

Analyzing cluster randomized trials designed to support generalizable inferences

Sarah E. Robertson^{1,2}, Jon A. Steingrimsso³, and Issa J. Dahabreh^{1,2,4}

¹CAUSALab, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

²Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

³Department of Biostatistics, Brown University School of Public Health, Providence, RI

⁴Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

April 7, 2022

Running header: Cluster trials designed for generalizability

Declaration: The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

Analyzing cluster randomized trials designed to support generalizable inferences

Running head: Cluster trials designed for generalizability

Abstract

Background: When planning a cluster randomized trial, evaluators often have access to an enumerated cohort representing the target population of clusters. Practicalities of conducting the trial, such as the need to oversample clusters with certain characteristics to improve trial economy or to support inference about subgroups of clusters, may preclude simple random sampling from the cohort into the trial, and thus interfere with the goal of producing generalizable inferences about the target population. **Methods:** We describe a nested trial design where the randomized clusters are embedded within a cohort of trial-eligible clusters from the target population and where clusters are selected for inclusion in the trial with known sampling probabilities that may depend on cluster characteristics (e.g., allowing clusters to be chosen to facilitate trial conduct or to examine hypotheses related to their characteristics). We develop and evaluate methods for analyzing data from this design to generalize causal inferences to the target population underlying the cohort. **Results:** We present identification and estimation results for the expectation of the average potential outcome and for the average treatment effect, in the entire target population of clusters and in its non-randomized subset. In simulation studies we show that different estimators have low bias but markedly different precision. **Conclusions:** Cluster randomized trials where clusters are selected for inclusion with known sampling probabilities that depend on cluster characteristics, combined with efficient estimation methods, can precisely quantify treatment effects in the target population, while addressing objectives of trial conduct that require oversampling clusters on the basis of their characteristics.

Keywords: design, generalizability, transportability, cluster randomized trials, causal inference, interference.

1 Introduction

When conducting cluster randomized trials evaluators often have access to an enumerated cohort representing the target population of clusters. For example, in the applications motivating our work – cluster randomized trials of vaccine effectiveness in U.S. nursing homes (National Library of Medicine (U.S.), 2013, 2018, 2019) – evaluators can often identify a roster of trial-eligible nursing homes using routinely collected data. Similarly, when conducting educational experiments, administrative data can be used to compile a list of all trial-eligible schools in a state (Tipton, 2013b). When clusters can be selected for participation from an enumerated cohort, the inferential goals of the trial and practicalities related to research economy may conflict with the goal of producing generalizable inferences for the target population underlying the enumerated cohort. For example, evaluators may be interested in oversampling certain groups of clusters to increase the trial’s ability to test hypotheses about effect modification (moderation) or to ensure that the trial can produce reasonably precise estimates in cluster subgroups defined by baseline characteristics. Furthermore, some clusters may be oversampled if they have attributes that facilitate the conduct of the trial (e.g., have infrastructure that facilitates data collection), particularly when resources are constrained. In such cases, it is possible to select clusters for participation in the trial using sampling probabilities that depend on baseline characteristics and are under the control of evaluators – and thus, known by design. Such sampling can help achieve the goals of the trial while supporting the generalizability of inferences to the target population.

Most recent work on generalizability methods has focused on individually randomized trials where participants are not representative of the target population, and where evaluators do not have control over an individual’s decision to participate in the trial and access to an enumerated cohort of individuals is not common (e.g., Cole and Stuart (2010), Dahabreh et al. (2020), Dahabreh et al. (2019c), and Rudolph and van der Laan (2017), Westreich et al. (2017)). Some work in educational and welfare policy research has discussed generalizability analyses with cluster randomized trial data in settings where cluster participation in the trial was *not* under evaluator control (e.g., O’Muircheartaigh and Hedges (2014), Tipton (2013a), and Tipton et al. (2017)). Recent work in educational research has mainly considered trials in which clusters are selected for participation

by sampling within strata defined by effect modifiers, such that the average treatment effect in the trial may directly generalize to the target population (Tipton, 2013b; Tipton et al., 2014; Tipton & Peck, 2017). This work has mentioned, without providing details, the possibility of using simple weighting (Stuart et al., 2011) or stratification (Tipton, 2013a) estimators to adjust for imbalances between the sampled clusters and the target population (e.g., for effect modifiers that were not stratified on) or when clusters are sampled with unequal probabilities across strata (e.g., to optimally estimate stratum-specific treatment effects (Tipton et al., 2019)).

Prior work using cluster randomized trial data, regardless of whether participation was under the control of evaluators, aggregated individual-level information to the cluster level and used weighting or stratification methods to generalize inferences to the target population (O’Muircheartaigh & Hedges, 2014; Tipton, 2013a, 2013b; Tipton et al., 2017; Tipton et al., 2014; Tipton & Olsen, 2018; Tipton & Peck, 2017; Tipton et al., 2019). These approaches may be inefficient for two reasons. First, they ignore individual-level information and instead operate at the level of clusters. Second, they incorporate information from non-randomized clusters only via the sampling probability (or the probability of trial participation when not under the evaluators’ control), without using models for the association of covariates with the outcome. Therefore, efficiency could be improved by incorporating individual-level information on the relationship of covariates and treatment with the outcome, and by using models of that relationship (in addition to the sampling probability or the probability of participation) when estimating treatment effects. Generalizability analyses using individual-level data requires accounting for various forms of within-cluster dependence (Balzer et al., 2019), including causal interference (e.g., due to herd immunity effects (Halloran & Struchiner, 1995)), even if the clusters are assumed to be independent – an issue that is well-appreciated for analyses of cluster randomized trials (Donner & Klar, 2000; Murray et al., 1998).

Here, we combine recent advances in the analysis of cluster randomized trials (Balzer et al., 2019; Benitez et al., 2022) and prior work on generalizability analyses for individually randomized trials (Dahabreh et al., 2020; Dahabreh et al., 2019c) to propose augmented weighting estimators for analyzing cluster randomized trials where the evaluators have sampled participating clusters using known sampling probabilities that depend on baseline characteristics. The methods we describe

can be used to estimate causal effects in the target population from which participating clusters are sampled, while exploiting individual-level information on the relationship of covariates and treatment with the outcome and allowing for arbitrary within-cluster dependence. We show that knowledge of the sampling probabilities leads to augmented weighting estimators that are robust to misspecification of the outcome model. In addition to robustness, we show that knowledge of the sampling probabilities can be used to develop more efficient estimators of causal estimands that pertain to the non-randomized subset of the target population, but not those that pertain to the entire target population. We evaluate the finite-sample performance of the methods in a simulation study motivated by a cluster randomized trial of vaccine effectiveness in U.S. nursing homes. Our simulations show that the precision of non-augmented weighting estimators can be improved substantially by estimating the sampling and treatment probabilities (even when they are known), rather than using the known probabilities. In contrast, the precision of the augmented weighting estimators is fairly similar whether using the true or estimated probabilities, and superior to non-augmented weighting estimators when the models for estimating the probabilities include covariates in addition to those used in the design (e.g., as may be necessary in trials with modest sample sizes that have baseline imbalances or are not representative of the target population with respect to variables not used in the design).

2 Study design, data, and causal quantities of interest

Study design and data

Consider the cluster version of the nested trial design for analyses extending inferences from a individually randomized trial to a target population (Dahabreh et al., 2021): among a cohort of clusters sampled from the target population (e.g., a cohort of trial-eligible clusters), a subset is chosen to participate in a randomized trial with cluster-level treatment assignment. We assume that participation of clusters in the trial is fully under the control of the investigators (e.g., as might be the case for interventions with favorable risk benefit profiles when all clusters in the enumerated cohort can be potentially included in the trial).

We index clusters in the cohort of trial-eligible clusters by $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$; the j th cluster has sample size N_j , and we allow the sample size to vary across clusters. Individuals in cluster j are indexed by $i \in \{1, \dots, N_j\}$. We use S_j for the cluster-level indicator of selection into the trial; $S = 1$ for randomized clusters and $S = 0$ for non-randomized clusters. For all clusters – both randomized and non-randomized – we have data on cluster-level covariates, X_j , and a matrix of individual-level covariates, \mathbf{W}_j , for all individuals in the cluster. For example, if p baseline covariates are collected from each individual in cluster j , then \mathbf{W}_j has dimension $N_j \times p$. We use A_j to denote the cluster-level treatment assignment; we only consider finite sets of possible treatments, which we denote as \mathcal{A} . We assume that covariates (X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) are measured at baseline, so that they cannot be affected by treatment. Selection into the trial depends on sampling probabilities that are chosen by the evaluators and are allowed to depend on covariates (X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) , using a Bernoulli-type sampling scheme at the cluster level (Breslow & Wellner, 2007; Dahabreh et al., 2019a; Saegusa & Wellner, 2013). Last, \mathbf{Y}_j is the vector of individual-level outcomes, such that $\mathbf{Y}_j = (Y_{j,i} : i \in \{1, \dots, N_j\})$ for each cluster j . We define the *cluster-level average observed outcome* in cluster j , \bar{Y}_j , as $\bar{Y}_j = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} Y_{j,i}$.

We assume independence across clusters, but we allow for arbitrary statistical dependence among individuals within each cluster (sometimes referred to as a partial interference assumption (Hudgens & Halloran, 2008)). Such dependence can occur because of (1) *shared exposures*: individuals share measured and unmeasured cluster-level factors; (2) *contagion*: outcomes may be contagious, so that $Y_{j,i}$ may depend on $Y_{j,i'}$ for any two individuals, i and i' , in cluster j ; (3) *covariate interference*: one individual’s covariates may affect another individual’s outcome, so that $Y_{j,i}$ may depend on $X_{j,i'}$ for any two individuals, i and i' , in cluster j ; or (4) *treatment-outcome interference*: one individual’s treatment assignment may affect another individual’s outcome, so that $Y_{j,i}$ may depend on $A_{j,i'}$ for any two individuals, i and i' , in cluster j .

