

Balancing Out Regression Error: Efficient Treatment Effect Estimation without Smooth Propensities

David A. Hirshberg
Columbia University
dah@stat.columbia.edu

Stefan Wager
Stanford University
swager@stanford.edu

Draft version March 2022

Abstract

There has been a recent surge of interest in doubly robust approaches to treatment effect estimation in observational studies, driven by a realization that they can be combined with modern machine learning methods to obtain estimators that pair good finite sample performance with asymptotic efficiency. These methods first fit a regularized regression model to the observed outcomes, and then use a weighted sum of residuals to debias it. Typically the debiasing weights are obtained by inverting a carefully tuned estimate of the propensity scores, and this choice can be justified by asymptotic arguments. However, there is no good reason to believe that an optimally tuned propensity model would also yield optimally tuned debiasing weights in finite samples. In this paper, we study an alternative approach to efficient treatment effect estimation based on using weights that directly optimize worst-case risk bounds; concretely, this amounts to selecting weights that uniformly balance out a class of functions known to capture the errors of the outcome regression with high probability. We provide general conditions under which our method achieves the semiparametric efficiency bound; in particular, unlike existing methods, we do not assume any regularity on the treatment propensities beyond overlap. In extensive experiments, we find that our method, weighting for uniform balance, compares favorably to augmented inverse-propensity weighting and targeted maximum likelihood estimation.

KEYWORDS: Convex optimization, semiparametric estimation, unconfoundedness.

1 Introduction

Suppose that a statistician wants to measure the average causal effect of a treatment and, in order to do so, has access to independent and identically distributed samples (X_i, Y_i, W_i) for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ represents covariates, $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a measured outcome, and $W_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is a binary treatment. Following the potential outcomes framework (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974), we posit the existence of quantities $Y_i^{(0)}$ and $Y_i^{(1)}$ that correspond to the outcome we would have observed had the i -unit received treatment status $W_i = 0$ or 1 respectively, such that $Y_i = Y_i^{(W_i)}$, and our target of inference is the conditional average

treatment effect,¹

$$\bar{\tau} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[Y_i^{(1)} - Y_i^{(0)} \mid X_i \right]. \quad (1)$$

In order for $\bar{\tau}$ to be identified we assume that we have access to enough features X_i for the treatment assignment W_i to be effectively randomized conditionally on these features, i.e., we assume that the treatment assignment is unconfounded (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983):

$$\left\{ Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)} \right\} \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i. \quad (2)$$

This set of assumptions underlies a substantial amount of work on the statistics of causal inference; see Imbens and Rubin (2015) for a review.

In both mathematical statistics and econometrics, the standard way to estimate average treatment effects under unconfoundedness is via augmented inverse-propensity weighting (AIPW), as proposed by Robins, Rotnitzky, and Zhao (1994) (see also Cassel, Särndal, and Wretman (1976)):

$$\hat{\tau}_{AIPW} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i) + W_i \frac{Y_i - \hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i)}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - (1 - W_i) \frac{Y_i - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i)}{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$ and $\hat{e}(x)$ denote estimates of the population conditional response functions $m^{(w)}(x)$ and treatment propensities $e(x)$,

$$m^{(w)}(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[Y^{(w)} \mid X = x \right] \quad \text{and} \quad e(x) = \mathbb{P} \left[W = 1 \mid X = x \right]. \quad (4)$$

AIPW estimators are often referred to as “doubly robust” to emphasize the fact that $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ is consistent whenever either the outcome regressions $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$ or the propensity regression $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ are consistent (see, e.g., Dudík et al., 2014; Kang and Schafer, 2007).

From a statistical perspective, a key advantage of AIPW methods is that they are semiparametrically efficient: Provided that the nuisance components $m^{(w)}(x)$ and $e(x)$ are smooth enough, and that we use good estimators $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$,

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{\tau}_{AIPW} - \bar{\tau}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N} (0, S^*), \quad (5)$$

$$S^* = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\text{Var} \left[Y^{(1)} \mid X = x \right]}{e(X)} + \frac{\text{Var} \left[Y^{(0)} \mid X = x \right]}{1 - e(X)} \right]; \quad (6)$$

moreover, no regular estimator can improve on this asymptotic risk (Hahn, 1998; Imbens, 2004; Newey, 1994; Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995; Robins, Rotnitzky, and Zhao, 1995). There have also been several refinements of AIPW estimators that preserve efficiency and double robustness while improving higher-order properties (Chernozhukov et al., 2017; Kang and

¹As discussed at length by Imbens (2004), the statistical tasks of estimating the conditional average treatment effect $\bar{\tau}$ and the average treatment effect $\tau = \mathbb{E}[Y_i^{(1)} - Y_i^{(0)}]$ are effectively the same. In particular, an efficient point estimate $\hat{\tau}$ for $\bar{\tau}$ is also an efficient point estimate for τ , and vice-versa; the only difference between the two problems is that confidence intervals for τ need to be inflated to account for a noise term $\bar{\tau} - \tau$ that is uncorrelated with the sampling error of $\hat{\tau} - \bar{\tau}$. The point estimates $\hat{\tau}$ constructed in this paper are thus appropriate for estimating either τ or $\bar{\tau}$; however, our inferential statements focus on $\bar{\tau}$. Our methodology can be extended to provide confidence intervals for τ via the bootstrap (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994), but we do not pursue this idea here.

Schafer, 2007; Scharfstein et al., 1999; Tan, 2010; Robins et al., 2007; van der Laan and Rubin, 2006).

Despite these results, there are still reasons to doubt that AIPW and its extensions provide the unique definitive answer on how to estimate average treatment effects under unconfoundedness. A key concern is that, conceptually, AIPW is a rather indirect procedure, and the task of estimating the nuisance components $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ is not particularly well tied to the goal of estimating average treatment effects. This disconnect appears increasingly unsettling in light of recent proposals that advocate estimating these nuisance components via sophisticated machine learning procedures that rely on careful tuning (Belloni et al., 2017; Chernozhukov et al., 2017; Farrell, 2015; van der Laan and Rose, 2011), and it is far from clear that choices of $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ that have been optimally tuned for estimating the population quantities (4) are also optimal for the purpose of being plugged into (3).

For example, if we use a cross-validated logistic lasso for the propensity model, we may hope for the $\hat{e}(X_i)$ to be reasonably well calibrated on the log-likelihood scale, but there is no particularly strong reason to expect the inverse-propensity weights $1/\hat{e}(X_i)$, etc., to be well calibrated, or for the strength of regularization obtained via cross-validation to be appropriate for this purpose. In practice, AIPW may sometimes inflate errors via division by noisy, poorly calibrated propensity estimates $\hat{e}(X_i)$ in (3). Practitioners are well aware of this problem and, as an ad hoc correction, usually trim the propensity estimates $\hat{e}(X)$ to some range $[\eta, 1 - \eta]$ to avoid extremely large weights. Others go further yet, and prefer to use methods based on nearest neighbor matching despite their being known to be inefficient in large samples (Abadie and Imbens, 2006).

This disconnect between the goal of estimating $\bar{\tau}$ and how the nuisance components are obtained is also reflected in formal results. Even though AIPW is efficient in the sense that it achieves (5) whenever $m^{(w)}(x)$ and $e(x)$ are smooth enough, AIPW is not in general minimax: In order to achieve efficiency, AIPW imposes stronger regularity conditions on $m^{(w)}(x)$ and $e(x)$ than are strictly necessary. Strikingly, Robins et al. (2008, 2017) provide examples of regularity classes on $m^{(w)}(x)$ and $e(x)$ where asymptotically efficient inference of average treatment effects is possible via higher-order influence functions, but AIPW is not even guaranteed to be \sqrt{n} -consistent.

In this paper, we propose a new approach to efficient treatment effect estimation that does not directly fit a propensity model $\hat{e}(X_i)$, but rather debiases pilot regression adjustments $\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(x)$ using weights explicitly chosen to optimize worst-case risk bounds. We focus on estimators of the type $\hat{\tau} = \hat{\mu}^{(1)} - \hat{\mu}^{(0)}$, where

$$\hat{\mu}^{(w)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)} \left(Y_i - \hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X_i) \right). \quad (7)$$

For example, AIPW falls into this category with $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(1)} = 1/\hat{e}(X_i)$, etc. Now, viewing $\hat{\mu}^{(w)}(x)$ as an estimate of the conditional average effect $\bar{\mu}^{(w)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(X_i)$, its error can be decomposed into “imbalance” and “pure noise” terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}^{(w)} - \bar{\mu}^{(w)} &= I_{f_n^{(w)}}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)} \varepsilon_i^{(w)}, \quad \varepsilon_i^{(w)} = Y_i^{(w)} - m^{(w)}(X_i), \\ I_{f_n^{(w)}}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_n^{(w)}(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\{i:W_i=1\}} \hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)} f_n^{(w)}(X_i), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $I_f(\gamma)$ denotes the conditional bias due to $f_n^{(w)}(x) := \hat{m}_n^{(w)}(x) - m^{(w)}(x)$, i.e., the

regression error in the outcome model. Provided the weights $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}$ only depend on $\{X_i, W_i\}$, the conditional mean-squared error of $\hat{\mu}^{(w)}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}^{(w)}\left(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}; \{X_i, W_i\}_{i=1}^n\right) &:= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{\mu}^{(w)} - \bar{\mu}^{(w)}\right)^2 \mid \{X_i, W_i\}_{i=1}^n\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \left(\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}\right)^2 \text{Var}\left[\varepsilon_i^{(w)} \mid X_i\right] + I_{f_n^{(w)}}^{(w)}\left(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We would want to use weights $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}$ that guarantee this conditional mean-squared error to be small.

Now, we of course cannot work with the bound (9) directly, as it depends on the unobservable outcome regression error $f_n^{(w)}(x)$. However, if we know that $f_n^{(w)} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ for some function class \mathcal{F}_n , we immediately get an upper bound for the conditional mean-squared error:²

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}^{(w)}\left(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}; \{X_i, W_i\}_{i=1}^n\right) \\ \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \left(\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}\right)^2 \text{Var}\left[\varepsilon_i^{(w)} \mid X_i\right] + \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} I_f^{(w)}\left(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}\right)\right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We propose using estimators of the form (10) with weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ chosen such as to make this bound as small as possible. In other words, we use a weighting scheme that optimizes minimax conditional error over plausible regression error functions $f_n^{(w)} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. The optimization problem we need to solve in order to compute $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ is convex and can be solved efficiently by standard methods, e.g., sub-gradient descent. To streamline working with the maximal imbalance terms as above we will, for the remainder of the paper, use the more compact notation $I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}\left(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}\right) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} I_f^{(w)}\left(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}\right)$.

Informally, minimizing the risk bound (10) seeks to make the conditional variance of $\hat{\tau}$ small, subject to having the γ -weighted average of $f(\cdot)$ over the treated sample roughly match the unweighted average of $f(\cdot)$ over the full sample, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i^{(1)} W_i f(X_i) \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i), \quad (11)$$

for all possible regression error functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$. When these two averages are approximately equal for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$, we say the the weighted treatment sample and the unweighted full sample *uniformly balance* the function class \mathcal{F}_n ; we thus call this procedure *weighting for uniform balance*, abbreviated WUB.

Our approach is in many ways similar to AIPW. In each case, we start by estimating the mean-response functions $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$, and then compute the pilot estimator $\hat{\tau}_{pilot} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i))$. Because non-parametric regression adjustments are generally biased on the \sqrt{n} -scale, $\hat{\tau}_{pilot}$ is in general not a \sqrt{n} -consistent estimator and some bias correction is required. Both methods seek to remove the bias by adding weighted averages of the residuals, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \gamma_i^{(w)} (Y_i - \hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X_i))$. Here, AIPW follows classical ideas going back to [Rosenbaum and Rubin \(1983\)](#), and attempts to inverse-propensity weight the residuals. The weakness of this approach is that they need to get $\hat{e}(x)$ from some other

²If we know that $f_n^{(w)} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ with high probability, then (10) is a useful with-high-probability bound on the conditional mean-squared error that can also be used to derive efficiency results, as discussed later.

non-parametric regression; this method will be calibrated to make good probability-scale propensity estimates—not to produce a good bias-reducing weights.

In contrast, we recognize that the only job of the weights $\gamma^{(w)}$ is to account for the regression error $f_n^{(w)}(\cdot)$ and control the resulting imbalance $I_{\gamma^{(w)}}(f_n^{(w)})$. To do this, we identify a set \mathcal{F}_n containing our regression error $f_n^{(w)}$ with high probability, and then simply pick γ to minimize a bound on the worst-case risk $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\tau} - \tau)^2$ for $f^{(w)} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. In other words, our approach uses optimization tools to directly pick weights γ with the desired properties, rather than by indirectly getting them from a plug-in propensity model. A similar desideratum is emphasized in a series of recent papers that advocate fitting propensity models via moment-based methods on the inverse-propensity scale (Graham et al., 2012; Hainmueller, 2012; Imai and Ratkovic, 2014; Kallus, 2016; Zubizarreta, 2015); we will further discuss connections to this literature in the related works section.

Finally, in order to use our method, a practitioner needs to make concrete choice for \mathcal{F}_n , which may at first appear like a daunting task. However, throughout this paper, we will exhibit several situations where practical choices of \mathcal{F}_n are available, and where choosing $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ by optimizing (10) yields efficient estimators even if we don't get \mathcal{F}_n quite right (e.g., if we make the set too big or too small by a constant factor). Our numerical experiments also reflect this phenomenon, as our WUB estimator performs favorably relative to other methods in a wide variety of settings.

1.1 A Motivating Result

To give a flavor for the kind of behaviors we can obtain via this approach, we start by stating a result for a simple instantiation of our method. A notable feature of our method is that since we never explicitly estimate treatment propensities, we might expect it to work well even if the population propensity function $e(x)$ is irregular—and our analysis will in fact confirm this intuition. To do so, we first list three assumptions that will underlie all results in this paper, and establish some notation.

Assumption 1 (Unconfoundedness). The treatment assignment is conditionally independent of potential outcomes given X_i , i.e., $\{Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)}\} \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i$.

Assumption 2 (Overlap). The treatment propensities $e(X)$ are bounded away from 0 and 1, in the sense that $e(X) \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$ almost surely for some $\eta \in (0, 1/4]$.³

Assumption 3 (Bounded Conditional Moments). The intrinsic errors $\varepsilon_i^{(w)} = Y_i^{(w)} - \mathbb{E}[Y_i^{(w)} \mid X_i]$ satisfy the moment condition $\mathbb{E}[|\varepsilon_i^{(w)}|^{2(1+\delta)} \mid X_i] < \infty$ almost surely for some $\delta > 0$.

Rademacher complexity. To characterize the complexity of the class of regression error functions \mathcal{F}_n over which we seek minimax performance, we follow standard practice (e.g., Bartlett and Mendelson, 2002) and use the *Rademacher complexity*

$$R_n(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i f(X_i) \right\| \right], \quad \sigma_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \begin{cases} +1 & \text{with prob. } 0.5, \\ -1 & \text{with prob. } 0.5. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

In other words, the Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{F} measures how well we can overfit to random coin flips using elements $f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{F}$.

³The assumption $\eta \leq 1/4$ has no intrinsic importance, but simplifies some constants appearing later.

Notation. For any absolutely convex set \mathcal{F} , let the *gauge norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ be $\|f\|_{\mathcal{F}} := \inf\{s : f \in s\mathcal{F}\}$, where $s\mathcal{F}$ denotes a scaling-up of \mathcal{F} by a factor s . We say that \mathcal{F} is *gauge-closed* if it is a closed set in the normed vector space $(\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}})$, where $\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\} := \cup_{s \geq 0} s\mathcal{F}$. We say that a sequence of sets $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is *dense* in the space $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ of continuous functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ vanishing at infinity if, for any function $f \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$, there exists a sequence $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $f_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ such that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |f(x) - f_n(x)| \rightarrow 0$; a set \mathcal{F} has a *dense span* if there exists such a sequence with $f_n \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}$ for all n . A set of functions \mathcal{F} is *pointwise separable* if it has a countable subset $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists a sequence $f_m \in \mathcal{F}_0$ such that $f_m \rightarrow f$ pointwise on \mathcal{X} and in mean square under P (see, e.g., [Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#), section 2.3.3). We write $X_n = \mathcal{O}_P(Y_n)$ if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all n , $\mathbb{P}[X_n \geq C_{\epsilon} Y_n] \leq \epsilon$ and $X_n = o_P(Y_n)$ if $X_n/Y_n \rightarrow_p 0$; for deterministic sequences we will write $x_n \lesssim y_n$ and $x_n \ll y_n$ to indicate the same relationships. Finally, we write $\mathcal{F}_{\rho} := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{E} f(X)^2 \leq \rho^2\}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho} := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)^2 \leq \rho^2\}$.

To make our estimated weights less sensitive to noise, we constrain them to the range $[0, u]$ for some upper bound u . This bound acts as a regularizer, taking it small aids in this. However, it is critical to choose u large enough that there are good balancing weights in the range $[0, u]$. Much of our argument in the remainder is predicated on the inverse propensity weights being a candidate in our optimization problem, which calls for the condition $u \geq \eta^{-1}$. In order to ensure that this condition is satisfied, at least in large samples, we typically let u grow with sample size n . In order to ensure that our bound u_n regularizes effectively, we control the rate at which it grows with n .

Theorem 1. *Let Assumptions 1–3 hold and \mathcal{F} be a symmetric, convex, gauge-closed, pointwise separable set with a dense span, that is totally bounded in $L_2(P)$, with $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$ and $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho}) = 0$. Suppose, moreover, that we have access to outcome estimators satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{m}_n^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} &= \mathcal{O}_P(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X_i) - m^{(w)}\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n) \quad \text{where} \\ \|f\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} &:= \frac{1}{|\{i : W_i = w\}|} \sum_{i:W_i=w} f(X_i)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad n^{-1/4} \leq \rho_n \ll 1 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then an estimator $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ of the form (7) is efficient, i.e., satisfies (5), if it uses the weights

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}^{(w)} &= \underset{0 \leq \gamma_i \leq u_n}{\text{argmin}} \ell^{(w)}(\gamma), \quad \ell^{(w)}(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \gamma_i^2 + I_{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho_n}^{(w)}}(\gamma)^2 \quad \text{for } u_n \text{ satisfying} \\ \eta^{-1} &< \liminf_n u_n, \quad u_n \ll \min\left\{(\sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n))^{-1}, n^{\frac{\delta}{2+2\delta}}, n^{1/6}, \rho_n^{-1/2}\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Moreover, the weights $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}$ converge to the population inverse propensities $1/e(X_i)$ or $1/(1 - e(X_i))$ under the $L_2(P_n)$ norm, and

$$\hat{V} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 (Y_i - \hat{m}^{(W_i)}(X_i))^2 \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\text{Var}[Y^{(1)} | X = x]}{e(X)} + \frac{\text{Var}[Y^{(0)} | X = x]}{1 - e(X)} \right] \quad (15)$$

is a consistent variance estimator.

The unusual feature of this result is that it provides an efficient treatment effect estimator without any assumptions on the treatment propensities beyond overlap. At a high level, the phenomenon driving our result is that, because $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ minimizes ℓ , we have

$$\ell^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) \leq \ell^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)}), \quad \text{where } \gamma_i^{*(w)} = \begin{cases} 1/(1 - e(X_i)) & \text{if } w = 0, \\ 1/e(X_i) & \text{if } w = 1, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

are the true population inverse propensity weights. The core of our argument follows from a rearrangement of this condition,

$$\left(\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)})\right)^2 \leq \left(\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)})\right)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \left(\gamma_i^{*2} - \hat{\gamma}_i^2\right). \quad (17)$$

Because $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ converge to the population inverse propensities, the latter term converges to zero, and it follows that the weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ uniformly balance the set \mathcal{F}_n asymptotically no worse than the population inverse propensities $\gamma^{*(w)}$.

In other words, our argument builds on the fact that although the weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ may not correct for every square-integrable function as the inverse-propensity weights do, they succeed at controlling the maximal imbalance for functions in the class \mathcal{F}_n of plausible regression errors just as well as $\gamma^{*(w)}$. This task of balancing \mathcal{F}_n can be much easier than accurately fitting the true propensity function, enabling efficient estimation of $\bar{\tau}$ in circumstances in which the propensity score cannot be estimated at any reasonable rate. For example, if true propensity function $e(x)$ is very rough but all elements of \mathcal{F}_n are very smooth, then it is acceptable to use weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ that correspond to over-smoothed estimates of $1/e(x)$ without incurring much bias.

The convergence of our uniform balancing weights to the population inverse propensities, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \rightarrow_p 0$, is a universal consistency phenomenon in line with results of [Lugosi and Zeger \(1995\)](#), [Stone \(1977\)](#), etc., who showed that there exist methods (such as k -nearest neighbors regression) that can consistently estimate any conditional mean surface in $L_2(P)$, but without a guarantee on the rate of convergence. Intuitively, the reason this universal consistency phenomenon occurs is that the population inverse propensities are the unique weights that balance all square-integrable functions, so the requirement that $I_f^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) \approx 0$ for all f in a function class \mathcal{F}_n with an $L_2(P)$ -dense span effectively demands convergence to them. Without stronger assumptions, we cannot prove any rate for the convergence of $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ to the population inverse-propensity weights. However, for the asymptotics of our estimator this does not matter; our optimization criterion (14) does virtually all of the work.

Although the Rademacher complexity assumption in [Theorem 1](#) is non-standard, in many problems of interest we can directly compare the performance of AIPW and WUB estimators and find interesting complementary behaviors. Recall that standard efficiency results for AIPW require that we have access to estimators $\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}_n(\cdot)$ satisfying the following risk bounds ([Hernan and Robins, 2017](#)):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X) - m^{(w)}(X) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} &= o(1), \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{e}_n(X) - e(X) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = o(1), \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X) - m^{(w)}(X) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{e}_n(X) - e(X) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} &= o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for $w = 0, 1$. In other words, $\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}_n(\cdot)$ need to be reasonably accurate, but AIPW can famously trade off performance of one of the two nuisance component estimators against

that of the other. Meanwhile, in several examples, the conditions of Theorem 1 hold with any subpolynomial sequence u_n exactly when $o(n^{-1/4})$ -consistent estimation of $m^{(w)}(\cdot)$ is possible under L_2 -error, i.e., there exists an estimator $\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(\cdot)$ for which

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(X) - m^{(w)}(X) \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = o \left(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}} \right). \quad (19)$$

For example, if $m^{(w)}(\cdot)$ is assumed to lie in a Hölder space of s_m -times differentiable functions over a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d , then the conditions of Theorem 1 and (19) both hold if and only if $s_m > d/2$.

The intriguing consequence of this comparison is that it suggests a sharp and simple characterization of when our method outperforms AIPW and vice-versa. If $\frac{1}{4}$ -th root consistent estimation of the outcome model as in (19) is possible, then WUB is preferable to AIPW, as given this condition we do not require any regularity on the propensity function $e(x)$, whereas AIPW still needs to guarantee a good enough $\hat{e}(x)$ to make (18) hold. For example, in the Hölder case where $m^{(w)}(x)$ has $s_m > d/2$ derivatives, the conditions of Theorem 1 are already satisfied, whereas AIPW still needs the propensity function $e(x)$ to also have $s_e > d/2$ derivatives. Conversely, if $\frac{1}{4}$ -th root consistent estimation is not possible, then WUB is no longer efficient, whereas AIPW may still be efficient if the propensity estimator $\hat{e}(x)$ that is accurate enough to make (18) hold.

1.2 Related Work

The problem of how best to estimate average treatment effects in observational studies, as formalized by Rubin (1974), has received considerable attention across several fields, and has motivated the study of methods ranging from semiparametric estimation techniques that aim for asymptotic efficiency (Chan et al., 2015; Hahn, 1998; Heckman et al., 1998; Hirano et al., 2003; Kang and Schafer, 2007; Newey, 1994; Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995; Robins et al., 1995; Scharfstein et al., 1999; Tan, 2010; Van der Laan and Robins, 2003; van der Laan and Rubin, 2006) to matching-based ideas that often pair unbiasedness with conceptual and algorithmic transparency (Abadie and Imbens, 2006; Dehejia and Wahba, 1999; Rosenbaum, 2002; Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Stuart, 2010; Zubizarreta, 2012).

