

On a theory of martingales for censoring

Benjamin R. Baer^{*1,2} and Robert L. Strawderman²

¹School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Scotland, KY16 9SS

²Department of Biostatistics and Computational Biology, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, USA, 14642

March 6, 2024

Abstract

A theory of martingales for censoring is developed. The Doob-Meyer martingale is shown to be inadequate in general, and a repaired martingale is proposed with a non-predictable centering term. Associated martingale transforms, variation processes, and covariation processes are developed based on a measure of half-predictability that generalizes predictability. The development is applied to study the Kaplan Meier estimator.

1 Introduction

A great deal of work in survival analysis assumes that the failure and censoring distributions are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. Such assumptions are pragmatic, stemming primarily from the reasonable expectations of sufficient realism and the relative mathematical ease. Additionally, a substantial amount of methodological and theoretical work in survival analysis assumes that the failure and censoring distributions are discrete as a way to avoid delicate probabilistic arguments. Given these considerations, we might anticipate that classical survival analysis theory is well polished, especially in the discrete case.

The seminal work of Aalen (1978) brought the Doob-Meyer theory of martingales derived from counting processes to the forefront of methodological research in survival analysis; there has been a tremendous amount of work published since that time focusing on generalizations and extensions of Aalen's work. Especially influential book-length treatments of this still-active research area include Fleming and Harrington (1991), Andersen et al. (1993), and Kalbfleisch and Prentice (2011).

The purpose of this work is to reveal and repair critical shortcomings with the Doob-Meyer martingale theory surrounding the censoring distribution when there is no assumption of absolute continuity. Although the censoring distribution does not have a central focus in many areas of survival analysis, it arises in the study of estimation of functionals of the failure distribution. For example, in their seminal textbooks on efficiency theory for censored and missing data, van der Laan and Robins (2003, Theorem 1.1) and Tsiatis (2006, Section 9.3) calculate the censoring tangent space assuming discrete time and independent censoring. Results in later sections of this work reveal that each implicitly assumed that their failure and censoring distributions do not share discontinuities; indeed, their calculations are based on a stochastic process for censoring that only reduces to a martingale under this assumption but is generally only an approximation (cf. Corollary 1). In fact, the authors are only aware of a few works that partially address the aforementioned deficiency are brief comments by Gill (1980, p. 36), Gill (1994, p. 170), and very recently some developments in Parner et al. (2023). See also the recent work of Baer et al. (2023) and Strawderman and Baer (2023) which avoid relying on approximations that are only valid under a no-shared-discontinuity assumption; although martingale theory itself plays no direct role in these developments.

In many respects, this work could have appeared decades ago, either as part of or shortly after the insightful developments in the monograph *Censoring and Stochastic Integration* by Gill (1980); nevertheless the results are clearly still timely given that estimation in survival analysis remains an active area of research. Section 2 defines the random variables under study. Section 3 sets the stage by constructing the Doob-Meyer martingale for censoring, developing a repaired martingale, and comparing the two. Interestingly, both martingales represented centered

*Corresponding author: benjamin.baer@st-andrews.ac.uk

versions of the same counting process. Martingale transforms and variation and covariation processes with respect to the repaired martingale are studied in Section 4, then adapted in Section 5 to produce familiar versions based on standard stochastic process theory and predictability. Three applications of the theory are presented in Section 6 concerning estimators of the survival function. Section 7 concludes with a discussion. All proofs are in the appendix.

2 Definitions and Notation

2.1 Observable and latent random variables

Define the time at-risk $X > 0$ and the failure indicator $\Delta \in \{0, 1\}$, and let these be jointly distributed random variables with distribution \mathbb{P} and associated expectation \mathbb{E} . Assume $X < \infty$.

Although not strictly necessary for most developments, we shall also consider latent random variables $T, C > 0$ satisfying $X = T \wedge C$ and $\Delta = I(T \leq C)$ which represent the potential failure and censoring time, respectively. Denote the joint distribution of these latent variables as \mathbb{P}^* with associated expectation \mathbb{E}^* ; the observed data distribution \mathbb{P} is then induced by the latent variable distribution \mathbb{P}^* . Unless otherwise specified, we do not assume T and C are independent.

2.2 Key definitions

For $u > 0$, define the stochastic processes

$$N_T(u) := I(X \leq u, \Delta = 1), \quad N_C(u) := I(X \leq u, \Delta = 0),$$

where N_T (resp. N_C) is the observed failure (resp. censoring) process. Define δ as the increment operator so that $\delta N_C(u) = N_C(u) - N_C(u-)$. For $t \geq 0$, define the corresponding natural filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{N_T(u), N_C(u) : 0 < u \leq t\}.$$

Next, define the stochastic processes

$$Y^\sharp(u) := I\{N_C(u-) = 0, N_T(u-) = 0\}, \quad Y^\dagger(u) := I\{N_C(u-) = 0, N_T(u) = 0\}.$$

For every $u > 0$, the usual at-risk process is given by $Y^\sharp(u) = I(X \geq u)$; the modified at-risk process Y^\dagger is instead given by

$$Y^\dagger(u) = Y^\sharp(u) - \delta N_T(u) = Y^\sharp(u+) + \delta N_C(u).$$

As expected, Y^\sharp is left-continuous; however, the modified at-risk process Y^\dagger is neither left-continuous nor right-continuous.

The process Y^\dagger was introduced in Baer et al. (2023) and plays an important role throughout this paper. Expressed in terms of the latent variables, the modified at-risk process $Y^\dagger(u) = I(T > u, C \geq u)$; hence, at time $u > 0$, this process can be informally interpreted as capturing the risk of being censored at u when the risk for failure has “passed” (i.e., lies beyond u). It will become clear in later developments that Y^\dagger plays an important role in the representation and estimation of functionals of interest in survival analysis.

3 Basic Theoretical Developments

In this section we construct the Doob-Meyer martingale for censoring, develop a repaired martingale, and compare the two.

3.1 Doob-Meyer martingales

Define the cause-specific cumulative functions

$$\Lambda_T^\sharp(t) := \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}}, \quad \Lambda_C^\sharp(t) := \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}},$$

which are well defined for all $t > 0$ through the usual $0/0 = 0$ convention. Finally, define for $t \geq 0$ the familiar stochastic processes

$$M_T^\sharp(t) := N_T(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u), \quad M_C^\sharp(t) := N_C(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u).$$

The following proposition states a result that is well-known.

Proposition 1. M_T^\sharp and M_C^\sharp are the unique Doob-Meyer \mathcal{F}_t -martingales.

Since M_C^\sharp is the unique Doob-Meyer martingale constructed by centering the observed censoring process N_C with a \mathcal{F}_t -predictable compensator, M_C^\sharp is often taken to be the relevant martingale when studying estimation of the censoring distribution and related functionals under random censoring. However, as will be shown below, this choice is not always appropriate.

3.2 Identification in the latent variable model

Define the latent marginal cumulative hazards as

$$\Lambda_T(t) := \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{P}^*(T \leq u)}{\mathbb{P}^*(T \geq u)}, \quad \Lambda_C(t) := \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{P}^*(C \leq u)}{\mathbb{P}^*(C \geq u)}.$$

These are functionals of the latent variable distribution \mathbb{P}^* and cannot necessarily be estimated with the observed data in the absence of assumptions.

Under independent censoring (i.e., $T \perp C$), it is well-established that $\Lambda_T^\sharp(t) = \Lambda_T(t)$ for all $t > 0$ of practical interest. Given the form of the Doob-Meyer martingale M_C^\sharp , one might assert that $\Lambda_C^\sharp(t) = \Lambda_C(t)$ for such t under independent censoring. However, this is not necessarily true. Define

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) := \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}};$$

similarly to Λ_C^\sharp , the function Λ_C^\dagger is well-defined as a Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral under the $0/0 = 0$ convention; see Appendix A.1, where it is additionally shown that Λ_C^\dagger is right-continuous. The result given below establishes that Λ_C^\dagger is the identification of Λ_C under independent censoring.

Theorem 1. If $T \perp C$, then $\Lambda_T^\sharp(t) = \Lambda_T(t)$ for $t > 0$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t)\} > 0$ and $\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \Lambda_C(t)$ for $t > 0$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(t)\} > 0$.

The asymmetry in identification of the cumulative hazards for failure and censoring stem directly from the asymmetry in Δ . This same theorem was proved in Baer et al. (2023) under a nominally weaker assumption. The equality does not necessarily hold for large t since for example aggressive early censorship could preclude observation of late failures.

Additional assumptions are needed to be able to equate Λ_C and Λ_C^\sharp . In view of Theorem 1, these assumptions follow from the assumptions needed to be able to equate Λ_C^\dagger and Λ_C^\sharp . Considering their definitions and where all quantities are finite, the latter are directly related through the expression

$$d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = \left\{ 1 - \frac{\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} \right\} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = \left\{ 1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \right\} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

Evidently, equality of Λ_C^\sharp and Λ_C^\dagger therefore depends on the behavior of both Λ_C^\dagger and Λ_T^\sharp . For example, the identity above shows that $d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) = d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)$ when Λ_T^\sharp is continuous at u . The next result establishes necessary and sufficient conditions under which $\Lambda_C^\sharp = \Lambda_C^\dagger$.

Proposition 2. For any $t > 0$, $\Lambda_C^\sharp(t) = \Lambda_C^\dagger(t)$ if and only if $\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$.

An obvious corollary is, under independent censoring and for $t > 0$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(t)\} > 0$, that $\Lambda_C^\sharp(t) = \Lambda_C(t)$ if and only if $\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\}\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$. This condition expresses that there are no-shared-discontinuities between the failure and censoring distributions and is entirely avoided by studying Λ_C^\dagger rather than Λ_C^\sharp .

3.3 A repaired censoring martingale

Define the stochastic process

$$M_C^\dagger(t) := N_C(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = N_C(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}.$$

The process M_C^\dagger was recently studied by Baer et al. (2023) in a nonparametric efficiency theory setting; it vanishes in expectation due to the appearance of Y^\dagger in both the numerator and denominator. The following result shows that it is also a martingale.