We collect data on baseline covariates from the cohort of trial-eligible clusters and view the cohort as a random sample from that target population of clusters. Treatment and outcome data are only needed from clusters participating in the trial; the observed data are independent and identically distributed realizations of the random tuple $O_j = (X_j, \mathbf{W}_j, S_j, S_j \times A_j, S_j \times \mathbf{Y}_j)$, $j \in$

$\{1, \dots, m\}$.

Causal estimands

Let $Y_{j,i}^a$ be the potential (counterfactual) outcome for individual i in cluster j under intervention to assign treatment $a \in \mathcal{A}$ (Robins & Greenland, 2000; Rubin, 1974) and let \mathbf{Y}_j^a denote the vector of potential outcomes in cluster j under intervention to assign treatment $a \in \mathcal{A}$, such that $\mathbf{Y}_j^a = (Y_{j,i}^a : i \in \{1, \dots, N_j\})$. We define the *average potential outcome* in cluster j , \bar{Y}_j^a , as
$$\bar{Y}_j^a = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} Y_{j,i}^a.$$

Following Balzer et al. (2019) and Benitez et al. (2022), our causal quantity of interest is the (cluster-level) expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population of clusters, $E[\bar{Y}^a]$. This expectation, over the entire target population of clusters, will be different from the expectation of the average potential outcome in the randomized subset of the target population, that is $E[\bar{Y}^a] \neq E[\bar{Y}^a | S = 1]$, when factors which affect the outcome are differentially distributed between clusters that are selected into the trial and those that are not. The average treatment effect in the target population comparing treatments $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a' \in \mathcal{A}$ is a contrast of the corresponding expectations of the average potential outcomes $E[\bar{Y}^a - \bar{Y}^{a'}] = E[\bar{Y}^a] - E[\bar{Y}^{a'}]$. Also of interest are causal quantities in the non-randomized subset of the target population. Specifically, the expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population, $E[\bar{Y}^a | S = 0]$, and the average treatment effect comparing treatments $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a' \in \mathcal{A}$, $E[\bar{Y}^a - \bar{Y}^{a'} | S = 0] = E[\bar{Y}^a | S = 0] - E[\bar{Y}^{a'} | S = 0]$.

3 Identification

For the target population

Identifiability conditions: The following conditions are sufficient to identify the the expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population: *A1. Consistency of cluster-level average potential outcomes:* if $A_j = a$, then $\bar{Y}_j^a = \bar{Y}_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and every $a \in \mathcal{A}$. *A2. Conditional exchangeability over A in the cluster randomized trial:* $\bar{Y}^a \perp\!\!\!\perp A | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1$ for every a .

A3. Positivity of treatment assignment probability in the trial: $\Pr[A = a|X = x, \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}, S = 1] > 0$ for every a , and every x and \mathbf{w} with positive density in the trial. *A4. Conditional exchangeability over S :* $\bar{Y}^a \perp\!\!\!\perp S|X, \mathbf{W}$ for every a . *A5. Positivity of trial participation:* $\Pr[S = 1|X = x, \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}] > 0$ for every x and \mathbf{w} with positive density in the target population. Note that conditions A2 through A5 are supported by study design when clusters are selected using sampling probabilities known to the evaluators and treatment is randomly assigned among randomized clusters. Condition A1 should be judged on the basis of substantive knowledge, but can be rendered more plausible by study design (e.g., using appropriate definitions of clusters to ensure the partial interference assumption is plausible).

Identification: As shown in Appendix A, and similar to work on individually randomized trials (Dahabreh et al., 2019c), under the above conditions, the expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population, $E[\bar{Y}^a]$, is identified by

$$\psi(a) \equiv E \left[E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] \right],$$

where the outer expectation is over the distribution of the target population of clusters. The average treatment effect in the target population can be identified by taking differences between expectations of the average potential outcomes under different treatments.

For the non-randomized subset of the target population

Identifiability conditions: To identify the expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population, we retain conditions A1 through A4 and replace condition A5 by the following, slightly weaker, condition:

A5. Positivity of trial participation:* $\Pr[S = 1|X = x, \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}] > 0$ for every x and \mathbf{w} with positive density among the non-randomized subset of the target population. Condition A5* is supported by the study design when the sampling probabilities are under the control of the evaluators.

Identification: As shown in Appendix A, and similar to work on individually randomized trials (Dahabreh et al., 2020), under identifiability conditions A1 through A4 and condition A5*, the expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population, $E[\bar{Y}^a | S = 0]$, is identified by

$$\phi(a) \equiv E \left[E[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] | S = 0 \right].$$

The average treatment effect in the non-randomized subset of the target population can be identified by taking differences between the expectations of the average potential outcomes in the non-randomized subset of the target population under different treatments.

4 Estimation and inference

For the target population

Estimation: We propose the following augmented inverse probability of selection weighting estimator for $\psi(a)$:

$$\hat{\psi}(a) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left\{ \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a)}{\hat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \hat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} + \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{p}(X, \mathbf{W})$ is an estimator for $\Pr[S = 1 | X, \mathbf{W}]$; $\hat{e}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ is an estimator for $\Pr[A = a | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]$ (the known-by-design sampling and treatment assignment probabilities can be used instead); and $\hat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ is an estimator for $E[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$. In Appendix B, we show that this estimator is the efficient one whether the functions $\Pr[S = 1 | X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\Pr[A = a | X, \mathbf{W}, S]$ are known to the evaluators or have to be estimated. In Appendix C, we show that $\hat{\psi}(a)$ is robust in the sense that it converges to $\psi(a)$ regardless of whether the estimator $\hat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ is consistent for $E[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$.

Inference: We estimate the sampling variance of $\widehat{\psi}(a)$ as

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{\widehat{\psi}(a)}^2 = \frac{1}{m} \widehat{Var} \left[\widehat{\Psi}_j^1(a) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $\widehat{Var} \left[\widehat{\Psi}_j^1(a) \right]$ is the sample variance of the influence curve $\widehat{\Psi}_j^1(a)$ (the “sample analog” of the influence function (Tsiatis, 2007) we give in Appendix B):

$$\widehat{\Psi}_j^1(a) = \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a)}{\widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \widehat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} + \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) - \widehat{\psi}(a).$$

The sampling variance can be used to obtain a $(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval as $\left(\widehat{\psi}(a) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \times \widehat{\sigma}_{\widehat{\psi}(a)} \right)$, where $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal distribution. Alternatively, inference may also be obtained via the non-parametric bootstrap (Efron & Tibshirani, 1994), accounting for clustering (Balzer et al., 2019).

For the non-randomized subset of the target population

Estimation: We propose the following augmented inverse odds of selection weighting estimator for $\phi(a)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\phi}(a) = & \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a) \{1 - \widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\}}{\widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \widehat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} \\ & + \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \{1 - \widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\} \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In Appendix B, we show that $\widehat{\phi}(a)$ is different from the efficient estimator when the function $\Pr[S|X, \mathbf{W}]$ is not known. Specifically, when $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ is not known the efficient estimator would have the term $\{1 - \widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\}$ replaced by the indicator for an observation belonging to the non-randomized clusters, $I(S_j = 0)$; see Dahabreh et al. (2020). Thus, at least in principle, knowledge of the sampling probability can lead to efficiency improvements. This phenomenon is analogous to well-known observations about the estimation of treatment effects in observational studies of point treatments with no unmeasured confounding. In that context, knowledge of the

probability of treatment can be used to improve efficiency when estimating the average treatment effect on the treated, but not for the the average treatment effect in the entire population underlying the observational study (Hahn, 1998). In Appendix C, we also show that $\hat{\phi}(a)$ is robust in the sense that it converges to $\phi(a)$ whether or not the estimator $\hat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ is consistent for $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$.

Inference: We estimate the sampling variance of $\hat{\phi}(a)$ as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\phi}(a)}^2 = \frac{1}{m} \widehat{Var}[\hat{\Phi}_j^1(a)], \quad (4)$$

where $\widehat{Var}[\hat{\Phi}_j^1(a)]$ is the sample variance of the influence curve $\hat{\Phi}_j^1(a)$ (the “sample analog” of the influence function we give in Appendix B):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_j^1(a) = \frac{1}{\hat{\pi}} \left\{ \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a) \{1 - \hat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\}}{\hat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \hat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} + \right. \\ \left. \{1 - \hat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\} \left\{ \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) - \hat{\phi}(a) \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\pi}$ is an estimator for $\Pr[S = 0]$, that is, $\hat{\pi} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0)$. The sampling variance can be used to obtain a $(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval as $\left(\hat{\phi}(a) \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \times \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\phi}(a)} \right)$, where $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal distribution. Inference may also be obtained via the non-parametric bootstrap (Efron & Tibshirani, 1994), accounting for clustering (Balzer et al., 2019).

Average treatment effects

The expectation of the average treatment effects can be estimated by taking differences between pairs of the estimators of the expectation of the average potential outcome described above. For example, the expectation of the average treatment effect in the entire target population, comparing treatments a and a' , using the augmented weighting estimator in equation (1), can be estimated as $\hat{\psi}(a) - \hat{\psi}(a')$. Analogous treatment effect estimators can be obtained for the non-randomized subset of the target population.

Modeling participation, treatment, and outcomes

As noted above, the sampling probability and the probability of treatment in the trial are both known by design and can be used to estimate the expectation of the average potential outcomes and average treatment effects. Nevertheless, estimating these probabilities using simple parametric models (at the cluster level) can result in more precise estimates (Lunceford & Davidian, 2004; Williamson et al., 2014).

