

A GMM Approach for Non-monotone Missingness on Both Treatment and Outcome Variables

Shenshen Yang*

This Draft: January 5, 2022

Abstract

I examine the common problem of multiple missingness on both the endogenous treatment and outcome variables. Two types of dependence assumptions for missing mechanisms are proposed for identification, based on which a two-step AIPW GMM estimator is proposed. This estimator is unbiased and more efficient than the previously used estimation methods. Statistical properties are discussed case by case. This method is applied to the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment and shows the significant effects of enrolling in the Oregon Health Plan on improving health-related outcomes and reducing out-of-pocket costs for medical care. There is evidence that simply dropping the incomplete data creates downward biases for some of the chosen outcome variables. Moreover, the estimator proposed in this paper reduced standard errors by 6-24% of the estimated effects of the Oregon Health Plan.

JEL Numbers: C13, C14, C26, C83

Keywords: Multiple missingness, missing outcome, missing covariates, GMM, endogeneity.

1 Introduction

Missingness in multiple variables is common in practice. This phenomenon is caused by various reasons, including sub-sampling and a combination of different data sets; a typical

*Ma Yinchu School of Economics, Tianjin University. Email: shenshenyang@tju.edu.cn. I am very grateful to Jason Abrevaya and Sukjin Han for their guidance and support, and I would like thank Brendan Kline, Haiqing Xu, Stephen Donald, Vasiliki Skreta, Daniel Akerberg, Dean Spears, Stephen Trejo, Isaiah Andrews, James Brand, Shaofei Jiang, Xue Li, Jiangang Zeng, and the participants at the UT Austin writing seminar, 2021 Asian Meeting of the Econometrics Society, 2021 European Winter Meeting of the Econometric Society for their helpful comments and suggestions.

example is missingness in both the endogenous treatment status and the outcome. This problem usually appears in empirical works but has not drawn enough attention. Researchers often observe missingness on both the endogenous treatment and outcome variables in a data set collected by surveys in both observational studies and field experiments. One approach that is regularly used by practitioners is to drop all observations in incomplete data; this is referred to as the complete case (CC) analysis. It is well known that the CC approach creates an inefficient estimator, and when the missing mechanism depends on endogenous variables, it is also biased (Little and Rubin [2002]; Qi and Sun [2014]). This paper proposes consistent and more efficient estimators with multiple missingness, which allows for the missing mechanism to be endogenous.

When there are two missing variables, the missing patterns can be divided into monotone missingness and strict non-monotone missingness; both are examples of a general non-monotone missing pattern.¹ Monotone missingness has been thoroughly studied in the literature (Tsiatis [2007]; Barnwell and Chaudhuri [2018]; Chaudhuri [2020]). It refers to the situation where the missingness of one indicates the missingness of the other variable. In our framework, this means that missingness in treatment implies missingness in the outcome. The monotone missing pattern can be caused by data attrition when once the survey participants drop out, they never return. However, in survey-collected data, missing variables can be caused by a broader range of reasons; as a result, strict non-monotone missingness often appears in a data set, which means that researchers can observe the outcome status for some observations, despite the missing treatment status. Survey data frequently suffers from strict non-monotone missingness; therefore, this paper focuses on strictly non-monotone missingness and discusses how to generate the proposed approach for more general missing patterns in the appendix.

There are two sources of endogeneity in the model. First, the full model with no missing values is endogenous because of the endogenous treatment variable. Second, the missingness can be endogenous and correlated with latent variables in the model. The endogeneity in the full model is often addressed using an exogenous instrumental variable, which is correlated with the endogenous regressor, but does not directly affect the outcome. This strategy has been widely used in the two-stage least squares (2SLS) estimation procedure, the generalized method of moments (GMM) model, and a more general nonparametric IV model (Theil [1971]; Angrist and Imbens [1995]; Baum et al. [2003]; Newey and Powell [2003]; Newey [2013]). The other source of endogeneity is from selective missingness. Prior studies in univariate missingness literature have shown that if the Missing at Random (MAR) assumption is satisfied—meaning that the missing mechanism is independent with missing values con-

¹The general non-monotone missing pattern also includes univariate missingness.

ditional on fully observed variables—the endogeneity of missingness can be solved (Cheng [1994]; Seaman et al. [2013]). However, the non-monotone missing pattern complicates this assumption, because simultaneous dependence between multiple missingness creates challenges in identifying the joint missing mechanism.

However, if some MAR-type of assumptions are satisfied, the missing mechanisms can still be identified. One simple way to modify the original MAR assumption is to assume that both missing mechanisms of the treatment and outcome variables are independent with partially missing variables conditional on some fully observed variables under every missing type. To keep it consistent, we still refer to it as MAR assumption. This assumption brings many desired properties, but can be violated in some cases with multiple stages of missing variables because it excludes any possible channels through which variables realized at previous stage can affect the missing mechanism at next stage. When data are collected sequentially (i.e., the treatment variable is collected before the outcome variable), the simultaneous dependence relationship can also be avoided. This happens when the realization of outcome status takes time and is collected via a later follow-up survey. Motivated by the sequential data collection process, we propose the alternative identifying assumption allows for the later-stage missingness (i.e., missingness on the outcome) to rely on partially observed variables in the previous stage (i.e., the partially observed treatment variable), which we describe as the sequentially updating feature of the missing mechanism; due to this feature, we name the assumption the Sequential MAR (SMAR) assumption.

Under either identifying assumption, the missing mechanism (i.e., the propensity of each missing pattern) is identified and utilized in an augmented inverse propensity weighted (AIPW) GMM estimator for the primary model coefficients. The moment function is composed of an inverse propensity weighted (IPW) moment function and an augmentation term chosen to make full use of the observed data and achieve higher efficiency; this function is equivalent to a two-step backward AIPW imputation approach, in which the missing outcome is initially imputed, followed by the imputation of the missing treatment.

The estimation strategy depends on a first-stage estimation of nuisance parameters, which are the propensities of missing patterns and models for incomplete data; we use sieve estimation for the first stage nuisance parameters. Even though AIPW has been shown to maintain double robustness and semiparametric efficiency in many cases (e.g., Robins et al. [1994]; Scharfstein et al. [1999]; Glynn and Quinn [2010]; Chen et al. [2008]; Cattaneo [2010]), the desired properties usually fail under non-monotone missingness (e.g., Tsiatis [2007]; Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016]; Seaman and Vansteelandt [2018]; Sun and Tchetgen Tchetgen [2018]). We show that under the MAR assumption, the double robustness and semiparametric efficiency properties are maintained, and this result is consistent with the findings of Chaudhuri

and Guilkey [2016]. The estimator is robust under the SMAR assumption, as long as the missing mechanism is correctly specified; as a result, the asymptotic variance is affected by the first stage missing mechanism estimation. We provide asymptotic variance for the estimator under the SMAR assumption and show that the estimator become more efficient than previously used estimators by incorporating the incomplete data.

The AIPW-GMM approach is used in the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment to estimate the effect of enrolling in the Oregon Health Plan (OHP) on health-related outcomes. The endogenous treatment variable and outcomes are collected via different-stage follow-up surveys. There are two reasons behind the missingness: non-response to surveys and non-response to treatment-and-outcome-related questions among survey responders. There exist participants who did not respond to the first follow-up survey but responded to the final survey, and some participants did not answer questions on treatment status; therefore, we observe non-monotone missing patterns. The data shows evidence that missing mechanisms of outcome variables are correlated with the endogenous treatment variable. As a result, the CC analysis yield biased estimation results. The regression results show significant effects of the OHP on reducing out-of-pocket costs for medical care, reducing the number of days when physical health is not good, and improving self-evaluated health conditions; these results suggest that CC estimators tend to overestimate the effect, with downward biases for out-of-pocket costs and self-evaluated health conditions outcomes, while the IPW estimator results are closer to those of the AIPW estimators. Furthermore, of the three different estimation strategies, the AIPW-GMM estimators achieve the smallest standard errors for all estimated coefficients. For the estimated effects of OHP, the AIPW approach reduces the standard errors by up to 24%. These results are consistent with the findings in the Monte Carlo simulation.

This paper contributes to the literature in the following aspects. First, it considers the problem of missing endogenous treatment variables and outcome variables, which lacks adequate attention. Related literature includes the partial identification approach developed by Horowitz and Manski [2000], when there exist multiple missing covariates and outcomes in randomized experiments. By making assumptions that can be plausible in many cases of program evaluation, this paper proposes a way to point identify the missing mechanism and to use it in the construction of a consistent and more efficient estimator. Second, this study contributes to the literature on non-monotone missingness (Robins and Gill [1997]; Gad [2011]; Sun and Tchetgen Tchetgen [2018]; Tchetgen et al. [2018]; Sun et al. [2018]; Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016]) by adapting the sequentially updating feature of the missing mechanism² and allowing the missing mechanism to depend on a partially observed variable

²Similar sequential feature has only been applied when the missing pattern is monotone (Chaudhuri

in a non-monotone missing pattern. Finally, this paper derives variance under the dynamic updating feature and provides sufficient conditions under which the closed-form efficient influence function is available under non-monotone missingness. The difficulties in achieving desired statistical properties hinder the usage of assumptions other than the MAR assumption, therefore, deriving closed-form variance can be useful in many scenarios, especially when data are collected via multiple surveys.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model; Section 3 missing mechanism and the assumptions and gives the identification result; Section 4 proposes the AIPW moment condition and GMM estimator based on the assumptions introduced in the previous sections; Section 5 discusses the asymptotic properties of the AIPW estimator; Section 6 illustrates the performance of the AIPW-GMM estimator through the Monte Carlo simulation results; Section 7 offers an empirical example using the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment Data; and Section 8 will provide our conclusions. Generalization of current method and proofs are listed in the appendix.

2 Model and Assumptions

We consider the following model:

$$Y_i = g(D_i, X_i; \beta) + \epsilon_i \tag{2.1}$$

where Y_i denotes the outcome of individual i and is missing for some observations; and D_i is a partially observed endogenous treatment variable. For purposes of this study, we only consider one partially missing endogenous treatment variable. X_i is a vector of K fully observed regressors, and we do not exclude the possibility that X_i contains endogenous variables.

We are interested in consistently estimating the parameter vector β , and we assume that there exists a vector of valid instrument variables Z_i for $[D_i, X_i]$ with $d_Z \geq d_D + d_X$, such that

$$E[Z_i \epsilon_i] = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

$$\text{cov}(Z_i, [D_i, X_i]) \neq 0 \tag{2.3}$$

Equations 2.2 and 2.3 are the exogeneity and relevance conditions, under which Z_i is a [\[2020\]](#).

valid instrument variable. We assume that Z_i plays a role in determining $[D_i, X_i]$. We do not place structural restrictions on the first-stage model; therefore, the regressors can be either discrete or continuous.³ In the full model, the moment condition follows directly from the exogeneity of Z_i :

$$E[Z_i(Y_i - g(D_i, X_i; \beta))] = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

Under the standard regularity conditions⁴ for g , the parameter value of interest β^0 is identified by the moment conditions:

$$\beta = \beta^0 \text{ if and only if } E[Z_i(Y_i - g(D_i, X_i; \beta))] = 0 \text{ for } \beta \in \mathcal{B}$$

We consider an environment where the instrument variables Z_i and fully observed covariates X_i are fully observed, but the endogenous treatment D_i and the outcome variable Y_i are partially missing. We use R_i^D and R_i^Y to indicate observing D_i and Y_i , such that

$$R_i^D = \begin{cases} 1 & D_i \text{ is observed} \\ 0 & D_i \text{ is unobserved} \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

$$R_i^Y = \begin{cases} 1 & Y_i \text{ is observed} \\ 0 & Y_i \text{ is unobserved} \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

In the following section, we will discuss the missing patterns and dependence between R^D , R^Y , and the other variables.

3 Patterns of Missingness

We first capture the missing mechanism and give two sets of assumptions to identify the propensity of missingness. The commonly used assumptions for univariate missing values are the Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) and the Missing at Random (MAR) assump-

³If more structures are added to the first stage, we could obtain additional moment conditions; as an example, a linear specification on D_i such that:

$$D_i = Z_i' \gamma + u_i$$

provides an extra moment condition besides Equation 2.4:

$$E[Z_i u_i] = 0$$

This extra information potentially helps to improve the precision and efficiency of the estimator (Rai 2020).

⁴The regularity conditions can be found in [Newey and McFadden \[1994\]](#).

tions. The MCAR assumes that missingness is independent from any variable in the data set, and MAR assumes that missingness is independent from the missing values conditioning on a set of observables.⁵ Missing mechanisms that fail the MCAR and MAR assumptions are called Missing Not at Random (MNAR); these allow the missingness to be correlated with the unobserved missing values, and therefore creates difficulties in identifying the missing mechanism. Extra parametric assumptions are usually imposed when the missing pattern is MNAR (Scharfstein et al. [1999]; Andrea et al. [2001]).

