

Data integration methods for micro-randomized trials

E. Huch^{1,*}, I. Nahum–Shani^{1,**}, L. Potter², C. Lam², D.W. Wetter², and W. Dempsey^{1,***}

¹d3 Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

²Department of Population Health Sciences and Huntsman Cancer Institute,
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A.

**email*: ekhuch@umich.edu

***email*: inbal@umich.edu

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

SUMMARY: Existing statistical methods for the analysis of micro-randomized trials (MRTs) are designed to estimate causal excursion effects using data from a single MRT. In practice, however, researchers can often find previous MRTs that employ similar interventions. In this paper, we develop data integration methods that capitalize on this additional information, leading to statistical efficiency gains. To further increase efficiency, we demonstrate how to combine these approaches according to a generalization of multivariate precision weighting that allows for correlation between estimates, and we show that the resulting meta-estimator possesses an asymptotic optimality property. We illustrate our methods in simulation and in a case study involving two MRTs in the area of smoking cessation.

KEY WORDS: Causal inference; Dynamic treatment regimes; Meta-analysis; mHealth.

1. Introduction

Micro-randomized trials (MRTs; Liao et al., 2016; Qian et al., 2022) are becoming an increasingly popular tool for developing just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAI) in mobile health (mHealth). JITAI leverage digital technologies to adapt the delivery of interventions to the rapidly changing needs of individuals (Nahum-Shani et al., 2015, 2018). To empirically inform these interventions, MRTs involve rapid sequential randomizations, meaning that each participant is randomized many times during the trial with short time intervals (e.g., a few hours or minutes) between subsequent randomizations. The goal of an MRT is to collect data that will enable investigators to estimate the causal effect of delivering just-in-time interventions on a proximal health-related outcome; e.g., the effect of delivering (vs. not delivering) a mobile-based supportive message on tobacco use in the next hour.

MRT data is typically analyzed with the weighted and centered least squares method (WCLS; Boruvka et al., 2018). WCLS is a semi-parametric method that enables unbiased estimation of time-varying treatment effects even when the model includes time-varying endogenous variables. WCLS has been extended in various directions, including for use with different estimands (Dempsey et al., 2020), binary outcomes (Qian et al., 2021), clustered data structure (Shi et al., 2023a), and greater statistical efficiency via auxiliary variables and supervised machine learning methods (Shi et al., 2023b; Shi and Dempsey, 2023). However, WCLS has not yet been extended to allow for data integration across multiple studies.

The benefit of data integration methods is that they can result in substantial increases in statistical efficiency relative to a single-study analysis. They are particularly useful in causal inference because experimental data sets are often small, which makes statistical efficiency a key consideration (Shi et al., 2023). The potential for efficiency gains depends largely on the size of the additional data set and its relevance to the target estimand. Investigators seeking to develop a JITAI often use previous MRTs and/or observational intervention studies as a

starting point for new studies. Consequently, previous studies often contain data that are relevant to estimating the target estimand in the study under consideration, indicating the possibility of efficiency gains via data integration.

The key challenge in realizing these efficiency gains is that the causal effects may differ between studies, so naively pooling the data sets together will, in general, result in biased estimates. Here, we propose an approach that achieves asymptotic unbiasedness under a weaker assumption—that the causal effects must be equal only in a conditional sense. We show that this assumption leads to several estimation strategies. Because the resulting estimators are correlated with one another, the classical method of precision weighting (Konstantopoulos and Hedges, 2019; Hedges and Olkin, 2014, Chapter 6) is not optimal for combining estimates. Instead, we introduce a meta-estimator that generalizes precision weighting to allow for correlation both *within* and *between* vector-valued estimates, and we show that it possesses an asymptotic optimality property.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 formally introduces the problem setup and WCLS. Sections 3, 4, and 5 develop our proposed data integration methods. Sections 6 and 7 present results from applying our methods in a simulation and case study, respectively. Section 8 closes with a discussion.

2. Preliminaries

This section introduces the problem setup, including the target estimand and basic causal assumptions. We then provide the main technical details for WCLS and discuss the extension of our problem setup to multiple studies.

2.1 *Single-study problem setup*

For a given participant, we observe a sequence of covariates (X_t) , treatment assignments (A_t) , and outcomes (Y_t) for T time points. To simplify the exposition, we assume that A_t is

binary (we discuss the extension to three or more treatment levels in Section 8). We denote the full treatment history up to time point t as

$$H_t = (X_1, A_1, Y_2, X_2, A_2, Y_3, \dots, X_t).$$

We adopt the potential outcomes framework of Rubin (1974) and posit the existence of potential values for all variables from Y_2 onward in the above sequence. For Y_2 , X_2 , and A_2 the potential values are $Y_2(a_1)$, $X_2(a_1)$, and $A_2(a_1)$, respectively, with $a_1 \in \{0, 1\}$. After A_2 , the potential values depend on multiple treatment assignments. For instance, the potential value for Y_3 is $Y_3(a_1, a_2)$. To make the notation more compact, we use an overbar to represent the history of a given variable up to a particular time point; e.g., $\bar{a}_3 = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$. Using this notation, the potential values can then be written as $Y_t(\bar{a}_{t-1})$, $X_t(\bar{a}_{t-1})$, and $A_t(\bar{a}_{t-1})$. We employ the following standard causal assumptions for dynamic treatment regimes:

ASSUMPTION 1: (*Consistency*) The observed variables are equal to the potential variables as follows: $Y_t = Y_t(\bar{A}_{t-1})$, $X_t = X_t(\bar{A}_{t-1})$, and $A_t = A_t(\bar{A}_{t-1})$.

ASSUMPTION 2: (*Strict Positivity*) The treatment assignment probabilities are bounded away from zero and one: $\exists \epsilon \in (0, 0.5]$ such that $\epsilon < \Pr(A_t = 1 \mid H_t) < 1 - \epsilon$ for all $t \in [T]$.

ASSUMPTION 3: (*Sequential Unconfoundedness*) The treatment assignment at time t is independent of all future potential values; i.e., for all $t \in [T]$ and all $(a_t, a_{t+1}, \dots, a_T) \in \{0, 1\}^{T-t+1}$, we have

$$A_t \perp\!\!\!\perp \{Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, a_t), X_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, a_t), A_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, a_t), \dots, Y_{T+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, a_t, a_{t+1}, \dots, a_T)\} \mid H_t.$$

Because A_t is randomized in an MRT, Assumptions 2 and 3 typically hold by design. The scientific goal is to learn how a set of (potentially) time-varying covariates, $R_t \subset H_t$, moderates the causal effect of A_t on the proximal outcome, Y_{t+1} :

$$\mathbb{E} \{Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 1) - Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 0) \mid R_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = r^*\}. \quad (1)$$

We denote these causal effects as $\beta_r(t, r^*)$. Boruvka et al. (2018) refer to $\beta_r(t, r^*)$ as ‘causal excursion effects’ because they represent the average effect of following the (stochastic) treatment policy up until $t - 1$ and then taking an ‘excursion’ from the policy. We use r^* to denote a generic value of r^* from the support of R_t . The definition given in Boruvka et al. (2018) allows for lags of more than one time point; e.g., the effect of A_t on Y_{t+2} . The extension to additional lags is straightforward, so we use a single lag to simplify the exposition. Boruvka et al. (2018) show that $\beta_r(t, r^*)$ can be identified from the data as

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\{Y_{t+1} | H_t, A_t = 1\} - \mathbb{E}\{Y_{t+1} | H_t, A_t = 0\} | R_t = r^*].$$

Following Boruvka et al. (2018), we assume that $\beta_r(t, r^*)$ is a linear function:

ASSUMPTION 4: (*Linear R_t -moderated Effects*) $\beta_r(t, r^*) = f_r(r^*)^\top \beta_r$ for some known function, f_r , determining feature transformations of r^* and some unknown parameter vector, β_r .

In a slight abuse of notation, we use β_r to refer to both (1) the nonparametrically defined estimand and (2) the vector of coefficients that determine it according to Assumption 4. In principle, f_r and other feature transformation functions we introduce later could depend on t ; however, we suppress the dependence in our notation for brevity.

