

Estimating Time-Varying Direct and Indirect Causal Excursion Effects with Longitudinal Binary Outcomes

Jieru Shi*, Zhenke Wu**, and Walter Dempsey***

Department of Biostatistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

**email:* herashi@umich.edu

***email:* zhenkewu@umich.edu

****email:* wdem@umich.edu

SUMMARY: Construction of just-in-time adaptive interventions, such as prompts delivered by mobile apps to promote and maintain behavioral change, requires knowledge about time-varying moderated effects to inform when and how we deliver intervention options. Micro-randomized trials (MRT) have emerged as a sequentially randomized design to gather requisite data for effect estimation. The existing literature (Qian et al., 2020; Boruvka et al., 2018; Dempsey et al., 2020) has defined a general class of causal estimands, referred to as “causal excursion effects”, to assess the time-varying moderated effect. However, there is limited statistical literature on how to address potential between-cluster treatment effect heterogeneity and within-cluster interference in a sequential treatment setting for longitudinal binary outcomes. In this paper, based on a cluster conceptualization of the potential outcomes, we define a larger class of direct and indirect causal excursion effects for proximal and lagged binary outcomes, and propose a new inferential procedure that addresses effect heterogeneity and interference. We provide theoretical guarantees of consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimator. Extensive simulation studies confirm our theory empirically and show the proposed procedure provides consistent point estimator and interval estimates with valid coverage. Finally, we analyze a data set from a multi-institution MRT study to assess the time-varying moderated effects of mobile prompts upon binary study engagement outcomes.

KEY WORDS: Binary Outcome; Causal Inference; Clustered Data; Just-In-Time Adaptive Interventions; Micro-randomized Trials; Mobile Health; Moderation Effect

1. Introduction

As internet-enabled devices become increasingly popular, mobile devices such as smartphones and wearable devices are used to sense the current context of the individual, as well as to deliver interventions intended to promote healthy behaviors and health-related behavioral change (e.g., Free et al., 2013). Examples include medication reminders, motivational messages, and reminders to engage in physical activity.

There is intense need in gathering sequential experimental data to guide the development of just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAI) (Nahum-Shani et al., 2018). JITAI are mHealth technologies that aim to deliver the right intervention components at the right times to offer optimal support to promote individuals' healthy behaviors. Micro-randomized trials (MRTs) (Klasnja et al., 2015) have emerged as a popular sequentially randomized design where each subject is repeatedly randomized to receive one of the multiple treatment options, often at hundreds or even thousands of times, over the course of the trial. In all cases the randomization probabilities are determined as part of the design and thus known. Between randomizations, the individual's current or recent context is collected via sensors and/or self-reports, and after each randomization a proximal, near-time outcome is collected. The time-varying treatments, information collected between treatments, and proximal outcomes constitute longitudinal data for use in assessing whether the treatment has an effect on the proximal outcome at each treatment occasion. For the domain scientists, estimates of these treatment effects are crucial to inform the development of mobile health interventions.

Many MRTs to date have longitudinal binary outcomes as the primary outcome. For example, in an MRT conducted by JOOL Health (Bidargaddi et al., 2018), the researchers intended to test whether sending a push notification containing a contextually tailored health message versus not sending push notification results in an increased likelihood of proximal engagement with the app. The outcome in this case is user engagement with the app, which is

a binary variable. Similarly, the Substance Abuse Research Assistance (SARA) study (Rabbi et al., 2018) has a proximal outcome of whether participants completed the survey and active tasks. In BariFit (Ridpath, 2017), the proximal outcome for the food tracking reminder is whether the participant completes their food log on that day or not. In the following, we present an example that highlights the limitations of existing work and the need for novel estimands and estimation techniques.

1.1 *Motivating Example*

This work is motivated by our involvement in the Intern Health Study (IHS; NeCamp et al., 2020), which is a 6-month micro-randomized trial on 1,565 medical interns. Medical internship during the first year of physician residency training is highly stressful, resulting in depression rates several folds higher than those of the general population. In order to understand whether mobile interventions improve participants' mental health, enrolled medical interns were randomized weekly to receive either mood, activity, or sleep notifications or receive no notifications for that week (probability 1/4 each). During a week when notifications are provided, interns were randomized daily with 50% probability to receive a notification. Mood valence surveys were administered daily to all interns. Participants' engagement with the mobile app is essential. We are interested in whether targeted notifications affect participants' daily survey completion. In this context, the proximal outcome is whether or not a participant completes the daily mood survey, which is a binary longitudinal outcome.

Qian et al. (2020) proposed an estimator of the marginal excursion effect (EMEE) to examine whether a particular time-varying intervention has an effect on a longitudinal binary outcome. This inferential method for data collected in an MRT relies on two key assumptions: no between-individual interference and no treatment effect heterogeneity. However, the 1,565 interns in the IHS represented 321 residency institutions and 42 specialties, resulting in naturally clustered subjects. In other words, we are studying an MRT in which there is a pre-

defined clustering structure, with randomization still at the individual level. An exploratory analysis is conducted to illustrate this issue. The clusters are defined by specialties, in particular, we remove specialties with fewer than six participants, and apply EMEE to every cluster separately to estimate the treatment effects. Figure 1 presents specialty-specific effect estimates of daily prompts upon daily survey completion, with evident cluster-level treatment effect heterogeneity. Motivated by this example, we are interested in performing inferences on novel causal excursion effects when cluster structures exist.

[Figure 1 about here.]

1.2 Main Contribution

For proximal and lagged binary outcomes, we propose a family of estimands of causal excursion effects to account for potential between-cluster treatment effect heterogeneity and within-cluster interference. We define direct and pairwise indirect causal excursion effects accounting for cluster structure. In particular, the direct effect characterizes the effect of an intervention when a person receives treatment versus not; the pairwise indirect effect accounts for how another individual’s treatment status within the same cluster affects one’s proximal or lagged outcome.

In this paper, we provide conditions that ensure identification and propose a new estimation method termed “cluster-based estimator of the marginal excursion effect” (C-EMEE) to consistently estimate direct and pairwise indirect causal excursion effects with longitudinal binary outcomes. A robust variance estimator is used to ensure consistent estimation of asymptotic variance. A small sample correction (Mancl and DeRouen, 2001) is added when the sample size is under 50. Theoretical results, including consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators, are presented. From a practical perspective, our proposed methods for estimating time-varying causal excursion effects include prior methods such

as EMEE as a special case, and are more well-suited for real-world environments in which clustering structures exist.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We begin with a brief literature review in Section 2. In Section 3, we define novel direct and pairwise indirect causal excursion effects for longitudinal binary outcomes. Following this, in Section 4, the cluster-based estimators of the marginal excursion effect are presented. The asymptotic properties of these estimators are assessed both theoretically and numerically using a variety of simulation scenarios in Section 5. In Section 6, we apply the proposed methods to data from the Intern Health Study (NeCamp et al., 2020), a mobile intervention study conducted to investigate whether mobile prompt notifications can be used to impact participants' engagement on completing their daily self-reported mood surveys. The paper concludes with a brief summary and discussion of future directions.

2. Preliminaries

2.1 *Micro-Randomized Trials (MRT)*

An MRT consists of a sequence of within-subject decision times $t = 1, \dots, T$ at which treatment options may be randomly assigned. The resulting longitudinal data for any subject can be summarized as

$$\{O_0, O_1, A_1, O_2, A_2, \dots, O_T, A_T, O_{T+1}\},$$

where O_0 is the baseline information, O_t is the information collected between time $t - 1$ and t which may include mobile sensor and wearable data, and A_t is the treatment option provided at time t . For simplicity we assume that there are two treatment options: $A_t \in \{0, 1\}$. We use over-bar to denote a sequence of variables up to a time point; for example $\bar{A}_t = (A_1, \dots, A_t)$. Information accrued up to time t is represented by the history $H_t := \{O_0, O_1, A_1, \dots, A_{t-1}, O_t\} = \{\bar{O}_t, \bar{A}_{t-1}\}$.

In an MRT, A_t results from realized randomization at decision occasion t ; here, we assume this randomization probability depends on the complete observed history H_t and is denoted by $p_t(A_t | H_t)$ and $\mathbf{p} = \{p_t(A_t | H_t)\}_{t=1}^T$. Treatment options are designed to impact a proximal or possibly lagged response $Y_{t,\Delta}$ which is a known function of the participant's data within a subsequent window of length $\Delta \geq 1$: $Y_{t,\Delta} = y(H_{t+\Delta})$; when $\Delta = 1$, we set $Y_{t,1} = y(H_{t+1})$ (Dempsey et al., 2020). In this paper, $Y_{t,\Delta}$ is a binary random variable.

REMARK 1 (Availability): At some decision points, it is inappropriate for scientific, ethical, or burden reasons to provide treatment. To address this, the observation vector O_t also contains an indicator of availability: $I_t = 1$ if available for treatment and $I_t = 0$ otherwise. Availability at time t is determined before treatment randomization. When an individual is unavailable for treatment ($I_t = 0$), then no treatment is provided ($A_t = 0$). In this paper, for simplicity, individuals are assumed always available for treatment. All methods can be readily extended to account for availability as in Boruvka et al. (2018) and Qian et al. (2020).

2.2 Existing Estimand and Inferential Method

Substantial work has been done by Boruvka et al. (2018), Dempsey et al. (2020) and Shi et al. (2021) on the estimation of causal excursion effects with continuous outcomes. Later, Qian et al. (2020) addressed the unique challenges in the binary outcome setting by adopting a log relative risk model for the causal excursion effect of A_t on $Y_{t,\Delta}$. Assuming availability at all time points, we have *causal excursion effects* for binary outcome defined by:

$$\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}(t; s) = \log \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[Y_{t,\Delta}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 1, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1)}) \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[Y_{t,\Delta}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1)}) \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s \right]}. \quad (1)$$

S_t is a time-varying potential effect moderator (or “state”) and a deterministic function of the observed history H_t . Here, we assume the reference distribution for treatment assignments from $t + 1$ to $t + \Delta - 1$ ($\Delta > 1$) is given by a randomization probability generically represented by $\pi_u(a_u | H_u)$, $u = t + 1, \dots, t + \Delta - 1$ and let $\pi = \{\pi_u\}_{u=t+1}^{t+\Delta-1}$. This generalization

contains previous definitions such as lagged effects (Boruvka et al., 2018) where $\pi_u = p_u$ and deterministic choices such as $a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1)} = \mathbf{0}$ (Dempsey et al., 2020; Qian et al., 2020), where $\pi_u = \mathbf{1}\{a_u = 0\}$ and $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function.