For a while, the first class of methods was sometimes regarded with suspicion among applied statisticians and there was a perception that, despite lacking strong asymptotic guarantees, other simpler approaches may work better in practice (Kang and Schafer, 2007). In recent years, however, there has been a surge of interest in semiparametrically efficient average treatment effect estimators that leverage ideas from the machine learning literature for improved finite sample performance (Belloni et al., 2017; Chernozhukov et al., 2017; Farrell, 2015; van der Laan and Rose, 2011). As a promising sign for this line of work, a recent comparison on numerous different treatment effect estimators performed by Dorie et al. (2017) in conjunction with the 2016 Atlantic Causal Inference Conference found targeted maximum likelihood estimation (TMLE) (van der Laan and Rose, 2011) combined with Bayesian additive regression trees (BART) (Chipman, George, and McCulloch, 2010) to perform extremely well. From an applied perspective, our paper fits into this trend of seeking efficient treatment effect estimators with better practical performance. However, unlike them, we do not seek to improve the quality of the nuisance parameter estimates used in conjunction with AIPW or related methods, and instead provide an alternative approach to constructing efficient estimators.

Conceptually, our approach draws from literature on average treatment effect estimation via balancing weights (Athey et al., 2016; Chan et al., 2015; Graham et al., 2012, 2016; Hainmueller, 2012; Hirano et al., 2001, 2003; Imai and Ratkovic, 2014; Kallus, 2016; Wang and Zubizarreta, 2017; Zhao, 2016; Zubizarreta, 2015). In one strand of this literature, Chan, Yam, and Zhang (2015), Graham, Pinto, and Egel (2012, 2016), Hainmueller (2012) and Imai and Ratkovic (2014) estimate weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ by fitting the corresponding treatment propensities subject to sharp balancing constraints of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i^{(1)} W_i X_i = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, etc., and show that series-based extensions of these methods can achieve semiparametric efficiency. Meanwhile, Athey, Imbens, and Wager (2016), Kallus (2016) and Zubizarreta (2015) use convex programming to directly optimize error bounds for average treatment effect estimation with high-dimensional linear controls. In terms of this literature, our paper most is closely related to Zubizarreta (2015) in that we seek to use weights $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}(x)$ that approximately balance a class of functions of interest, Athey, Imbens, and Wager (2016) in that we combine such weights with a regularized outcome regression to attain \sqrt{n} -consistency and asymptotic normality,⁴ Kallus (2016) in that we seek balance over a non-parametric class of functions, and Chan et al. (2015) and Wang and Zubizarreta (2017) in that we seek to establish semiparametric efficiency.

The major point of departure between our paper and this line of work is that while some existing papers have shown that methods based on balancing can be efficient under regularity conditions, the conditions assumed by these papers so strong that they do not provide much formal reason to prefer balancing methods over AIPW. These papers all consider the Hölder case of s -times differentiable functions in \mathbb{R}^d , and so this problem provides a natural context for comparing results. In a classic paper, Hirano, Imbens, and Ridder (2003) showed that inverse-propensity weighting with estimated weights is asymptotically preferable to inverse-propensity weighting with the population propensities because estimated propensities have balancing properties; to do so, they assumed the propensity model to be $s_e \geq 7d$ times differentiable and the outcome model to be $s_m \geq 1$ times differentiable. More recently, Chan, Yam, and Zhang (2015) derived efficiency of exact balancing on a sieve assuming $s_e \geq 13d$ and $s_m \geq 3d/2$. In contrast, recall that AIPW only needs $s_e/(2s_e + d) + s_m/(2s_m + d) > 1/2$, and we simply ask for $s_m > d/2$. Thus, although these previous papers were of considerable interest in providing conceptual motivation for balancing approaches, ours is the first to establish concrete asymptotic advantages to using them relative to AIPW.⁵

Finally, in groundbreaking work, Robins et al. (2008, 2017) proposed a completely different way of improving AIPW estimators than what we have discussed here. Instead of focusing on balance, these authors consider higher-order influence function (HOIF) estima-

⁴More specifically, Athey et al. (2016) study estimators of the type (7) in high-dimensional linear settings, under an assumption that the true conditional mean functions are of the form $m^{(w)}(x) = \beta^{(w)} \cdot x$ for sparse vectors $\beta^{(w)}$. They pair L_1 -consistent regression adjustments (i.e., estimators $\hat{\beta}^{(w)}$ for which $\|\hat{\beta}^{(w)} - \beta^{(w)}\|_1$ gets small) with weights $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}$ that balance the feature vectors X_i under the infinity norm (i.e., that make $\|\sum_i (1 - \hat{\gamma}_i^{(1)}) W_i X_i\|_\infty$, etc., small). At a heuristic level, we can view the work of Athey et al. (2016) as a special case of the present analysis where \mathcal{F}_n is the unit $\|\cdot\|_1$ ball in \mathbb{R}^{pn} ; see also Javanmard and Montanari (2014, 2015) and Zhu and Bradic (2016).

⁵Another reason sometimes advanced in favor of pure balancing methods that do not use a regression adjustment (e.g., as in Chan et al. (2015), Graham et al. (2012, 2016), Hainmueller (2012), Hirano et al. (2003), Imai and Ratkovic (2014), Zubizarreta (2015), etc.) is that they fit within paradigm of design-based inference, which Rubin (2008) argued leads to more credible conclusions in applications.

tors of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{HOIF,k} &= \hat{\psi}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\psi}_1(X_i, Y_i, W_i) + \dots \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n} \hat{\psi}_k(X_{i_1}, Y_{i_1}, W_{i_1}; \dots; X_{i_k}, Y_{i_k}, W_{i_k}), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the $\hat{\psi}_k(\cdot)$ are specific pre-computed functionals of the data. In this context, the AIPW estimator is nothing but the first estimator in the above sequence of estimators, i.e., $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW} = \hat{\tau}_{HOIF,1}$, with $\hat{\psi}_1(X_i, Y_i, W_i) = \hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i) + W_i(Y_i - \hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i))/\hat{e}(X_i) - \dots$ as specified in (3). The main advantage of HOIF estimators is that they are efficient under strictly more general conditions than AIPW; for example, under the assumption that both $e(x)$ and $\mu_{(w)}(x)$ belong to Hölder smoothness classes, HOIF estimators with order k diverging at an appropriate rate are efficient essentially whenever \sqrt{n} -consistent estimation of $\bar{\tau}$ is possible.

The main downside of HOIF estimators is that they appear to be fairly delicate to implement, and ideas based on HOIF have yet to prove themselves in applications; the main difficulty is that the required higher-order functionals $\hat{\psi}_k(\cdot)$ are substantially more complicated than the first order functionals $\hat{\psi}_1(\cdot)$ used for AIPW. Robins et al. (2008, 2017) do not report any numerical results, whether on real or simulated data. In a recent advance, Mukherjee, Newey, and Robins (2017) proposed a HOIF estimator based on empirical moments alone in the case where efficient estimation of $\bar{\tau}$ is possible. In general, however, this promising idea requires estimating influence functions of a diverging order (roughly, $k = \log(n)$ in (20)), which is still a methodologically and computationally experimental proposition (at the time of writing, their preprint also did not report on any numerical results). In contrast, in Section 3, we discuss a practical implementation of our method that appears to be a serious competitor to state-of-the-art methods over a wide range of problem types. As both approaches based on HOIF and WUB are new and very different, we believe there to be considerable potential in studying both approaches and seeing whether they can build on each other.

2 Weighting for Uniform Balance

We aim to estimate average treatment effects using n independent and identically distributed samples $(X_i, Y_i, W_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ where \mathcal{X} is a Locally Compact Hausdorff (LCH) space and the marginal law μ_X on X_i is regular, and assume that the outcomes Y_i are generated via potential outcomes $\{Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)}\}$ such that $Y_i = Y_i^{(W_i)}$. The distribution of our observations is described by the conditional response functions $m^{(w)}(x)$ and $e(x)$ as defined in (4), as well as the conditional variance function

$$V^{(w)}(x) := \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\varepsilon_i^{(w)} \right)^2 \mid X_i = x \right], \quad \varepsilon_i^{(w)} = Y_i^{(w)} - m_i^{(w)}, \quad (21)$$

for $w \in \{0, 1\}$. Our main target of inference is the conditional average treatment effect

$$\bar{\tau} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(m^{(1)}(X_i) - m^{(0)}(X_i) \right), \quad (22)$$

although our method can also be used to estimate the average treatment effect $\tau = \mathbb{E}[\bar{\tau}]$. Throughout our analysis, we will make Assumptions 1–3.

As discussed in Section 1.1, our method relies on balancing out a class \mathcal{F}_n of functions known to contain the unobservable regression error $f_n^{(w)}(x) := \hat{m}_n^{(w)}(x) - m^{(w)}(x)$ with high probability. Thus, in order to state a general result, it is helpful to have a formal understanding of which regression adjustments $\hat{m}_n^{(w)}(x)$ have the property that their regression errors can be efficiently balanced out using such a method. To this end, we use the notion of \mathcal{D} -consistency as follows.

Definition 1. \hat{m} is a \mathcal{D} -consistent estimator of m if there exists a sequence of symmetric, convex, gauge-closed sets \mathcal{F}_n with the following three properties:

$$\|\hat{m} - m\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} = \mathcal{O}_P(1), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_n) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \mathbb{E}[f^2(X)] = 0. \quad (23)$$

In the interest of generality, we allow the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ to be defined in terms of a potentially random sequence of sets $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ depending on $\{X_i, W_i\}_{i=1}^n$ that are *asymptotically equivalent* to the set \mathcal{F}_n used to define \mathcal{D} -consistency above in the following sense.

Definition 2. The sequences of sets \mathcal{F}_n and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ are asymptotically equivalent if

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left[s^{-1}\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n \subseteq s\mathcal{F}_n\right] = 1 \quad \text{for some finite } s \geq 1. \quad (24)$$

Given this setup, we construct our WUB estimator as follows.

$$\hat{\tau} := \hat{\mu}^{(1)} - \hat{\mu}^{(0)} \quad \text{where} \quad (25)$$

$$\hat{\mu}^{(w)} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}^{(w)}(X_i) + \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i \left(Y_i - \hat{m}^{(w)}(X_i)\right) \quad (26)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(w)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{0 \leq \gamma_i \leq u_n} \ell(\gamma), \quad \ell(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\{i:W_i=w\}} \gamma_i^2 + I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma)^2, \quad (27)$$

As a result of the constraint $\gamma_i \in [0, u_n]$, we will often be working with values and functions clipped into this range. We use the following notation:

$$[x]_u = 0 \text{ if } x \leq 0, \quad [x]_u = x \text{ if } 0 \leq x \leq u, \quad [x]_u = u \text{ if } u \leq x. \quad (28)$$

When u is clear from context, we will write $[x]$ with the same meaning.

Theorem 2. If $\hat{m}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}$ are \mathcal{D} -consistent (Definition 1) with associated sequence \mathcal{F}_n that is pointwise separable and satisfies $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \|f\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \rho_n$ for $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, the sequence $(r_n \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is increasing ($r_n \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq r_{n+1} \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$) and dense in $C_0(\mathcal{X})$ for some sequence $r_n \ll \sqrt{n}$; the sequences of sets \mathcal{F}_n and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ are asymptotically equivalent (Definition 2); the sets \mathcal{F}_n and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ are totally bounded in $L_2(P)$ for all n ; and the sequence u_n satisfies

$$\eta^{-1} < \liminf_n u_n, \quad u_n \ll \min\left\{(\sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_n))^{-1}, n^{\frac{\delta}{2+2\delta}}, \rho_n^{-1}, \rho_n \sqrt{n}\right\}$$

then

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \bar{\tau}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\operatorname{Var}[Y^{(1)} | X = x]}{e(X)} + \frac{\operatorname{Var}[Y^{(0)} | X = x]}{1 - e(X)}\right]\right). \quad (29)$$

Moreover, the weights $\hat{\gamma}$ converge to the population inverse propensity weights γ^* in the $L_2(P_n)$ norm, i.e., $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \rightarrow_p 0$.

In order to use the result of Theorem 2 to construct asymptotically valid confidence intervals for $\bar{\tau}$, we need to estimate the variance. Under additional assumptions on the weight bound u_n , the plug-in variance estimator is consistent.

Theorem 3. *If the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied and $u_n \ll \rho_n^{-1/2}$, $u_n \lesssim n^{1/6}$,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 (Y_i - \hat{m}^{(W_i)}(X_i))^2 \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\text{Var} [Y^{(1)} | X = x]}{e(X)} + \frac{\text{Var} [Y^{(0)} | X = x]}{1 - e(X)} \right].$$

2.1 Examples

Before presenting a sketch of the proof of Theorem 2, we review some cases of practical interest where the Assumptions of Theorem 1 or Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 hold. The goal of these examples is not to be exhaustive, but rather to verify that our theory enables us to work in a variety of settings that have been the focus of previous research. Our claims about each example are proven in Appendix B.

Example 1 (Penalized Least Squares on Classes Satisfying an Entropy Condition). If \mathcal{F} is symmetric, convex, gauge-closed, pointwise separable, and totally bounded in $L_2(P)$, with $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\text{span} \{\mathcal{F}\}$ dense in $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ with empirical metric entropy satisfying $\mathcal{H}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(P_n)) \lesssim \epsilon^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $\|m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$, $\varepsilon_i^{(w)}$ is subgaussian, and we use the estimator

$$\hat{m}^{(w)} := \underset{m \in \text{span } \mathcal{F}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{|\{i : W_i = w\}|} \sum_{i: W_i = w} (Y_i - m(X_i))^2 + \rho_n^2 \|m\|_{\mathcal{F}}^\nu \quad (30)$$

$$\text{with any } \rho_n, \nu \text{ satisfying } n^{-1/4} \leq \rho_n \ll 1, \quad \nu \geq \frac{2\alpha}{2 + \alpha},$$

the assumptions of Theorem 1 are satisfied when

$$\eta^{-1} \leq \liminf_n u_n, \quad u_n \ll \min \left\{ n^{1/6}, n^{\frac{\delta}{2+2\delta}}, n^{\frac{2-\alpha}{4+2\alpha}}, \rho_n^{-1/2}, \rho_n^{\alpha/2-1} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

With this example, we aimed to show the applicability of our approach in a wide variety of function classes. Our next two examples will focus on a specific function class, a ball in the Hölder space $C^s(\mathcal{X})$ of $\lfloor s \rfloor$ -times differentiable functions with $(s - \lfloor s \rfloor)$ -Hölder continuous $\lfloor s \rfloor$ th partials with norm

$$\|f\|_{C^k} := \sum_{0 \leq \|\beta\|_1 \leq \lfloor s \rfloor} \|D^\beta f\|_\infty + \sum_{\|\beta\|_1 = \lfloor s \rfloor} \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|D^\beta f(x) - D^\beta f(y)|}{|x - y|^{s - \lfloor s \rfloor}}.$$

Here $\lfloor s \rfloor$ is the largest integer no greater than s and we use multi-index notation: β is a vector with nonnegative integer coefficients and

$$D^\beta f := \frac{\partial^{\|\beta\|_1} f}{\partial x_1^{\beta_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\beta_d}}.$$

We will restrict our attention to the case that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded and $s > d/2$. The penalized least squares approach works in this setting, but we will show in addition that if $m^{(w)} \in C^s(\mathcal{X})$ with $\lfloor s \rfloor > d/2$, we can use *any* sufficiently smooth estimator $\hat{m}^{(w)}$ that is consistent in $\|\cdot\|_\infty$.

Example 2 ($C^s(\mathcal{X})$ for $s > d/2$: Penalized Least Squares). If $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded, $\|m^{(w)}\|_{C^s(\mathcal{X})} < \infty$ for $s > d/2$, and $\varepsilon_i^{(w)}$ is subgaussian, this is an instance of Example 1 with \mathcal{F} the unit ball in $C^s(\mathcal{X})$ and $\alpha = d/s$.

Example 3 ($C^s(\mathcal{X})$ for $\lfloor s \rfloor > d/2$: $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -consistent estimators). If $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded, $m^{(w)}, \hat{m}^{(w)} \in C^s(\mathcal{X})$ with $\lfloor s \rfloor > d/2$, and $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n)$ with $n^{-1/2} \ll \rho_n \ll 1$, the assumptions of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 are satisfied with $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \mathcal{F}_n = \{f : \|f\|_{C^{\lfloor s \rfloor}} \leq 1, \|f\|_\infty \leq \rho_n\}$ and u_n satisfying (31) with $\alpha = d/\lfloor s \rfloor$ and $u_n \ll \rho_n \sqrt{n}$.

In our final example, we define our set \mathcal{F} in terms of an normalized countable dictionary of functions, $\Psi := \{\psi_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \mathbb{E} \psi_j(X)^2 < \infty$. For any sequence $\beta := \{\beta_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$, we define the function $\langle \psi, \beta \rangle$ pointwise by $\langle \psi, \beta \rangle(x) := \sum_{j=1}^\infty \beta_j \psi_j(x)$. If this series converges for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we say the function $\langle \psi, \beta \rangle$ is *defined pointwise*. We define the symmetric convex hull \mathcal{B}_Ψ of Ψ as follows.

$$\mathcal{B}_\Psi := \left\{ \langle \psi, \beta \rangle : \sum_{j=1}^\infty |\beta_j| \leq 1 \text{ and } \langle \psi, \beta \rangle \text{ is defined pointwise} \right\} \quad (32)$$

Classes of this type are Donsker, which implies $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_\rho) = 0$, the primary assumption on \mathcal{F} in Theorem 1 (Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Section 2.13.2), (Ledoux and Talagrand, 2013, Theorem 14.6).

Example 4 (Symmetric Convex Hulls of Countable Dictionaries). If \mathcal{B}_Ψ is a class of type (32) with $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|\psi_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\text{span}\{\psi_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ dense in $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$, $\|m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Psi} < \infty$, $\varepsilon_i^{(w)}$ is bounded, and we use the estimator

$$\hat{m}^{(w)} = \underset{m \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{B}_\Psi\}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{|\{i : W_i = w\}|} \sum_{i: W_i = w} (Y_i - m(X_i))^2 + \rho_n^2 \|m\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Psi} \quad (33)$$

with any ρ_n satisfying $R_n(\mathcal{B}_\Psi) \ll \rho_n^2 \ll 1$

then the assumptions of Theorem 1 are satisfied with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}_\Psi$ and constant $u_n = u > \eta^{-1}$.

In this example, both $\hat{m}^{(w)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ can be computed efficiently for a finite approximation $\Psi_p := \{\psi_j : j \in 1 \dots p\}$ of our dictionary Ψ . The optimization problem (33) we solve to compute $\hat{m}^{(w)}$ is the p -dimensional lasso and the optimization problem (27) we solve to compute the weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ is a Second Order Cone Program and can be solved using off-the-shelf software. See Appendix B.5 for details.

2.2 Proof Outline

2.2.1 Universal Consistency of Weights

Although the distribution of the weights $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ played a fairly minor role in motivating our estimator, our analysis starts by establishing convergence of these weights to the true inverse propensity weights $\gamma^{*(w)}$ in mean square error, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \rightarrow_p 0. \quad (34)$$

To do this, we study the optimization problem (27); for simplicity, we here discuss the setting where the sets \mathcal{F}_n that we want to balance are known and take $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \mathcal{F}_n$.

Using Lagrange duality, we show that we can characterize $\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)}$ as $[\hat{g}(X_i)]_{u_n}$, where \hat{g} minimizes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_n(g) &= \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{F}_n}^2}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1(\{W_i = w\}) [g(X_i)]_{u_n}^2 - 2g(X_i)) \\ &\quad + \frac{2u_n}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \max\{g(X_i) - u_n, 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

We can interpret this objective function as a noisy estimate of mean-squared error on the inverse-propensity scale. For example, in the case $W_i = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_n(g) &= \mathbb{E} \left[W ([g(X)]_{u_n} - e^{-1}(X))^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_g(W_i, X_i) - \mathbb{E} h_g(W_i, X_i)) + \psi(g) - \mathbb{E} e^{-1}(X), \quad \text{with} \\ h_g(W_i, X_i) &= 2W_i u_n \max\{g(X) - u_n, 0\} + W_i [g(X)]_{u_n}^2 - 2g(X), \quad \text{and} \\ \psi(g) &= \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{F}_n}^2}{n} + 2\mathbb{E} [(u_n e(X) - 1) \max\{g(X) - u_n, 0\}] - 2\mathbb{E} [\min\{g(X), 0\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

In other words, the function $\mathbb{M}_n(g)$ we minimize is the mean-squared error for estimating $\gamma^{*(w)}$, perturbed by mean-zero noise dependent on g , and controlled by the regularizer ψ .

While the noise in this problem has more complex structure than what we encounter in least squares regression problems, we are able to use techniques for showing universal consistency of M-estimators like those used in [Lugosi and Zeger \(1995\)](#), [Stone \(1977\)](#), etc., to establish our consistency result (34).

2.2.2 Bounding Bias

Given the consistency result (34), we are now ready to characterize the behavior of our estimator itself at the \sqrt{n} scale. It is helpful to split the error of our estimator $\hat{\tau}$ into two components: A conditional bias component due to errors in the regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$, and a pure variance component due to the irreducible noise $\varepsilon_i^{(w)} = Y_i - m^{(W_i)}(X_i)$:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \bar{\tau}) = \left(\sqrt{n} I_{f_n^{(0)}}^{(0)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(0)}) + \sqrt{n} I_{f_n^{(1)}}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(1)}) \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(W_i)} \quad (37)$$

where, as usual, $f_n^{(w)} := \hat{m}_n^{(w)} - m^{(w)}$. We now show that the conditional bias component is asymptotically negligible. To do so, first recall that with our definition of scaled sets, $I_{\alpha\mathcal{F}}(\gamma) = \alpha I_{\mathcal{F}}(\gamma)$, so

$$\sqrt{n} I_{f_n^{(w)}}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) \leq \sqrt{n} \inf \left\{ I_{\alpha\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) : \alpha \geq \|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \right\} = \|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n} I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}), \quad (38)$$

and that under the conditions of Theorem 2 $\|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$. Thus, in order to establish asymptotic unbiasedness at the \sqrt{n} -scale, it suffices to verify that $\sqrt{n} I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) = o_P(1)$.

The optimality condition (17) satisfied by our weights $\hat{\gamma}$ directly implies that

$$\left(\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)})\right)^2 \leq \left(\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)})\right)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \left(\gamma_i^{*2} - \hat{\gamma}_i^2\right). \quad (39)$$

Now, the \sqrt{n} -scaled imbalance at the population inverse propensity weights, $\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)})$, is the supremum of a \sqrt{n} -scaled centered empirical process, i.e.,

$$\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)}) = \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{1(\{W_i = w\})}{\mathbb{P}[W_i = w | X_i]}\right) f(X_i) : f \in \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \quad (40)$$

By a well-known symmetrization argument (e.g., [Giné and Nickl, 2015](#), Theorem 3.1.21), the absolute mean of this supremum has a simple upper bound in terms of the Rademacher complexity of the class of inverse-propensity weighted elements of \mathcal{F}_n . Given overlap (Assumption 2), this bound is on the same order as $\sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)$, which goes to zero by assumption. Finally, thanks to consistency of the weights (34) and overlap, the second term on the right-hand side of (39) is also $o_P(1)$, and we have asymptotic unbiasedness.

This argument built around (40) is a refinement of the core argument of [Athey et al. \(2016\)](#), enabled by our consistency result for $\hat{\gamma}$. [Athey et al. \(2016\)](#) choose weights solving same optimization problem (27), but characterize the behavior of their weights in terms of a simpler variant of (39)

$$\left(\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)})\right)^2 \leq \left(\sqrt{n}I_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)})\right)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \gamma_i^{*2} \quad (41)$$

Because the second term in this bound is of constant order, this implies the same of the maximal imbalance. To show that the conditional bias is nonetheless asymptotically negligible, [Athey et al. \(2016\)](#) show that in the high-dimensional setting they consider, their outcome estimator f_n is consistent in the gauge norm, i.e., $\|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \rightarrow_p 0$. While this argument can, for certain outcome estimators $\hat{m}^{(w)}$, be used to establish asymptotic unbiasedness and \sqrt{n} -consistency of $\hat{\tau}$ in the nonparametric setting we consider in this paper, it has notable limitations. In particular, in order to obtain efficiency when the noise $\varepsilon_i^{(w)}$ is heteroskedastic, the sharper results derived here are imperative.