The existence of multiple partially missing variables complicates the missing mechanism. Based on the features of the missing patterns, prior studies have described multiple missing patterns as monotone missingness versus non-monotone missingness. Monotone missingness is defined as the situation where missingness happens gradually, and missingness in one variable indicates missingness in other variables. In our framework, it is implied that Y_i is missing when D_i is missing or vice versa. We focus on the former possibility, since it is a more reasonable scheme compared to the latter. The missing mechanism is formally defined as monotone if $(1 - R_i^D)R_i^Y = 0$ almost surely.

For monotone missingness, each stage can be seen as a subsample of the last step, and the missingness depends on the fully observed variables from the previous stage. One reason behind this pattern is data attrition; when the program participants choose to drop out of the survey, they do not return to the following surveys of their outcomes. Another example is data composed of multi-phase sampling, from which the researchers choose a subsample of the previous phase to collect information on, due to budget constraints and survey design.

Non-monotone missingness is a more general pattern that allows for the possibility of observing Y_i while D_i is missing; it is also referred to as general missingness (Van Buuren [2018]), and includes well-discussed univariate missingness,⁶ monotone missingness, and strict non-monotone missingness. Non-monotone missingness arises in various scenarios other than data attrition, including general survey non-responses, panel studies in which participants drop out but return in later surveys, and general sub-sampling in each stage. In Figure 1, we illustrate the missing patterns included in non-monotone missingness; among the patterns, strict non-monotone missingness is the most frequently seen and interesting case, so we will focus on this case.

With a non-monotone missing pattern, the previous MAR assumption is difficult to justify (Robins [1997]; Robins and Gill [1997]; Little and Rubin [2002]; Sun and Tchetgen Tchetgen

⁵These two assumptions can be seen as strong ignorability and conditional ignorability assumptions.

⁶Discussions on univariate missingness on the regressor can be found in Little [1992], Abrevaya and Donald [2017], Breunig and Haan [2018]; Wang et al. [2010], Groenwold et al. [2012], Abrevaya [2019] studied on methods dealing with missing outcome variables.




Figure 1: Examples of monotone missing patterns

[2018])⁷, and it creates challenges in identification. The challenge was first introduced by Robins and Gill [1997] when they considered a case where two partially missing variables exist and showed that MAR assumption implicitly implies the MCAR assumption in a logistic model; when there are other fully observed variables, the traditional MAR becomes a stronger assumption of conditional ignorability for the same observables. In our framework, because we have two potentially missing variables in the environment, we can observe four missing patterns in the data. We use M to denote the four patterns and introduce difficulties in point identifying the distribution of the missing patterns. We suppress the index i for the following arguments:

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= M_1 : \text{Observe both D and Y} \\
M &= M_2 : \text{Observe D but not Y} \\
M &= M_3 : \text{Observe Y but not D} \\
M &= M_4 : \text{Observe neither D nor Y}
\end{aligned}$$

The MAR assumption assumes mean independence between missingness and missing values conditioning on the observables under each missing pattern and can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[M = M_1|Z, X, D, Y] &= \Pr[M = M_1|Z, X, D, Y] \\
\Pr[M = M_2|Z, X, D, Y] &= \Pr[M = M_2|Z, X, D] \\
\Pr[M = M_3|Z, X, D, Y] &= \Pr[M = M_3|Z, X, Y] \\
\Pr[M = M_4|Z, X, D, Y] &= \Pr[M = M_4|Z, X]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

The first equation is intentionally redundant to show that no information is lost under the pattern M_1 . Equation 3.1 implies Equation 3.2⁸:

⁷The statistical literature has shown that for commonly used estimation process, it is difficult to include all features allowed by the previous MAR assumption. In this paper, we focus more on the challenge in identification, and show some features allowed by the previous MAR assumption must be excluded to identify the missing mechanism.

⁸Derivation is omitted, and the intuition behind is that each missing pattern depends on the observed variables under that pattern. Therefore, when $R^Y = 1$, $\Pr[R^D = 1|Z, X, D, Y, R^Y = 1]$, as a part of the missing mechanism, depends on Y ; and when $R^Y = 0$, $\Pr[R^D = 1|Z, X, D, Y, R^Y = 1]$ does not depend on Y anymore. Therefore, $E[R^D|Z, X, D, Y, R^Y] = E[R^D|Z, X, R^Y Y, R^Y]$; same argument can be applied on $E[R^Y|Z, X, D, Y, R^D]$.

$$\begin{aligned}
E[R^D|Z, X, D, Y, R^Y] &= E[R^D|Z, X, R^Y Y, R^Y] \\
E[R^Y|Z, X, D, Y, R^D] &= E[R^Y|Z, X, R^D D, R^D]
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.2}$$

One way to model Equation 3.1 is using the threshold crossing model. To illustrate how the simultaneous relationship affects identification, we can rewrite the assumption in Equation 3.2 into the following simultaneous binary model⁹:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^D &= 1 \left[f(Z, X, R^Y Y, R^Y) \geq \mu \right] \\
R^Y &= 1 \left[g(Z, X, R^D D, R^D) \geq \nu \right]
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.3}$$

for some unknown functions f and g , with μ and ν as uniformly distributed latent variables. The simultaneous feature in the binary model creates a problem in the identification of $\Pr [R^D = 1, R^Y = 1|Z, X, D, Y]$. A similar problem has been widely discussed in the entry game model, and there is a well-known challenge to identify joint distribution of the simultaneous bivariate model. Prior studies provided partial identification strategies for the simultaneous binary model (e.g., [Tamer \[2003\]](#); [Ciliberto and Tamer \[2009\]](#); [Balat and Han \[2018\]](#)) and point identification under additional restrictions. Even though identifying the missing mechanism is an important step to identifying the main model, that is not our primary interest. As an intermediate step, we want to avoid either partial identification or too-complex structural assumptions. Therefore, we provide two sets of ignorability-type assumptions that could be satisfied under many settings and rule out the simultaneity, and we provide justifications for these assumptions. These assumptions are used to point identify the missing mechanism.

3.1 Missing at Random Assumption

The first assumption is a stronger version of the MAR used in the univariate missingness literature by assuming the ignorability of multiple missingness conditioning on a common set of fully observed variables.¹⁰

⁹The equivalence between Equations 3.2 and 3.3 follows from the property of binary variables.

¹⁰Prior studies have implicitly shown that the MAR assumption in a univariate missingness setting is justified under the strong version of MAR; this can be displayed using the example from [Sun and Tchetgen Tchetgen \[2018\]](#), except for minor differences.

Assumption MAR.

$$R^D \perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y) | Z, X \quad (1)$$

$$R^Y \perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y) | Z, X, R^D \quad (2)$$

We refer to this assumption as the MAR assumption for convenience, following the name used in prior studies. [Chaudhuri and Guilkey \[2016\]](#) applied similar assumptions, and one important example is non-monotonically missing instrumental variables, assuming the missingness was independent with unobserved values conditioning on fully observed variables.

If there are no endogenous variables in X , the MAR assumption can be interpreted as exogenous missingness, assuming that the joint missingness is independent with unobserved values conditioning on fully observed exogenous covariates. Missingness is determined by instrument variables (e.g., random assignment) and personal characteristics (e.g., age, education, distance to research center).

Example 1. *In some field experiments, experimenters collect data via face-to-face visits. Missingness is believed to be caused by missed experimenter visits, either accidentally or by design, instead of self-selection of the participants. Therefore, missingness on D and Y depends on survey participant characteristics (e.g., location, gender, age, etc.) and instrument variables (e.g., random assignment into treatment group), instead of the treatment and outcome status.*

3.2 Sequential Missing at Random Assumption

The MAR assumption introduced above is easy to use and interpret, and under it, the estimator satisfies many desired statistical properties. Therefore, this type of assumptions are welcomed in statistical literature. However, it is sometimes violated in applied research. One test is to check the correlation between the correlation between Y and R^D when Y is observed. When the data are collected from different stages of surveys, it is highly possible that the treatment variable D realized at the previous stage plays some roles in affecting the missing mechanism at later stage R^Y . The MAR assumption introduced above does not allow this kind of dependence relation, and it is unclear how does the missing mechanism of outcome variable depends on R^D . We therefore propose a different assumption that allows for dependence between partially observed D and the missingness mechanism on Y , which occurs after the realization of R^D .

When missingness happens sequentially, the missing process has the analogous “dynamic updating” feature introduced in [Chaudhuri \[2020\]](#), and this feature is applied to the monotone

missing pattern. Despite the non-monotone pattern, this dynamic feature is still allowed in our framework. We can therefore make a Sequential MAR (SMAR) assumption that missingness on D is independent with unobserved values conditional on the fully observed variables, and missingness on Y is independent with the unobserved values conditional on fully observed variables and the partially observed D .

The SMAR assumption is formalized below:

Assumption SMAR. ¹¹

$$R^D \perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y) | Z, X \quad (1)$$

$$R^Y \perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y) | Z, X, R^D D, R^D \quad (2)$$

and (2) is equivalent to

$$R^Y \perp\!\!\!\perp ((1 - R^D)D, Y) | Z, X, R^D D, R^D \quad (2')$$

The SMAR assumption allows R^Y to be correlated with D ; on the other hand, R^Y can be correlated with Y through the correlation with D . Therefore, it assumes that R^Y is independent with Y conditioning on the fully observed variables assumed in the MAR assumption, as well as $R^D D$. Under the SMAR assumption, we need to take $R^D D$ into consideration when capturing the mechanism behind R^Y , unlike the MAR assumption; and the other crucial feature assumed in SMAR is that D does not affect R^Y if D is not observed. In the following, we will provide an example of when these features hold.

Example 2. *In survey-collected data sets, missingness can be due to both attrition and self-selection. For the self-selected missingness, we make an extra assumption that survey participants are honest reporters to exclude distortion from misreporting. Besides the participants whose missing mechanisms are determined by the fully observed variables, we assume there exists the other group of participants who choose to report if they have the information. Therefore, missing indicators R^D and R^Y can be interpreted as indicators of awareness, or an effort to acquire the status of D and Y .*

Knowledge of treatment status D_i can be caused by participants' characteristics, as well as the instrument variables. Age, living area, and education level can all affect participants' motivation to acquire their treatment status. The instrument variables can also affect R^D . One

¹¹Both the assumption MAR and the assumption SMAR can be relaxed to conditional mean independence condition.




Figure 2: Sequential Missing Mechanism

classic instrument variable used in the field-experiment literature is the random assignment of treatment, with non-perfect compliance as the instrumented endogenous variable. Researchers are likely to visit participants in the treatment group more than the control group, which might cause lack of awareness of treatment status for the control group. Moving to the next stage, if participants have no knowledge of their treatment status (i.e., $R^D = 0$), D does not enter their information set and thus does not affect their motivation to attain knowledge about their outcome status (i.e., D does not affect R^Y). This explains the assumed non-correlation between R^Y and D when $R^D = 0$.

On the other hand, for participants who already have information about D , this enters their information set and plays a role in determining whether or not they learn their outcome status. This is consistent with the feature that R^Y depends on D when $R^D = 1$, which is allowed in the SMAR assumption but not allowed in MAR assumption; as a result, the missing mechanism diverges for those with and without information about D . One example of this is that people with health insurance tend to care more about their health status because it affects their premium in the next billing cycle.

Figure 2 illustrates the sequential missing procedure. We use I_1 to denote the initial information set, which includes the fully observed variables. Variables in I_1 play roles in determining R^D ; when $R^D = 1$, D is contained in the information set I_2 , and when $R^D = 0$, D is not included in I_2 . I_2 contains the variables determining R^Y . The missing mechanisms of Y diverge at I_2 , and D only affects R^Y when $R^D = 1$. Therefore, the missing mechanism at each stage diverge across different observed variables in the previous stage.

Remark 3.1. The SMAR and MAR assumption are two parallel assumptions, assuming

different conditioning variables for conditional independence, and we can not tell which is weaker directly. Depending on characteristics of the data sets, we can choose the most suitable assumption and achieve identification.

Assumptions MAR and SMAR differ when it comes to the hypothetical missing mechanism on R^Y . We define p_d and p_y as:

$$p_d \equiv \Pr[R^D|Z, X, D, Y] = \Pr[R^D|Z, X] \quad (3.4)$$

$$p_y \equiv \Pr[R^Y|Z, X, D, Y, R^D] = \Pr[R^Y|\mathcal{C}, R^D] \quad (3.5)$$

The second equality in Equation 3.4 holds under either assumption MAR or assumption SMAR. \mathcal{C} represents the conditioning variables for ignorability of R^Y ; under the assumption MAR, $\mathcal{C} = (Z, X)$; and under the assumption SMAR, $\mathcal{C} = (R^D, Z, X)$. The distribution of missing patterns derives from the multiplication of p_d and p_y . For each missing pattern M_m , $m = 1, 2, 3, 4$, the probability of observing it is equal to

$$\Pr[M_m|Z, X, D, Y] = \Pr[R^Y = M_m^Y|\mathcal{C}, R^D] \times \Pr[R^D = M_m^D|Z, X] \quad (3.6)$$

for M_m^D, M_m^Y being the corresponding value of R^D and R^Y under missing pattern M_m .