2.2 Weighted, centered least squares (WCLS)

This section introduces the WCLS method as a means of facilitating the development of our methods in subsequent sections. To simplify notation, we use \mathbb{P}_n to denote the empirical expectation operator: $\mathbb{P}_n Z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$. Using this notation, the WCLS estimator is defined as the solution to the estimating equation $0 = \mathbb{P}_n U(\alpha, \beta_r)$ with $U(\alpha, \beta_r)$ equal to

$$\sum_{t=1}^T W_t [Y_{t+1} - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \{A_t - p_r(1 | R_t)\} f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r] \begin{bmatrix} g(H_t) \\ \{A_t - p_r(1 | R_t)\} f_r(R_t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

In Equation (2), $W_t = p_r(A_t | R_t) / p_h(A_t | H_t)$ is a ratio of conditional treatment assignment probabilities. $g(H_t)$ is a transformation of H_t thought to explain variation in the expected

value of the outcome. α is a corresponding nuisance parameter that is included as a means of increasing statistical efficiency by ‘de-noising’ the outcome. Crucially, $g(H_t)$ need not correspond with the true conditional expectation of Y_{t+1} given H_t . Boruvka et al. (2018) show that the WCLS estimator of β_r is consistent and asymptotically Gaussian with a covariance matrix that can be consistently estimated via a sandwich estimator. These sandwich estimators take the form $\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}^{-\top}$, where $\mathbf{B} = \mathbb{P}_n \partial U(\alpha, \beta_r)$ and $\mathbf{M} = \mathbb{P}_n U(\alpha, \beta_r)U(\alpha, \beta_r)^\top$ (Stefanski and Boos, 2002).

We can still apply WCLS when p_r , p_h , or both are unknown, provided we know the parametric form (e.g., logistic regression) for the unknown probabilities. In this case, we estimate the corresponding parameters according to their own estimating equations and plug the solutions into the WCLS estimating equation. We can propagate the uncertainty due to estimating these parameters by ‘stacking’ all of the estimating equations vertically and forming a joint sandwich estimator (See background material in Carroll et al., 2006). Although the parametric form of p_h must be correctly specified, p_r may be assumed constant without loss of consistency or asymptotic normality.

2.3 Extension to multiple studies

We now extend the problem setup above to multiple studies. We assume that $\beta_r(t, r^*)$ is defined in a single study population, and we refer to this study as the “internal study.” We allow access to one or more additional “external studies.” Mathematically, we distinguish between these studies using the variable I (for “internal”), which takes on a value of one if an observation is sampled from the internal study population and zero otherwise. Similarly, we denote the number of participants as n_1 and n_0 in the internal and external studies, respectively. We assume the following relationship between the internal and external studies:

ASSUMPTION 5: (*Shared S_t -moderated Effects*) There exists a set of (potentially) time-varying moderators $S_t \supseteq R_t$ such that the S_t -conditional causal excursion effects, $\beta_s(t, s^*)$,

are equal between studies for all s^* :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \{ Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 1) - Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 0) \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s^*, I = 1 \} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \{ Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 1) - Y_{t+1}(\bar{A}_{t-1}, 0) \mid S_t(\bar{A}_{t-1}) = s^*, I = 0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 5 effectively assumes that the average causal effects are equal between studies within appropriately defined strata. The R_t -moderated causal excursion effects may still differ between studies; however, Assumption 5 implies that these differences must be due to differences in the conditional distribution of S_t given R_t .

3. Methods based on conditional mean models

Beginning in this section, we develop five data integration methods that extend WCLS to the multi-study setting. Table 1 compares the methods and offers recommendations on when each method is most applicable. This section introduces the first two methods, A-WCLS and P-WCLS, which rely on models for certain conditional means.

[Table 1 about here.]

3.1 A-WCLS

Our first method is based on the following smoothing identity:

$$\beta_r(t, r^*) = \mathbb{E} \{ \beta_s(t, S_t) \mid R_t = r^* \}. \quad (3)$$

This identity implies that one strategy to estimate $\beta_r(t, r^*)$ is to first estimate $\beta_s(t, S_t)$ and then appropriately average its value conditional on R_t . To that end, we introduce an additional linearity assumption:

ASSUMPTION 6: (*Linear S_t -moderated Effects*) $\beta_s(t, s^*) = f_s(s^*)^\top \beta_s$ for some known function, f_s , determining feature transformations of s^* and some unknown parameter vector, β_s .

Assumption 6 is identical to Assumption 4, replacing R 's with S 's. Given Assumption 6, Equation (3) implies that

$$\beta_r(t, r^*) = \mathbb{E} \{f_s(S_t) | R_t = r^*\}^\top \beta_s. \quad (4)$$

From this identity, we observe that it would be sufficient to estimate the expected value of each component of $f_s(S_t)$ conditional on $R_t = r^*$ and multiply the resulting vector by β_s . For concreteness, we now assume a simple parametric form for this expectation:

ASSUMPTION 7: (*Linear* $\mathbb{E} \{f_s(S_t) | R_t\}$) $\mathbb{E} \{f_s(S_t) | R_t = r^*\} = \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top f_r(r^*)$ for some known function, f_r , determining feature transformations of r^* and some partially known parameter matrix, $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. We further assume that each column of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is either fully known or fully unknown.

Applying Assumption 7 to Equation (4), we see that $\beta_r(t, r^*) = f_r(r^*)^\top \mathbf{\Gamma} \beta_s$ and, consequently, we have $\beta_r = \mathbf{\Gamma} \beta_s$. We name this method **A**pportioned-WCLS (**A**-WCLS) because it apportions the S_t -conditional effects among the elements of $f_r(R_t)$ according to the corresponding conditional expectations. We make the following clarifying remarks regarding Assumption 7.

REMARK 1: The expressions above indicate that Assumptions 6 and 7 actually imply Assumption 4. We list Assumption 4 as a separate assumption because it is required for the other methods. A key insight from the above derivation is that the analyst must choose feature transformations of R_t (encoded by f_r) that allow the expectation of $f_s(S_t)$ to be expressed as a linear function. This assumption can be checked using standard regression diagnostics and plots.

REMARK 2: Assumption 7 is not required for valid inference of $\beta_r(t, r^*)$; rather, it is a simplifying assumption. We could, for instance, assume a GLM-style link function for the various components of $\mathbb{E} \{f_s(S_t) | R_t = r^*\}$, and the methods described below would generalize naturally (though, Assumption 4 would no longer hold).

REMARK 3: Because $R_t \subseteq S_t$, some columns of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are known. In particular, for each common element of $f_r(R_t)$ and $f_s(S_t)$, there will be a corresponding column in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ with a single nonzero entry equal to one. In a similar fashion, we could assume that other elements in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are zero and modify the method below accordingly.

With the parametric identification formula $\beta_r = \mathbf{\Gamma}\beta_s$, estimation proceeds as follows:

- (1) Estimate the unknown treatment assignment probabilities p_h , p_s , and p_r by solving a set of estimating equations (e.g., score functions for logistic regression).
- (2) Estimate β_s by applying WCLS to the combined data set.
- (3) Set $\sigma_r^2(R_t) = p_r(1|R_t) \{1 - p_r(1|R_t)\}$ and solve the following estimating equation for all j corresponding to non-common elements of $f_r(R_t)$ and $f_s(S_t)$:

$$0 = \mathbb{P}_n I \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_r^2(R_t) \left[\{f_s(S_t)\}_j - f_r(R_t)^\top \gamma_j \right] f_r(R_t),$$

The final step is a weighted least-squares regression within the internal-study population. The weights are not required for consistency or asymptotic normality, but they can improve the efficiency of the resulting estimator.

To simplify the inference procedures, we order the elements of $f_s(S_t)$ and $f_r(R_t)$ such that the common elements appear first and in the same positions. We denote the number of common elements as c and the dimensions of $f_r(R_t)$ and $f_s(S_t)$ as d_r and d_s , respectively.

We form $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$ as

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_c & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \cdots & \hat{\gamma}_{d_s-c+1} & \hat{\gamma}_{d_s-c+2} & \cdots & \hat{\gamma}_{d_s} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(d_r-c),c} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

We then calculate our estimate of β_r as $\hat{\beta}_r = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}\hat{\beta}_s$. Letting $\phi = (\beta_s \ \gamma_{d_s-c+1} \ \dots \ \gamma_{d_s})^\top$ with $\hat{\phi}$ defined similarly, standard results in M-estimation then guarantee (under mild regularity conditions) that $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\phi} - \phi) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}_\phi)$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\phi$ consistently estimated via a sandwich estimator. The delta method gives the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}_r$: $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \beta_r) \xrightarrow{d}$

$N(0, \mathbf{D}_\phi \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\phi \mathbf{D}_\phi^\top)$, where \mathbf{D}_ϕ is the total derivative of $\beta_r = \Gamma \beta_s$ with respect to ϕ :

$$\mathbf{D}_\phi = \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi^\top} \beta_r = \left[\Gamma \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \beta_{s,(d_s-c+1):d_s}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d_r} \end{array} \right].$$

In practice, we plug in estimates for \mathbf{D}_ϕ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\phi$, and inference proceeds as usual.