In contrast, the expectation of the average observed outcome conditional on baseline covariates and treatment in the trial, $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$, is not known and has to be estimated. To use individual-level information when estimating this expectation, we modify the strategy of Balzer et al. (2019) for use in the context of analyses extending causal inferences to a target population. To begin, we specify and fit a working regression model for the conditional expectation of the individual-level outcome, $Y_{j,i}$, given cluster-level covariates, X_j , and the individual's covariates, $W_{j,i}$, (not the entire matrix \mathbf{W}_j); the regression can be fit separately by treatment arm, to allow for effect modification. Next, we obtain estimated values from the fitted model on all individuals in the data, regardless of trial selection status. We denote these predictions as $\hat{h}_a(X_j, W_{j,i})$. Last, we obtain estimates $\hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)$ by averaging the predictions over individuals in each cluster, $\hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \hat{h}_a(X_j, W_{j,i})$. We note that it is also possible (and may be necessary in some cases when data have already been aggregated to the cluster level) to estimate $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ using only cluster-level data (e.g., by regressing cluster-level averages of the observed outcomes on cluster characteristics and cluster-level averages, or other summaries, of individual characteristics).

5 Simulation studies

We conducted a simulation study to verify the performance of the proposed augmented weighting estimators and to compare them against non-augmented weighting estimators. The choices in the simulation study, such as cluster size and the number of clusters in the sample from the target population, were informed by recently completed and ongoing trials of vaccine effectiveness in U.S.

nursing homes (Gravenstein et al., 2016; Gravenstein et al., 2017; Gravenstein et al., 2021; National Library of Medicine (U.S.), 2013, 2018, 2019).

Baseline data generation: We generated a sample of $m = 5000$ trial-eligible clusters from the target population. Each cluster had a sample size N_j , $j = 1, \dots, m$, randomly drawn from a Poisson distribution with mean parameter of 100. Thus, the number of individuals in each cluster varied, but on average there were approximately 100 individuals per cluster, which is similar to the sample sizes in the trials we used to motivate the simulation.

We generated a binary cluster-level covariate, X_j , with a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $\Pr[X_j = 1] = 0.05$. In each cluster, we generated individual-level covariates, $\mathbf{W}_j = (\mathbf{W}_{1,j}, \mathbf{W}_{2,j})$. For each cluster j , we generated the elements of each vector $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$ using draws from two cluster-specific independent normal distributions, each with its own mean and variance of 1. We independently drew the cluster-specific mean for each of these individual-level covariates from a continuous uniform distribution from -1 to 1.

Selecting the clusters in the randomized trial with known sampling probabilities: We used the complete baseline information for the 5000 trial-eligible clusters in the target population sample. We simulated trials with three different cluster sample sizes: 50, 100, or 250 clusters. We sampled clusters into the randomized trial so that $\Pr[X_j = 1 | S_j = 1] = 0.5$; that is to say, we wanted the clusters enrolled in the trial to be (approximately) equally split between the two possible levels of the cluster-level covariate X_j . To accomplish this, we had to oversample clusters with $X_j = 1$ and undersample clusters with $X_j = 0$.

For Bernoulli-type sampling of clusters from the target population sample, we used the sampling probability given by

$$\Pr[S_j = 1 | X_j = x] = \frac{\Pr[S_j = 1]}{\Pr[X_j = x]} \Pr[X_j = x | S_j = 1], \text{ for } x = 0, 1.$$

For example, suppose that the targeted trial sample size was 50 clusters, the target population sample was 5000 clusters, and the desired proportion of clusters with $X_j = 1$ in the trial was

0.5. Then, among clusters with $X_j = 1$, we set the known-by-design sampling probability to $\Pr[S_j = 1|X_j = 1] = \frac{50/5000}{0.05} \cdot 0.5 = 0.1$; similarly, among clusters with $X_j = 0$ we set the sampling probability to $\Pr[S_j = 1|X_j = 0] \approx 0.005$. Note that when designing cluster randomized trials, the quantities $\Pr[S_j = 1]$ and $\Pr[X_j = x|S_j = 1]$ would reflect the choice of the evaluators for the design of the trial and $\Pr[X_j = x]$ would be chosen on the basis of background knowledge about the target population or empirically estimated in the target population sample (in the simulation, we used the estimated $\Pr[X_j = x]$ value in each run of the simulation).

Treatment and outcome generation: Treatment A_j was randomized at the cluster-level, following a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $\Pr[A_j = 1|S_j = 1] = 0.5$. For each individual i in cluster j , we calculated the linear predictor $L_{j,i} = (2A_j - 1)X_j + 0.5(2A_j - 1)W_{1,j,i} + 0.5(2A_j - 1)W_{2,j,i}$. We then simulated binary individual-level outcomes from a Bernoulli distribution with parameter $\Pr[Y_{j,i} = 1|X_j, W_{1,j,i}, W_{2,j,i}, A_j] = \exp(L_{j,i})/\{1 + \exp(L_{j,i})\}$.

Estimators: We considered estimation of the expectation of average potential outcomes and the average treatment effects in the entire target population and its non-randomized subset. When estimating quantities in the entire target population, we applied the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator in equation (1) with the outcome-model fit using cluster-level information (AIPW1) or individual-level information (AIPW2). We also considered the following non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator (IPW):

$$\widehat{\psi}_w(a) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a) \bar{Y}_j}{\widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \widehat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)}. \quad (5)$$

This estimator can be viewed as a special case of $\widehat{\psi}(a)$ with the outcome model terms $\widehat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ set identically to 0.

When estimating quantities in the non-randomized subset of the target population, we used the augmented inverse odds weighting estimator in equation (3) with the outcome-model fit using only cluster-level information (AIOW1) or both cluster- and individual-level information (AIOW2). We compared these estimators against the following non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator

(IOW):

$$\widehat{\phi}_w(a) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a) \{1 - \widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\} \bar{Y}_j}{\widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \widehat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)}. \quad (6)$$

Similar to the inverse probability weighting estimator above, $\widehat{\phi}_w(a)$ can be viewed as a special case of $\widehat{\phi}(a)$ with the outcome model terms $\widehat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ set identically to 0.

We note in passing that the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator (using the known-by-design or estimated probabilities) is asymptotically at least as efficient as the non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator using the known-by-design probabilities, when the outcome model is correctly specified (see Appendix D; a similar result is not available for odds weighting estimators). Finally, we compared all these estimators against a trial-only estimator, which is estimated by averaging the individual-level outcomes in each cluster and then taking the average of these averages over the clusters participating in the trial.

Model specification: For all estimators we considered three possible versions for the sampling probability and probability of treatment in the trial: one where the known-by-design probabilities were used, one where both probabilities were estimated with a simple logistic regression model at the cluster level (conditional only on the cluster-level variable, X_j , that determined the sampling probabilities), and one where both probabilities were estimated with a more complex logistic regression model at the cluster level (on the cluster-level variable, X_j , that determined the sampling probabilities and cluster-level averages of the individual-level covariates, $\mathbf{W}_j = (\mathbf{W}_{1,j}, \mathbf{W}_{2,j})$).

For estimators that involve outcome modeling (i.e., AIPW and AIOW), we either modeled the outcome using cluster-level data (AIPW1 and AIOW1) or individual-level data (AIPW2 and AIOW2). When modeling using cluster-level data, we used a linear regression model for the cluster-specific average outcome, conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$. When modeling using individual-level data, we used a logistic regression model for the indicator of the outcome, conditional on X_j and the elements of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$ corresponding to each observation, separately in each treatment arm. The outcome model was correctly specified when

using individual-level data; the outcome model was misspecified when using cluster-level data (as would be the case in most practical applications, when the true underlying individual-level model is complex), and thus the regression of the cluster-level average of individual observed outcomes on cluster-level covariates is best viewed as an attempt to approximate the underlying true function.

Performance assessment: We evaluated the performance of the estimators over 1000 simulation runs, in terms of bias and average standard deviation. We compared the estimated average standard deviation of the estimators (over the simulation runs) against (1) the average of the influence curve-based standard deviations, and (2) the average of a standard deviation estimated using a clustered bootstrap procedure (Field & Welsh, 2007), using 250 bootstrap samples in each of the 1000 simulation runs. We also compared the coverage of the augmented weighting estimators when using the influence curve-based standard deviation versus the standard deviation estimated using the clustered bootstrap procedure. To facilitate numerical comparisons, we multiplied the simulation estimates of the bias and average standard deviation by the square root of the target cluster sample size, $\sqrt{5000}$. Because of the complexity of our data generating model, we obtained estimates of the “true” values for the expectations of the average potential outcomes and the average treatment effects using numerical methods (i.e., by generating both potential outcomes under the two levels of treatment for each observation over the simulation runs).

Simulation results: We present results for estimands pertaining to the entire target population in the main text; results for estimands pertaining to the non-randomized subset of the target population were similar and are presented in Appendix E. Table 1 shows the scaled bias (i.e., bias $\times \sqrt{5000}$) of each estimator across the simulation runs. The trial-only estimator, as expected, is biased for estimating the expectation of the average potential outcomes or the average treatment effect in the entire target population because sampling into the cluster randomized trial depends on the effect modifier, X_j . All estimators that account for the sampling of clusters for participation in the trial (IPW, AIPW1, AIPW2) show negligible bias, even in small cluster randomized trials.

In Table 2, we present the scaled estimated standard deviation (i.e., the estimated standard deviation $\times \sqrt{5000}$) for estimators that account for the sampling of clusters for participation in the

trial (IPW, AIPW1, AIPW2). When using the true sampling and treatment probabilities, IPW had substantially higher standard deviation compared with both AIPW1 and AIPW2. Estimating the sampling and treatment probabilities, using a simple model that only included X_j (i.e., the variable used to determine the cluster sampling probability) or a more complex model that included X_j and cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$, reduced the standard deviation of IPW but not enough to reach the standard deviation of AIPW1 or AIPW2. In contrast, AIPW1 and AIPW2 had similar performance when using the true sampling and treatment probabilities, when estimating these probabilities conditional on the variable X_j (i.e., the variable used to determine the cluster sampling probability), or when estimating these probabilities using a more complex model that included X_j and cluster-level averages of that included X_j and cluster-level averages of the elements of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$.