2.2.3 Efficiency and Gaussianity

In the preceding section, we've shown that $\hat{\gamma}_i$ is a consistent estimator of the true inverse-propensity weights, and that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \bar{\tau}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - W_i)\hat{\gamma}_i\varepsilon_i^{(0)} + W_i\hat{\gamma}_i\varepsilon_i^{(1)} + o_P(1). \quad (42)$$

This strongly suggests that $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \bar{\tau})$ should have a Gaussian limit. Because $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i^{(w)} | (X_i, W_i)_{i \leq n}] = 0$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ is a function of $(X_i, W_i)_{i \leq n}$, this term is a mean-zero martingale array with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{H}_{n,j} = \sigma((X_i, Z_i)_{i \leq n}, (Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)})_{i \leq j})$. We have a central limit theorem if the weights are uniform enough that a conditional Lindeberg condition is satisfied and weakly dependent enough that the conditional variance sequence $V_n(\hat{\gamma})$ converges, where

$$V_n(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - W_i)\gamma_i^2 V^{(0)}(X_i) + W_i\gamma_i^2 V^{(1)}(X_i). \quad (43)$$

In the proof of Theorem 2, we verify these conditions and, moreover, verify that the limit of V_n matches the rate given in (29). Moreover, the consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$ for the population inverse propensity weights implies convergence of $V_n(\hat{\gamma})$ to the oracle variance, i.e., $V_n(\hat{\gamma}) \rightarrow_p V_n(\gamma^*)$, establishing semiparametric efficiency.

3 Experiments

3.1 Methods Under Comparison

Here, we compare our proposal, weighting for uniform balance, to AIPW with cross-fitting as advocated by Chernozhukov et al. (2017), as well as the two best performing methods at the 2016 Atlantic Causal Inference Competition (Dorie et al., 2017): targeted learning (van der Laan and Rose, 2011; van der Laan and Rubin, 2006), and a pure black-box method based on BART, i.e., Bayesian additive regression trees (Chipman et al., 2010; Hill, 2011). We review the implementation of all these methods in detail below.

3.1.1 Augmented Inverse-Propensity Weighting

Our first baseline is AIPW (3), with components $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ estimated via a cross-validated lasso and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ estimated via a cross-validated logistic lasso (Tibshirani, 1996). Following Imai and Ratkovic (2013), we run the lasso for the two components $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ at the same time, with a parametrization that penalizes the “main effect” $(\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot) + \hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot))/2$ and the “treatment effect” $(\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot))/2$ instead of penalizing $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ directly. We ran both lassos on a large dictionary of series functions \mathcal{B}_Ψ as described in Example 4. Specifically, we used a basis sequence $\psi_j = a_j \psi'_j$, where ψ'_j are d -dimensional interactions of standardized Hermite polynomials, which are orthonormal with respect to the standard Gaussian distribution. The associated square-summable sequence (a_j) of weights varies with order k of the polynomial ψ_j ; $a_j = 1/(k\sqrt{n_{k,d}})$ where $n_{k,d}$ is the number of terms of order k . Observe that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = 1$ and therefore, for standard normal X , $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \psi_j(X)^2 = 1$.

As recommended in Chernozhukov et al. (2017), we fit all models via 10-fold cross-fitting; i.e., for 10 separate data folds, we first estimate the nuisance terms using the 9 other folds, and then make predictions on the left out fold. This type of method provides a flexible strategy for obtaining semiparametric efficiency results using potentially complicated nuisance component estimators (Schick, 1986).

Following standard practice in applications, we also stabilize the inverse propensity weights by bounding the estimated propensities away from 0 and 1. Given propensity estimates $\hat{e}_{raw}(X_i)$ obtained from lasso logistic regression, we actually plug a trimmed version $\hat{e}(X_i) = \text{trim}_T(\hat{e}_{raw}(X_i))$ into (3) with threshold $T = 0.05$ where $\text{trim}_T(e) := \max\{T, \min\{e, 1 - T\}\}$. We also considered AIPW without trimming; however, this performed substantially worse.

3.1.2 Targeted Learning

Just like the above estimator, targeted learning also starts by estimating the nuisance components $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$, $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ non-parametrically. Then, we estimate the average treatment

effect as follows: First compute the univariate regression adjustments

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\xi}^{(0)} &= \sum_{\{W_i=0\}} \left(Y_i - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i) \right) / (1 - \hat{e}(X_i)) \bigg/ \sum_{\{W_i=0\}} (1 - \hat{e}(X_i))^{-2}, \\ \hat{\xi}^{(1)} &= \sum_{\{W_i=1\}} \frac{Y_i - \hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i)}{\hat{e}(X_i)} \bigg/ \sum_{\{W_i=0\}} \hat{e}^{-2}(X_i),\end{aligned}\tag{44}$$

and then plug predictions from these regression models into the standard doubly robust estimator,

$$\hat{\tau}_{TMLE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i) + \frac{\hat{\xi}^{(1)}}{\hat{e}(X_i)} - \frac{\hat{\xi}^{(0)}}{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)} \right),\tag{45}$$

where ‘‘TMLE’’ is commonly used as an acronym for targeted maximum likelihood estimation (Scharfstein, Rotnitzky, and Robins, 1999; van der Laan and Rose, 2011; van der Laan and Rubin, 2006). Confidence intervals for $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ are obtained via robust standard errors for $\hat{\xi}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{\xi}^{(1)}$ in (44). As with AIPW, we trim the estimated propensities at level $T = 0.05$.

Gruber and van der Laan (2012) advocate pairing (45) with computationally estimators for $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$, $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ that rely on a form of stacking; here, however, due to resource constraints (and also to enable a crisper comparison of different estimation strategies), we also implement targeted learning via a cross-fit lasso as above. In our real data application, we use the R-package of `tmle` of Gruber and van der Laan (2012) out of the box.

3.1.3 Weighting for Uniform Balance

As reflected in our theory, weighting for uniform balance is motivated by the following argument: if we start with regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ that are consistent but have some noticeable bias captured by a class \mathcal{F} , then we can correct for this bias by adding a weighted average of the regression residuals with weights γ_i that approximately balance all functions in \mathcal{F} . From this perspective, we should take the class \mathcal{F} to be large enough to cover many different plausible forms of bias. In Theorem 1 and elsewhere, we constructed our set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ by intersecting the original balancing class \mathcal{F} with a small $L_2(P_n)$ ball of radius $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$. In our experiments, we take $\rho_n = n^{-1/6}$ and $u_n = \max\{1/0.05, n^{1/6}\}$.

We consider two forms of weighting for uniform balance. The first, simpler, method balances the class \mathcal{F} of functions fit by the regression exactly as described in Theorem 2. In our simulations we take $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}_\Psi$ and estimate the regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$, using the lasso with cross-fitting as described above, resulting in an estimator $\hat{\tau}_{WUB-S}$ of the form (25) (the S is for ‘‘simple’’).

In applications, however, we may worry about different types of bias that cannot parsimoniously be captured by the Hermite basis used above. Thus, we also consider balancing the following richer class $\Psi \cup \Xi$, where Ξ contains:⁶

- Basis elements obtained by depth-3 recursive dyadic partitioning (i.e., pick a feature, split along its median, and recurse),

⁶We note that some of the functions ψ_j are not normalized, and instead have an implicit scaling. Also, some functions ψ_j are random (e.g., strata of an estimated model); a theoretical analysis working with random functions classes like these could be of considerable interest, but is beyond the scope of the present manuscript.

- Multi-scale strata of the propensity estimates $\hat{e}(X_i)$ obtained via a logistic lasso (we balanced over histogram bins of length 0.05, 0.1, and 0.2).
- Strata of lasso predictions $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$,
- Strata of the treatment effect estimates $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$,
- Large leaves (> 10 observations from each class) generated by a greedy classification tree trained on the treatment assignments W_i (Breiman et al., 1984).

The different sets of functions we are balancing over in $\Psi \cup \Xi$ aim at several purposes. Balancing the original unit ball in \mathcal{B}_Ψ seeks to correct for the well-understood bias of the lasso. Moving to the additional functions Ξ , balancing over dyadic indicator functions seeks to correct for small potential jumps that are not representable by a function of small or moderate norm in our smooth function class \mathcal{B}_Ψ , while balancing over propensity strata is motivated by the result of Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) that propensity matching is consistent under unconfoundedness. The final estimator $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ is then obtained as before, i.e., using the cross-fit lasso estimate of $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_{\Psi \cup \Xi}$. We believe that enabling the practitioner to easily add more balancing constraints driven by subject matter knowledge is a major practical draw of our method.

3.1.4 Bayesian Additive Regression Trees

Finally, Hill (2011) recommends estimating average treatment effects via predictions from BART (Chipman, George, and McCulloch, 2010),

$$\hat{\tau}_{BART} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{m}_{BART}^{(1)}(X_i) - \hat{m}_{BART}^{(0)}(X_i) \right), \quad (46)$$

and this method has been found to perform well in several surveys (e.g., Dorie et al., 2017). Conceptually, this treatment effect estimator is not directly comparable to AIPW, TMLE or WUB: the three other methods seek to combine raw regression adjustments with a second-step correction to mitigate bias, whereas BART is entirely reliant on the regression adjustments $\hat{m}_{BART}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ being accurate.

As always, we train the models $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ via cross-fitting; this idea is closely related to out-of-bag prediction as recommended with random forests (Breiman, 2001). As recommended in Hill (2011), we use posterior credible intervals from the BART algorithm as confidence intervals for $\hat{\tau}_{BART}$. Unlike the confidence intervals for $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$, $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ which are justified by asymptotic theory, the confidence intervals for $\hat{\tau}_{plain}$ with BART regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ are heuristic.

3.1.5 Further Baselines

To understand the relevant merits of different regression adjustments and debiasing techniques, we also tested $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$, $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ with BART rather than lasso regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$. We kept the rest of the procedures the same, i.e., we still used the same propensity estimates for $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$, and used the same balancing weights for $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$. Because we do not understand the asymptotics of $\hat{m}_{BART}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ well, these methods are somewhat heuristic; however, they appear to perform well.

We also consider the straw-man baseline using uncorrected lasso regression adjustments, $\hat{\tau}_{plain} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i))$. Unlike with BART, the biases of the lasso are well understood, and this estimator is not recommended. We do not attempt to build confidence intervals using it.

3.2 Simulation Analysis

We start by comparing the 4 above methods on simulation designs. We proceed in two parts: First, in Section 3.2.2, we compare the formally justified lasso-based methods $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$, $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$; then in Section 3.2.3, we examine BART treatment effect estimators, and also consider the 3 other estimators with regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ obtained via BART instead of the lasso.

3.2.1 Simulation Specifications

In all our simulations, we generate data as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{d \times d}), W_i | X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(e(X_i)), \varepsilon_i | X_i, W_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ Y_i &= b(X_i) + (W_i - 0.5)\tau(X_i) + \sigma\nu(X_i)\varepsilon_i, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

for different choices of dimension d , noise level σ , noise heterogeneity $\nu(\cdot)$, propensity function $e(\cdot)$, baseline main effect $b(\cdot)$ and treatment effect function $\tau(\cdot)$. We considered the following 4 setups, each of which depends on a sparsity level k and an overlap parameter η .

1. This setting has a homogeneous treatment effect, $\tau(x) = -0.2$, but has correlation between the main effect and the propensities. First define the auxiliary parameters $\zeta_i = \sum_{j=1}^k X_{ij}/\sqrt{k}$ and $\theta_i = 2 \text{sign}(\theta_i)\theta_i^2$; then set $e(X_i) = \text{trim}_\eta(1/(1 + \exp(-2\theta_i)))$, $b(X_i) = \theta_i + 0.2(e(X_i) - 0.5)$ and $\nu(X_i) = 1$.
2. This setting has highly non-linear nuisance components. Writing $\theta_i = 2^{k-1} \prod_{j=1}^k X_{ij}$, let $b(X_i) = \text{sign}(\theta_i)\sqrt{|\theta_i|}$, $e(X_i) = 0.5 + (0.5 - \eta) \max\{-1, \min\{1, b(X_i)\}\}$, $\tau(X_i) = (X_{i1} + X_{i2})/2$ and $\nu(X_i) = 1$.
3. This setting has noise heterogeneity: $\tau(X_i) = 4 \cdot (1 - k^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^k \cos(X_{ij}\pi/2))^2$, $e(X_i) = \text{trim}_\eta(0.4 + \tau^2(X_i))$, $\nu(X_i) = e(X_i)$ and $b(X_i) = 4d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d X_{ij}$.
4. The last setting is the easiest: $\theta_i = \sum_{j=1}^k X_{ij}/\sqrt{k}$, $b(X_i) = \max\{0, \theta_i\}$, $e(X_i) = \text{trim}_\eta(0.5 \cdot (1 + \text{sign}(\theta_i)\theta_i^2))$, $\tau(X_i) = \sin(2\pi X_{i1})$ and $\nu(X_i) = 1$.

Due to space constraints, we only display some representative choices for d , σ , k , η and the sample size n ; a full set of results for all combinations of these parameters is available from the authors.

3.2.2 Comparison of Lasso-Based Methods

In Table 1 we compare results for AIPW, TMLE and WUB in the 4 simulation settings defined in Section 3.2.1. As discussed earlier, all nuisance components $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$, $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ are estimated via cross-fit lasso regression on a Hermite basis expansion. For comparison,

							root-mean squared error					coverage					
		n	d	σ	κ	η	plain	AIPW	TMLE	WUB-S	WUB	oracle	AIPW	TMLE	WUB-S	WUB	oracle
setup 1		500	12	1	3	0.1	0.37	0.70	0.63	0.42	0.31	0.31	0.87	0.82	0.57	0.86	0.90
		500	12	1	3	0.2	0.36	0.64	0.60	0.42	0.15	0.17	0.66	0.63	0.44	1.00	0.98
		500	12	1	4	0.1	0.40	0.68	0.62	0.44	0.31	0.30	0.87	0.82	0.50	0.82	0.89
		500	12	1	4	0.2	0.40	0.70	0.65	0.47	0.16	0.19	0.62	0.57	0.30	0.95	0.94
		1000	12	1	3	0.1	0.25	0.61	0.55	0.28	0.17	0.19	0.62	0.52	0.68	0.90	0.94
		1000	12	1	3	0.2	0.32	0.60	0.56	0.37	0.11	0.14	0.28	0.20	0.23	0.96	0.92
		1000	12	1	4	0.1	0.29	0.64	0.58	0.30	0.18	0.19	0.66	0.56	0.64	0.93	0.96
		1000	12	1	4	0.2	0.36	0.66	0.62	0.41	0.11	0.13	0.24	0.20	0.16	0.98	0.96
setup 2		1000	6	1	2	0.1	0.25	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.10	0.09	0.70	0.67	0.37	0.87	0.94
		1000	6	1	2	0.2	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.07	0.07	0.66	0.61	0.58	0.92	0.96
		1000	6	1	3	0.1	0.51	0.29	0.29	0.48	0.22	0.09	0.22	0.15	0.00	0.40	0.97
		1000	6	1	3	0.2	0.32	0.26	0.26	0.31	0.14	0.08	0.18	0.16	0.03	0.69	0.96
		1000	12	1	2	0.1	0.30	0.18	0.19	0.25	0.12	0.09	0.57	0.52	0.08	0.80	0.96
		1000	12	1	2	0.2	0.22	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.09	0.08	0.46	0.43	0.32	0.88	0.91
		1000	12	1	3	0.1	0.59	0.36	0.35	0.59	0.29	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.17	0.98
		1000	12	1	3	0.2	0.41	0.33	0.33	0.40	0.20	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.36	0.96
setup 3		500	12	0.5	3	0.1	0.16	0.18	0.19	0.17	0.16	0.12	0.84	0.88	0.70	0.88	0.99
		500	12	0.5	4	0.1	0.16	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.81	0.83	0.70	0.86	0.99
		500	12	1	3	0.1	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.16	0.84	0.90	0.72	0.88	0.98
		500	12	1	4	0.1	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.21	0.20	0.16	0.82	0.87	0.70	0.83	0.95
		1000	12	0.5	3	0.1	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.90	0.91	0.79	0.94	0.96
		1000	12	0.5	4	0.1	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.86	0.90	0.78	0.95	0.97
		1000	12	1	3	0.1	0.11	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.91	0.92	0.80	0.94	0.96
		1000	12	1	4	0.1	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.92	0.92	0.81	0.94	0.98
setup 4		1000	6	1	4	0.1	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
		1000	6	1	4	0.2	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.96
		1000	6	1	5	0.1	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.96	0.94	0.92	0.94	0.94
		1000	6	1	5	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.96
		1000	12	1	4	0.1	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.97
		1000	12	1	4	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.95	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.95
		1000	12	1	5	0.1	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.94	0.93	0.94	0.96	0.96
		1000	12	1	5	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.96	0.96

Table 1: Comparison of the performance of augmented inverse-propensity weighting (AIPW), targeted learning (TMLE) and weighting for uniform balance (WUB) on simulated data; for the latter, we also consider a “simple” variant (WUB-S) described in Section 3.1.3. The “oracle” method uses the true treatment propensities for residual balancing (48). All regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ are obtained via a lasso with cross-fitting; the treatment propensity estimates used by AIPW and TMLE are trimmed at level $T = 0.05$; the nominal coverage rate for all confidence intervals is $\alpha = 0.95$; and all reported numbers are averaged over 200 simulation runs.

						root-mean squared error					coverage				
	n	d	σ	κ	η	plain	AIPW	TMLE	WUB	oracle	plain	AIPW	TMLE	WUB	oracle
setup 1	500	12	1	3	0.1	0.39	0.58	0.53	0.21	0.27	0.51	0.83	0.81	0.96	0.94
	500	12	1	3	0.2	0.32	0.61	0.56	0.16	0.19	0.62	0.66	0.62	0.98	0.96
	500	12	1	4	0.1	0.40	0.58	0.53	0.22	0.27	0.48	0.80	0.79	0.96	0.94
	500	12	1	4	0.2	0.35	0.66	0.60	0.17	0.21	0.57	0.66	0.63	0.97	0.96
	1000	12	1	3	0.1	0.32	0.41	0.38	0.14	0.17	0.25	0.66	0.62	0.95	0.94
	1000	12	1	3	0.2	0.26	0.47	0.43	0.10	0.13	0.38	0.45	0.39	0.97	0.94
	1000	12	1	4	0.1	0.40	0.47	0.45	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.58	0.53	0.98	0.98
	1000	12	1	4	0.2	0.32	0.57	0.53	0.11	0.13	0.18	0.32	0.28	0.98	0.97
setup 2	1000	6	1	2	0.1	0.31	0.10	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.02	0.95	0.93	0.68	0.96
	1000	6	1	2	0.2	0.20	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.29	0.98	0.98	0.88	0.96
	1000	6	1	3	0.1	1.01	0.30	0.33	0.45	0.15	0.00	0.75	0.18	0.04	0.96
	1000	6	1	3	0.2	0.72	0.26	0.28	0.31	0.11	0.00	0.64	0.34	0.14	0.96
	1000	12	1	2	0.1	0.36	0.10	0.11	0.18	0.10	0.02	0.96	0.89	0.55	0.96
	1000	12	1	2	0.2	0.24	0.09	0.09	0.12	0.09	0.18	0.94	0.90	0.78	0.92
	1000	12	1	3	0.1	1.02	0.44	0.43	0.52	0.12	0.00	0.22	0.04	0.01	0.98
	1000	12	1	3	0.2	0.76	0.44	0.44	0.40	0.11	0.00	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.98
setup 3	500	12	0.5	3	0.1	0.82	0.43	0.38	0.36	0.21	0.00	0.60	0.66	0.72	0.98
	500	12	0.5	4	0.1	0.71	0.43	0.41	0.36	0.19	0.00	0.39	0.47	0.64	0.98
	500	12	1	3	0.1	0.93	0.52	0.48	0.44	0.26	0.00	0.54	0.63	0.66	0.98
	500	12	1	4	0.1	0.82	0.57	0.53	0.50	0.23	0.00	0.34	0.44	0.51	0.97
	1000	12	0.5	3	0.1	0.36	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.04	0.94	0.92	0.98	0.97
	1000	12	0.5	4	0.1	0.35	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.10	0.04	0.78	0.80	0.92	0.98
	1000	12	1	3	0.1	0.55	0.19	0.18	0.15	0.14	0.02	0.88	0.90	0.96	0.98
	1000	12	1	4	0.1	0.55	0.24	0.22	0.18	0.14	0.02	0.74	0.80	0.92	0.98
setup 4	1000	6	1	4	0.1	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.90	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.93
	1000	6	1	4	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.96
	1000	6	1	5	0.1	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.88	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.94
	1000	6	1	5	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.97	0.96
	1000	12	1	4	0.1	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.90	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.96
	1000	12	1	4	0.2	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.87	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
	1000	12	1	5	0.1	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.86	0.93	0.93	0.96	0.94
	1000	12	1	5	0.2	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.86	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.96

Table 2: Comparison of the performance of augmented inverse-propensity weighting (AIPW), targeted learning (TMLE) and weighting for uniform balance (WUB) on simulated data. The “oracle” method uses the true treatment propensities for residual balancing (48). The regression adjustments $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ are obtained via BART, whereas the fitted propensities $\hat{e}(\cdot)$ are obtained via a logistic lasso with cross-fitting (in both cases, we use cross-fitting). The treatment propensity estimates used by AIPW and TMLE are trimmed at level $T = 0.05$; the nominal coverage rate for all confidence intervals is $\alpha = 0.95$; and all reported numbers are averaged over 200 simulation runs.

we also included the “plain” estimator of the form (46), and the “oracle” double robust estimator that has access to the true treatment propensities $e(\cdot)$, and uses them to compute

$$\hat{\tau}_* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i) - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i) + W_i \frac{Y_i - \hat{m}^{(1)}(X_i)}{e(X_i)} - (1 - W_i) \frac{Y_i - \hat{m}^{(0)}(X_i)}{1 - e(X_i)} \right). \quad (48)$$

Given strong enough regularity conditions, this oracle estimator is asymptotically equivalent to the other efficient methods considered here (Hahn, 1998; Newey, 1994; Robins and Rotnitzky, 1995). However, $\hat{\tau}_*$ will be efficient under much weaker conditions on $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$; it is sufficient for $\hat{m}^{(w)}(x)$ to simply be consistent in $L_2(P)$ (Wager et al., 2016). For the plain estimator, no standard confidence intervals are available; for the oracle method, we get asymptotic inference the same way as for AIPW.

The results are generally encouraging for WUB. First, our simpler method, $\hat{\tau}_{WUB-S}$, already behaves reasonably well relative to $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ (except in setting 2 with $\kappa = 3$). Our full method, $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$, then further improves on its performance, and compares favorably to $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ over a wide variety of simulation designs, both in terms of mean-squared error and coverage. We draw attention to some designs with simulation settings 1 and 2, where $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ nearly matches the performance of the oracle $\hat{\tau}_*$, whereas $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ are substantially worse.

It appears that the ability of our flexible optimization-based approach to algorithmically incorporate classical ideas like propensity matching into an asymptotically efficient procedure may prove to be quite useful in practice.

3.2.3 BART Regression Adjustments

We now consider a related setting, where $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ are estimated via BART instead of the lasso. The main conceptual difference is that, now, the “plain” estimator (46) is no longer a simple straw-man, but is instead a popular method that has been found to work well in many situations; moreover, it is now possible to get heuristic confidence intervals via the BART posterior.

We present results in Table 2. The tradeoff between using BART versus the lasso for $\hat{m}^{(0)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{m}^{(1)}(\cdot)$ is not completely clear-cut, and both sometimes perform better than the other: In setting 1, using BART instead of lasso regression adjustments makes all methods perform better, whereas in setting 3 it makes them work worse. We note that, in setting 3, the baseline effect $b(\cdot)$ is linear, so the strong performance of the lasso in a polynomial basis is not surprising.