3.2 P-WCLS

This section introduces **Projected-WCLS (P-WCLS)**. P-WCLS requires Assumptions 1–6, but it does not require Assumption 5; hence, the required assumptions are somewhat weaker than those of A-WCLS. P-WCLS estimates β_r by projecting $f_s(S_t)^\top \hat{\beta}_s$ onto $f_r(R_t)$. In terms of implementation, we estimate p_h , p_s , p_r , and β_s as detailed in Section 3.1, but we replace the estimation of Γ with direct estimation of β_r according to the following estimating equation:

$$U_{\beta_r} = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{t=1}^T I \sigma_r^2(R_t) \{ f_s(S_t)^\top \hat{\beta}_s - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \} f_r(R_t). \quad (5)$$

Solving this equation for β_r amounts to performing a regression of the estimated S_t -moderated causal excursion effects, $f_s(S_t)^\top \hat{\beta}_s$, on $f_r(R_t)$ weighted by $\sigma_r^2(R_t)$. A natural follow-up question is whether and how this estimator differs from A-WCLS. Theorem 1 provides a partial answer.

THEOREM 1: *Under Assumption 7, A-WCLS and P-WCLS are equivalent.*

The proof relies on straightforward linear algebra and is provided in Web Appendix A. As pointed out in Stefanski and Boos (2002), the estimating equations defining a given estimator are not unique; however, provided two sets of estimating equations produce the same estimator, they also have the same asymptotic variance. Consequently, the asymptotic variances for A-WCLS and P-WCLS are also equivalent under Assumption 7—a fact that we confirmed empirically while running our simulation study. We introduce A-WCLS as a separate method because (a) it provides guidance on how to select f_r (see Remark 1), (b) it is distinct from P-WCLS under modifications of Assumption 7 (see Remarks 2 and 3), and (c) the interpretation of β_r as a linear combination of β_s allows us to connect and

interpret multiple levels of moderation analysis. In cases where A-WCLS and P-WCLS are equivalent, we recommend performing inference via P-WCLS because it allows for a simpler implementation—the delta method is not needed.

4. Methods based on density ratio models

This section introduces **Exponentially Tilted WCLS (ET-WCLS)**. Rather than assuming a model for shared conditional expectations, ET-WCLS relates the internal and external studies via an exponential density ratio model. We also show how to combine the resulting estimator with WCLS to produce a meta-estimator that is asymptotically superior to WCLS.

4.1 ET-WCLS

Similar to A-WCLS and P-WCLS, ET-WCLS assumes that the S_t -conditional causal excursion effects are equal between studies (Assumption 5). In contrast to A-WCLS and P-WCLS, however, ET-WCLS does not require them to assume a particular parametric form (i.e., Assumptions 6 and 7 do not apply). Instead, we assume the studies can be related according to a density ratio as follows:

ASSUMPTION 8: (*Exponential Tilt Density Ratio*) $p(S_t | I = 0) > 0$ if $p(S_t | I = 1) > 0$ except, perhaps, on sets of measure zero. Further, there exists a set of feature transformations, $d(S_t)$, and corresponding parameter vector, ω , such that the conditional densities of S_t can be related as follows:

$$\omega(S_t) := \frac{p(S_t | I = 1)}{p(S_t | I = 0)} = \exp \{d(S_t)^\top \omega\}.$$

Assumption 8 allows us to view the external data as an unevenly sampled representation of the internal study population. This relationship suggests a strategy in which we estimate $\omega(S_t)$ and use it to counterbalance the under- and over-representation of each data point, similar to the methods provided in Graham et al. (2012, 2016) and Tan (2006). Qin (1998)

details how to estimate density ratios of this form via a slight modification of logistic regression (due to case-control parity, the non-intercept coefficients are identical). The full estimation procedure for ET-WCLS is given below:

- (1) If needed, estimate p_h and p_r as explained in Section 3.1
- (2) Maximize the log-likelihood $\ell(\omega) = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{t=1}^T (Id(S_t)^\top \omega - \log [1 + \rho \exp \{d(S_t)^\top \omega\}])$, where $\rho := n_1/n_0$ to obtain an estimate of ω
- (3) Estimate β_r as the solution to Equation (2), replacing W_t with $[(1 - I) \exp \{d(S_t)^\top \omega\} W_t]$

In Web Appendix A, we prove the following result about ET-WCLS:

THEOREM 2: *Assuming the existence of certain moments, the ET-WCLS estimator is a consistent, asymptotically normal estimator of β_r .*

We prove Theorem 2 using classical results in M-estimation. The regularity conditions require the reweighted WCLS equation to have bounded fourth moments. From a practical standpoint, this requirement means that there must be sufficient overlap between studies in the distributions of S_t ; otherwise, ET-WCLS may suffer from instability in a manner similar to other weighting methods, such as inverse probability weighting (Robins et al., 2007; Seaman and White, 2013).

4.2 Meta-estimator

A common practical challenge with weighting-based estimators is that they can exhibit high variance under insufficient overlap, even if the theoretical requirements are satisfied. For ET-WCLS in particular, this challenge results in ET-WCLS being less efficient than WCLS-Internal (the single-study analysis) unless the external study is large relative to the internal study. This dilemma begs the question: Is it possible to pool the WCLS-Internal and ET-WCLS estimates such that the resulting estimator is more efficient than either estimate

individually? This section introduces an asymptotically optimal meta-estimator that provides an affirmative answer to this question.

The central challenge in developing the meta-estimator is that WCLS-Internal and ET-WCLS are, in general, correlated due to estimation of ω , which involves both the internal and external studies. Consequently, the classical solution of precision weighting is not guaranteed to be optimal. We note that closely related problems have been considered in the meta-analysis literature. Valentine (2019) summarizes multivariate methods that are applicable to vector-valued effect-size estimates provided there is no correlation between estimates. In contrast, Hedges and Olkin (2014, Chapter 10) provide a meta-analysis method for dependent estimates of a scalar-valued parameter. However, our setting involves both of these challenges: vector-valued estimates with correlation both within *and* between estimates. We were unable to locate a method that addresses both of these challenges.

The first step toward a solution is to jointly stack all relevant estimating equations. For full generality, we consider the case with $J \geq 2$ distinct estimators of β_r . We stack these estimators in a single vector as follows:

$$\hat{\theta} = \left(\hat{\beta}_{r1}^\top, \hat{\beta}_{r2}^\top, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{rJ}^\top \right)^\top.$$

We then form a sandwich estimator, $\hat{\Sigma}$, of $\Sigma := \text{Var} \left(\sqrt{n} \hat{\theta} \right)$ that captures the dependence structure both within *and* between the $\hat{\beta}_{rj}$'s. Letting $\hat{\Lambda} := \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}$, the meta-estimator is then defined as

$$\hat{\beta}_r = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_{j,k} \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_j \hat{\theta} = (\mathbf{1}_J^\top \otimes \hat{\Omega}) \hat{\Lambda} \hat{\theta}$$

with $\hat{\Omega} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_{j,k} \right)^{-1}$. We denote the population-level analogs of $\hat{\Lambda}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ as Λ and Ω , respectively. $\hat{\beta}_r$ reduces to standard precision weighting when the off-diagonal blocks of $\hat{\Lambda}$ (or, equivalently, $\hat{\Sigma}$) are zero. Similarly, it reduces to the estimator given in Hedges and Olkin (2014, Chapter 10) when β_r is a scalar. $\hat{\Omega}$ is guaranteed to exist and, consequently,

β_r is well-defined provided $\hat{\Sigma}$ is positive definite. This property follows from the following proposition, the proof of which is given in Web Appendix A.

PROPOSITION 1: Let A be a positive definite square matrix. Then for any partition of this matrix into equal-sized blocks, the sum of these blocks is also positive definite and, hence, invertible.

We now turn our attention to the asymptotic properties of $\hat{\beta}_r$. In Web Appendix A, we prove the following result:

THEOREM 3: Consider the class of unbiased estimators of β_r that can be written in the form $B\hat{\theta}$ for some matrix B that may depend on $\hat{\Sigma}$. Among this class of estimators, $\hat{\beta}_r$ achieves the minimum asymptotic variance, $\frac{1}{n}(1_J^\top \otimes \Omega)\Lambda(1_J \otimes \Omega)$, which can be consistently estimated as $\frac{1}{n}(1_J^\top \otimes \hat{\Omega})\hat{\Lambda}(1_J \otimes \hat{\Omega})$.