Theorem 2. M_C^\dagger is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

At first glance, this theorem would appear to contradict the uniqueness noted in Proposition 1, which may be regarded as a direct consequence of the Doob-Meyer theorem. However, it is important to keep in mind that the Doob-Meyer theorem only pertains to centering terms (i.e. compensators) with finite expectation that are increasing, right-continuous, and \mathcal{F}_t -predictable. The following result establishes that there is no contradiction to the Doob-Meyer theorem because the centering term

$$A_C^\dagger(t) := \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}$$

used to define M_C^\dagger is not \mathcal{F}_t -predictable, hence does not meet the key premise of the Doob-Meyer theorem.

Proposition 3. The centering term A_C^\dagger in the \mathcal{F}_t -martingale $M_C^\dagger = N_C - A_C^\dagger$ is increasing, right-continuous, satisfies $A_C^\dagger(0) = 0$ but is not \mathcal{F}_t -predictable.

Although the result makes clear that A_C^\dagger is a non-standard centering term due to its non-predictability, it does not clarify the relationship between A_C^\dagger and the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable centering term of the Doob-Meyer martingale M_C^\sharp . When X is discrete we may readily see for $t \geq 0$ that the centering term of M_C^\sharp satisfies that

$$A_C^\sharp(t) := \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \mathbb{E}\{\delta N_C(u) \mid \mathcal{F}_{u-}\} \quad (1)$$

is a sum of expectations conditional on \mathcal{F}_{u-} . Indeed, this is an example of the Doob decomposition (Durrett, 2010, Theorem 5.2.10) for discrete time martingales, and it is routinely used to motivate properties of Doob-Meyer martingales in continuous time.

Define the filtration

$$\mathcal{G}_t := \sigma\{N_T(u) : 0 < u \leq t; N_C(u) : 0 < u < t\}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{F}_{t-} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t$ for all $t > 0$: whereas \mathcal{F}_{t-} contains all information *before* time t , the sigma algebra \mathcal{G}_t additionally contains *present* information about N_T at time t . When X is discrete we may readily see for $t \geq 0$ that

$$A_C^\dagger(t) = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \mathbb{E}\{\delta N_C(u) \mid \mathcal{G}_u\} \quad (2)$$

is a sum of expectations conditional on \mathcal{G}_u rather than on \mathcal{F}_{u-} . Importantly, the martingale “drift-free” property holds for both M_C^\sharp and M_C^\dagger by removing information in the past.

3.4 Comparison

The identification result in Theorem 1, combined with Theorem 2, shows that M_C^\dagger is in general the relevant martingale to analyze when the latent cumulative hazard Λ_C for censoring is of interest. We now state a result that directly compares M_C^\dagger to the Doob-Meyer martingale M_C^\sharp ; this may be considered as a modest extension of Proposition 2. Recall that two stochastic processes are indistinguishable if they are almost surely equal uniformly over time.

Corollary 1. M_C^\sharp and M_C^\dagger are indistinguishable if and only if $\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = 0$ for all $u > 0$.

Under the more stringent no-shared-discontinuities condition in Corollary 1, the Doob-Meyer martingale M_C^\sharp can be studied in place of M_C^\dagger . Earlier work has often implicitly relied on this no-shared-discontinuities condition by working with M_C^\sharp (see e.g. van der Laan and Robins, 2003; Tsiatis, 2006).

4 Martingale Transforms

We now turn our attention to developing a theory for transforms of the martingale M_C^\dagger . Throughout we exploit that the centering term A_C^\dagger of the \mathcal{F}_t -martingale M_C^\dagger is \mathcal{G}_t -adapted. We start by generalizing the notion of \mathcal{F}_t -predictability. Define the set of half-predictable rectangles

$$\{0\} \times A, A \in \mathcal{G}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad [a, b) \times A, 0 < a < b \leq \infty, A \in \mathcal{G}_a. \quad (3)$$

Define \mathcal{H} as the sigma algebra generated by the half-predictable rectangles, and define a process H as half-predictable if, as a mapping from $[0, \infty) \times \Omega$ to \mathbb{R} , it is \mathcal{H} -measurable.

Lemma 1. *If H is a half-predictable process, then H is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and, for any $t > 0$, $H(t)$ is \mathcal{G}_t -measurable.*

The lemma shows that half-predictability generalizes \mathcal{F}_t -predictability and implies \mathcal{G}_t -adaptedness.

4.1 Martingale transforms

Define the martingale transform

$$(H \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) := \int_{(0,t]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u),$$

for a stochastic process H . Fleming and Harrington (1991, Theorems 1.5.1 and 2.4.1) show that $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is a martingale whenever H is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and bounded, driven by the predictability of the centering term (or compensator) of M_C^\dagger .

For the martingale of interest M_C^\dagger , the centering term is not \mathcal{F}_t -predictable but is \mathcal{G}_t -adapted. The following result is suggested by the corresponding heuristic motivation that for all $u > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\delta M_C^\dagger(u) \mid \mathcal{G}_u\} = 0,$$

which is established in detail in Appendix B.1.

Theorem 3. *If H is half-predictable and bounded, then $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.*

Since the constant function $u \mapsto 1$ is \mathcal{G}_t -adapted and bounded, Theorem 3 shows that the stochastic process $M_C^\dagger = 1 \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale. Thus Theorem 3 generalizes Theorem 2 to create a large class of martingales based on M_C^\dagger . A simplified statement and proof of Theorem 3 is provided in Appendix B.2 that assumes discrete time.

4.2 Variation and covariation processes

Second order moments of martingale transforms may be conveniently calculated based on a theory of covariation processes. Fleming and Harrington (1991, Theorems 2.4.3 and 2.6.1) study predictable covariation processes based on M_T^\dagger ; in this section we consider covariation processes based on M_C^\dagger that have half-predictable centering terms.

Define the multiplicative survival functions

$$F^\sharp(t) := \prod_{(0,t]} \left\{ 1 - d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \right\}, \quad G^\dagger(t) := \prod_{(0,t]} \left\{ 1 - d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\},$$

where \prod is the product integral (Gill and Johansen, 1990).

Theorem 4. *If H_1, H_2 are bounded and half-predictable processes, then the process*

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger) - \int_{(0,\cdot]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)$$

is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale. If H_1 is a bounded and half-predictable process and H_3 is a bounded and \mathcal{F}_t -predictable process, then the process

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(H_3 \cdot M_T^\dagger)$$

is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

The theorem shows that M_T^\sharp and M_C^\dagger are orthogonal despite that M_T^\sharp and M_C^\sharp are generally only orthogonal when $\mathbb{E}\{N_T(\cdot)\}$ and $\mathbb{E}\{N_C(\cdot)\}$ share no discontinuities (see e.g. Theorem 2.6.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991)). A simplified statement and proof of Theorem 4 is provided in Appendix B.4 that assumes discrete time.

The covariation process result could be anticipated by considering $H_1(u) = H_3(u) = I(u = a)$, for some $a \in (0, t]$. In this case the product of the two martingale transforms

$$\begin{aligned} (H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_3 \cdot M_T^\sharp)(t) &= \left\{ \delta N_C(a) - Y^\dagger(a) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(a) \right\} \left\{ \delta N_T(a) - Y^\sharp(a) \delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(a) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \delta N_C(a) - Y^\dagger(a) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(a) \right\} \left\{ -\delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(a) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is a martingale by Theorem 3 as it is proportional to $(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t)$. In this simple case, a half-predictable centering term is identically zero.

5 Alternative Development: Doob-Meyer Martingales and Predictability

The development so far has been based entirely on \mathcal{G}_t -adaptedness due to the special structure of the centering term A_C^\dagger of M_C^\dagger . In this section, we exploit standard stochastic process theory from the Strasbourg school (Andersen et al., 1993, p. 116-117) to develop alternative versions of some of the previous results which make more stringent assumptions. The starting point is the following algebraic identity, which expresses M_C^\dagger through the Doob-Meyer martingales M_T^\sharp and M_C^\sharp .

Lemma 2. *For all $t > 0$, $M_C^\dagger(t) = M_C^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u)$.*

The identity provides an alternative proof of Theorem 2 which states that M_C^\dagger is a martingale, as described in detail in Appendix C.2. An alternative proof of Corollary 1 is also provided there.

Now we consider a version of Theorem 3 which concerns transforms of the martingale M_C^\dagger . In light of Lemma 2, such martingale transforms are simply sums of transforms of M_C^\sharp and M_T^\dagger , which are well understood.

Proposition 4. *Assume $\mathbb{E}[\int_{(0,\infty)} H^2(u) \{1 - \delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\int_{(0,\infty)} H^2(u) \{1 - \delta \Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)] < \infty$. If H is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and locally bounded, then $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.*

Compared with Theorem 3, this result assumes that H is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable, which is more restrictive than being half-predictable.

We now consider variation and covariation processes of martingale transforms.

Proposition 5. *If H_1 and H_2 are \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and locally bounded, then the following is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale*

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) H_2(u) \frac{F^\sharp(u) G^\dagger(u)}{F^\sharp(u-) G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

If H_1 and H_2 are \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and locally bounded, then the following is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_T^\sharp)(t).$$

The centering terms in Proposition 5 are \mathcal{F}_t -predictable as a direct consequence of applying the standard theory to provide them. In the following corollary, we leverage another algebraic identity analogous to Lemma 2 and stated in Appendix C.1 to produce the same half-predictable centering terms as in Theorem 4.

Corollary 2. *If H_1 and H_2 are \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and locally bounded, then the following is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale*

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) H_2(u) \frac{F^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

If H_1 and H_2 are \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and locally bounded, then the following is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_T^\sharp)(t).$$

Although the development in this section is fairly intuitive, it is also somewhat less natural than the earlier development based on half-predictability. Besides requiring a stronger assumption of \mathcal{F}_t -predictability, the results in this section break down in more general contexts; see Section 6.3 for more discussion.

6 Applications to the Kaplan Meier Estimator

In this section we highlight two applications of the theory developed for M_C^\dagger . Among the most pervasive problems in survival analysis is the estimation of the failure survival function

$$F(t) := \prod_{(0,t]} \left\{ 1 - d\Lambda_T(u) \right\}.$$

based on an i.i.d. sample of the observed data with size n . Denote \mathbb{P}_n as the empirical distribution with expectation \mathbb{E}_n .