To examine methods for statistical inference, we focus on the augmented weighting estimators (AIPW1 and AIPW2) because they were nearly unbiased and had a substantially lower standard deviation compared with IPW. Table 3 presents the average of the estimated standard error using the influence curve-based approach (IC) and the cluster bootstrap (BS), along with the corresponding coverage of Wald-style 95% confidence intervals obtained using these standard errors for the augmented weighting estimators (AIPW1 and AIPW2). Ideally, the scaled average standard error should equal the scaled estimated standard deviation in Table 2. In general, the influence curve-based approach for the average standard error was smaller than the estimated standard deviation of the estimators, especially in smaller cluster trials. Using the influence curve-based standard errors resulted in undercoverage in the smaller cluster trials of 50 or 100 clusters, but nearly nominal coverage in larger cluster trials of 250 clusters. The average standard error based on the cluster bootstrap was similar to the estimated standard deviation of the estimators. Using the bootstrap-based standard errors resulted in near-nominal coverage for all trial sizes we examined.

6 Discussion

We described a nested cluster randomized trial design where clusters are selected for inclusion in the trial with known sampling probabilities that depend on cluster characteristics and proposed robust

augmented weighting estimators for this design that allow the sampling probabilities to depend on baseline covariates. The robustness of the proposed estimators stems from the fact that the sampling probability and the probability of treatment in the trial are known by design and thus models for them can always be correctly specified. Our estimators give evaluators the option of exploiting individual-level data on the relationship between covariates, treatment and outcomes, to further increase efficiency, while accounting for within-cluster dependence (including various forms of interference). We showed that knowledge of the sampling probabilities can be used to develop efficient augmented weighting estimators of causal estimands that pertain to the non-randomized subset of the target population, but not those that pertain to the entire target population.

Our proof-of-concept simulations, motivated by large cluster randomized trials of vaccine effectiveness (National Library of Medicine (U.S.), 2013, 2018, 2019), show that the augmented weighting estimators perform well in finite samples and better than previously described non-augmented weighting estimators. The augmented weighting estimators had about the same performance whether the true or estimated sampling and treatment probabilities were used, even in small trials. In contrast, our simulation results suggest that estimating the known-by-design sampling and treatment probabilities when using the non-augmented weighting estimators can substantially improve precision, but typically not enough to reach the precision of the augmented weighting estimators. In the simulation, the standard deviation estimated using a clustered bootstrap procedure worked well for inference with the augmented weighting estimators and the influence curve-based standard deviation (which is computationally faster) also performed well in larger cluster trial sizes.

Prior work on designing a cluster randomized trial to support generalizable inferences has focused on sampling clusters such that crude (unadjusted) analyses of the trial data can estimate treatment effects in the target population (Tipton, 2013b; Tipton et al., 2014; Tipton & Peck, 2017). Such “representative” sampling using a constant sampling probability across strata defined by effect modifiers puts a premium on simple analyses but cannot accommodate other practical aspects of trial conduct, such as the need for rapid recruitment of clusters, the recruitment of clusters with established research infrastructure, or the desire for efficient estimation within subgroups of clusters defined by covariates. When representative sampling does not result in good balance

between the trial and the target population, this prior work has mentioned the possibility of using simple weighting or stratification methods, without providing evidence of good performance. Our proposed design essentially works in the opposite direction, by acknowledging that research practicalities will often lead evaluators to select clusters for participation conditional on baseline covariates, while still pursuing generalizable inferences – an instance of experimental design with multiple objectives (Sverdlov & Rosenberger, 2013; Sverdlov et al., 2020; Woodcock & LaVange, 2017). For example, our approach can support trials designed to test hypotheses in subgroups of clusters, by oversampling clusters with certain characteristics, and uses the known-by-design sampling probabilities to produce inferences that apply to the target population.

Our proposed design and analysis methods should be useful when practicalities of trial conduct (e.g., efficient recruitment) or the trial’s inferential goals require oversampling clusters with certain characteristics. They can form the basis for explicit approaches to the planning of future cluster randomized trials (Copas & Hooper, 2021; Raudenbush, 1997) via formal optimization procedures for trading-off competing research objectives. Such optimization efforts are motivated by the desire to use the most efficient experimental designs that are feasible; thus, they should routinely be paired with efficient estimation approaches, such as those that we have proposed.

In most cases evaluators will choose sampling probabilities that depend on a low dimensional set of discrete covariates (e.g., those deemed as the most likely and strong effect modifiers for the treatment effects of interest). That said, our methods can also accommodate more complex sampling schemes. For example, when evaluators would like to sample clusters based on multiple covariates (as may be the case in large cluster randomized trials that motivate our work (National Library of Medicine (U.S.), 2013, 2018, 2019)), a predictive score or other dimensionality reduction approach could be used to create a lower dimensional variable that can then be used to determine the sampling probabilities.

Throughout, our exposition assumed that the evaluators have complete control over cluster participation in the trial. Nevertheless, the methods can be easily extended to allow for the possibility that selected clusters may decline participation in the trial. When sampled clusters can decline participation, additional causal assumptions regarding the exchangeability of clusters that agree to

participate with those that do not, among the sampled clusters, will be needed (this is analogous to recent results for individually randomized trials (Dahabreh et al., 2019d)). Furthermore, a model for the probability of participation among sampled clusters will need to be specified and estimated because participation among the sampled clusters will not be under the control of the evaluators.

In summary, cluster randomized trials where clusters are selected for inclusion with known sampling probabilities that depend on cluster characteristics, combined with efficient estimation methods, can lead to substantial improvements in the precision of the estimated effect in the target population, while also addressing competing objectives of trial conduct.

7 Acknowledgment

Removed for peer review.

8 Declaration

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Balzer, L. B., Zheng, W., van der Laan, M. J., & Petersen, M. L. (2019). A new approach to hierarchical data analysis: Targeted maximum likelihood estimation for the causal effect of a cluster-level exposure. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, *28*(6), 1761–1780.
- Benitez, A., Petersen, M. L., van der Laan, M. J., Santos, N., Butrick, E., Walker, D., Ghosh, R., Otieno, P., Waiswa, P., & Balzer, L. B. (2022). Defining and estimating effects in cluster randomized trials: A methods comparison. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.09633*.
- Breslow, N. E., & Wellner, J. A. (2007). Weighted likelihood for semiparametric models and two-phase stratified samples, with application to Cox regression. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, *34*(1), 86–102.
- Cole, S. R., & Stuart, E. A. (2010). Generalizing evidence from randomized clinical trials to target populations: The ACTG 320 trial. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *172*(1), 107–115.
- Copas, A. J., & Hooper, R. (2021). Optimal design of cluster randomized trials allowing unequal allocation of clusters and unequal cluster size between arms. *Statistics in Medicine*, *40*(25), 5474–5486.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Haneuse, S. J. A., Robins, J. M., Robertson, S. E., Buchanan, A. L., Stuart, E. A., & Hernán, M. A. (2021). Study designs for extending causal inferences from a randomized trial to a target population. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *190*(8), 1632–1642.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Hernán, M. A., Robertson, S. E., Buchanan, A., & Steingrímsson, J. A. (2019a). Generalizing trial findings in nested trial designs with sub-sampling of non-randomized individuals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06080*.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Robertson, S. E., & Hernán, M. A. (2019b). On the relation between g-formula and inverse probability weighting estimators for generalizing trial results. *Epidemiology*, *30*(6), 807–812.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Robertson, S. E., Steingrímsson, J. A., Gravenstein, S., & Joyce, N. R. (2022). Extending inferences from a cluster randomized trial to a target population. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14761*.

- Dahabreh, I. J., Robertson, S. E., Steingrímsson, J. A., Stuart, E. A., & Hernán, M. A. (2020). Extending inferences from a randomized trial to a new target population. *Statistics in Medicine*, *39*(14), 1999–2014.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Robertson, S. E., Tchetgen Tchetgen, E. J., Stuart, E. A., & Hernán, M. A. (2019c). Generalizing causal inferences from individuals in randomized trials to all trial-eligible individuals. *Biometrics*, *75*(2), 685–694.
- Dahabreh, I. J., Robins, J. M., Haneuse, S. J.-P., & Hernán, M. A. (2019d). Generalizing causal inferences from randomized trials: Counterfactual and graphical identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.10792*.
- Donner, A., & Klar, N. (2000). *Design and analysis of cluster randomization trials in health research*. Wiley.
- Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1994). *An introduction to the bootstrap* (Vol. 57). Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Field, C. A., & Welsh, A. H. (2007). Bootstrapping clustered data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, *69*(3), 369–390.
- Gravenstein, S., Dahal, R., Gozalo, P. L., Davidson, H. E., Han, L. F., Taljaard, M., & Mor, V. (2016). A cluster randomized controlled trial comparing relative effectiveness of two licensed influenza vaccines in US nursing homes: Design and rationale. *Clinical Trials*, *13*(3), 264–274.
- Gravenstein, S., Davidson, H. E., Taljaard, M., Ogarek, J., Gozalo, P., Han, L., & Mor, V. (2017). Comparative effectiveness of high-dose versus standard-dose influenza vaccination on numbers of US nursing home residents admitted to hospital: A cluster-randomised trial. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, *5*(9), 738–746.
- Gravenstein, S., McConeghy, K. W., Saade, E., Davidson, H. E., Canaday, D. H., Han, L., Rudolph, J., Joyce, N., Dahabreh, I. J., & Mor, V. (2021). Adjuvanted influenza vaccine and influenza outbreaks in US nursing homes: Results from a pragmatic cluster-randomized clinical trial. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, *73*(11), e4229–e4236.