The proof relies on showing that $\hat{\beta}_r$ is asymptotically equivalent to an oracle estimator having the same mathematical formulation as β_r , but employing Σ and Λ instead of $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}$. The optimality of this oracle estimator follows from an application of the Gauss–Markov Theorem for generalized least squares. Theorem 3 immediately implies that pooling the WCLS-Internal and ET-WCLS estimators is asymptotically superior to simply selecting one of the two estimators. More generally, the meta-estimator provides an asymptotically optimal formula for combining correlated estimates that is applicable in broader settings than those considered here.

One drawback of the meta-estimator is that it relies on accurate estimation of a large, full-rank covariance matrix. Consequently, we expect its performance to degrade in small samples when this covariance matrix is poorly estimated. In these settings, one path forward is to assume that Σ takes on a Kronecker structure, a common assumption in high-dimensional

covariance estimation (Srivastava et al., 2008). Web Appendix B provides the methodological details.

5. Combination methods

Having developed two general data integration strategies, we now turn our attention to developing methods that combine them for increased robustness and efficiency.

5.1 DR-WCLS

The first combination method we develop is **D**oubly **R**obust WCLS (**DR**-WCLS): a combination of P-WCLS and ET-WCLS that produces valid inferences provided that the assumptions for at least one method hold. We develop methods separately for the internal and external study, then discuss how to combine them using the meta-estimator of Section 4.2. We discuss the internal study first. Our proposed method is based on a ‘pseudo-outcome,’ \tilde{Y}_{t+1} , similar to those employed in Bang and Robins (2005) and Kennedy (2023):

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{Y_{t+1} - m(H_t, A_t)}{A_t - p_h(0|H_t)} + m(H_t, 1) - m(H_1, 0) \\ &= \frac{W_t \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} \{Y_{t+1} - m(H_t, A_t)\}}{\sigma_r^2(R_t)} + m(H_t, 1) - m(H_1, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where $m(H_t, A_t)$ is a model having $\mathbb{E}\{m(H_t, 1) - m(H_t, 0)|S_t\} = f_s(S_t)^\top \beta_s$, such as

$$m(H_t, A_t) = g(H_t)^\top \alpha + \{A_t - p_s(1|S_t)\} f_s(S_t)^\top \beta_s.$$

We then have $E[\tilde{Y}_{t+1}|S_t, I = 1] = \beta_s(t, S_t)$ even if $f_s(S_t)^\top \beta_s$ is misspecified. Thus, based on our smoothing identity (Equation (3)), we can estimate β_r by regressing \tilde{Y}_{t+1} on $f_r(R_t)$ in the internal study according to the following estimating equation:

$$0 = \mathbb{P}_n I \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_r^2(R_t) [\tilde{Y}_{t+1} - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r] f_r(R_t). \quad (6)$$

The resulting estimator is fully robust in the sense that it does not require any of Assumptions 6, 7, or 8 to hold. However, the estimator above uses the external study only to

produce a shared model, $m(H_t, A_t)$, and as such produces limited efficiency gains relative to standard WCLS.

To attain meaningful efficiency gains, we now turn our attention toward developing a doubly-robust estimator that uses the external study more directly. This estimator cannot be represented using a single pseudo-outcome as above. Instead, we work directly from an expanded version of Equation (6). The estimating equation defining the external-study is $0 = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{U}(\beta_r)$, where $\tilde{U}(\beta_r)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1-I}{1-\pi} \omega(S_t) W_t \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} \{Y_{t+1} - m(H_t, A_t)\} f_r(R_t) \\ & + \frac{I}{\pi} \sigma_r^2(R_t) \{m(H_t, 1) - m(H_t, 0)\} f_r(R_t) \\ & - \frac{I}{\pi} \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r f_r(R_t), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with π representing the population proportion of individuals belonging to the internal study. Note that this nuisance parameter requires its own estimating equation of the form $0 = \mathbb{P}_n(I - \pi)$. On the one hand, if the model-based assumptions (Assumptions 6 and 7) hold, then the first term has expectation zero and the second term (equal to $\beta_s(t, S_t)$ by Assumption 6) is projected onto $f_r(R_t)$ in a manner similar to P-WCLS. On the other hand, if Assumption 8 holds, then

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1-I}{1-\pi} \omega(S_t) W_t [A_t - p_r(1|R_t)] m(H_t, A_t) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{I}{\pi} \sigma_r^2(R_t) [m(H_t, 1) - m(H_t, 0)],$$

so the corresponding terms in Equation (7) cancel in expectation, leaving only the term involving Y_{t+1} and the last line. Under Assumption 8, the expectation of the former is $\sigma_r^2(R_t) \beta_r(t, R_t) = \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r$. Consequently, β_r solves the estimating equation in expectation, which implies that the solution to Equation (7) is a consistent estimator of β_r .

Combining these observations, we see that the external study estimator possesses the desired double-robustness property. After forming these two estimates and the corresponding joint sandwich estimator, we can then combine them via the meta-estimator of Section 4.2. The meta-estimator preserves the doubly-robust nature of the individual estimators and, by

Theorem 3, results in an estimator with lower asymptotic variance than either individual estimator.

5.2 PET-WCLS

In this section, we briefly discuss our second combination method, **PET**-WCLS, which combines **P**-WCLS and **ET**-WCLS, effectively requiring Assumptions 6, 7, and 8 to hold. We form the estimator by combining WCLS-Internal, P-WCLS, and ET-WCLS according to our meta-estimator. When Assumptions 6, 7, and 8 all hold, PET-WCLS is guaranteed to be asymptotically superior to any other linear combination of its constituent methods by Theorem 3.

6. Simulation

This section details a simulation study we performed to empirically evaluate the performance of our proposed estimators.

6.1 Simulation setup

Throughout the simulation study, we use $T = 20$ time points. The simulation includes two simulated studies: one internal, one external. We vary the number of participants in each study, n_1 and n_0 , to investigate the impact of sample size on the efficiency of our estimators. The simulation employs three simulated covariates: X_{t1} , X_{t2} , and X_{t3} . We set $R_t = X_{t1}$, $S_t = \{X_{t1}, X_{t2}\}$, $\beta_s(t, S_t) = 1 + 2X_{t1} - 3X_{t2}$, and $\beta_r(t, R_t) = -2 + 5X_{t1}$. Web Appendix E provides additional details on the simulation setup and a link to the computer code.

In the results below, we label methods that use only the internal data set with the suffix -Internal. The other methods use both the internal and external data sets. WCLS-Pooled naively applies WCLS to the pooled data set, which generally results in biased estimates.

6.2 Simulation results

[Table 2 about here.]

Table 2 summarizes the performance of each method with $n_1 = n_0 = 400$. As expected, every method except WCLS-Pooled exhibited minimal bias and near-nominal confidence interval coverage. We show in Web Appendix F that the bias—albeit minimal—apparent in the density ratio methods (ET-WCLS, DR-WCLS, and PET-WCLS) diminishes with larger sample sizes.

P-WCLS, ET-WCLS, DR-WCLS, and PET-WCLS all outperform WCLS-Internal in terms of statistical efficiency and rMSE. PET-WCLS performs best—likely because it is asymptotically superior to WCLS, P-WCLS, and ET-WCLS—achieving efficiency improvements of 36.3% and 53.9% relative to WCLS-Internal. P-WCLS outperforms WCLS-Internal only when it uses the external data; otherwise, its performance is quite similar to WCLS-Internal. Web Appendix F shows additional comparisons, including different sample sizes and method variations.

7. Case study

In this section, we apply P-WCLS to the MARS and Affective Science studies.

7.1 Study design

In both studies, the treatment is to send push notifications that prompt participants to engage in evidence-based self-regulatory strategies. The stated goal of these notifications is to “improve smokers’ ability to resist craving and build self-regulatory skills” (Nahum-Shani et al., 2021).

Six times per day for ten days, the mHealth app prompted participants to answer a two-question (2-Q) survey about cigarette availability and current affect. Immediately upon answering the survey (or about two minutes later in the case of non-response), the app

randomly assigned participants to receive a prompt to engage in a self-regulatory strategy with probability 0.5. Approximately one hour after randomization, the app prompted participants to answer additional questions in an ecological momentary assessment (EMA; Shiffman et al., 2008).

7.2 Data analysis

At the time of writing, the Affective Science study is still enrolling participants, but the MARS study has completed enrollment and the results are currently being analyzed. Consequently, we have access only to a subset of preliminary data ($n_1 = 68$, $n_0 = 97$) that will be further refined to assess the studies' primary aims. Although the MARS study recruited 114 participants, we excluded 17 due to withdrawn consent (3), lack of microrandomizations (1), insufficient EMA adherence (11), or missing baseline tobacco dependence (2). The main hypotheses for the MARS study are based on self-reported (via EMA) engagement with self-regulatory strategies. Because our primary goal is to use these studies to demonstrate our methods, we restrict attention to a separate outcome: The amount of time (in seconds) spent in the app activities in the hour following micro-randomization.

