left\{ 2\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2^2 + \delta^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{3U} \right) \right\} \\ & = \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + r^2 \frac{U}{\delta^2} 2\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2^2 + r^2 U \left( 1 + \frac{\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{3U} \right) \\ & \leq \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{2} + \frac{U}{4} \left( 1 + \frac{\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{3U} \right) \\ & \leq 2\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + U \\ & \leq 2L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + U. \end{aligned}$$

### 3. Collecting results

In summary

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \} \\
& \geq r \{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \} - 2\lambda r^2 \left( \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \\
& \geq r \{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \} - 2\lambda(2L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + U).
\end{aligned}$$

□

## J.2 Lipschitz bound

**Lemma J.2** (Relating empirical and population loss). *w.p.*  $1 - \zeta$ ,

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad | \{ \Psi_n(f_h, g, h) - \Psi_n(f_h, g, h_*) \} - \{ \Psi(f_h, g, h) - \Psi(f_h, g, h_*) \} | \leq \epsilon$$

where

$$\epsilon = 18\delta (\|f_h\|_2 + \delta) \max \left( 1, \frac{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right).$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps.

### 1. Matching symbols

Write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_n(f_h, g, h) - \Psi_n(f_h, g, h_*) &= \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] - \mathbb{E}_n[\{g(M) - h_*(X)\}f_h(Z)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_n[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_n[\ell(\tilde{h}) - \ell(0)]
\end{aligned}$$

where, matching symbols with Lemma H.3,

$$\ell(\tilde{h}) = \tilde{h}, \quad \tilde{h} = (h_* - h)f_h, \quad \tilde{h}^* = 0.$$

In particular,  $\ell(0) = 0$  so, as desired,

$$\ell(\tilde{h}) - \ell(0) = \ell(\tilde{h}) = \tilde{h} = \{h_*(x) - h(x)\}f_h(z).$$

Note that  $g$  disappears, so we will get a result that holds  $\forall g \in \mathcal{G}$  for free.

### 2. Lipschitz continuity

The function  $\ell$  is 1-Lipschitz with respect to  $\tilde{h}$  since its gradient with respect to this component is 1, which trivially has an  $\ell_2$  norm bounded by 1. Therefore by Corollary H.2, w.p.  $1 - \zeta$

$$\forall \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{Q}_{B, L^2 B}, \quad | \mathbb{E}_n[\ell(\tilde{h}) - \ell(0)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(\tilde{h}) - \ell(0)] | \leq 18\delta(\|\tilde{h} - 0\|_2 + \delta).$$

i.e.

$$\forall h : h - h_* \in \mathcal{H}_B, \quad | \Psi_n(f_h, g, h) - \Psi_n(f_h, g, h_*) - \Psi(f_h, g, h) + \Psi(f_h, g, h_*) | \leq 18\delta(\|(h_* - h)f_h\|_2 + \delta).$$

Since  $\|h - h_*\|_{\infty} \leq 1$  for  $h - h_* \in \mathcal{H}_B$ , I further bound  $\|(h_* - h)f_h\|_2 \leq \|f_h\|_2$ , which gives

$$\forall h : h - h_* \in \mathcal{H}_B, \quad | \mathbb{E}_n[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] | \leq 18\delta(\|f_h\|_2 + \delta).$$

### 3. Extrapolation outside the ball

Consider the case where  $\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \sqrt{B}$ . Then the inequality holds replacing  $h - h_*$  with  $\frac{\sqrt{B}}{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}}(h - h_*)$  and replacing  $f_h$  with  $\frac{\sqrt{B}}{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}}f_h$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{B}{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} | \mathbb{E}_n[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] | \\
& \leq 18\delta \left( \frac{\sqrt{B}}{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}} \|f_h\|_2 + \delta \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_n[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] \\ & \leq 18\delta \left( \frac{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{B}} \|f_h\|_2 + \frac{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \delta \right). \end{aligned}$$