Intriguingly, in setting 2, using BART regression adjustments generally improves the performance of AIPW and TMLE, but somewhat degrades the performance of WUB. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that, for $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ to work well, we need for the bias of $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ to be in the balancing class \mathcal{F} . For the lasso, we have a fairly good idea for what kind of bias to expect, and so we can choose a good balancing class \mathcal{F} ; however, since BART is still more a black box, it is entirely possible that we may be missing some systematic forms of bias. On the other hand, $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ use inverse propensity weights that, given fast enough rates of convergence, can balance *all* residual functions arising from low-MSE machine learning adjustments; thus, they may be less sensitive to idiosyncracies of BART.

3.3 Application: Estimating the Effect of 401(k) Eligibility

We also revisit an example of Chernozhukov et al. (2017), based on a dataset Chernozhukov and Hansen (2004), the goal of which is to measure the effect of the eligibility for 401(k) retirement savings plans on net financial assets. The source of identification, as argued by Poterba et al. (1995), is that when 401(k) plans were first introduced, eligibility for the plans was effectively random after controlling for appropriate observables.

We pre-process our data exactly as in Section 4.2 of Chernozhukov et al. (2017) and, in particular, control for the same $p = 9$ observables as them. The full dataset has 9,915 observations; here, we consider the performance of $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$, $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ on random subsamples of size $n = 100, \dots, 1,500$. The dataset `pension` is made available as part of the R-package `hdm` (Chernozhukov et al., 2016).

We implement $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ as described above, except we now use a random forest (Breiman, 2001) rather than a lasso to estimate $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{e}(\cdot)$; random forests were one of the machine learning methods discussed by Chernozhukov et al. (2017).⁷ Also, following Chernozhukov et al. (2017), we trim the propensity estimates at level $T = 0.01$. For $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ we use the `tmle` package of Gruber and van der Laan (2012); the regression adjustments are obtained via a superlearner with library `SL.glm`, `SL.step`, `SL.glm.interaction` and `SL.randomForest`. Finally, we implement $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ as in Section 3.1.3, with the extended set of balancing functions, but now with $\hat{m}^{(w)}(\cdot)$ obtained via a random forest.⁸

A challenge in comparing results in this example is that we do not have access to an outside source of ground truth; thus, we need to use $\hat{\tau}$ estimates obtained on the full $n = 9,915$ observations as our point of comparison. However, although all 3 methods yield similar results on the full dataset, they do not give exactly the same estimates: with $n = 9,915$, we get $\hat{\tau}_{WUB} = 8.5 \pm 1.3$, $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW} = 8.8 \pm 1.2$ and $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE} = 6.5 \pm 1.7$ (in units of \$1,000, along with estimated standard errors). For this reason, we use two different gold standards: First, we run a “self” comparison where each method uses its own full sample estimates as its gold standard (e.g., $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ on $n = 500$ is compared with $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ on $n = 9,915$), while second, we run a “consensus” comparison with an averaged gold standard $(\hat{\tau}_{AIPW} + \hat{\tau}_{TMLE} + \hat{\tau}_{WUB})/3$ on $n = 9,915$.

Results are given in Figure 1. First, we see that our method, $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$, and $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$ both perform comparably and have good coverage; however, $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ has a slightly lower mean-squared error than $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$. Meanwhile, $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ achieves very good small-sample mean-squared error, but this comes at the expense of worse coverage. Unlike in the simulations, we note that $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ now has a substantially different implementation from $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$, because we used the package `tmle` with its built-in superlearner library; thus, it is not immediately which aspect of the methods is driving the difference in performance.

4 Discussion

In order to estimate causal effects using observational data, we always need to correct for potential bias arising from the correlation of treatment assignment probabilities and

⁷With random forests, we simply used out-of-bag prediction (i.e., leave-one-out cross-fitting) rather than K -fold cross-fitting.

⁸Because the predictors X are on extremely different scales, we chose to balance the unscaled set of all 2nd order interactions of 5th degree natural splines in each feature instead of the weighted Hermite basis Ψ we worked with in simulation. Truncation of higher order interactions terms was for computational tractability.




Figure 1: Comparison of $\hat{\tau}_{AIPW}$, $\hat{\tau}_{TMLE}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{WUB}$ on the 401(k) example as described in (Chernozhukov et al., 2017), on random subsets of size $n = 100, \dots, 1500$ from the full dataset. The nominal coverage rate is $\alpha = 0.95$; the root-mean squared error (RMSE) is reported in units of \$1,000. The circles denote mean results averaged over 100 simulation runs; here, the empty circles denote performance against the “self” gold standard, while the circles with crosses are for the “consensus” gold standard. The lines are obtained via smoothing splines; the solid lines are for the “self” gold standard and the dashed lines are for the “consensus” gold standard.

non-causal effects. As established in the seminal paper of Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983), controlling for the propensity score is both necessary and sufficient for eliminating such biases under unconfoundedness. Most of the existing literature has focused on the “sufficiency” part of this result, and studied the propensity score as a useful dimension reduction tool, i.e., a 1-dimensional summary of observations that can be used to eliminate bias. This point of view has led to popular estimators such as propensity matching or stratification and, at a high level, may also be used to understand the AIPW method of Robins, Rotnitzky, and Zhao (1994).

Conversely, in this paper, we focused directly on bias reduction via numerical convex optimization, and showed that when the propensity function $e(x)$ is hard to estimate, our method may be preferable to AIPW estimation. In other words, if the propensity score $e(x)$ is a complicated object, then we are better off not focusing on it as a dimension reduction tool. Rather pleasingly, however, we find that even though our procedure is purely motivated by bias reduction, we still recover the propensity score in very large samples via a universal consistency result.

Acknowledgment

We are grateful for numerous helpful discussions with Guido Imbens, Jamie Robins and José Zubizarreta that have shaped our thinking on this topic, as well as for comments from seminar participants at several venues. This paper was started while S.W. was visiting

Columbia University as a postdoctoral research scientist.

References

- A. Abadie and G. W. Imbens. Large sample properties of matching estimators for average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, 74(1):235–267, 2006.
- S. Athey, G. W. Imbens, and S. Wager. Approximate residual balancing: De-biased inference of average treatment effects in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.07125*, 2016.
- P. L. Bartlett and S. Mendelson. Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):463–482, 2002.
- P. L. Bartlett, O. Bousquet, S. Mendelson, et al. Local rademacher complexities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33(4):1497–1537, 2005.
- A. Belloni, V. Chernozhukov, I. Fernández-Val, and C. Hansen. Program evaluation and causal inference with high-dimensional data. *Econometrica*, 85(1):233–298, 2017.
- S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- L. Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- L. Breiman, J. Friedman, C. J. Stone, and R. A. Olshen. *Classification and Regression Trees*. CRC press, 1984.
- C. M. Cassel, C. E. Särndal, and J. H. Wretman. Some results on generalized difference estimation and generalized regression estimation for finite populations. *Biometrika*, 63(3):615–620, 1976.
- K. C. G. Chan, S. C. P. Yam, and Z. Zhang. Globally efficient non-parametric inference of average treatment effects by empirical balancing calibration weighting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 2015.
- V. Chernozhukov and C. Hansen. The effects of 401 (k) participation on the wealth distribution: An instrumental quantile regression analysis. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(3):735–751, 2004.
- V. Chernozhukov, C. Hansen, and M. Spindler. hdm: High-dimensional metrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00354*, 2016.
- V. Chernozhukov, D. Chetverikov, M. Demirer, E. Duflo, C. Hansen, W. Newey, and J. Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 2017.
- H. A. Chipman, E. I. George, and R. E. McCulloch. BART: Bayesian additive regression trees. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(1):266–298, 2010.
- R. H. Dehejia and S. Wahba. Causal effects in nonexperimental studies: Reevaluating the evaluation of training programs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1053–1062, 1999.
- V. Dorie, J. Hill, U. Shalit, M. Scott, and D. Cervone. Automated versus do-it-yourself methods for causal inference: Lessons learned from a data analysis competition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.02641*, 2017.
- M. Dudík, D. Erhan, J. Langford, L. Li, et al. Doubly robust policy evaluation and optimization. *Statistical Science*, 29(4):485–511, 2014.
- B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*, volume 57. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1994.
- M. H. Farrell. Robust inference on average treatment effects with possibly more covariates than observations. *Journal of Econometrics*, 189(1):1–23, 2015.
- G. B. Folland. *A Guide to Advanced Real Analysis*. MAA, 2009.

- E. Giné and R. Nickl. *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- B. Graham, C. Pinto, and D. Egel. Inverse probability tilting for moment condition models with missing data. *Review of Economic Studies*, pages 1053–1079, 2012.
- B. Graham, C. Pinto, and D. Egel. Efficient estimation of data combination models by the method of auxiliary-to-study tilting (ast). *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, pages –, 2016.
- S. Gruber and M. J. van der Laan. tmle: An r package for targeted maximum likelihood estimation. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 51(i13), 2012.
- J. Hahn. On the role of the propensity score in efficient semiparametric estimation of average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, 66(2):315–331, 1998.
- J. Hainmueller. Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Political Analysis*, 20(1):25–46, 2012.
- J. J. Heckman, H. Ichimura, and P. Todd. Matching as an econometric evaluation estimator. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 65(2):261–294, 1998.
- M. A. Hernan and J. M. Robins. *Causal Inference*. CRC Boca Raton, 2017.
- J. L. Hill. Bayesian nonparametric modeling for causal inference. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 20(1), 2011.
- K. Hirano, G. W. Imbens, G. Ridder, and D. B. Rubin. Combining panel data sets with attrition and refreshment samples. *Econometrica*, 69(6):1645–1659, 2001.
- K. Hirano, G. W. Imbens, and G. Ridder. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189, 2003.
- K. Imai and M. Ratkovic. Estimating treatment effect heterogeneity in randomized program evaluation. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(1):443–470, 2013.
- K. Imai and M. Ratkovic. Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(1):243–263, 2014.
- G. W. Imbens. Nonparametric estimation of average treatment effects under exogeneity: A review. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1):4–29, 2004.
- G. W. Imbens and D. B. Rubin. *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- A. Javanmard and A. Montanari. Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):2869–2909, 2014.
- A. Javanmard and A. Montanari. De-biasing the lasso: Optimal sample size for Gaussian designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.02757*, 2015.
- I. M. Johnstone. Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models. *Manuscript*, 2015.
- N. Kallus. Generalized optimal matching methods for causal inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.08321*, 2016.
- J. D. Kang and J. L. Schafer. Demystifying double robustness: A comparison of alternative strategies for estimating a population mean from incomplete data. *Statistical Science*, pages 523–539, 2007.
- V. Koltchinskii et al. Local rademacher complexities and oracle inequalities in risk minimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(6):2593–2656, 2006.
- M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand. *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- G. Lugosi and K. Zeger. Nonparametric estimation via empirical risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 41(3):677–687, 1995.

- R. Mukherjee, W. K. Newey, and J. M. Robins. Semiparametric efficient empirical higher order influence function estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07577*, 2017.
- W. K. Newey. The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica*, 62(6):1349–1382, 1994.
- J. Neyman. Sur les applications de la théorie des probabilités aux expériences agricoles: Essai des principes. *Roczniki Nauk Rolniczych*, 10:1–51, 1923.
- J. Peypouquet. *Convex Optimization in Normed Spaces: Theory, Methods and Examples*. Springer, 2015.
- D. Pollard. *Convergence of stochastic processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- J. M. Poterba, S. F. Venti, and D. A. Wise. Do 401 (k) contributions crowd out other personal saving? *Journal of Public Economics*, 58(1):1–32, 1995.
- P. Rigollet and A. Tsybakov. Exponential screening and optimal rates of sparse estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(2):731–771, 2011.
- J. Robins, L. Li, R. Mukherjee, E. Tchetgen, and A. van der Vaart. Minimax estimation of a functional on a structured high dimensional model. *Annals of Statistics*, forthcoming, 2017.
- J. Robins and A. Rotnitzky. Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models with missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(1):122–129, 1995.
- J. Robins, A. Rotnitzky, and L. Zhao. Analysis of semiparametric regression models for repeated outcomes in the presence of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(1):106–121, 1995.
- J. Robins, M. Sued, Q. Lei-Gomez, and A. Rotnitzky. Comment: Performance of double-robust estimators when “inverse probability” weights are highly variable. *Statistical Science*, 22(4):544–559, 2007.
- J. Robins, L. Li, E. Tchetgen, and A. van der Vaart. Higher order influence functions and minimax estimation of nonlinear functionals. In *Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of David A. Freedman*, pages 335–421. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2008.
- J. M. Robins, A. Rotnitzky, and L. P. Zhao. Estimation of regression coefficients when some regressors are not always observed. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(427):846–866, 1994.
- P. R. Rosenbaum. *Observational Studies*. Springer, 2002.
- P. R. Rosenbaum and D. B. Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- D. B. Rubin. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5):688, 1974.
- D. B. Rubin. For objective causal inference, design trumps analysis. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 808–840, 2008.
- D. O. Scharfstein, A. Rotnitzky, and J. M. Robins. Adjusting for nonignorable drop-out using semiparametric nonresponse models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448):1096–1120, 1999.
- A. Schick. On asymptotically efficient estimation in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1139–1151, 1986.
- C. J. Stone. Consistent nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 595–620, 1977.
- E. A. Stuart. Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical Science*, 25(1):1, 2010.

- Z. Tan. Bounded, efficient and doubly robust estimation with inverse weighting. *Biometrika*, 97(3):661–682, 2010.
- R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, pages 267–288, 1996.
- V. Tikhomirov. ε -entropy and ε -capacity of sets in functional spaces. In *Selected works of AN Kolmogorov*, pages 86–170. Springer, 1993.
- S. van de Geer. *Empirical Processes in M-Estimation (Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics)*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 2000.
- M. J. Van der Laan and J. M. Robins. *Unified Methods for Censored Longitudinal Data and Causality*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- M. J. van der Laan and S. Rose. *Targeted learning: causal inference for observational and experimental data*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- M. J. van der Laan and D. Rubin. Targeted maximum likelihood learning. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 2(1):1–40, 2006.
- A. van der Vaart. Bracketing smooth functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 52(1):93–105, 1994.
- A. W. Van Der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer, 1996.
- S. Wager, W. Du, J. Taylor, and R. J. Tibshirani. High-dimensional regression adjustments in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2016. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1614732113.
- Y. Wang and J. R. Zubizarreta. Approximate balancing weights: Characterizations from a shrinkage estimation perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00998*, 2017.
- Y. G. Yatracos. On the estimation of the derivatives of a function with the derivatives of an estimate. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 28(1):172–175, 1989.
- Q. Zhao. Covariate balancing propensity score by tailored loss functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.05890*, 2016.
- Y. Zhu and J. Bradic. Linear hypothesis testing in dense high-dimensional linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02987*, 2016.
- J. R. Zubizarreta. Using mixed integer programming for matching in an observational study of kidney failure after surgery. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(500): 1360–1371, 2012.
- J. R. Zubizarreta. Stable weights that balance covariates for estimation with incomplete outcome data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(511):910–922, 2015.

A Appendix: Proof of Main Results

A.1 Establishing Convex Duality

Our first task is to establish the representation (35) via convex duality. Before we begin, we state two standard results used in the proof: Lagrange Duality given the Slater Condition (Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004, Section 5.2.3), and the Kneser-Kuhn minimax theorem (Johnstone, 2015, Theorem A.1).

A finite dimensional convex optimization problem $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$ subject to $g_j(x) \leq 0$ for $j = 1 \dots J$ satisfies the Slater condition if there exists a point at which the constraints are satisfied with strict inequality. If the Slater condition is satisfied, we have strong Lagrange duality, i.e.

$$\inf\{f(x) : g_j(x) \leq 0 \text{ for } j = 1 \dots J\} = \sup_{\lambda: \lambda_j \geq 0} \inf_x S(x, \lambda), S(x, \lambda) := f(x) + \sum_{j=1}^J \lambda_j g_j(x) \quad (49)$$

and if this value is greater than $-\infty$, the latter supremum is attained at a point λ^* . We incorporate constraints of the form $g_j(x) \geq 0$ by negating them, i.e. writing $-g_j(x) \leq 0$. When we do this we will continue to write $S(x, \lambda)$ as above, with lagrange multipliers λ_j in the set of non-negative reals \mathbb{R}_+ for constraints of the form $g_j(x) \leq 0$ and the set of non-positive reals \mathbb{R}_- for constraints of the form $g_j(x) \geq 0$.

The Kneser-Kuhn minimax theorem gives conditions under which minimization and maximization can be reordered in Saddle point problems:

$$\inf_{u \in U} \sup_{v \in V} f(u, v) = \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{u \in U} f(u, v) \quad (50)$$

whenever $f(\cdot, v)$ is convex and continuous for all $v \in V$, $f(u, \cdot)$ is concave for all $u \in U$, U is compact and convex, and V is convex.

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{F} be the closed unit ball of a normed vector space $(\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}, \|\cdot\|)$ of functions from $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\|f\|_\infty \leq \|f\|$. Let $X_1 \dots X_n \in \mathcal{X}$ and $W_1 \dots W_n \in \{0, 1\}$ be given sequences. For $L \leq 0 < U$,*

1. *The following equivalence holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\gamma: L \leq \gamma_i \leq U} \ell(\gamma) &= - \inf_{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}} \mathbb{M}_n(g) \quad \text{where} \\ \ell(\gamma) &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} \gamma_i^2 + \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i W_i) f(X_i) \right)^2 \\ \mathbb{M}_n(g) &:= \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} (U(g(X_i) - U)_+ + L(g(X_i) - L)_-) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} [g(X_i)]_{L,U}^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \\ \text{where } (x)_+ &= \max\{x, 0\}, (x)_- = \min\{x, 0\}, [x]_{L,U} = \max\{L, \min\{x, U\}\} \end{aligned}$$

2. *$\ell(\gamma)$ has a unique minimum over the set $\{\gamma : L \leq \gamma_i \leq U\}$ at a point $\hat{\gamma}$. If \mathbb{M}_n has a minimum \hat{g} over the set $\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}$, then $\hat{\gamma}_i = [\hat{g}(X_i)]_{L,U}$ for all i with $W_i = 1$.*

3. \mathbb{M}_n has a minimum $\hat{\gamma}$ over the set $\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}$ if $(\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}, \|\cdot\|)$ is reflexive.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $n_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n W_i$, the dimension of γ . If $n_1 = 0$, every claim in our lemma is trivially satisfied, so we may assume for the remainder of our proof that $n_1 \geq 1$.

Our proof has essentially two pieces. In the first, we establish a strong duality result:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : L \leq \gamma_i \leq U\}} \ell(\gamma) = \sup_{\lambda, f \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}} \phi(\lambda, f), \text{ where} \\
\phi(\lambda, f) &:= \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) \text{ and} \\
S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} \gamma_i^2 + t^2 \\
&+ \frac{2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i W_i) f(X_i) - t \right) + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i}(\gamma_i - U) + \lambda_{L,i}(\gamma_i - L)) \text{ and} \\
\Lambda &:= \{(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}, \lambda_U, \lambda_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_-^{n_1}\}
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

In the second, we show the existence of a maximizer λ^* , f^* of ψ , give an explicit characterization of λ^* as a function of f^* and a simpler characterization of f^* in terms of a partially maximized version of ψ , and characterize the minimizer $\hat{\gamma}$ of ℓ in terms of f^* and λ^* . This is a rough outline. The problem decomposes less cleanly than this suggests.

We begin by considering an optimization problem equivalent to $\inf_{\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : L \leq \gamma_i \leq U\}} \ell(\gamma)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : L \leq \gamma_i \leq U\}} \ell(\gamma) \\
&= \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} \gamma_i^2 + t^2 : (\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}, \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i W_i) f(X_i) \leq t, L \leq \gamma_i \leq U \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Slater's condition is satisfied, i.e. our constraints are satisfied with strict inequality at a point (γ, t) with $\gamma \in (L, U)^{n_1}$ and $t > \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i W_i) f(X_i)$. Therefore by (49),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} \gamma_i^2 + t^2 : (\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}, \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i W_i) f(X_i) \leq t, L \leq \gamma_i \leq U \right\} \\
&= \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}} S'((\gamma, t), \lambda) \text{ where } S'((\gamma, t), \lambda) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Because this infimum is nonnegative, Slater's condition also implies that the latter supremum is attained at some value $\lambda^* \in \Lambda$. Because we can arbitrarily scale the lagrange multipliers without changing the problem, we choose the $2/\sqrt{n}$ and $2/n$ scales on the $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\lambda_{U,i}, \lambda_{L,i}$ that appear in (51) to simplify expressions that occur later in the proof.

This brings us, in a sense, halfway to our desired duality result. We've shown that $\inf_{\gamma \in [L, U]^{n_1}} \ell(\gamma) = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))$ and want to show that this is equal to $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))$.

To do this, we apply our minimax theorem (50) to the convex-concave function $S_{\lambda}((\gamma, t), f) := S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))$ for each fixed λ , then take our sup over λ . Because we

must restrict (γ, t) to a compact set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+$ in order to apply our minimax theorem,

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = \sup_{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{B}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)). \quad (54)$$

In order to complete our proof of the duality result (51), we must show that there exists a compact set \mathcal{B} large enough that we can ignore it, i.e.

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) \quad (55)$$

$$\sup_{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathcal{B}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = \sup_{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)). \quad (56)$$

It is trivial to show that (55) is satisfiable for compact \mathcal{B} . Recall the supremum in on the left side of (55) is attained at some point λ^* . Because $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda^*, f))$ is continuous and strongly convex in (γ, t) , its infimum over $(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ is attained at a point (γ^*, t^*) . It follows that (55) is satisfied if $(\gamma^*, t^*) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Our argument establishing (56) will involve a simplification of the dual problem,

$$\sup_{\{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}\}} \phi(\lambda, f) \quad \text{where} \quad \phi(\lambda, f) := \inf_{\{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}\}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)).$$

which we will now carry out. First, we compute an explicit form for ϕ by minimizing $S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))$ with respect to (γ, t) for fixed (λ, f) . For fixed (λ, f) , $S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))$ is convex and differentiable and attains its infimum at

$$\gamma_i = \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}) \quad \text{and} \quad t = \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{n}},$$

which can be seen from the first order optimality conditions

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = \frac{2}{n} \gamma_i - \frac{2}{n} \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) + \frac{2}{n} (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}), \\ 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = 2t - \frac{2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these values, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\lambda, f) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{n} \\ &+ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}^2 f(X_i)^2 - \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i})) - \frac{2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &+ \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}) (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i})) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i} U + \lambda_{L,i} L) \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i} U + \lambda_{L,i} L). \end{aligned}$$

To simplify the first expression into the second, we observe that the middle term on the second line and the first term on the third sum to $-\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2$ and then add like terms. We can simplify this further by explicitly maximizing with respect to λ .

Because every instance of f in the expression $S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f))$ is multiplied by $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$, it is natural to reparameterize in terms of $(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}, g)$ where $g = \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f$. We define the reparameterized function $\phi'(\lambda, g) = \phi(\lambda, g/\lambda_{\mathcal{F}})$ on the set $\mathcal{G} := \{(\lambda, \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} f) : (\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}\}$, observing that for $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$ we can let $g/\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ be an arbitrary member of \mathcal{F} , our choice having no influence on the value of S , ϕ , etc. It will be useful to have the following more concrete characterizations of \mathcal{G} and ϕ' :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} &= \{(\lambda, g) : g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}, \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \|g\|, \lambda_{U,i} \geq 0, \lambda_{L,i} \leq 0\} \\ \phi'(\lambda, g) &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i} U + \lambda_{L,i} L). \end{aligned}$$

We will now maximize $\phi'(\lambda, g)$ with respect to λ for fixed g . This will reduce our dual problem to a maximization over $\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}$.