- Hahn, J. (1998). On the role of the propensity score in efficient semiparametric estimation of average treatment effects. *Econometrica*, *66*(2), 315–331.
- Halloran, M. E., & Struchiner, C. J. (1995). Causal inference in infectious diseases. *Epidemiology*, *6*(2), 142–151.
- Hudgens, M. G., & Halloran, M. E. (2008). Toward causal inference with interference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *103*(482), 832–842.
- Lunceford, J. K., & Davidian, M. (2004). Stratification and weighting via the propensity score in estimation of causal treatment effects: A comparative study. *Statistics in Medicine*, *23*(19), 2937–2960.
- Murray, D. M. et al. (1998). *Design and analysis of group-randomized trials* (Vol. 29). Oxford University Press.
- National Library of Medicine (U.S.) (2013). *High dose influenza vaccination and morbidity & mortality in U.S. nursing homes, identifier: NCT01815268*. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01815268>
- National Library of Medicine (U.S.) (2018). *Adjuvanted influenza vaccination and morbidity and mortality in U.S. nursing homes, identifier: NCT02882100*. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02882100>
- National Library of Medicine (U.S.) (2019). *Comparative effectiveness of recombinant versus standard dose quadrivalent influenza vaccine in U.S. nursing homes, identifier: NCT03965195*. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT03965195>
- O’Muircheartaigh, C., & Hedges, L. V. (2014). Generalizing from unrepresentative experiments: A stratified propensity score approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C: Applied Statistics*, 195–210.
- Raudenbush, S. W. (1997). Statistical analysis and optimal design for cluster randomized trials. *Psychological methods*, *2*(2), 173.
- Robins, J. M., & Greenland, S. (2000). Causal inference without counterfactuals: Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *95*(450), 431–435.
- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *66*(5), 688.

- Rudolph, K. E., & van der Laan, M. J. (2017). Robust estimation of encouragement design intervention effects transported across sites. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, *79*(5), 1509–1525.
- Saegusa, T., & Wellner, J. A. (2013). Weighted likelihood estimation under two-phase sampling. *Annals of Statistics*, *41*(1), 269.
- Stuart, E. A., Cole, S. R., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2011). The use of propensity scores to assess the generalizability of results from randomized trials. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)*, *174*(2), 369–386.
- Sverdlov, O., & Rosenberger, W. F. (2013). On recent advances in optimal allocation designs in clinical trials. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, *7*(4), 753–773.
- Sverdlov, O., Ryznik, Y., & Wong, W. K. (2020). On optimal designs for clinical trials: An updated review. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, *14*(1), 1–29.
- Tipton, E. (2013a). Improving generalizations from experiments using propensity score subclassification: Assumptions, properties, and contexts. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *38*(3), 239–266.
- Tipton, E. (2013b). Stratified sampling using cluster analysis: A sample selection strategy for improved generalizations from experiments. *Evaluation Review*, *37*(2), 109–139.
- Tipton, E., Hallberg, K., Hedges, L. V., & Chan, W. (2017). Implications of small samples for generalization: Adjustments and rules of thumb. *Evaluation Review*, *41*(5), 472–505.
- Tipton, E., Hedges, L., Vaden-Kiernan, M., Borman, G., Sullivan, K., & Caverly, S. (2014). Sample selection in randomized experiments: A new method using propensity score stratified sampling. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *7*(1), 114–135.
- Tipton, E., & Olsen, R. B. (2018). A review of statistical methods for generalizing from evaluations of educational interventions. *Educational Researcher*, *47*(8), 516–524.
- Tipton, E., & Peck, L. R. (2017). A design-based approach to improve external validity in welfare policy evaluations. *Evaluation Review*, *41*(4), 326–356.
- Tipton, E., Yeager, D. S., Iachan, R., & Schneider, B. (2019). Designing probability samples to study treatment effect heterogeneity. In P. J. Lavrakas, M. W. Traugott, C. Kennedy, A. L.

- Holbrook, E. D. de Leeuw, & B. T. West (Eds.), *Experimental methods in survey research: Techniques that combine random sampling with random assignment* (pp. 435–456). John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsiatis, A. (2007). *Semiparametric theory and missing data*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Westreich, D., Edwards, J. K., Lesko, C. R., Stuart, E., & Cole, S. R. (2017). Transportability of trial results using inverse odds of sampling weights. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *186*(8), 1010–1014.
- Williamson, E. J., Forbes, A., & White, I. R. (2014). Variance reduction in randomised trials by inverse probability weighting using the propensity score. *Statistics in Medicine*, *33*(5), 721–737.
- Woodcock, J., & LaVange, L. M. (2017). Master protocols to study multiple therapies, multiple diseases, or both. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *377*(1), 62–70.

Tables

Table 1: Scaled bias in the entire target population.

Estimand	n	Values for probabilities	Trial-only	IPW	AIPW1	AIPW2
ATE	50	True	12.978	-0.162	-0.07	-0.055
		Estimated (simple)	12.978	-0.088	-0.07	-0.053
		Estimated (complex)	12.978	0.07	-0.093	-0.067
	100	True	13.487	-0.089	-0.008	-0.006
		Estimated (simple)	13.487	-0.009	-0.008	-0.006
		Estimated (complex)	13.487	-0.02	-0.017	-0.018
	250	True	13.129	-0.191	-0.024	-0.023
		Estimated (simple)	13.129	-0.065	-0.024	-0.022
		Estimated (complex)	13.129	-0.03	-0.021	-0.018
E $[\bar{Y}^{a=1}]$	50	True	6.546	0.254	-0.031	-0.027
		Estimated (simple)	6.546	-0.031	-0.031	-0.027
		Estimated (complex)	6.546	0.136	-0.038	-0.03
	100	True	6.741	-0.067	-0.019	-0.021
		Estimated (simple)	6.741	-0.024	-0.019	-0.022
		Estimated (complex)	6.741	-0.037	-0.024	-0.026
	250	True	6.601	-0.114	-0.005	-0.005
		Estimated (simple)	6.601	-0.022	-0.005	-0.005
		Estimated (complex)	6.601	-0.003	-0.003	-0.001
E $[\bar{Y}^{a=0}]$	50	True	-6.432	0.417	0.038	0.028
		Estimated (simple)	-6.432	0.057	0.038	0.027
		Estimated (complex)	-6.432	0.066	0.055	0.037
	100	True	-6.745	0.022	-0.011	-0.015
		Estimated (simple)	-6.745	-0.016	-0.011	-0.016
		Estimated (complex)	-6.745	-0.017	-0.008	-0.008
	250	True	-6.528	0.077	0.019	0.018
		Estimated (simple)	-6.528	0.044	0.019	0.018
		Estimated (complex)	-6.528	0.026	0.018	0.016

Results are scaled by \sqrt{m} (i.e., multiplied by $\sqrt{5000} \approx 70.7$). ATE is defined as $E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}] - E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}]$; n = number of clusters in the trial; Values for probabilities = how the treatment and sampling probabilities are obtained for the estimators (True = use the known-by-design sampling probabilities and probabilities of treatment in the trial; Estimated (simple) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j only (the variable used to determine the sampling probabilities); Estimated (complex) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$); Trial-only = average the individual-level outcomes in each cluster and then take the average of these averages over the clusters participating in the trial; IPW = non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator; AIPW1 = augmented inverse probability weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit only at the cluster-level; AIPW2 = augmented inverse probability weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit at the individual-level.

Table 2: Scaled estimated standard deviation in the entire target population.

Estimand	n	Values for probabilities	IPW	AIPW1	AIPW2
ATE	50	True	13.625	1.431	1.383
		Estimated (simple)	2.805	1.431	1.383
		Estimated (complex)	3.758	1.455	1.437
	100	True	9.679	0.971	0.961
		Estimated (simple)	1.007	0.971	0.962
		Estimated (complex)	1.547	0.982	0.976
	250	True	6.26	0.626	0.615
		Estimated (simple)	1.240	0.626	0.615
		Estimated (complex)	0.995	0.623	0.619
E $[\bar{Y}^{a=1}]$	50	True	10.038	1.007	0.957
		Estimated (simple)	1.965	1.007	0.957
		Estimated (complex)	2.729	1.016	0.983
	100	True	6.982	0.663	0.654
		Estimated (simple)	0.675	0.663	0.655
		Estimated (complex)	1.176	0.675	0.673
	250	True	4.369	0.428	0.419
		Estimated (simple)	0.867	0.428	0.419
		Estimated (complex)	0.731	0.429	0.424
E $[\bar{Y}^{a=0}]$	50	True	9.587	1.009	0.949
		Estimated (simple)	2.030	1.009	0.950
		Estimated (complex)	2.906	1.033	0.997
	100	True	6.822	0.682	0.683
		Estimated (simple)	0.724	0.682	0.683
		Estimated (complex)	1.155	0.684	0.684
	250	True	4.386	0.430	0.420
		Estimated (simple)	0.888	0.430	0.420
		Estimated (complex)	0.736	0.428	0.422

Results are scaled by \sqrt{m} (i.e., multiplied by $\sqrt{5000} \approx 70.7$). ATE is defined as $E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}] - E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}]$; n = number of clusters in the trial; Values for probabilities = how the treatment and sampling probabilities are obtained for the estimators; True = use the known-by-design sampling probabilities and probabilities of treatment in the trial; Estimated (simple) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j only (the variable used to determine the sampling probabilities); Estimated (complex) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$; IPW = non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator; AIPW1 = augmented inverse probability weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit only at the cluster-level; AIPW2 = augmented inverse probability weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit at the individual-level.

Table 3: Coverage and scaled average of the estimated standard error for the augmented weighting estimators in the entire target population.