In summary

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall h : h - h_* \in \mathcal{H} \\ & \mathbb{E}_n[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] - \mathbb{E}[\{h_*(X) - h(X)\}f_h(Z)] \\ & \leq 18\delta (\|f_h\|_2 + \delta) \max \left( 1, \frac{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

### J.3 Collecting results

**Lemma J.3** (Collecting results). *w.p.*  $1 - \zeta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\ & \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - \delta\eta_n - 18\delta^2 \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma J.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\ & \geq r \left\{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \right\} - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma H.4

$$\forall h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad |\{\Psi_n(fh, g, h) - \Psi_n(fh, g, h_*)\} - \{\Psi(fh, g, h) - \Psi(fh, g, h_*)\}| \leq \epsilon$$

where

$$\epsilon = 18\delta (\|f_h\|_2 + \delta) \max \left( 1, \frac{\|h - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right).$$

Therefore

$$r \left\{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \right\} \geq r \left\{ \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \right\} - r\epsilon.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} r\epsilon & = \frac{\delta}{2\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2} 18\delta (\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 + \delta) \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) \\ & = 9\delta^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\delta}{\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2} \right) \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) \\ & \leq 18\delta^2 \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Finally recall Lemma H.1: if  $f_h$  satisfies  $\|f_h - T(h_* - h)\|_2 \leq \epsilon'$ , then

$$\frac{\Psi(f, g, h) - \Psi(f, g, h_*)}{\|f_h\|_2} \geq \|T(h_* - h)\|_2 - 2\epsilon'.$$

Since  $\|f_{\hat{h}} - T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \leq \eta_n$ ,

$$\frac{\Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*)}{\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2} \geq \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - 2\eta_n.$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
r \left\{ \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \right\} &\geq r \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \{ \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - 2\eta_n \} \\
&= \frac{\delta}{2 \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2} \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \{ \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - 2\eta_n \} \\
&= \frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - \delta\eta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \} \\
&\geq r \{ \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \} - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U \\
&\geq r \{ \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi(f_{\hat{h}}, \hat{g}, h_*) \} - r\epsilon - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U \\
&\geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - \delta\eta_n - 18\delta^2 \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## K Rate conditions

### K.1 Combining upper and lower bounds

**Lemma K.1** (Combining upper and lower bounds). *w.p. 1 - 4ζ,*

$$\|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{\delta} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\}$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps.

#### 1. Transitivity

By Lemma I.6, w.p. 1 - 3ζ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + 2\lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma J.3, w.p. 1 - ζ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, \hat{h}) - \Psi_n(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - 2\lambda \left( \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_{2,n}^2 \right) \right\} \\
&\geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - \delta\eta_n - 18\delta^2 \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore w.p. 1 - 4ζ, either  $\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \leq \delta$  or

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 - \delta\eta_n - 18\delta^2 \max \left( 1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} \right) - 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - 2\lambda U \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + 2\lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

which simplifies as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + 2\lambda U + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \quad + \delta\eta_n + 18\delta^2 \max\left(1, \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B}\right) + 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2\lambda U \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + 18\delta^2 \frac{\|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{B} + 4\lambda L^2 \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \quad + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda U) \\
& = 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \left(18\delta^2 \frac{1}{B} + 4\lambda L^2\right) \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \quad + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda U)
\end{aligned}$$

## 2. Finite sample terms

Next, I focus on

$$\left(18\delta^2 \frac{1}{B} + 4\lambda L^2\right) \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)$$

Since  $\lambda \geq \delta^2/U$  and  $\mu \geq 2\lambda(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(18\delta^2 \frac{1}{B} + 4\lambda L^2\right) \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \leq \lambda \left(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2\right) \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \leq 2\lambda \left(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2\right) (\|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \leq 2\lambda \left(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2\right) (\|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \leq 2\lambda \left(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2\right) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

## 3. Collecting results

Therefore either  $\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \leq \delta$  or