Under the assumption that $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}(t; s) = f_t(s)^\top \beta^*$, where $f_t(S_t) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is a feature vector depending only on state $S_t = s$ and decision point t , a consistent estimator of β^* can be obtained by applying the EMEE method (Qian et al., 2020):

$$\mathbb{P}_n \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,\Delta} W_t e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \left(Y_{t,\Delta} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \right) \begin{pmatrix} g_t(H_t) \\ (A_t - \tilde{p}_t(A_t = 1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \end{pmatrix} \right] = 0, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbb{P}_n is defined as the average of a function over the sample, and $g_t(H_t) \in \mathcal{R}^p$ is a vector of control variables chosen to help reduce the variance of the estimators and construct more powerful test statistics. The product $W_{t,\Delta} = \prod_{u=t+1}^{t+\Delta-1} \pi_u(A_u | H_u) / p_u(A_u | H_u)$ is the standard inverse probability weighting for settings with $\Delta > 1$, and $W_{t,\Delta} = 1$ when $\Delta = 1$. $W_t(H_t) = \tilde{p}(A_t|S_t) / p_t(A_t|H_t)$ is a weight where the numerator is an arbitrary function with range $(0, 1)$ that only depends on S_t and the denominator is the MRT specified randomization probability.

REMARK 2: Typically, lagged effects of interest have short time horizons, therefore Δ is chosen to be small in order to provide more detailed insight into the causal excursion effect. Increasing Δ will result in exponential growth of variance since the weight $W_{t,\Delta}$ is a product of $\Delta - 1$ density ratios. This is known as the curse of the horizon (Liu et al., 2020).

3. Cluster-level proximal treatment effects

The primary question of interest is whether treatment has an immediate and/or lagged effect on the binary outcome. Due to potential within cluster interference, we consider two types of moderated effects: a direct and a pairwise indirect effect.

Consider a cluster of size G . We have $\bar{a}_{t,j} = (a_{1,j}, \dots, a_{t,j})$ denote the sequence of realized

treatments up to and including decision time t for individual $j \in [G] := \{1, \dots, G\}$ in the cluster. Let $\bar{a}_t = (\bar{a}_{t,1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{t,G})$ denote the set of realized treatments up to and including decision time t for all individuals in the cluster and $\bar{a}_{t,-j} = \bar{a}_t \setminus \bar{a}_{t,j}$ to denote this set with the j th individual's realized treatments removed. $Y_{t,\Delta,j}(\bar{a}_{t+\Delta-1}) \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes the potential response of individual $j \in [G]$ under a treatment sequence $\bar{a}_{t+\Delta-1}$, which may depend on the realized treatments for all individuals in the cluster.

3.1 Direct causal excursion effects

At the cluster level, our interest lies in the effect of providing treatment versus not at time t on a random individual j in the cluster $[G]$. The corresponding solutions should be constructed by comparing the potential outcomes $Y_{t,\Delta,j}(\bar{a}_{t,\Delta,-j}, (\bar{a}_{t-1,j}, a_{t,j} = 1, a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),j}))$ and $Y_{t,\Delta,j}(\bar{a}_{t,\Delta,-j}, (\bar{a}_{t-1,j}, a_{t,j} = 0, a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),j}))$. The “fundamental problem of causal inference” (Rubin, 1978; Pearl, 2009) is that these potential outcomes on the same individual cannot be observed simultaneously, so to define treatment effects, we take averages of potential relative risks.

Let $S_t(\bar{a}_{t-1})$ denote a vector of moderator variables chosen from $H_t(\bar{a}_{t-1})$, the cluster-level history up to decision point t . We write $S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = (S_{t,j}(\bar{A}_{t-1}), S_{t,-j}(\bar{A}_{t-1}))$ to clarify that the potential moderator variables can contain both information on the selected individual as well as other individuals in the cluster. Then the *direct causal excursion effect*, denoted by $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}(t; s)$, can be defined as

$$\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}(t; s) = \log \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p},\pi} \left[Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1,-J}, (\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, 1, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J})) | S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p},\pi} \left[Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1,-J}, (\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J})) | S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s \right]}, \quad (3)$$

where J is a uniformly distributed random index defined on $[G]$. The expectation is over the potential outcomes $Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\cdot)$, the set of randomized treatments ($\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1,-J} \sim \mathbf{p}$, $\bar{A}_{t-1,J} \sim \mathbf{p}$, $\tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J} \sim \pi$), and the random index J . By “direct”, we mean that we are only studying the relationship between the treatment realization $a_{t,j}$ and outcome $Y_{t,\Delta,j}$, with all

previous and future treatments on the individual and all treatments on other members of the cluster are fixed to a specific value. Different choices of variables in $S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1})$ address a variety of scientific questions. A primary analysis, for instance, may focus on the fully marginal proximal effects and therefore set $S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = \emptyset$. A second analysis may focus on assessing the effect conditional on variables only related to the individual indexed by J and set $S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = X_{t,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J})$. A third analysis may consider cluster-level effect moderators, for example $S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = G^{-1} \sum_j X_{t,j}(\bar{A}_{t-1,j})$.

REMARK 3: Treatment micro-randomization could also take place at the cluster level. For example, as an alternative to focusing on the individual-level direct treatment effect as in (3), one could contrast providing treatment to every member in cluster $[G]$ at time t with not providing treatment to anyone, which represents a cluster-level direct effect. Domain scientists can use this setup to investigate whether community treatment allocation affects the aggregated outcome of the community as a whole.

REMARK 4: Prior work by Shi et al. (2021) constructed a framework where causal excursion effects are considered under potential cluster-level treatment effect heterogeneity and interference. The causal estimands target a linear contrast because the outcome of interest is continuous. As regards binary outcomes, however, relative risk is often more scientifically meaningful.

REMARK 5: The advantage of relative risk over odds ratio is that it is collapsible, i.e., there exist weights for arbitrarily specified moderators that yield a weighted average of the moderated effects (Pearl, 2009). As such, in the context of time-varying moderated treatment effects, defining causal excursion effects as relative risks on a log scale is natural.

3.2 Pairwise indirect causal excursion effects

Of secondary interest is a pairwise indirect effect. This is meant to measure the indirect effect on individual j (who is not given a treatment) while a random treatment allocation on patient j' is implemented. This pairwise within-cluster treatment interference can be assessed by comparing $Y_{t,\Delta,j}(\bar{a}_{t+\Delta-1,-\{j,j'\}}, (\bar{a}_{t-1,j}, 0, a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),j}), (\bar{a}_{t-1,j'}, 1, a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),j'}))$ and $Y_{t,\Delta,j}(\bar{a}_{t+\Delta-1,-\{j,j'\}}, (\bar{a}_{t-1,j}, 0, a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),j}), (\bar{a}_{t-1,j'}, 0, a_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),j'}))$.

As these two outcomes cannot be observed simultaneously, we consider averages of potential risks in the definition. The *pairwise indirect causal excursion effect*, denoted by $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}^{(IE)}(t; s)$, is defined as:

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p},\pi} \left[Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1,-\{J,J'\}}, (\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}), (\bar{A}_{t-1,J'}, 1, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J'})) | S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p},\pi} \left[Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1,-\{J,J'\}}, (\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}), (\bar{A}_{t-1,J'}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J'})) | S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s \right]}, \quad (4)$$

where J' is uniformly distributed random index on the set $[G] \setminus \{J\}$. The expectation is over the potential outcomes of $Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\cdot)$, the set of randomized treatments $(\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1,-\{J,J'\}} \sim \mathbf{p}$, $\bar{A}_{t-1,J} \sim \mathbf{p}$, $\bar{A}_{t-1,J'} \sim \mathbf{p}$, $\tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J} \sim \pi$, and $\tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J'} \sim \pi)$, and the random indices J and J' . The moderators can be written as $S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = (S_{t,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1}), S_{t,J'}(\bar{A}_{t-1}), S_{t,-\{J,J'\}}(\bar{A}_{t-1}))$ to clarify that the variables can contain both information on the two selected individuals as well as others in the cluster. Note that a similar effect can be defined when the individual j does receive treatment. For now, we focus on the effect defined by (4).

REMARK 6: The effect defined by (4) extends the pairwise indirect causal excursion effects in Shi et al. (2021) to adjust for binary outcomes, and generalizes the *group average indirect causal effect* from Tchetgen and VanderWeele (2012) to a *cluster-level causal excursion effect* that allows for moderation and time-varying treatments. The pairwise contrast is over two individuals within the same cluster, where one is fixed to receive no treatment, and vary the other individual's treatment allocation. It is important to point out that this particular definition is only one among a variety of possible definitions of the “indirect effect”, which

is of scientific interest and could be reasonably estimated. We could theoretically extend the setup beyond pairwise indirect effect, but this would be less relevant in our scientific context, and the power to detect such effects would also be low.

3.3 Identification

To express the causal excursion effect in terms of the observed data, we make the following assumptions (Robins, 1986):

ASSUMPTION 1: We assume consistency, positivity, and sequential ignorability:

- Consistency: For each $t \leq T$ and $j \in [G]$, $\{Y_{t,\Delta,j}(\bar{A}_{t+\Delta-1}), O_{t,j}(\bar{A}_{t-1}), A_{t,j}(\bar{A}_{t-1})\} = \{Y_{t,\Delta,j}, O_{t,j}, A_{t,j}\}$, where \bar{A}_t is *joint* treatment history across all individuals in the cluster, i.e., observed values equal the corresponding potential outcomes;
- Positivity: if the joint density $\{H_t = h, A_t = a\}$ is greater than zero, then $\mathbb{P}(A_t = a_t | H_t = h_t) > 0$.
- Sequential ignorability: for each $t \leq T$ and $j \in [G]$, the potential outcomes, $\{Y_{t,1,j}(\bar{a}_t), O_{t+1,j}(\bar{a}_t), A_{t+1,j}(\bar{a}_t), \dots, Y_{T,1,j}(\bar{a}_T)\}_{j \in [G], \bar{a}_T \in \{0,1\}^{T \times G}}$, are independent of $A_{t,j}$ conditional on the observed history H_t .

