

# Efficiently transporting average treatment effects using a sufficient subset of effect modifiers

Kara E. Rudolph<sup>1</sup>, Nicholas Williams<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth A. Stuart<sup>2</sup>, and Iván Díaz<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

<sup>3</sup>Division of Biostatistics, Department of Population Health Sciences, New York University Grossman School of Medicine.

## Abstract

We develop flexible and nonparametric estimators of the average treatment effect (ATE) transported to a new population that offer potential efficiency gains by incorporating only a sufficient subset of effect modifiers that are differentially distributed between the source and target populations into the transport step. We develop both a one-step estimator when this sufficient subset of effect modifiers is known and a collaborative one-step estimator when it is unknown. We discuss when we would expect our estimators to be more efficient than those that assume all covariates may be relevant effect modifiers and the exceptions when we would expect worse efficiency. We use simulation to compare finite sample performance across our proposed estimators and existing estimators of the transported ATE, including in the presence of practical violations of the positivity assumption. Lastly, we apply our proposed estimators to a large-scale housing trial.

*Keywords:* transportability; efficiency; generalizability; effect modification; causal inference

## 1 Introduction

The effect of a treatment or exposure on an outcome may differ from one sample or population to another. Such treatment effect heterogeneity drives concerns about external validity—meaning that a treatment effect estimated in a study sample applies to a target population—and transportability and generalizability—the ability, or license, to transport an effect estimated in one population to a different population, in the case of transportability (Pearl and Bareinboim, 2011), or to generalize an effect estimated in one population to the broader population from which the sample was drawn, in the case of generalizability (Westreich et al., 2019).

There could be multiple reasons why the effect of an exposure on an outcome would differ from one population to another. We will review these intuitively as well as using directed acyclic graphs (DAGs). Assume a general observed data structure  $O = (S, W, A, M, S \times Y)$ , where  $S$  is an indicator of the population and represents all factors that produce differences between the

two populations (Pearl, 2015);  $S = 1$  denotes the source population and  $S = 0$  denotes the target population;  $W$  denotes a vector of baseline covariates;  $A$  denotes treatment/ exposure;  $M$  denotes intermediate variables (e.g., treatment adherence, mediators); and  $Y$  denotes the outcome, only observed in the source population. First, there could be differences in the distribution of baseline covariates between the two populations that also modify the treatment effect (called “effect modifiers”). This is represented in Figure S1a in the Supplementary Materials where there is an arrow from  $S$  to  $W$ . Second, there could be downstream factors, like treatment uptake or adherence, or mediation mechanisms, whose conditional distributions differ between the two populations. This is represented in Figure S1b where there is also an arrow from  $S$  to  $M$ . In these two scenarios, the average treatment effect of  $A$  on  $Y$  would be transportable from  $S = 1$  to  $S = 0$  under  $S$ -ignorability and  $S$ -admissibility, respectively, as discussed by Pearl (2015). (Note that the first scenario is both  $S$ -ignorable and  $S$ -admissible.)

However, there are also scenarios that would not be transportable. For example, there could be unmeasured factors that differ between the populations that are also responsible for treatment effectiveness. This could be represented by the addition of an arrow from  $S$  to  $Y$  as in Figure S1c. In this case, there are no measured variables that separate  $S$  from  $Y$ , and so the effect of  $A$  on  $Y$  cannot be transported across  $S$ . There exists multiple approaches for sensitivity analyses in the presence of unmeasured variables that separate  $S$  from  $Y$  (Colnet et al., 2021; Andrews and Oster, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2017, 2018; Huang, 2022; Nie et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2023).


In this paper, we focus on the simplest setting where we have observed data  $O = (S, W, A, S \times Y)$  that satisfies  $S$ -ignorability (and  $S$ -admissibility), meaning that differences in the effect of  $A$  on  $Y$  across populations in  $S$  are due to differences in the distribution of baseline covariates that also modify the treatment effect. In this setting, the transported average treatment effect (transported ATE) is defined as the average effect of  $A$  on  $Y$  transported to the target population, denoted  $E(Y_1 - Y_0 \mid S = 0)$ , where  $Y_a$  denotes the counterfactual outcome had treatment been set to value  $a$ , possibly counter to fact. Others have shown that the transported ATE is identified by the statistical parameter  $E[E(Y \mid A = 1, W, S = 1) - E(Y \mid A = 0, W, S = 1) \mid S = 0]$  under the following assumptions. First, the so-called “transport” assumption or  $S$ -admissibility:  $E(Y \mid A, W, S = 1) = E(Y \mid A, W, S = 0)$  (Pearl and Bareinboim, 2011). Second, the conditional exchangeability assumption:  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_a \mid W, S = 0$ . And third, positivity, meaning that there is a positive conditional probability of every exposure (conditional on  $W$  and  $S = 1$ ) for each observed  $w$  in the target population:  $p(w \mid S = 0) > 0$  implies  $p(a \mid w, S = 1) > 0$  (Rudolph and van der Laan, 2017).

Multiple classes of estimators exist to estimate the transported ATE, including those based on inverse probability weighting (e.g., Cole and Stuart, 2010; Li et al., 2018), matching (e.g., Stuart et al., 2011; Bennett et al., 2020), g-computation (e.g., Dahabreh et al., 2019), and doubly robust nonparametric estimators based on the efficient influence function (e.g., Rudolph and van der Laan, 2017). However, for a given estimator, estimates of transported effects may be less precise than estimates of their non-transported counterparts (Tipton, 2013).

The goal of this paper is to optimize the efficiency of nonparametric estimators of the transported ATE by assuming that only a subset of baseline covariates,  $V \subseteq W$ , modifies the treatment effect, and a further subset,  $Z \subseteq V$  also differ in distribution across  $S$ —as opposed to allowing all  $W$  to act as effect modifiers that differ in distribution across  $S$ . This scenario is depicted in Figure 1. In this DAG, we categorize covariates,  $W$ , as follows:  $V$  is the subset of  $W$  that are effect modifiers on the additive scale,  $V \subseteq W$ ;  $X$  is the subset of  $W$  that differ in distribution across

$S, X \subseteq W$ ; and  $Z$  is the subset that are both effect modifiers *and* differ in distribution across  $S$ ,  $Z = V \cap X$ . In this DAG, we follow previous convention and put a box around variable sets to indicate effect modification (VanderWeele and Robins, 2007; Hernán et al., 2002). We consider both the scenario where a *sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport*,  $Z$ , is known and the scenario where  $Z$  is unknown.

Figure 1: Directed acyclic graph (DAG) where:  $A$  represents treatment,  $Y$  represents outcome,  $S$  represents population,  $W$  represents baseline covariates and can be further categorized into i) effect modifiers on the additive scale,  $V \subseteq W$ ; ii) covariates that differ in distribution across  $S$ ,  $X \subseteq W$ ; and iii) covariates that are both effect modifiers *and* differ in distribution across  $S$ ,  $Z = V \cap X$ . This DAG depicts the differential distribution of effect modifiers,  $Z$ , across  $S$ , and differential distribution of non-effect modifiers,  $X \setminus Z$ , across  $S$ .  $Z$  is a sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport.



This paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 2, we show an alternative identification result of the transported ATE, assuming a subset of effect modifiers,  $V$ , and a subset of these,  $Z$ , that differ in distribution across  $S$ . A particular case of this identification result when  $V = Z$  was discussed by (Zeng et al., 2023; Colnet et al., 2021). In Section 3, we derive the efficient influence function (EIF) in the model that assumes that subset  $Z$  are the true effect modifiers that differ in distribution across  $S$ , from which we obtain the nonparametric efficiency bound. Using the nonparametric efficiency bound, we outline scenarios where assuming subsets  $V$  and  $Z$  result in efficiency gains, and scenarios where incorporating these assumptions results in efficiency losses. We propose an extension of an existing nonparametric estimator (Rudolph and van der Laan, 2017), assuming subsets  $V$  and  $Z$  of effect modifiers are known. However, in practice, which covariates modify the treatment effect and also differ in distribution across  $S$  may be unknown. So, in Section 4, we propose an alternative nonparametric estimator, related to the collaborative nonparametric estimator of Benkeser et al. (2020), in the common setting where subsets  $V$  and  $Z$  are unknown, and describe implementation of a “black box” version of this estimator as well as an interpretable version that returns the identified effect modifier subsets in addition to the transported

ATE estimate. In Section 5, we illustrate finite sample performance of our proposed estimators in several scenarios using simulation. In Section 6, we apply our proposed estimators to data from the Moving to Opportunity Study (MTO). Section 7 concludes.