Estimand	n	Values for probabilities	AIPW1				AIPW2			
			ASE		Coverage		ASE		Coverage	
			IC	BS	IC	BS	IC	BS	IC	BS
ATE	50	True	1.174	1.667	0.878	0.965	1.204	1.37	0.904	0.949
		Estimated (simple)	1.197	1.667	0.905	0.965	1.230	1.370	0.922	0.951
		Estimated (complex)	1.241	1.777	0.900	0.969	1.287	1.572	0.932	0.963
	100	True	0.866	0.953	0.911	0.956	0.886	0.926	0.923	0.947
		Estimated (simple)	0.886	0.953	0.938	0.956	0.906	0.927	0.942	0.948
		Estimated (complex)	0.904	0.974	0.940	0.963	0.927	0.964	0.944	0.954
	250	True	0.596	0.616	0.959	0.967	0.593	0.606	0.954	0.961
		Estimated (simple)	0.601	0.616	0.961	0.967	0.598	0.606	0.963	0.961
		Estimated (complex)	0.606	0.615	0.960	0.962	0.603	0.610	0.957	0.961
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}]$	50	True	0.814	1.086	0.861	0.945	0.836	0.961	0.885	0.934
		Estimated (simple)	0.835	1.086	0.891	0.945	0.860	0.960	0.910	0.935
		Estimated (complex)	0.865	1.155	0.894	0.950	0.899	1.09	0.915	0.944
	100	True	0.608	0.672	0.913	0.945	0.622	0.653	0.923	0.941
		Estimated (simple)	0.623	0.672	0.927	0.945	0.638	0.653	0.935	0.939
		Estimated (complex)	0.637	0.687	0.923	0.941	0.653	0.679	0.930	0.939
	250	True	0.409	0.424	0.942	0.952	0.406	0.416	0.946	0.959
		Estimated (simple)	0.413	0.424	0.95	0.952	0.411	0.416	0.947	0.958
		Estimated (complex)	0.417	0.423	0.946	0.951	0.414	0.419	0.947	0.955
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}]$	50	True	0.806	1.157	0.855	0.944	0.826	0.928	0.880	0.944
		Estimated (simple)	0.821	1.157	0.888	0.944	0.841	0.928	0.917	0.944
		Estimated (complex)	0.845	1.23	0.885	0.947	0.873	1.053	0.916	0.953
	100	True	0.603	0.661	0.902	0.937	0.617	0.643	0.914	0.936
		Estimated (simple)	0.615	0.661	0.920	0.937	0.630	0.643	0.926	0.934
		Estimated (complex)	0.626	0.673	0.917	0.939	0.642	0.666	0.927	0.934
	250	True	0.408	0.420	0.944	0.961	0.405	0.412	0.949	0.962
		Estimated (simple)	0.411	0.420	0.956	0.961	0.408	0.412	0.959	0.962
		Estimated (complex)	0.414	0.420	0.957	0.961	0.412	0.415	0.957	0.962

ASE = average of the estimated standard error over the simulations, scaled by \sqrt{m} (i.e., multiplied by $\sqrt{5000} \approx 70.7$); IC = influence-curve based; BS= bootstrap; Coverage = coverage, using 95% normal confidence intervals. ATE is defined as $E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}] - E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}]$; n = number of clusters in the trial; Values for probabilities = how the treatment and sampling probabilities are obtained for the estimators; True = use the known-by-design sampling probabilities and probabilities of treatment in the trial; Estimated (simple) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j only (the variable used to determine the sampling probabilities); Estimated (complex) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$; AIPW1 = augmented inverse probability weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit only at the cluster-level; AIPW2 = augmented inverse probability weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit at the individual-level.

Appendix A Identification results under a nonparametric model

This section of the Appendix summarizes results from a technical report (Dahabreh et al., 2022) dealing with cluster randomized trials nested within cohorts of trial eligible individuals, under a non-parametric model in which *the sampling probability is not under the control of the evaluators*. These results remain valid when the sampling probabilities are known and are presented here for completeness.

Expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population: Under identifiability conditions A1 through A5, given in the main text, the expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population, $E[\bar{Y}^a]$, is identified by

$$\psi(a) \equiv E \left[E \left[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a \right] \right].$$

Starting with the causal quantity of interest,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\bar{Y}^a] &= E \left[E \left[\bar{Y}^a | X, \mathbf{W} \right] \right] \\ &= E \left[E \left[\bar{Y}^a | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1 \right] \right] \\ &= E \left[E \left[\bar{Y}^a | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a \right] \right] \\ &= E \left[E \left[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a \right] \right] \\ &\equiv \psi(a), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the law of total expectation, the second by condition A4, the third by condition A2, the fourth by condition A1, the last by the definition of $\psi(a)$, and quantities are well-defined because of the positivity conditions A3 and A5.

Expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population: Under identifiability conditions A1 through A4 and condition A5*, given in the main text, the expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of

the target population, $E[\bar{Y}^a | S = 0]$, is identified by

$$\phi(a) \equiv E \left[E[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] | S = 0 \right].$$

Starting with the causal quantity of interest,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\bar{Y}^a | S = 0] &= E \left[E[\bar{Y}^a | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 0] | S = 0 \right] \\ &= E \left[E[\bar{Y}^a | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1] | S = 0 \right] \\ &= E \left[E[\bar{Y}^a | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] | S = 0 \right] \\ &= E \left[E[\bar{Y} | X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] | S = 0 \right] \\ &\equiv \phi(a), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the law of total expectation conditional on $S = 0$, the second by condition *A4*, the third by condition *A2*, the fourth by condition *A1*, the last by the definition of $\phi(a)$, and quantities are well-defined because of the positivity conditions *A3* and *A5**.

Appendix B Estimation under the semiparametric model where the sampling probability and the probability of treatment are known

Expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population: In a technical report (Dahabreh et al., 2022), it has been shown that the influence function of $\psi(a)$ under a non-parametric model for the law of the observed data is

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{p_0}^1(a) = & \frac{I(S = 1, A = a)}{\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \left\{ \bar{Y} - E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] \right\} \\ & + E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \psi_{p_0}(a), \end{aligned}$$

where the subscript p_0 indicates the “true” law; $\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ is the cluster-level probability of participating in the trial given (X, \mathbf{W}) ; $\Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]$ is the probability of being assigned to treatment a given (X, \mathbf{W}) among clusters participating in the trial; and $E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ is the conditional expectation of the cluster-level average observed outcome \bar{Y} given (X, \mathbf{W}) among clusters participating in the trial and assigned to treatment a .

Now consider the semiparametric model with $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ known to the evaluators and the tangent space of that model. The influence function $\Psi_{p_0}^1(a)$ above belongs to the tangent space of this semiparametric model and thus $\Psi_{p_0}^1(a)$ is equal to its own projection onto the tangent space of the semiparametric model. It follows that $\Psi_{p_0}^1(a)$ is also the influence function under the semiparametric model with $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ known. Furthermore, a similar argument holds for the semiparametric model with both $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S]$ known.

Thus, we can conclude that $\hat{\psi}(a)$, that is, the estimating equation estimator based on the influence function $\Psi_{p_0}^1(a)$, is the efficient estimator under the semiparametric models with $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$, or both $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S]$, known.

Expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population: In a technical report, it has been shown that the influence function of $\phi(a)$

under a non-parametric model for the law of the observed data is

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{p_0}^1(a) = \frac{1}{\pi_{p_0}} & \left\{ \frac{I(S=1, A=a)\{1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]\}}{\Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]\Pr_{p_0}[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1]} \left\{ \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a] \right\} \right. \\ & \left. + I(S=0)\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_{p_0} = \Pr_{p_0}[S=0]$.

Now consider a semiparametric model with $\Pr[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ known. To obtain the efficient influence function under this semiparametric model, we need to project $\Psi_{p_0}^1(a)$ to the tangent space of this semiparametric model. Using Theorems 4.3 and 4.5 of Tsiatis (2007) and standard iterated expectation arguments, we find that the efficient influence function under this semiparametric model is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a) = \frac{1}{\pi_{p_0}} & \left\{ \frac{I(S=1, A=a)\{1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]\}}{\Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]\Pr_{p_0}[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1]} \left\{ \bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a] \right\} \right. \\ & \left. + \{1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]\} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The difference between $\Phi_{p_0}^1(a)$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a)$ is the substitution of $\{1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]\}$ for $I(S=0)$ in the second term of the latter. Furthermore, a similar argument shows that $\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a)$ is the efficient influence function semiparametric model with both $\Pr[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\Pr[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S]$ known. Thus, we can conclude that $\hat{\phi}(a)$, that is, the estimating equation estimator based on the above efficient influence function $\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a)$, is the efficient estimator under the semiparametric models with $\Pr[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]$, or both $\Pr[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\Pr[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S]$, known.

For completeness, in Appendix D we shall compare the asymptotic variance of the augmented inverse odds weighting estimator (corresponding to the influence function, $\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a)$) versus the asymptotic variance of the augmented inverse odds weighting estimator in the technical report (corresponding to the influence function, $\Phi_{p_0}^1(a)$). This shows that the asymptotic variance of the augmented odds weighting estimator corresponding to $\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a)$ is less than or equal to the estimator corresponding to $\Phi_{p_0}^1(a)$.

Appendix C Robustness

In this section, we use \xrightarrow{P} to denote convergence in probability.

C.1 Expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population

Recall that the estimator of the expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population is defined as

$$\widehat{\psi}(a) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left\{ \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a)}{\widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \widehat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} + \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\}.$$

Assume that, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $\widehat{p}(X, \mathbf{W}) \xrightarrow{P} \Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\widehat{e}_a(X, \mathbf{W}) \xrightarrow{P} \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]$ (this assumption is reasonable because both $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]$ are under the evaluators' control and models for them can always be correctly specified). Furthermore, assume that $\widehat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W}) \xrightarrow{P} g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$ where $g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$ is not necessarily equal to $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ (i.e., allowing for misspecification of the outcome model). Then, as the number of clusters grows,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}(a) \xrightarrow{P} E \left[\frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \bar{Y}}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] \\ + E \left[g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W}) \left\{ 1 - \frac{I(S = 1, A = a)}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using an iterated expectation argument (Dahabreh et al., 2019b) and the definition of $\psi(a)$, we have

$$E \left[\frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \bar{Y}}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] = E [E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]] \equiv \psi(a).$$

Furthermore, using another iterated expectation argument

$$E \left[g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W}) \left\{ 1 - \frac{I(S = 1, A = a)}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right\} \right] = 0,$$

for all $g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$.