In an MRT, because the treatment is sequentially randomized with known probabilities bounded away from 0 and 1, positivity and sequential ignorability are satisfied by design. Here, we allow that individual treatment randomization probabilities depend on cluster-level history. Consistency is a necessary assumption for linking the potential outcomes as defined here to the data. Since an individual's outcomes may be influenced by the treatments provided to other individuals in the same cluster, consistency holds due to our use of a cluster-based conceptualization of potential outcomes as seen in Hong and Raudenbush (2006) and Vanderweele et al. (2013)

LEMMA 1: Under assumption 1, the moderated direct treatment effect $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}(t; s)$ is equal

to

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [W_{t,\Delta,J} Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 1] | S_{t,J} = s]}{\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [W_{t,\Delta,J} Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0] | S_{t,J} = s]},$$

where each expectation is with respect to the distribution of the data collected using the treatment assignment probabilities.

Under assumption 1, the moderated indirect treatment effect $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}^{(IE)}(t; s)$ is equal to

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1] | S_{t,J,J'} = s]}{\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0] | S_{t,J,J'} = s]},$$

where $W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} = \prod_{u=t+1}^{t+\Delta-1} \pi_u(A_{u,j}, A_{u,j'} | H_u) / p_u(A_{u,j}, A_{u,j'} | H_u)$. The moderators $S_{t,J}$ and $S_{t,J,J'}$ can contain information on the selected individuals as well as others in the same cluster. Proof of Lemma 1 can be found in the Appendix 8.1.

4. Estimation

Motivated by the identification result in Lemma 1, we consider estimation of direct and pairwise indirect effects using clustered MRT data.

4.1 Direct Effect Estimation

We make the following assumptions regarding the direct treatment effect specification:

ASSUMPTION 2: Suppose that the direct causal excursion effect $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}(t; s) = f_t(S_t)^\top \beta^*$ for some q -dimensional parameter β^* , and $f_t(S_t) \in \mathcal{R}^q$ is a feature vector depending only on S_t at decision point t .

This model allows for time-varying effects. The estimation method described below readily generalizes to situations where the parametric model has a known functional form that may be nonlinear; the use of a linear model here enhances presentation clarity. Under Assumption 2, a consistent estimator $\hat{\beta}$ can be obtained by solving the following estimating

equations:

$$\mathbb{P}_M \left[\frac{1}{G_m} \sum_{j=1}^{G_m} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,j} W_{t,\Delta,j} e^{-A_{t,j} f_t(S_{t,j})^\top \beta} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,j} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_{t,j} f_t(S_{t,j})^\top \beta} \right) \right. \\ \left. \times \begin{pmatrix} g_t(H_t) \\ (A_{t,j} - \tilde{p}_t(A_{t,j} = 1 | S_{t,j})) f_t(S_{t,j}) \end{pmatrix} \right] = 0, \quad (5)$$

where M is the total number of clusters, and G_m is the size of cluster m . \mathbb{P}_M is defined as the average of a function over the sample, which in this context is the sample of *clusters*. $\exp\{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha\}$ is a working model for $\mathbb{E}\{Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:t+\Delta-1,J}) | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0\}$. The weighting and centering, together with the factor $\exp\{-A_{t,j} f_t(S_{t,j})^\top \beta\}$, makes the resulting estimator for β consistent even when the working model $\exp\{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha\}$ is misspecified. This new estimation method is termed as “cluster-based estimator of the marginal excursion effect” (C-EMEE). In Appendix 8.2, we prove the following result:

LEMMA 2: *Under Assumption 2, then, given invertibility and moment conditions, the estimator $\hat{\beta}$ that solves (5) satisfies $\sqrt{M}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \rightarrow N(0, Q^{-1}WQ^{-1})$, and*

$$Q = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha^*} \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)(1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right],$$

$$W = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,\Delta,J} W_{t,J} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,\Delta,J}(A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_{t,J})) f_t(S_{t,J}) \times \right. \\ \left. \sum_{t=1}^T W_{t,\Delta,J'} W_{t,J'} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,\Delta,J'}(A_{t,J'} - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_{t,J'})) f_t(S_{t,J'})^\top \right],$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,\Delta,j} = e^{-A_{t,j} f_t(S_{t,j})^\top \beta^*} \times \left(Y_{t,\Delta,j} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha^* + A_{t,j} f_t(S_{t,j})^\top \beta^*} \right)$, and α^* solves Equation (5).

Both J and J' are randomly sampled indices from the same cluster.

In practice, plug-in estimates \hat{Q} and \hat{W} are used to estimate the covariance structure.

Appendix 8.4.2 presents small sample size adjustments that are used in the analysis.

4.2 Connection to the Standard MRT Analysis

In standard MRTs, the individual is the unit of interest. Here, the cluster is the unit of interest (Shi et al., 2021). It is clear from Lemma 2 that if the cluster-size is one then we recover the estimators and asymptotic theory for EMEE. In addition, we explore if there are other cases in which two methods yield equivalent inference results, thus allowing us to develop a general connection between them.

Lemma 3 below implies that if cluster-level variations in proximal outcomes are independent of treatment option, then both methods are equivalent. In contrast, if these types of cluster-level variation differ by treatment status, then C-EMEE and EMEE will no longer be equivalent. Proof of Lemma 3 can be found in Appendix 8.3.

LEMMA 3: *Consider the direct effect when the moderator is defined on the individual (i.e., $S_{t,j}$), and the randomization probabilities only depend on the individual's observed history, (i.e., $p(A_{t,j}|H_t) = p(A_{t,j}|H_{t,j})$). If the cluster size is constant across clusters (i.e., $G_m \equiv G$), then the point estimates from (2) and (5) are equal for any sample size. Moreover, if*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[W_{t,\Delta,j}\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,\Delta,j} \times W_{t',\Delta,j'}\tilde{\epsilon}_{t',\Delta,j'} \mid H_{t,j}, A_{t,j} = a, H_{t',j'}, A_{t',j'} = a'] \mid S_{t,j}, S_{t',j'}] = \psi(S_{t,j}, S_{t',j'}), \quad (6)$$

for some function ψ , i.e., the marginal residual correlation doesn't depend on a and a' , then the estimators share the same asymptotic variance.

To illustrate Lemma 3, consider $\Delta = 1$ and for participant j at decision time t , suppose the generative model for the proximal outcome is:

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{t,1,j}] = \mathbf{c}(S_{t,j}) \exp \left\{ g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + \underbrace{X_{t,j}^\top e_g}_{(I)} + A_{t,j} \left(f_t(H_t)^\top \beta + \underbrace{X_{t,j}^\top b_g}_{(II)} \right) \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{c}(S_{t,j})$ does not contain any treatment terms. (I) and (II) are random effects with design matrix $X_{t,j}$. Random effects in (I) allow for cluster-level variation in proximal out-

comes regardless of the treatment allocation, while random effects in (II) allow for cluster-level variation in the fully-conditional treatment effect. Given the above generative model, sufficient condition (6) holds if $b_g \equiv 0$, i.e., when the treatment effect does not exhibit cluster-level variation.

For this reason, we refer to (6) as a *treatment-effect heterogeneity condition* for binary outcomes. When clusters exhibit treatment-effect heterogeneity, the proposed approach is necessary for assessing direct effects rather than standard MRT analyses. In Section 5, we conduct simulations to support this statement.

4.3 Pairwise Indirect Causal Excursion Effect Estimation

We make the following assumptions regarding the pairwise indirect treatment effect specification:

ASSUMPTION 3: Assume the indirect treatment effect of interest $\beta_{\mathbf{p},\pi,\Delta}^{(IE)}(t; s) = f_t(S_t)^\top \beta^{**}$ for some q -dimensional parameter β^{**} , and $f_t(S_t) \in \mathcal{R}^q$ is a feature vector depending only on the state at decision point t , S_t .

We now consider the inference on the unknown q -dimensional parameter β^{**} . To do so, we define a new weight as $W_{t,j,j'} = \frac{\tilde{p}(A_{t,j}, A_{t,j'} | S_t)}{p_t(A_{t,j}, A_{t,j'} | H_t)}$, where $\tilde{p}_t(a, a' | S_t) \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary as long as it does not depend on terms in H_t other than S_t , and $p_t(A_{t,j}, A_{t,j'} | H_t)$ is the marginal probability that individuals j and j' receive treatments $A_{t,j}$ and $A_{t,j'}$ respectively given H_t . Here we consider an estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(IE)}$ of β^{**} which solves the following set of estimating equations:

$$\mathbb{P}_M \left[\frac{1}{G_m(G_m - 1)} \sum_{j \neq j'}^{G_m} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,j,j'} W_{t,\Delta,j,j'} e^{-(1-A_{t,j})A_{t,j'} f_t(S_{t,j,j'})^\top \beta} \times \right. \quad (7)$$

$$\left. \left(Y_{t,\Delta,j} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + (1-A_{t,j})A_{t,j'} f_t(S_{t,j,j'})^\top \beta} \right) \begin{pmatrix} g_t(H_t) \\ (1 - A_{t,j})(A_{t,j'} - \tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_{t,j,j'})) f_t(S_{t,j,j'}) \end{pmatrix} \right] = 0,$$

where $\tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_{t,j,j'}) = \frac{\tilde{p}_t(0,1|S_{t,j,j'})}{\tilde{p}_t(0,0|S_{t,j,j'}) + \tilde{p}_t(0,1|S_{t,j,j'})}$. If an individual's randomization probabilities only

depends on their own observed history, then $\tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_{t,j,j'}) = \tilde{p}_t(A_{t,j'} = 1|S_{t,j'})$, and the weight can be simplified to $W_{t,j,j'} = W_{t,j} \times W_{t,j'}$ and $W_{t,\Delta,j,j'} = W_{t,\Delta,j} \times W_{t,\Delta,j'}$. In Appendix 8.2, we proved the following result:

LEMMA 4: *Under assumption 3, invertibility and moment conditions, the estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(IE)}$ that solves (7) satisfies $\sqrt{M} \left(\hat{\beta}^{(IE)} - \beta^{**} \right) \rightarrow N(0, Q^{-1}WQ^{-1})$, where*

$$Q = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha^{**}} \left(\tilde{p}_t(0, 1|S_t) + \tilde{p}_t(0, 0|S_t) \right) \tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right],$$

$$W = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,J,J'} W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J,J'} (1 - A_{t,J}) (A_{t,J'} - \tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_{t,J,J'})) f_t(S_{t,J,J'}) \right. \\ \left. \times \sum_{t=1}^T W_{t,\tilde{J},\tilde{J}'} \times W_{t,\Delta,\tilde{J},\tilde{J}'} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,\tilde{J},\tilde{J}'} (1 - A_{t,\tilde{J}}) (A_{t,\tilde{J}'} - \tilde{p}_t^*(1|S_{t,\tilde{J},\tilde{J}'})) f_t(S_{t,\tilde{J},\tilde{J}'})^\top \right].$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,j,j'} = e^{-A_{t,j} f_t(S_{t,j,j'})^\top \beta^{**}} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,j} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha^{**} + (1-A_{t,j}) A_{t,j'} f_t(S_{t,j,j'})^\top \beta^{**}} \right)$, and α^{**} solves Equation (7). Both (J, J') and (\tilde{J}, \tilde{J}') are independently, randomly sampled pairs from the same cluster.