## 2 Identification the ATE in the absence of intermediate variables

We assume the same observed data as discussed in the Introduction:  $O = (S, W, A, S \times Y)$ , and assume  $O_1, \dots, O_n$  represents a sample of  $n$  i.i.d. observations of  $O$ . We assume the following nonparametric structural equation model:

$$S = f(U_S); W = f(S, U_W); A = f(S, W, U_A); Y = f(W, A, U_Y),$$

where each variable is a deterministic, unknown function,  $f$ , of unobserved exogenous errors,  $(U_S, U_W, U_A, U_Y)$ , as well as possibly observed endogenous variables (Pearl, 2009). We assume  $S$  can be separated into a source population,  $S = 0$ , and a target population,  $S = 1$ . We also assume  $A$  denotes a binary treatment/exposure variable.  $Y$  can be categorical or continuous. As described in the Introduction,  $W = (Z, V \setminus Z, X \setminus Z, W \setminus \{V \cap X\})$ .

We use  $P$  to denote the distribution of  $O$ .  $P$  is an element of the nonparametric statistical model defined as all continuous densities on  $O$ . We let  $E$  denote expectation, and define  $Pf = \int f(o)dP(o)$  for a given function  $f(o)$ .

As stated in the Introduction, without assuming a known subset of effect modifiers, and under the assumptions of  $S$ -admissibility, conditional exchangeability, and positivity, it is well known that the transported ATE of a binary treatment can be identified as

$$E(Y_1 - Y_0 | S = 0) = E[E(Y | A = 1, w, S = 1) - E(Y | A = 0, w, S = 1) | S = 0].$$

We retain the assumptions of

**A1** (Conditional exchangeability).  $Y_a \perp\!\!\!\perp A | W, S = 0$ , and

**A2** ( $S$ -admissibility / Transportability of the outcome model).  $E(Y | A, W, S = 1) = E(Y | A, W, S = 0)$ .

For convenience in some of the results and methods we propose, we will parameterize the outcome conditional expectation as

$$E(Y | A, W, S = 1) = A \times f(W) + g(W),$$

where, under the identification assumptions listed above,  $f(W)$  represents the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) in the source population,  $E(Y | A = 1, W, S = 1) - E(Y | A = 0, W, S = 1) = f(W)$ , and  $g(W)$  represents the conditional outcome expectation among the untreated in the source population,  $E(Y | A = 0, W, S = 1)$ . This parameterization was also used by Chernozhukov et al. (2018); Nie and Wager (2021); Hahn et al. (2020); Colnet et al. (2021).

We now make two additional assumptions on our statistical model that, together, assume a *sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport*.

The first of these two assumptions implies that only the variables  $V$ , where  $V \subseteq W$ , are modifiers of the ATE, such that  $E(Y_1 - Y_0 | W, S = 1) = E(Y_1 - Y_0 | V, S = 1)$  under assumptions **A1** and **A2**. Formally, we can state the assumption as:

**A3** (Treatment effect modifiers). The function  $f(\cdot)$  depends on  $W$  only through a transformation  $V = V(W)$ .

The second of these two assumptions implies that only the effect modifiers  $Z$ , where  $Z \subseteq V$ , differ in distribution across  $S$ . Formally, we can state the assumption as:

**A4** (Partial study heterogeneity of effect modifiers). Assume there is a subset  $Z \subseteq V$  such that  $S \perp\!\!\!\perp V \mid Z$ .

We make a few notes about these additional assumptions. First, the above implies that only the variables  $V$  are effect modifiers, and they modify the effect on the additive scale:

$$E(Y \mid A = 1, W, S = 1) - E(Y \mid A = 0, W, S = 1) = f(V).$$

Second, because only the subset  $Z$  differs in distribution across  $S$ , it constitutes a sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport. Third, we make the assumption **A4** with respect to  $V$  and not  $W$ , because the subset of  $W$  that differ in distribution between  $S = 1$  and  $S = 0$  only matter for transporting if they also modify the treatment effect.  $Z$  is the intersection variables that are effect modifiers and variables that differ in distribution across  $S$ . Fourth, assumptions **A3** and **A4** involve only observed data distributions; therefore, they are testable. In Section 4 we will use this fact to propose estimators for the case where  $V$  and  $Z$  are unknown.

Lastly, for the transported ATE to be well-defined, we assume:

**A5** (Positivity of study and treatment mechanisms). Assume

- $P(W = w \mid S = 0) > 0$  implies  $P(A = a \mid W = w, S = s) > 0$  for  $s \in \{0, 1\}$ , which means that there is a positive probability of each value of treatment in the source and target populations conditional on covariates,  $w$ , that are observed in the target population.
- $P(Z = z \mid S = 0) > 0$  implies  $P(Z = z \mid S = 1) > 0$ , which means each of a sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport values,  $z$ , observed in the target population must also be observed in the source population.

This assumption also depends on only on the observed data, so is also testable.

**Lemma 1.** *Under assumptions **A1-A5**, we have  $E(Y_1 - Y_0 \mid S = 0)$  is identified by  $\theta$  and  $\theta_{alt}$ , where*

$$\theta = E[E\{f(V) \mid Z\} \mid S = 0],$$

and

$$\theta_{alt} = E[E\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\} \mid S = 0].$$

We include the proof in Section S1 the Supplementary Materials.

A particular case of this identification result where  $V = Z$  has been shown previously (Colnet et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2023). We focus on the statistical parameter  $\theta$  for the remainder of the paper, as this allows for pooling in estimating the inner expectation, which is possible in our illustrative application since we measured the covariates  $V$  in both samples. However, when only  $Z$  but not  $V \setminus Z$  is measured in the target population,  $\theta$  is unidentifiable (we cannot estimate  $E\{f(V) \mid Z\}$ ) and  $\theta_{alt}$  must be used instead. We describe an estimator for  $\theta_{alt}$  in Section S2 Supplementary Materials.

### 3 Efficient estimation when the effect modifiers ( $V$ ) and a sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport ( $Z$ ) are known

We now extend the efficient influence function (EIF) and semi-parametric estimator of Rudolph and van der Laan (2017) for the statistical parameter,  $\theta$ , making use of the assumptions A3 and A4 when  $V$  and  $Z$  are known.

#### 3.1 Efficient influence function under assumptions A3 and A4 when $Z$ are known

**Theorem 1.** *The efficient influence function for estimation of  $\theta$  in the model with restrictions (A3 and A4) is equal to:*

$$D_{\theta}(O; P) = \frac{1}{P(S=0)} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S=1\}(2A-1)P(S=0|Z)}{P(A|S=1,W)P(S=1|Z)} \{Y - Af(V) - g(W)\} + P(S=0|Z)[f(V) - E\{f(V)|Z\}] + \mathbb{1}\{S=0\}[E\{f(V)|Z\} - \theta] \right].$$

The EIF in Theorem 1 is similar to the EIF for the transported ATE under the more general model that allows all  $W$  to modify the additive treatment effect. Rudolph and van der Laan (2017) show that the nonparametric EIF for

$$\lambda = E\{f(W) | S = 0\}$$

is equal to the following:

$$D_{\lambda}(O; P) = \frac{1}{P(S=0)} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S=1\}(2A-1)P(S=0|W)}{P(A|S=1,W)P(S=1|W)} \{Y - Af(W) - g(W)\} + \mathbb{1}\{S=0\}\{f(W) - \lambda\} \right].$$

Comparing  $D_{\theta}$  with  $D_{\lambda}$ , we see two main differences: 1) in the first term,  $D_{\theta}$  has weights  $\frac{P(S=0|Z)}{P(S=1|Z)}$  whereas  $D_{\lambda}$  has weights  $\frac{P(S=0|W)}{P(S=1|W)}$ ; and 2)  $D_{\theta}$  has an additional term.

#### 3.2 Efficiency considerations

We now compare the efficiency bounds of  $\theta$  with  $\lambda$  under assumptions A3 and A4 to identify scenarios where we would expect  $\theta$  to result in efficiency gains and scenarios where we would expect it to result in efficiency losses. We restrict the comparison to the smaller model under assumptions A3 and A4 so that we are comparing efficiency bounds of the same target parameter (i.e., to make an apples-to-apples comparison).