Maximizing $\phi'(\lambda, g)$ respect to $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$. This is straightforward: ϕ' depends on $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ only through the third term in the expression above and is therefore decreasing in $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$. Its supremum under our constraints is attained at the minimal allowed value $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} = \|g\|$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \|g\|} \phi'(\lambda, g) &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i} U + \lambda_{L,i} L). \end{aligned}$$

Maximizing $\sup_{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \|g\|} \phi'(\lambda, g)$ with respect to λ_U, λ_L . Observe that for a term C invariant in λ_U, λ_L ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \|g\|} \phi'(\lambda, g) - C \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} -(\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i})^2 + 2g(X_i)(\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}) - 2(\lambda_{U,i} U + \lambda_{L,i} L) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} -(\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i})^2 + 2(g(X_i) - U)(\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}) + 2(U - L)\lambda_{L,i}. \end{aligned}$$

We can maximize each term in this sum separately with respect to $(\lambda_{U,i}, \lambda_{L,i})$. To understand this problem more easily, we reparameterize in terms of $x = \lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}$ and $y = \lambda_{L,i}$. Observing that $\lambda_{U,i} \in \mathbb{R}_+, \lambda_{L,i} \in \mathbb{R}_- \iff x \in \mathbb{R}, y \leq 0 \wedge x$, we are maximizing $-x^2 + 2(g(X_i) - U)x + 2(U - L)y$ over the latter set. Because $(U - L) > 0$, this expression is maximized with respect to y uniquely at $y = 0 \wedge x$. It follows that we must maximize $-x^2 + 2(g(X_i) - U)x + 2(U - L)(0 \wedge x)$ with respect to x . This maximum

is either the maximum of $-x^2 + 2(g(X_i) - U)x$ over the range $x \geq 0$ or the maximum of $-x^2 + 2(g(X_i) - L)x$ over the range $x \leq 0$. Because both of these functions are unimodal, the maximum over the associated range will occur at their unconstrained maximum if it satisfies the range constraint and at the boundary $x = 0$ otherwise. The unconstrained maxima are $x = g(X_i) - U$ and $x = g(X_i) - L$ respectively. At most one of these unconstrained maxima can be in range: because $U > L$, $g(X_i) - U > 0 \implies g(X_i) - L > 0$ and $g(X_i) - L < 0 \implies g(X_i) - U < 0$. Consequently, the following point is well-defined and maximizes $-x^2 + 2(g(X_i) - U)x + 2(U - L)(0 \wedge x)$:

$$x = \begin{cases} g(X_i) - U & \text{if } g(X_i) - U > 0 \\ g(X_i) - L & \text{if } g(X_i) - L < 0 . \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then because the optimal $y = 0 \wedge x$, the following point maximizes the expression $-x^2 + 2(g(X_i) - U)x + 2(U - L)y$ over $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \leq 0 \wedge x$:

$$(x, y) = \begin{cases} (g(X_i) - U, 0) & \text{if } g(X_i) - U > 0 \\ (g(X_i) - L, g(X_i) - L) & \text{if } g(X_i) - L < 0 . \\ (0, 0) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Returning to our original parameterization, $(\lambda_{L_i} = y, \lambda_{U_i} = x - y)$, $\sup_{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \|g\|} \phi'(\lambda, g)$ is maximized at

$$(\lambda_{U,i}, \lambda_{L,i}) = \begin{cases} (g(X_i) - U, 0) & \text{if } g(X_i) - U > 0 \\ (0, g(X_i) - L) & \text{if } g(X_i) - L < 0 \\ (0, 0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

or more compactly, $(\lambda_{U,i}, \lambda_{L,i}) = ((g(X_i) - U)_+, (g(X_i) - L)_-)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\{\lambda \in \Lambda: \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \geq \|g\|\}} \phi'(\lambda, g) &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} [g(X_i)]_{L,U}^2 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} (U(g(X_i) - U)_+ + L(g(X_i) - L)_-) = -\mathbb{M}_n(g). \end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbb{M}_n(g) &= S((\lambda^*(g), g/\|g\|), (\gamma^*(g), t^*(g))) \quad \text{with} \\ \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}^*(g) &= \|g\| \\ \lambda_{U,i}^*(g) &= (g(X_i) - U)_+ \\ \lambda_{L,i}^*(g) &= (g(X_i) - L)_- \\ \gamma^*(g) &= [g(X_i)]_{L,U} \\ t^*(g) &= \frac{\|g\|}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

and satisfies

$$\sup_{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}} -\mathbb{M}_n(g) = \sup_{\{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}\}} \inf_{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)).$$

With our simplification of the dual complete, will now show (56), establishing the validity of (51). The lower bound

$$\mathbb{M}_n(g) \geq \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \geq \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} - 2\|g\|$$

implies that for some finite radius R , $\|g\| \geq R \implies \mathbb{M}_n(g) \geq \mathbb{M}_n(0)$ and therefore for some finite radius R , $\inf_{\{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}\}} \mathbb{M}_n(g) = \inf_{\{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}: \|g\| \leq R\}} \mathbb{M}_n(g)$. Consequently,

$$\sup_{\{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}\}} \inf_{\{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_+\}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = \sup_{\{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}: \|g\| \leq R\}} S((\gamma^*(g), t^*(g)), (\lambda^*(g), g/\|g\|))$$

and because $\gamma^*(g) \in [L, U]^{n_1}$ and $t^*(g) \leq R/\sqrt{n}$ on this range,

$$\sup_{\{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}\}} \inf_{\{(\gamma, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_+\}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)) = \sup_{\{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}\}} \inf_{\{(\gamma, t) \in [L, U]^{n_1} \times [0, R/\sqrt{n}]\}} S((\gamma, t), (\lambda, f)),$$

so (56) holds if \mathcal{B} contains the bounded set $[L, U]^{n_1} \times [0, R/\sqrt{n}]$. This completes our proof of Claim 1.

Now we will establish Claim 2. Because $[L, U]^{n_1}$ is compact and ℓ is continuous and strictly convex, $\inf_{\gamma \in [L, U]^{n_1}} \ell(\gamma)$ is uniquely attained at a point $\hat{\gamma}$. If $\inf_{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}} \mathbb{M}_n(g)$ is attained at a point \hat{g} , by construction of \mathbb{M}_n we have $-\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{g}) = \sup_{(\lambda, f) \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma^*(\hat{g}), t^*(\hat{g})), (\lambda, f))$. Because this quantity is finite, i.e. the Lagrange multipliers do not drive it to infinity, our constraints $\gamma \in [L, U]^{n_1}$ and $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i^*(g)W_i)f(X_i) \leq t$ must be satisfied at $(\gamma^*(\hat{g}), t^*(\hat{g}))$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{g}) &= \sup_{\lambda, f \in \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}} S((\gamma^*(\hat{g}), t^*(\hat{g})), (\lambda, f)) \\ &= \sum_{i: W_i=1} \gamma_i^*(\hat{g})^2 + t^*(\hat{g})^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{i: W_i=1} \gamma_i^*(\hat{g})^2 + \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \gamma_i^*(\hat{g})W_i)f(X_i) \right)^2 \\ &= \ell(\gamma^*(\hat{g})). \end{aligned}$$

By Claim 1, $\ell(\hat{\gamma}) = -\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{g})$ and therefore $\ell(\hat{\gamma}) \geq \ell(\gamma^*(\hat{g}))$. Because $\hat{\gamma}$ is the unique minimum of ℓ , it follows that $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma^*(\hat{g})$, i.e. $\hat{\gamma}_i = [\hat{g}(X_i)]_{L, U}$. This completes our proof of Claim 2.

We will now establish Claim 3, i.e. show that if $(\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}, \|\cdot\|)$ is reflexive, \mathbb{M}_n does attain its infimum. We will work with $\psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) := -\sup_{\lambda_F \geq \|g\|} \phi^l(\lambda, g)$, which we discussed but did not name in our proof of Claim 1. To make things simple, we add a term $\delta_C(\lambda_U, \lambda_L)$ which takes the value zero for values $(\lambda_U, \lambda_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_-^{n_1}$ and infinity otherwise; this lets us think of minimizing ψ as an unconstrained problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=1} (\lambda_{U,i}U + \lambda_{L,i}L) + \delta_C(\lambda_U, \lambda_L). \end{aligned}$$

We work with ψ instead of \mathbb{M}_n because it is easier: ψ is convex but \mathbb{M}_n is not. It is sufficient to show that ψ attains its infimum: there exist functions $\lambda_U^*(g), \lambda_L^*(g)$ such that

$$\mathbb{M}_n(g) = \psi(\lambda_U^*(g), \lambda_L^*(g), g) = \inf_{(\lambda_U, \lambda_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_-^{n_1}} \psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g),$$

so $\inf_{g \in \text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}} \mathbb{M}_n(g)$ is attained at a point g^* iff $\inf_{\mathbb{R}_+^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_-^{n_1} \times \text{span } g} \psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g)$ is attained at a point $(\lambda_U^*, \lambda_L^*, g^*)$.

A function on a reflexive space has a finite minimum if it is convex, proper (finite at some point), coercive (goes to $+\infty$ at infinity), and lower-semicontinuous (Peypouquet, 2015, Theorem 2.19), so we will show that ψ has these properties.

ψ is convex Because sums of convex functions are convex, it suffices to show convexity of each term. The first term in ψ is the convex function $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ applied to a linear function of $(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g)$; the second and fourth terms are linear; the third term is an increasing function of the convex function $\|\cdot\|$, and the fifth term $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}$ is convex because $\mathbb{R}_+^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}_-^{n_1}$ is.

ψ is proper $\psi(0, 0, 0) = 0 < \infty$

ψ is coercive First, we will show $\psi \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|g\| \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$\psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) \geq \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \geq \frac{\|g\|^2}{n} - 2\|g\|.$$

This lower bound goes to infinity with $\|g\|$.

Now we will show that for finite $\|g\|$, $\psi \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|\lambda_U\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ or $\|\lambda_L\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$. We may restrict our attention to the case $\lambda_{U,i} \geq 0$ and $\lambda_{L,i} \leq 0$, as if $\lambda_{U,i} < 0$ or $\lambda_{L,i} > 0$, $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda_U, \lambda_L) = +\infty$. In this case, $U\lambda_{U,i} \geq 0$ and $L\lambda_{L,i} \geq 0$ for all i . Consequently,

$$\psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) \geq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} \lambda_{U,i}U - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \geq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} \lambda_{U,i}U - 2\|g\|.$$

This lower bound goes to $+\infty$ as $\|\lambda_U\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ with finite $\|g\|$. Finally, consider the lower bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) &\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 - 2\|g\|. \end{aligned}$$

This goes to infinity if $\|\lambda_U\|_\infty$ and $\|g\|$ are finite and $\|\lambda_L\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$. In summary, $\psi \rightarrow +\infty$ if $\|g\| \rightarrow \infty$; $\|g\| < \infty$ and $\|\lambda_U\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$; or $\|g\| < \infty$ and $\|\lambda_U\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|\lambda_L\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$. This list is exhaustive: $(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g)$ cannot go to infinity without one of these conditions happening. Therefore ψ is coercive.

ψ is lower-semicontinuous Because finite sums of lower-semicontinuous functions are lower-semicontinuous, it suffices to show that each term is lower-semicontinuous. All terms are continuous with the exception of $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}$, which is lower-semicontinuous.

This completes our proof of Claim 3. □

A.2 Universal Consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$: Finite Sample Bounds

Given the duality established in Lemma 1, we have the tools to characterize the behavior of $\hat{\gamma}$ and to establish consistency in the sense we need, i.e. $\|[g] - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P_n)} \rightarrow_p 0$. In this section, we establish explicit finite-sample bounds for this error; then, in the following section, we verify that these bounds in fact go to zero, thus proving consistency.

As a preliminary step, we first re-write the expression \mathbb{M}_n in a convenient form. While Lemma 1 characterizes $\hat{\gamma} := \inf_{\gamma: L \leq \gamma_i \leq U} \ell(\gamma)$, for any bounds $L \leq 0 \leq U$, we restrict our attention to bounds of the form $0 \leq \gamma_i \leq u$ in the remainder. To keep our expressions compact, we use standard empirical process notation (see, e.g., [Van Der Vaart and Wellner, 1996](#)).

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g) &= \psi_{\mathcal{F}}(g) + PW([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 + (P_n - P)h_g(W, X) - Pe^{-1}(X) \\
&= \psi_{\mathcal{F}}(g) + P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 + (P_n - P)h'_g(W, X) - Pe^{-1}(X) \quad \text{where} \\
\psi_{\mathcal{F}}(g) &= \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{n} + 2P(ue(X) - 1)(g(X) - u)_+ - 2P(g(X))_- \\
h_g(W, X) &= 2Wu(g(X) - u)_+ + W[g(X)]^2 - 2g(X); \\
h'_g(W, X) &= h_g(W, X) - W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \\
&= 2Wu(g(X) - u)_+ + 2We^{-1}(X)[g(X)] - 2g(X) - We^{-2}(X).
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

In order to verify this expansion, we first write

$$\mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g) = \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{n} + Ph_g(W, X) + (P_n - P)h_g(W, X),$$

and then create and complete a square in $Ph_g(W, X)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Ph_g(W, X) &= P(2Wu(g(X) - u)_+ + W[g(X)]^2 - 2g(X)) \\
&= 2uPe(X)(g(X) - u)_+ + P(e(X)[g(X)]^2 - 2[g(X)] + e^{-1}(X)) \\
&\quad - 2P(g(X) - [g(X)]) - Pe^{-1}(X) \\
&= 2uPe(X)(g(X) - u)_+ + Pe(X)(g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \\
&\quad - 2P(g(X) - u)_+ - 2P(g(X))_- - Pe^{-1}(X).
\end{aligned}$$

To derive the second expression above, expand the distance term $PW([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2$ as $[P_n + (P - P_n)]W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2$. Our centered term becomes $(P_n - P)h'_g(W, X)$.

The interpretation of each expression for $\mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g)$ is the essentially the same: up to constants, it is the mean squared error of $[g]$ as an estimator of e^{-1} , plus a penalty $\psi_{\mathcal{F}}(g)$ on the complexity of g , corrupted by a random mean-zero ‘noise’ term dependent on g . In these terms, our estimator \hat{g} is the solution to a penalized M-estimation problem $\min_g \mathbb{M}_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g)$; this problem is slightly atypical in that the MSE $PW([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2$ depends only on a clipped version $[g]$ of g , the precise form of the ‘noise’ term is atypical, and the penalty term $\psi_{\mathcal{F}}(g)$ involves the random norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$. Nonetheless, essentially standard techniques from the theory of penalized M-estimation can be used to establish the following consistency guarantees for this problem.

Lemma 2. *Let \mathcal{F} be pointwise separable with $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$ and $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} f(X)^2 \leq \rho^2$, let $s \geq 1$, and define*

$$a_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g)^2 := \mathbb{E} e(X) (g - e^{-1}(X))^2 + \psi_{s^{-1}\mathcal{F}}(g). \tag{58}$$

Then, writing auxiliary quantities

$$\beta_n \geq 8u\sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}) \vee (3\eta s^2 \rho \sqrt{n})^{-1}, \quad a_n^{\star 2} > \inf_{g: \|g\|_\infty \leq 6s^2 \sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g)^2, \quad \text{and } \alpha_n := a_n^{\star} \vee \beta_n,$$

and assuming that $u \in [\eta^{-1} \vee 4, 3s^2 \sqrt{n}\beta_n]$, the solution $\hat{g} := \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \operatorname{span}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}}$ satisfies

$$P\{P_n W([\hat{g}(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\} \leq P\left\{-(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset s\mathcal{F})\right\} + e^{-\lambda_T} / (1 - e^{-\lambda_T}) + e^{-\lambda_\epsilon} \quad \text{where}$$

$$\lambda_T = \frac{\alpha_n^2}{u^2(256R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 148\rho^2)} \wedge \frac{3\alpha_n}{16un^{-1/2}}$$

$$\lambda_\epsilon = \frac{(\epsilon^2 - 7s^2\alpha_n^2)_+}{6^2 s^4 \alpha_n^2 (256u^2 R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 34u^2 \rho^2) + (6)(72)s^2 \alpha_n u^2 \rho n^{-1/2} + 40\eta^{-3} n^{-1}} \wedge \frac{\epsilon^2 - 7s^2\alpha_n^2}{32s^2 \alpha_n u n^{-1/2}}. \quad (59)$$

To characterize the minimizer \hat{g} of $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ and prove the above result, we use the optimality condition it satisfies, $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{g}) \leq \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g)$ for all g and therefore for an approximation g^* to e^{-1} . We work with an approximation because we are not assuming that $e^{-1} \in \operatorname{span} \mathcal{F}$; $\|e^{-1}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ may be infinite and the statement $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{g}) \leq \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(e^{-1})$ vacuous. The approximation g^* we consider trades off complexity, in terms of our regularization term ψ , and accurate approximation, in terms of the MSE $\mathbb{E} W([g] - e^{-1}(X))^2$. Our essential argument classifies all functions g as falling into three overlapping categories:

1. g is comparable to g^* in terms of MSE
2. the complexity penalty $\psi_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g)$ is larger than some threshold $T \geq \psi_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g^*)$. We claim that this implies that the difference $\psi_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g) - \psi_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g^*)$ overwhelms any difference in the MSE and noise terms at g and g^* with high probability, making $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g) > \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g^*)$.
3. g has larger MSE than g^* and the complexity penalty $\psi_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g) \leq T$. We claim that this implies that the scale of the noise $(P_n - P)h'_g$ is small enough that with high probability, $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g) > \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g^*)$

If the claimed implications of belonging in the second and third category hold, our optimality condition implies that with high probability \hat{g} cannot be in either of them, so it must be in the first, desirable one. Our proof of Lemma 2 starts by verifying Lemmas 3 and 4 below, which can be used to rule out these last two categories respectively.

Lemma 3. *Let \mathcal{F} , s , u , β_n , $a_n(\cdot)$, a_n^{\star} , α_n , be as in Lemma 2, let g^* satisfy $\|g^*\|_\infty \leq 6s^2 \sqrt{n}\beta_n$ and $a_n(g^*)^2 \leq a_n^{\star 2}$, and let $\mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) := \mathbb{M}_{n,s\mathcal{F}}(g) - \mathbb{M}_{n,s^{-1}\mathcal{F}}(g^*)$, $\mathcal{G}_T = \{g : T \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}\}$, and $T = 6s^2 \sqrt{n}\alpha_n$. $P\{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_T} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \leq 0\} \leq e^{-\lambda_T} / (1 - e^{-\lambda_T})$ for λ_T defined in (59).*

Lemma 4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 3, with $\mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,T} = \{g : \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq T, P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\}$, $P\{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon,T}} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \leq 0\} \leq e^{-\lambda_\epsilon}$ for λ_ϵ defined in (59).*

Intuitively, Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 hold because some signal exceeds the noise terms $(P_n - P)h_g$ and $(P_n - P)h'_g$ with high probability. Naturally, bounds on these noise terms are essential to our proofs. We use the upper tail of Talagrand's inequality to get bounds that hold with high probability simultaneously for all $g \in r\mathcal{F}$, where r is an appropriate scale: if \mathcal{H}

is a countable class of functions with $a \leq h \leq b$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \text{var}\{h(W, X)\} \leq V$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h \geq x \right\} \\ & \leq \exp \left\{ - \left(\frac{n(x - \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h)_+^2}{8(b-a) \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h + 4V} \wedge \frac{3n(x - \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h)}{4(b-a)} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

This form of Talagrand's inequality is a straightforward consequence of the following standard one established by Bousquet (Giné and Nickl, 2015, Theorem 3.3.9): if \mathcal{H}' is a countable class of mean-zero functions, $U \geq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} \|h\|_\infty$, $V \geq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} Ph^2$, and $t \geq 0$,

$$P \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} P_n h \geq \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} P_n h + t \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ - \frac{nt^2}{4U \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} P_n h + 2V + \frac{2}{3}Ut} \right\}. \quad (61)$$

To derive our form, apply the standard form to $\mathcal{H}' = \{Ph - h : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$, observing that $-b \leq Ph - h \leq -a$ and therefore $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} h \leq U := b - a$ and $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} Ph^2 = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \text{var}\{h\}$, substitute for the denominator the upper bound $2a \vee 2b \geq a + b$ with $a = 4U \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}'} P_n h + 2V$ and $b = \frac{2}{3}Ut$, and take $t = x - \mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h$.

Our class \mathcal{F} is not in general countable, so this inequality is not directly applicable to suprema over $r\mathcal{F}$. It applies nonetheless. We will show that when \mathcal{F} is pointwise separable, any claim applicable to suprema over countable sets applies to suprema of the functions $\phi(f) = (P_n - P)h_{rf}$, $\phi'(f) = (P_n - P)h'_{rf}$, etc. over \mathcal{F} . After this paragraph we will use such methods without remark. Pointwise separability guarantees the existence of a countable set $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with the property that for any n and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a sequence $f_j \in \mathcal{F}_0$ satisfying $\|f_j - f\|_{L_2(P_n)} \vee \|f_j - f\|_{L_2(P)} \rightarrow 0$. It follows that for any function $\phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is continuous in the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)} \vee \|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$, the uncountable supremum $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \phi(f)$ is equal to the countable supremum $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_0} \phi(f)$. Because the functions $\phi(f) = (P_n - P)h_{rf}$, $\phi'(f) = (P_n - P)h'_{rf}$, etc. are continuous in this sense, this result applies to them.

To apply this inequality in our setting, we need bounds on $\mathbb{E} \sup_{g \in r\mathcal{F}} (P - P_n)h_g$, the width of the range $[a, b]$ of h_g for $g \in r\mathcal{F}$, $\sup_{g \in r\mathcal{F}} \text{var}\{h_g\}$, and their analogs for h'_g . We collect the bounds we will use in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5. For h_g and h'_g defined in (57) with $u \geq 4$ and any pointwise separable class \mathcal{G} ,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} (P - P_n)h_g \leq 8uR_n(\mathcal{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} (P - P_n)h'_g \leq 8uR_n(\mathcal{G}) \quad (62)$$

$$a \leq h'_g \leq h_g \leq b \quad \text{for } a, b \text{ with } b - a \leq 2u(2u \vee \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g\|_\infty) \quad (63)$$

$$\mathbb{E} h_g(W, X)^2 \leq 9.25u^2 \mathbb{E} g(X)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} h'_g(W, X)^2 \leq 4.25u^2 \mathbb{E} g^2 + 9u^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E} g^2} + \eta^{-3} \quad (64)$$

Proof. First, we bound $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\{h_g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}} (P - P_n)h_g$ and $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\{h'_g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}} (P - P_n)h'_g$ in terms of the Rademacher complexity of the sets $\{h_g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ and $\{h'_g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$, using the symmetrization bound $\mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P_n - P)h \leq 2R_n(\mathcal{H})$. To bound the Rademacher complexity of the first set, we write $h_g(W_i, X_i) = \psi_i(g(X_i))$ where

$$\psi_i(g) = \begin{cases} -2g & \text{if } W_i = 0 \text{ or } W_i = 1 \text{ and } g < 0 \\ g^2 - 2g & \text{if } W_i = 1 \text{ and } g \in [0, u] \\ 2u(g - u) + u^2 - 2g = 2(u - 1)g - u^2 & \text{if } W_i = 1 \text{ and } g > u \end{cases}$$

For all i , the function ψ_i is $2u$ -Lipschitz and vanishes at zero, so via the contraction principle for Rademacher processes (Giné and Nickl, 2015, Theorem 3.2.1),

$$R_n(\{h_g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}) = \mathbb{E}_{W,X} \mathbb{E}_\sigma \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sigma_i \phi_i(g(X_i)) \leq \mathbb{E}_{W,X}(2)(2u) \mathbb{E}_\sigma \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sigma_i g(X_i) = 4uR_n(\mathcal{G}).$$

To bound the Rademacher complexity of the second, we may use the same argument, as $h'_g(W_i, X_i) = \phi_i(g(X_i))$ where

$$\psi_i(g) = \begin{cases} -2g & \text{if } W_i = 0 \\ -2g - e^{-2}(X_i) & \text{if } W_i = 1 \text{ and } g < 0 \\ 2e^{-1}(X_i)g - 2g - e^{-2}(X_i) & \text{if } W_i = 1 \text{ and } g \in [0, u] \\ 2u(g - u) + 2e^{-1}(X_i)u - 2g - e^{-2}(X_i) & \text{if } W_i = 1 \text{ and } g > u, \end{cases}$$

and again for all i , the function ψ_i is $2u$ -Lipschitz and vanishes at zero.