To apply our methods, we must select two sets of moderators, S_t and R_t . The goal is to estimate how R_t moderates treatment efficacy. In contrast, $S_t \supseteq R_t$ is a set of moderators such that Assumption 5 is plausible; i.e., conditional on S_t , the causal excursion effects are equal between studies. We include two variables in R_t : an indicator for whether the participant completed the last 2-Q survey and the smoker's baseline tobacco dependence (measured by the participant's response to the question "How many cigarettes do you smoke per day?"). S_t includes two additional variables: an indicator for whether the participant identifies as male and the participant's self-reported race/ethnicity. The race/ethnicity variable is divided into three categories: Latino, non-Latino white, and other, which includes non-Latino black and other minority races.

Based on these choices, Assumption 5 states that participants with the same 2-Q survey completion status, baseline tobacco dependence, gender, and race/ethnicity have the same causal excursion effects regardless of which study they participated in (MARS or Affective Science). Although we cannot verify this assumption, we can attempt to falsify it via a χ^2 model comparison test. The resulting p-value is 0.98, indicating essentially no evidence against Assumption 5.

We apply P-WCLS because (1) it performed well in our simulation study and (2) it is less sensitive to misspecification of its required sub-model ($\beta_s(t, s^*)$) than the methods relying on density ratios. Table 3 displays the estimates of β_r via WCLS-Internal, P-WCLS-Internal, and P-WCLS-Pooled. As expected, P-WCLS-Pooled produces the smallest standard errors because it leverages the MARS data to improve statistical efficiency. For completeness, we also show results for our other methods in Web Appendix C.

Figure 1 provides a visual depiction of the estimated effects. We have strong evidence of a positive effect across most values of R_t . The estimated coefficients suggest that the effects are more than twice as large among those who responded to the previous 2-Q survey compared to those who did not. In contrast, we see limited evidence that a smoker’s baseline tobacco dependence (mean: 13.1, SD: 7.6) moderates these effects.

[Table 3 about here.]

[Figure 1 about here.]

8. Discussion

This paper presents five methods for pooling data across multiple MRTs for the purpose of estimating causal excursion effects. The simulations demonstrate that the methods outperform the standard single-study analysis (WCLS-Internal) without losing the ability to

perform calibrated inference on β_r . The case study provides an illustrative example of (1) the mechanics of applying the method to real MRTs and (2) the potential for efficiency gains.

In practice, researchers must decide which method and corresponding assumptions to employ for a given analysis. While implementing the case study and simulation, we found that the exponential tilt models were more difficult to specify accurately than the conditional mean models, in part because common regression diagnostics can be used to check the latter. Moreover, when the exponential tilt models are misspecified, we observed that the resulting estimators—including the robust estimators—can be highly unstable. Our recommendations in Table 1 largely reflect this finding.

All five data integration methods rely on Assumption 5—that the S_t -moderated causal excursion effects are equal between studies. Future work might consider how to relax this assumption, perhaps assuming bounds on discrepancies between the S_t -moderated causal excursion effects in each study. Under this modified assumption, a natural approach would be to penalize the internal-study estimates toward those of the external study. This approach would require careful consideration of the resulting bias–variance tradeoff.

In addition to the data integration methods, we also developed an asymptotically optimal meta-estimator that generalizes the classical method of precision weighting. We suspect this meta-estimator could be applied in other settings outside of mHealth, especially in the areas of meta-analysis and data integration.

An interesting direction for future research would be to combine some of the ideas here with other extensions of WCLS; e.g., the extensions to binary outcomes or clustered MRTs. This direction would allow the application of these methods in broader mHealth contexts. Boruvka et al. (2018) briefly mention that it is possible to extend WCLS to the setting of three or more treatment levels by introducing multiple centered treatment indicators. Web

Appendix D provides a proof that this strategy does, in fact, result in consistent estimates and discusses how to apply this strategy to our methods.

As these methods are applied to future MRTs, one potential challenge is identifying how to relate measurements and treatments across different study designs. At a minimum, our proposed methods require (1) treatments with similar effects, (2) a shared set of moderators, and (3) a similar outcome between studies. Moreover, these variables must be selected so that Assumption 5 is plausible. Relaxations of Assumption 5 could help address this challenge, but the practical relevance of external studies will remain a central consideration in whether and how to integrate data across MRTs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Jamie Yap and Qinggang Yu (d3c team members) for their assistance in curating the data for the case study. This work was supported in part by grant P50DA054039 provided through the NIH and NIDDK. The MARS and Affective Science studies were funded by grants U01CA229437 and R01CA224537, respectively, provided through the NIH and NCI.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data underlying this article cannot be shared publicly due to privacy of the participants involved in the MARS and Affective Science studies.

REFERENCES

- Bang, H. and Robins, J. M. (2005). Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics* **61**, 962–973.
- Boruvka, A., Almirall, D., Witkiewitz, K., and Murphy, S. A. (2018). Assessing time-varying

- causal effect moderation in mobile health. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**, 1112–1121.
- Carroll, R. J., Ruppert, D., Stefanski, L. A., and Crainiceanu, C. M. (2006). *Measurement error in nonlinear models: a modern perspective*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Dempsey, W., Liao, P., Kumar, S., and Murphy, S. A. (2020). The stratified micro-randomized trial design: sample size considerations for testing nested causal effects of time-varying treatments. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **14**, 661.
- Graham, B. S., de Xavier Pinto, C. C., and Egel, D. (2012). Inverse probability tilting for moment condition models with missing data. *The Review of Economic Studies* **79**, 1053–1079.
- Graham, B. S., Pinto, C. C. d. X., and Egel, D. (2016). Efficient estimation of data combination models by the method of auxiliary-to-study tilting (AST). *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **34**, 288–301.
- Hedges, L. V. and Olkin, I. (2014). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. Academic Press.
- Kennedy, E. H. (2023). Towards optimal doubly robust estimation of heterogeneous causal effects. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **17**, 3008–3049.
- Konstantopoulos, S. and Hedges, L. V. (2019). Statistically analyzing effect sizes: Fixed- and random-effects models. In Cooper, H., Hedges, L. V., and Valentine, J. C., editors, *The Handbook of Research Synthesis and Meta-Analysis*, chapter 12, pages 245–280. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Liao, P., Klasnja, P., Tewari, A., and Murphy, S. A. (2016). Sample size calculations for micro-randomized trials in mhealth. *Statistics in Medicine* **35**, 1944–1971.
- Nahum-Shani, I., Hekler, E. B., and Spruijt-Metz, D. (2015). Building health behavior models to guide the development of just-in-time adaptive interventions: A pragmatic framework. *Health Psychology* **34**, 1209.

- Nahum-Shani, I., Potter, L. N., Lam, C. Y., Yap, J., Moreno, A., Stoffel, R., Wu, Z., Wan, N., Dempsey, W., Kumar, S., Ertin, E., Murphy, S. A., Rehg, J. M., and Wetter, D. W. (2021). The mobile assistance for regulating smoking (mars) micro-randomized trial design protocol. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* **110**, 106513.
- Nahum-Shani, I., Smith, S. N., Spring, B. J., Collins, L. M., Witkiewitz, K., Tewari, A., and Murphy, S. A. (2018). Just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAIs) in mobile health: key components and design principles for ongoing health behavior support. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* **52**, 446–462.
- Qian, T., Walton, A. E., Collins, L. M., Klasnja, P., Lanza, S. T., Nahum-Shani, I., Rabbi, M., Russell, M. A., Walton, M. A., Yoo, H., et al. (2022). The microrandomized trial for developing digital interventions: Experimental design and data analysis considerations. *Psychological Methods* **27**, 874–894.
- Qian, T., Yoo, H., Klasnja, P., Almirall, D., and Murphy, S. A. (2021). Estimating time-varying causal excursion effects in mobile health with binary outcomes. *Biometrika* **108**, 507–527.
- Qin, J. (1998). Inferences for case-control and semiparametric two-sample density ratio models. *Biometrika* **85**, 619–630.
- Robins, J., Sued, M., Lei-Gomez, Q., and Rotnitzky, A. (2007). Comment: Performance of double-robust estimators when “inverse probability” weights are highly variable. *Statistical Science* **22**, 544–559.
- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology* **66**, 688–701.
- Seaman, S. R. and White, I. R. (2013). Review of inverse probability weighting for dealing with missing data. *Statistical methods in medical research* **22**, 278–295.
- Shi, J. and Dempsey, W. (2023). A meta-learning method for estimation of causal excursion