**Proposition 1** (Efficiency bounds). *Define*

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^2(W) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W)}{\mathbb{P}^2(A | W, S = 1)} \sigma^2(A, W, S = 1) | W, S = 1 \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W)}{\mathbb{P}^2(A | W, S = 1)} \sigma^2(A, W, S = 1) | A, W, S = 1 \right] | W, S = 1 \right\} \\ f(W) &= \mathbb{E}(Y | S = 1, A = 1, W) - \mathbb{E}(Y | S = 1, A = 0, W) \\ \mathbf{q} &= \mathbb{P}(S = 0)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma^2(A, W, S)$  is the variance of  $Y$  conditional on  $(A, W, S)$ . Then, under assumptions **A3** and **A4**, we have that non-parametric efficiency bound for estimating  $\lambda$  in the non-parametric model is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \tau^2(W) \frac{\mathbb{P}^2(S = 0 | W)}{\mathbb{P}^2(S = 1 | W)} \right\} + \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{P}(S = 0 | Z) [f(V) - \mathbb{E}\{f(V) | Z\}]^2 \} \\ + \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}} \mathbb{E} \{ [\mathbb{E}(f(V) | Z) - \lambda]^2 | S = 0 \},\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

whereas the non-parametric efficiency bound for estimating  $\theta$  in the non-parametric model is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \tau^2(W) \frac{\mathbb{P}^2(S = 0 | Z)}{\mathbb{P}^2(S = 1 | Z)} \right\} + \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{P}^2(S = 0 | Z) [f(V) - \mathbb{E}\{f(V) | Z\}]^2 \} \\ + \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}} \mathbb{E} \{ [\mathbb{E}(f(V) | Z) - \theta]^2 | S = 0 \}.\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

Contrasting these two efficiency bounds reveals in which situations it might be expected to obtain efficiency gains from using assumptions **A3** and **A4** in the identification and estimation of the transported effects. First, note that the last term in both efficiency bounds is identical. Consider now the first term in (1) and (2). The ratio  $\frac{\mathbb{P}(S=0|Z)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1|Z)}$  is expected to be more stable than  $\frac{\mathbb{P}(S=0|W)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1|W)}$ , so we would expect this to contribute to the  $\theta$  estimator having lower variance and better efficiency. However, if  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W)$  is correlated with  $\tau^2(W)$ , then this correlation may influence efficiency. If the correlation between  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | Z)$  and  $\tau^2(W)$  is smaller than the correlation between  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W)$  and  $\tau^2(W)$ , then the first term of (1) might be larger than the first term in (2). This could occur, for example, if the profiles  $W$  that have a large conditional variance in  $S = 1$  are not well-represented in  $S = 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W)$  is small. In other words, if  $\text{Var}(Y | A, W, S = 1)$  is positively correlated with  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W)$  more than with  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | Z)$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | W)$  may act to down-weight unstable observations more than  $\mathbb{P}(S = 1 | Z)$ . In this case, we would potentially expect an advantage of the  $\lambda$  estimator; whether or not it outweighs the advantage of  $\theta$  due to increased stability of  $\frac{\mathbb{P}(S=0|Z)}{\mathbb{P}(S=1|Z)}$  depends on specifics of the data-generating mechanism. Finally, consider the middle terms in (1) and (2). The difference is in  $\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | Z)^2$  for (2) and  $\mathbb{P}(S = 0 | W)$  for (1). The squared term in (2) will act to decrease the variance and increase the efficiency, adding an efficiency advantage for the  $\theta$  estimator regardless of the data-generating mechanism. So, to summarize, we would expect the  $\theta$  estimator to be more efficient than the  $\lambda$  estimator in many cases, especially in the presence of practical positivity violations in finite samples and if the outcome model is well-behaved. We examine the above scenarios, among others, in simulations in Section 5.

### 3.3 Estimation

We now propose a “one-step” nonparametric estimator of  $\theta$  under [A3](#) and [A4](#) that is the sample average of the uncentered EIF. We first use a doubly robust unbiased transformation to estimate  $f(V)$ , which makes our estimator of the CATE doubly robust. Specifically, we have the following lemma:

**Lemma 2** (Doubly robust unbiased transformation for estimation of the CATE  $f(V)$ ). *For any distribution  $P_1$ , define*

$$\begin{aligned} T(O; P_1) &= \frac{2A - 1}{P_1(A | S = 1, W)} \{Y - E_1(Y | A, W, S = 1)\} \\ &\quad + E_1(Y | A = 1, W, S = 1) - E_1(Y | A = 0, W, S = 1). \end{aligned}$$

*If  $P_1$  is such that  $P_1(A | S = 1, W) = P(A | S = 1, W)$  or  $E_1(Y | A, W, S = 1) = E(Y | A, W, S = 1)$ , we have that  $E\{T(O; P_1) | W, S = 1\} = f(W)$ . Furthermore, under assumption [A3](#) we also have that  $E\{T(O; P_1) | V, S = 1\} = f(V)$ .*

We note that the elements of Lemma 2 were discussed by [Zeng et al. \(2023\)](#).

We introduce some additional notation to simplify the presentation of the results. Let  $e_A(w) = P(A = 1 | W = w, S = 1)$ ,  $e_S(w) = P(S = 1 | W = w)$ , and  $\mathbf{p} = P(S = 0)$ .

**Theorem 2** (First-order bias of plug-in estimator). *Define  $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i = 0\}$ . For any estimator  $\hat{\gamma} = (\hat{e}_A, \hat{e}_S, \hat{f}, \hat{g})$ , let  $\hat{\theta}$  denote the plug in estimator defined as*

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{n \times \hat{\mathbf{p}}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i = 0\} \hat{E}[\hat{f}(V_i) | Z_i].$$

*The bias of  $\hat{\theta}$  is equal to*

$$\hat{\theta} - \theta = -E[D_{\hat{\theta}}(O; \hat{\gamma})] + R_D(\gamma, \hat{\gamma}),$$

*where  $R_D$  is a second order term equal to a sum of products of errors of the type  $(a(\hat{\gamma}) - a(\gamma))(b(\hat{\gamma}) - b(\gamma))$ .*

The proof of this theorem is identical to that of [Theorem 3](#) below, which is included in the Supplementary Materials.

Under [Lemma 2](#), which states the double robustness property (i.e., the estimator is consistent if either the models for  $e_A$  and  $e_S$  are consistent or the model for  $Y$  conditional on  $S = 1, A, W$  is consistent), we propose the following one-step estimator based on the above theorem:

1. First, estimate nuisance parameters  $\hat{e}_A(W) = \hat{P}(A | S = 1, W)$  and  $\hat{E}(Y | A, W, S = 1)$ . One could use parametric regression models (e.g., generalized linear models) or data-adaptive regressions that incorporate machine learning in model fitting for these regressions and for those that follow below. We do that latter in the simulations, illustrative example, and in the software we provide.
2. Regress  $T(O_i; \hat{P})$  on  $V_i$  among observations with  $S_i = 1$ . The resulting predicted values (generated for all observations  $i$ ) are estimates of  $f(V_i)$ , denoted  $\hat{f}(V_i)$ .



3. Regress  $\hat{f}(V_i)$  on  $Z_i$  in the pooled target and source populations. The resulting predicted values are denoted  $\hat{E}\{f(V_i) | Z_i\}$ .
4. Compute an initial estimator  $\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i=0\}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i = 0\} \hat{E}\{f(V_i) | Z_i\}$ .
5. Compute estimates of  $g(W_i)$  for all observations  $i$ , denoted  $\hat{g}(W_i)$ , by generating predicted values from the estimator of  $E(Y | A = 0, W, S = 1)$ .
6. Estimate the nuisance parameter  $\hat{P}(S = 1 | W)$  using regression.
7. Compute the one-step estimator as  $\tilde{\theta} = \hat{\theta} + \frac{1}{n} \sum D_{\theta}(O_i; \hat{P})$ , where  $\hat{P}$  is comprised of  $\hat{P}(A | S = 1, W)$ ,  $\hat{P}(S = 1 | Z)$ ,  $\hat{f}(V)$ ,  $\hat{g}(W)$  and  $\hat{E}\{f(V) | Z\}$ .
8. Last, we can estimate the variance of  $\tilde{\theta}$  as the sample variance of  $\frac{1}{n} \sum D_{\theta}(O_i; \hat{P})$ .

A cross-fitted version of the above estimator can be used to avoid relying on the Donsker class assumption to achieve asymptotic normality (Klaassen, 1987; Zheng and van der Laan, 2011; Chernozhukov et al., 2016). Perform crossfitting for estimation of all parameters:  $(\hat{e}_A, \hat{e}_S, \hat{f}(V), \hat{g}(W), \hat{E}\{f(V) | Z\})$ , and call this set  $\eta$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_J$  denote a random partition of data with indices  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  into  $J$  prediction sets of approximately the same size such that  $\bigcup_{j=1}^J \mathcal{V}_j = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For each  $j$ , the training sample is given by  $\mathcal{T}_j = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{V}_j$ .  $\hat{\eta}_j$  denotes the estimator of  $\eta$ , obtained by training the corresponding prediction algorithm using only data in the sample  $\mathcal{T}_j$ , and  $j(i)$  denotes the index of the validation set which contains observation  $i$ . Then use these fits,  $\hat{\eta}_{j(i)}(O_i)$  in computing each efficient influence function, i.e., compute  $D_{\theta}(O_i, \hat{\eta}_{j(i)})$ .