Since $F(t) = F^\sharp(t)$ under independent censoring and for $t > 0$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t)\} > 0$, by Theorem 1, this problem is often reduced to estimation of $F^\sharp(t)$. The standard nonparametric estimator is the Kaplan and Meier (1958) estimator

$$F_n^\sharp(t) := \prod_{(0,t]} \left\{ 1 - \frac{d\mathbb{E}_n\{N_T(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}_n\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} \right\},$$

which may be recognized as a plugin estimator given the form of Λ_T^\sharp and the definition of F^\sharp .

The martingale theory in the previous sections was developed for a single observation. Throughout this section we apply minor extensions of these earlier results to a sample of independent observations.

6.1 Application I: Variance

The theory of transforms of M_C^\dagger may be applied to calculate the asymptotic variance of the Kaplan Meier estimator since its influence function

$$\frac{I(X > t)}{G^\dagger(t)} + \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} - F^\sharp(t), \quad (4)$$

which dictates its first-order asymptotic behavior, contains a martingale transform based on M_C^\dagger .

Proposition 6. *Let $t > 0$ and define the variance*

$$\sigma^2(t) := \{F^\sharp(t)\}^2 \int_{(0,t]} \frac{1}{G^\dagger(u-)} d \left\{ \frac{1}{F^\sharp(u)} \right\}.$$

The Kaplan Meier estimator $F_n^\sharp(t)$ satisfies $\sqrt{n}\{F_n^\sharp(t) - F^\sharp(t)\} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}\{0, \sigma^2(t)\}$.

The asymptotic variance was first derived by Greenwood (1926) in a rather different setting. The results of nonparametric efficiency theory show that $\sigma^2(t)$ is the nonparametric efficiency bound for estimating $F^\sharp(t)$ and hence that the Kaplan Meier estimator $F_n^\sharp(t)$ is asymptotically efficient (Bickel et al., 1993).

6.2 Application II: Covariance

The theory of transforms of M_C^\dagger may again be applied to calculate the asymptotic covariance of the Kaplan Meier estimator at distinct time points. The influence function of the Kaplan Meier estimator, reported in Eq. (4), may be algebraically rewritten using integration by parts as

$$- \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_T^\sharp(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)}, \quad (5)$$

as discussed by Baer et al. (2023, Section 5.1.3).

We may therefore calculate the covariance using the covariation process between transforms of M_C^\sharp and M_C^\dagger .

Proposition 7. *Let $s, t > 0$ and define the covariance*

$$\sigma^2(s, t) := F^\sharp(s)F^\sharp(t) \int_{(0, s \wedge t]} \frac{1}{G^\dagger(u-)} d \left\{ \frac{1}{F^\sharp(u)} \right\}.$$

The Kaplan Meier estimator F_n^\sharp satisfies that the vector $(F_n^\sharp(s), F_n^\sharp(t))$ is asymptotically normal with expectation zero and covariance $\sigma^2(s, t)$.

Although the result derived here considers only two time points $s, t > 0$, existing results show that the function F_n^\sharp is asymptotically a Gaussian process with kernel σ^2 (Andersen et al., 1993).

6.3 Application III: the class of estimators

In this section, we consider estimation of the marginal functional

$$F^\sharp(t) = \prod_{(0,t]} \left\{ 1 - \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} \right\}$$

when more data is available and other estimators are available besides the Kaplan Meier estimator.

Consider that data on a finite-dimensional time-varying variable L is available in addition to the data on N_T, N_C considered previously. Denote $\bar{L}(t) = \{L(u) : 0 \leq u \leq t\}$ as the history of the variable. With this additional data, the natural filtration is now $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\{L(u), 0 \leq u \leq t; N_T(u), N_C(u), 0 < u \leq t\}$ and also $\mathcal{G}_t := \sigma\{L(u), 0 \leq u \leq t; N_T(u) : 0 < u \leq t; N_C(u) : 0 \leq u < t\}$. The results in Sections 3 and 4 may be readily verified as continuing to hold in this setting.

The following result gives the influence function of all regular and asymptotically linear estimators for $F^\sharp(t)$, which characterizes all well-behaved (i.e. regular and asymptotically linear) estimators (Tsiatis, 2006). As with F^\sharp , the definitions of G^\dagger and M_C^\dagger are unchanged.

Proposition 8 (Theorem 3 in Baer et al. (2023)). *If G^\dagger is known, the class of influence function for estimating $F^\sharp(t)$ is*

$$\frac{\Delta}{G^\dagger(X-)} I(X > t) + \int_{(0,\infty)} H\{u; \bar{L}(u)\} dM_C^\dagger(u) - F^\sharp(t),$$

where H is sufficiently regular index function that varies to generate the class.

Note that the influence function of the Kaplan-Meier estimator belongs to this class; see Lemma 1 in Baer et al. (2023).

When L is left-continuous, it is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable, so the integral in Proposition 8 may be shown to be a martingale transform using the predictability-based techniques in Section 5. More generally, it may not be left-continuous; for example, Baer et al. (2023) develop Proposition 8 in the context of L being a recurrent event process which is clearly not \mathcal{F}_t -predictable. In general, the theory developed in Section 4 may be used to study the influence functions.

7 Discussion

Although the basic survival analysis setting involving the time at-risk X and the failure indicator Δ has been intensely studied, the vast majority of existing work has exclusively focused on the observed failure process N_T . We showed that the observed censoring process N_C arises naturally in the study of N_T and, surprisingly, that proper analysis differs in some important ways from that of N_T . The familiar terms $Y^\sharp, \Lambda_T^\sharp, M_T^\sharp$ are appropriate for the direct study of N_T while the somewhat unfamiliar terms $Y^\dagger, \Lambda_C^\dagger, M_C^\dagger$ are most appropriate for the study of N_C . We developed an understanding of M_C^\dagger through half-predictability that lead to general results on martingale transforms and covariation processes.

The relationship between $\Delta = I(T \leq C)$ and the latent variables T, C imposes that that censoring occurs after failure, even when coincident (Kaplan and Meier, 1958); as a pivotal consequence, ties (i.e. that $T = C$) are not considered to be observable. This may be updated by defining the failure indicator instead by $\Delta = I(T \leq C) + I(T = C) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ (Langberg et al., 1978). Equivalently, the observed failure and censoring processes could be defined as

$$N'_T(u) := I(T \leq u, T \leq C), \quad N'_C(u) := I(C \leq u, C \leq T);$$

in this case, both jump at a tie, and (N'_C, N'_T) is no longer a multivariate counting process. Alternatively, a third process could be introduced that only jumps at ties.

A natural extension of our work would be to competing risks where multiple types of failure may coincide with each other. Additionally, extending the study of half-predictability to incorporate localization would interesting.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Ashkan Ertefaie for helpful conversations during the initial stages of the work. BB was partially supported by the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (R61/R33 NS120240).

References

- Aalen, O. (1978). Nonparametric inference for a family of counting processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(4):701–726.
- Andersen, P. K., Borgan, Ø., Gill, R. D., and Keiding, N. (1993). *Statistical Models Based on Counting Processes*. Springer Verlag, New York.
- Baer, B. R., Strawderman, R. L., and Ertefaie, A. (2023). Causal inference for the expected number of recurrent events in the presence of a terminal event. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16571*.
- Bickel, P. J., Klaassen, C. A., Ritov, Y., and Wellner, J. A. (1993). *Efficient and Adaptive Eestimation for Semiparametric Models*. Springer, New York.
- Durrett, R. (2010). *Probability: Theory and Examples*, volume 4. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Elliott, R. J. (1982). *Stochastic Calculus and Applications*, volume 1. Springer Verlag, New York.
- Fleming, T. R. and Harrington, D. P. (1991). *Counting Processes and Survival Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Gill, R. D. (1980). *Censoring and Stochastic Integrals*. Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- Gill, R. D. (1994). Lectures on survival analysis. In Bernard, P., editor, *Ecole d'Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XXII*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Gill, R. D. and Johansen, S. (1990). A survey of product-integration with a view toward application in survival analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 18(4):1501–1555.
- Greenwood, M. (1926). A report on the natural duration of cancer. In *Her Majesty's Stationary Office*, 33, pages 1–26, London.
- He, S.-W., Wang, J.-G., and Yan, J. (1992). *Semimartingale Theory and Stochastic Calculus*. CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- Kalbfleisch, J. D. and Prentice, R. L. (2011). *The Statistical Analysis of Failure Time Data*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kaplan, E. L. and Meier, P. (1958). Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53(282):457–481.
- Langberg, N., Proschan, F., and Quinzi, A. (1978). Converting dependent models into independent ones, preserving essential features. *The Annals of Probability*, 6(1):174–181.
- Parner, E. T., Andersen, P. K., and Overgaard, M. (2023). Regression models for censored time-to-event data using infinitesimal jack-knife pseudo-observations, with applications to left-truncation. *Lifetime Data Analysis*, pages 1–18.
- Peterson Jr, A. V. (1976). Bounds for a joint distribution function with fixed sub-distribution functions: Application to competing risks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 73(1):11–13.
- Strawderman, R. L. and Baer, B. R. (2023). On the role of Volterra integral equations in self-consistent, product-limit, inverse probability of censoring weighted, and redistribution-to-the-right estimators for the survival function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09020v3*.
- Tsiatis, A. A. (2006). *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*. Springer, New York.
- van der Laan, M. J. and Robins, J. M. (2003). *Unified Methods for Censored Longitudinal Data and Causality*. Springer, New York.
- van der Laan, M. J. and Rose, S. (2011). *Targeted Learning: Causal Inference for Observational and Experimental Data*. Springer, New York.