- effects to assess time-varying moderation. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.16297> .
- Shi, J., Wu, Z., and Dempsey, W. (2023a). Assessing time-varying causal effect moderation in the presence of cluster-level treatment effect heterogeneity and interference. *Biometrika* **110**, 645–662.
- Shi, J., Wu, Z., and Dempsey, W. (2023b). Incorporating auxiliary variables to improve the efficiency of time-varying treatment effect estimation. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.17260> .
- Shi, X., Pan, Z., and Miao, W. (2023). Data integration in causal inference. *WIREs Computational Statistics* **15**, e1581.
- Shiffman, S., Stone, A. A., and Hufford, M. R. (2008). Ecological momentary assessment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* **4**, 1–32.
- Srivastava, M. S., von Rosen, T., and Von Rosen, D. (2008). Models with a Kronecker product covariance structure: estimation and testing. *Mathematical methods of statistics* **17**, 357–370.
- Stefanski, L. A. and Boos, D. D. (2002). The calculus of m-estimation. *The American Statistician* **56**, 29–38.
- Tan, Z. (2006). A distributional approach for causal inference using propensity scores. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101**, 1619–1637.
- Valentine, J. C. (2019). Stochastically dependent effect sizes. In Cooper, H., Hedges, L. V., and Valentine, J. C., editors, *The Handbook of Research Synthesis and Meta-Analysis*, chapter 13, pages 281–297. Russell Sage Foundation.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Web Appendices referenced in Sections 3, 4, 6, and 7 are available at the end of this document. The code for the simulation study is publicly available at <https://github.com/eastonhuch/mrt-data-integration.git>.

Received March 2024.




Figure 1. Estimated effect of prompts on time spent in the mobile app within the Affective Science study. Dashed lines denote pointwise 95% confidence bands.

	$\mathbb{E}(f_s(S_t) R_t)$ model	$\beta_s(t, s^*)$ model	$\omega(S_t)$ model	Combination method	Recommended use case
A-WCLS	✓				Known structure/constraints for $\mathbb{E}(f_s(S_t) R_t)$
P-WCLS		✓			High confidence in $\beta_s(t, s^*)$; low confidence in $\omega(S_t)$
ET-WCLS			✓		Subcomponent in PET-WCLS
DR-WCLS		✓	✓	✓	Medium confidence in both $\beta_s(t, s^*)$ and $\omega(S_t)$
PET-WCLS		✓	✓	✓	High confidence in both $\beta_s(t, s^*)$ and $\omega(S_t)$

Table 1

Summary of proposed methods. The first three columns indicate which models are required for each method. “Combination method” indicates which methods combine several individual estimators. “Recommended use case” presents recommendations on when each method is particularly appropriate; see Section 8 for further discussion.

Coefficient name	True value	Method	Avg estimate	Relative efficiency	rMSE	Coverage
Intercept	-2	WCLS-Internal	-1.94	100.0%	1.57	94.5%
	-2	WCLS-Pooled	-0.48	N/A	1.77	61.0%
	-2	P-WCLS-Internal	-1.94	99.9%	1.57	95.3%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled	-1.96	119.0%	1.31	95.8%
	-2	ET-WCLS	-2.32	113.1%	1.42	92.5%
	-2	DR-WCLS	-2.27	116.6%	1.37	95.3%
	-2	PET-WCLS	-2.27	136.3%	1.18	94.3%
Slope	5	WCLS-Internal	4.86	100.0%	1.77	96.0%
	5	WCLS-Pooled	3.44	N/A	1.86	58.8%
	5	P-WCLS-Internal	4.86	99.9%	1.77	96.0%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled	4.92	130.9%	1.35	95.8%
	5	ET-WCLS	5.02	116.7%	1.51	93.8%
	5	DR-WCLS	5.10	124.9%	1.42	96.3%
	5	PET-WCLS	5.14	153.9%	1.16	94.0%

Table 2

Results from the simulation with 400 individuals in both the internal and external studies. For the “Avg estimate” and “Coverage” columns, the boldface indicates values within Monte Carlo error (3σ) of the truth. For the “Relative efficiency” and “rMSE” columns, the boldface indicates the best performance for each coefficient (PET-WCLS in both cases).

Coefficient Name	WCLS-Internal	P-WCLS-Internal	P-WCLS-Pooled
Intercept	*25.15 (9.50)	*25.16 (10.04)	*28.77 (6.61)
Tobacco Dependence	0.09 (0.58)	0.09 (0.61)	-0.04 (0.43)
2-Q Survey Completion	*39.47 (7.35)	*39.45 (7.76)	*40.89 (6.13)

Table 3

Estimates of β_r (standard errors) from applying WCLS-Internal, P-WCLS-Internal, and P-WCLS-Pooled in the case study; asterisks denote statistical significance at the 0.05 level. P-WCLS-Pooled produces the smallest standard errors.

Web appendices for *Data integration methods for micro-randomized trials*

E. Huch^{1,*}, I. Nahum–Shani^{1,**}, L. Potter², C. Lam², D.W. Wetter², and W. Dempsey^{1,***}

¹d3 Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

²Department of Population Health Sciences and Huntsman Cancer Institute,
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A.

March 2024

A Proofs

This appendix provides proofs of Theorems 1, 2, and 3 and Proposition 1.

Proof of Theorem 1

The equivalence can be shown as follows. Let \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{S} denote design matrices containing $f_r(R_t)$ and $f_s(S_t)$, respectively, across all time points and participants. Let \mathbf{D} denote a diagonal matrix with entries equal to $\sigma_r^2(R_t)$ and appearing in the same order as the rows of \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{S} . The estimate of β_r using P-WCLS is then $\hat{\beta}_r^P = (\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{S} \hat{\beta}_s$. The estimate of β_r using A-WCLS is $\hat{\beta}_r^A = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} \hat{\beta}_s$, where $\hat{\beta}_s$ is the WCLS estimate of the shared conditional model.

For $j \leq c$, the j -th column of $(\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{S}$ is the j -th canonical basis vector for \mathbb{R}^{d_r} because $\mathbf{S}_j = \mathbf{R}_j$ (we are, in effect, regressing \mathbf{S}_j on itself). For $j > c$, the j -th column is $(\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{S}_j$. In both cases, this corresponds to the j -th column of $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$, so $(\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{S} = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$. Consequently, we have $\hat{\beta}_r^P = (\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{R})^{-1} \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{S} \hat{\beta}_s = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} \hat{\beta}_s = \hat{\beta}_r^A$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2

We first note that Bayes' rule implies that $\omega(S_t)$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$\omega(S_t) = \frac{p(S_t | I = 1)}{p(S_t | I = 0)} = \frac{p(R_t | I = 1)}{p(R_t | I = 0)} \cdot \frac{p(S_t | R_t, I = 1)}{p(S_t | R_t, I = 0)}.$$

The estimating equation is $0 = \mathbb{P}_n U_{\text{ET}}(\alpha, \beta_r)$ with

$$U_{\text{ET}}(\alpha, \beta_r) = (1 - I) \sum_{t=1}^T \omega(S_t) W_t \left\{ Y_{t+1} - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - [A_t - p_r(1|R_t)] f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right\} \left[[A_t - p_r(1|R_t)] f_r(R_t) \right].$$

Under certain regularity conditions—in particular, finite fourth moments of $U_{\text{ET}}(\alpha, \beta_r)$ —classical results in M-estimation guarantee that the corresponding estimator, $\hat{\beta}_r$, will converge in probability to the root of $\mathbb{E} U_{\text{ET}}(\alpha, \beta_r) = 0$. We now show that this root corresponds to the estimand of interest. We focus on the rows of $U_{\text{ET}}(\alpha, \beta_r)$ corresponding to β_r .