Software to implement this estimator is available for download from <https://github.com/nt-williams/transport> (function `transport_ate_incomplete()`).

## 4 Efficient estimation when effect modifiers, including a sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport, are unknown

A practical drawback of the estimator proposed in Section 3 is that, in many cases, researchers will not know which subset of covariates are effect modifiers,  $V \subseteq W$ , nor which are a sufficient subset required for transport required for transporting,  $Z \subseteq V$ . Consequently, in this section we propose an alternative one-step transport estimator that does not rely on knowing or prespecifying  $V$  or  $Z$ . Briefly, because  $S \perp\!\!\!\perp W | e_S(W)$  (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983), we can regress  $f(W)$  on  $e_S(W)$  to obtain an estimate of  $\lambda$  using the following reparameterization of  $\lambda$  (original parameterization given in Section 3.1 and in Rudolph and van der Laan (2017)):

$$\lambda = E[f(W) | S = 0] = E\{E[f(W) | e_S(W), S = 0] | S = 0\} = E\{E[f(W) | e_S(W)] | S = 0\}.$$

Our proposed estimator when  $V$  and  $Z$  are unknown is similar to that of Benkeser et al. (2020). It can be thought of as a type of “collaborative” estimator, because instead of estimating the propensity of being in the source population conditional on  $Z$ ,  $P(S = 1 | Z)$ , or conditional on  $W$ ,  $P(S = 1 | W)$ , as in  $\theta$  or  $\lambda$ , respectively, it estimates 1) the propensity of being in the source population conditional on the conditional mean outcome difference comparing treated and untreated in

the source population (i.e., the CATE in the source population, under the identifying assumptions),  $P(S = 1 | f(W))$ , which we denote as  $h_S(W)$ , and 2) the CATE conditional on the propensity score of being in the target population ( $E\{f(W) | e_S(W)\}$ ). Thus, only the subset of covariates that are predictive of the CATE,  $V$  will be included in the estimates of  $f(W)$  and only the further subset that are predictive of  $S = 1$  versus  $S = 0$ ,  $Z$ , will be included in  $e_S(W)$ .

This approach is simpler than alternative collaborative estimators (e.g., [van der Laan and Gruber, 2010](#); [Schnitzer and Cefalu, 2018](#)), but that simplicity comes at a price. Although our proposed estimator is asymptotically linear, it is not doubly robust—we rely on consistent estimation of  $f(W)$ . In addition, like the estimator upon which it is based ([Benkeser et al., 2020](#)), it is super efficient—meaning that its asymptotic variance is less than the asymptotic variance of  $\lambda$ —but may under-cover in terms of the 95% CI in scenarios with practical violations of the positivity assumption.

#### 4.1 Estimating equation when $V, Z$ are unknown

We define  $k(w) = E\{f(W) | e_S(W) = e_S(w)\}$ , and let

$$\begin{aligned} U_\lambda(O; P) &= \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S = 1\}}{p} \left\{ \frac{A}{e_A(W)} - \frac{1 - A}{1 - e_A(W)} \right\} \frac{1 - h_S(W)}{h_S(W)} \{Y - Af(W) - g(W)\} \\ &\quad + \frac{\{1 - e_S(W)\}}{p} [f(W) - k(W)] \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S = 0\}}{p} [k(W) - \lambda], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda$  was defined in Section 3.1. Below we will prove that  $U_\lambda(\cdot; P)$  is a doubly robust estimating equation for  $\lambda$  in the non-parametric model. The estimating equation  $U_\lambda(\cdot; P)$  is of the same form as  $D_\theta(\cdot; P)$ , but depends on  $W$  instead of  $V$  and  $Z$ . Therefore,  $U_\lambda(\cdot; P)$  makes it possible to construct an estimator of  $\lambda$ , but to take advantage of assumptions A3 and A4 if they hold—even if effect modifiers,  $V$ , and a sufficient subset required for transport,  $Z$ , are unknown—as long as the conditional average treatment effect  $f(W)$  (i.e.,  $f(V)$  under A3) can be estimated consistently.

Because  $U_\lambda(\cdot; P)$  depends on  $P$  through  $\eta = (e_A, e_S, h_S, f, k, g)$ , we will use the notation  $U_\lambda(\cdot; \eta)$ .

**Theorem 3** (Alternative representation of first-order bias of plug-in estimator). *For any estimator  $\hat{\eta} = (\hat{e}_A, \hat{e}_S, \hat{h}_S, \hat{f}, \hat{k}, \hat{g})$ , let  $\hat{\lambda}_C$  denote the plug in estimator defined as*

$$\hat{\lambda}_C = \frac{1}{n \times \hat{p}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i = 0\} \hat{k}(W_i).$$

*The bias of  $\hat{\lambda}_C$  is equal to*

$$\hat{\lambda}_C - \lambda = -E[U_{\hat{\lambda}}(O; \hat{\eta})] + R_U(\eta, \hat{\eta}),$$

*where  $R_U$  is a second order term (defined in the proof of the lemma) equal to a sum of products of errors of the type  $(a(\hat{\eta}) - a(\eta))(b(\hat{\eta}) - b(\eta))$ . The proof is included in Section S3 of the Supplementary Materials.*

## 4.2 Estimation

We now propose a collaborative “one-step” nonparametric estimator of  $\lambda$ , that can take advantage of assumptions **A3** and **A4** if they hold, that is the sample average of the uncentered EIF. Although it is similar to the estimator proposed when  $V$  and  $Z$  are known (denoted  $\theta$  and described in Section 3.3), unlike the estimator for  $\theta$ , this one 1) does not rely on knowing  $V$  and  $Z$  *a-priori* but 2) does rely on consistent estimation of  $f(W)$  (so is not doubly robust). To distinguish between the “one-step” and collaborative “one-step” estimator for  $\lambda$ , we denote  $\lambda$  estimated using  $U_\lambda$  as  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$ .

This estimator can be implemented as follows. The first four steps are identical to the estimator in Section 3.3, with a modification to Step 3 for an “interpretable” version of the estimator.

1. First, estimate nuisance parameters  $\hat{e}_A(W) = \hat{P}(A | S = 1, W)$  and  $\hat{E}(Y | A, W, S = 1)$ . One could use parametric regression models (e.g., generalized linear models) or data-adaptive regressions that incorporate machine learning in model fitting for these regressions and for those that follow below. We do the latter in the simulations, illustrative example, and in the software we provide.
2. Use the above nuisance parameter estimates to calculate  $T(O_i; \hat{P})$  among observations with  $S_i = 1$ .
3. Regress  $T(O_i; \hat{P})$  on  $W$  among observations with  $S_i = 1$ . The resulting predicted values (generated for all observations  $i$ ) are estimates of  $f(W_i)$ , denoted  $\hat{f}(W_i)$ . Note here that if only  $V \subset W$  are effect modifiers (i.e., assumption **A3** holds), then  $f(W)$  will depend only on  $V$ .

Depending on which algorithms are used for this regression, the interpretable version of this estimator may output covariates retained as part of  $V$ . For example, in our simulations, illustrative example, and software, we use the adaptive lasso (Zou, 2006) for the interpretable version of this estimator to fit this regression and output the retained covariates.

4. Regress  $S$  on  $\hat{f}(W)$ . The resulting predicted values are estimates of  $h_S(w)$ , denoted  $\hat{h}_S(w)$ .
5. Estimate the nuisance parameter  $\hat{e}_S(W) = \hat{P}(S = 1 | W)$  using regression. Note here that if only  $Z \subset V$  differ in distribution among  $S$  (i.e., assumption **A4** holds), then  $\hat{e}_S(W)$  will depend only on  $Z$ .

For the interpretable version of the estimator, we can use an algorithm that outputs the covariates retained (as in Step 3) to regress  $S$  on  $V$ , and output the covariates retained as  $Z$ . Again, in our simulations, illustrative example, and software, we use the adaptive lasso for this fitting this regression.

6. Regress  $\hat{f}(W)$  on  $\hat{e}_S(W)$ . The predicted values,  $\hat{k}(W) = \hat{E}(\hat{f}(W) | \hat{e}_S(W))$ , reflect study heterogeneity in the CATEs.
7. Compute an initial estimator  $\hat{\lambda}_C = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i=0\}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i=0\} \hat{k}(W_i)$ .
8. Compute estimates of  $g(W_i)$  for all observations  $i$ , denoted  $\hat{g}(W_i)$ , by generating predicted values from the estimator of  $E(Y | A = 0, W, S = 1)$ .