5. Simulations

The simulation design is a generalization of the simulation experiments in Qian et al. (2020). Our simulation study demonstrates the performance of the proposed methods by generating data with predetermined cluster structures. The purpose of this study is to demonstrate that when within-cluster interference and cluster-level treatment effect heterogeneity (discussed in Section 4.2) exist, the proposed C-EMEE method produces a consistent estimator with nominal coverage probability, whereas the EMEE may not.

5.1 Simulation setup

To evaluate the performance of the proposed inferential procedure, we use the following generative model. The states $Z_{t,j}$ are generated using a first-order Markov chain within each subject. The treatment randomization probability is constant with $p(A_t = 1|H_t) = 0.2$.

We focus on lag-1 proximal response ($\Delta = 1$), and the outcome $Y_{t,1,j}$ is generated from a Bernoulli distribution with

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j}) = \{0.1\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{A_{t,j}(0.1+0.3Z_{t,j})}. \quad (8)$$

Here, $Z_{t,j}$ moderates the conditional treatment effect and the true conditional treatment effect is: $\beta_{\mathbf{p},1}(t; H_t) = 0.1 + 0.3Z_{t,j}$. Additional details about the simulation setup can be found in Appendix 8.4.1.

5.2 Simulation Scenarios

In the following, we consider four simulation scenarios that extend the generative model described above. All four scenarios concern the estimation of the marginal proximal treatment effect β_0^* . In each case, we report the bias, standard errors (SE), root mean squared error (RMSE) of $\hat{\beta}_0$, and 95% confidence interval coverage probabilities (CP) across 1000 replicates. We adopt the small sample correction technique in Mancl and DeRouen (2001) to modify the variance estimator. Also, as in Liao et al. (2016), we use critical values from a t distribution. In particular, for a known p -dimensional vector c , to test the null hypothesis $c^\top \beta = 0$ or to form two-sided confidence intervals, we use the critical value $t_{n-p-q}^{-1}(1 - \xi/2)$ where p, q are the dimensions of α, β ; respectively, and ξ is the significance level. We vary the number of clusters and cluster size and compare the proposed cluster-based method C-EMEE to EMEE. As we are using clusters of equal size, we expect both methods to produce the same point estimation. Two methods will give different estimations if cluster sizes are different.

Simulation Scenario I. The generative model is as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j}) = \{0.1\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{A_{t,j}(0.1+0.3Z_{t,j})+e'_g}. \quad (9)$$

In particular, the present scenario concerns the estimation of β_0^* when an important individual-level moderator exists, and the proximal outcomes for subjects in the same cluster share a random cluster-level intercept term that does not interact with treatment. To prevent this intercept from shifting the expected outcome, we modified it by two steps: First, we draw

e_g from a truncated normal distribution with $\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 0.5, a = -1, b = 1$. Second, we shift e_g to e'_g to ensure that $\mathbb{E}[e^{e'_g}] = \mathbb{E}[e^\mu] = 1$, in which case, $e'_g = e_g - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} - \log \frac{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma} - \sigma) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma} - \sigma)}{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma})}$.

The resulting marginal excursion effect is:

$$\beta_0^* = \log \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 1)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0)\}} = 0.477. \quad (10)$$

Table 1 shows that both EMEE and the proposed C-EMEE approach achieve nearly unbiasedness and proper coverage. This is in line with our theoretical results in Section 4.2 stating asymptotic equivalence of the two procedures under no cluster-level treatment heterogeneity. This demonstrates that the performance of the EMEE approach is not impacted by cluster-level correlation that does not interact with treatment.

Simulation Scenario II. In the second scenario, we extend the above generative model to include a random cluster-level intercept term that interacts with treatment. Similar to e_g and e'_g , b_g follows a truncated normal distribution with $\mu = 0, \sigma = 0.5, a = -1, b = 1$, and $b'_g = b_g - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} - \log \frac{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma} - \sigma) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma} - \sigma)}{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma})}$ is a random-intercept term within the treatment effect for cluster g . The generative model then takes the form of:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j}) = \{0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{A_{t,j}(0.1+0.3Z_{t,j}+b'_g)}. \quad (11)$$

The fully marginal excursion effect is equal to (10). In Table 1 we observe that if cluster-level random effects interact with treatment (i.e. $b'_g \neq 0$), then both methods produce nearly unbiased estimates of β_0 but only the proposed method achieves the nominal 95% coverage probability. To further demonstrate this, Figure 2 presents nominal coverage as a function of the standard deviation of the random effect b'_g and cluster size respectively. This shows that the coverage probability of the EMEE method decays rapidly while the proposed method achieves the nominal 95% coverage probability for all choices of the standard deviation of b'_g and cluster sizes. Note that even when cluster size is 5 (i.e., small clusters), the nominal coverage drops below 85%.

[Figure 2 about here.]

Simulation Scenario III. In the third scenario, we assume the treatment effect for an individual depends on the average state of all individuals in the cluster. We simulate data under a ground truth with cluster-level moderator $\bar{Z}_{t,g} = \frac{1}{G_g} \sum_{j=1}^{G_g} Z_{t,j}$ for cluster g :

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j}) = \{0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{A_{t,j}(0.1+0.3\bar{Z}_{t,g}+b'_g)}. \quad (12)$$

The true marginal excursion effect here is:

$$\beta_0^* = \log \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 1)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0)\}} = 0.4. \quad (13)$$

The proposed estimator again achieves the nominal 95% coverage probability while the EMEE method does not (see Scenario III, Table 1).

[Table 1 about here.]

Simulation Scenario IV. The fourth scenario considers the pairwise indirect excursion effect. For individual j at decision point t , we constructed the total effect as $TE_{t,j} = \sum_{j \neq j'} A_{t,j'} \beta_{20}$, where $\beta_{20} = -0.1$. The generative model is given by:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j}) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \{0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{A_{t,j}(0.1+0.3\bar{Z}_{t,g}+b'_g)+TE_{t,j}}. \quad (14)$$

In order to prevent the newly-added total effect term from inflating the expected outcome and keep it on the same scale with previous three scenarios, we divided a regularization constant $\gamma = [pe^{\beta_{20}} + (1-p)]^{m-2}$ in front of the generative model (see Appendix 8.4.3 for proof). This model implies a fully marginal indirect effect equal to:

$$\beta_0^{**} = \log \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0, A_{t,j'} = 1)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0, A_{t,j'} = 1)\}} = -0.1. \quad (15)$$

Table 2 presents the results. We see that the proposed indirect estimator exhibited nearly no bias and achieved the nominal coverage probability.

[Table 2 about here.]

In addition, similar conclusion holds when $\Delta > 1$, and the simulation results can be found in Appendix 8.5.

6. Case Study

In Section 1.1, we introduced the Intern Health Study (NeCamp et al., 2020), which is a 6-month MRT exploring when to offer mHealth interventions to individuals in stressful environments to improve their mental health. According to Figure 1, sending a notification can on average have a negative impact on survey completion the following day at most specialties. Our aim in this section is to reevaluate this causal effect in light of the results for all participants. We will perform inference on the lag-1 ($\Delta = 1$) marginal and moderated causal excursion effects, and the data set used in the analyses contains 1562 participants.

In this paper, all analyses are conducted using daily data. Recall that an individual was randomized to receive a mobile notification with probability 0.375 every day. Because of the form of the intervention, all participants were assumed available for this intervention throughout the study; i.e., $I_t = 1$. The binary proximal outcome $Y_{t,1}$, mood survey completion, is coded as 1 if a participant self-reported his or her mood score on that day, and 0 otherwise. The average daily mood survey completion rate is 0.344 when a notification is delivered and 0.367 when there is no notification. In the following analysis, clusters are constructed based on a subject’s membership of medical specialty, because with similar working content and schedules, interns are more likely to adjust to notifications similarly. The effect of targeted notification treatment on interns’ engagement with the mobile intervention study is assessed using our proposed method, C-EMEE, and compared with EMEE.

6.1 Direct treatment effect analysis

In this section, we assess the marginal excursion effect as well as the effect moderation by time-varying observations. For an individual j , the day-in-study is coded as a subscript t . For all the analyses in this section, we always include the prior week’s completion rate ($R_{t,j}$) and day-in-study (t_j) in the control variable $g_t(H_t)$, as they are prognostic of $Y_{t,1,j}$ in a

preliminary generalized estimating equation. Therefore, the working model is specified as $g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t_j + \alpha_2 R_{t,j}$.

First, we estimate the marginal treatment effect β_0 of the targeted notifications on completing self-reported mood score survey with the analysis model:

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 1) \}}{\mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0) \}} = \beta_0.$$

Results of the fully marginal analysis are presented in Table 3 and compares our proposed approach against the EMEE approach from Qian et al. (2020). The results show that the SE increases with increasing cluster size. Across all clustering levels explored in our study, the marginal excursion effect differs significantly from zero. This suggests that sending a notification reduces the likelihood of responding to a mood survey the next day.