Proposition 3.1. *If either the Assumption MAR or the Assumption SMAR hold, the probability of missing patterns in 3.6 is identified.*

The identification result follows directly from selection on observables.

4 AIPW-GMM Estimator

The IPW estimator has been widely applied in the missing data literature (Rosenbaum and Rubin [1983]; Wooldridge [2007]; Seaman and White [2013]). It reweights the sample and inflates the underrepresented subsample due to missingness to provide a consistent estimator. Compared to the imputation method (e.g., expectation-maximization, multiple imputations), the IPW estimator avoids making parametric assumptions on the model for an incomplete subsample and is easier to compute. The efficiency of the IPW estimator can be improved by adding an augmentation term, and this approach is referred to as the Augmented IPW (AIPW) approach. The AIPW estimator takes full advantage of the data set by incorporating dropped information in the IPW estimation into the augmentation term and achieves semi-parametric efficiency bounds under certain conditions (Robins et al. [1994]; Robins [1997]; Carpenter et al. [2006]; Tsiatis [2007]; Chen et al. [2008]; Glynn and Quim [2010]).

4.1 AIPW Moment Condition

First, we make an overlap assumption:

Assumption Overlap. (a) $p_d \in [\kappa_d, 1)$ almost surely in (Z, X)

(b) $p_y \in [\kappa_y, 1)$ almost surely in (\mathcal{C}, R^D) for $\kappa_d > 0, \kappa_y > 0$.

This assumption requires the possibility that each of the four missing patterns is positive (i.e., the strict non-monotone missing pattern).¹²

We further introduce the notation of probability from observing both the treatment and outcome, which is defined as:

$$p_{11}(X, Z, D) = \Pr[R^Y = 1 | \mathcal{C}, R^D = 1] \times \Pr[R^D = 1 | Z, X]$$

We construct a moment function $m_{aipw}(\beta)$:

$$m_{aipw}(\beta) = \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) + \phi(Z, X, R^D, R^Y, R^D D, R^Y Y, \beta) \quad (4.1)$$

The moment function above is composed of an IPW moment function and an augmenting term ϕ , which is determined by fully observed variables and coefficient parameter β . We set the augmentation term to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) - (E[Y | Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X])] \\ &+ \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y | Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X])] \\ &+ \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z (E[Y | Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

$$= \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [Y - E[Y | Z, X]] \quad (4.3)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y | Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X])] \quad (4.4)$$

$$+ \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z (E[Y | Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) \quad (4.5)$$

The augmentation term is composed of observed variables, as well as two sets of nuisance parameters, the missing mechanism (p_d, p_y, p_{11}) , and the imputed value for the unob-

¹²A weaker version of the overlap assumption is introduced in Section A, when a more general missing pattern is allowed.

served model: $(E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X], E[Y|Z, X])$ ¹³. Identification of the missing mechanisms was shown in the previous section. The assumptions of MAR or SMAR identifies the second set of nuisance parameters; under either assumption, these can be identified by¹⁴:

$$\begin{aligned} E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X] &= E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X, R^D = 1] \\ E[Y|D, Z, X] &= E[Y|D, Z, X, R^D = 1, R^Y = 1] \\ E[Y|Z, X] &= E[Y|Z, X, R^D = 0, R^Y = 1] \end{aligned}$$

The moment function above can be interpreted as a two-step AIPW imputation. With full data, the moment function is:

$$m_{full}(\beta) = Z\epsilon = Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta))$$

The goal is to construct an unbiased estimator of ϵ under missingness on D and Y . Without partially missing D , the AIPW estimator for ϵ is written as:

$$\epsilon_{aipw} = \frac{R^Y}{p_y} (Y - g(D, X; \beta)) + \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta))$$

When D is partially missing, $g(D, X; \theta)$ and $E[Y|D, Z, X]$ are not fully observed as functions of D . We again use the AIPW strategy on the functions of D and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{aipw} &= \frac{R^Y}{p_y} \left[Y - \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} g(D, X; \beta) + \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X] \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) \left[\frac{R^D}{p_d} (E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) + \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) E\{E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X\} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Proposition 4.1. *If $\hat{\epsilon}$ is defined as in 4.6, $m_{aipw}(\beta) = Z\epsilon_{aipw}$.*

The moment function is used to construct a moment condition, following the theorem below:

¹³The last two terms in the augmentation term can be re-arranged into the augmentation term used with monotone missingness, introduced in Chaudhuri [2020]; and the first term is added to take into consideration observations with $R^D = 0$, while $R^Y = 1$.

¹⁴Under Assumption MAR, $E[Y|Z, X]$ can also be identified by $E[Y|Z, X, R^D = 1, R^Y = 1]$ and $E[Y|Z, X, R^Y = 1]$.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose Assumption MAR or SMAR, and Assumption Overlap hold, $E[m_{aipw}(\beta)] = 0$ when $\beta = \beta^0$.*

The equality in this theorem will be used as the AIPW moment condition.

4.2 Estimation Strategy

The estimation procedure is composed of two steps. In the first step, we construct appropriate estimators for (p_d, p_y, p_{11}) and $(E[Y|D, Z, X], E[Y|Z, X], E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])$, and denote the estimators as $(\hat{p}_d, \hat{p}_y, \hat{p}_{11})$ and $(\hat{E}[Y|D, Z, X], \hat{E}[Y|Z, X], \hat{E}[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])$. Estimation strategies on the nuisance parameters depend on the researcher's prior belief about model structures. If the correct specification of the nuisance parameter is not clear, nonparametric estimation could be applied to avoid models that are too restrictive. We will apply the series estimation strategy on the models, and we will show the corresponding asymptotic properties thereof in the following section.

After constructing the nuisance parameters, we plug them back into the GMM estimation equation and solve:

$$\hat{\beta}_{AIPW-GMM} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta} \hat{m}_{aipw,i}(\beta)' \hat{W} \hat{m}_{aipw,i}$$

where

$$\hat{m}_{aipw} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{R_i^D R_i^Y}{\hat{p}_{11,i}} Z_i (Y_i - g(D_i, X_i; \beta)) + \hat{\phi}_i$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}_i &= \left(\frac{R_i^Y}{\hat{p}_{y,i}} - \frac{R_i^D R_i^Y}{\hat{p}_{11,i}} \right) Z_i \left[(Y_i - \hat{E}[g(D_i, X_i; \beta)|Z_i, X_i]) - (\hat{E}[Y_i|Z_i, X_i] - \hat{E}[g(D_i, X_i; \beta)|Z_i, X_i]) \right] \\ &+ \left(\frac{R_i^D}{\hat{p}_{d,i}} - \frac{R_i^D R_i^Y}{\hat{p}_{11,i}} \right) Z_i \left[(\hat{E}[Y_i|D_i, Z_i, X_i] - g(D_i, X_i; \beta)) - (\hat{E}[Y_i|Z_i, X_i] - \hat{E}[g(D_i, X_i; \beta)|Z_i, X_i]) \right] \\ &+ \left(1 - \frac{R_i^D R_i^Y}{\hat{p}_{11,i}} \right) Z_i (\hat{E}[Y_i|Z_i, X_i] - \hat{E}[g(D_i, X_i; \beta)|Z_i, X_i]) \end{aligned}$$

is the estimator of the augmentation term ϕ and \hat{W} is the estimator of chosen weight matrix W .

5 Asymptotic Properties

Though the AIPW estimator is known to have the efficient property in many cases, the efficiency usually fails with non-monotone missingness. One critical condition to produce closed-form semiparametric efficient bound is the independence of different missing indicators condition on the same set of variables (Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016]); this condition implies that the asymptotic variances should be different under Assumption MAR and Assumption SMAR. Under the MAR assumption, desired statistical properties hold such that the AIPW-GMM estimator maintains the double robustness property and achieves the efficient semiparametric bound. Under the SMAR assumption, double robustness fail, and we are not able to prove efficiency; but it shows efficiency improvement from incorporating observations with missing values.

5.1 Asmptotic Properties

We make the standard assumptions for asymptotic normality in the GMM model:

Assumption M. (1) $(Z_i, X_i, D_i, Y_i, R_i^D D_i, R_i^Y Y_i, R_i^D, R_i^Y)$ are *i.i.d.*;

(2) $E[m_{aipw}(\beta)]$ is differentiable with respect to $\beta \in \text{int}(\mathcal{B})$;

(3) Define $G(\beta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} E[m_{aipw}]$, $G(\beta)$ has full rank at $\beta = \beta^0$;

(4) V_{MAR} and V_{SMAR} are bounded and positive semidefinite;

We then derive the variance of the moment functions under different assumptions, and use these derivations to construct the asymptotic distribution of the AIPW-GMM estimator. For a semi-parametric GMM estimation, the variance closely relates to robustness of the estimator, thereby indicating how the first-stage nuisance parameters estimators affect the variance of the primary model.

Under the Assumption MAR, the ignorabilities of R^D and R^Y depend on the same set of conditioning variables. The assumption is powerful enough that the double robustness property of AIPW estimator is maintained.

Theorem 5.1. *If Assumption MAR and Overlap hold, $E[m_{aipw}(\beta)] = 0$ when either $(\hat{p}_d, \hat{p}_y, \hat{p}_{11})$, or $(\hat{E}[g(D, X; \beta)|X, Z], \hat{E}[g(D, X; \beta)|X, Z, Y], \hat{E}[Y|X, Z, D], \hat{E}[Y|X, Z])$ are correctly specified.*

As a direct result of double robustness, the first-stage estimators of the nuisance parameters do not affect the variance of the primary model.

Theorem 5.2. *Let V_{MAR} denote $\text{Var}(m_{aipw})$ under assumption MAR and Overlap, then*

$$V_{MAR} = E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} \text{Var} (m_{full}|Z, X) + E [m_{full}|Z, X] E [m_{full}|Z, X]' \right] - \Delta$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta = & \text{Var} \left(\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E [m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E [m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\ & + \text{Var} \left(\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E [m_{full}|Y, Z, X] - E [m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\ & + 2E \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_d} + \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) \text{Cov} (ZY, E [m_{full}|D, Z, X] | Z, X) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) \text{Cov} (Zg(D, X; \beta), ZY | Z, X) \right] \end{aligned}$$

The first term in V_{MAR} is similar to the Ω_β that was introduced in [Chen et al. \[2008\]](#), and Δ captures improvements in efficiency when we include the partially observed variables in the moment function.

Under the Assumption SMAR, the double robustness property no longer holds with non-monotone missingness. However, the estimator remains robust as long as the missing mechanism is correctly specified.

Theorem 5.3. *If Assumption SMAR and Overlap hold, $E [m_{aipw}(\beta)] = 0$ when $(\hat{p}_d, \hat{p}_y, \hat{p}_{11})$ is correctly specified.*

Proof of Theorem 5.3 follows directly from the proof of Theorem 4.1.

The double robustness fails under the SMAR assumption because parts of the missing mechanisms depend on partially missing variables. As a result, the consistency of some parameters in the first-step estimation of nuisance parameters affects the consistency and efficiency of the primary model and has a direct effect on the variance. Luckily, only the estimator \hat{p}_{11} affects the consistency through the first component in the augmenting term, and we can therefore construct a correction term following [Newey \[1994\]](#).

Theorem 5.4. *Let V_{SMAR} denote $\text{Var} (m_{aipw})$ under assumption SMAR and Overlap, then*

$$V_{SMAR} = E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} \text{Var} ((m_{full} - E [m_{full}|Z, X]) | D, Z, X) \right] + \text{Var} (E [m_{full}|D, Z, X]) - \Delta$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta &= Var \left(\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\
&+ Var \left((1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} - 1 \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \right) \\
&+ E \left[\left(\frac{1 - p_d^2}{p_{11}} - \frac{(1 - p_d)^2}{p_{01}} \right) Var(Y|D, Z, X) \right] \\
&+ 2E[(1 - p_d)Cov(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X]|Z, X)]
\end{aligned}$$

Let n denote the sample size. Under certain regularity conditions, \sqrt{n} convergence can be maintained with a non-parametric estimation in the first stage. We assume the well-established regularity conditions for Sieve basis functions that are presented in the literature (Newey [1994]; Chen et al. [2008]; Cattaneo [2010]; Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016]), and we construct \sqrt{n} normality.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\hat{E}(w)$ denote a vector of sieve estimation of first-stage nuisance estimators. For each component $e \in E$, suppose e is a function of d_e elements and is s_e times differentiable. Let $\eta = 1$ for power series basis; and $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ for spline basis. Let K denote the terms in the series estimator, n denote the sample size, and $K = n^\nu$ such that:*

$$4\eta + 2 < \frac{1}{\nu} < 4\frac{s_e}{d_e} - 6\eta$$

then,

(1) Under Assumption MAR, Overlap, and M,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \rightarrow_d N(0, (G'WG)^{-1}G'WV_{MAR}WG(G'WG)^{-1})$$

Furthermore, if $W = V_{MAR}^{-1}$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \rightarrow_d N(0, (G'V_{MAR}^{-1}G)^{-1})$$

(2) Under Assumption SMAR, Overlap, and M,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \rightarrow_d N(0, (G'WG)^{-1}G'WV_{SMAR}WG(G'WG)^{-1})$$

Furthermore, if $W = V_{SMAR}^{-1}$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \rightarrow_d N(0, (G'V_{SMAR}^{-1}G)^{-1})$$

The regularity conditions used here are no different from the conditions used in the work of Cattaneo [2010], Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016]. These conditions restrict the estimation of nuisance parameters to converge fast enough that they do not affect the convergence rate of the second-step estimation.