9. Compute the one-step estimator as  $\tilde{\lambda}_C = \hat{\lambda}_C + \frac{1}{n} \sum U_\lambda(O_i; \tilde{P})$ , where  $\tilde{P}$  is comprised of  $\hat{e}_A(W)$ ,  $\hat{e}_S(W)$ ,  $\hat{f}(W)$ ,  $\hat{g}(W)$ ,  $\hat{h}_S(W)$ , and  $\hat{k}(W)$ . .
10. Last, we can estimate the variance of  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  as the sample variance of  $\frac{1}{n} \sum U_\lambda(O_i; \tilde{P})$ .

As in the previous section, a cross-fitted version of the above estimator can be used. Software to implement this estimator is available for download from <https://github.com/nt-williams/transport> (function `transport_ate_incomplete_sans_Z()`).

## 5 Simulation

We performed a simulation study to illustrate when using assumptions **A3** and **A4** can improve or hurt estimator efficiency and to examine estimator performance in finite sample sizes. We considered four data-generating mechanisms (DGMs), outlined in Table 1, below.

Table 1: Data-generating mechanisms considered in the simulation.

DGM 1	$P(W = 1) = 0.5$ $P(V = 1) = 0.33$ $P(Z = 1) = 0.66$ $P(A = 1) = 0.5$ $P(S = 1   W) = 0.4 + 0.5W - 0.3Z$ $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(A + W + AV + 2.5AZ, (0.1 + 0.8W)^2)$
DGM 2	$P(W = 1) = 0.5$ $P(V = 1) = 0.33$ $P(Z = 1) = 0.66$ $P(A = 1) = 0.5$ $P(S = 1   W) = 0.5 - 0.4W + 0.3Z$ $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(A + W + AV + 2.5AZ, (0.1 + 0.5W)^2)$
DGM 3	$P(W = 1) = 0.25$ $P(Z = 1) = 0.5$ $P(A = 1) = 0.5$ $P(S = 1   W, Z) = 0.8 - 0.6Z - 0.18W$ $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(1.2 + 0.25A + 0.5Z + 0.5W + AZ, 0)$
DGM 4	$P(W = 1) = 0.5$ $P(V_1 = 1) = 0.75$ $P(V_2 = 1) = 0.33$ $P(Z = 1) = 0.25$ $P(A = 1) = 0.5$ $P(S = 1   W, Z) = 0.8 - 0.5Z - 0.25W$ $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(1.2 + 0.25A + 0.5W + AZ + 0.5Z + 0.4AV_1 - 0.75AV_2, 0)$

The first DGM (DGM 1) considers a scenario where incorporating additional assumptions **A3** and **A4** results in worse rather than better efficiency. In this case, using  $\tilde{\theta}$  or  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  instead of  $\tilde{\lambda}$  should

yield a larger variance, which is the result of the positive correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1 | W)$  that is greater than the correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1 | Z)$ . The second DGM (DGM 2), is similar to DGM 1, but the correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1 | W)$  is negative, resulting in  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  having a smaller efficiency bound than  $\tilde{\lambda}$ . Data-generating mechanism three (DGM 3) is a special case where  $V = Z$ , and is formulated so that estimating  $P(S = 1 | W)$  may result in practical positivity violations while  $P(S = 1 | V)$  will not. Data-generating mechanism four (DGM 4) satisfies both assumptions [A3](#) and [A4](#). We would expect estimators  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  to also have smaller variance than  $\tilde{\lambda}$  in DGMs 3 and 4.

We conducted 1000 simulations for sample sizes  $n \in \{100, 1000, 10000\}$ . All estimator nuisance parameters were correctly specified using an ensemble of a main-effects generalized linear model (GLM), a GLM including all two-way interactions, and an intercept-only model; random forests ([Breiman, 2001](#)) and multivariate adaptive regression splines (MARS) ([Friedman et al., 1991](#)) were also included in the ensemble library when estimating  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$ . Estimator performance was evaluated in terms of absolute bias, 95% confidence interval (CI) coverage, the variance between simulations scaled by  $n$ , the mean of the estimated variance within simulations, and the relative efficiency of the estimated variance comparing  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  to  $\tilde{\lambda}$ .

Table 2 shows the results of our simulation using the one-step estimators,  $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\lambda}_C$ , for DGMs 1 and 2. Table 3 shows the results of our simulation using the one-step estimators,  $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\lambda}_C$ , for DGMs 3 and 4. As expected, all estimators are unbiased or become unbiased with increasing sample size. With DGM 1, we see that estimating  $\theta$  would incur larger variance as compared to estimating  $\lambda$  due to the positive correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1|W)$  that is greater than the correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1|Z)$ . However, when the correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1|W)$  is switched to be negative in DGM 2 estimating  $\theta$  instead of  $\lambda$  yields efficiency gains. When  $n = 100$  all estimators are biased for with DGM 3; however, using  $\tilde{\theta}$  results in improved confidence interval coverage and efficiency compared to  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , due to the practical positivity violations that are more of an issue when using  $\tilde{\lambda}$ . When the sample size is increased to 1000 the efficiency gains of  $\tilde{\theta}$  relative to  $\tilde{\lambda}$  are more pronounced. When  $V$  is treated as unknown, using  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  still yields efficiency gains compared to assuming all of  $W$  are effect-modifiers. DGM 4 represents a more complex, nonlinear outcome model. This may account for the suboptimal performance of  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  compared to  $\tilde{\lambda}$  under sample size 100. When increasing the sample size to 1000, the advantage of  $\tilde{\theta}$  vs.  $\tilde{\lambda}$  becomes apparent. Finally, under the largest sample size of 10000, both  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  demonstrate marked efficiency gains over  $\tilde{\lambda}$ .

Table 2: Simulation results comparing various “one-step” estimators at increasing sample-sizes among two data-generating mechanisms. There is a positive correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1|W)$  in DGM 1, and a negative correlation between  $\sigma^2(A, W, S = 1)$  and  $P(S = 1|W)$  in DGM 2.

Estimator	$n$	Bias	95% CI Covr.	$n \times \text{Var.}$	Var.	Rel. Eff.
<b>DGM 1</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.05	0.90	50.62	53.72	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	100	0.03	0.94	18.61	22.84	0.43
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.01	0.91	37.64	41.14	0.77
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.95	5.48	5.62	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	1000	0.00	0.94	11.30	10.89	1.94
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.94	11.39	10.44	1.86
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.96	4.82	5.11	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	10000	0.00	0.95	9.61	10.65	2.08
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.95	9.55	10.63	2.08
<b>DGM 2</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.02	0.89	47.02	40.43	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	100	0.01	0.94	4.81	4.67	0.12
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.03	0.87	41.93	37.15	0.92
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.95	13.17	13.30	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	1000	0.00	0.96	2.82	3.05	0.23
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.96	5.61	4.77	0.36
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.94	14.10	13.10	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	10000	0.00	0.94	3.11	2.98	0.23
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.95	3.06	2.99	0.23

Table 3: Simulation results comparing “one-step” estimators,  $\tilde{\theta}$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  at various sample-sizes with data-generating mechanisms 3 and 4.

Estimator	$n$	Bias	95% CI Covr.	$n \times$ Var.	Var.	Rel. Eff.
<b>DGM 3</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$	100	0.38	0.91	97.32	92.98	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.43	0.94	60.89	86.67	0.93
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.10	0.90	106.41	92.40	0.99
$\tilde{\lambda}$	1000	0.04	0.94	328.11	342.26	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.01	0.96	31.63	34.76	0.10
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.04	0.94	199.28	215.98	0.63
$\tilde{\lambda}$	10000	0.00	0.94	110.27	105.26	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.95	33.98	32.06	0.30
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.94	48.54	45.38	0.43
<b>DGM 4</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$	100	0.20	0.95	49.45	52.68	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.36	0.93	116.34	101.57	1.93
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.08	0.92	88.86	87.09	1.65
$\tilde{\lambda}$	1000	0.01	0.91	41.00	34.58	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.94	26.87	27.14	0.78
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.01	0.91	67.71	59.30	1.71
$\tilde{\lambda}$	10000	0.00	0.94	43.36	40.94	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.96	21.67	22.77	0.56
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.95	30.62	31.86	0.78

## 6 Illustrative Example

We now apply our proposed estimators to the Moving to Opportunity study (MTO), which was a randomized trial where families living in public housing in five U.S. cities could sign up to be randomized to receive a Section 8 (also called Housing Choice) voucher (Kling et al., 2007; Sanbonmatsu et al., 2011). These vouchers subsidize rent on the private market for families to be 30-40% of their income. The families (parents and children) were followed for 10-15 years after randomized receipt (or not) of the housing voucher and educational, economic, and health outcomes were measured Sanbonmatsu et al. (2011). Here, we are interested in transporting the ATE of moving with the voucher ( $A$ ) on behavioral problems in adolescence ( $Y$ , scored by the Behavioral Problems Index (Zill, 1990)) from the New York City site ( $S = 1$ ,  $n=1200$  (rounded sample size)) to the Los Angeles site ( $S = 0$ ,  $n=850$  (rounded sample size)) among children who were  $\leq 5$  years old at the time of randomization. The two site-specific ATEs are qualitatively different (-0.0247 vs. 0.0012 for  $S = 1$  vs.  $S = 0$ , respectively). It is possible that differences in the distribution of a sufficient subset of effect modifiers required for transport between the two cities,  $Z$ , can account for some of the difference in site-specific ATEs. We consider baseline covariates,  $W$ , that include parent and child characteristics and characteristics of the baseline neighborhood

(a detailed list is in Section S5 of the Supplementary Materials). For the estimator  $\tilde{\theta}$  that relies on specifying  $V$  and  $Z$ , we include:  $V = \{\text{gender, Black race, parent was under age 18 at birth of child, household member with a disability, parent graduated high school}\}$ , and  $Z = \{\text{household member with a disability, parent graduated high school}\}$ . For this illustrative example, we use a single imputed dataset (missingness was  $\leq 2\%$  for covariates and  $13\%$  for the outcome).