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathbb{E}_{Y_{t+1}, A_t, H_t | I=0} \{ U_{\text{ET}}(\alpha, \beta_r) \} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{Y_{t+1}, A_t, H_t | I=0} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \left(Y_{t+1} - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \omega(S_t) \frac{p_r(A_t|R_t)}{p_h(A_t|H_t)} \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t) \middle| I = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{H_t, A_t | I=0} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{Y_{t+1} | A_t, H_t, I=0} \left(\right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left[Y_{t+1} - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \cdot \omega(S_t) \frac{p_r(A_t|R_t)}{p_h(A_t|H_t)} \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \middle| A_t, H_t, I = 0 \right) \middle| I = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{H_t | I=0} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{A_t | H_t, I=0} \left(\right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left[\mathbb{E}(Y_{t+1} | A_t, H_t) - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \cdot \omega(S_t) \frac{p_r(A_t|R_t)}{p_h(A_t|H_t)} \{A_t - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \middle| H_t, I = 0 \right) \middle| I = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{S_t | I=0} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{H_t | S_t, I=0} \left(\right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \sum_{a=0}^1 \left[\mathbb{E}(Y_{t+1} | A_t = a, H_t, I = 0) - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \{a - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \cdot p_h(a|H_t) \omega(S_t) \frac{p_r(a|R_t)}{p_h(a|H_t)} \{a - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \middle| S_t, I = 0 \right) \middle| I = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{S_t | I=0} \left[\mathbb{E}_{H_t | S_t, I=0} \left\{ \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \sum_{a=0}^1 \left(\left[\mathbb{E}(Y_{t+1} | A_t = a, H_t, I = 0) - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \{a - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right] \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \cdot \omega(S_t) p_r(a|R_t) \{a - p_r(1|R_t)\} f_r(R_t) \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \middle| S_t, I = 0 \right\} \middle| I = 0 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{S_t|I=0} \left(\left[\mathbb{E}_{H_t|S_t, I=0} \left\{ \mathbb{E}(Y_{t+1}|A_t = 1, H_t) - \mathbb{E}(Y_{t+1}|A_t = 0, H_t) \middle| S_t, I = 1 \right\} - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \omega(S_t) \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) \middle| I = 0 \right) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=0} \left(\mathbb{E}_{S_t|R_t, I=0} \left[\left\{ \beta_s(S_t, t) - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right\} \cdot \omega(S_t) \middle| R_t, I = 0 \right] \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) \middle| I = 0 \right) \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=0} \left\{ \frac{p(R_t|I=1)}{p(R_t|I=0)} \mathbb{E}_{S_t|R_t, I=0} \left[\frac{p(S_t|R_t, I=1)}{p(S_t|R_t, I=0)} \left\{ \beta_s(S_t, t) - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right\} \middle| R_t, I = 0 \right] \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) \middle| I = 0 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=1} \left[\sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) \mathbb{E}_{S_t|R_t, I=1} \left\{ \beta_s(S_t, t) - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \middle| R_t, I = 1 \right\} \middle| I = 1 \right] \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=1} \left[\sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) \left\{ \beta_r(R_t, t) - f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r \right\} \middle| I = 1 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\hat{\beta}_r$ converges in probability to

$$\beta_r^* = \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=1} \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) f_r(R_t)^\top \right\}^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=1} \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) \beta_r(R_t, t).$$

In particular, provided $\beta_r(t, R_t) = f_r(R_t)^\top \beta_r$ (Assumption 4), we have

$$\beta_r^* = \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=1} \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) f_r(R_t)^\top \right\}^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t|I=1} \sigma_r^2(R_t) f_r(R_t) f_r(R_t)^\top \right\} \beta_r = \beta_r.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 1

Let A be an arbitrary positive definite square matrix. Now partition A into equal-sized blocks, forming a $J \times J$ block matrix for some arbitrary (but compatible) $J \in \mathbb{N}$, yielding submatrices of dimension $D \times D$. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$, we can write

$$\alpha^\top \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J A_{jk} \right) \alpha = \alpha^\top (1_J^\top \otimes I_D) A (1_J \otimes I_D) \alpha = \beta^\top A \beta > 0$$

because A is positive definite. Thus, $\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J A_{jk} \right)$ is positive definite and, consequently, invertible.

□

Proof of Theorem 3

We first define an oracle version of $\hat{\beta}_r$: $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}} = (1_J^\top \otimes \Omega) \Lambda \hat{\theta}$, where $\Omega = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_{jk} \right)^{-1}$. It's straightforward to verify that $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ is asymptotically multivariate Gaussian with mean β_r and covariance matrix $\frac{1}{n} (1_J^\top \otimes \Omega) \Lambda (1_J \otimes \Omega)$. We first show that $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ is optimal in the class of estimators shown in the Theorem.

Lemma 1. Consider the class of unbiased estimators of β_r that can be written in the form $B\hat{\theta}$ for some matrix B . Among this class of estimators, $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ achieves the minimum asymptotic variance: $\frac{1}{n}(1_J^\top \otimes \Omega)\Lambda(1_J \otimes \Omega)$.

Proof. Lemma 1 can be proved by writing $\hat{\beta}_r$ as a generalized least squares (GLS) estimate and applying the Gauss–Markov Theorem for GLS. For completeness, we provide a more primitive proof below.

We can write any other estimator that is linear in $\hat{\theta}$ as $\check{\beta}_r = [(1_J^\top \otimes \Omega)\Lambda + A]\hat{\theta}$ for some matrix A . Because $\mathbb{E}[(1_J^\top \otimes \Omega)\Lambda\hat{\theta}] = \beta_r$, requiring $\check{\beta}_r$ to be unbiased means that

$$\mathbb{E}(A\hat{\theta}) = A(1_J \otimes \beta_r) = \sum_{j=1}^J A_j \beta_r = 0,$$

where A_j is the j -th submatrix of A partitioned as $A = [A_1 \ A_2 \ \dots \ A_J]$. Because this must be true for all β_r , it must be the case that $\sum_{j=1}^J A_j = 0$. Now we turn our attention to the variance:

$$\text{Var}(\check{\beta}_r) = (1_J^\top \otimes \Omega)\Lambda(1_J \otimes \Omega) + (1_J^\top \otimes \Omega)\Lambda\Sigma A^\top + A\Sigma\Lambda(1_J \otimes \Omega) + A\Sigma A^\top.$$

The first term is $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}})$, the last term is positive semidefinite, and the middle two components (which are transposed versions of each other) are equal to zero because

$$A\Sigma\Lambda(1_J \otimes \Omega) = A(1_J \otimes \Omega) = \sum_{j=1}^J A_j \Omega = \left[\sum_{j=1}^J A_j \right] \Omega = 0.$$

The final equality follows from the unbiasedness condition: $\sum_{j=1}^J A_j = 0$. Thus, we have

$$\text{Var}(\check{\beta}_r) = \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}) + A\Sigma A^\top \geq \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}).$$

Because this holds for any matrix A that results in an unbiased estimator, it follows that $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ achieves the minimum variance in the desired class of estimators. □

Having shown that $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ has the desired optimality property, we now show that $\hat{\beta}_r$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$. We do so via two more lemmas. The first guarantees that $\hat{\beta}_r$ and $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ will have the same limiting distribution provided $\|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}})\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

Lemma 2. Suppose $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ and $\|X_n - Y_n\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Then $Y_n \xrightarrow{d} X$.

Proof. By the Portmanteau theorem, it suffices to show that for any bounded Lipschitz function f , we have $\mathbb{E}f(Y_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}f(X)$ in the L^∞ norm as $n \rightarrow \infty$; i.e., $\|\mathbb{E}f(Y_n) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. Now we let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary and show that eventually (in n) $\|\mathbb{E}f(Y_n) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\|_\infty < \epsilon$. By the triangle inequality we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}f(Y_n) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbb{E}f(Y_n) - \mathbb{E}f(X_n)\|_\infty + \|\mathbb{E}f(X_n) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\|_\infty.$$

Because $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, the Portmanteau theorem guarantees that we can find an $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq N_1$ we have $\|\mathbb{E}f(X_n) - \mathbb{E}f(X)\|_\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Now let K be a bound on $\|f\|_\infty$. Because f is Lipschitz, it is also uniformly continuous, so we can find a $\delta > 0$ such that $\|f(y) - f(x)\|_\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ whenever $\|y - x\|_\infty < \delta$. Also, because $\|X_n - Y_n\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$, we can find an N_2 such that $\Pr\{\|Y_n - X_n\|_\infty > \delta\} < \frac{\epsilon}{8K}$. Applying these constants we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|E f(Y_n) - E f(X_n)\|_\infty \\
&= \|E \{f(Y_n) - f(X_n)\}\|_\infty \\
&= \left\| \Pr(\|Y_n - X_n\|_\infty < \delta) E \left\{ f(Y_n) - f(X_n) \mid \|Y_n - X_n\|_\infty < \delta \right\} + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \Pr(\|Y_n - X_n\|_\infty > \delta) E \left\{ f(Y_n) - f(X_n) \mid \|Y_n - X_n\|_\infty > \delta \right\} \right\|_\infty \\
&< \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{8K} (2K) \\
&= \epsilon/2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $n > \max(N_1, N_2)$ we have

$$\|E f(Y_n) - E f(X)\|_\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon,$$

which implies $Y_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ as desired. □

The second lemma guarantees that, in fact, $\|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}})\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$ under the mild assumption that the sandwich estimator is consistent.