A Additional Material for Section 3	10
A.1 Basic properties of Λ_C^\dagger	10
A.2 Proofs	10
B Additional Material for Section 4	14
B.1 Proof of martingale transform	14
B.2 Proof of martingale transform in discrete time	15
B.3 Proof of variation and covariation processes	16
B.4 Proof of variation and covariation processes in discrete time	18
C Additional Material for Section 5	22
C.1 Proofs	22
C.2 Alternative proofs of previous results	26
D Additional Material for Section 6	27

A Additional Material for Section 3

A.1 Basic properties of Λ_C^\dagger

We start by showing that Λ_C^\dagger is well-defined. First, we establish that $\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t) - N_C(s)\} > 0$ implies that $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(s)\} > 0$ for all $t > s > 0$. According to the definitions of N_C and Y^\dagger , we see that $\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t) - N_C(s)\} = \mathbb{P}(\Delta = 0, s < X \leq t)$ and $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(s)\} = \mathbb{P}(X > s) + \mathbb{P}(X = s, \Delta = 0)$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\Delta = 0, s < X \leq t) \leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta = 0, X > s)$, it is now easy to see that $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(s)\} > 0$. Next, we show that $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(s)\} = 0$ implies $\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t) - N_C(s)\} = 0$ for all $t > s > 0$. Here, $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(s)\} = 0$ necessarily implies $\mathbb{P}(\Delta = 0, X > s) = 0$; hence, we must also have $\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t) - N_C(s)\} = \mathbb{P}(\Delta = 0, s < X \leq t) = 0$. Under the usual convention that $0/0 = 0$, it follows that $\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) < \infty$ is finite for $t \in \mathcal{S}$ and constant and well-defined for $t \in \mathcal{S}^c$.

Finally, we show that Λ_C^\dagger is right-continuous. In particular, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \searrow t} \int_{(0,s]} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} &= \lim_{s \searrow t} \int_{(0,\infty)} I(u \leq s) \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} \left\{ \lim_{s \searrow t} I(u \leq s) \right\} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} I(u \leq t) \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the monotone convergence theorem.

A.2 Proofs

Throughout the proofs in this section we adopt the following helpful notation to study tail behavior. Define the sets $\mathcal{S}^- = \{s : \mathbb{E}[Y^\sharp(s+)] > 0\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{s : \mathbb{E}[Y^\dagger(s)] > 0\}$, and $\mathcal{S}^+ = \{s : \mathbb{E}[Y^\sharp(s)] > 0\}$. Then, because $Y^\sharp(s+) \leq Y^\dagger(s) \leq Y^\sharp(s)$ for $s > 0$, it can be shown that $\mathcal{S}^- \subseteq \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^+$. Define $\tau = \sup \mathcal{S}^+$; then, because $\sup \mathcal{S}^+ = \sup \mathcal{S}^-$, it follows that $\tau = \sup \mathcal{S}$.

Proof of Proposition 1. These results are well-known. For example, Theorems 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 of Fleming and Harrington (1991) can be used to establish the result for M_T^\sharp ; parallel calculations then prove that M_C^\sharp is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale. Uniqueness follows from Theorem 1.4.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991). \square

Proof of Theorem 1. For $t \in \mathcal{S}$, we see that

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{P}(X \leq u, \Delta = 0)}{\mathbb{P}^*(T > u, C \geq u)} = \int_{(0,t]} \frac{\mathbb{P}^*(T > u) d\mathbb{P}^*(C \leq u)}{\mathbb{P}^*(T > u, C \geq u)} = \int_{(0,t]} \frac{d\mathbb{P}^*(C \leq u)}{\mathbb{P}^*(C \geq u)}.$$

The second equality follows from iterated expectation, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq t, \Delta = 0) = \mathbb{P}^*(C \leq t, T > C) = \int_{(0,t]} \mathbb{P}^*(T > u) d\mathbb{P}^*(C \leq u).$$

Note the central importance of the asymmetric definition of $\Delta = I(T \leq C)$ in this expression.

The proof that $\Lambda_T^\sharp(t) = \Lambda_T(t)$ for $t \in \mathcal{S}^+$ is well-known and follows similarly. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Appendix A.1 shows that Λ_C^\dagger is right-continuous. To prove the first result, we consider the cases $t < \tau$ and $t \geq \tau$ separately.

First, suppose that $t < \tau$. Then, $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t)\} \geq \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(t)\} > 0$. In this case, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_C^\dagger(t) - \Lambda_C^\sharp(t) &= \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} \right\} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\} - \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \frac{\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \frac{\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\} \delta\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\} \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\ &= \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u). \end{aligned}$$

The summation in this last expression vanishes if and only if $\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)$ and $\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)$ share no discontinuities on $(0, t]$. This establishes for $t < \tau$ that $\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \Lambda_C^\sharp(t)$ if and only if $\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)$ and $\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)$ share no discontinuities on $(0, t]$.

Next, we consider the case where $t \geq \tau$. We begin by noting that for such t , we can write

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) - \Lambda_C^\sharp(t) = \left\{ \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau-) - \Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau-) \right\} + \left\{ \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) \right\} + \left\{ \Lambda_C^\dagger(t) - \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \Lambda_C^\sharp(t) + \Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) \right\}.$$

By the arguments given previously, the first term is zero if and only if $\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = 0$ for every $u < \tau$. Hence, we must only establish conditions under which the remaining terms on the right-hand side are zero. To do so, it is helpful to separately consider the cases where $\tau \in \mathcal{S}^c$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$.

Suppose $\tau \in \mathcal{S}^c$. Then, note that $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\} = \mathbb{P}(X \geq u) = 0$ for any $u \geq \tau$. Following arguments similar to those in Appendix A.1, it is easy to show that $\mathbb{P}(vX \geq u) = 0$ implies that $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\} = 0$ and hence that $\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\} = \delta\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = 0$. Therefore,

$$\left\{ \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) \right\} + \left\{ \Lambda_C^\dagger(t) - \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \Lambda_C^\sharp(t) + \Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) \right\} = 0$$

there and the result stated in the proposition holds.

Now, suppose that $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$. In this case, $(\tau, t] \in \mathcal{S}^c$ and the argument just given can again be used to prove that

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) - \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \Lambda_C^\sharp(t) + \Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) = 0.$$

It therefore suffices to consider what happens to $\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau)$ when $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$. In this case, we must have $\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) > 0$ and $\delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) > 0$; since these differ only by the choice of denominator, equality holds if and only if $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(\tau)\} = \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(\tau)\}$. However, $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(\tau)\} = \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(\tau)\}$ if and only if $\delta\mathbb{E}\{N_T(\tau)\} = 0$, or equivalently, $\delta\Lambda_T^\dagger(\tau) = 0$. Hence, when $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, $\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) = 0$ if and only if $\delta\Lambda_T^\dagger(\tau) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(\tau) = 0$.

Taken together, the above arguments establish that, for each $t > 0$, $\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \Lambda_C^\sharp(t)$ if and only if

$$\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = 0$$

for all $u \in (0, t]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. The stochastic process $M_C^\dagger(t)$ is clearly adapted. For $t > 0$, $M_C^\dagger(t)$ is also absolutely integrable since

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| N_C(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right| \right\} &\leq \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t)\} + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t)\} + \int_{(0,t]} \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t)\} + \int_{(0,t]} \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\} \frac{d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t) + N_C(t)\} \\
&\leq 2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the interchange of expectations and integration in the first equality is justified by Tonelli's theorem.

Finally, we establish the no-drift property that $\mathbb{E}\{M(t+s) \mid \mathcal{F}_t\} = M(t)$ for any $s > 0$. After rewriting these expressions in the same manner as Fleming and Harrington (1991), we find that we must show that

$$\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t+s) - N_C(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right\}. \quad (6)$$

When $Y^\sharp(t+) = 0$ almost surely, this follows immediately since both expressions vanish.

Now assume $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t+)\} > 0$; the first term simplifies as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t+s) - N_C(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t\} &= \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t+s) - N_C(t) \mid N_T(u), N_C(u), 0 \leq u \leq t\} \\
&= Y^\sharp(t+) \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t+s) - N_C(t) \mid Y^\sharp(t+) = 1\} \\
&= Y^\sharp(t+) \frac{\mathbb{E}\{N_C(t+s) - N_C(t)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t+)\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the second term simplifies as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right\} &= Y^\sharp(t+) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \mid Y^\sharp(t+) = 1 \right\} \\
&= Y^\sharp(t+) \int_{(t,t+s]} \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u) \mid Y^\sharp(t+) = 1\} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= Y^\sharp(t+) \int_{(t,t+s]} \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t+)\}} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \frac{Y^\sharp(t+)}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t+)\}} \int_{(t,t+s]} \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \frac{Y^\sharp(t+)}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(t+)\}} \int_{(t,t+s]} d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}.
\end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The desired result (6) now follows since $\int_{(t,t+s]} d\mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = \mathbb{E}\{N_C(t+s) - N_C(t)\}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. The centering term may be expressed as

$$\int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = \begin{cases} I(X > t) \Lambda_C^\dagger(t) + I(X \leq t) \Lambda_C^\dagger(X) & \text{when } \Delta = 0, \\ I(X > t) \Lambda_C^\dagger(t) + I(X \leq t) \Lambda_C^\dagger(X-) & \text{when } \Delta = 1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Appendix A.1 shows that Λ_C^\dagger is right-continuous; hence, in each case, the centering term is right-continuous. Since N_C is right-continuous, it follows that M_C^\dagger is also right-continuous.

We now show that the centering term is not \mathcal{F}_t -predictable by considering the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - \int_{(0,t]} \delta N_T(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - \int_{(0,t)} \delta N_T(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - \delta N_T(t) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(t) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - I(\Delta = 1, X < t) \left\{ \Lambda_C^\dagger(X) - \Lambda_C^\dagger(X-) \right\} - \delta N_T(t) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(t), \end{aligned}$$

valid for all $t > 0$. The first summand is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, , e.g. Proposition 1.4.2). The second summand is also \mathcal{F}_t -predictable as it is adapted and left-continuous (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Lemma 1.4.1). Since the first and second summands are \mathcal{F}_t -predictable, the centering term is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable if and only if the final summand is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable. However, $\delta N_T(t) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(t)$ is clearly not \mathcal{F}_t -predictable since, for $t > 0$, $\delta N_T(t) = N_T(t) - N_T(t-)$ depends on $N_T(t)$ which is not in \mathcal{F}_{t-} (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Proposition 1.4.1, Exercise 1.6). \square

Before the proof of Corollary 1, we provide two lemmas.