We see in Figure 2 that in New York City, moving with the housing voucher is associated with fewer behavioral problems among adolescent children, 10-15 years after baseline (risk difference (RD) -0.0245, 95% CI: -0.0589, 0.0095). In contrast, in Los Angeles, moving with the housing voucher is not associated with fewer behavioral problems among adolescent children, 10-15 years after baseline (RD 0.0012, 95% CI: -0.0364, 0.0387). To apply our transport estimators, we treat the NYC site as the source population and the LA site as the target population. This means that at this point, we do not use outcome data from LA.


All three transport estimators correctly predict the null association in LA, but with appreciable differences in terms of their estimated variances. Using the existing one-step transport estimator that assumes all  $W$  operates as effect modifiers and differ in distribution across sites,  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , we estimate a slightly positive effect in terms of the point estimate, but one that is decidedly non-statistically significant when taking the very wide confidence into account (RD: 0.0295, 95% CI: -0.1022, 0.1611). In contrast, the confidence intervals using our proposed estimators are much narrower. Our one-step transport estimator that makes use of known  $V$  and  $Z$ ,  $\tilde{\theta}$ , estimates a null association with a confidence interval similar to the nontransported estimate (RD: -0.0054, 95% CI: -0.0398, 0.0290). Similarly, even if we do not specify  $V$  or  $Z$ , our collaborative one-step transport estimator,  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$ , estimate returns a very similar estimate with negligibly wider confidence intervals (RD: -0.0011, 95% CI: -0.0385, 0.0363). The similar estimates obtained from  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  could be because  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  is finding a similar set of  $V$  (parent was under age 18 at birth of child, household member with a disability) and  $Z$  (household member with a disability) as what we hypothesized and input for  $\tilde{\theta}$  (which was specified above).

## 7 Conclusion

We considered whether, and more specifically, when, assuming the existence of a subset of covariates that are effect modifiers ( $V$ ) and a possible further sufficient subset required for transport ( $Z$ ) would result in nonparametric efficiency gains in estimating the transported ATE. We first showed an alternative identification result for the transported ATE that incorporated knowledge of these relevant subsets. We also proposed two novel nonparametric transport estimators of the ATE—one when  $V$  and  $Z$  are known, and one when they are unknown. Both of our novel estimators demonstrated efficiency gains in many of the simulation scenarios considered as well as marked efficiency gains in the illustrative example. This evidence, coupled with comparisons of the efficiency bounds, suggests that our proposed estimators may offer meaningful efficiency gains over the standard nonparametric estimator (Rudolph and van der Laan, 2017) in real-world finite data analyses, particularly in observational studies challenged by practical positivity violations. Efficiency gains are not just a theoretical advantage—they can result in substantially narrower standard errors such that estimates convey more information and may make the difference between detecting versus not detecting a meaningful treatment effect. Moreover, because transport estimators may be used to predict the effect of a treatment or intervention if applied to a new, target population, their



Figure 2: Effect estimates and 95% confidence intervals using data from the Moving to Opportunity Long-term Follow-up. The ATE is interpreted as the effect of moving with the housing voucher on Behavioral Problems Index score among adolescents, 10-15 years after randomization. New York City is considered as the source population and Los Angeles is considered as the target population in this example. “Not transported” denotes estimates using the non-transported one-step estimator; “transportfullw” denotes estimates using the transport one-step estimator  $\tilde{\lambda}$ ; “transport knownvz” denotes estimates using our proposed transport one-step estimator assuming known effect modifiers and a known sufficient subset required for transport  $\tilde{\theta}$ ; and “transport unknownvz” denotes estimates using our proposed transport collaborative one-step estimator when effect modifiers and a sufficient subset required for transport are unknown. All results were approved for release by the U.S. Census Bureau, authorization number CBDRB-FY23-CES018-009.



resulting estimates may be used to make policy decisions and inform population treatment guidelines (Matthay and Glymour, 2022; Stuart, 2021; Mehrotra et al., 2021; Hontelez et al., 2021). Therefore, the ability to detect an effect may mean the difference between deciding to implement versus not implement policies that would improve population health and well-being.

**Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by R01DA056407.

This research was conducted as a part of the U.S. Census Bureau’s Evidence Building Project Series. The Census Bureau has reviewed this data product to ensure appropriate access, use, and disclosure avoidance protection of the confidential source data used to produce this product (Data Management System (DMS) number: P-7504667, Disclosure Review Board (DRB) approval number: CBDRB-FY23-CES018-009).

## References

- Isaiah Andrews and Emily Oster. A simple approximation for evaluating external validity bias. *Economics Letters*, 178:58–62, 2019.
- David Benkeser, Weixin Cai, and Mark J van der Laan. A nonparametric super-efficient estimator of the average treatment effect. *Statistical Science*, 35(3):484–495, 2020.
- Magdalena Bennett, Juan Pablo Vielma, and José R Zubizarreta. Building representative matched samples with multi-valued treatments in large observational studies. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 29(4):744–757, 2020.
- Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, et al. Double machine learning for treatment and causal parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.00060*, 2016.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68, 2018.
- Stephen R Cole and Elizabeth A Stuart. Generalizing evidence from randomized clinical trials to target populations the actg 320 trial. *American journal of epidemiology*, 172(1):107–115, 2010.
- Bénédicte Colnet, Julie Josse, Erwan Scornet, and Gaël Varoquaux. Generalizing a causal effect: sensitivity analysis and missing covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06435*, 2021.
- Issa J Dahabreh, Sarah E Robertson, Eric J Tchetgen, Elizabeth A Stuart, and Miguel A Hernán. Generalizing causal inferences from individuals in randomized trials to all trial-eligible individuals. *Biometrics*, 75(2):685–694, 2019.

- Jerome H Friedman et al. Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *The annals of statistics*, 19(1): 1–67, 1991.
- P Richard Hahn, Jared S Murray, and Carlos M Carvalho. Bayesian regression tree models for causal inference: Regularization, confounding, and heterogeneous effects (with discussion). *Bayesian Analysis*, 15(3):965–1056, 2020.
- Miguel A Hernán, Sonia Hernández-Díaz, Martha M Werler, and Allen A Mitchell. Causal knowledge as a prerequisite for confounding evaluation: an application to birth defects epidemiology. *American journal of epidemiology*, 155(2):176–184, 2002.
- Jan AC Hontelez, Caroline A Bulstra, Anna Yakusik, Erik Lamontagne, Till W Bärnighausen, and Rifat Atun. Evidence-based policymaking when evidence is incomplete: The case of hiv programme integration. *PLoS Medicine*, 18(11):e1003835, 2021.
- Melody Huang. Sensitivity analysis in the generalization of experimental results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03408*, 2022.
- Chris AJ Klaassen. Consistent estimation of the influence function of locally asymptotically linear estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1548–1562, 1987.
- Jeffrey R Kling, Jeffrey B Liebman, and Lawrence F Katz. Experimental analysis of neighborhood effects. *Econometrica*, 75(1):83–119, 2007.
- Fan Li, Kari Lock Morgan, and Alan M Zaslavsky. Balancing covariates via propensity score weighting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(521):390–400, 2018.
- Ellicott C Matthey and M Maria Glymour. Causal inference challenges and new directions for epidemiologic research on the health effects of social policies. *Current Epidemiology Reports*, 9(1):22–37, 2022.
- Megha L Mehrotra, Daniel Westreich, M Maria Glymour, Elvin Geng, and David V Glidden. Transporting subgroup analyses of randomized controlled trials for planning implementation of new interventions. *American journal of epidemiology*, 190(8):1671–1680, 2021.
- Trang Quynh Nguyen, Cyrus Ebnesajjad, Stephen R Cole, and Elizabeth A Stuart. Sensitivity analysis for an unobserved moderator in rct-to-target-population generalization of treatment effects. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 225–247, 2017.
- Trang Quynh Nguyen, Benjamin Ackerman, Ian Schmid, Stephen R Cole, and Elizabeth A Stuart. Sensitivity analyses for effect modifiers not observed in the target population when generalizing treatment effects from a randomized controlled trial: Assumptions, models, effect scales, data scenarios, and implementation details. *PloS one*, 13(12):e0208795, 2018.
- Xinkun Nie and Stefan Wager. Quasi-oracle estimation of heterogeneous treatment effects. *Biometrika*, 108(2):299–319, 2021.
- Xinkun Nie, Guido Imbens, and Stefan Wager. Covariate balancing sensitivity analysis for extrapolating randomized trials across locations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04723*, 2021.