Thus, we can conclude that, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $\widehat{\psi}(a) \xrightarrow{P} \psi(a)$, whether $g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$ equals $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S =$

1, $A = a$] or not.

C.2 Expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population

The argument is similar to the one for the entire population, given above. Recall that the estimator of the expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\phi}(a) &= \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a) \{1 - \widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\}}{\widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \widehat{e}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \{1 - \widehat{p}(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\} \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j), \end{aligned}$$

Assume again that, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $\widehat{p}(X, \mathbf{W}) \xrightarrow{P} \Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]$ and $\widehat{e}_a(X, \mathbf{W}) \xrightarrow{P} \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]$ (an assumption supported by study design). Furthermore, assume that $\widehat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W}) \xrightarrow{P} g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$ where $g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$ is not necessarily equal to $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ (i.e., allowing for misspecification of the outcome model). Then, as the number of clusters grows,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\phi}(a) &\xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{\Pr[S = 0]} E \left[\frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \bar{Y}}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\Pr[S = 0]} E \left[g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W}) \left\{ \Pr[S = 0|X, \mathbf{W}] - \frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \Pr[S = 0|X, \mathbf{W}]}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using an iterated expectation argument (Dahabreh et al., 2019b) and the definition of $\phi(a)$, we have

$$E \left[\frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \Pr[S = 0|X, \mathbf{W}] \bar{Y}}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] = E \left[E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] | S = 0 \right] \equiv \phi(a).$$

Furthermore, using another iterated expectation argument we have

$$E \left[g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W}) \left\{ \Pr[S = 0|X, \mathbf{W}] - \frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \Pr[S = 0|X, \mathbf{W}]}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right\} \right] = 0,$$

for all $g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$.

Thus, we can conclude that, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $\widehat{\phi}(a) \xrightarrow{p} \phi(a)$, whether $g_a^*(X, \mathbf{W})$ equals $E[\overline{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ or not.

Appendix D Comparison of asymptotic variances when using the known sampling and treatment probabilities

D.1 Expectation of the average potential outcome in the target population

We shall compare the asymptotic variance of the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator $\widehat{\psi}(a)$ (and a version of it using the true sampling probability and the true probability of treatment in the trial) versus the asymptotic variance of a non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator that uses the true sampling probability and the true probability of treatment in the trial. Here, we assume that $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, A = a]$ is consistently estimated by $\widehat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$.

When the sampling $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] = p(X, \mathbf{W})$ and treatment probabilities $\Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1] = e_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ are known, we might consider the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator,

$$\check{\psi}(a) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left\{ \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a)}{p(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)e_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)} \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} + \widehat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

and the non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator

$$\check{\psi}_w(a) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{I(S_j = 1, A_j = a)\bar{Y}_j}{p(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)e_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)}. \quad (8)$$

Note that the above estimators are obtained from $\widehat{\psi}(a)$ and $\widehat{\psi}_w(a)$, respectively, by substituting the true (known-by-design) probabilities for the estimated ones. The variance of the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{m}(\check{\psi}(a) - \psi(a))$, which is the same as the variance of the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{m}(\widehat{\psi}(a) - \psi(a))$ (Hahn, 1998), is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\check{\psi}(a)} &= E_{p_0} \left[\left(\Psi_{p_0}^1(a) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= E_{p_0} \left[\frac{\text{Var}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]}{\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} + \left(E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] \right)^2 - \left(\psi_{p_0}(a) \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The variance of the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{m}(\check{\psi}_w(a) - \psi(a))$, using the results from page 22

of Tsiatis (2007), is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\tilde{\psi}_w(a)} &= E_{p_0} \left[\left(\frac{I(S=1, A=a)\bar{Y}}{\Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1]} - \psi_{p_0}(a) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= E_{p_0} \left[\frac{E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}^2|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a]}{\Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1]} - (\psi_{p_0}(a))^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from an iterated expectation argument after expanding the square.

Taking the difference between $V_{\tilde{\psi}(a)}$ and $V_{\tilde{\psi}_w(a)}$, and using the fact that

$$\text{Var}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a] = E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}^2|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a] - (E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a])^2,$$

we find that

$$V_{\tilde{\psi}(a)} - V_{\tilde{\psi}_w(a)} = E \left[(E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a])^2 \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{\Pr_{p_0}[S=1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A=a|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1]} \right\} \right] \leq 0.$$

Thus, we conclude that $V_{\tilde{\psi}_w(a)} \geq V_{\tilde{\psi}(a)}$.

This result suggests that, when the sampling probability and the probability of treatment in the trial are under the control of the evaluators and both the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator and the non-augmented inverse probability weighting estimator are consistent, the augmented estimator (whether using the estimated or true sampling and treatment probabilities) will have asymptotic variance no larger than that of the non-augmented weighting estimator using the true sampling and treatment probabilities, provided the model for $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S=1, A=a]$ is correctly specified.

Of course, it can be argued that this result is not practically useful because the model for the outcome is never correctly specified in practical applications. Nevertheless, if the model for the outcome can be reasonably approximated (e.g., using machine learning or other data adaptive methods) then we would expect the efficiency of the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator to be smaller than that of the non-augmented weighting estimator. Furthermore, any misspecification of the outcome model is unlikely to prove detrimental because of the robustness property of the augmented inverse probability weighting estimator.

D.2 Expectation of the average potential outcome in the non-randomized subset of the target population

Comparing the non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator vs augmented inverse odds weighting estimator: A similar analytical result as the one presented in Section D.1 is not available for estimators of $\phi(a)$. Nevertheless, when the sampling probabilities $\Pr[S = 1|X = x, \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}]$ are small for all covariate patterns \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w} (as will often be the case), we should expect the behavior of (augmented) inverse odds weighting estimators to be similar to that of (augmented) inverse probability weighting estimators.

For completeness, we provide the asymptotic variance of the augmented inverse odds weighting estimator versus that of the non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator when the sampling and treatment probabilities are known, as would be the case in a designed study where clusters are sampled with known sampling probability and the treatment assignment is under the control of the investigators. Here, we assume that $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ can be estimated consistently by $\hat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$.

When the sampling $\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] = p(X, \mathbf{W})$ and treatment probabilities $\Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1] = e_a(X, \mathbf{W})$ are known, we might consider the following two estimators: an augmented inverse odds weighting estimator for $\phi(a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\phi}(a) = & \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m w_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j, S_j, A_j) \left\{ \bar{Y}_j - \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \right\} \\ & + \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \{1 - p(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j)\} \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with

$$w_a(X, \mathbf{W}, S, A) = \frac{I(S = 1, A = a) \{1 - p(X, \mathbf{W})\}}{p(X, \mathbf{W})e_a(X, \mathbf{W})},$$

and a non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator for $\phi(a)$,

$$\check{\phi}_w(a) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m w_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j, S_j, A_j) \bar{Y}_j. \quad (10)$$

Note that the above augmented inverse odds weighting estimator and non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator are obtained from $\hat{\phi}(a)$ and $\hat{\phi}_w(a)$, respectively, by substituting the true probabilities for the estimated ones.

The asymptotic variance of the distribution of $\sqrt{m}(\check{\phi}(a) - \phi(a))$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\check{\phi}(a)} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi_{p_0}^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \text{Var}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]}{\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \{ \mathbb{E}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{m}(\check{\phi}_w(a) - \phi(a))$, applying the results from page 22 of Tsiatis (2007), is

$$V_{\check{\phi}_w(a)} = \frac{1}{\pi_{p_0}^2} \mathbb{E}_{p_0} \left[\left(\frac{I(S = 1, A = a)\bar{Y}(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])}{\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}] \Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} - I(S = 0)\phi_{p_0}(a) \right)^2 \right].$$

Comparing the augmented inverse odds weighting estimators: For completeness, we shall compare the asymptotic variance of the augmented inverse odds weighting estimator $\check{\phi}(a)$ using the true sampling probability and the true probability of treatment in the trial, from equation (9) (corresponding to the influence function, $\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a)$, in Appendix B) versus the asymptotic variance of an augmented inverse odds weighting estimator that uses the true sampling probability and the true probability of treatment in the trial (corresponding to the influence function, $\Phi_{p_0}^1(a)$ in the technical report and also given in Appendix B):

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\phi}(a) &= \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m w_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j, S_j, A_j) \{ \bar{Y}_j - \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j) \} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m I(S_j = 0) \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m (1 - S_j) \hat{g}_a(X_j, \mathbf{W}_j), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with

$$w_a(X, \mathbf{W}, S, A) = \frac{I(S = 1, A = a)\{1 - \Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]\}}{\Pr[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]\Pr[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]}.$$

Here, we assume that $E[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]$ can be consistently estimated by $\hat{g}_a(X, \mathbf{W})$.