5.2 Efficiency

The well-known efficiency property of the AIPW estimator usually fails with the non-monotone missing pattern (Tsiatis [2007]; Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016]). We show two sufficient conditions in which the estimator maintains the efficiency property.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose Assumption SMAR and Overlap hold, and $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp D|Z, X$, the correction term for V_{SMAR} is equivalent to zero.*

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose Assumption Overlap, Assumption M, and one of the following assumptions hold:*

(i) *Assumption MAR*

(ii) *Assumption SMAR and $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp D|Z, X$*

then for β^0 , the asymptotic variance lower bound for $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^0)$ of any regular estimator $\hat{\beta}$ is given by $\Omega = (G'V_{MAR}^{-1}G)^{-1}$. An estimator with an asymptotic variance that is equal to Ω has the following asymptotic linear representation:

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi(Z_i, X_i, R_i^D, R_i^Y, R_i^D D_i, R_i^Y Y_i)$$

where

$$\psi(Z, X, R^D, R^Y, R^D D, R^Y Y) = -\Omega^{-1} G' V_{MAR}^{-1} m_{aipw}(Z, X, R^D, R^Y, R^D D, R^Y Y; \beta^0)$$

Although there are two sufficient conditions under which semiparametric efficiency bound holds, condition (ii) only holds when D does not affect the Y conditional of (Z, X) and is an unreasonable assumption. In the settings with different missing variables, however, (ii) can be more useful. One example is when there exists multiple missing treatments at different stages, and the treatments themselves are independent conditional on fully observed variables, then the SMAR assumption can be applied and achieves the closed-form semiparametric efficiency bound; the other example is when the fully observed variables are D and X , and the partially missing variables are Z and Y , and it is reasonable to assume that $Z \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|D, X$.

6 Monte Carlo Simulation

The previous results suggest that the AIPW-GMM approach yields consistent and more efficient results. This section provides numerical evidence of these properties.

We consider the full model:

$$Y_i = \alpha D_i + \beta X_i + \epsilon_i \equiv 0.3D_i + 0.5X_i + \epsilon_i$$

$$D_i = 1(0.1 + 0.3Z_i + 0.1X_i \geq u_i)$$

where D_i is a single-value endogenous variable; X_i is an exogenous variable; Z_i is an instrument variable; and ϵ_i and u_i are jointly normally distributed with $\gamma = \text{corr}(\epsilon_i, u_i)$. R^D is determined by fully observed Z, X ; and R^Y is determined by Z, X and partially observed D . These variables are determined via the binary model stated below:

$$R^D = 1(p_d \geq u_{rd})$$

$$R^Y = 1(p_y \geq u_{ry})$$

where

$$p_d = 0.2 + 0.2X + 0.3Z$$

$$p_y = 0.3 - 0.05X + 0.2Z + 0.3R_D D$$

and u_{rd}, u_{ry} are correlated. Since R^Y is determined by the endogenous variable D , and is conditional on Z, X ; u_{ry} is correlated with ϵ , which is allowed in the SMAR assumption.

Table 1 shows the simulation results with different values for the correlation between ϵ and u . Because D affects R^Y , and D is correlated with ϵ when it is an endogenous treatment variable, this implies that R^Y is also endogenous in the sense that R^Y is correlated with ϵ . The higher the correlation between ϵ and u is, the more endogenous R^Y is; the endogeneity of R^Y will affect the consistency of the estimator derived from the complete case analysis because the moment condition no longer holds. As is shown in the Table 1, the complete case estimator for α is more biased when $\text{corr}(\epsilon, u)$ is higher, while the other two estimators remain consistent. The other finding is that in all exercises, the AIPW estimators have smaller RMSE compared to the other estimation strategies. The IPW estimators have higher RMSE than the CC estimator in some cases, because they not only drop all the observations

Table 1: Monte Carlo Simulation with Different Values for $\text{corr}(\epsilon, u)$

	$\alpha = 0.3$			$\beta = 0.5$		
	$\hat{\alpha}$	Mean Bias	RMSE	$\hat{\beta}$	Mean Bias	RMSE
N = 1000, R = 500, $\text{corr}(\epsilon, u) = 0.8$						
Complete Case	0.1842	0.1158	0.1537	0.4973	0.0027	0.1180
IPW	0.3223	0.0223	0.1255	0.5017	0.0017	0.1901
AIPW	0.3246	0.0246	0.0878	0.4798	0.0202	0.0863
N = 1000, R = 500, $\text{corr}(\epsilon, u) = 0.5$						
Complete Case	0.2178	0.0822	0.1405	0.4949	0.0051	0.1252
IPW	0.2974	0.0026	0.1285	0.5050	0.0050	0.1803
AIPW	0.2993	0.0007	0.0932	0.4903	0.0097	0.1144
N = 1000, R = 500, $\text{corr}(\epsilon, u) = 0.3$						
Complete Case	0.2552	0.0448	0.1162	0.4992	0.0008	0.1293
IPW	0.3136	0.0136	0.1498	0.5405	0.0405	0.3948
AIPW	0.3028	0.0028	0.0915	0.4792	0.0208	0.0919

with incomplete data, but also run a nonparametric estimation with the limited data on the nuisance parameters.

Table 2 shows the simulation results when the imputed values $\hat{E}[Y|Z, X]$, $\hat{E}[Y|D, Z, X]$, or $\hat{E}[D|Z, X]$ are misspecified. The AIPW-GMM estimator was shown to be robust when the missing mechanisms were correctly specified in Section 5, and misspecified imputed values should not affect the performance of the estimator. We can observe some evidence of the theoretical result on robustness in Table 2. The final exercise illustrates how the AIPW estimator can be biased when \hat{p}_y is misspecified and is captured by a function of Z, X without the partially observed D ; this is the result when the missing mechanism is wrongly specified, and also when the correlation between the treatment status and the missing mechanism of the outcome is ignored.

7 Application

The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment is a large scale social experiment, for which most of the data were collected via surveys. In 2008, a group of low-income individuals was randomly selected for the opportunity to apply for the Oregon Health Plan (OHP) Standard, which is a Medicaid-extension program to cover low-income adults who are not eligible for the OHP Plus, which covers children, pregnant women, and families enrolled in the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program. The OHP standard program was not open for applicants until 2008. Participants registered for the lottery and were randomly assigned to win, conditional on the number of household members on the waiting list. The lottery

Table 2: Monte Carlo Simulation with Misspecified Imputed Values

	$\alpha = 0.3$			$\beta = 0.5$		
	$\hat{\alpha}$	Mean Bias	RMSE	$\hat{\beta}$	Mean Bias	RMSE
N = 1000, R = 500, misspecified $E[Y Z, X], E[Y D, Z, X]$						
Complete Case	0.1840	0.1160	0.1523	0.4904	0.0096	0.1253
IPW	0.3277	0.0277	0.1491	0.5344	0.0344	0.1039
AIPW	0.3067	0.0067	0.0857	0.4812	0.0188	0.0867
N = 1000, R = 500, misspecified $E[D Z, X]$						
Complete Case	0.2178	0.0822	0.1405	0.4949	0.0051	0.1252
IPW	0.2997	0.0003	0.1295	0.5076	0.0076	0.1714
AIPW	0.2990	0.0010	0.0923	0.4925	0.0075	0.1145
N = 1000, R = 500, misspecified p_y						
Complete Case	0.1716	0.1284	0.1665	0.4914	0.0086	0.1206
IPW	0.1705	0.1295	0.1674	0.5035	0.0035	0.1416
AIPW	0.3649	0.0649	0.1166	0.4716	0.0284	0.1324

winners were asked to return their application form. Only 60.82% of the lottery winners chose to return their application forms, and only some of those applications were approved. As such, this produced an endogenous non-compliance problem.

The data sets used here were composed of four parts. The descriptive data set recorded lottery participants' basic information and administrative data on the lotteries. The researchers conducted three follow-up surveys to collect information on health insurance, healthcare needs, experiments, and costs. The initial follow-up survey was conducted right after the experiment during the period of June to November 2008 and included 58,405 survey participants. The intermediate survey was conducted six months after the experiment for a subsample of initial survey participants and included 11,756 participants. The final survey was conducted a year after the experiment for the same group of people who participated in the initial survey. These three surveys were referred to as the 0m, 6m, and 12m surveys, respectively.

We select the variables from the descriptive data, the 0m survey data, and the 12m survey data. The summary statistics of the variables used in this example are showed in Table 3. In the experiment, 50.66% of the survey participants were randomly selected to win the lottery, and selection into the lottery was used as the instrument variable, which is random conditional on the number of people in a household. For the number-of-household-members variable, 1 represented a household with a single member, while 2 and 3 represent households with two and more than two members. The age varies from 20 to 63; therefore, the influence of Medicare is excluded. The genders are balanced in the experiment; approximately 55% of the lottery participants are female. Most of the respondents are from the metropolitan

statistical area, and less than 10% of the participants required a non-English questionnaire.

The second block in the table records partially observed variables. There are 7,611 participants with observed treatment statuses. We choose enrollment into the OHP program, including both the OHP standard and the OHP plus, as the treatment variable.¹⁵

There are three outcomes from the final stage survey, including out-of-pocket costs for medical care, the number of days when physical health was not good, and how physical health had changed in the past six months. We refer to the health change as “Worse Health” in the later regression table, because for this variable, the higher the value, the worse the health status has become.

7.1 Missing Pattern

We first show the missing pattern of the chosen treatment and outcome variables to confirm the non-monotone missing pattern; the main reason for missingness in this data set is non-response to the surveys. The non-response rates for the initial (0m) and final (12m) surveys are shown in Figure 3. For both the 0m and 12m surveys, the response rates were less than 50%. Furthermore, 16.88% of participants responded to the 0m but not to the 12m survey, so it is highly possible to observe their treatment statuses, but not their outcome statuses; for the group that responded to the 12m but not the 0m survey, it is possible to observe the opposite.

Another important source of missingness is non-response to survey questions among responders. We choose the survey participants who returned both the 0m and the 12m surveys, and the missing rate of answers for the questions on treatment and outcome status are shown in Figure 4. 16,566 participants returned both stage surveys. However, we could not confirm the treatment status for 8.73% of the respondents after correction of the variable.¹⁶ For the

¹⁵We did not choose the recorded enrollment for the OHP Standard in the administrative data as the treatment variable for the following reasons. First, the application’s approval took a long time, it took 277 days for some people to get their application forms approved, and this was just before the final round of the survey; therefore, the administrative data do not show precise enrollment statuses during the first round of the survey. Moreover, even though some people were granted late approval, the effective date for the insurance card did not change; the late receivers needed to renew their insurance card to get coverage, which involved another endogenous self-selection problem. This directly results in the fact that even though they were approved and notified before the final round survey, approximately 1,400 participants chose the “Not Covered” option in the final round of the survey, and approximately 160 participants did not know their exact status OHP insurance, even though they were already notified about the application decision.

A previous study (Finkelstein et al. [2012]) used external administrative data to recover the treatment status and avoid the missing problem. Since our goal is to show how the survey data can be used to get a consistent estimate, we choose to use the variables recorded in the survey, instead of in other data sets.

¹⁶If the participants mentioned that they had been successfully enrolled in the OHP Standard, and the administrative data showed consistent enrollment status, the OHP enrollment variable is corrected to value 1, whether it was missing or not.