Lemma A.2.1. *Let $U(t)$ and $V(t)$ be two right-continuous processes for $t \geq 0$. Then, U and V are indistinguishable if and only if $U(t) = V(t)$ almost surely for each $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. The result is well-known in the literature. If U and V are indistinguishable, $U(t) = V(t)$ are almost surely for each $t \geq 0$. Now, suppose only that $U(t) = V(t)$ almost surely for each $t \geq 0$. Then, by countable additivity, the set $A = \{\omega : V(t, \omega) = U(t, \omega) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{Q}_+\}$ has probability one. By right-continuity of the sample paths, it follows that $U(t)$ and $V(t)$ necessarily have the same paths for all $\omega \in A$. \square

Lemma A.2.2. *Let Z be a nonnegative random variable. Then, $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 1$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}(Z) = 0$.*

Proof of Corollary 1. Recall that the stochastic processes M_C^\dagger and M_C^\sharp are indistinguishable if their difference vanishes uniformly in t , that is, if

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ M_C^\dagger(t) - M_C^\sharp(t) = 0 \text{ for all } t > 0 \right\} = 1. \quad (9)$$

We begin by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} M_C^\dagger(t) - M_C^\sharp(t) &= \left\{ N_C(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} - \left\{ N_C(t) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \right\} \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta N_T(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d \left\{ \Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} + \int_{(0,t]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dN_T(u). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In particular, since the expression (10) is right-continuous in t , the proof follows immediately from Lemma A.2.1 provided that, for each $t > 0$, the expression (10) is identically zero if and only if $\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\} \delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$. By Proposition 2, the first term on the right-side is zero for each t if and only if $\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\} \delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$. Since that the first term on the right-side is nonnegative, it suffices to focus on the behavior of the right-continuous, nonnegative process

$$Z(t) = \int_{(0,t]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dN_T(u) = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \frac{\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \delta N_T(u).$$

Fix an arbitrary $t > 0$. By Lemma A.2.2, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} = 0$ if and only if $\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\} \delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$. However, since

$$\mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \frac{\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \delta \mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\},$$

arguments similar to those in Proposition 2 show that $\mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} = 0$ if and only if $\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_T(u)\} \delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\} = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$, or equivalently if and only if $\delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = 0$ for all $u \in (0, t]$. \square

B Additional Material for Section 4

Proof of Lemma 1. Denote \mathcal{P} as the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable sigma algebra. Since $\mathcal{F}_{t-} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_t$, the set of half-predictable rectangles contains the set of rectangles

$$\{0\} \times A, A \in \mathcal{F}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad [a, b) \times A, 0 < a < b \leq \infty, A \in \mathcal{F}_{a-},$$

which generates \mathcal{P} (Elliott, 1982, Cor. 6.3.3). Therefore the $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, proving the first claim.

We now establish the second claim. Let $t > 0$. For $B \in \mathcal{H}$, define $B_t = \{\omega : (t, \omega) \in B\}$. Using that \mathcal{G}_t is a filtration, we may readily see that $\{B \in \mathcal{H} : B_t \in \mathcal{G}_t\} = \mathcal{H}$. Thus for any set $B \in \mathcal{H}$, we have that $B_t \in \mathcal{G}_t$ so that $I_B(t, \cdot) = I_{B_t}$ is \mathcal{G}_t -measurable as its pullback is either B_t or its complement. The half-predictable process H may be expressed as

$$H(t, \omega) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^m k_{j,m} I_{B_{j,m}}(t, \omega).$$

for a triangular array of constants $k_{j,m}$ and $B_{j,m} \in \mathcal{H}$. For any fixed m , the summation $\sum_{j=1}^m k_{j,m} I_{B_{j,m}}(t, \cdot)$ is \mathcal{G}_t -measurable as each summand is \mathcal{G}_t -measurable. Thus the pointwise limit $H(t, \cdot)$ is also \mathcal{G}_t -measurable. \square

B.1 Proof of martingale transform

Lemma B.1.1. *If B is a half-predictable rectangle, then the process*

$$\int_{(0, \cdot]} I_B(u) dM_C^\dagger(u)$$

is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

Proof. Define $L(t) := \int_{(0, t]} I_B(u) dM_C^\dagger(u)$. For $B = \{0\} \times A$ with $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$, $I_B(u) = 0$ for all $u > 0$ so $L(t) = 0$ is obviously an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

Let $B = [a, b) \times A$ for $0 < a < b \leq \infty, A \in \mathcal{G}_a$. The process L is clearly \mathcal{F}_t -adapted. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}\{|L(t)|\} \leq \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_{(0, t]} |dM_C^\dagger(u)|\right\} \leq 2 < \infty.$$

Finally, for $t, s > 0$, the process L has no drift since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_{(t, t+s]} I_B(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{I_A \int_{(t, t+s] \cap [a, b)} dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{I_A \int_{(t, t+s] \cap (a, b]} dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right\} + \mathbb{E}\left\{I_A I(t < a \leq t+s) \delta M_C^\dagger(a) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right\} - \mathbb{E}\left\{I_A I(t < b \leq t+s) \delta M_C^\dagger(b) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{I_A \int_{(a \vee t, b \wedge (t+s)]} dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[I_A \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_{(a \vee t, b \wedge (t+s)]} dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{a \vee t}\right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

vanishes, where I_A denotes the indicator of the set A . \square

We now prove the main result.

Proof of Theorem 3. We proceed using the same proof strategy as Theorem 1.5.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991).

Define \mathcal{V} as the vector space of bounded and adapted H such that $\int_{(0, \cdot]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u)$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale. Let $H_j \in \mathcal{V}$ for $j = 1, \dots$ to be an increasing sequence such that $H := \sup_j H_j$ is almost surely bounded. We will show

that $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale; it clearly is absolutely integrable and adapted. For $t, s > 0$, it is drift-free since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0, t+s]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0, t+s]} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} H_j(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0, t+s]} H_j(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} H_j(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale and so \mathcal{V} is closed under supremums over the increasing sequence H_j , $j = 1, \dots$.

Since \mathcal{V} also contains the constant functions and, by Lemma B.1.1, contains the indicators of the half-predictable rectangles, the result now follows from Lemma 1.5.2 in Fleming and Harrington (1991), a corollary of the monotone class theorem. \square

B.2 Proof of martingale transform in discrete time

We now give a simplified statement and proof of Theorem 3 that is valid in discrete time and avoids measure theoretic technicalities.

Theorem B.2.1. *Assume $\mathbb{E}\{N_C(\cdot)\}$ is a step-function. If H is \mathcal{G}_t -adapted and bounded, then $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.*

Proof. Assume that censoring is discrete so that the identified cumulative hazard for censoring is

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

Let D be the set of discontinuities. Then N_C jumps on D almost surely.

Since $\mathcal{G}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t$, the transform $H \cdot M_C^\dagger = \int_{(0, \cdot]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u)$ is clearly adapted. Let $t > 0$ and suppose that H is bounded by $C < \infty$. The integrability follows from the usual argument that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \int_{(0, t]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \right| \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \sum_{(0, t] \cap D} H(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \right| \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{(0, t] \cap D} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| H(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \right| \right\} \\ &\leq C \sum_{(0, t] \cap D} \left[\mathbb{E} \{ \delta N_C(u) \} + \mathbb{E} \left\{ Y^\dagger(u) \frac{\delta \mathbb{E}\{N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} \right\} \right] \\ &\leq 2C. \end{aligned}$$

Let $s > 0$. The conditional expectation may be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{(t, t+s] \cap D} H(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{(t, t+s] \cap D} \mathbb{E} \left\{ H(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{G}_u \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{(t, t+s] \cap D} H(u) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{G}_u \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

The first equality uses that $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{G}_u$ for $u > t$, the second uses the half-predictability of H . The third identity uses that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\delta N_C(u)|\mathcal{G}_u\} = Y^\dagger(u)\mathbb{E}\{\delta N_C(u)|Y^\dagger(u) = 1\} = Y^\dagger(u)\frac{\mathbb{E}\{\delta N_C(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}} = Y^\dagger(u)\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

Therefore the conditional expectation vanishes and hence the transform $H \cdot M_C^\dagger$ is drift-free.

Since the three conditions defining a martingale are verified, we may conclude that the transform is a martingale. \square

B.3 Proof of variation and covariation processes

We start with a series of technical lemmas.

Lemma B.3.1. $\int_{(0,\cdot]} M_C^\dagger(u-) dM_C^\dagger(u)$ is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

Proof. The process is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale by Corollary 2.4.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991) since no special properties of A_C^\dagger are used in the proof; see also Lemma 2.4.1 and Theorem 2.4.1 in the same book. \square

Lemma B.3.2. *The process*

$$\left(M_C^\dagger\right)^2 - \int_{(0,\cdot]} \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)$$

is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

Proof. The algebraic identity

$$\left(M_C^\dagger(t)\right)^2 - \int_{(0,t]} \{1 - \delta A_C^\dagger(u)\} dA_C^\dagger(u) = 2 \int_{(0,t]} M_C^\dagger(u-) dM_C^\dagger(u) + M_C^\dagger(t) - 2 \int_{(0,t]} \delta A_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \quad (11)$$

holds for all $t > 0$, as shown in the proof of Theorem 2.6.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991). The middle and last summand on the RHS of Eq. (11) are both an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale by Theorem 3; the first summand on the RHS of Eq. (11) is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale by Lemma B.3.1. \square

Let $\text{Exp}(1)$ denote a random variable with an exponential distribution with unit rate.

Lemma B.3.3. *Let $X > 0$ be a random variable cumulative hazard Λ . Then $\Lambda(X)$ is stochastically dominated by $\text{Exp}(1)$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}\{\text{Exp}(1) \leq u\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\Lambda(X) \leq u\}$ for all $u > 0$.*

Proof. Define $A = \Lambda(X)$ and $B \sim [\text{Exp}(1)]_{\mathcal{S}}$; our goal is to show that $\mathbb{P}(B \leq u) < \mathbb{P}(A \leq u)$ for all $u > 0$.

First, consider $a_0 \in \mathcal{S}$; let $x_0 = \inf\{x : \Lambda(x) = a_0\}$. By right-continuity of Λ , we know $\Lambda(x_0) = a_0$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A \leq a_0) &= \mathbb{P}\{x : \Lambda(x) \leq \Lambda(x_0)\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(x : x \leq x_0) + \mathbb{P}\{x : x > x_0, \Lambda(x) = \Lambda(x_0)\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(x : x \leq x_0) \\ &= 1 - \prod_{(0,x_0]} \{1 - d\Lambda(x)\} \end{aligned}$$

since Λ is monotonically non-decreasing. The remaining term involves the product integral which satisfies

$$\prod_{(0,x_0]} \{1 - d\Lambda(x)\} = \exp\{-\Lambda(x_0)\} \prod_{0 < x \leq x_0} [\{1 + \delta\Lambda(x)\} \exp\{-\delta\Lambda(x)\}] \leq \exp\{-\Lambda(x_0)\},$$

where the equality follows from Definition 4 in Gill and Johansen (1990) and the inequality follows from $(1+\lambda)e^{-\lambda} \leq 1$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Since $\Lambda(x_0) = a_0$ by construction, we have shown that $\mathbb{P}\{\text{Exp}(1) \leq a_0\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{\Lambda(X) \leq a_0\}$ for all $a_0 \in \mathcal{S}$.