Second, we bound the range of h_g and h'_g . With $M := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g\|_\infty$, for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$

$$h_g \in [-2g, (2u(g - u) + u^2 - 2g) \vee (u^2 - 2g)] \subseteq [-2M, (2(u - 1)M - u^2) \vee u^2 + 2M].$$

For $h'_g = h_g - W([g] - e^{-1})^2$, the upper range bound remains the same and the lower shifts down by no more than u^2 , i.e. $h_g, h'_g \in [-2M - u^2, (2(u - 1)M - u^2) \vee u^2 + 2M]$. The width of this interval is $2(u^2 + 2M) \vee 2uM$. The first of these widths is larger iff $M \leq u^2/(u - 2)$, in which case it is bounded by $2u^2(1 + 2/(u - 2)) = 2u^3/(u - 2) \leq 4u^2$, the last step using $u/(u - 2) \leq 2$ for $u \geq 4$. Substituting this bound gives the claimed width bound $4u^2 \vee 2uM$.

Third, we bound $\mathbb{E} h_g^2$ using a simple calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} h_g^2 &= 4u^2 \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+^2 + \mathbb{E} W[g]^4 + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 \\ &\quad + 4u \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+[g]^2 - 8u \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+g - 4 \mathbb{E}[g]^2g \\ &\leq 4u^2 \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+^2 + \mathbb{E} W[g]^4 + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 + 4u \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+[g]^2 \\ &\leq 4u^2 \mathbb{E} g^2 + u^2 \mathbb{E} g^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 + 4u^2 \mathbb{E} g^2 \\ &\leq 9.25u^2 \mathbb{E} g^2. \end{aligned}$$

We drop the negated terms on the second line; by consideration of the signs the factors take on their common support, they are all either zero or negative pointwise. In the last step, we use $4 \leq u^2/4$.

We bound $\mathbb{E} (h'_g)^2$ using a similar approach:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} (h'_g)^2 &= 4u^2 \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} W e^{-2}[g]^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 + \mathbb{E} W e^{-4} \\ &\quad + 8u \mathbb{E} W e^{-1}[g](g - u)_+ - 8u \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+g - 4u \mathbb{E} W e^{-2}(g - u)_+ \\ &\quad - 8 \mathbb{E} W e^{-1}[g]g - 4W e^{-3}[g] + 4 \mathbb{E} W e^{-2}g \\ &\leq 4u^2 \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} W e^{-2}[g]^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 + \mathbb{E} W e^{-4} + 8u \mathbb{E} W e^{-1}[g](g - u)_+ + 4 \mathbb{E} W e^{-2}g \\ &= 4u^2 \mathbb{E} W(g - u)_+^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} e^{-1}[g]^2 + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 + \mathbb{E} e^{-3} + 8u \mathbb{E}[g](g - u)_+ + 4\eta^{-1} \mathbb{E} g \\ &\leq 4u^2 \mathbb{E} ((g - u)_+^2 + [g]^2) + 4 \mathbb{E} g^2 + \mathbb{E} e^{-3} + 8u^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(g - u)_+^2} + 4\eta^{-1} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} g^2} \\ &\leq 4.25u^2 \mathbb{E} g^2 + \eta^{-3} + 9u^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E} g^2} \end{aligned}$$

As before, we dropped negated terms from the initial expression by consideration of the signs their factors take on their common support and in the last step use the bound $4 \leq u^2/4$ to combine the first two terms and the bound $4\eta^{-1} \leq 4u \leq u^2$ to combine the last two. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Define $\mathcal{G}_{[q,r]} := \{\|g\|_{\mathcal{F}} \in [q, r]\}$; in these terms $\mathcal{G}_T = \mathcal{G}_{[T, \infty)}$. We will use a *peeling argument*, covering $\mathcal{G}_{[T, \infty)}$ with a union of strata of comparable $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ -regularity, $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_{[2^{k-1}T, 2^k T]}$, and applying the union bound,

$$P\left\{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[T, \infty)}} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \leq 0\right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\left\{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[2^{k-1}T, 2^k T]}} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \leq 0\right\}. \quad (65)$$

Consider a single term. On $\mathcal{G}_{[r/2, r]}$, $\psi_{s\mathcal{F}}(g) \geq \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2/(s^2n) \geq r^2/(4s^2n)$; therefore $\mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \geq r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2} + (P_n - P)(h_g - h_{g^*})$. Taking infima,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[r/2, r]}} \mathcal{L}(g) \leq 0\right\} &\subseteq \left\{r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2} + \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[r/2, r]}} (P_n - P)(h_g - h_{g^*}) \leq 0\right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{\sup_{g \in r\mathcal{F}} (P - P_n)(h_g - h_{g^*}) \geq r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We use Talagrand's inequality (60), to bound the probability of this event. This will require, for $\mathcal{H} = \{h_g - h_{g^*} : g \in r\mathcal{F}\}$, bounding (1) the mean $\mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h$, (2) the maximal variance $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \text{var } h$, and (3) the range of $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h \leq 8uR_n(\mathcal{F})r \leq r\beta_n/\sqrt{n}$$

The first problem reduces to bounding $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\{h_g : g \in r\mathcal{F}\}} (P - P_n)h$, as

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\{h_g : g \in r\mathcal{F}\}} (P - P_n)h + \mathbb{E}(P_n - P)h_{g^*}.$$

Lemma 5 establishes the bound $8uR_n(r\mathcal{F}) = 8uR_n(\mathcal{F})r$ for the first term; the second is zero.

$$\sup_{g \in r\mathcal{F}} \text{var}(h_g - h_{g^*}) \leq 37u^2\rho^2r^2$$

We use the simple bound $\text{var}(h_g - h_{g^*}) \leq \mathbb{E}(h_g - h_{g^*})^2 \leq 2(\mathbb{E}h_g^2 + \mathbb{E}h_{g^*}^2) \leq 4(\mathbb{E}h_g^2 \vee \mathbb{E}h_{g^*}^2)$. Lemma 5, gives $\mathbb{E}h_g^2 \vee \mathbb{E}h_{g^*}^2 \leq 9.25u^2(\mathbb{E}g^2 \vee \mathbb{E}g^{*2}) \leq 9.25u^2(\rho r \vee \sqrt{\mathbb{E}g^{*2}})^2$.

We will show that $\rho r \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}g^{*2}}$, so this quantity is $9.25u^2\rho^2r^2$. As we consider only $r \geq T$, it suffices to show that $\rho T \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}g^{*2}}$. To do this, we will bound $\mathbb{E}g^{*2}$ using the condition $\mathbb{E}e(X)(g^* - e^{-1})^2 \leq a_n^{*2}$ and the reverse triangle inequality.

$$a_n^* \geq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}e(X)(g^* - e^{-1})^2} \geq \left| \sqrt{\mathbb{E}e(X)g^{*2}} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}e(X)e^{-2}} \right| \geq \sqrt{\eta \mathbb{E}g^{*2}} - \sqrt{\eta^{-1}},$$

so $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}g^{*2}} \leq \eta^{-1/2}(a_n^* + \eta^{-1/2}) \leq 2\eta^{-1}$, as $a_n^{*2} \leq a_n(0)^2 = \mathbb{E}e^{-1}(X) \leq \eta^{-1}$. To complete our argument, we will show that $\rho T \geq 2\eta^{-1}$ is implied one of our assumptions on β_n : $\rho T \geq 6s^2\rho\sqrt{n}\beta_n$, so it suffices to show that $6s^2\rho\sqrt{n}\beta_n \geq 2\eta^{-1}$, i.e. our assumption $\beta_n \geq (3\eta s^2\rho\sqrt{n})^{-1}$.

The range of $h_g - h_{g^*}$ is no wider than $4ur$ for $g \in r\mathcal{F}$

If $h_g \in [a, b]$ and $h_{g^*} \in [c, d]$, $h_g - h_{g^*} \in [a-d, b-c]$, an interval of width $(b-a) + (d-c) \leq 2((b-a) \vee (d-c))$. By Lemma 5, $(b-a) \vee (d-c) \leq 2u(2u \vee r \vee 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n) = 2ur$, in our final simplification using $r \geq T \geq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n \geq 2u$, the last inequality following from our assumed upper bound on u .

Therefore, for $r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2} - r\beta_n/\sqrt{n} \geq 0$, $P\{\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}}(P - P_n)h \geq r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2}\} \leq e^{-\lambda(r)}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(r) &= \frac{n(r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2} - r\beta_n/\sqrt{n})^2}{256u^2R_n(\mathcal{F})r^2 + 148u^2\rho^2r^2} \wedge \frac{3n(r^2/(4s^2n) - a_n^{*2} - r\beta_n/\sqrt{n})}{16ur} \\ &= \frac{n(r/(4s^2n) - \beta_n/\sqrt{n} - a_n^{*2}/r)^2}{256u^2R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 148u^2\rho^2} \wedge \frac{3n(r/(4s^2n) - \beta_n/\sqrt{n} - a_n^{*2}/r)}{16u}.\end{aligned}$$

Our first step will be to bound the sum (65) in terms of its first term $e^{-\lambda(T)}$. We have the property $\lambda(2r) \geq 2\lambda(r)$, as $a(2r) - b - c/(2r) = 2(ar - b - c/r) + b + c/(2r)$. It follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\left\{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{[2^{k-1}T, 2^kT]}} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \leq 0\right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda(2^k T)} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-2^{k-1}\lambda(2T)} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-k\lambda(2T)} = \frac{e^{-\lambda(2T)}}{1 - e^{-\lambda(2T)}}.$$

All that remains is to upper bound this quantity by lower bounding $\lambda(2T)$. First, calculate

$$\begin{aligned}2T/(4s^2n) - \beta_n/\sqrt{n} - a_n^{*2}/(2T) &= \frac{12s^2\sqrt{n}(\beta_n \vee a_n^*)}{4s^2n} - \frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{a_n^{*2}}{12s^2\sqrt{n}(\beta_n \vee a_n^*)} \\ &\geq \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}}(\beta_n \vee a_n^*) - \left(\frac{\beta_n}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{a_n^*}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{\beta_n \vee a_n^*}{\sqrt{n}}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this lower bound in the expression for $\lambda(T)$, we get a bound λ satisfying $\lambda \leq \lambda(T)$:

$$\lambda := \frac{(\beta_n \vee a_n^*)^2}{u^2(256R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 148\rho^2)} \wedge \frac{3(\beta_n \vee a_n^*)}{16un^{-1/2}}.$$

This completes our proof: the claimed bound is $e^{-\lambda}/(1 - e^{-\lambda})$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4. We show that for sufficiently large ϵ , $\mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) > 0$ with high probability for all $g \in \mathcal{G}_{T,\epsilon} = \{g : \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq T, P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\}$.

Our first step is to express \mathcal{L}_{g^*} in terms of $P_n([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) &\geq \psi_{s\mathcal{F}}(g) + P\epsilon(X) ([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 + (P_n - P)(h_g - h_{g^*}) - a_n^{*2} \\ &= \psi_{s\mathcal{F}}(g) + P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 - (P_n - P)W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \\ &\quad + (P_n - P)(h_g - h_{g^*}) - a_n^{*2} \\ &= \psi_{s\mathcal{F}}(g) + P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 + (P_n - P)(h'_g - h_{g^*}) - a_n^{*2} \\ &\geq P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 + (P_n - P)(h'_g - h_{g^*}) - a_n^{*2}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{T,\epsilon}} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \geq \epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2} + \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{T,\epsilon}} (P_n - P)(h'_g - h_{g^*}),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{T,\epsilon}} \mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) \leq 0 \right\} &\subseteq \left\{ \epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2} + \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{T,\epsilon}} (P_n - P)(h'_g - h_{g^*}) \leq 0 \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \sup_{g \in T\mathcal{F}} (P - P_n)(h'_g - h_{g^*}) \geq \epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We use Talagrand's inequality (60) to bound the probability of this last event. This will require, for $\mathcal{H} = \{h'_g - h_{g^*} : g \in T\mathcal{F}\}$, bounding (1) the mean $\mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h$, (2) the maximal variance $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \text{var } h$, and (3) the range of $h \in \mathcal{H}$. The arguments for showing that $\mathbb{E} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h \leq 8uR_n(\mathcal{F})T \leq T\beta_n/\sqrt{n}$ and that the width of the range of $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is bounded by $4uT$ are identical to the ones used in Lemma 3. Meanwhile, to show that $\sup_{g \in T\mathcal{F}} \text{var}(h'_g - h_{g^*}) \leq 8.5u^2\rho^2T^2 + 18u^2\rho T + 10\eta^{-3}$, we use the simple bound $\text{var}(h'_g - h_{g^*}) \leq \mathbb{E}(h'_g - h_{g^*})^2 \leq 2(\mathbb{E}(h'_g)^2 + \mathbb{E}h_{g^*}^2)$. Lemma 5 gives $\mathbb{E}(h'_g)^2 \leq 4.25u^2\mathbb{E}g^2 + 4\eta^{-1}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}g^2} + \eta^{-3} \leq 4.25u^2\rho^2T^2 + 9u^2\rho T + \eta^{-3}$ and we showed in the proof of Lemma 3 that $\mathbb{E}h_{g^*}^2 \leq 4\eta^{-3}$. Adding these bounds and doubling gives the claimed variance bound.

Therefore, for $\epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2} - T\beta_n/\sqrt{n} \geq 0$, $P\{\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (P - P_n)h \geq \epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2}\} \leq e^{-\lambda}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{n(\epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2} - T\beta_n/\sqrt{n})^2}{256u^2T^2R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 34u^2\rho^2T^2 + 72u^2\rho T + 40\eta^{-3}} \wedge \frac{3n(\epsilon^2 - a_n^{*2} - T\beta_n/\sqrt{n})}{16uT} \\ &= \frac{(\epsilon^2 - (a_n^{*2} + T\beta_n/\sqrt{n}))^2}{(T/\sqrt{n})^2(256u^2R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 34u^2\rho^2) + (T/\sqrt{n})72u^2\rho n^{-1/2} + 40\eta^{-3}n^{-1}} \wedge \frac{3(\epsilon^2 - (a_n^{*2} + T\beta_n/\sqrt{n}))}{(T/\sqrt{n})16un^{-1/2}} \\ &= \frac{(\epsilon^2 - (a_n^{*2} + T\beta_n/\sqrt{n}))^2}{6^2s^4\alpha_n^2(256u^2R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 34u^2\rho^2) + (6)(72)s^2\alpha_nu^2\rho n^{-1/2} + 40\eta^{-3}n^{-1}} \wedge \frac{\epsilon^2 - (a_n^{*2} + T\beta_n/\sqrt{n})}{32s^2\alpha_nun^{-1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The claimed bound follows by loosening and simplifying this one slightly; we lower bound the numerators by substituting an upper bound for $a_n^{*2} + T\beta_n/\sqrt{n}$.

$$\begin{aligned} a_n^{*2} + T\beta_n/\sqrt{n} &= a_n^{*2} + [6s^2\sqrt{n}(\beta_n \vee a_n^*)][\beta_n/\sqrt{n}] \\ &= a_n^{*2} + 6s^2\beta_n(\beta_n \vee a_n^*) \\ &\leq 7s^2(\beta_n \vee a_n^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2. Define the excess loss $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{g^*}(g) := \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g) - \mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g^*)$ relative to an approximation to e^{-1} , $g^* \in \text{span } \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Our estimator \hat{g} satisfies $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{g^*}(\hat{g}) \leq 0$ for any g^* . We will use this condition to characterize \hat{g} .

To avoid complications involving the random norm $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ that occurs in $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{g^*}$, we work with a high probability lower bound $\mathcal{L}_{g^*}(g) := \mathbb{M}_{n,s\mathcal{F}}(g) - \mathbb{M}_{n,s^{-1}\mathcal{F}}(g^*)$; substituting a smaller norm $\|g\|_{s\mathcal{F}}$ for the instance of $\|g\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ occurring in $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g)$ and a larger norm $\|g^*\|_{s^{-1}\mathcal{F}}$ for the instance of $\|g^*\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ that occurs in $\mathbb{M}_{n,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(g^*)$. These bounds are valid on the set equivalence event $s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq s\mathcal{F}$; in terms of gauges, this reads $\|\cdot\|_{s\mathcal{F}} \leq \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq \|\cdot\|_{s^{-1}\mathcal{F}}$ or equivalently $s^{-1}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \leq s\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}}$.

On this event, $\mathcal{L}_{g^*}(\hat{g}) \leq 0$ for all g^* ; we will characterize functions with this property using two approximations g_1^*, g_2^* . Our goal is to show that with high probability, no such function is far from e^{-1} . We will break this into a tightness and a consistency-given-tightness

result, i.e. if $P_n W([\hat{g}(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2$, then $\mathcal{G}_T \cup \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon, T}$ contains an element \hat{g} satisfying $\mathcal{L}_{g_i^*}(g) \leq 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_T &= \{g : T \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}}\}; \\ \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon, T} &= \{g : \|g\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq T, P_n W([g(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}& \{P_n W([\hat{g}(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_T} \mathcal{L}_{g_1^*}(g) \leq 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon, T}} \mathcal{L}_{g_2^*}(g) \leq 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ \neg(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq s\mathcal{F}) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We use the union bound to bound the probability of this event.

$$\begin{aligned}& P\{P_n W([\hat{g}(X)] - e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\} \\ & \leq P\left\{ \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_T} \mathcal{L}_{g_1^*}(g) \leq 0 \right\} + P\left\{ \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\epsilon, T}} \mathcal{L}_{g_2^*}(g) \leq 0 \right\} + P\left\{ \neg(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq s\mathcal{F}) \right\}\end{aligned}\quad (66)$$

We use Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 respectively to bound the first two terms. The third term appears directly in our bound. \square

A.3 Universal Consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$ without Reflexiveness

In combination, Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, bound $P\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\hat{\gamma}_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\right\}$, the distance of our weights from the inverse propensity weights. However, the reflexiveness assumption of Lemma 1 is a substantial restriction on the function classes $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \mathcal{F}$ to which this bound applies. In particular, the Hölder spaces discussed in Example 2 and Example 3 are not reflexive. In this section, we use a finite-dimensional approximation argument to prove essentially the same bound under a condition that is typically satisfied for the function classes we consider: the condition that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and \mathcal{F} are totally bounded in $L_2(P)$.

Lemma 6. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and \mathcal{F} be two sets of functions mapping $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, each of which is totally bounded in $L_2(P)$, with $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ gauge-closed and \mathcal{F} pointwise separable, $\sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, and $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} f(X)^2 \leq \rho^2$. Then for any $s \geq 1$ and $u, \lambda_T, \lambda_{\epsilon}$ defined in relation to \mathcal{F} as in Lemma 2,*

$$P\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\hat{\gamma}_i^{(w)} - e^{-1}(X_i))^2 > \epsilon^2\right\} \leq P\left\{\neg(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq s\mathcal{F})\right\} + e^{-\lambda_T} / (1 - e^{-\lambda_T}) + e^{-\lambda_{\epsilon}}\quad (67)$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Let C_{δ} be the symmetric convex hull of the set of centers of a finite δ -cover of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} \cup \mathcal{F}$ in $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)} \vee \|\cdot\|_{L_1(P_n)}$. Note that a finite δ -cover in this norm exists whenever $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and \mathcal{F} are totally bounded in $L_2(P)$ and uniformly bounded in $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$, as a uniform boundedness is sufficient to guarantee total boundedness in any empirical norm, and we may intersect any finite set of finite covers to get a finite cover.

Define finite dimensional approximations $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\delta} := \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \cap C_{\delta}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\delta} := \mathcal{F} \cap C_{\delta}$. Note that while we define our optimization problem (27) in terms of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ because we do not know \mathcal{F} , these approximations are just a device in this proof, so it causes no trouble here to define $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\delta}$ in terms of \mathcal{F} .

While we usually leave the function class we are working with implicit when working with the function ℓ defined in (27), we will need to be explicit in this proof. We will write

$$\ell_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\{i:W_i=1\}} \gamma_i^2 + I_{\mathcal{G}}^{(1)}(\gamma)^2.$$

Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 apply to the pair of sets $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta$ and \mathcal{F}_δ : each set is symmetric, convex, and gauge-closed; \mathcal{F}_δ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta$ inherit the bound $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ from \mathcal{F} and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ respectively; \mathcal{F}_δ inherits the bound $\mathbb{E} f(X)^2 \leq \rho$ from \mathcal{F} ; the space $(\text{span}\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta\}, \|\cdot\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta})$ is finite dimensional and therefore reflexive (see e.g. [Peypouquet, 2015](#), Theorem 1.24), and \mathcal{F}_δ inherits pointwise measurability from \mathcal{F} . Because $R_n(\mathcal{F}_\delta) \leq R_n(\mathcal{F})$ and $\{s^{-1}\mathcal{F}_\delta \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta \subseteq s\mathcal{F}_\delta\} \supseteq \{s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq s\mathcal{F}\}$, for

$$\beta_n \geq 8u\sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}), \quad a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}^* \geq \inf_{g:\|g\|_\infty \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}^2(g), \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{n,\delta} := a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}^* \vee \beta_n$$

the minimizer $\hat{\gamma}_\delta$ of $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_\delta}$ satisfies

$$P\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} ((\hat{\gamma}_\delta)_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\right\} \leq P\left\{-(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq s\mathcal{F})\right\} + e^{-\lambda_{T,\delta}}/(1 - e^{-\lambda_{T,\delta}}) + e^{-\lambda_{\epsilon,\delta}} \quad \text{where}$$

$$\lambda_{T,\delta} = \frac{\alpha_{n,\delta}^2}{u^2(256R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 148\rho^2)} \wedge \frac{3\alpha_{n,\delta}}{16un^{-1/2}}$$

$$\lambda_{\epsilon,\delta} = \frac{(\epsilon^2 - 7s^2\alpha_{n,\delta}^2)_+}{6^2s^4\alpha_{n,\delta}^2(256u^2R_n(\mathcal{F}) + 34u^2\rho^2) + (6)(72)\eta^{-1}s^2\alpha_{n,\delta}\rho n^{-1/2} + 40\eta^{-3}n^{-1}} \wedge \frac{\epsilon^2 - 7s^2\alpha_{n,\delta}^2}{32s^2\alpha_{n,\delta}un^{-1/2}}. \quad (68)$$

This bound depends on δ only through $a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}^*$. We'll eliminate this dependence by giving a bound in terms of a_n^* . Let g_j be a sequence with $\|g_j\|_\infty \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n$ satisfying $a_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g_j)^2 \downarrow \inf_{\|g\|_\infty \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g)^2$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Define the approximating sequence $\tilde{g}_j \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\delta$ by $\tilde{g}_j := \|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}} f_j$ where f_j is the center of an element of the δ -cover used to define \mathcal{F}_δ which contains $g_j/\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. We will show that

$$a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}(\tilde{g}_j)^2 \leq a_n(g_j)^2 + \delta^2\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + 2\delta\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}} \left(\|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)} + u + 1 \right) \quad (69)$$

by comparing like terms. By construction, $\|\tilde{g}_j\|_{\mathcal{F}_\delta} \leq \|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\|\tilde{g}_j\|_\infty \leq \|g_j\|_\infty$, and using the condition $\|\tilde{g}_j - g_j\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}$, we may bound the other terms of $a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}(\tilde{g}_j)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\tilde{g}_j(X) - e^{-1}(X))^2 \\ & \leq P(|\tilde{g}_j(X) - g_j(X)| + |g_j(X) - e^{-1}(X)|)^2 \\ & \leq \|\tilde{g}_j - g_j\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + 2\|\tilde{g}_j - g_j\|_{L_2(P)}\|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)} + \|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \\ & \leq \delta^2\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + 2\delta\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}\|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)} + \|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \\ & P(ue(X) - 1)(\tilde{g}_j(X) - u)_+ \\ & = P(ue(X) - 1)((\tilde{g}_j(X) - g_j(X)) + (g_j(X) - u)_+) \\ & \leq P(ue(X) - 1)|\tilde{g}_j(X) - g_j(X)| + P(ue(X) - 1)(g_j(X) - u)_+ \\ & \leq \|ue - 1\|_{L_2(P)}\|\tilde{g}_j - g_j\|_{L_2(P)} + P(ue(X) - 1)(g_j(X) - u)_+ \\ & \leq u\delta\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}} + P(ue(X) - 1)(g_j(X) - u)_+ \\ & - P(\tilde{g}_j(X))_- \leq \delta\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}} - P(g_j(X))_- \quad \text{analogously.} \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (69). For sufficiently large j ,

$$\frac{\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{n} + \|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq a_{n,\mathcal{F}}(g_j) \leq 2 \inf_{\|g\| \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}}^2(g),$$

and consequently $\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\|g_j - e^{-1}\|_{L_2(P)}$ have a uniform-in- j upper bounds. By taking δ arbitrarily small, we can make the excess terms in (69) and therefore the gap $\lim_n a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}^2(\tilde{g}_j) - \lim_n a_{n,\mathcal{F}}^2(g_j)$ arbitrarily small. Because $\|\tilde{g}_j\|_{\infty} \leq \|g_j\|_{\infty} \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_j$, this implies the same for the gap $\inf_{\|g\| \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}_\delta}^2(g) - \inf_{\|g\| \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}}^2(g)$. In particular, we can make the former infimum smaller than any bound $a_{n,\mathcal{F}}^* > \inf_{\|g\| \leq 6s^2\sqrt{n}\beta_n} a_{n,\mathcal{F}}^2(g)$, so (68) remains valid if we substitute $\alpha_n := a_{n,\mathcal{F}}^* \vee \beta_n$, i.e.

$$P\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} ((\hat{\gamma}_\delta)_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2 \geq \epsilon^2\right\} \leq P\left\{-(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset s\mathcal{F})\right\} + e^{-\lambda_T}/(1 - e^{-\lambda_T}) + e^{-\lambda_\epsilon}$$

with $\lambda_T, \lambda_\epsilon$ defined, in terms of \mathcal{F} , as in Lemma 2.