Two analyses are conducted by incorporating an individual-level effect moderator $S_{t,j}$ with the model:

$$\log \frac{\mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 1) | S_t \}}{\mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0) | S_t \}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 S_{t,j},$$

where in the first model, $S_{t,j} = R_{t,j}$ represents a subject's completion rate during the past week, whereas in the second model, $S_{t,j} = t_j$ represents a subject's day-in-study. Estimated treatment effects moderation by prior week's completion rate or day-in-study are shown in Figure 3 below. The shaded area represents the 95% confidence band of the moderation effects at varying values of the moderator. In the first 50 days of the study, sending notifications had no significant impact on the daily survey completion. However, in the latter half of the study, sending a notification was significantly less likely to elicit engagement.

In light of this, it might not be ideal to overburden participants for an extended period if the notifications don't serve any therapeutic purpose. In addition, notifying highly engaged or less engaged participants will not affect their willingness to complete the mood survey. In contrast, mobile prompts negatively affect the completion status of participants with a prior

week’s completion rate roughly between 0.2 and 0.6. Additional analysis has been done on evaluating lag treatment effects (i.e., $\Delta > 1$), see more details in Appendix 8.6.

[Figure 3 about here.]

6.2 Pairwise indirect treatment effect analysis

Finally, we consider pairwise indirect effect analyses. In this analysis, clusters are constructed based on each subjects’ joint membership of medical specialty and institution. This was done as interference was only likely when interns are in close geographic proximity. Here, we consider the marginal indirect effect (i.e., no moderators) when the individual did not receive the intervention at decision time t . Table 3 presents the results. We see limited evidence of an indirect effect.

[Table 3 about here.]

Our analysis suggests a significantly lower response rate to mood surveys when a mobile intervention is delivered compared to when it is not delivered. We conclude that researchers should not only consider the therapeutic effect of mobile interventions but also the impact on engagement when designing mobile intervention components in future mHealth studies.

7. Discussion

This paper considered the statistical problem of assessing whether time-varying interventions have a causal effect on a proximal and/or lagged binary response. We defined novel direct and pairwise indirect causal excursion effects on the longitudinal binary outcome by accounting for potential within-cluster interference and between cluster treatment heterogeneity. Theoretical results, including consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators, are presented.

The methods we propose have several practical advantages over EMEE. First, our proposed approach provides more valid interval estimates, hence addresses the undercoverage

issues associated with existing inferential methods, ensuring a reasonable inference for the intervention effectiveness. Second, the proposed estimands and estimation methods enable domain scientists to answer a wider variety of scientific questions. For example, it is now possible to select moderators at the cluster level, which provides deeper insight into how community aggregated characteristics affect an individual's binary outcome of interest. It also enables the estimation of peer effects, which may be of scientific interest in, for example, epidemiology and sociology research. Finally, the proposed method is easy-to-implement, with all estimation procedures we discussed above easily implemented in R using existing statistics packages.

While this work represents a major step forward in the analysis of data from micro-randomized trials, a few directions for future research are worth considering. First we have assumed a binary treatment in this work; extension to treatment with multiple levels can refine causal understanding of categorical treatments. Second, since there are numerous moderators that can be potentially included in $f_t(S_t)$ to improve estimation efficiency of the treatment effect, regularization methods for model selection in building the causal effect model $f_t(S_t)^\top \beta$ with high-dimensional $f_t(S_t)$ can be useful. Lastly, it is worthwhile to extend the current framework beyond clustered structures such as overlapping communities or a general network among the subjects (Ogburn and VanderWeele, 2014; Papadogeorgou et al., 2019). We leave these topics for future work.

REFERENCES

- Bidargaddi, N., Almirall, D., Murphy, S., Nahum-Shani, I., Kovalcik, M., Pituch, T., Maaieh, H., and Strecher, V. (2018). To prompt or not to prompt? a microrandomized trial of time-varying push notifications to increase proximal engagement with a mobile health app. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* **6**, e10123.
- Boruvka, A., Almirall, D., Witkiewitz, K., and Murphy, S. A. (2018). Assessing time-varying

- causal effect moderation in mobile health. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**, 1112–1121.
- Dempsey, W., Liao, P., Kumar, S., and Murphy, S. A. (2020). The stratified micro-randomized trial design: sample size considerations for testing nested causal effects of time-varying treatments. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **14**, 661.
- Free, C., Phillips, G., Galli, L., Watson, L., Felix, L., Edwards, P., Patel, V., and Haines, A. (2013). The effectiveness of mobile-health technology-based health behaviour change or disease management interventions for health care consumers: a systematic review. *PLoS Medicine* **10**, e1001362.
- Hong, G. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2006). Evaluating kindergarten retention policy: A case study of causal inference for multilevel observational data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101**, 901–910.
- Klasnja, P., Hekler, E. B., Shiffman, S., Boruvka, A., Almirall, D., Tewari, A., and Murphy, S. A. (2015). Microrandomized trials: An experimental design for developing just-in-time adaptive interventions. *Health Psychology* **34**, 1220.
- Liao, P., Klasnja, P., Tewari, A., and Murphy, S. A. (2016). Sample size calculations for micro-randomized trials in mhealth. *Statistics in Medicine* **35**, 1944–1971.
- Liu, Y., Bacon, P.-L., and Brunskill, E. (2020). Understanding the curse of horizon in off-policy evaluation via conditional importance sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6184–6193.
- Mancl, L. A. and DeRouen, T. A. (2001). A covariance estimator for gee with improved small-sample properties. *Biometrics* **57**, 126–134.
- Nahum-Shani, I., Smith, S. N., Spring, B. J., Collins, L. M., Witkiewitz, K., Tewari, A., and Murphy, S. A. (2018). Just-in-time adaptive interventions (jitais) in mobile health: key components and design principles for ongoing health behavior support. *Annals of*

Behavioral Medicine **52**, 446–462.

NeCamp, T., Sen, S., Frank, E., Walton, M. A., Ionides, E. L., Fang, Y., Tewari, A., and Wu, Z. (2020). Assessing real-time moderation for developing adaptive mobile health interventions for medical interns: Micro-randomized trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **22**, e15033.

Ogburn, E. L. and VanderWeele, T. J. (2014). Causal diagrams for interference. *Statistical Science* **29**, 559–578.

Papadogeorgou, G., Mealli, F., and Zigler, C. M. (2019). Causal inference with interfering units for cluster and population level treatment allocation programs. *Biometrics* **75**, 778–787.

Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality*. Cambridge university press.

Qian, T., Yoo, H., Klasnja, P., Almirall, D., and Murphy, S. A. (2020). Estimating time-varying causal excursion effect in mobile health with binary outcomes.

Rabbi, M., Kotov, M. P., Cunningham, R., Bonar, E. E., Nahum-Shani, I., Klasnja, P., Walton, M., and Murphy, S. (2018). Toward increasing engagement in substance use data collection: development of the substance abuse research assistant app and protocol for a microrandomized trial using adolescents and emerging adults. *JMIR Research Protocols* **7**, e166.

Ridpath, J. (2017). How can we use technology to support patients after bariatric surgery?

Robins, J. (1986). A new approach to causal inference in mortality studies with a sustained exposure period—application to control of the healthy worker survivor effect. *Mathematical modelling* **7**, 1393–1512.

Rubin, D. (1978). Bayesian inference for causal effects: The role of randomization. *The Annals of Statistics* **6**, 34–58.

Shi, J., Wu, Z., and Dempsey, W. (2021). Assessing time-varying causal effect moder-

ation in the presence of cluster-level treatment effect heterogeneity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.01681* .

Tchetgen, E. J. T. and VanderWeele, T. J. (2012). On causal inference in the presence of interference. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **21**, 55–75.

Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press.

Vanderweele, T. J., Hong, G., Jones, S. M., and Brown, J. L. (2013). Mediation and spillover effects in group-randomized trials: a case study of the 4rs educational intervention. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**, 469–482.

8. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Supplementary material includes proof of the identification result (Appendix 8.1), proof of Lemma 2 and Lemma 4 (Appendix 8.2), and proof of Lemma 3 (Appendix 8.3). We provide additional simulation study results in Appendix 8.4 and 8.5. An analysis on lagged outcomes in the case study is given in Appendix 8.6.

8.1 *Technical Details*

Proof. [Proof of the identifiability result] It suffices to show that under Assumption 1, the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, a, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}) \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}), I_{t,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}) = 1 \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = a, I_{t,J} = 1 \} \mid S_t, I_{t,J} = 1 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We have the following sequence of equality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, a, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}) \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}), I_{t,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}) = 1 \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, a, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}) \mid H_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}), I_{t,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}) = 1 \right\} \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}), I_{t,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}) = 1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, a, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}) \mid H_t \right\} \mid S_t, I_{t,J} = 1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, a, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}) \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = a \right\} \mid S_t, I_{t,J} = 1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = a, I_{t,J} = 1 \} \mid S_t, I_{t,J} = 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

8.2 *Proof of Lemma 2 and Lemma 4*

We next provide a detailed proof of asymptotic normality and consistency for the C-EMEE estimator. To establish Lemma 2, we assume the following regularity conditions.

ASSUMPTION 4: Suppose $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta$, where Θ is a compact subset of a Euclidean space. Suppose Equation (5) has unique solution $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) \in \Theta$, which are consistent estimators for the solutions (α', β') that solves $E\{m_M(\alpha, \beta)\} = 0$.

Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and $(\alpha', \beta') \in \Theta$ satisfies that $E\{m_M(\alpha', \beta')\} = 0$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[I_{t,J} e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \right] = 0 \quad (17)$$

Proof. [Proof of Consistency for direct and indirect effects] For simplicity of the proof and without the loss of generality, we assume that $I_{t,J} = 1$. By the law of iterated expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \mid H_t \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) \mid H_t \right] f_t(S_t) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,\Delta,J} (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 1 \right] \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) f_t(S_t) \right) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha'} \right) W_{t,\Delta,J} \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0 \right] (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0) \right\} W_{t,\Delta,J} \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0) \right] W_{t,\Delta,J} \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) \end{aligned}$$

This indicates that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 1) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0) \right]$$

which is equivalent to:

$$\mathbb{E}[f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'] = \log \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 1)}{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0)} = \beta(t, H_t)$$

Under Assumption 2, we have that $\beta' = \beta^*$. In addition, Assumption 4 implies that $\hat{\beta}$ converges in probability to β^* , and this completes the proof.