Now, consider $a_0 \notin \mathcal{S}$. Put $a_+ = \inf\{a : a \geq a_0, a \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Since Λ is right continuous, $a_+ \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus the previous argument, applied to “ $<$ ” rather than “ \leq ”, shows that $\mathbb{P}(A < a_+) \geq 1 - \exp\{-a_+\}$. The result follows since $\mathbb{P}(A \leq a_0) = \mathbb{P}(A < a_+)$ by the monotonicity of Λ . \square

Lemma B.3.4. $\int_{(0,\cdot]} M_C^\dagger(u-) dM_C^\dagger(u)$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

Proof. Define $L(t) := \int_{(0,\cdot]} M_C^\dagger(u-) dM_C^\dagger(u)$. The process L is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left(M_C^\dagger(u-) \right)^2 d\langle M_C^\dagger, M_C^\dagger \rangle(u) &= \mathbb{E} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left(M_C^\dagger(u-) \right)^2 \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left\{ M_C^\dagger(u-) \right\}^2 Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

is finite, where the equality concerning the local variation process is from Lemma B.3.2 (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Theorem 2.4.4).

The integrand in Eq. (12) may be written

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ M_C^\dagger(u-) \right\}^2 &= \left\{ N_C(u-) - \int_{(0,t)} Y^\dagger(v) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 \\ &= N_C(u-) - 2N_C(u-) \int_{(0,u)} Y^\dagger(v) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(v) + \left\{ \int_{(0,u)} Y^\dagger(v) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $N_C(u-)Y^\dagger(u) = 0$ for all $u > 0$, we see that Eq. (12) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left\{ M_C^\dagger(u-) \right\}^2 d\langle M_C^\dagger, M_C^\dagger \rangle(u) &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{(0,\infty)} \left\{ \int_{(0,u)} Y^\dagger(v) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \int_{(0,\infty)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\}^3 \right] \quad (\text{since the squared term is increasing in } u) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \Lambda_C^\dagger(X) \right\}^3 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

If $T \perp C$, then Lemma B.3.3 shows that

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Lambda_C^\dagger(X)^3\} = \mathbb{E}\{\Lambda_C(X)^3\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{\Lambda_C(C)^3\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{\text{Exp}(1)^3\} = 6 < \infty,$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 1 as the expectation is only over u such that $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\} > 0$. When $T \not\perp C$, there exists latent variables such that the same arguments holds with $\Lambda_C^\dagger \leq \Lambda_C$ (see e.g. Peterson Jr, 1976). \square

Proposition B.3.1. *The process*

$$\left(M_C^\dagger \right)^2 - \int_{(0,\cdot]} \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)$$

is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

Proof. The follows immediately from the algebraic decomposition Eq. (11) in the proof of Lemma B.3.2 and from Lemma B.3.4. \square

We now prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 4. Define the stochastic process Q so that

$$Q(t) := (H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t)(H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

The proof that Q is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale will have three steps: first we establish the claim when H_1 and H_2 are simple, second we establish the claim when H_1 is simple and H_2 is bounded, and third we establish the full claim.

First, suppose that H_1 and H_2 are simple half-predictable processes so that $H_j = I_{B_j}$ for a half-predictable B_j , defined in Eq. (3). We must show that Q is adapted, absolutely integrable, and is drift-free. Q is clearly adapted, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| (H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t)(H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right| \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ (M_C^\dagger)^2(t) \right\} + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \\ & \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t]} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \\ & = 2 \mathbb{E} \{ N_C(u) \} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition B.3.1 and the third equality follows from Theorem 2. As the final matter in this first case, we now show that Q is drift-free. This follows from the same argument in Fleming and Harrington (1991, Theorem 2.4.2). Thus Q is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale when H_1, H_2 are simple.

Second, it follows that Q is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale when H_1 is simple through the same monotone class argument in Fleming and Harrington (1991, Theorem 2.4.2).

Third, it follows that Q is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale when H_2 is bounded through another monotone class argument, as in Fleming and Harrington (1991, Theorem 2.4.2). This is the final case, so the proof that Q is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale is complete. The proof for the stochastic process $(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(H_3 \cdot M_T^\sharp)$ is similar so omitted. \square

B.4 Proof of variation and covariation processes in discrete time

In this section we state and prove a version of Theorem 4 that is valid in discrete time and avoids measure theoretic technicalities. For simplicity, we make use of the lemmas in Appendix B.3.

Theorem B.4.1. *Assume X is discrete. If H_1 and H_2 are \mathcal{G}_t -adapted and bounded, then the following is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale*

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u). \quad (14)$$

If H_1 is \mathcal{G}_t -adapted and bounded and H_3 is \mathcal{F}_t -predictable and bounded, then the following is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale

$$(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_3 \cdot M_T^\sharp)(t).$$

Proof. We start by considering the variation process. Adaptedness and integrability are straightforward to verify, so we focus on proving the no-drift property.

Let $s, t > 0$. By expanding the integrals over disjoint intervals $(0, t]$ and $(t, t + s]$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t+s]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ & = \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(t,t+s]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\}. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

We may determine the desired centering term by expressing the conditional expectation in Eq. (15) as a contrast between the centering term evaluated at $t + s$ and at t . Note, if the centering term is an integral over $(0, \cdot]$, then this contrast will simply be an integral over $(t, t + s]$.

By expanding the interval $(t, t + s] = (t, v) \cup \{v\} \cup (v, t + s]$, the double integral in the conditional expectation may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(t,t+s]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) = \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u)H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v) \\ & = \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(t,v)} H_1(u)H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v) + \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{\{v\}} H_1(u)H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v) \\ & \quad + \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(v,t+s]} H_1(u)H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v). \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

We now simplify the conditional expectation of each of these three summands. Recall that we are assuming that censoring is discrete so that the identified cumulative hazard for censoring is

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u).$$

The conditional expectation of the first summand in Eq. (16) may be seen to vanish by leveraging that $u < v$, that is, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} \int_{(t, v)} H_1(u) H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{t < u < v} H_1(u) H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{t < u < v} \mathbb{E} \left\{ H_1(u) H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{G}_v \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{t < u < v} H_1(u) H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{G}_v \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the conditional expectation of the last summand in Eq. (16) may be seen to vanish by leveraging that $u > v$, that is, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} \int_{(v, t+s]} H_1(u) H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{v < u < t+s} H_1(u) H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{v < u < t+s} \mathbb{E} \left\{ H_1(u) H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{G}_u \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{v < u < t+s} H_1(u) H_2(v) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{G}_u \right\} \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional expectation of the middle summand in Eq. (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} \int_{\{v\}} H_1(u) H_2(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t, t+s]} H_1(v) H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) dM_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \left\{ \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the last equality applies the discreteness assumption, is more complicated to handle. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) M_C^\dagger(v) \right\} &= \left\{ N_C(v) - \sum_{0 < u \leq v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\}^2 - \left\{ N_C(v-) - \sum_{0 < u < v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\}^2 \\
&= \left\{ \delta N_C(v) - Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 + 2 \left\{ \delta N_C(v) - Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} \left\{ N_C(v-) - \sum_{0 < u < v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \\
&= \left\{ \delta N_C(v) - Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 - 2 \left\{ \delta N_C(v) - Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} \sum_{0 < u < v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \left\{ \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 - 2 \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \sum_{0 < u < v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u),
\end{aligned}$$

we see that Eq. (17) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \left\{ \delta \left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) M_C^\dagger(v) \right\} + 2 \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \sum_{0 < u < v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \left\{ \delta \left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) M_C^\dagger(v) \right\} + 2 \mathbb{E} \left(\delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{G}_v \right) \sum_{0 < u < v} Y^\dagger(u) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \delta \left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) M_C^\dagger(v) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

Since Eq. (18) has $\left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2$ as an integrator and Proposition B.3.1 shows that

$$\left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) \right\}^2 - \int_{(0,v]} \left\{ 1 - \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \tag{19}$$

is an \mathcal{F}_v -martingale, we now seek to express Eq. (18) in a way involving a martingale transform with respect to Eq. (19). Since the martingale transform satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \left\langle \delta \left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) M_C^\dagger(v) \right\} - \left\{ 1 - \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \mathbb{E} \left\langle \delta \left\{ M_C^\dagger(v) M_C^\dagger(v) \right\} - \left\{ 1 - \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{G}_v \right\rangle \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by adding and subtracting we see that Eq. (18) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_2(v) \left\{ 1 - \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(v) H_2(v) \left\{ 1 - \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right]
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t+s]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(t,t+s]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t]} H_2(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(v)H_2(v) \left\{ 1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} Y^\dagger(v) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right],
\end{aligned}$$

proving that the stochastic process is drift free. It is therefore a martingale.

We now turn our attention to the covariation process. Adaptedness and integrability are straightforward to verify, so we focus on proving the no-drift property. The key steps of the proof are the same as in the previous case for the variation process; however, we go through all of the details again for completeness.

Let $s, t > 0$. By expanding the integrals over disjoint intervals $(0, t]$ and $(t, t + s]$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t+s]} H_3(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t]} H_3(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(t,t+s]} H_3(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\}, \quad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

since each integral is a martingale so is mean zero conditional on \mathcal{F}_t . We may determine the desired centering term by expressing the conditional expectation in Eq. (20) as a contrast between the centering term evaluated at $t + s$ and at t . Note, if the centering term is an integral over $(0, \cdot]$, then this contrast will simply be an integral over $(t, t + s]$.