Table 3: Summary Statistics in the OHIE Data

	Count	Mean	Sd	Min	Max
Z: Selected in the lottery	58405	0.5066	0.5000	0	1
X: Number of people in household	58405	1.2926	.4608	1	3
X: Age	58405	39.8863	12.1226	20	63
X: Female	58405	0.5464	0.4978	0	1
X: Zip code in a metropolitan statistical area	58405	0.7658	0.4235	0	1
X: Individual requested English-language materials	58405	.9072	.2902	0	1
D: Currently have OHP insurance	7611	0.1566	0.3634	0	1
Y: Total out-of-pocket costs for medical care, last 6 months	22539	230.5913	539.7317	0	4740
Y: Number of days (out of the past 30) when physical health not good	21415	9.5070	10.8559	0	30
Y: How has your health changed: past 6 months	23443	2.1503	.6058	1	3
Observations	58405				




Figure 3: Non-response to the surveys

outcome variables, the non-response rates vary from 1.35% to 9.53% among survey responders. The question related to subjective healthiness (worse health) suffers the least from missingness, while the question that asks for clear memories of the exact number of days when physical health is not good has the highest percentage of missing.

The non-response to survey and survey questions result in non-monotone missing patterns, and these are shown in Figure 5. We observe four missing types for all three outcomes, and this is consistent with the strict non-monotone missingness.

Next, we show evidence of a violation of the MAR assumption in this example. The MAR assumption assumes away the correlation between missingness in the outcomes and the partially observed treatment variable. We run a regression as a simple test on the correlation between them. As is shown in 4, when $R^D = 1$ (i.e., enrollment status in the OHP program is observed), there exists a significant correlation between R^Y and D . To use the SMAR assumption, it is also necessary to confirm that R^D does not depend on partially observe Y , so we run the same regression for the outcomes, and we find a small and insignificant correlation between R^D and Y when $R^Y = 1$; the results are recorded in Table 5.

7.2 Regression Results

Table 6 shows the regression results. The nuisance estimators are estimated by the sieve with B-spline basis functions, and the number of knots was selected through cross-validation. The




Figure 4: Non-response to survey questions




Figure 5: Non-monotone Missing Pattern

Table 4: Regression of R^Y on D when $R^D = 1$

	Out-of-Pocket Costs	Days of Bad Health	Worse Health
Currently have OHP insurance	-0.0382*** (0.00865)	-0.0393*** (0.00880)	-0.0379*** (0.00854)
Selected in the lottery	-0.0197** (0.00657)	-0.0124 (0.00668)	-0.0207** (0.00648)
Number of people in household	0.0107 (0.00706)	0.0150* (0.00718)	0.00953 (0.00697)
Female	0.0419*** (0.00644)	0.0391*** (0.00655)	0.0437*** (0.00636)
Age	0.00451*** (0.000261)	0.00422*** (0.000265)	0.00501*** (0.000257)
Zip code in a metropolitan statistical area	0.00360 (0.00729)	0.000263 (0.00741)	-0.00327 (0.00719)
Individual requested English-language materials	-0.0123 (0.0127)	0.0370** (0.0129)	-0.0242 (0.0125)
Constant	0.424*** (0.0219)	0.350*** (0.0222)	0.438*** (0.0216)
Observations	23140	23140	23140

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 5: Regression of R^D on Y when $R^Y = 1$

	Out-of-Pocket Costs	Days of Bad Health	Worse Health
Selected in the lottery	-0.00729 (-1.15)	-0.00602 (-0.92)	-0.00857 (-1.37)
Number of people in household	0.00168 (0.24)	-0.00226 (-0.31)	0.00365 (0.53)
Female	0.0464*** (7.20)	0.0495*** (7.46)	0.0454*** (7.14)
Age	0.00420*** (16.08)	0.00421*** (15.41)	0.00414*** (15.98)
Zip code in a metropolitan statistical area	-0.00584 (-0.80)	-0.00500 (-0.66)	-0.00734 (-1.02)
Individual requested English-language materials	0.0951*** (8.05)	0.0898*** (7.12)	0.0998*** (8.61)
Total out of pocket costs for medical care, last 6 months	1.64e-08 (0.81)		
Number of days (out of the past 30) when physical health not good		-0.000401 (-1.31)	
How has your health changed: past 6 months			-0.00820 (-1.57)
Constant	0.351*** (16.60)	0.363*** (16.45)	0.366*** (16.00)
Observations	22766	21415	23443

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

estimated effects of OHP are shown in the first row. For the out-of-pocket costs, the CC estimator gives a lower number than the other two estimation strategies, while the IPW and AIPW estimators are closer to each other. The same pattern happens for the outcome of worse health, and the confidence interval of the CC estimator does not include the estimated values from IPW and AIPW approaches. This is the evidence that the CC estimator can be biased in some circumstances; for the two outcomes introduced above, the CC estimator tends to overestimate the effect.

We also find that AIPW estimators have smaller standard errors for all coefficient estimates than the other two estimation strategies; this is because the AIPW estimator tends to be significant at a higher significance level when the estimates are the same. Using the estimated coefficients on the OHP enrollment as an example, the standard errors were improved by 6–24% for different outcomes, compared to the CC and IPW estimators. For the days-of-bad-health outcome, the AIPW estimator is significant with a 99.9% significance level, while the other two estimators are significant at a lower significance level. However, this result was not apparent in the primary table, because the sample size was still as large as 14,500 when all observations with incomplete information are dropped. Therefore, we present another example in which the data are restricted to people who were 35–40 years of age, the days-of-bad-health outcome is shown in the table 7. When the sample size is small, the differences between the three estimates are more significant. The AIPW estimator is the only significant estimator with a significance level being 99%. The AIPW estimator gives an estimate lower than the other two estimation methods, while the IPW is closer to AIPW, compared to the CC estimator.

The results above show that enrolling in the OHP program reduced out-of-pocket costs by \$199.7, reduced the number of days when physical health was not good by 3.3 days, and improved the health index by an average of 0.31. For survey participants who were 35–40 years of age, the effect of OHP enrollment on reducing days of bad physical health was greater than the overall population, and on average, OHP enrollees tended to have five fewer days when their physical health was not good.

8 Conclusion

This paper studies the problem of two missing variables, and we focus on the missing treatment and outcome as an example, and we include a discussion of how to extend the current framework to more than two missing variables in Section A. The first thing to do is to find the appropriate assumptions on the missing mechanism so that it can be identified. We propose the MAR assumption and the SMAR assumption, the difference between which lies in

Table 6: Regression Results

	Out-of-Pocket Costs			Days of Bad Health			Worse Health		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CC GMM	IPW GMM	AIPW GMM	CC GMM	IPW GMM	AIPW GMM	CC GMM	IPW GMM	AIPW GMM
OHP	-225.3*** (38.59)	-191.0*** (35.11)	-199.7*** (32.99)	-3.059** (1.053)	-2.626** (0.890)	-3.295*** (0.805)	-0.380*** (0.0579)	-0.312*** (0.0508)	-0.310*** (0.0456)
Female	59.73*** (6.963)	46.96*** (10.75)	49.45*** (6.044)	-0.0935 (0.191)	0.199 (0.193)	0.140 (0.149)	-0.00485 (0.0103)	0.00492 (0.0107)	0.00734 (0.00841)
Number of Household Members	-2.252 (7.596)	6.856 (8.566)	-5.612 (6.665)	-1.434*** (0.201)	-0.834*** (0.235)	-1.390*** (0.157)	-0.0418*** (0.0108)	0.00311 (0.0126)	-0.0351*** (0.00900)
Age	1.079*** (0.290)	0.196 (0.730)	1.284*** (0.254)	0.164*** (0.00750)	0.195*** (0.00813)	0.168*** (0.00609)	0.00457*** (0.000421)	0.00629*** (0.000453)	0.00558*** (0.000354)
MSA	-16.64* (7.803)	-1.405 (7.431)	-26.33*** (7.089)	-0.972*** (0.218)	-0.657** (0.240)	-0.957*** (0.177)	-0.0376** (0.0115)	-0.0102 (0.0126)	-0.0225* (0.00981)
English-Speaking	32.60* (13.65)	39.81* (16.87)	21.17* (20.54)	1.646*** (0.319)	2.427*** (0.403)	1.400*** (0.259)	0.159*** (0.0171)	0.216*** (0.0209)	0.186*** (0.0149)
Constant	124.2*** (24.75)	68.29** (25.69)	152.4*** (21.01)	4.112*** (0.659)	0.856 (0.816)	4.112*** (0.521)	1.950*** (0.0357)	1.733*** (0.0422)	1.850*** (0.0306)
Observations	14500	14500	58396	13696	13696	58393	14933	14933	58358

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 7: Table: Effect of OHP on Days of Bad Health, for Age 35-40

	Days of Bad Health: Age 35-40		
	(1) CC GMM	(2) IPW GMM	(3) AIPW GMM
OHP	-3.305 (3.397)	-3.822 (3.547)	-5.855** (2.271)
Female	0.834 (0.587)	0.971 (0.650)	0.825 (0.460)
Number of Household Members	-1.472* (0.582)	-1.070 (0.812)	-1.624*** (0.472)
Age	0.412* (0.200)	1.333 (1.111)	0.472** (0.163)
MSA	-0.286 (0.708)	0.165 (0.759)	-1.270* (0.589)
English Speaking	0.106 (0.798)	0.589 (0.991)	-0.348 (0.697)
Constant	-4.605 (7.449)	-40.06 (42.26)	-4.792 (6.096)
Observations	1305	1305	6630

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

whether the correlation between the missing mechanism and partially observed variables is allowed; the identified missing mechanism is used in constructing an AIPW-GMM estimator.

Even though there are many desirable asymptotic properties recorded in the literature for the AIPW approach, many of these fail with non-monotone missingness. We find that these properties are maintained under the MAR assumption; they only hold under the SMAR assumption when the treatment variable has no direct effect on the outcome. The Monte Carlo simulation shows that the AIPW-GMM estimator performs better than the previously used CC and IPW estimators, in the sense that it is consistent and has the smallest standard error compared to the other two approaches. The performance is also verified in the empirical example of estimating the treatment effect of OHP on health-related outcomes. The AIPW-GMM estimator reduced the standard error by 6-24% on the estimated coefficients for the treatment variables, compared to the CC and IPW estimators, and showed a significant effect of enrolling in the OHP on reducing out-of-pocket costs for medical care, reducing the number of days when physical health is not good, and improving health status.

A Discussion

The paper majorly focused on missing treatment and outcome variables with a strict non-monotone missing pattern; this method can be generalized to a more general arrangement. This section will discuss ways to extend the current approach.

A.1 Generalization to General Missing Patterns

The previous sections only considered the case where the missing pattern is strictly non-monotone and can be extended to a more general case that allows for monotone missingness, as well as univariate missingness. First, we propose a weaker overlap assumption.

Assumption Weak Overlap. $p_{11} \in [\kappa_{11}, 1)$ almost surely in (D, Z, X) .

We provide a new AIPW moment function denoted by \tilde{m} such that:

$$\tilde{m}_{aipw} = \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) + \tilde{\phi}(Z, X, R^D, R^Y, R^D D, R^Y Y, \beta) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\phi} &= p_{01} \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&+ \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&+ \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) \tag{A.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem A.1. *Suppose Assumption MAR or SMAR, and Assumption Weak Overlap hold, $E[\tilde{m}_{aipw}] = 0$ when $\beta = \beta^0$.*

Proof of Theorem A.1 follows the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

For the previous moment condition to hold, we require p_d to be strictly positive in Z, X ; and p_y to be strictly positive in Z, X when $R^D = 0$ and in Z, X, D when $R^D = 1$. Therefore, we need:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{01} &= \Pr [R^D = 0, R^Y = 1|Z, X] > 0 \\
p_{11} &= \Pr [R^D = 1, R^Y = 1|Z, X, D] > 0
\end{aligned}$$

To allow for the case where $p_{01} = 0$, we multiply the augmentation term involving p_y by p_{01} . Adding in p_{01} does not affect the consistency of the estimator; thus, the first-stage estimation therefore does not affect the efficiency of the primary model.

A.2 Generalization to More than Two Missing Variables

This method can be extended to a situation in which there exists additional missing variables. We take missing IV, missing treatment status, and missing outcome as an example to illustrate the idea of extending the current method to more than two missing values. We use R^Z as the indicator of observing Z :

$$R^Z = \begin{cases} 1 & Z \text{ is observed} \\ 0 & Z \text{ is unobserved} \end{cases}$$

For simplicity, we only develop the moment condition under the SMAR-like assumption. Suppose there exists a vector of fully observed variables X , and we make two analogous ignorability assumptions on the missing mechanism, and the overlap assumption is:

Assumption A.1.

$$\begin{aligned}
R^Z &\perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y)|X \\
R^D &\perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y)|X, R^Z Z, R^Z \\
R^Y &\perp\!\!\!\perp (D, Y)|X, R^Z Z, R^D D, R^Z, R^D
\end{aligned}$$

Assumption A.2. (a) $p_z \in [\kappa_z, 1)$ almost surely in (X)

(b) $p_d \in [\kappa_d, 1)$ almost surely in $(X, R^Z Z, R^Z)$

(c) $p_y \in [\kappa_y, 1)$ almost surely in $(X, R^Z Z, R^D D, R^Z, R^D)$ for $\kappa_z > 0, \kappa_d > 0, \kappa_y > 0$.