The asymptotic variance of the distribution of $\sqrt{m}(\check{\phi}(a) - \phi(a))$ (Hahn, 1998) is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\check{\phi}(a)} &= E \left[(\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a))^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi_{p_0}^2} \left\{ E \left[\frac{(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \text{Var}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]}{\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]\Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + E \left[(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{m}(\bar{\phi} - \phi(a))$, using the results from page 22 of Tsiatis (2007), is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\bar{\phi}(a)} &= E \left[(\tilde{\Phi}_{p_0}^1(a))^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi_{p_0}^2} \left\{ E \left[\frac{(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \text{Var}_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a]}{\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]\Pr_{p_0}[A = a|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1]} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + E \left[(1 - S) \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the difference between $V_{\check{\phi}(a)}$ and $V_{\bar{\phi}(a)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\check{\phi}(a)} - V_{\bar{\phi}(a)} &= E \left[(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \\ &\quad - E \left[(1 - S) \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \\ &= E \left[(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}])^2 \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \\ &\quad - E \left[(1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]) \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \\ &= - E \left[\Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}](1 - \Pr_{p_0}[S = 1|X, \mathbf{W}]) \{ E_{p_0}[\bar{Y}|X, \mathbf{W}, S = 1, A = a] - \phi_{p_0}(a) \}^2 \right] \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that $V_{\check{\phi}(a)} \leq V_{\bar{\phi}(a)}$.

Appendix E Additional simulation results

Appendix Table 1: Scaled bias in the non-randomized subset of the target population.

Estimand	n	Values for probabilities	Trial-only	IOW	AIOW1	AIOW2
ATE in $S = 0$	50	True	13.110	-0.164	-0.0700	-0.055
		Estimated (simple)	13.110	-0.088	-0.0700	-0.053
		Estimated (complex)	13.110	0.071	-0.094	-0.067
	100	True	13.762	-0.091	-0.008	-0.005
		Estimated (simple)	13.762	-0.008	-0.008	-0.006
		Estimated (complex)	13.762	-0.021	-0.017	-0.018
	250	True	13.821	-0.205	-0.022	-0.021
		Estimated (simple)	13.821	-0.068	-0.025	-0.024
		Estimated (complex)	13.821	-0.03	-0.021	-0.018
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=1} S=0]$	50	True	6.612	0.264	-0.030	-0.026
		Estimated (simple)	6.612	-0.031	-0.031	-0.027
		Estimated (complex)	6.612	0.137	-0.038	-0.030
	100	True	6.879	-0.060	-0.019	-0.021
		Estimated (simple)	6.879	-0.025	-0.019	-0.022
		Estimated (complex)	6.879	-0.038	-0.024	-0.026
	250	True	6.947	-0.116	-0.002	-0.002
		Estimated (simple)	6.947	-0.022	-0.005	-0.005
		Estimated (complex)	6.947	-0.003	-0.002	-0.001
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=0} S=0]$	50	True	-6.498	0.428	0.040	0.029
		Estimated (simple)	-6.498	0.057	0.039	0.027
		Estimated (complex)	-6.498	0.066	0.056	0.037
	100	True	-6.883	0.030	-0.011	-0.015
		Estimated (simple)	-6.883	-0.016	-0.011	-0.016
		Estimated (complex)	-6.883	-0.017	-0.008	-0.008
	250	True	-6.874	0.089	0.021	0.020
		Estimated (simple)	-6.874	0.045	0.020	0.018
		Estimated (complex)	-6.874	0.027	0.019	0.016

Results are scaled by \sqrt{m} (i.e., multiplied by $\sqrt{5000} \approx 70.7$). ATE in $S = 0$ is defined as $E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}|S=0] - E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}|S=0]$; n = number of clusters in the trial; Values for probabilities = how the treatment and sampling probabilities are obtained for the estimators (True = use the known-by-design sampling probabilities and probabilities of treatment in the trial; Estimated (simple) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j only (the variable used to determine the sampling probabilities); Estimated (complex) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$); Trial-only = average the individual-level outcomes in each cluster and then take the average of these averages over the clusters participating in the trial; IOW = non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator; AIOW1 = augmented inverse odds weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit only at the cluster-level; AIOW2 = augmented inverse odds weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit at the individual-level.

Appendix Table 2: Scaled estimated standard deviation in the non-randomized subset of the target population.

Estimand	n	Values for probabilities	IOW	AIOW1	AIOW2
ATE in $S = 0$	50	True	13.689	1.437	1.389
		Estimated (simple)	2.818	1.438	1.389
		Estimated (complex)	3.785	1.462	1.444
	100	True	9.772	0.980	0.970
		Estimated (simple)	1.016	0.979	0.970
		Estimated (complex)	1.569	0.990	0.984
	250	True	6.415	0.643	0.631
		Estimated (simple)	1.274	0.646	0.635
		Estimated (complex)	1.036	0.643	0.639
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=1} S=0]$	50	True	10.112	1.014	0.963
		Estimated (simple)	1.974	1.011	0.961
		Estimated (complex)	2.753	1.022	0.988
	100	True	7.082	0.671	0.663
		Estimated (simple)	0.682	0.669	0.661
		Estimated (complex)	1.196	0.682	0.680
	250	True	4.539	0.450	0.441
		Estimated (simple)	0.889	0.440	0.431
		Estimated (complex)	0.761	0.441	0.436
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=0} S=0]$	50	True	9.661	1.015	0.955
		Estimated (simple)	2.038	1.014	0.954
		Estimated (complex)	2.928	1.038	1.001
	100	True	6.927	0.688	0.689
		Estimated (simple)	0.729	0.687	0.688
		Estimated (complex)	1.171	0.689	0.689
	250	True	4.552	0.456	0.444
		Estimated (simple)	0.912	0.443	0.432
		Estimated (complex)	0.767	0.440	0.434

Results are scaled by \sqrt{m} (i.e., multiplied by $\sqrt{5000} \approx 70.7$). ATE in $S = 0$ is defined as $E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}|S=0] - E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}|S=0]$; n = number of clusters in the trial; Values for probabilities = how the treatment and sampling probabilities are obtained for the estimators (True = use the known-by-design sampling probabilities and probabilities of treatment in the trial; Estimated (simple) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j only (the variable used to determine the sampling probabilities); Estimated (complex) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$); IOW = non-augmented inverse odds weighting estimator; AIOW1 = augmented inverse odds weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit only at the cluster-level; AIOW2 = augmented inverse odds weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit at the individual-level.

Appendix Table 3: Coverage and scaled average of the estimated standard error for the augmented weighting estimators in the non-randomized subset of the target population.

Estimand	n	Values for probabilities	AIOW1				AIOW2			
			ASE		Coverage		ASE		Coverage	
			IC	BS	IC	BS	IC	BS	IC	BS
ATE in $S = 0$	50	True	1.179	1.672	0.880	0.965	1.209	1.375	0.903	0.949
		Estimated (simple)	1.202	1.673	0.901	0.965	1.234	1.376	0.920	0.949
		Estimated (complex)	1.246	1.786	0.900	0.969	1.292	1.579	0.932	0.962
	100	True	0.873	0.960	0.912	0.956	0.892	0.933	0.922	0.945
		Estimated (simple)	0.892	0.961	0.938	0.957	0.913	0.935	0.940	0.948
		Estimated (complex)	0.911	0.983	0.941	0.963	0.934	0.972	0.943	0.953
	250	True	0.605	0.625	0.952	0.963	0.602	0.614	0.956	0.958
		Estimated (simple)	0.610	0.627	0.956	0.96	0.607	0.616	0.962	0.959
		Estimated (complex)	0.615	0.627	0.956	0.958	0.612	0.622	0.955	0.958
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=1} S=0]$	50	True	0.817	1.092	0.856	0.943	0.839	0.966	0.882	0.933
		Estimated (simple)	0.838	1.091	0.889	0.945	0.863	0.964	0.909	0.934
		Estimated (complex)	0.869	1.161	0.892	0.95	0.903	1.095	0.913	0.945
	100	True	0.614	0.680	0.920	0.945	0.628	0.662	0.921	0.938
		Estimated (simple)	0.628	0.677	0.925	0.944	0.643	0.659	0.935	0.935
		Estimated (complex)	0.642	0.694	0.921	0.941	0.659	0.685	0.928	0.937
	250	True	0.417	0.444	0.936	0.951	0.414	0.436	0.936	0.949
		Estimated (simple)	0.421	0.433	0.943	0.949	0.419	0.425	0.943	0.950
		Estimated (complex)	0.425	0.433	0.94	0.949	0.422	0.429	0.943	0.951
$E[\bar{Y}^{a=0} S=0]$	50	True	0.809	1.162	0.855	0.940	0.830	0.933	0.876	0.944
		Estimated (simple)	0.824	1.162	0.888	0.940	0.845	0.932	0.915	0.944
		Estimated (complex)	0.849	1.235	0.883	0.947	0.877	1.059	0.914	0.953
	100	True	0.608	0.670	0.896	0.940	0.622	0.652	0.901	0.933
		Estimated (simple)	0.620	0.667	0.916	0.936	0.635	0.649	0.926	0.931
		Estimated (complex)	0.631	0.680	0.915	0.939	0.647	0.673	0.924	0.932
	250	True	0.415	0.439	0.943	0.957	0.413	0.432	0.947	0.962
		Estimated (simple)	0.418	0.429	0.950	0.957	0.416	0.421	0.953	0.955
		Estimated (complex)	0.422	0.429	0.954	0.958	0.420	0.425	0.952	0.959

ASE = average of the estimated standard error over the simulations, scaled by \sqrt{m} (i.e., multiplied by $\sqrt{5000} \approx 70.7$); IC = influence-curve based; BS = bootstrap; Coverage = coverage, using 95% normal confidence intervals. ATE in $S = 0$ is defined as $E[\bar{Y}^{a=1}|S=0] - E[\bar{Y}^{a=0}|S=0]$; n = number of clusters in the trial; Values for probabilities = how the treatment and sampling probabilities are obtained for the estimators (True = use the known-by-design sampling probabilities and probabilities of treatment in the trial; Estimated (simple) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j only (the variable used to determine the sampling probabilities); Estimated (complex) = estimate the sampling and treatment probabilities conditional on X_j and the cluster-level averages of $\mathbf{W}_{1,j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{2,j}$); AIOW1 = augmented inverse odds weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit only at the cluster-level; AIOW2 = augmented inverse odds weighting estimator, with the outcome model fit at the individual-level.