- Judea Pearl. Myth, Confusion, and Science in Causal Analysis. Technical Report R-348, Cognitive Systems Laboratory, Computer Science Department University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, May 2009.
- Judea Pearl. Generalizing experimental findings. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 3(2):259–266, 2015.
- Judea Pearl and Elias Bareinboim. Transportability of causal and statistical relations: A formal approach. In *Twenty-fifth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2011.
- Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55, 1983.
- Kara E Rudolph and Mark J van der Laan. Robust estimation of encouragement-design intervention effects transported across sites. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 79(5):1509, 2017.
- Lisa Sanbonmatsu, Lawrence F Katz, Jens Ludwig, Lisa A Gennetian, Greg J Duncan, Ronald C Kessler, Emma K Adam, Thomas McDade, and Stacy T Lindau. Moving to opportunity for fair housing demonstration program: Final impacts evaluation. 2011.
- Mireille E Schnitzer and Matthew Cefalu. Collaborative targeted learning using regression shrinkage. *Statistics in Medicine*, 37(4):530–543, 2018.
- Elizabeth A Stuart. Accounting for differences in population: Predicting intervention impact at scale. In *The Scale-Up Effect in Early Childhood and Public Policy*, pages 265–279. Routledge, 2021.
- Elizabeth A Stuart, Stephen R Cole, Catherine P Bradshaw, and Philip J Leaf. 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, 2011.
- Elizabeth Tipton. Improving generalizations from experiments using propensity score subclassification: Assumptions, properties, and contexts. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 38(3):239–266, 2013.
- Mark J van der Laan and Susan Gruber. Collaborative double robust targeted maximum likelihood estimation. *The international journal of biostatistics*, 6(1), 2010.
- Tyler J VanderWeele and James M Robins. Four types of effect modification: a classification based on directed acyclic graphs. *Epidemiology*, 18(5):561–568, 2007.
- Daniel Westreich, Jessie K Edwards, Catherine R Lesko, Stephen R Cole, and Elizabeth A Stuart. Target validity and the hierarchy of study designs. *American journal of epidemiology*, 188(2): 438–443, 2019.
- Zhenghao Zeng, Edward H Kennedy, Lisa M Bodnar, and Ashley I Naimi. Efficient generalization and transportation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00092*, 2023.
- Wenjing Zheng and Mark J van der Laan. Cross-validated targeted minimum-loss-based estimation. In *Targeted Learning*, pages 459–474. Springer, 2011.


Nicholas Zill. *Behavior problems index based on parent report*. Child Trends, 1990.

Hui Zou. The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 101(476):1418–1429, 2006.


# Supplementary Materials for Efficiently transporting average treatment effects using a sufficient subset of effect modifiers

Figure S 1: Directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) considering sources of effect heterogeneity across populations,  $S$ .


(a) Differential distribution of  $W$  across  $S$ , where  $W$  may be effect modifiers.



(b) Differential distribution of  $W$  (where  $W$  may be effect modifiers), as well as the conditional distribution of  $M1$  given its parents, and the conditional distribution of  $M2$  given its parents across  $S$ .



(c) Differential distribution of  $W$  (where  $W$  may be effect modifiers), as well as the conditional distribution of  $M1$  given its parents, the conditional distribution of  $M2$  given its parents, and the conditional distribution of  $Y$  given its parents across  $S$ . The differential distribution of  $Y$  given its parents across  $S$  may be due to the differential distribution of unmeasured effect modifiers,  $U$ , across  $S$ .



## S1 Proof of identification result in Lemma 1.

*Proof*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(Y_1 - Y_0 \mid S = 0) &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_1 - Y_0 \mid W, S = 0) \mid S = 0\} \\
&\text{by assumption 1} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_1 - Y_0 \mid A, W, S = 0) \mid S = 0\} \\
&\text{by consistency} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 1, W, S = 0) - \mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 0, W, S = 0) \mid S = 0\} \\
&\text{by assumption 2} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 1, W, S = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 0, W, S = 1) \mid S = 0\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{f(W) \mid S = 0\} \\
&\text{by assumption 3} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid S = 0\} \\
&\text{by assumption 4} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}[f(V) \mid Z, S = 0] \mid S = 0\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}[f(V) \mid Z, S = 1] \mid S = 0\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}[f(V) \mid Z] \mid S = 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## S2 Estimator for $\theta_{\text{alt}}$

Here, we propose an estimator for  $\theta_{\text{alt}}$ , defined below. This estimator only requires that  $Z$  is measured in the target population,  $S = 0$ , so it will be necessary to use  $\theta_{\text{alt}}$  instead of  $\theta$  when  $V \setminus Z$  is not measured in the target population.

$$\theta_{\text{alt}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\} \mid S = 0].$$

As the proposed estimator is based on the efficient influence function, we first give the following result.

**Theorem 4.** *The efficient influence function for estimation of  $\theta_{\text{alt}}$  in the model with Assumptions 3 and 4 is equal to:*

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\theta_{\text{alt}}}(O; \mathbb{P}) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(S = 0)} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S = 1\}(2A - 1) \mathbb{P}(S = 0 \mid Z)}{\mathbb{P}(A \mid S = 1, W) \mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid Z)} \{Y - Af(V) - g(W)\} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S = 1\} \mathbb{P}(S = 0 \mid Z)}{\mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid Z)} [f(V) - \mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\}] \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{1}\{S = 0\} [\mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\} - \theta_2] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We propose a “one-step” semiparametric estimator of  $\theta_{\text{alt}}$  under Assumptions 3 and 4 that is the sample average of the uncentered EIF. We use a doubly robust unbiased transformation to estimate  $f(V)$ , and another doubly robust unbiased transformation to estimate  $\mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\}$ , and then plug these estimates into the one-step estimator. This makes our estimator doubly robust. We use Lemma 2 from the main text and the following:

**Lemma 3** (Doubly robust unbiased transformation for estimation of  $\mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\}$ ). *For any distribution  $P_1$ , define*

$$U(O; P_1) = \frac{\mathbb{1}\{S = 1\}}{P_1(S = 1 \mid Z)} \{f(V) - \mathbb{E}_1(f(V) \mid Z, S = 1)\} + \mathbb{E}_1(f(V) \mid Z, S = 1).$$

*If  $P_1$  is such that  $P_1(S = 1 \mid Z) = P(S = 1 \mid Z)$  or  $\mathbb{E}_1(f(V) \mid Z, S = 1) = \mathbb{E}(f(V) \mid Z, S = 1)$ , we have that  $\mathbb{E}\{U(O; P_1) \mid Z\} = \mathbb{E}\{f(V) \mid Z, S = 1\}$ .*

Our estimation strategy proceeds as follows:

1. First, estimate nuisance parameters  $\hat{P}(A \mid S = 1, W)$  and  $\hat{E}(Y \mid A, W, S = 1)$ , as described in the main text.
2. Use the above nuisance parameter estimates to calculate  $T(O_i; \hat{P})$  for observations with  $S_i = 1$ .
3. Regress  $T(O_i; \hat{P})$  on  $V_i$  among observations with  $S_i = 1$ . The resulting predicted values are estimates of  $f(V_i)$ , denoted  $\hat{f}(V_i)$ .
4. Regress  $\hat{f}(V_i)$  on  $Z_i$  in the source population. The resulting predicted values are denoted  $\hat{E}\{f(V_i) \mid Z_i, S = 1\}$ .
5. Compute  $U(O_i; \hat{P})$  for observations with  $S_i = 1$ .
6. Regress  $U(O_i; \hat{P})$  on  $Z_i$ . Using this fitted model, generate predicted values for all observations  $i$ , denoted  $\hat{E}\{U(O_i; \hat{P}) \mid Z_i\}$ .
7. Compute an initial estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{\text{alt}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i=0\}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{S_i = 0\} \hat{E}\{U(O_i; \hat{P}) \mid Z_i\}$ .
8. Compute estimates of  $g(W_i)$  for observations with  $S_i = 1$ , denoted  $\hat{g}(W_i)$ , by generating predicted values from the estimator of  $\mathbb{E}(Y \mid A = 0, W, S = 1)$ .
9. Compute the one-step estimator as  $\tilde{\theta}_{\text{alt}} = \hat{\theta}_{\text{alt}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum D_{\theta, \text{alt}}(O_i; \hat{P})$ , where  $\hat{P}$  is comprised of  $\hat{P}(A \mid S = 1, W)$ ,  $\hat{P}(S = 1 \mid Z)$ ,  $\hat{f}(V)$ ,  $\hat{g}(W)$  and  $\hat{E}\{f(V) \mid Z\}$ .
10. Last, we can estimate the variance of  $\tilde{\theta}_{\text{alt}}$  as the sample variance of  $\frac{1}{n} \sum D_{\theta, \text{alt}}(O_i; \hat{P})$ .