The moment function is correspondingly:

$$m_{aipw} = \frac{R^Z R^D R^Y}{p_{111}} Z (Y - g(D, X; \beta)) + \phi(Z, X, R^Z, R^D, R^Y, R^Z Z, R^D D, R^Y Y, \beta)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi = & \left(1 - \frac{R^Z}{p_z}\right) \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} [E[Z|X] (Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - E[m_{full}|X]] \\
& + \frac{R^Z}{p_z} \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) \frac{R^Y}{p_y} [Z (Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - E[m_{full}|X]] \\
& + \frac{R^Z R^D}{p_z p_d} \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) [Z (E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - E[m_{full}|X]] \\
& + \left(1 - \frac{R^Z}{p_z}\right) \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) \frac{R^Y}{p_y} [E[Z|X] (Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|X]) - E[m_{full}|X]] \\
& + \left(1 - \frac{R^Z}{p_z}\right) \frac{R^D}{p_d} \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) [E[Z|X] (E[Y|D, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - E[m_{full}|X]] \\
& + \frac{R^Z}{p_z} \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) [Z (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - E[m_{full}|X]] \\
& + \left(1 - \frac{R^Z R^D R^Y}{p_{111}}\right) E[m_{full}|X]
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$p_{111} = \Pr [R^Z = 1, R^D = 1, R^Y = 1|X, Z, D]$$

In the case where there are two partially missing variables, the moment function can be

derived through a three-step AIPW imputation by imputing the functions of Z using the AIPW strategy after the second step.

Theorem A.2. *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and A.2 hold, $E[m_{aipw}] = 0$ when $\beta = \beta^0$.*

The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4.1.

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Proposition 4.1;

$\hat{\epsilon}$ in 4.6 is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\epsilon} = & \frac{R^Y}{p_y} \left[Y - \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} g(D, X; \beta) + \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X] \right) \right] \\ & + \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) \left[\frac{R^D}{p_d} (E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) + \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) E\{E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

We expand the right hand side and get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\epsilon} = & \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} (Y - g(D, X; \beta)) + \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \right) (Y - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) \\ & + \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \right) (E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) \\ & - + \left(1 - \frac{R^D}{p_d}\right) \left(1 - \frac{R^Y}{p_y}\right) (E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) \\ = & \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} (Y - g(D, X; \beta)) + \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \right) (Y - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) \\ & + \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \right) (E[Y | D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) \\ & + \left[\left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y}\right) - \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \right) - \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \right) \right] (E[Y | D, Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) \\ = & \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \\ & + \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) - (E[Y | D, Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X])] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
& + \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])
\end{aligned}$$

In the third equality, p_{11} is replaced by $p_d p_y$, because $\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} = 0, \forall Z, X$ if $R^D = 0$. Therefore,

$$\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_y} \equiv \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d(Z, X) p_y(Z, X, R^D D, R^D)} = \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d(Z, X) p_y(Z, X, D, R^D = 1)} = \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We proceed the proof term by term, we first show the expected value of the first term equals to zero:

$$E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \right] = E [Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta))] = 0$$

where the first equality sign follows $E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} |Z, X, D, Y \right] = 1$, and the second equality sign follows the population moment condition.

Analogously, the zero expectation of the latter three terms can be proved by

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) |Z, X, D, Y \right] &= 0 \\
E \left[\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) |Z, X, D, Y \right] &= 0 \\
E \left[\left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) |Z, X, D, Y \right] &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $E[m_{aipw}(\beta)] = 0$.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 5.1

The AIPW estimator maintains the property of double robustness under the assumption MAR. In this section, we give a detailed discussion to show the moment condition holds when either the missing mechanism or the imputed values of missing variables is correctly

specified.

First, we show the moment condition specified in Theorem 4.1 holds when the missing mechanism is correctly specified. The expectation of moment function is written as:

$$E [m_{aipw}(\beta)] = E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \right] + E [\phi(Z, X, R^D, R^Y, R^D D, R^Y Y, \beta)] \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The first term in equation B.2 equals to the expectation of full data moment function, and equals to zero:

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \right] &= E \left\{ E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) | Z, X, D, Y \right] \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} | Z, X, D, Y \right] Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ \frac{\Pr [R^D = 1, R^Y = 1 | Z, X, D, Y]}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \right\} \\ &= E [Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta))] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows the full data moment condition defined in equation 2.4.

The second term in equation B.2 equals to zero following the analogous argument. We show the expectation of each element in ϕ equals to zero:

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left\{ \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(Y - E [g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X]) - (E [Y | Z, X] - E [g(D, X; \beta) | Z, X])] \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ E \left[\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) a(Z, X, Y) | Z, X, D, Y \right] \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ E \left[\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) | Z, X, D, Y \right] a(Z, X, Y) \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ \left(\frac{\Pr [R^Y = 1 | Z, X, D, Y]}{p_y} - \frac{\Pr [R^D = 1, R^Y = 1 | Z, X, D, Y]}{p_{11}} \right) a(Z, X, Y) \right\} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

where a is a function of the observables such that

$$a(Z, X, Y) = Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X, Y]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])]$$

The last equality holds if p_{11}, p_y are correctly specified.

The second term follows the same argument.

$$E \left[\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) |Z, X, D, Y \right] = \frac{\Pr [R^D = 1|Z, X, D, Y]}{p_d} - \frac{\Pr [R^D = 1, R^Y = 1|Z, X, D, Y]}{p_{11}} = 0$$

if p_d is also correctly specified.

And the third term equals to 0, following

$$E \left[\left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) |Z, X, D, Y \right] = 1 - \frac{\Pr [R^D = 1, R^Y = 1|Z, X, D, Y]}{p_{11}} = 0$$

Therefore, the moment condition holds if (p_d, p_y, p_{11}) are correctly specified.

Next, we show the moment condition holds if $E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X], E[Y|Z, X]$ are correctly specified. We first consider the first component of the augmentation term ϕ :

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\{ \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_{11} + p_{01}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_{11} + p_{01}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) E[a(Z, X, Y)|Z, X] \right\} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

following $E[Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X, Y] |Z, X] = E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]$.

The same proof can be applied on the second component of ϕ , following

$$E[E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X] = E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]$$

Next, we combine the last term in ϕ and the IPW moment condition and get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\{ \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} [(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) \right\} \\
& = 0 + E \{ E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X] \} \\
& = E[m_{aipw}(\beta)] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows:

$$E[Y - g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X] = E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]$$

and the last equality follows the iterative law of expectations.

B.4 Proof of Theorem 5.2

We use m_{full} to denote the original population level moment function, such that:

$$m_{full}(\beta) = Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta))$$

We reorganize the moment function into:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{aipw}(\beta) &= \underbrace{\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X])}_{(1)} + \underbrace{E[m_{full}|Z, X]}_{(2)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X])}_{(3)} \\
&+ \underbrace{\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z (Y - E[Y|Z, X])}_{(4)}
\end{aligned}$$

We discuss the variance of each term.

The variance of the first term equals to:

$$\begin{aligned}
Var((1)) &= E \left[Var \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | Z, X \right) \right] \\
&\quad + Var \left(E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | Z, X \right] \right) \\
&= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var((m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | Z, X) \right] = E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var(m_{full}|Z, X) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

The variance of the second term equals to:

$$Var((2)) = E \left[E[m_{full}|Z, X] E[m_{full}|Z, X]' \right]$$

The covariance between (1) and (2) equals to 0 following:

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((1), (2)) &= E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) E[m_{full}|Z, X] \right] \\
&= E \left[(E[m_{full}|Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) E[m_{full}|Z, X] \right] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

The covariance between (1) and (3) is equivalent to the negative of $Var((3))$, following

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((1), (3)) &= Cov \left((1), \frac{R^D}{p_d} (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\
&\quad - Cov \left((1), \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\
&= E \left[\frac{1}{p_d} (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X])^2 \right] \\
&\quad - E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X])^2 \right] \\
&= -Var((3))
\end{aligned}$$

Also, $Cov((2), (3)) = Cov((2), (4)) = 0$ following similar argument as in the proof for $Cov((1), (2))$.

Next, we derive the correlation between (3) and the other terms.

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((1), (4)) &= E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11} p_y} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) Z (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&\quad - E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}^2} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) Z (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[\left(\frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) E[(m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) Z (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) | Z, X] \right] \\
&= -Var((4)) - E \left[\left(\frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) Z^2 Cov(g(D, X; \beta), Y|Z, X) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((3), (4)) &= E \left[\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right. \\
&\quad \left. Z (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_d} + \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) Cov(ZE[Y|D, Z, X], E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] | Z, X) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{MAR} &= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var(m_{full}|Z, X) + E[m_{full}|Z, X] E[m_{full}|Z, X]' \right] \\
&\quad - Var \left(\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\
&\quad - Var \left(\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|Y, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\
&\quad - 2E \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_d} + \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) Cov(ZE[Y|D, Z, X], E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] | Z, X) \right] \\
&\quad - 2E \left[\left(\frac{1}{p_y} - \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) Z^2 Cov(g(D, X; \beta), Y|Z, X) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

B.5 Proof of Theorem 5.4

The first part of this proof heavily depend on the results from [Newey \[1994\]](#) and [Newey and McFadden \[1994\]](#). Two takeaways from [Newey \[1994\]](#) are: (a) the methods of estimating the nuisance parameters do not affect the asymptotic variance of the estimator; (b) the nuisance parameters do not affect the variance of the primary model if it does not affect consistency of the model.

First, we rewrite the moment function as:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{aipw}(\beta) &= \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \\
&+ (1 - p_d) \left(\frac{(1 - R^D)R^Y}{p_{01}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) \\
&\quad \times Z[(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&+ \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z[(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&+ \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])
\end{aligned}$$

by replacing

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} &= \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_y} + \frac{(1 - R^D)R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \\
&= \frac{p_d R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} + \frac{(1 - p_d)(1 - R^D)R^Y}{p_{01}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \\
&= (1 - p_d) \left(\frac{(1 - R^D)R^Y}{p_{01}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

in the second component in m_{aipw} .

The nuisance parameters include the probability of observing D , Y , and both, conditional on the observables. Recall that the imputed values for incomplete model, i.e, $E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]$, $E[Y|Z, X]$, $E[Y|D, Z, X]$ do not affect the moment condition, they do not have effect on the variance of V_{SMAR} . On the other hand, among the propensities, only p_{11} affect consistency of m_{aipw} via the first component, therefore, despite existence of multiple nuisance parameters in four components, we need to only create the correction term for one of them. For simplicity of notation, denote

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_c &= -(1 - p_d) \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z[(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&= -(1 - p_d) \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z[Y - E[Y|Z, X]]
\end{aligned}$$

Derivation of the correction term closely follows [Newey \[1994\]](#). Note that p_{11} can be seen as a conditional expectation of $R^D R^Y$. Results from Section 4 in [Newey \[1994\]](#) can be applied.

We first need to find a linearization of ϕ_c . Because p_{11} only affects ϕ_c through its values instead of functional form, we apply equation (3.17) from Newey [1994] directly, and derive the linearization of ϕ_c as:

$$D(\mathcal{O}, \phi_c) = E \left[(1 - p_d) \frac{1}{p_{11}} (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \hat{p}_{11}(D, Z, X) \right]$$

and from result in (4.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial E[D(\mathcal{O}, \phi_c)]}{\partial \theta} &= E \left\{ (1 - p_d) \frac{1}{p_{11}} (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) (R^D R^Y - p_{11}) \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}) \right\} \\ &= E \left[(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} - 1 \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{O}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the correction term to be incorporated is $(1 - p_d) \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X])$.

Now, we proceed calculation of the V_{SMAR} term by term. We reorganize the influence function as in Section B.4:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{SMAR}(\beta) &= \underbrace{\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X])}_{(1)} + \underbrace{E[m_{full}|Z, X]}_{(2)} \\ &+ \underbrace{\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X])}_{(3)} \\ &+ \underbrace{\left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (Y - E[Y|Z, X])}_{(4)} \\ &+ \underbrace{(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} - 1 \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X])}_{(5)} \end{aligned}$$

where (5) is the correction term added for nuisance parameter used in (3).

The variance of the first term equals to:

$$\begin{aligned}
Var((1)) &= E \left[Var \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | D, Z, X \right) \right] \\
&\quad + Var \left(E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | D, Z, X \right] \right) \\
&= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var((m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | D, Z, X) \right] + Var(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \\
&= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var((m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | D, Z, X) \right] + Var(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X]) \\
&\quad + Var(E[m_{full}|Z, X]) - 2Cov(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X], E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \\
&= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var(m_{full}|D, Z, X) \right] + Var(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X]) - Var(E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \\
&= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var(m_{full}|D, Z, X) \right] + Var(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X]) - Var((2))
\end{aligned}$$

The $-Var((2))$ cancels out with the variance of the second term.