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta}{2} \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \left(18\delta^2 \frac{1}{B} + 4\lambda L^2\right) \|\hat{h} - h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \mu(\|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \|\hat{h}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \\
& \quad + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda U) \\
& \leq 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \left\{2\lambda \left(18\frac{U}{B} + 4L^2\right) + \mu\right\} \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\
& \quad + O(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda U)
\end{aligned}$$

Treating  $(L, U, B)$  as constants,

$$\|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{\delta} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \frac{1}{\delta} O\{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\}$$

In the case that  $\|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \leq \delta$ ,

$$\|T(\hat{h} - h_*)\|_2 \leq \|T(\hat{h} - h_*) - f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 + \|f_{\hat{h}}\|_2 \leq \eta_n + \delta$$

so the previous bound holds in both scenarios.

□

## K.2 Population loss UB

**Lemma K.2** (Population loss).

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2).$$

*Proof.* I proceed in steps.

### 1. Definition

Recall that

$$\Psi^\lambda(f, g, h) = \Psi(f, g, h) - \lambda \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) &= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \lambda \left( \frac{2}{3} \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \lambda \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

### 2. First term

Focusing on the first term, defining  $f_0 = T(h_0 - h_*)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(f, \hat{g}, h_*) &= \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{g}(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{g}(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] + \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\{\hat{g}(M) - g_0(M)\}f(Z)] + \mathbb{E}[f_0(Z)f(Z)] \\ &\leq \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 \|f\|_2 + \|f_0\|_2 \|f\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)\}f(Z)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{g_0(M) - h_*(X)|Z\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{h_0(X) - h_*(X)|Z\}f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[T(h_0 - h_*)(Z)f(Z)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f_0(Z)f(Z)]. \end{aligned}$$

### 3. Supremum

Recall that for  $a, b > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (a\|f\| - b\|f\|^2) \leq \frac{a^2}{4b}$$

In our problem,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \Psi(f, \hat{g}, h_*) - \lambda \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ (\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \|f_0\|_2) \|f\|_2 - \lambda \frac{U}{\delta^2} \|f\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &\leq (\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2 + \|f_0\|_2)^2 \cdot \left( \frac{\lambda U}{\delta^2} \right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\ &\leq 2(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \|f_0\|_2^2) \cdot 1 \cdot \frac{1}{4} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \|f_0\|_2^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

since  $\lambda \geq \delta^2/U$ .

□

### K.3 Main result

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* By Lemma K.1, w.p.  $1 - 4\zeta$ ,

$$\|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \leq \frac{4}{\delta} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\}.$$

By Lemma K.2,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \Psi^{\lambda/2}(f, \hat{g}, h_*) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\delta} (\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2) + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\} \\ & = \frac{2}{\delta} \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T(h_0 - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2 + \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2 + \frac{2}{\delta} \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the bound for both quantities is

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2, \|T(h_0 - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq O \left\{ \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2 + \frac{\|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2}{\delta} + \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2}{\delta} + \delta + \eta_n + \frac{\lambda}{\delta} \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) + \frac{\mu}{\delta} \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Further suppose  $\lambda, \mu = O(\delta^2)$  and  $\|T(h_* - h_0)\|_2 \leq \delta$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \lambda + (\lambda + \mu) \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \delta^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta^2 + \delta\eta_n + \delta^2 + \delta^2 \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right\} \\ & = \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta\eta_n + \delta^2 \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \|T(h_0 - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq \|T(h_0 - h_*)\|_2 + \|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2 \\ & \leq \delta + \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta\eta_n + \delta^2 \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \right\} \\ & = \frac{1}{\delta} O \left\{ \|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2 + \delta\eta_n + \delta^2 \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the bound for both quantities is

$$\|T(h_* - \hat{h})\|_2, \|T(h_0 - \hat{h})\|_2 \leq O \left\{ \frac{\|\hat{g} - g_0\|_2^2}{\delta} + \eta_n + \delta \max(1, \|h_*\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) \right\}$$

□