### S3 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof* We will use the notation  $k(W) = E\{f(W) \mid e_S(W)\}$  in this proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
E[U_\lambda(O; \hat{\eta})] &= E \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{S=1\}}{p} \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}_A(W)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}_A(W)} \right\} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \{Y - Af(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{1-\hat{e}_S(W)}{p} \{\hat{f}(W) - \hat{k}(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{1-e_S(W)}{p} \{\hat{k}(W) - k(W)\} \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{S=1\}}{p} \left\{ \frac{A}{\hat{e}_A(W)} - \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}_A(W)} \right\} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \{A(f(W) - \hat{f}(W)) + g(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{1-e_S(W)}{p} \{\hat{f}(W) - f(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{\hat{e}_S(W) - e_S(W)}{p} \{\hat{f}(W) - \hat{k}(W)\} \right] \\
&= E \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{S=1\}}{p} \frac{A}{\hat{e}_A(W)} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W) + g(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \\
&- E \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1}\{S=1\}}{p} \frac{1-A}{1-\hat{e}_A(W)} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \{g(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{1-e_S(W)}{p} \{\hat{f}(W) - f(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{\hat{e}_S(W) - e_S(W)}{p} \{E[\hat{f}(W) \mid \hat{e}_S(W), e_S(W)] - \hat{k}(W)\} \right] \tag{3} \\
&= E \left[ \frac{e_S(W)}{p} \frac{e_A(W)}{\hat{e}_A(W)} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W) + g(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \\
&- E \left[ \frac{e_S(W)}{p} \frac{1-e_A(W)}{1-\hat{e}_A(W)} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \{g(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{1-e_S(W)}{p} \{\hat{f}(W) - f(W)\} \right] + \text{(3)} \\
&= E \left[ \frac{e_S(W)}{p} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \left\{ \frac{e_A(W)}{\hat{e}_A(W)} - \frac{1-e_A(W)}{1-\hat{e}_A(W)} \right\} \{g(W) - \hat{g}(W)\} \right] \tag{4} \\
&+ E \left[ \left\{ \frac{e_S(W)}{p} \frac{e_A(W)}{\hat{e}_A(W)} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} - \frac{1-e_S(W)}{p} \right\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right] + \text{(3)} \\
&= \text{(4)} \\
&+ E \left[ \frac{e_S(W)}{p} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} \left\{ \frac{e_A(W)}{\hat{e}_A(W)} - 1 \right\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right] \tag{5} \\
&+ E \left[ \left\{ \frac{e_S(W)}{p} \frac{1-\hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} - \frac{1-e_S(W)}{p} \right\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right] + \text{(3)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (3) + (4) + (5) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \frac{e_S(W)}{\mathbf{p}} \frac{1 - \hat{h}_S(W)}{\hat{h}_S(W)} - \frac{1 - e_S(W)}{\mathbf{p}} \right\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right] \\
&= (3) + (4) + (5) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\mathbf{p} \times \hat{h}_S(W)} \{e_S(W) - \hat{h}_S(W)\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right] \\
&= (3) + (4) + (5) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\mathbf{p} \times \hat{h}_S(W)} \{S - \hat{h}_S(W)\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right] \\
&= (3) + (4) + (5) \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\mathbf{p} \times \hat{h}_S(W)} \{h_S^*(W) - \hat{h}_S(W)\} \{f(W) - \hat{f}(W)\} \right], \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where we define  $h_S^*(w) = \mathbb{P}(S = 1 \mid f(W) = f(w), \hat{f}(W) = \hat{f}(w))$ . The theorem follows after noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[U_\lambda(O; \hat{\eta}) - U_\lambda(O; \eta)] &= \hat{\lambda} - \lambda \\
&+ \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\hat{\mathbf{p}}} - 1 \right\} (\hat{\lambda} - \lambda). \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

where we define  $R_U(\hat{\eta}, \eta) = (3) + (4) + (5) + (6) + (7)$ . □

## S4 Additional simulation results

Table S 1: Simulation results comparing “one-step” estimators,  $\tilde{\theta}$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  at various sample-sizes with data-generating mechanisms 1 and 2 with no cross-fitting.

Estimator	$n$	Bias	95% CI Covr.	$n \times \text{Var.}$	Var.	Rel. Eff.
<b>DGM 1</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.09	0.75	11.71	5.16	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	100	0.04	0.86	13.92	8.65	1.68
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.05	0.84	13.01	8.03	1.55
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.95	5.39	5.26	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	1000	0.00	0.95	10.66	10.39	1.97
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.95	9.44	9.87	1.87
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.95	5.13	5.09	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	10000	0.00	0.95	10.48	10.63	2.09
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.95	10.48	10.61	2.08
<b>DGM 2</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.02	0.67	15.08	4.09	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	100	0.01	0.91	3.66	2.72	0.67
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.01	0.70	11.97	2.95	0.72
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.93	12.65	11.11	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	1000	0.00	0.96	2.91	2.93	0.26
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.93	6.95	4.12	0.37
$\tilde{\lambda}$		0.00	0.95	13.36	12.94	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$	10000	0.00	0.96	2.91	2.97	0.23
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.96	2.91	2.97	0.23

Table S 2: Simulation results comparing “one-step” estimators,  $\tilde{\theta}$ ,  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , and  $\tilde{\lambda}_C$  at various sample-sizes with data-generating mechanisms 3 and 4 with no cross-fitting.

Estimator	$n$	Bias	95% CI Covr.	$n \times$ Var.	Var.	Rel. Eff.
<b>DGM 3</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$	100	0.00	0.82	26.81	18.07	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.12	0.86	32.18	26.10	1.44
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.01	0.75	35.76	15.87	0.88
$\tilde{\lambda}$	1000	0.02	0.86	45.85	32.42	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.94	31.71	30.87	0.95
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.91	38.69	32.30	1.00
$\tilde{\lambda}$	10000	0.00	0.95	94.12	90.24	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.95	32.01	31.74	0.35
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.95	41.59	40.82	0.45
<b>DGM 4</b>						
$\tilde{\lambda}$	100	0.19	0.76	16.15	9.70	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.10	0.81	25.34	14.77	1.52
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.13	0.77	26.42	13.41	1.38
$\tilde{\lambda}$	1000	0.03	0.86	29.24	19.78	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.93	23.35	19.96	1.01
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.86	32.79	20.36	1.03
$\tilde{\lambda}$	10000	0.00	0.94	42.31	39.61	1.00
$\tilde{\theta}$		0.00	0.95	22.12	22.06	0.56
$\tilde{\lambda}_C$		0.00	0.94	29.89	27.35	0.69

## S5 MTO baseline covariates

We considered the following baseline covariates,  $W$ , that include parent and child characteristics and characteristics of the baseline neighborhood (with percent missing given in parentheses):

- Adolescent characteristics (all had 0% missing except race/ethnicity, which had 2% missing): site (LA, NYC), age, race/ethnicity (categorized as black, latine, white, other), number of family members (categorized as 2, 3, or 4+), someone from school asked to discuss problems the child had with schoolwork or behavior during the 2 years prior to baseline, child enrolled in special class for gifted and talented students.
- Adult household head characteristics (which all had 0% missing): high school graduate, marital status (never vs ever married), whether had been a teen parent, work status, receipt of AFDC/TANF, whether any family member has a disability.
- Neighborhood characteristics (which all had 0% missing except neighborhood poverty, which had 2% missing): felt neighborhood streets were unsafe at night; very dissatisfied with neighborhood; poverty level of neighborhood.

- Reported reasons for participating in MTO (which had 0% missing): to have access to better schools.
- Moving-related characteristics (which had 0% missing): moved more than 3 times during the 5 years prior to baseline, previous application for Section 8 voucher.