We can also establish the consistency of $\hat{\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} g_t(H_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} g_t(H_t) \mid H_t \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + A_{t,J} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, \right] g_t(H_t) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) g_t(H_t) W_{t,\Delta,J} \left(e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 1) - e^{g_t(H_t)\alpha'} \right) \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) g_t(H_t) W_{t,\Delta,J} \left(e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0) - e^{g_t(H_t)\alpha'} \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[g_t(H_t) W_{t,\Delta,J} \left(\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0) - e^{g_t(H_t)\alpha'} \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

This indicates that:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0) = e^{g_t(H_t)\alpha'}$$

Since $\exp\{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha\}$ is a working model for $\mathbb{E}\{Y_{t,\Delta,J}(\bar{A}_{t-1,J}, 0, \tilde{A}_{t+1:(t+\Delta-1),J}) | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0\}$, therefore $\alpha' = \alpha^*$. Then $\hat{\alpha}$ is a consistent estimator of α^* .

We next consider the indirect effect estimator. Similarly, we have the assumption:

ASSUMPTION 5: Suppose $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta$, where Θ is a compact subset of a Euclidean space.

Suppose Equation 7 has unique solution $(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) \in \Theta$, which are consistent estimators for the solutions (α', β') that solves $E\{m_M(\alpha, \beta)\} = 0$.

Suppose Assumption 1 hold, and $(\alpha', \beta') \in \Theta$ satisfies that $E\{m_M(\alpha', \beta')\} = 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[I_{t,J} I_{t,J'} W_{t,J,J'} W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} e^{-(1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + (1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right) (1 - A_{t,J})(A_{t,J'} - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t) \right] = 0 \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity of the proof and without the loss of generality, we assume $I_{t,J} = 1$ and $I_{t,J'} = 1$.

Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathbb{E} \left[W_{t,J,J'} W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} e^{-(1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right. \\
&\quad \left. (Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + (1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'}) (1 - A_{t,J})(A_{t,J'} - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[W_{t,J,J'} W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} e^{-(1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. (Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + (1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'} f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'}) (1 - A_{t,J})(A_{t,J'} - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) | H_t \right] f_t(S_t) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} (Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha' + f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'}) (1 - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \tilde{p}_t(A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1 | S_t) f_t(S_t) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha'} \right) \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t) \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0 \right] \right. \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \tilde{p}_t(A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0 \mid S_t) f_t(S_t) \right) \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E} [Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1] - \mathbb{E} [Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0] \right] W_{t,\Delta,J,J'} \\
& \quad \left(\tilde{p}_t(A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0 \mid S_t) + \tilde{p}_t(A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1 \mid S_t) \right) \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t)
\end{aligned}$$

This indicates that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'} \mathbb{E} [Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1] \right] = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0]]$$

which is equivalent to:

$$\mathbb{E}[f_t(S_t)^\top \beta'] = \log \frac{\mathbb{E} [Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1]}{\mathbb{E} [Y_{t,\Delta,J} \mid H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0]} = \beta^{(IE)}(t, H_t)$$

Under Assumption 3, we have that $\beta' = \beta^{**}$. In addition, Assumption 5 implies that $\hat{\beta}$ converges in probability to β^{**} , and this completes the proof.

Proof. [Proof of Asymptotic Normality] For the log-linear model, there is not a closed form solution; However, by Theorem 5.9 and Problem 5.27 of Van der Vaart (2000). Because $m_M(\alpha, \beta)$ is continuously differentiable and hence Lipschitz continuous, Theorem 5.21 of Van der Vaart (2000) implies that $\sqrt{M}\{(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) - (\alpha^*, \beta^*)\}$ is asymptotically normal with mean zero and covariance matrix:

$$\mathbb{E} [\dot{m}_M(\alpha^*, \beta^*)]^{-1} \mathbb{E} [m_M(\alpha^*, \beta^*) m_M(\alpha^*, \beta^*)^\top] \mathbb{E} [\dot{m}_M(\alpha^*, \beta^*)]^{-1^\top}$$

The term Q depends on the derivative of the score function with respect to θ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}_t}{\partial \alpha} &= -e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha} g_t(H_t) \\
\frac{\partial \tilde{\epsilon}_t}{\partial \beta} &= -e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \times \left(Y_{t,\Delta} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \right) A_t f_t(S_t) \\
&\quad - e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \times \left(e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \right) A_t f_t(S_t) \\
&= e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} Y_{t,\Delta} A_t f_t(S_t)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to centering the matrix is block diagonal and so the covariance outer-term for β is given

by:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{m}_M(\beta) &= \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} W_t W_{t,\Delta} A_t (A_t - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) \left(Y_{t,\Delta} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \right) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top + \\ &\quad e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} W_t W_{t,\Delta} A_t (A_t - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{-A_t f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} W_t W_{t,\Delta} A_t (A_t - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) Y_{t,\Delta} f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta^*} \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta} | H_t, A_t = 1) = \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta} | H_t, A_t = 0)$, thus, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} E[Y_{t,\Delta} | H_t, A_t = 1] \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} E[Y_{t,\Delta} | H_t, A_t = 0] \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha^*} \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t(1|S_t)) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$W = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,\Delta,J} W_{t,J} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J} h_{t,J}(H_t) \times \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,\Delta,J'} W_{t,J'} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J'} h_{t,J'}(H_t)^\top \right]$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J} = e^{-A_{t,J} f_t(S_{t,J})^\top \beta} \times \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_{t,J} f_t(S_{t,J})^\top \beta} \right)$, and $h_{t,J}(H_t) = (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_{t,J})) f_t(S_{t,J})$.

Similar for the indirect effect. Let $\tilde{p}_t(0, 1 | S_t)$ and $\tilde{p}_t(0, 0 | S_t)$ be the shorthand notations for $\tilde{p}_t(A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1 | S_t)$ and $\tilde{p}_t(A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0 | S_t)$, respectively, then the covariance outer-term for $\hat{\beta}^{(IE)}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} (\tilde{p}_t(0, 1 | S_t) + \tilde{p}_t(0, 0 | S_t)) \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) e^{-f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E}[Y_{t,\Delta,J} | A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1, H_t] f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} (\tilde{p}_t(0, 1 | S_t) + \tilde{p}_t(0, 0 | S_t)) \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E}[Y_{t,\Delta,J} | A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0, H_t] f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha^*} (\tilde{p}_t(0, 1 | S_t) + \tilde{p}_t(0, 0 | S_t)) \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t) (1 - \tilde{p}_t^*(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \end{aligned}$$

and replace $\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J,J'}$ with $e^{-A_{t,J}f_t(S_{t,J,J'})^\top \beta} \left(Y_{t,\Delta,J} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + (1-A_{t,J})A_{t,J'}f_t(S_{t,J,J'})^\top \beta} \right)$, W can be calculated as in the linear case in Shi et al. (2021). This completes the proof.

8.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. Consider the W -matrix for the direct effect asymptotic variance:

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,j} W_{t,\Delta,j} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,j} h_{t,j}(H_t) \times \frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,j} W_{t,\Delta,j} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,j} h_{t,j}(H_t)^\top \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{G^2} \sum_{j,j'} \sum_{t,t'} \mathbb{E} \left[W_{t,j} W_{t,\Delta,j} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,j} (A_{t,j} - \tilde{p}(1|S_t)) W_{t',j'} W_{t',\Delta,j'} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t',j'} (A_{t',j'} - \tilde{p}(1|S_{t'})) f_t(S_t) f_{t'}(S_{t'})^\top \right] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,j} = e^{-A_{t,j}f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \times \left(Y_{t,\Delta,j} - e^{g_t(H_t)^\top \alpha + A_{t,j}f_t(S_t)^\top \beta} \right)$.

Consider the cross-terms with $j \neq j'$ and without loss of generality assume $t \geq t'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a,a'} \tilde{p}_t(a | S_t) (a - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) W_{t,\Delta,j} \tilde{p}_{t'}(a' | S_{t'}) (a' - \tilde{p}_{t'}(1 | S_{t'})) W_{t',\Delta,j'} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\epsilon}_{t,j} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t',j'} | H_{t,j}, A_{t,j} = a, H_{t',j'}, A_{t',j'} = a' \right] | S_t, S_{t'} \right] f_t(S_t) f_{t'}(S_{t'})^\top \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption of the error cross-term being constant in a and a' we can re-write the above as:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a,a'} \tilde{p}_t(a | S_t) (a - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) W_{t,\Delta,j} \tilde{p}_{t'}(a' | S_{t'}) (a' - \tilde{p}_{t'}(1 | S_{t'})) \psi(S_t, S_{t'}) f_t(S_t) f_{t'}(S_{t'})^\top W_{t',\Delta,j'} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(S_t, S_{t'}) W_{t,\Delta,j} W_{t',\Delta,j'} f_t(S_t) f_{t'}(S_{t'})^\top \underbrace{\left(\sum_{a,a'} \tilde{p}_t(a | S_t) (a - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) \tilde{p}_{t'}(a' | S_{t'}) (a' - \tilde{p}_{t'}(1 | S_{t'})) \right)}_{=0} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(S_t, S_{t'}) W_{t,\Delta,j} W_{t',\Delta,j'} f_t(S_t) f_{t'}(S_{t'})^\top \cdot 0 \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that the W -matrix simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t) \times \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{j=1}^G \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta,J} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t) \times \right. \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_{t,J} W_{t,\Delta} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t,J} (A_{t,J} - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t)^\top \right] \\
= & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_t W_{t,\Delta} \tilde{\epsilon}_t (A_t - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t) \times \sum_{t=1}^{T-\Delta+1} W_t W_{t,\Delta} \tilde{\epsilon}_t (A_t - \tilde{p}_t(1 | S_t)) f_t(S_t)^\top \right]
\end{aligned}$$

which is the W matrix as in the standard MRT analysis.