It follows that if $|\frac{1}{n}((\hat{\gamma}_\delta)_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2 - \frac{1}{n}(\hat{\gamma}_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2| \leq \nu$, then

$$P\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\hat{\gamma}_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2 \geq \epsilon^2 + \nu\right\} \leq P\left\{-(s^{-1}\mathcal{F} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \subset s\mathcal{F})\right\} + e^{-\lambda_T}/(1 - e^{-\lambda_T}) + e^{-\lambda_\epsilon}.$$

To complete our proof, we will show that $\hat{\gamma}_\delta \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Because $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\gamma_i - e^{-1}(X_i))^2$ is continuous in γ , this implies that we may take δ small enough to satisfy this condition for arbitrary $\nu > 0$, establishing the claimed bound. To do this, we use the $\frac{2}{n}$ -strong convexity of $\ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} ((\hat{\gamma}_\delta)_i - \hat{\gamma}_i)^2 \leq \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) - \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}).$$

In order to get a useful upper bound on the right side in the expression above, we exploit the similarity of $\ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ and $\ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}$:

$$\ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) \leq \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}) \leq \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) \quad \text{where} \quad \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) - \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) = I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta)^2 - I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta)^2.$$

We can bound this difference in terms of

$$I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) - I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) = \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \inf_{f' \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \hat{\gamma}_\delta)(f - f')(X_i) \leq \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}} \inf_{f' \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta} u \|f - f'\|_{L_1(P_n)} \leq u\delta.$$

Using the identity $a^2 - b^2 = (a + b)(a - b) = (2b + (a - b))(a - b) = 2(a - b)b + (a - b)^2$,

$$\ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) - \ell_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) \leq 2u\delta I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\delta}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}_\delta) + u^2\delta^2 \leq 2u\delta I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}^{(1)}(\hat{\gamma}) + u^2\delta^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

□

A.4 Universal Consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$: Asymptotics

In order to prove our asymptotic results, we need to work out the asymptotic consequences of the bounds in the previous section under the assumptions of Theorem 2. Our first step is to show that the quantity a_n^* appearing in the bound from Lemma 2 goes to zero. We use the following well-known density property (see, e.g., Folland, 2009, Proposition 5.7): if, as we've assumed, P is a regular Borel measure on the locally compact Hausdorff space \mathcal{X} , then $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $L_2(P)(\mathcal{X})$.

Lemma 7. *Let $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n > \eta^{-1}$ and define $a_{n, \mathcal{F}_n}(\cdot)$ as in (58) for any $s \geq 1$. If, for any increasing sequence $r_n \ll n^{-1/2}$, the sequence of sets $(r_n \mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is increasing ($r_k \mathcal{F}_k \subseteq r_{k+1} \mathcal{F}_{k+1}$) and dense in $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$, then for any sequence $b_n \rightarrow \infty$, $\inf_{\|g\|_\infty \leq b_n} a_{n, \mathcal{F}_n}(g)^2 \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we will show the existence of a sequence $(g_{j_n})_{n=1}^\infty$ with the property that $\limsup a_n(g_{j_n})^2 \leq \epsilon$. Because $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ is dense in $L_2(P)$, there exists $g^* \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathbb{E}(g^* - e^{-1})^2 < \epsilon/2$. We may assume $g^* \in [0, \eta^{-1}]$, because if it were not, $[g^*]_{\eta^{-1}} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ would be a better approximation with this property.

Density of $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ in $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ implies the existence of a sequence $g_j \in r_j \mathcal{F}_j$ with $\|g_j(x) - g^*(x)\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. We may choose a subsequence $g_{j_n} \in r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ satisfying in addition $\|g_{j_n}\|_\infty \leq b_n$ by taking $j_n = \max\{j \leq n : \|g_j\|_\infty \leq b_n\}$. We will show that each term in $a_n(g_{j_n})^2$ is appropriately bounded.

In each of the following steps, we will assume $\eta^{-1} < u_n$; this holds for all sufficiently large n under our assumption $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n > \eta^{-1}$.

$$\limsup \mathbb{E} e(X)(g_{j_n} - e^{-1})^2 < \epsilon$$

$e^{-1} \in [0, \eta^{-1}] \subseteq [0, u_n]$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{E} e(X)(g_{j_n} - e^{-1})^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}(g_{j_n} - g^*)^2 \vee 2\mathbb{E}(g^* - e^{-1})^2.$$

The second term is less than ϵ ; the first is bounded by $2\|g_{j_n} - g^*\|_\infty^2$ and becomes arbitrarily small in the limit.

$$\|g_{j_n}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n}^2/n \rightarrow 0$$

Because of our nesting property, $\|g_{j_n}\|_{r_n \mathcal{F}_n} \leq \|g_{j_n}\|_{r_{j_n} \mathcal{F}_{j_n}}$, and consequently

$$\frac{\|g_{j_n}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n}}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{r_n}{\sqrt{n}} \|g_{j_n}\|_{r_n \mathcal{F}_n} \leq \frac{r_n}{\sqrt{n}} \|g_{j_n}\|_{r_{j_n} \mathcal{F}_{j_n}} \leq \frac{r_n}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow 0.$$

$$\mathbb{E}(ue(X) - 1)(g_{j_n}(X) - u)_+ \rightarrow 0$$

For sufficiently large n , $\|g_{j_n} - g^*\|_\infty \leq u_n - \eta^{-1}$. It follows that for all X ,

$$(g_{j_n}(X) - u_n)_+ = ((g_{j_n}(X) - g^*(X)) + (g^*(X) - u_n))_+ \leq ((u_n - \eta^{-1}) + (\eta^{-1} - u_n))_+ \leq 0$$

and therefore $\mathbb{E}(ue(X) - 1)(g_{j_n}(X) - u)_+ = 0$.

$$-\mathbb{E}(g_{j_n}(X))_- \rightarrow 0$$

Because $g^* \geq 0$, $(g_{j_n}(X))_- \geq (g_{j_n}(X) - g^*(X))_-$. Consequently,

$$-\mathbb{E}(g_{j_n}(X))_- \leq -\mathbb{E}(g_{j_n}(X) - g^*(X))_- = \mathbb{E}(g^*(X) - g_{j_n}(X))_+ \leq \|g_{j_n} - g^*\|_\infty \rightarrow 0.$$

□

To complete our asymptotic consistency result, we show the existence of a sequence β_n such that Lemma 6 applies and for any fixed ϵ' , the upper bound it establishes on $P\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\hat{\gamma}_i^- e^{-1}(X))^2 \geq \epsilon'\}$ goes to zero.

Lemma 8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$, defined in (27), is a consistent estimator of $\gamma^{*(w)}$ in the sense $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \rightarrow_p 0$.*

Proof. We prove this in the case $w = 1$; the $w = 0$ case follows by symmetry. We work with the bound (67) on $P\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=1} (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 > \epsilon^2\}$, valid under the conditions $u_n \in [\eta^{-1} \vee 4, 3s^2 \sqrt{n} \beta_n]$ and $\beta_n \geq 8u_n \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n) \vee (3\eta s^2 \rho_n \sqrt{n})^{-1}$. To establish consistency with a given sequence u_n using this bound, we will show that there exists a sequence β_n such that the bound is valid for all sufficiently large n and for any $\epsilon > 0$, each term goes to zero. To do this, we will collect conditions on β_n sufficient to imply that each term goes to zero and that the bound is valid and show that these conditions are simultaneously satisfiable. Given our lower bound on $\liminf_n u_n$, the condition $u_n \geq \eta^{-1} \vee 4$ is satisfied for all large n , so (67) is valid if $\beta_n \geq \max\{8u_n \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n), (3\eta s^2 \rho_n \sqrt{n})^{-1}, u_n (3s^2 \sqrt{n})^{-1}\}$.

The first term in (67) goes to zero irrespective of β_n . The second term in (67) goes to zero iff $\lambda_T \rightarrow \infty$, for which it is sufficient that $\beta_n \gg u_n \sqrt{R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)}$, $\beta_n \gg u_n \rho_n$, and $\beta_n \gg u_n n^{-1/2}$. The third term in (67) goes to zero iff $\lambda_\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$, for which it suffices that $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ and $u_n \ll \min\{R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)^{-1/2}, \rho_n^{-1}, n^{1/2}, \rho_n^{-1/2} n^{1/4}\}$. For the first condition, $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$, it suffices that $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$ and, via Lemma 7, that $\sqrt{n} \beta_n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. $n^{-1/2} \ll \beta_n \ll 1$.

It follows that it is sufficient to have $u_n \ll \min\{R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)^{-1/2}, \rho_n^{-1}, n^{1/2}, \rho_n^{-1/2} n^{1/4}\}$ and $\kappa_n \ll \beta_n \ll 1$ where κ_n is the maximum of all the aforementioned lower bounds on β_n , i.e.

$$\kappa_n := \max\left\{u_n \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n), \rho_n^{-1} n^{-1/2}, u_n n^{-1/2}, u_n \sqrt{R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)}, u_n \rho_n, n^{-1/2}\right\}.$$

There exists a sequence β_n satisfying this condition if $\kappa_n \rightarrow 0$. This condition and our conditions on u_n are satisfied when

$$\rho_n \gg n^{-1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad u_n \ll \min\left\{(\sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n))^{-1}, R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)^{-1/2}, \rho_n \sqrt{n}, \rho_n^{-1}, n^{1/2}\right\}.$$

We can drop the conditions $u_n \ll n^{1/2}$ and $u_n \ll \rho_n^{-1/2} n^{1/4}$. The first is implied by the conditions $u_n \ll \rho_n^{-1}$ and $\rho_n \gg n^{-1/2}$ and the second by the conditions $u_n \ll \rho_n^{-1}$ and $u_n \ll n^{1/2}$. To complete our proof, we will show that we can also drop the conditions $\rho_n \gg n^{-1/2}$ and $u_n \ll R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)^{-1/2}$. The resulting reduced set of conditions is satisfied by assumption. To justify this, we will show that under our assumption that $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ is increasing and dense in $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X})$ for a sequence $r_n \ll n^{1/2}$, $\rho_n \gg n^{-1/2}$ and $R_n(\mathcal{F})^{-1/2} \gg (\sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n))^{-1}$. The latter statement is equivalent to $n R_n(\mathcal{F}_n) \gg 1$, which is what we will work with.

Because the sequence of sets $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ are increasing and dense, there is a nonconstant function f which is in $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ for all large n . Consequently, $\rho_n \geq r_n^{-1} \text{var}\{f(X)\} \gg n^{-1/2}$. We use this property of $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ and the CLT to asymptotically lower bound $n R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)$:

$$n R_n(\mathcal{F}_n) \gg \sqrt{n} R_n(r_n \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \sqrt{n} R_n(\{f\}) = \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i f(X_i) \right| \rightarrow \mathbb{E} |Z| \quad \text{where } Z \sim N(0, \text{var}\{f(X)\}).$$

This completes our proof. □

A.5 Proof of Theorem 2

We now prove our main result. As a preliminary to our argument, we recall that for any real sequences a_i, b_i ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 - b_i^2 \leq 2 \max_i |a_i| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i)^2 \right)^{1/2}; \quad (70)$$

this inequality can be verified by simply expanding out

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 - b_i^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (2a_i + (b_i - a_i))(a_i - b_i) \\ &\leq 2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (a_i - b_i) \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2 \max_i |a_i| \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i)^2 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Now, we begin our proof by decomposing our estimation error $\hat{\mu}^{(w)} - \bar{\mu}^{(w)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}^{(w)} - \bar{\mu}^{(w)} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}^{(w)}(X_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i (Y_i - \hat{m}^{(w)}(X_i)) \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m^{(w)}(X_i) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{m}^{(w)}(X_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i (m^{(w)} - \hat{m}^{(w)})(X_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(w)} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m^{(w)}(X_i) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})(X_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})(X_i) \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(w)} \\ &= I_{f_n^{(w)}}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i(w) \text{ where } f_n^{(w)} = \hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}. \end{aligned}$$

We will first show that our imbalance term is $o_P(n^{-1/2})$. Because $f_n \in \|f_n\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ and $I_{\alpha\mathcal{F}}^{(w)}(\gamma) = \alpha I_{\mathcal{F}}^{(w)}(\gamma)$,

$$I_{f_n^{(w)}}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}) \leq I_{\|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}(\hat{\gamma}) = \|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n} I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}).$$

We've assumed that $\|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \in \mathcal{O}_P(1)$; our set equivalence condition implies that $\|f_n^{(w)}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n} \in \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ as well. It's therefore sufficient to show that $I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}) \in o_P(n^{-1/2})$. We do this using (17),

$$\left(\sqrt{n} I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}) \right)^2 \leq \left(\sqrt{n} I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^{(w)}(\gamma^{*(w)}) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \gamma_i^{*2} - \hat{\gamma}_i^2, \quad (71)$$

and show that both terms in this bound are $o_P(1)$.

The first term in our bound (71) is the square of the supremum of a \sqrt{n} -scaled empirical process, and can be bounded in terms of the Rademacher complexity of the class \mathcal{F}_n . First, we use set equivalence and the union bound to reduce our question about $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n$ to one about \mathcal{F}_n .

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \sup_{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n} \sqrt{n}(P_n - P) \left(1 - \frac{1(W = w)}{P\{W = w \mid X\}} \right) f(X) \geq \epsilon \right\} \\ & \leq P \left\{ \sup_{f \in s\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n}(P_n - P) \left(1 - \frac{1(W = w)}{P\{W = w \mid X\}} \right) f(X) \geq \epsilon \right\} + P \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n \subseteq s\mathcal{F}_n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The second term in this bound goes to zero by assumption, so we will bound the first. By symmetrization (Giné and Nickl, 2015, Corollary 3.1.25) and Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \sup_{f \in s\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n}(P_n - P) \left(1 - \frac{1(W = w)}{P\{W = w \mid X\}} \right) f(X) \geq \epsilon \right\} \\ & \leq 4P \left\{ \sup_{f \in s\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n}P_n\sigma \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1(W = w)}{P\{W = w \mid X\}} \right) f(X) \geq (\epsilon - \sqrt{2}\rho_n)/2 \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{8}{\epsilon - \sqrt{2}\rho_n} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in s\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n}P_n\sigma \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1(W = w)}{P\{W = w \mid X\}} \right) f(X). \end{aligned}$$

We derive a simpler bound using a contraction principle for symmetric processes (Giné and Nickl, 2015, Theorem 3.1.17), $\mathbb{E} P_n \sigma_i a_i f(X_i) \leq \max_{i \leq n} |a_i| \mathbb{E} P_n \sigma_i f(X_i)$, with $a_i = 1 - 1(W_i = w)/P\{W_i = w \mid X_i\} \in [-\eta^{-1}, 1]$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{\epsilon - \sqrt{2}\rho_n} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in s\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n}P_n\sigma \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1(W = w)}{P\{W = w \mid X\}} \right) f(X) \\ & \leq \frac{8}{\epsilon - \sqrt{2}\rho_n} \eta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in s\mathcal{F}_n} \sqrt{n}P_n\sigma \cdot f(X) = \frac{8\eta^{-1}s}{\epsilon - \sqrt{2}\rho_n} \sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Under our assumptions $\sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_n) \rightarrow 0$ and $\rho_n \rightarrow 0$, this bound goes to zero, and consequently this term goes to zero in probability. Using (70), bounding the second term in (71) reduces to showing a kind of consistency of $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ as an estimator of $\gamma^{*(w)}$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \gamma_i^{*2} - \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \leq 2\eta^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2}.$$

This bound goes to zero by the consistency result established in Lemma 8. This completes our proof that $\sqrt{n}I_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n}^{(w)}(\hat{\gamma}) \rightarrow_p 0$.

We've now shown that $\hat{\mu}^{(w)} - \bar{\mu}^{(w)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(w)} + o_P(n^{-1/2})$, so

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\tau} - \bar{\tau}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(1)} - (1 - W_i) \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(w)} + o_P(1).$$

To characterize the asymptotic distribution of this quantity, we apply a CLT for martingale difference arrays to the nonnegligible term. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{n,i} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(W_i \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(1)} - (1 - W_i) \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(0)} \right) \\ \mathcal{H}_{n,i} &= \sigma \left(\{X_j, W_j : j \leq n\} \cup \{Y_i(0), Y_i(1)\}_{j < i} \right)\end{aligned}$$

$\xi_{n,i}$ is a martingale difference array with respect to the sequence of filtrations $\mathcal{H}_{n,i}$. Our nonnegligible term may be written $\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{n,i}$, and converges in distribution to a normal random variable with variance V if (Pollard, 2012, VIII.1 Theorem 1)

1. a conditional Lindeberg condition is satisfied:

$$L_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\xi_{n,i}^2 \mathbf{1}(|\xi_{n,i}| > \epsilon) \mid \mathcal{H}_{n,i} \right) \rightarrow_p 0 \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

2. the conditional variance converges:

$$V_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\xi_{n,i}^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_{n,i-1} \right) \rightarrow_p V.$$

To apply this result, we first bound L_n using our finite conditional moment assumption (Assumption 3) on ε_i . We use the standard method for showing that a Lyapunov condition implies a Lindeberg condition:

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon^{2\delta} L_n &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\epsilon^{2\delta} \xi_{n,i}^2 \mathbf{1}(|\xi_{n,i}| > \epsilon \mid \mathcal{H}_{n,i}) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(|\xi_{n,i}|^{2+2\delta} \mid \mathcal{H}_{n,i} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{1+\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(|\hat{\gamma}_i|^{2+2\delta} \left| \varepsilon_i^{(W_i)} \right|^{2+2\delta} \mid \mathcal{H}_{n,i} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{u_n^{2+2\delta}}{n^\delta} \max_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \varepsilon_i^{(W_i)} \right|^{2+2\delta} \mid X_i, W_i \right)\end{aligned}$$

Our finite conditional moment assumption implies that the second factor in this bound is finite almost surely. Our first factor goes to zero by our assumption $u_n \ll n^{\frac{\delta}{2+2\delta}}$.

Second, we expand the conditional variance V_n around the variance at the weights γ^* .

$$\begin{aligned}V_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \left(W_i V^{(1)}(X_i) + (1 - W_i) V^{(0)}(X_i) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{\gamma}_i^2 - \gamma_i^{*2} \right) \left(W_i V^{(1)}(X_i) + (1 - W_i) V^{(0)}(X_i) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i^{*2} \left(W_i V^{(1)}(X_i) + (1 - W_i) V^{(0)}(X_i) \right).\end{aligned}$$

The second term, the conditional variance at γ^* , is an iid sum and converges to its expectation $V := \mathbb{E} \frac{V^{(1)}(X_i)}{e(X_i)} + \frac{V^{(0)}(X_i)}{1-e(X_i)}$. We will show that the first term converges to zero. Let $w_i = W_i V^{(1)}(X_i) + (1 - W_i) V^{(0)}(X_i)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\hat{\gamma}_i^2 - \gamma_i^{*2}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\hat{\gamma}_i + \gamma_i^*) (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (2\gamma_i^* + (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)) (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \gamma_i^* (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz, the magnitude of the first term in the line above is bounded by

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \gamma_i^* (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*) \leq 2 \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \gamma_i^{*2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \right)}.$$

The first of these factors is bounded almost surely by $\eta^{-2} \max(\text{ess sup } V^{(1)}(X), \text{ess sup } V^{(0)}(X))$, which is bounded under Assumption 3, and the second is $o_P(1)$ by Lemma 8. The second term in that line is bounded by $(\max_{i \leq n} w_i) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\gamma}_i - \gamma_i^*)^2 \right)$, and this is $o_P(1)$ for the same reasons.

To extend this result to asymptotic normality around τ , add the terms from $\sqrt{n}(\tau - \bar{\tau}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\tau(X_i) - \tau)$ to the front of the martingale difference sequence.

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{n,i} &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\tau(X_i) - \tau) & i \in [0, n] \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(W_i \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(1)} - (1 - W_i) \hat{\gamma}_i \varepsilon_i^{(0)} \right) & i \in [n+1, 2n] \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{H}_{n,i} &= \begin{cases} \sigma(\{X_j : j < i\}) & i \in [1, n] \\ \sigma(\{X_j, Z_j : j \leq n\} \cup \{Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)}\}_{j < i}) & i \in [n+1, 2n] \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Because these n added terms have constant conditional variance $\frac{1}{n} \text{var}(\tau(X))$, the conditional variance of this sequence converges to the limit $\text{var}(\tau(X)) + V$. To show the conditional Lindeberg condition still holds, we need

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left((\tau - \tau(X))^2 \mathbf{1}(|\tau - \tau(X)| > \sqrt{n}\epsilon) \right) \rightarrow_p 0$$

which follows from tightness of $\tau(X)$.

A.6 Proof of Theorem 1

This theorem is a special case of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 with $\mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho_n}$. We will show that its assumptions are satisfied. The ones we don't assume directly are equivalence of \mathcal{F}_{ρ_n} and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho_n}$, \mathcal{D} -consistency, and density and increasingness of the sequence $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ for $r_n \ll \sqrt{n}$.

We begin by showing equivalence. To simplify this problem, we use the union bound:

$$\begin{aligned} P\left\{\neg\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}\subseteq\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho_n}\subseteq\sqrt{2}\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}\right)\right\} &\leq P\left\{\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}\not\subseteq\sqrt{2}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho_n}\right\}+P\left\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\rho_n}\not\subseteq\sqrt{2}\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}\right\} \\ &= P\left\{\{f\in\mathcal{F}:Pf^2\leq\rho_n^2\}\not\subseteq\{f\in\mathcal{F}:P_n f^2\leq 2\rho_n^2\}\right\} \\ &\quad + P\left\{\{f\in\mathcal{F}:P_n f^2\leq\rho_n^2\}\not\subseteq\{f\in\mathcal{F}:Pf^2\leq 2\rho_n^2\}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

[Bartlett et al. \(2005, Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 2.2\)](#) bound these two terms: for $\rho_n^2 \geq 20R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}) + 26x_n/n$, each is bounded by e^{-x_n} . Our assumption $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_\rho) \rightarrow 0$ implies $20R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}) \ll n^{-1/2} \lesssim \rho_n^2$, so the bound applies and goes to zero for a sequence x_n with $1 \ll x_n \ll n\rho_n^2$.