Now we consider the covariance between different terms:

$$Cov((1), (2)) = 0, Cov((2), (3)) = 0, Cov((2), (4)) = 0$$

$Cov((2), (5))$ also equals to zero following analogous argument and the fact that $p_{11} = E[R^D R^Y | Z, X, D, Y]$.

$$Cov((1), (3)) = -Var((3))$$

following analogous argument in the Section [B.4](#).

Now we consider the covariance between (1) and (4):

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((1), (4)) &= E \left[-(1 - p_d) \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}^2} (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[-\frac{1 - p_d}{p_{11}} E[(m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) | D, Z, X] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

We notice that the covariance between (1) and (5) equals to:

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((1), (5)) &= E \left[(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}^2} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{1}{p_{11}} - 1 \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, some parts in $Cov((1), (4))$ and $Cov((1), (5))$ cancels with each other, and get:

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov((1), (4)) + Cov((1), (5)) &= -E \left[\frac{1 - p_d}{p_{11}} Var(Y|D, Z, X) \right] \\
&\quad - E[(1 - p_d)Cov(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X]|Z, X)]
\end{aligned}$$

The variance of (4) equals to:

$$Var((4)) = E \left[(1 - p_d)^2 \left(\frac{1}{p_{01}} + \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) Var(Y|D, Z, X) \right]$$

Next, consider covariance between (3), (4), (5)

$$\begin{aligned}
&Cov((3), (4)) \\
&= E \left[-(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_{11}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}^2} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[-(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{1}{p_d} - 1 \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[-\frac{(1 - p_d)^2}{p_d} Cov(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X]|Z, X) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&Cov((3), (5)) \\
&= E \left[(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_d p_{11}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}^2} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&\quad - E \left[(1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[\frac{(1 - p_d)^2}{p_d} Cov(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X]|Z, X) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

The two covariances cancel with each other.

$$\begin{aligned}
& Cov((4), (5)) \\
&= E \left[-(1 - p_d)^2 \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}^2} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) (Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right] \\
&= E \left[(1 - p_d)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_{11}} \right) Var(E[Y|D, Z, X] | Z, X) \right] \\
&= -Var((5))
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, V_{SMAR} is derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{SMAR} &= E \left[\frac{1}{p_{11}} Var((m_{full} - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) | D, Z, X) \right] + Var(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X]) \\
&\quad - Var \left(\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) (E[m_{full}|D, Z, X] - E[m_{full}|Z, X]) \right) \\
&\quad - Var \left((1 - p_d) \left(\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} - 1 \right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \right) \\
&\quad - E \left[\left(\frac{1 - p_d^2}{p_{11}} - \frac{(1 - p_d)^2}{p_{01}} \right) Var(Y|D, Z, X) \right] \\
&\quad - 2E[(1 - p_d)Cov(E[m_{full}|D, Z, X], E[Y|D, Z, X] | Z, X)]
\end{aligned}$$

where the two terms come from $Var((4)) + 2Cov((1), (4)) + 2Cov((1), (5))$.

B.6 Proof of Theorem 5.5

The sketch of the proof follows Cattaneo [2010], Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016], Newey [1994], Newey [1997] closely, and most of the results have been proved in the proof of Proposition 2.3 in Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016].

First, by the results showed in Theorem 5 and Theorem 8 in Cattaneo [2010], under the conditions listed in Theorem 5.5,

$$\|\hat{p} - p\|_\infty = o_p(N^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \tag{B.3}$$

$$\|\hat{q} - q\|_\infty = o_p(N^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \tag{B.4}$$

where p stands for the missing mechanism parameters (p_d, p_y, p_{11}) , and q stands for the

imputed missing values $(E[D|Z, X], E[Y|Z, X], E[Y|Z, X, D])$.

Then, what left is to show the multiplication of the nuisance parameters converges to zero in probability. We show the sketch for

$$\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}}\right) [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])]$$

and we use analogous conditions to the conditions (32) and (33) from the proof of proposition 2.3 in [Chaudhuri and Guilkey \[2016\]](#), what left to show is that

$$o_p(1) = \sqrt{N} \left(\bar{\xi}_N(\beta^0, \hat{p}, \hat{q}(\beta^0)) - \bar{\xi}_N(\beta^0, p, q(\beta^0)) \right) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$o_p(1) = \sup_{|\beta - \beta^0| \leq \delta_N} \frac{\sqrt{N} |\bar{\xi}_N(\beta, \hat{p}, \hat{q}(\beta)) - E[\bar{\xi}_N(\beta, p, q(\beta))] - \bar{\xi}_N(\beta^0, \hat{p}, \hat{q}(\beta^0))|}{1 + C\sqrt{N}|\beta - \beta^0|} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

for all positive sequences $\delta_N = o(1)$ and a generic constant $C > 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\xi}_N(\beta, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\nu}_i \hat{\tau}_i \\ \bar{\xi}_N(\beta, p\hat{q}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nu_i \tau_i \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nu_i = \left(\frac{R_i^D}{p_{d,i}} - \frac{R_i^D R_i^Y}{p_{11,i}} \right)$$

$$\tau_i = [(E[Y_i|D_i, Z_i, X_i] - g(D_i, X_i; \beta)) - (E[Y_i|Z_i, X_i] - E[g(D_i, X_i; \beta)|Z_i, X_i])]$$

Condition [B.5](#) holds follows the fact that $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\nu_i|$ and $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\tau_i|$ are $O_p(1)$, which follows the conditions [B.3](#) and [B.4](#).

The proof of the condition [B.6](#) also follows the proof of the analogous condition in [Chaudhuri and Guilkey \[2016\]](#). First, $E[\bar{\xi}_N(\beta, p, q(\beta))] = 0$ under either the Assumption MAR or the Assumption SMAR, therefore, the condition [B.6](#) reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned}
o_p(1) &= \sup_{|\beta - \beta_0| \leq \delta_N} \frac{\sqrt{N} |\bar{\xi}_N(\beta, \hat{p}, \hat{q}(\beta)) - \bar{\xi}_N(\beta^0, \hat{p}, \hat{q}(\beta^0))|}{1 + C\sqrt{N}|\beta - \beta^0|} \\
&= \sup_{|\beta - \beta_0| \leq \delta_N} \frac{|\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\nu}_i(\hat{\tau}_i(\beta) - \hat{\tau}_i(\beta^0))|}{1 + C\sqrt{N}|\beta - \beta^0|}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

Proof of equation B.7 can be found in proof of Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4 in Chaudhuri and Guilkey [2016], by setting $\omega_i = c$ for some constant c in their corresponding condition. The key condition used in the proof is that $E[\tau_i(\beta)] = 0$ for any β , and it holds from the definition of $\tau_i(\beta)$.

The analogous proof sketch can be used on the component for $R^Y = 1$, i.e.,

$$\left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])]$$

Next, we combine the IPW moment condition and the last component in the augmentation term into:

$$\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} [(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] + (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) \tag{B.8}$$

and proof of convergence of equation B.8 can be found in Theorem 8 in Cattaneo [2010].

B.7 Proof of Lemma 5.1

Suppose Assumption SMAR and Overlap hold, and $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp D|Z, X$, then the AIPW estimator maintains double-robustness, following the fact

$$E[Y|Z, X] = E[Y|D, Z, X]$$

and therefore estimation on p_{11} does not affect consistency of the primary estimator. Then, there is no correction term needed for the AIPW estimator, under the SMAR assumption. Or, the correction term derived in the section B.5 equals to 0 following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - p_d) \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}}\right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|Z, X]) \\
&= (1 - p_d) \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}}\right) (E[Y|D, Z, X] - E[Y|D, Z, X]) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $V_{SMAR} = V_{MAR}$.

B.8 Proof of Theorem 5.6

We proceed the proof the efficiency following the classical three steps.

Step 1 We denote the fully observed variables as $O = (Z, X, R^D, R^Y, R^D D, R^Y Y)$, and consider a class of parametric submodels indexed by θ such that the distribution of O can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_\theta(O) &= \left[p_{\theta,d}(Z, X) p_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D) f_\theta(Y|Z, X, D) f_\theta(D|Z, X) \right]^{R^D R^Y} \\
&\quad \times \left[p_{\theta,d}(Z, X) \left(1 - p_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D)\right) f_\theta(D|Z, X) \right]^{R^D(1-R^Y)} \\
&\quad \times \left[(1 - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)) p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X) f_\theta(Y|Z, X) \right]^{(1-R^D)R^Y} \\
&\quad \times \left[(1 - p_{\theta,d}^0(Z, X)) \left(1 - p_{\theta,y}(Z, X)\right) \right]^{(1-R^D)(1-R^Y)} f_\theta(Z, X)
\end{aligned}$$

where $p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)$ is defined as the probability of observing Y given $R^D = 1$; and $p_{\theta,d}^0(Z, X)$ defined as the probability of observing Y given $R^D = 0$. They are defined formally as:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X) &= \Pr \left[R^Y = 1 | Z, X, D, R^D = 1 \right] \\
p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X) &= \Pr \left[R^Y = 1 | Z, X, R^D = 0 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

The score function is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_\theta(O) &= s_\theta(Z, X) + R^D R^Y s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X) + R^D(1 - R^Y) s_\theta(D|Z, X) + (1 - R^D) R^Y s_\theta(Y|Z, X) \\
&\quad + \left\{ R^D R^Y \left(\frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)} + \frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D)}{p_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D)} \right) + R^D(1 - R^Y) \left(\frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)} - \frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D)}{1 - p_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D)} \right) \right. \\
&\quad + (1 - R^D) R^Y \left(\frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X)} - \frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{1 - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)} \right) \\
&\quad \left. + (1 - R^D)(1 - R^Y) \left(-\frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X)}{1 - p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X)} - \frac{\dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{1 - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)} \right) \right\} \\
&= s_\theta(Z, X) + R^D R^Y s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X) + R^D(1 - R^Y) s_\theta(D|Z, X) + (1 - R^D) R^Y s_\theta(Y|Z, X) \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{R^D - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X) + R^D \frac{R^Y - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)}{p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X) \right. \\
&\quad \left. (1 - R^D) \frac{R^Y - p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,y}^0(D, Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $s_\theta(Z, X) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_\theta(Z, X)$, $s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_\theta(Y, D|Z, X)$, $s_\theta(D|Z, X) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_\theta(D|Z, X)$, $s_\theta(Y|Z, X) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} f_\theta(Y|Z, X)$, and $\dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)$, $\dot{p}_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X, D)$, $\dot{p}_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} p_{\theta,y}^0(Z, X)$.

The tangent set is characterized by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T} &\equiv R^D R^Y f_{11}(Y, D, Z, X) + R^D(1 - R^Y) f_{10}(D, Z, X) + (1 - R^D) R^Y f_{01}(Y, Z, X) + f_0(Z, X) \\
&\quad + R^D R^Y \frac{b_{11}(D, Z, X)}{c_{11}(D, Z, X)} + R^D(1 - R^Y) \frac{b_{10}(D, Z, X)}{c_{10}(D, Z, X)} + (1 - R^D) R^Y \frac{b_{01}(D, Z, X)}{c_{01}(D, Z, X)} \\
&\quad + (1 - R^D)(1 - R^Y) \frac{b_{00}(Z, X)}{c_{00}(Z, X)}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{11}(Y, D, Z, X) &\in L_0^2(F(Y, D|Z, X)), f_{10}(D, Z, X) \in L_0^2(F(D|Z, X)) \\
f_{01}(Y, Z, X) &\in L_0^2(F(Y|Z, X)), f_0(Z, X) \in L_0^2(F(Z, X))
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 The full data moment condition is written as:

$$AE \left[m_{full}(Z, X, D, Y; \beta^0) \right] = 0$$

for any matrix A of size $d_\theta \times d_m$, where d_θ is the dimension of unknown parameters while

d_m is the number of moment conditions. The matrix A is added to convert an over-identified system of moment conditions into the just-identified moment conditions. In our framework, the moment condition m_{full} is defined to be $m_{full}(Z, X, D, Y; \beta^0) \equiv Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta^0))$.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \beta^0(\theta_0) &= -(AG)^{-1}AE \left[m_{full}(Z, X, D, Y; \beta^0) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_{\theta_0}(Z, X, D, Y) \right] \\ &= -(AG)^{-1}AE \left[m_{full}(Z, X, D, Y; \beta^0) (s(Z, X)' + s(D|Z, X)' + s(Y|D, Z, X)') \right]\end{aligned}$$

Then, we conjecture such that

$$E[\varphi \mathcal{S}'_O] = E \left[m_{full}(Z, X, D, Y; \beta^0) (s(Z, X)' + s(D|Z, X)' + s(Y|D, Z, X)') \right]$$