By expanding the interval $(t, t + s] = (t, v) \cup \{v\} \cup (v, t + s]$, the double integral in the conditional expectation may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(t,t+s]} H_3(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) = \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(u)H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(v) \\
&= \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(t,v)} H_1(u)H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(v) + \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{\{v\}} H_1(u)H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(v) \\
&\quad + \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(v,t+s]} H_1(u)H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(v). \quad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

We now simplify the conditional expectation of each of these three summands. Recall that we are assuming that the time at-risk is discrete so that the identified cumulative hazards are

$$\Lambda_C^\dagger(t) = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u); \quad \Lambda_T^\sharp(t) = \sum_{0 < u \leq t} \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u).$$

The conditional expectation of the first summand in Eq. (16) may be seen to vanish by leveraging that $u < v$, that is, since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(t,v)} H_1(u)H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{t < u < v} H_1(u)H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_T^\sharp(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{t < u < v} \mathbb{E} \left\{ H_1(u)H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_T^\sharp(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{v-} \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{t < u < v} H_1(u)H_2(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \delta M_T^\sharp(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{v-} \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality uses that $H_1(u) \in \mathcal{G}_u \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{v-}$, $\delta M_C^\dagger(u) \in \mathcal{F}_u \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{v-}$ since $u < v$, and that $H_3(v) \in \mathcal{F}_{v-}$ by Fleming and Harrington (1991, Prop. 1.4.1).

Similarly, the conditional expectation of the last summand in Eq. (16) may be seen to vanish by leveraging that $u > v$, that is, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{(v,t+s]} H_1(u) H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{v < u < t+s} H_1(u) H_3(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{v < u < t+s} \mathbb{E} \left\{ H_1(u) H_3(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \delta M_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{G}_u \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} \sum_{v < u < t+s} H_1(u) H_3(v) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \delta M_C^\dagger(u) \middle| \mathcal{G}_u \right\} \delta M_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional expectation of the middle summand in Eq. (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} \int_{\{v\}} H_1(u) H_3(v) dM_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(t,t+s]} H_1(v) H_3(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) dM_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_3(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \delta M_T^\#(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the last equality applies the discreteness assumption, is more complicated to handle. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \delta M_T^\#(v) &= \left\{ \delta N_C(v) - Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} \left\{ \delta N_T(v) - Y^\#(v) \delta \Lambda_T^\#(v) \right\} \\ &= -\delta \Lambda_T^\#(v) \left\{ \delta N_C(v) - Y^\dagger(v) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(v) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

we see that Eq. (22) equals

$$-\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t < v \leq t+s} H_1(v) H_3(v) \delta \Lambda_T^\#(v) \delta M_C^\dagger(v) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = 0, \quad (23)$$

by Theorem 3 since $\delta \Lambda_T^\#(v) \leq 1$ is bounded.

In summary, we have shown that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,t+s]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t+s]} H_3(u) dM_T^\#(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right\} = \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) \int_{(0,t]} H_3(u) dM_T^\#(u),$$

proving that the product of these martingale transforms is itself a martingale. \square

C Additional Material for Section 5

C.1 Proofs

Throughout the proofs in this section we adopt the following helpful notation to study tail behavior. Define $\mathcal{S}^- = \{s : \mathbb{E}[Y^\#(s+)] > 0\}$, $\mathcal{S} = \{s : \mathbb{E}[Y^\dagger(s)] > 0\}$, and $\mathcal{S}^+ = \{s : \mathbb{E}[Y^\#(s)] > 0\}$. Then, because $Y^\#(s+) \leq Y^\dagger(s) \leq Y^\#(s)$ for $s \geq 0$, it can be shown that $\mathcal{S}^- \subseteq \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}^+$. Define $\tau = \sup \mathcal{S}^+$; then, because $\sup \mathcal{S}^+ = \sup \mathcal{S}^-$, it follows that $\tau = \sup \mathcal{S}$.

Proof of Lemma 2. Consider first the case where $t \in S$. Then, for $t < \tau$ and using the definitions of $M_C^\dagger(t)$ and $M_C^\sharp(t)$ and the fact that $Y^\dagger(u) = Y^\sharp(u) - \delta N_T(u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_C^\dagger(t) - M_C^\sharp(t) &= \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta N_T(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) \delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta N_T(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \delta M_T^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the useful identity

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} - 1 = \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\} - \mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} = \frac{-\mathbb{E}\{\delta N_T(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} = -\delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(u). \quad (24)$$

Next, suppose $t \geq \tau$. Using the result above, we can decompose $M_C^\dagger(t)$ as follows:

$$M_C^\dagger(t) = \left\{ M_C^\sharp(\tau-) + \int_{(0,\tau)} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\} + \delta M_C^\dagger(\tau) + \int_{(\tau,t]} dM_C^\dagger(t). \quad (25)$$

Now, for $u > \tau$, we necessarily have $\delta N_T(u) = 0$ and $Y^\sharp(u) = 0$; moreover, by arguments given in Appendix A.1 (see also Proposition 2), we also have $\delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) = 0$ on this same interval. Hence,

$$\int_{(\tau,t]} dM_C^\dagger(t) = 0,$$

and it suffices to consider the behavior of $\delta M_C^\dagger(\tau)$.

Similarly to Proposition 2, it is again useful to separately consider the cases that $\tau \in \mathcal{S}^c$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$. Suppose first that $\tau \in \mathcal{S}^c$. Then, the analysis just done for $u > \tau$ continues to apply; hence, $\delta M_C^\dagger(\tau) = \delta M_C^\sharp(\tau) = 0$ and it follows that

$$M_C^\dagger(t) = M_C^\sharp(\tau) + \int_{(0,\tau]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) = M_C^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u),$$

establishing the desired result in this case. Now, suppose instead that $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$; in this case, algebra shows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M_C^\dagger(\tau) &= \delta N_C^\dagger(\tau) - Y^\dagger(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) \\ &= \delta M_C^\sharp(\tau) + Y^\sharp(\tau) \{ \delta \Lambda_C^\sharp(\tau) - \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) \} + \delta N_T(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

Given that $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(\tau)\} \geq \mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(\tau)\} > 0$; therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M_C^\dagger(\tau) &= \delta M_C^\sharp(\tau) + Y^\sharp(\tau) \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\dagger(u)\}}{\mathbb{E}\{Y^\sharp(u)\}} - 1 \right\} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) + \delta N_T(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) \\ &= \delta M_C^\sharp(\tau) - Y^\sharp(\tau) \delta \Lambda_T^\sharp(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) + \delta N_T(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) \\ &= \delta M_C^\sharp(\tau) + \delta M_T^\sharp(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

the penultimate step following from (24). Returning to (25),

$$\begin{aligned} M_C^\dagger(t) &= \left\{ M_C^\sharp(\tau-) + \int_{(0,\tau)} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\} + \delta M_C^\sharp(\tau) + \delta M_T^\sharp(\tau) \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(\tau) \\ &= M_C^\sharp(\tau) + \int_{(0,\tau]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= M_C^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta \Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. Applying Lemma 2, the martingale transform is

$$(H \cdot M_C^\dagger) = \int_{(0,t]} H(u) dM_C^\dagger(u) = \int_{(0,t]} H(u) dM_C^\sharp(u) + \int_{(0,t]} H(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger dM_T^\sharp(u) = (H \cdot M_C^\sharp) + (\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger H \cdot M_T^\sharp). \quad (26)$$

Each summand is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale by Theorem 2.4.4 in Fleming and Harrington (1991), since $\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger$ is bounded and non-stochastic and the first assumptions of Proposition 4 correspond to the assumptions of Theorem 2.4.4. The result follows since a sum of martingales is a martingale. \square

Denote $\langle M \rangle$ as the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable variation process of an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale M .

Proof of Proposition 5. We calculate the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable variation $\langle M_C^\dagger \rangle$ and the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable covariation $\langle M_C^\dagger, M_T^\sharp \rangle$. After, the result follows directly from Theorem 2.4.3 in Fleming and Harrington (1991).

We start by calculating the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable covariation $\langle M_C^\dagger, M_T^\sharp \rangle$. Consider the stochastic process

$$\begin{aligned} M_C^\dagger(t)M_T^\sharp(t) &= \left\{ M_C^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\} M_T^\sharp(t) \\ &= M_C^\sharp(t)M_T^\sharp(t) + M_T^\sharp(t) \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u). \end{aligned}$$

We calculate the compensator for each summand using Theorem 2.4.2 and 2.6.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991). First we see that

$$\left\langle M_C^\dagger(t), M_T^\sharp(t) \right\rangle = - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) d \left\{ \int_{(0,u]} Y^\sharp(v) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(v) \right\} = - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u).$$

Second,

$$\left\langle M_T^\sharp(t), \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle = \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \{1 - Y^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u).$$

Therefore the following is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale,

$$\begin{aligned} M_C^\dagger(t)M_T^\sharp(t) &+ \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \int_{(0,t]} Y^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= M_C^\dagger(t)M_T^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} \right\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= M_C^\dagger(t)M_T^\sharp(t), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by applying Eq. (24).

We now calculate the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable variation $\langle M_C^\dagger \rangle$. Consider the stochastic process

$$\begin{aligned} M_C^\dagger(t)M_C^\dagger(t) &= \left\{ M_C^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\}^2 \\ &= M_C^\sharp(t)M_C^\sharp(t) + 2M_C^\sharp(t) \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) + \left\{ \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We calculate the compensator for each summand using Theorem 2.4.2 and 2.6.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991). First we see that

$$\left\langle M_C^\dagger(t) \right\rangle = \int_{(0,t]} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) = \int_{(0,t]} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u),$$

by applying Eq. (24); second,

$$\left\langle M_C^\dagger(t), \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle = \int_{(0,t]} \{\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)\}^2 \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u);$$

third,

$$\left\langle \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle = \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u).$$

Therefore, due to the bilinearity of \mathcal{F}_t -predictable variation, the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable variation of M_C^\dagger is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M_C^\dagger(t) \rangle &= \left\langle M_C^\sharp(t) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle \\ &= \langle M_C^\sharp(t) \rangle + \left\langle \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle + 2 \left\langle M_C^\sharp(t), \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) + \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \left[\{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} + \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} - 2\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \right] Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(u) G^\dagger(u)}{F^\sharp(u-) G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u), \end{aligned}$$

where last equality follows from the simplification

$$\begin{aligned} &\{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} + \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} - 2\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \\ &= \{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u)\} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} + \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) - 2\delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \\ &= 1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= 1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} \{1 - \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)\} \\ &= \frac{F^\sharp(u) G^\dagger(u)}{F^\sharp(u-) G^\dagger(u-)}, \end{aligned}$$

which twice applied Eq. (24). Finally, the martingale transform results follow directly from Theorem 2.4.3 in Fleming and Harrington (1991). \square

The next result considers the difference between the \mathcal{F}_t -predictable centering terms, derived in Proposition 5, and the \mathcal{G}_t -adapted centering terms, stated in Theorem 4. The result is strictly algebraic, analogous to Lemma 2.