8.4 More details on simulations

8.4.1 Generative model for $Z_{t,j}$.

The states $Z_{t,j}$ are generated using a first-order Markov chain for each subject, with state space $\{0, 1, 2\}$ and transition matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix}
0.5 & 0.25 & 0.25 \\
0.25 & 0.5 & 0.25 \\
0.25 & 0.25 & 0.5
\end{pmatrix}.$$

This Markov chain can reach a stationary distribution, which is a uniform distribution on the state space. The true conditional treatment effect based on the generative model is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{\mathbf{p},1}(t; H_t) &= \log \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 1)}{\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,1,j} | H_t, A_{t,j} = 0)} \\
&= \frac{\{0.1\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{(0.1+0.3Z_{t,j})}}{\{0.1\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\}} \\
&= 0.1 + 0.3Z_{t,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

8.4.2 Small sample size adjustment for covariance estimation.

The robust sandwich covariance estimator Mancl and DeRouen (2001) for the entire variance matrix is given by $Q^{-1}\Lambda Q^{-1}$, and the first term, Q can be estimated by:

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{G_m} \sum_{j=1}^{G_m} D_{j,m}^\top W_{j,m} D_{j,m}$$

where $D_{j,m}$ is the model matrix for individual j in group g associated with equation (5), and $W_{j,m}$ is a diagonal matrix of individual weights. The middle term Λ 's estimation is given by
$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \left(\frac{1}{G_m} \sum_{i=1}^{G_m} D'_{i,m} W_{i,m} (I_{i,m} - H_{i,m})^{-1} e_{i,m} \right) \times \left(\frac{1}{G_m} \sum_{j=1}^{G_m} e'_{j,m} (I_{j,m} - H_{j,m})^{-1} W_{j,m} D_{j,m} \right)$$
 where I_i is an identity matrix of correct dimension, e_i is the individual-specific residual vector and

$$H_{j,m} = D_{j,m} \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{G_m} \sum_{j=1}^{G_m} D'_{j,m} W_{j,m} D_{j,m} \right)^{-1} D'_{j,m} W_{j,m}$$

From $Q^{-1}\Lambda Q^{-1}$ we extract $\hat{\Sigma}_\beta$.

In the simulation study, we have all equal-size clusters, so the G_m term could be extracted out of the summation. Hence, we have:

$$\left(\sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{G_m} \sum_{j=1}^{G_m} D'_{j,m} W_{j,m} D_{j,m} \right)^{-1} = G_m \left(\sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{G_m} D_{j,m}^\top W_{j,m} D_{j,m} \right)^{-1}$$

8.4.3 Indirect Effect.

The total effect is defined as: $TE_{t,j} = \sum_{j \neq j'} A_{t,j'} \beta_{20}$, and the generative model looks like:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,\Delta,j} | H_t, A_{t,j}) = \{0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{A_{t,j}(0.1+0.3\bar{Z}_{t,g}+b_g)+TE_{t,j}} \quad (20)$$

The expectation of the conditional expectation takes the form that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1] | S_t] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{c}(z) \exp\{\beta_{20} + \sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20}\} \right] \quad (21)$$

$$= \mathbf{c}(z) e^{\beta_{20}} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp\left\{ \sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20} \right\} \right] \quad (22)$$

Where the term $\mathbb{E} \left[\exp\left\{ \sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20} \right\} \right]$ can be calculated as the MGF of a binomial random variable with $n = k - 2, p$, and $t = \beta_{20}$. Therefore, this term equals to:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp\left\{ \sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20} \right\} \right] = [pe^{\beta_{20}} + (1-p)]^{m-2}$$

Therefore, as for the generative model, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1] | S_t] = \{0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} e^{\beta_{20}} [pe^{\beta_{20}} + (1-p)]^{m-2}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0] | S_t] = \{0.1\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t,j}=2}\} [pe^{\beta_{20}} + (1-p)]^{m-2}$$

And the indirect treatment effect is:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 1] | S_t]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1,J} | H_t, A_{t,J} = 0, A_{t,J'} = 0] | S_t]} &= \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\beta_{20} + \sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20}\} | S_t]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20}\} | S_t]} \\ &= \log \frac{e^{\beta_{20}} \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20}\} | S_t]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\sum_{i \neq J, J'} A_{t,i} \beta_{20}\} | S_t]} \\ &= \beta_{20} \end{aligned}$$

8.5 Simulation for Lag Treatment Effect Estimation

8.5.1 Simulation setup.

To evaluate the proposed estimator with $\Delta > 1$, we extend the simulation setup in Section 5 with $\Delta = 2$. Assuming the lag-2 treatment effect is smaller than lag-1 effect, we set $\beta_{\Delta 0} = 0.05$ and $\beta_{\Delta 1} = 0.065$. Notice that the values we chose for all parameters are only intended to evaluate our proposed method, not supported by any scientific studies. Thus, the proximal response is:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,2,j} | H_{t+1}, A_{t+1,j}) = (0.1\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_t(0.05+0.065Z_t)+A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \quad (23)$$

Here we identify two prespecified future (after time t) "reference" treatment regimes that define the distribution for $A_{t+1}, \dots, A_{t+\Delta-1}$. The first one assigns treatment with probabilities between zero and one and corresponds to the distribution of treatments in the data we have at hand, and the second one chooses the reference regime $A_u = 1$ for $u > t$, with probability one. In this case, the lag Δ treatment effect represents the impact of a sequential treatments on the proximal response Δ time units later. Here we only present lag-2 direct causal excursion

effect, the corresponding pairwise indirect effect can be constructed and estimated in the similar way.

Simulation Scenario I. The first scenario concerns the estimation of β_{Δ}^* when an important individual-level moderator exists and proximal outcomes share a random cluster-level intercept term that does not interact with treatment. We then incorporate a cluster-level random-intercept e_g which follows a truncated normal distribution with $\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 0.5, a = -0.8, b = 0.8$. However, in the data generative model, instead of directly plugging in e_g , we define e'_g to ensure that $\mathbb{E}[e^{e'_g}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\mu}] = 1$, in which case, $e'_g = e_g - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} - \log \frac{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma} - \sigma) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma} - \sigma)}{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma})}$. So that

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,2,j} | H_{t+1}, A_{t+1,j}) = (0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_t(0.05+0.065Z_t)+A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})+e'_g} \quad (24)$$

Table 4 presents the results, which shows the proposed C-EMEE approach achieves nearly unbiasedness and proper coverage under both future treatment specifications. This demonstrates that our proposed approach is applicable and stable in terms of lag treatment effect estimation with $\Delta > 1$

Simulation Scenario II. In the second scenario, we extend the above generative model to include a random cluster-level intercept term that interacts with treatment at time t . Similar to e_g and e'_g , b_g follows a truncated normal distribution with $\mu = 0, \sigma = 0.5, a = -0.8, b = 0.8$, and $b'_g = b_g - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} - \log \frac{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma} - \sigma) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma} - \sigma)}{\Phi(\frac{b}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{a}{\sigma})}$ is a random-intercept term within the treatment effect per cluster. The model takes the form of:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,2,j} | H_{t+1}, A_{t+1,j}) = (0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_t(0.05+0.065Z_t+b'_g)+A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \quad (25)$$

Table 4 presents the results. With the presence of cluster-level random effects interact with treatment (i.e. $b'_g \neq 0$), the proposed method produces nearly unbiased estimates and achieves the nominal 95% coverage probability under both future treatment specifications.

Simulation Scenario III. In the third scenario, we assume the lag treatment effect for an individual depends on the average state of all individuals in the cluster. Therefore, we define the cluster-level moderator $\bar{Z}_{t,g} = \frac{1}{G_g} \sum_{j=1}^{G_g} Z_{t,j}$ and consider the generative model:

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,2,j} | H_{t+1}, A_{t+1,j}) = (0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_t(0.05+0.065\bar{Z}_{t,g}+b'_g)+A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \quad (26)$$

The proposed estimator again achieves the nominal 95% coverage probability. (see Scenario III, Table 4).

8.5.2 Lag Treatment Effect Calculation.

Sequential Treatment Regime. As stated by the sequential treatment reference regime, we have the weight $W_{t,\Delta} = \frac{\pi(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} = \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})}$. Thus, the true lag $\Delta = 2$ treatment effect can simply be calculated as:

$$\beta_{t,2} = \log \frac{E \left[Y_{t,2} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = 1 \right]}{E \left[Y_{t,2} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = 0 \right]} \quad (27)$$

Under our simulation setting, the term $E \left[Y_{t,2} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = a \right]$ is equal to:

$$E \left[(0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_t(0.05+0.065Z_t+b'_g)+A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = a \right]$$

Splitting the expectation above to two terms, we have the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[e^{A_t(0.05+0.065Z_t+b'_g)} \mid H_t, A_t = a \right] \\ &= e^{a(0.05+0.065Z_t)} \end{aligned}$$

In the simulation setting, A_{t+1} is independent with H_t , therefore we have the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[(0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = a \right] \\ &= E \left[(0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.21\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the true lag $\Delta = 2$ treatment effect under sequential treatment regime is equal

to:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{t,2} &= \log \frac{E \left[Y_{t,2} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = 1 \right]}{E \left[Y_{t,2} \frac{1[A_{t+1}=1]}{p(A_{t+1}|H_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = 0 \right]} \\ &= 0.05 + 0.065Z_t\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Observed Distribution Treatment Regime. As specified by this reference treatment regime, we have future treatment reference distribution the same with the distribution of treatments in the data we have at hand, i.e., $\pi(A_{t+1} \mid H_{t+1}) = p(A_{t+1} \mid H_{t+1})$ and $W_{t,\Delta} = 1$. Thus, the true lag $\Delta = 2$ treatment effect can be calculated as:

$$\beta'_{t,2} = \log \frac{E[Y_{t,2} \mid H_t, A_t = 1]}{E[Y_{t,2} \mid H_t, A_t = 0]}\tag{29}$$

Similar as above, under our simulation setting, the term $E[Y_{t,2} \mid H_t, A_t = a]$ is equal to:

$$E \left[(0.11\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=0} + 0.25\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=1} + 0.2\mathbf{1}_{Z_{t+1}=2}) e^{A_t(0.05+0.065Z_t+b'_g)+A_{t+1}(0.1+0.3Z_{t+1})} \mid H_t, A_t = a \right]$$

and the true lag $\Delta = 2$ treatment effect under observed treatment distribution regime is equal to $0.05 + 0.065Z_t$:

8.5.3 Marginal Lag Treatment Effect Simulation Results.

The choice for prespecified future reference treatment regimes is of vital importance and often time yields to different treatment effect estimations. Following the derivations above, the fully marginal lag $\Delta = 2$ treatment effect is 0.115 for both treatment reference regimes. Table 4 presents the simulation results. Overall, these results indicate that our proposed C-EMEE method produces unbiased estimation of lag-2 treatment effect, and achieves the nominal 95% coverage probability. Closer inspection of the table shows the sequential treatment regime yields to bigger SE and RMSE estimations, which is caused by only using data points with $A_{t+1} = 1$.