Then, we confirm term by term, and the first term equals

$$\begin{aligned}& E \left[\frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \mathcal{S}_O \right] \\ &= E \left\{ \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \times \left(s_{\theta}(Z, X) + s_{\theta}(Y, D|Z, X) + \frac{R^D - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + R^D \frac{R^Y - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)}{p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,y}^1(Z, X) \right) \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) \times \left(s_{\theta}(Z, X) + s_{\theta}(Y, D|Z, X) + \frac{R^D - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)}{p_{\theta,d}(Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,d}(Z, X) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + R^D \frac{R^Y - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)}{p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X)(1 - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X))} \dot{p}_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X) \right) \right\} \\ &= E[m_{full}(Z, X, D, Y; \beta) (s(Z, X)' + s(D|Z, X)' + s(Y|D, Z, X)')]\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows law of iterated expectation and that $\frac{E[R^D R^Y | Z, X, D, Y]}{p_{11}} = 1$; the last equality follows the definition of m_{full} and the fact the SMAR assumption such that

$$\begin{aligned}E[R^D | Z, X, D, Y] - p_{\theta,d}(Z, X) &= 0 \\ E[R^Y | Z, X, D, Y, R^D = 1] - p_{\theta,y}^1(D, Z, X) &= 0\end{aligned}$$

Then we need to show, the expectation of interaction between \mathcal{S}_O and the augmenting terms in φ equals to zero. For the second term, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\{ \left(\frac{R^Y}{p_y} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \theta)|Z, X])] \mathcal{S}_O \right\} \\
&= E \left\{ (1 - p_d) \left(\frac{(1 - R^D)R^Y}{p_{01}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \times Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&\quad \times \left(R^D R^Y s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X) + (1 - R^D)R^Y s_\theta(Y|Z, X) \right) \left. \right\} \\
&= E [(1 - p_d)Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&\quad \times (s_\theta(Y|Z, X) - s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X))] \\
&= E [(1 - p_d)Z [(Y - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] s_\theta(D|Z, X, Y)] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

The third term equals to

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\{ \left(\frac{R^D}{p_d} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \mathcal{S}_O \right\} \\
&= E \left\{ \left(\frac{R^D}{p_{11} + p_{10}} - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \times Z [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \\
&\quad \times \left(R^D R^Y s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X) + R^D(1 - R^Y)s_\theta(D|Z, X) \right) \left. \right\} \\
&= E \left[\frac{p_{10}}{p_d} \tilde{Z} [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \right. \\
&\quad \times (s_\theta(D|Z, X) - s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X))] \\
&= E \left[-\frac{p_{10}}{p_d} Z [(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] s_\theta(Y|D, Z, X) \right] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

The last term equals to

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{R^D R^Y}{p_{11}} \right) Z (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) \mathcal{S}_O \right\} \\
&\quad \times Z (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) \\
&= E \{ (-p_{01}s_\theta(D|Z, X, Y) - p_{10}s_\theta(Y|Z, X, D) - s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X)) Z (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X]) \} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we confirm that φ is in the tangent set, we can rewrite φ into the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi &= R^D R^Y \left\{ \frac{1}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta))] + \frac{1 - p_d}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - E[Y|Z, X])] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{p_d} [Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \right\} \\
&\quad + R^D(1 - R^Y) \left\{ \frac{1}{p_d} [Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \right\} \\
&\quad + (1 - R^D)R^Y \left\{ \frac{1 - p_d}{p_{01}} Z(Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \right\} + Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])
\end{aligned}$$

Set $b_{11}, b_{01}, b_{10}, b_{00}$ to be zero, and we can easily confirm that

$$Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \theta)|Z, X]) \in L_0^2(F(Z, X))$$

$$\frac{1 - p_d(Z, X)}{p_{01}(Z, X)} Z(Y - E[Y|Z, X]) \in L_0^2(F(Y|Z, X))$$

$$\frac{1}{p_d(Z, X)} [Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] \in L_0^2(F(D|Z, X))$$

The last to confirm is that the function following $R^D R^Y$ is in $L_0^2(F(Y, D|Z, X))$, and this is the case when either condition (1) or (2) in Theorem 5.6 holds. Under condition (1):

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left\{ \frac{1}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta))] + \frac{1 - p_d}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - E[Y|Z, X])] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{p_d} [Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] |Z, X \right\} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

because all the missing probabilities depend on the fully observed Z, X .

Under condition (2):

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left\{ \frac{1}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta))] + \frac{1 - p_d}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - E[Y|Z, X])] |Z, X, D \right\} \\
&= E \left\{ \frac{1}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z(E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta))] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1 - p_d}{p_{11}} [Z(Y - E[Y|D, Z, X])] |Z, X, D \right\} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

and can be interpreted as a function in $L_0^2(F(Y|D, Z, X))$.

$$E \left[\frac{1}{pd} [Z (E[Y|D, Z, X] - g(D, X; \beta)) - Z (E[Y|Z, X] - E[g(D, X; \beta)|Z, X])] | Z, X \right] = 0$$

and can be interpreted as a function in $L_0^2(F(D|Z, X))$.

Note that $s_\theta(Y, D|Z, X) = s_\theta(Y|D, Z, X) + s_\theta(D|Z, X)$. Therefore, $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}$.

Therefore, given A , the efficient influence function is $-(AG)^{-1}A\varphi$, and the variance of it is $(AG)^{-1}AV_{MAR}A'(AG)^{-1'}$. The efficient influence function involves A affecting the variance, and we choose the variance minimizer to be $A = G'V_{MAR}^{-1}$, then the efficiency bound is $\Omega = (G'V_{MAR}^{-1}G)^{-1}$.

References

- Jason Abrevaya. Missing dependent variables in fixed-effects models. *Journal of econometrics*, 211(1):151–165, 2019. [6](#)
- Jason Abrevaya and Stephen G Donald. A gmm approach for dealing with missing data on regressors. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 99(4):657–662, 2017. [6](#)
- Rotnitzky Andrea, Daniel Scharfstein, Ting-Li Su, and James Robins. Methods for conducting sensitivity analysis of trials with potentially nonignorable competing causes of censoring. *Biometrics*, 57(1):103–113, 2001. [3](#)
- Joshua D Angrist and Guido W Imbens. Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 90(430):431–442, 1995. [1](#)
- Jorge F Balat and Sukjin Han. Multiple treatments with strategic interaction. *Available at SSRN 3182766*, 2018. [3](#)
- Jean-Louis Barnwell and Saraswata Chaudhuri. Efficient estimation in sub and full populations with monotonically missing at random data. Technical report, Technical report, McGill University, 2018. [1](#)
- Christopher F Baum, Mark E Schaffer, and Steven Stillman. Instrumental variables and gmm: Estimation and testing. *The Stata Journal*, 3(1):1–31, 2003. [1](#)

- Christoph Breunig and Peter Haan. Nonparametric regression with selectively missing covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00411*, 2018. [6](#)
- James R Carpenter, Michael G Kenward, and Stijn Vansteelandt. A comparison of multiple imputation and doubly robust estimation for analyses with missing data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 169(3):571–584, 2006. [4](#)
- Matias D Cattaneo. Efficient semiparametric estimation of multi-valued treatment effects under ignorability. *Journal of Econometrics*, 155(2):138–154, 2010. [1](#), [5.1](#), [5.1](#), [B.6](#), [B.6](#)
- Saraswata Chaudhuri. On efficiency gains from multiple incomplete subsamples. *Econometric Theory*, 36(3):488–525, 2020. [1](#), [2](#), [3.2](#), [13](#)
- Saraswata Chaudhuri and David K Guilkey. Gmm with multiple missing variables. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31(4):678–706, 2016. [1](#), [3.1](#), [5](#), [5.1](#), [5.1](#), [5.2](#), [B.6](#), [B.6](#), [B.6](#), [B.6](#)
- Xiaohong Chen, Han Hong, Alessandro Tarozi, et al. Semiparametric efficiency in gmm models with auxiliary data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(2):808–843, 2008. [1](#), [4](#), [5.1](#), [5.1](#)
- Philip E Cheng. Nonparametric estimation of mean functionals with data missing at random. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 89(425):81–87, 1994. [1](#)
- Federico Ciliberto and Elie Tamer. Market structure and multiple equilibria in airline markets. *Econometrica*, 77(6):1791–1828, 2009. [3](#)
- Amy Finkelstein, Sarah Taubman, Bill Wright, Mira Bernstein, Jonathan Gruber, Joseph P Newhouse, Heidi Allen, Katherine Baicker, and Oregon Health Study Group. The oregon health insurance experiment: evidence from the first year. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 127(3):1057–1106, 2012. [15](#)
- Ahmed M Gad. A selection model for longitudinal data with non-ignorable non-monotone missing values. *Journal of Data Science*, 9(171-180), 2011. [1](#)
- Adam N Glynn and Kevin M Quinn. An introduction to the augmented inverse propensity weighted estimator. *Political analysis*, pages 36–56, 2010. [1](#), [4](#)
- Rolf HH Groenwold, A Rogier T Donders, Kit CB Roes, Frank E Harrell Jr, and Karel GM Moons. Dealing with missing outcome data in randomized trials and observational studies. *American journal of epidemiology*, 175(3):210–217, 2012. [6](#)

- Joel L Horowitz and Charles F Manski. Nonparametric analysis of randomized experiments with missing covariate and outcome data. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 95(449):77–84, 2000. [1](#)
- Roderick JA Little. Regression with missing x’s: a review. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 87(420):1227–1237, 1992. [6](#)
- Roderick JA Little and Donald B Rubin. Bayes and multiple imputation. *Statistical analysis with missing data*, pages 200–220, 2002. [1](#), [3](#)
- KW Newey and Daniel McFadden. Large sample estimation and hypothesis. *Handbook of Econometrics, IV, Edited by RF Engle and DL McFadden*, pages 2112–2245, 1994. [4](#), [B.5](#)
- Whitney K Newey. The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1349–1382, 1994. [5.1](#), [5.1](#), [B.5](#), [B.6](#)
- Whitney K Newey. Convergence rates and asymptotic normality for series estimators. *Journal of econometrics*, 79(1):147–168, 1997. [B.6](#)
- Whitney K Newey. Nonparametric instrumental variables estimation. *American Economic Review*, 103(3):550–56, 2013. [1](#)
- Whitney K Newey and James L Powell. Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, 71(5):1565–1578, 2003. [1](#)
- Li Qi and Yanqing Sun. Missing data approaches for probability regression models with missing outcomes with applications. *Journal of statistical distributions and applications*, 1(1):23, 2014. [1](#)
- James M Robins. Non-response models for the analysis of non-monotone non-ignorable missing data. *Statistics in medicine*, 16(1):21–37, 1997. [3](#), [4](#)
- James M Robins and Richard D Gill. Non-response models for the analysis of non-monotone ignorable missing data. *Statistics in medicine*, 16(1):39–56, 1997. [1](#), [3](#)
- James M Robins, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Lue Ping Zhao. Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866, 1994. [1](#), [4](#)
- Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983. [4](#)

- 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. [1](#), [3](#)
- Shaun Seaman, John Galati, Dan Jackson, and John Carlin. What is meant by” missing at random”? *Statistical Science*, pages 257–268, 2013. [1](#)
- Shaun R Seaman and Stijn Vansteelandt. Introduction to double robust methods for incomplete data. *Statistical science: a review journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, 33(2):184, 2018. [1](#)
- Shaun R Seaman and Ian R White. Review of inverse probability weighting for dealing with missing data. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 22(3):278–295, 2013. [4](#)
- BaoLuo Sun and Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen. On inverse probability weighting for nonmonotone missing at random data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):369–379, 2018. [1](#), [3](#), [10](#)
- BaoLuo Sun, Neil J Perkins, Stephen R Cole, Ofer Harel, Emily M Mitchell, Enrique F Schisterman, and Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen. Inverse-probability-weighted estimation for monotone and nonmonotone missing data. *American journal of epidemiology*, 187(3):585–591, 2018. [1](#)
- Elie Tamer. Incomplete simultaneous discrete response model with multiple equilibria. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70(1):147–165, 2003. [3](#)
- Eric J Tchetgen Tchetgen, Linbo Wang, and BaoLuo Sun. Discrete choice models for nonmonotone nonignorable missing data: Identification and inference. *Statistica Sinica*, 28(4):2069–2088, 2018. [1](#)
- Henri Theil. Principles of econometrics. Technical report, 1971. [1](#)
- Anastasios Tsiatis. *Semiparametric theory and missing data*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007. [1](#), [4](#), [5.2](#)
- Stef Van Buuren. *Flexible imputation of missing data*. CRC press, 2018. [3](#)
- Lu Wang, Andrea Rotnitzky, and Xihong Lin. Nonparametric regression with missing outcomes using weighted kernel estimating equations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(491):1135–1146, 2010. [6](#)

Jeffrey M Wooldridge. Inverse probability weighted estimation for general missing data problems. *Journal of econometrics*, 141(2):1281–1301, 2007. 4