Lemma C.1.1. *For $t > 0$, the difference between Eq. (14) and variation martingale in Proposition 5 is*

$$\int_{(0,t]} H_1(u) H_2(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) Y^\sharp(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} dM_T^\sharp(u).$$

Proof. For simplicity we consider the difference in \mathcal{F}_t -predictable variation, i.e. so that $H_1, H_2 = 1$. For $t < \tau$, the

difference is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ - \int_{(0,t]} \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} - \left\{ - \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u)}{F^\sharp(u-)G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \frac{F^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u-)} Y^\sharp(u) - Y^\dagger(u) \right\} \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \frac{F^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u-)} - \{1 - \delta N_T(u)\} \right\} Y^\sharp(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \{1 - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)\} - \{1 - \delta N_T(u)\} \right\} Y^\sharp(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \delta N_T(u) - \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \right\} Y^\sharp(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) Y^\sharp(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} dM_T^\sharp(u).
\end{aligned}$$

The result follows as the $t \geq \tau$ case follows similarly. \square

Proof of Corollary 2. That $(H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_T^\sharp)(t)$ is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale follows immediately from Proposition 5; notice that 0 is both a \mathcal{G}_t -adapted and a \mathcal{F}_t -predictable centering term.

Now, it follows from Lemma C.1.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \frac{F^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\
&= \left\{ (H_1 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) (H_2 \cdot M_C^\dagger)(t) - \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \frac{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u)}{F^\sharp(u-)G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right\} \\
&\quad + \int_{(0,t]} H_1(u)H_2(u) \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) Y^\sharp(u) \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} dM_T^\sharp(u).
\end{aligned}$$

The first expression is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale by Proposition 5, and the second expression is a local \mathcal{F}_t -martingale by Theorem 2.4.1 in Fleming and Harrington (1991). The result follows since a sum of local martingales is a local martingale. \square

C.2 Alternative proofs of previous results

Alternative proof of Theorem 2. By Proposition 1, M_T^\sharp and M_C^\dagger are \mathcal{F}_t -martingales. Since $\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger$ is non-stochastic and bounded by 1, we see $\int_{(0,\cdot]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u)$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Theorem 1.5.1). Thus $M_C^\dagger + \int_{(0,\cdot]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u)$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale; the result follows from Lemma 2. \square

Alternative proof of Corollary 1. Recall that the stochastic processes M_C^\dagger and M_C^\sharp are indistinguishable if their difference vanishes uniformly in t , that is, if

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ M_C^\dagger(t) - M_C^\sharp(t) = 0 \text{ for all } t > 0 \right\} = 1.$$

The result in Lemma 2 implies $M_C^\dagger(t) - M_C^\sharp(t) = \int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u)$. In view of the proofs of Proposition 2 and Lemma 2, it suffices to prove that the martingale

$$\int_{(0,t]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) = 0 \tag{27}$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{0 < u \leq t} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) = 0 \tag{28}$$

for $t \in (0, \tau]$. Equivalently, since (27) holds if and only if

$$\left\langle \int_{(0, \tau]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle = 0, \quad (29)$$

by He et al. (1992, p. 186), we need only show that (28) and (29) are equivalent. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \int_{(0, \tau]} \delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) dM_T^\sharp(u) \right\rangle &= \int_{(0, \tau]} \left(\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right)^2 Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= \sum_{0 < u \leq \tau} \left(\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right)^2 Y^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ &= (A) + 2(B) + (C) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (A) &= \sum_{0 < u \leq \tau} Y^\sharp(u) \left(\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \right)^2 \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ (B) &= \sum_{0 < u \leq \tau} Y^\sharp(u) \left(\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \right) \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u) \\ (C) &= \sum_{0 < u \leq \tau} Y^\sharp(u) \left(\delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \right)^2 \delta\Lambda_T^\sharp(u). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\delta\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) - \delta\Lambda_C^\sharp(u) \geq 0$ for $u > 0$, each of (A), (B), and (C) are nonnegative. Moreover, Proposition 2 implies that (A) = (B) = 0 almost surely if and only if (28) holds. Similarly, (C) = 0 almost surely if and only if (28) holds. Hence, the desired result is proved. \square

D Additional Material for Section 6

Proof of Proposition 6. The influence function of the Kaplan Meier estimator $F_n^\sharp(t)$ is

$$D(X, \Delta; t, \mathbb{P}) := \frac{I(X > t)}{G^\dagger(t)} + \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} - F^\sharp(t),$$

as shown in Gill (1994); van der Laan and Rose (2011). Denote \mathbb{V} as the variance and the covariance operator. Therefore the asymptotic variance of the $n^{1/2}$ -scaled Kaplan Meier estimator is

$$\mathbb{V} \left\{ \frac{I(X > t)}{G^\dagger(t)} \right\} + \mathbb{V} \left\{ \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\} + 2\mathbb{V} \left\{ \frac{I(X > t)}{G^\dagger(t)}, \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\}, \quad (30)$$

which we simplify in this proof.

Recall that $\mathbb{P}(X > t) = F^\sharp(t)G^\dagger(t)$. The first summand in Eq. (30) is simply the variance of a Bernoulli random variable and hence satisfies

$$\mathbb{V} \left\{ \frac{I(X > t)}{G^\dagger(t)} \right\} = \frac{F^\sharp(t)G^\dagger(t) \{1 - F^\sharp(t)G^\dagger(t)\}}{\{G^\dagger(t)\}^2}.$$

The last summand in Eq. (30) may be readily simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{V} \left\{ \frac{I(X > t)}{G^\dagger(t)}, \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dN_C(u) - Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{G^\dagger(t)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ I(X > t) \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dN_C(u) - Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{G^\dagger(t)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ I(X > t) \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\} \\ &= -F^\sharp(t) \int_{(0, t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)}. \end{aligned}$$

The first identity leverages that the martingale transform vanishes in expectation from Theorem 3, and the next identity leverages the relationship between the indicator being for the event $X > t$ while the martingale transform is over the domain with $u \leq t$.

Now, simplifying the second summand in Eq. (30) requires appealing to Theorem 4 so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V} \left\{ \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u)} \right\}^2 \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} Y^\dagger(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \right] \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \left\{ \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u)} \right\}^2 \frac{G^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} G^\dagger(u-) F^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u) \\ &= \int_{(0,t]} \frac{\{F^\sharp(t)\}^2}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)}. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\{D(X, \Delta; t, \mathbb{P})\} &= \frac{F^\sharp(t)G^\dagger(t) \{1 - F^\sharp(t)G^\dagger(t)\}}{\{G^\dagger(t)\}^2} - \int_{(0,t]} \frac{\{F^\sharp(t)\}^2}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{d\Lambda_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \\ &= \{F^\sharp(t)\}^2 \left[\frac{1}{F^\sharp(t)G^\dagger(t)} - 1 - \int_{(0,t]} \frac{1}{F^\sharp(u)} d \left\{ \frac{1}{G^\dagger(u)} \right\} \right] \\ &= \{F^\sharp(t)\}^2 \int_{(0,t]} \frac{1}{G^\dagger(u-)} d \left\{ \frac{1}{F^\sharp(u)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

by integration by parts (Fleming and Harrington, 1991, Theorem A.1.2). \square

Proof of Proposition 7. It follows from traditional semiparametric theory that the asymptotic covariance is

$$\sigma^2(s, t) = \mathbb{V} \left\{ \frac{I(X > s)}{G^\dagger(s)} + \int_{(0,s]} \frac{F^\sharp(s)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} - F^\sharp(s), - \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_T^\sharp(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} \right\}, \quad (31)$$

where we recall that \mathbb{V} is the covariance operator. This expression can be decomposed into three covariances, and we evaluate them each in turn.

The first expression in Eq. (31) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V} \left\{ \frac{I(X > s)}{G^\dagger(s)}, \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_T^\sharp(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} \right\} &= \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{G^\dagger(s)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ I(X > s) \int_{(0,t]} \frac{dN_T(u) - Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)} \right\} \\ &= \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{G^\dagger(s)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ -I(X > s) \int_{(0,s \wedge t]} \frac{d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)} + \int_{(s,t]} \frac{dN_T(u) - Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)} \right\} \\ &= -F^\sharp(s)F^\sharp(t) \int_{(0,s \wedge t]} \frac{d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)} + \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{G^\dagger(s)} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(s,t]} \frac{dN_T(u) - Y^\sharp(u) d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)} \right\} \\ &= -F^\sharp(s)F^\sharp(t) \int_{(0,s \wedge t]} \frac{d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)}. \end{aligned}$$

The second identity follows by decomposing the set $(0, t] = (0, s \wedge t] \cup (s, t]$.

The second expression in Eq. (31) is

$$\mathbb{V} \left\{ \int_{(0,s]} \frac{F^\sharp(s)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)}, \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_T^\sharp(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} \right\} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{(0,s]} \frac{F^\sharp(s)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_C^\dagger(u)}{G^\dagger(u)} \int_{(0,t]} \frac{F^\sharp(t)}{F^\sharp(u)} \frac{dM_T^\sharp(u)}{G^\dagger(u-)} \right\} = 0,$$

by applying Theorem 4.

The last expression in Eq. (31) also vanishes as it is the expectation of a martingale transform. Therefore the asymptotic covariance is

$$F^\sharp(s)F^\sharp(t) \int_{(0,s \wedge t]} \frac{d\Lambda_T^\sharp(u)}{F^\sharp(u)G^\dagger(u-)} = F^\sharp(s)F^\sharp(t) \int_{(0,s \wedge t]} \frac{1}{G^\dagger(u-)} d \left\{ \frac{1}{F^\sharp(u)} \right\}.$$

□