To show \mathcal{D} -consistency, we need to show that $\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ for $f_n := \hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}$. It suffices to show that our assumptions $\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ and $\|f_n\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n)$ imply that $\|f_n\|_{L_2(P)} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n)$. To show this, observe that by the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left\{\|f_n\|_{L_2(P)} > AB\rho_n\right\} &\leq P\left\{\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}} > C\right\} + P\left\{\|f_n\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} > B\rho_n\right\} \\ &\quad + P\left\{\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq C, \|f_n\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} \leq B\rho_n, \|f_n\|_{L_2(P)} > AB\rho_n\right\} \end{aligned}$$

By the aforementioned assumptions, we can make the first two terms arbitrarily small by taking B, C large enough. We will address this final term with another union bound. Observe that $P_n W f^2 \leq \|f\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})}^2$ and $\|f\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq \eta^{-1} P W f^2$, so

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left\{\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq C, \|f_n\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} \leq B\rho_n, \|f_n\|_{L_2(P)} \geq AB\rho_n\right\} \\ &\leq P\left\{\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq C, P_n W f_n^2 \leq B^2\rho_n^2, P W f_n^2 \geq \eta A^2 B^2 \rho_n^2\right\} \\ &\leq P\left\{\{f \in C\mathcal{F} : P_n W f^2 \leq B^2\rho_n^2\} \not\subseteq \{f \in C\mathcal{F} : P W f^2 \leq \eta A^2 B^2 \rho_n^2\}\right\} \\ &= P\left\{\{h \in W\mathcal{F} : P_n h^2 \leq C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\} \not\subseteq \{h \in W\mathcal{F} : P h^2 \leq \eta C^{-2} A^2 B^2 \rho_n^2\}\right\} \\ &\quad \text{where } W\mathcal{F} = \{Wf : f \in \mathcal{F}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $A^2 = 2\eta^{-1}$, the bound we used to show equivalence applies: for $C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2 \geq 20R_n(\{h \in W\mathcal{F} : P h^2 \leq C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\}) + 26x_n/n$, this term is bounded by e^{-x_n} . Because $\{h \in W\mathcal{F} : P h^2 \leq C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\} \subseteq \{Wf : f \in \mathcal{F}, P f^2 \leq \eta^{-1} C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\}$, we have $R_n(\{h \in W\mathcal{F} : P h^2 \leq C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\}) \leq R_n(\{Wf : f \in \mathcal{F}, P f^2 \leq \eta^{-1} C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\})$, and by the contraction principle for Rademacher processes ([Giné and Nickl, 2015, Theorem 3.2.1](#)), this is bounded by $2R_n(\{f \in \mathcal{F} : P f^2 \leq \eta^{-1} C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\})$. As before, our assumption $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{n}R_n(\mathcal{F}_\rho) \rightarrow 0$ implies $R_n(\{f \in \mathcal{F} : P f^2 \leq \eta^{-1} C^{-2} B^2 \rho_n^2\}) \ll n^{-1/2} \lesssim \rho_n^2$, and consequently, the bound applies and goes to zero for a sequence x_n with $1 \ll x_n \ll n\rho_n^2$. This completes our proof that $\|f_n\|_{L_2(P)} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n)$.

To show density and increasingness, observe that because $\rho_n \gg n^{-1/2}$, there exists a sequence $r_n \ll \sqrt{n}$ such that $\rho_n r_n \rightarrow \infty$. For that sequence r_n , $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$ increases to span $\{\mathcal{F}\}$ and consequently inherits its density properties.

A.7 Proof of Theorem 3

We decompose our variance estimator into three terms.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 (Y_i - \hat{m}^{(W_i)}(X_i))^2 &= P_n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 (\varepsilon_i^{(W_i)} + (m^{(W_i)} - \hat{m}^{(W_i)})(X_i))^2 \\ &= P_n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \varepsilon_i^{(W_i)2} + 2P_n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \varepsilon_i^{(W_i)} (m^{(W_i)} - \hat{m}^{(W_i)})(X_i) + P_n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 (m^{(W_i)} - \hat{m}^{(W_i)})(X_i)^2 \end{aligned}$$

The first term is shown in the proof of Theorem 2 to converge to the desired quantity.

We'll now show that the second term is $\mathcal{O}_p(\max_{w \in \{0,1\}} u_n^2 \|1(W_i = w)(\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})\|_{L_2(P_n)})$. It suffices to consider the $W_i = 1$ terms in this sum, as the sum of the $W_i = 0$ terms behave analogously.

$$\begin{aligned} P_n W_i \hat{\gamma}_i^2 \varepsilon_i^{(1)} (m^{(1)} - \hat{m}^{(1)})(X_i) &\leq \sqrt{P_n W_i \hat{\gamma}_i^4 \varepsilon_i^{(1)2} P_n W_i (\hat{m}^{(1)} - m^{(1)})^2} \\ &\leq u_n^2 \|W(\hat{m}^{(1)} - m^{(1)})\|_{L_2(P_n)} \sqrt{P_n W_i \varepsilon_i^{(1)2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last factor in this bound is $\mathcal{O}_P(1)$, as $P_n W_i \varepsilon_i^{(1)2} \rightarrow_p \mathbb{E} W_i \varepsilon_i^{(1)2}$.

We'll now show that the third term is $\mathcal{O}_p(\max_{w \in \{0,1\}} u_n^2 \|1(W_i = w)(\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})\|_{L_2(P_n)})$.

$$\begin{aligned} P_n \hat{\gamma}_i^2 (m^{(W_i)} - \hat{m}^{(W_i)})(X_i)^2 &\leq u_n^2 P_n (m^{(W_i)} - \hat{m}^{(W_i)})(X_i)^2 \\ &\leq u_n^2 \|(1 - W)(\hat{m}^{(0)} - m^{(0)})\|_{L_2(P_n)}^2 + u_n^2 \|W(\hat{m}^{(1)} - m^{(1)})\|_{L_2(P_n)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second and third terms are $o_P(1)$ if $\max_{w \in \{0,1\}} u_n^2 \|(\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})\|_{L_2(P_n)} \rightarrow_p 0$. We will show that this is the case using our assumptions $u_n^2 \rho_n^2 \rightarrow 0$, $u_n \ll n^{1/6}$, and a Glivenko-Cantelli property of \mathcal{F}_n implied by our Rademacher complexity condition. We first decompose the square of this scaled empirical norm into a scaled sum of the corresponding population norm and the variation around it:

$$u_n^4 P_n (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})^2 \leq u_n^4 P (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})^2 + u_n^4 (P_n - P) (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})^2.$$

We will show that each term converges to zero. Consider the first. Because $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$, we use the decomposition

$$P \left(u_n^4 P (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})^2 \geq \epsilon \right) \leq P \left(u_n^4 \sup_{f \in K\mathcal{F}_n} P f^2 \geq \epsilon \right) + P \left(\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \geq K \right).$$

We can choose K so that the second term is arbitrarily small, and the first term in this bound is deterministic and goes to zero under our assumption $u_n \ll \rho_n^{-1/2}$ for any $K < \infty$. We work with the same decomposition for the second term:

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(u_n^4 (P_n - P) (\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)})^2 \geq \epsilon \right) \\ \leq P \left(u_n^4 \sup_{f \in K\mathcal{F}_n} (P_n - P) f^2 \geq \epsilon \right) + P \left(\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}_n} \geq K \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again we can choose K so that the second term is arbitrarily small. We will show the first term goes to zero for any $K < \infty$ by showing that under our Rademacher complexity

assumptions, $u_n^4 \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in K\mathcal{F}_n} (P_n - P)f^2 \rightarrow 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& u_n^4 \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in K\mathcal{F}_n} (P_n - P)f^2 \\
&= K^2 u_n^4 \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} (P_n - P)f^2 \\
&\leq K^2 u_n^4 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} P_n \sigma \cdot f^2 \text{ by symmetrization} \\
&\leq K^2 u_n^4 (2)(4) \mathbb{E} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} P_n \sigma \cdot f \text{ by the contraction principle for Rademacher processes} \\
&= 8K^2 u_n^4 R_n(\mathcal{F}_n).
\end{aligned}$$

This is bounded by $u_n \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)$ if $u_n \leq n^{1/6}$, and therefore goes to zero under our assumptions $u_n \lesssim n^{1/6}$, $u_n \ll n^{-1/2} R_n(\mathcal{F})^{-1}$.

B Appendix: Examples

B.1 Example 1: Penalized Least Squares for Classes Satisfying an Entropy Condition

In order to show that Theorem 1 applies in this case, it suffices to show that $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n)$, $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$, $\sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}) \rightarrow 0$, and that our stated conditions on u_n imply the corresponding conditions of Theorem 1.

Van de Geer (2000, Theorem 10.2) establishes the first two of these properties:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n) \text{ and } \|\hat{m}^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1) \\
& \text{when } \nu \geq \frac{2\alpha}{2+\alpha} \text{ and } \rho_n^{-1} = \mathcal{O}_P\left(|\{i : W_i = w\}|^{\frac{1}{2+\alpha}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

These conditions on ν and ρ_n are satisfied; the first we've assumed directly and the second follows from the concentration of $|\{i : W_i = 1\}|/n$ around $\mathbb{E} 1(W_i = w) \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$ and our assumption $\rho_n \gtrsim n^{-1/4}$, which implies $\rho_n^{-1} \lesssim n^{1/4} \ll n^{1/(2+\alpha)}$ for $\alpha < 2$. The bound $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \|\hat{m}^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} + \|m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ follows by the triinner inequality under our assumption $\|m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} < \infty$.

To show that $\sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}) \rightarrow 0$ and establish appropriate conditions on u_n , we bound $R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n})$ in terms of its radius ρ_n in $L_2(P)$ and the empirical metric entropy of \mathcal{F} using Koltchinskii et al. (2006, Equation 2.4):

$$\begin{aligned}
& R_n(\mathcal{F}_n) \lesssim \max\{n^{-1/2} \rho_n^{1-\alpha/2}, n^{-1/(1+\alpha/2)}\} \\
& \text{when } \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_n} \|f\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \rho_n, \mathcal{H}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(P_n)) \lesssim \epsilon^{-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}) \rightarrow 0$, and the only condition on u_n from Theorem 1 which is not immediately satisfied under our assumptions on u_n is $u_n \ll n^{-1/2} R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n})^{-1}$. The aforementioned bound on $R_n(\mathcal{F}_{\rho_n})$ shows that our assumption $u_n \ll \min\{\rho_n^{\alpha/2-1}, n^{\frac{2-\alpha}{4+2\alpha}}\}$ is sufficient.

B.2 Example 2: Penalized Least Squares in Hölder Classes on Compacta

In order to show that this is an instance of Example 1, we need to verify that $\mathcal{F} = C^s(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies its conditions. To do this, we must (1) show that \mathcal{F} is totally bounded in $L_2(P)$ (2) bound the metric entropy $\mathcal{H}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(P_n))$, (3) show density of $\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}$, and (4) show pointwise separability of $\text{span}\{\mathcal{F}\}$.

In this case, well-known results make each step is straightforward. Addressing (1) and (2), the metric entropy of a Hölder class $C^s(\mathcal{X})$ satisfies $\mathcal{H}(\epsilon, C^s(\mathcal{X}), \|\cdot\|_\infty) \lesssim \epsilon^{-d/s}$ if \mathcal{X} is a bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^d (Tikhomirov, 1993; van der Vaart, 1994). Because $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ dominates $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_n)}$, finiteness of this entropy implies that $C^s(\mathcal{X})$ is totally bounded in $L_2(P)$, and we have the required entropy condition in $L_2(P_n)$.

To address (3) and (4), we use the well-known result that polynomials with rational coefficients are dense in the space $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ of continuous functions on a compact set \mathcal{X} endowed with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. This is a straightforward consequence of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem (see e.g. Folland, 2009, Theorem 5.1.7). Because $C^s(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, this implies pointwise separability as well: the countable set of polynomials with rational coefficients is dense in $C^s(\mathcal{X})$ in the supremum norm on \mathcal{X} and therefore pointwise for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and in $L_2(P)$.

B.3 Example 3: $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -consistent Estimators in Hölder Classes on Compacta

We will show that Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 apply with \mathcal{F} the unit ball in $C^{\lfloor s \rfloor}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_n = \mathcal{F}_n = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_\infty \leq \rho_n\}$. Because $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ dominates $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P)}$, $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\rho_n}$, and the properties we need to establish in this case all follow from the previous example with the exception of nestedness and density of $r_n \mathcal{F}_n$, for which the argument used in the previous example applies, and the condition that $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{C^{\lfloor s \rfloor}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$. This condition follows from a bound of Yatracos (1989, Proposition 2):

$$\|D^\beta \hat{m}^{(w)} - D^\beta m^{(w)}\|_\infty \lesssim \|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_\infty^{\frac{s - \|\beta\|_1}{\|\beta\|_1}},$$

which, applied to all partials D^β with $\|\beta\|_1 \leq \lfloor s \rfloor$, implies

$$\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{C^{\lfloor s \rfloor}} \lesssim \|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_\infty^{\frac{s - \lfloor s \rfloor}{\lfloor s \rfloor}}.$$

The sufficiency of weaker conditions on u_n can be shown easily in this setting using bounds on $R_n(\mathcal{F}_n)$ that exploit its shrinking radius in $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, but we will not do that here.

B.4 Example 4: Symmetric Convex Hulls of Countable Dictionaries

We will show that Theorem 1 applies with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}_\Psi$. Classes of this type are symmetric and convex, gauge-closed with the gauge of $\langle \psi, \beta \rangle$ equal to $\|\beta\|_1 := \sum_{j=1}^\infty |\beta_j|$, pointwise separable and totally bounded in $L_2(P)$ given that they are defined in terms of pointwise and $L_2(P)$ convergent series, and have the property $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{n} R_n(\mathcal{F}_\rho)$ as discussed following (32). To show that Theorem 1 applies, we must show that our estimator $\hat{m}^{(w)}$ has the properties (1) $\|\hat{m}^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ and (2) $\|\hat{m}^{(w)} - m^{(w)}\|_{L_2(P_n^{(w)})} = \mathcal{O}_P(\rho_n)$.

Writing $m^{(w)} = \langle \psi, \beta \rangle$, these properties follow from the following Lemma applied to the units $\{(X_i, Y_i) : W_i = w\}$ with empirical measure $P_n^{(w)}$.

Lemma 9. *Let $\{\psi_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfy $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \|\psi_j\|_\infty \leq 1$ and \mathcal{B} be a set of sequences β with the property that $\langle \psi(x), \beta \rangle := \sum_{j=1}^\infty \psi_j(x) \beta_j$ converges pointwise for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. If we observe n iid samples $(X_i, Y_i) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $Y_i = \langle \psi(X_i), \beta \rangle + \varepsilon_i$ for some $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\hat{\beta} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} P_n(Y_i - \langle \psi(X_i), \beta \rangle)^2 + \rho^2 \|\beta\|_1$ satisfies $P_n \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle^2 + (\rho^2/2) \|\hat{\beta}\|_1 \leq 1.5\rho^2 \|\beta\|_1$ on the event $\{\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| \leq \rho^2/4\}$.*

Properties (1) and (2) follow if $P\{\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n^{(w)} \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| > \rho_n^2/4\} \rightarrow 0$, as $\|\beta\|_1 = \|m^{(w)}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\Psi}$ is finite by assumption. To show this, we first expand $P_n^{(w)} \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i) = (P_n \mathbf{1}(W_i = w))^{-1} P_n W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)$ and apply the union bound to deal with the first factor.

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left\{ \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left| P_n^{(w)} \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i) \right| > \rho_n^2/4 \right\} \\ &= P \left\{ \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| > (P_n \mathbf{1}(W_i = w)) \rho_n^2/4 \right\} \\ &\leq P \left\{ \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| > P(W_i = w) \rho_n^2/8 \right\} + P\{P_n \mathbf{1}(W_i = w) < P(W_i = w)/2\} \end{aligned}$$

The second term goes to zero by the law of large numbers. Via Markov's inequality and symmetrization, we bound the second in terms of a Rademacher complexity.

$$\begin{aligned} P\{\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| > \rho_n^2/8\} &\leq 8P(W_i = w)^{-1} \rho_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| \\ &\leq 16P(W_i = w)^{-1} \rho_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n \sigma_i W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)|. \end{aligned}$$

To simplify this bound, we exploit our uniform bound $|\varepsilon_i| \leq M$. A contraction principle for symmetric processes (Giné and Nickl, 2015, Theorem 3.1.17) implies $\mathbb{E} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n \sigma_i W \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| \leq M \mathbb{E} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n \sigma_i \psi_j(X_i)|$, so our bound goes to zero if $\rho_n^{-2} R_n(\{\psi_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}) \rightarrow 0$. Because $\{\psi_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq B_\Psi$, this follows from our assumption $\rho_n^2 \gg R_n(B_\Psi)$.

We conclude our argument with a proof of Lemma 9. The argument is standard in the context of the finite-dimensional Lasso (see e.g. Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2011, Theorem 4.1) and extends to this infinite-dimensional setting without modification.

Proof. Rearranging our optimality condition

$$P_n(Y_i - \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 + \rho^2 \|\hat{\beta}\|_1 \leq P_n(Y_i - \langle \psi(X_i), \beta \rangle)^2 + \rho^2 \|\beta\|_1$$

gives

$$P_n \left[(Y_i - \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} \rangle)^2 - (Y_i - \langle \psi(X_i), \beta \rangle)^2 \right] \leq \rho^2 (\|\beta\|_1 - \|\hat{\beta}\|_1).$$

Expand the left side using the identity $(Y - \hat{f})^2 - (Y - f)^2 = (\hat{f} - f)^2 - 2(Y - f)(\hat{f} - f)$.

$$P_n \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle^2 - 2P_n \varepsilon_i \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle \leq \rho^2 (\|\beta\|_1 - \|\hat{\beta}\|_1).$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$P_n \varepsilon_i \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle = \langle P_n \varepsilon_i \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle \leq \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_1.$$

Consequently, on the event $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |P_n \varepsilon_i \psi_j(X_i)| < \rho^2/4$,

$$P_n \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle^2 \leq (\rho^2/2) \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_1 + \rho^2 (\|\beta\|_1 - \|\hat{\beta}\|_1)$$

and rearranging and using the triangle inequality to bound $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_1$ gives

$$P_n \langle \psi(X_i), \hat{\beta} - \beta \rangle^2 + (\rho^2/2) \|\hat{\beta}\|_1 \leq (\rho^2/2) (\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_1 + \|\beta\|_1 - \|\hat{\beta}\|_1) + (\rho^2/2) \|\beta\|_1 \leq 1.5 \rho^2 \|\beta\|_1.$$

□

B.5 Computation in Example 4: Symmetric Convex Hulls of Countable Dictionaries

In the example discussed in the previous section, we use weights

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(w)} := \operatorname{argmin}_{0 \leq \gamma_i \leq u} \ell(\gamma), \quad \ell_{\mathcal{F}}(\gamma) := \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i: W_i=w} \gamma_i^2 + I_{\mathcal{F}}^{(w)}(\gamma)^2 \quad \text{where}$$

$$\mathcal{F} := \left\{ \langle \psi, \beta \rangle : \|\beta\|_1 \leq 1, \|\langle \psi, \beta \rangle\|_{L_2(P_n)} \leq \rho, \langle \psi, \beta \rangle \text{ is defined pointwise} \right\}.$$

For the purpose of computation, we approximate $\hat{\gamma}^{(w)}$ by $\hat{\gamma}_p^{(w)}$ minimizing $\ell_{\mathcal{F}_p}(\gamma)$ for a finite dimensional approximation for \mathcal{F}_p of \mathcal{F} ,

$$\mathcal{F}_p := \left\{ \langle \psi, \beta \rangle : \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|\beta\|_1 \leq 1, \|\langle \psi, \beta \rangle\|_{L_2(P_n)} \leq \rho \right\}.$$

As discussed in the proof of Lemma 6, the distance $\|\hat{\gamma}^{(w)} - \hat{\gamma}_p^{(w)}\|_2$ can be bounded in terms of the quantity $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \inf_{f' \in \mathcal{F}_p} \|f - f'\|_{L_1(P_n)}$ using the strong convexity of the function $\ell_{\mathcal{F}}$. We will not get into those details here.

To compute $\hat{\gamma}_p^{(w)}$, we use a dual characterization from the proof of Claim 3 of Lemma 1,

$$(\hat{\gamma}_p^{(w)})_i := [\hat{g}(X_i)]_u \quad \text{where} \quad (\hat{\lambda}_U, \hat{\lambda}_L, \hat{g}) := \operatorname{argmin}_{(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n_w} \times \mathbb{R}_-^{n_w} \times \operatorname{span} \mathcal{F}_p} \psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g),$$

$$\psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=w} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) + \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}^2}{n} + \frac{2u}{n} \sum_{i: W_i=w} \lambda_{U,i}$$

Here $n_w := |\{i : W_i = w\}|$ is the dimension of $\hat{\gamma}_p^{(w)}$ and \mathbb{R}_+ and \mathbb{R}_- are the nonnegative and nonpositive reals respectively.

We will now express $\psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g)$ in matrix/vector notation and show that this optimization problem can be rewritten as a second order cone program (SOCP). For any $g \in \operatorname{span} \{\mathcal{F}_p\}$, we can write $g(X_i) = (\Psi\beta)_i$ where Ψ is the $n \times p$ matrix Ψ with elements $\Psi_{ij} = \psi_j(X_i)$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Let Ψ_w be the $n_w \times p$ submatrix of Ψ containing rows

$i \in \{i : W_i = w\}$ and the 1_d be the $d \times 1$ vector of ones. We can write the first, second, and fourth terms of $\psi(\lambda_U, \lambda_L, g)$ straightforwardly in these terms.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} (g(X_i) - (\lambda_{U,i} + \lambda_{L,i}))^2 &= \|\Psi_w \beta - \lambda_U - \lambda_L\|_2^2, \\ -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i) &= -\frac{2}{n} 1_n^T \Psi \beta, \\ \frac{2u}{n} \sum_{i:W_i=w} \lambda_{U,i} &= \frac{2u}{n} 1_{n_w}^T \lambda_U. \end{aligned}$$

The third can be written as a minimum involving new variables satisfying some constraints.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\langle \psi, \beta \rangle\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}^2 &= \max \left\{ \|\beta\|_1, \|\langle \psi, \beta \rangle\|_{L_2(P_n)} \right\}^2 \\ &= \min \{s^2 : s \in \mathbb{R}, \|\beta\|_1 \leq s, \|\Psi \beta\|_2 \leq s\} \\ &= \min \{s^2 : s \in \mathbb{R}, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^p, \beta = u + v, u \geq 0, v \leq 0, 1_p^T u - 1_p^T v \leq s, \|\Psi \beta\|_2 \leq s\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using these expressions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\gamma}_p^{(w)})_i &:= [(\Psi \hat{\beta})_i]_u \text{ where } (\hat{\beta}, \hat{\lambda}_U, \hat{\lambda}_L, \hat{s}, \hat{u}, \hat{v}) \text{ minimize } \|Qx\|^2 + f^T x \text{ with} \\ x^T &= (\beta^T \quad \lambda_U^T \quad \lambda_L^T \quad s \quad u^T \quad v^T) \\ Q &:= \frac{1}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_w & -I_{n_w \times n_w} & -I_{n_w \times n_w} & 0 & 0_p^T & 0_p^T \\ 0_p^T & 0_{n_w}^T & 0_{n_w}^T & 1 & 0_p^T & 0_p^T \end{pmatrix} \\ f &:= \frac{1}{n} (-2(1_n^T \Psi)^T \quad 2u 1_{n_w}^T \quad 0_{n_w}^T \quad 0 \quad 0_p^T \quad 0_p^T) \\ &\text{over } (\beta, \lambda_U, \lambda_L, s, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_w} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p \text{ satisfying} \\ &\lambda_U \geq 0, \lambda_L \leq 0, \beta = u + v, u \geq 0, v \leq 0, 1_p^T u - 1_p^T v \leq s, \|\Psi \beta\|_2 \leq s \end{aligned}$$

To rewrite this as a SOCP, introduce a new scalar variable t and minimize t subject to the constraints above and the new constraint $\|Qx\|^2 + f^T x \leq t$, which we may write as a standard SOC constraint

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} (1 + (f^T x - t))/2 \\ Q \end{pmatrix} x \right\|_2 \leq (1 - (f^T x - t))/2.$$