[Table 4 about here.]

8.6 *More on Case Study*

Following the discussion in the main paper, we consider lag $\Delta = 2$ direct moderation effect analyses under both sequential treatment regime and observed treatment distribution regime. In this analysis, the same clusters are constructed as the main paper. Here, Table 5 presents the results. We see limited evidence of an lag-2 direct effect.

[Table 5 about here.]

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the lag-2 moderation effect of prior week completion rate and day in study on both clustering levels. In general, the lag-2 moderation effects are much weaker than lag-1, which indicates that the smart phone notification has a rather short time impact on users engagement.

Combining the analyses in Section 6, it suggests that if the the goal is to estimate the causal excursion effect of the targeted notifications, the treatment and moderation effects from distant past contributes very minimal to the proximal outcome, therefore it is sufficient to focus on lag-1 effect only.

[Figure 4 about here.]

[Figure 5 about here.]

8.7 *Code to Replicate Simulation and Case Study Results*

The R code used to generate the simulation experiments and case study results in this paper can be obtained at <https://github.com/Herashi/binaryMRT-mHealth>.

Received October 2007. Revised February 2008. Accepted March 2008.




Figure 1: Observed treatment effect heterogeneity of the estimated relative risks using the existing EMEE across the clusters (specialties with greater than or equal to 6 people).




Figure 2: Left: Cluster size (G) versus nominal coverage probability with fixed total sample size. **Right:** Standard deviation of random intercept b'_g versus nominal coverage probability.




Figure 3: Moderation Analysis: **Left:** Treatment effect moderate by prior week’s completion rate, and **Right:** Treatment effect moderate by day-in-study.




Figure 4: Moderation Analysis: **Left:** Treatment effect moderate by prior week's completion rate, and **Right:** Treatment effect moderate by day-in-study. Clusters are constructed based on a subject's membership of medical institution.




Figure 5: Moderation Analysis: **Left:** Treatment effect moderate by prior week’s completion rate, and **Right:** Treatment effect moderate by day-in-study. Clusters are constructed based on a subject’s joint membership of medical institution and specialty.

Table 1: C-EMEE and EMEE comparison over Scenarios I; II; and III;

Scenario	Estimator	# of Clusters	Cluster Size	Bias	SE	RMSE	CP
I	C-EMEE	25	5	2.73×10^{-3}	0.069	0.069	0.949
	EMEE				0.069	0.069	0.948
	C-EMEE	25	10	-6.40×10^{-4}	0.048	0.047	0.945
	EMEE				0.049	0.049	0.941
	C-EMEE	50	10	-3.96×10^{-4}	0.034	0.034	0.938
	EMEE				0.034	0.034	0.940
	C-EMEE	50	20	-7.86×10^{-4}	0.024	0.024	0.957
	EMEE				0.024	0.024	0.954
	C-EMEE	100	20	-1.15×10^{-3}	0.017	0.016	0.949
	EMEE				0.016	0.016	0.950
C-EMEE	100	25	-2.58×10^{-4}	0.015	0.016	0.941	
EMEE				0.015	0.016	0.937	
II	C-EMEE	25	5	-1.09×10^{-2}	0.113	0.114	0.937
	EMEE				0.078	0.114	0.816
	C-EMEE	25	10	-7.65×10^{-3}	0.102	0.101	0.934
	EMEE				0.055	0.101	0.719
	C-EMEE	50	10	-3.51×10^{-3}	0.072	0.072	0.957
	EMEE				0.039	0.072	0.717
	C-EMEE	50	20	-2.88×10^{-3}	0.068	0.069	0.934
	EMEE				0.027	0.069	0.563
	C-EMEE	100	20	-1.83×10^{-3}	0.048	0.048	0.941
	EMEE				0.019	0.048	0.567
C-EMEE	100	25	-1.03×10^{-3}	0.047	0.048	0.943	
EMEE				0.017	0.048	0.526	
III	C-EMEE	25	5	8.90×10^{-3}	0.115	0.111	0.957
	EMEE				0.080	0.111	0.840
	C-EMEE	25	10	6.29×10^{-3}	0.104	0.104	0.945
	EMEE				0.057	0.104	0.712
	C-EMEE	50	10	8.30×10^{-3}	0.072	0.073	0.942
	EMEE				0.040	0.074	0.728
	C-EMEE	50	20	-7.74×10^{-4}	0.068	0.067	0.939
	EMEE				0.028	0.067	0.603
	C-EMEE	100	20	3.36×10^{-3}	0.048	0.047	0.952
	EMEE				0.020	0.047	0.594
C-EMEE	100	25	1.70×10^{-3}	0.047	0.049	0.943	
EMEE				0.018	0.049	0.524	

Table 2: C-EMEE for estimation of indirect effects.

Scenario	# of Clusters	Cluster Size	Bias	SE	RMSE	CP
IV	25	5	-2.01×10^{-4}	0.051	0.050	0.947
	25	10	-3.96×10^{-4}	0.025	0.024	0.951
	50	10	-4.36×10^{-4}	0.017	0.017	0.956
	50	20	3.91×10^{-4}	0.009	0.009	0.953
	100	20	2.89×10^{-4}	0.006	0.006	0.945
	100	25	-1.36×10^{-4}	0.005	0.005	0.951

Table 3: Fully marginal causal excursion effect of notifications on daily mood survey completion rate in IHS. EMEE estimates use the estimator in Qian et al. (2020), while the C-EMEE estimates use our proposed estimator.

Outcome	Cluster	Method	Estimate	Std. Error	p-value
Direct Effect	Institution \times Specialty	C-EMEE	-0.058	0.006	<0.05
	Institution	C-EMEE	-0.055	0.009	<0.05
	Individual	EMEE	-0.053	0.005	<0.05
Indirect Effect	Institution \times Specialty	C-EMEE	-0.003	0.010	0.74

Table 4: Simulation: C-EMEE estimators for lag $\Delta = 2$ effect, under the policy of sequential treatments (ST) versus the observed treatment distribution (OTD), and comparison for Scenarios I, II, III.

Scenario	Policy	# of Clusters	Cluster Size	Bias	SE	RMSE	CP
I	ST	25	5	-9.89×10^{-5}	0.140	0.128	0.961
	OTD			3.66×10^{-3}	0.077	0.075	0.950
	ST	25	10	6.73×10^{-3}	0.099	0.091	0.962
	OTD			4.61×10^{-3}	0.054	0.055	0.944
	ST	50	10	6.56×10^{-3}	0.067	0.066	0.955
	OTD			3.46×10^{-3}	0.038	0.037	0.962
	ST	50	20	6.46×10^{-3}	0.048	0.046	0.956
	OTD			6.74×10^{-3}	0.027	0.028	0.932
	ST	100	20	7.45×10^{-3}	0.033	0.034	0.955
	OTD			4.56×10^{-3}	0.019	0.020	0.935
ST	100	25	5.83×10^{-3}	0.030	0.029	0.948	
OTD			5.66×10^{-3}	0.017	0.018	0.941	
II	ST	25	5	-4.76×10^{-3}	0.164	0.157	0.956
	OTD			-1.42×10^{-4}	0.112	0.108	0.952
	ST	25	10	-7.33×10^{-3}	0.130	0.123	0.965
	OTD			-4.46×10^{-3}	0.096	0.097	0.942
	ST	50	10	1.27×10^{-3}	0.089	0.089	0.945
	OTD			1.42×10^{-3}	0.068	0.067	0.946
	ST	50	20	8.82×10^{-3}	0.074	0.073	0.955
	OTD			6.35×10^{-3}	0.062	0.061	0.951
	ST	100	20	1.83×10^{-3}	0.052	0.051	0.954
	OTD			1.65×10^{-3}	0.044	0.044	0.955
ST	100	25	7.73×10^{-3}	0.049	0.050	0.939	
OTD			5.91×10^{-3}	0.042	0.043	0.940	
III	ST	25	5	1.88×10^{-3}	0.163	0.154	0.950
	OTD			3.74×10^{-4}	0.110	0.111	0.943
	ST	25	10	-7.76×10^{-3}	0.131	0.128	0.949
	OTD			-5.93×10^{-3}	0.097	0.097	0.946
	ST	50	10	2.20×10^{-4}	0.089	0.085	0.956
	OTD			6.58×10^{-4}	0.067	0.066	0.947
	ST	50	20	-2.06×10^{-3}	0.074	0.073	0.948
	OTD			6.15×10^{-4}	0.062	0.062	0.939
	ST	100	20	-2.25×10^{-3}	0.052	0.051	0.952
	OTD			-2.96×10^{-3}	0.043	0.044	0.949
ST	100	25	-2.04×10^{-3}	0.049	0.050	0.942	
OTD			-2.61×10^{-3}	0.043	0.043	0.945	

Table 5: Fully marginal causal excursion effect of notifications on daily mood survey completion rate in IHS

Policy	Cluster	Estimate	Std. Error	p-value
ST	Institution \times Specialty	-0.011	0.010	0.30
	Institution	-0.005	0.014	0.73
OTD	Institution \times Specialty	-0.009	0.007	0.17
	Institution	-0.004	0.009	0.64