Lemma 3. *If $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$, then $\|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}})\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{A}_n = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_{jk} \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_j$ and $A = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_{jk} \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \Lambda_j$. By the continuous mapping theorem we have $\|\hat{A}_n - A\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because (1) $\|\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and (2) \hat{A}_n and A are continuous functions of $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ and Σ , respectively.

Now we can write $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}) = (\hat{A}_n - A)\sqrt{n}\hat{\theta}_n$. Because $\sqrt{n}\hat{\theta}_n$ converges in distribution, Slutsky's Theorem guarantees that $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}})$ converges in distribution to 0, which implies that $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_r - \hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}})$ also converges in probability to 0. □

Taken together, these two lemmas imply that $\hat{\beta}_r$ and $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ have the same limiting distribution and, thus, $\hat{\beta}_r$ inherits the optimality property of $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$ asymptotically. Finally, the continuous mapping theorem guarantees that the following plug-in estimator consistently estimates the asymptotic variance:

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}_r) = \frac{1}{n} (1_J^\top \otimes \hat{\Omega}) \hat{\Lambda} (1_J \otimes \hat{\Omega}).$$
□

B Meta-estimator Under Kronecker-structured Covariance

In this section, we assume that $\Sigma := \text{Var}(\sqrt{n}\hat{\theta}) = \tilde{\Sigma} \otimes \Psi$, for some unknown matrices $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and Ψ . Below, we denote $\tilde{\Lambda} := \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1}$. Under this assumption, Ψ drops out of the expression for $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$:

$$\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_{jk} \Psi^{-1} \right)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_{jk} \Psi^{-1} \hat{\theta}_j = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\theta}_j \sum_{k=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_{jk}}{\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_{jk}} = \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_j \otimes I_p \right) \hat{\theta}}{\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \tilde{\Lambda}_{jk}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 3 can then easily be adapted to show that a plug-in estimator, $\hat{\beta}_r$, formed by replacing $\tilde{\Lambda}$ with a consistent estimator, $\hat{\tilde{\Lambda}}$, is asymptotically equivalent to $\hat{\beta}_r^{\text{Pop}}$. It then follows that $\hat{\beta}_r$ is asymptotically Gaussian with mean β_r and variance that can be consistently estimated as

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}_r) = \frac{\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_j \otimes I_p \right) \hat{\Sigma} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_j \otimes I_p \right) \right] \right]}{n \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^J \hat{\Lambda}_{jk} \right)^2},$$

provided $\hat{\Lambda}$ converges in probability to $\tilde{\Lambda}$. Note that the above holds even if the Kronecker assumption fails, in which case $\hat{\Lambda}$ need only be converging in probability to some positive definite matrix. If the Kronecker assumption is correct, then this estimator is also asymptotically optimal by Theorem 3.

For the above properties to hold, our estimates of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ need only be consistent. One option is to estimate $\tilde{\Sigma}$ using the same variance term (e.g., the intercept) across the $\hat{\beta}_{rj}$'s. Using the first element, for example, we might set

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_{m_1, m_1} & \cdots & \hat{\Sigma}_{m_1, m_J} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{\Sigma}_{m_J, m_1} & \cdots & \hat{\Sigma}_{m_J, m_J} \end{bmatrix},$$

for $m_j = 1 + jP$. We then estimate $\tilde{\Lambda}$ as $\hat{\Lambda} = \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}$. Alternative variance estimators based on more entries in $\hat{\Sigma}$ are also possible (e.g., an average across estimators of the above form).

We view this Kronecker-based meta-estimator as a reasonable compromise between efficiency and robustness in small samples. In large samples, the full-rank precision-weighted estimator will outperform this estimator unless the Kronecker assumption—which we view as a convenient simplifying assumption—is actually true.

C Additional Case Study Results

In addition to P-WCLS, we also tested our other methods on the case study. Web Table 1 displays the results. The point estimates are very similar across methods. ET-WCLS has the smallest standard errors, followed by PET-WCLS, P-WCLS-Pooled, and then DR-WCLS. Similar to the simulation, we applied a degrees-of-freedom adjustment in computing the standard errors, multiplying the sandwich estimator by $n/(n-p)$ where $n = n_0 + n_1$ and p is the total number of parameters. Without this adjustment, PET-WCLS has the smallest estimated standard errors.

Coefficient Name	P-WCLS-Pooled	ET-WCLS	DR-WCLS	PET-WCLS
Intercept	*28.77 (6.61)	*27.10 (6.42)	*30.55 (7.33)	*27.51 (6.57)
Tobacco Dependence	-0.04 (0.43)	0.04 (0.42)	-0.05 (0.46)	0.00 (0.43)
2-Q Survey Completion	*40.89 (6.13)	*40.66 (5.64)	*42.12 (6.38)	*40.83 (5.76)

Web Table 1: Estimates of β_r (standard errors) from applying P-WCLS-Pooled, ET-WCLS, DR-WCLS, and PET-WCLS in the case study; asterisks denote statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

We used linear terms for each variable in S_t for the density ratio. None of the non-intercept coefficients were statistically significant, so we did not consider interactions or nonlinear terms (e.g., polynomials).

D Extension to Multiple Treatment Levels

In this appendix, we describe how to extend WCLS and our methods (which build on WCLS) to the setting of two or more non-control treatment levels. Boruvka et al. (2018) briefly mention the key idea, which is to introduce centered indicators for each non-control treatment level. Below, we provide the details and prove that this strategy does, in fact, produce consistent estimates.

For generality, we assume below that there are $J \in \mathbb{N}$ such treatment levels; i.e., there are $J + 1$ distinct treatment options, including the control action. The support of A_t is thus $\{0, 1, \dots, J\}$ with $A_t = 0$ corresponding to the control action. We also introduce treatment indicators as follows: $A_{tj} = 1\{A_t = j\}$ for $j \in [J]$. We allow each treatment level its own moderators, so we have a feature transformation function, f_{rj} , and corresponding coefficient vector, β_{rj} , for all $j \in [J]$. With this notation in place, the estimating equation takes the following form:

$$0 = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{p_r(A_t | R_t)}{p_h(A_t | H_t)} \left[Y_{t+1} - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \sum_{j=1}^J \{A_{tj} - p_r(j | R_t)\} f_{rj}(R_t)^\top \beta_{rj} \right] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} g(H_t) \\ \{A_{t1} - p_r(1 | R_t)\} f_{r1}(R_t) \\ \vdots \\ \{A_{tJ} - p_r(J | R_t)\} f_{rJ}(R_t) \end{bmatrix}$$

Similar to standard WCLS, this estimating equation can be solved via standard software for weighted least squares. Inference then proceeds via a sandwich estimator for the variance. We now show that the population-level solution, β_r^* , to the estimating equation corresponds to the estimand of interest, namely the causal excursion effects defined in (1) for each treatment level relative to the control action. We focus only on the rows corresponding to the β_{rj} 's. The expectation of these rows can be written as

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{H_t} \sum_{a=1}^J \left[\mathbb{E}(Y_{t+1} | A_t = a) - g(H_t)^\top \alpha - \sum_{j=1}^J \{A_{tj} - p_r(j | R_t)\} f_{rj}(R_t)^\top \beta_{rj} \right] \cdot p_r(a | R_t) \begin{bmatrix} \{A_{t1} - p_r(1 | R_t)\} f_{r1}(R_t) \\ \vdots \\ \{A_{tJ} - p_r(J | R_t)\} f_{rJ}(R_t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the denominator weight $p_h(A_t | H_t)$ canceled as we took an expectation over A_t . By the law of total probability, we have $1 - p_r(j | R_t) = \sum_{k \in [J] - \{j\}} p_r(k | R_t)$, which causes many terms to cancel. The a -th block can then be written as

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t} f_{ra}(R_t) p_r(a | R_t) \left[\{1 - p_r(a | R_t)\} \{\beta_{ra}(R_t, t) - f_{ra}(R_t)^\top \beta_{ra}\} - \sum_{j \in [J] - \{a\}} p_r(j | R_t) \{\beta_{rj}(R_t, t) - f_{rj}(R_t)^\top \beta_{rj}\} \right].$$

Collecting similar terms, we see that the estimand can be written as $\beta^* = \mathbf{Q}^{-1}v$ for the following matrix, \mathbf{Q} , and vector, v :

$$\mathbf{Q} = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t} \begin{bmatrix} p_1(1 - p_1) f_{r1}(R_t) f_{r1}(R_t)^\top & -p_1 p_2 f_{r1}(R_t) f_{r2}(R_t)^\top & \dots & -p_1 p_J f_{r1}(R_t) f_{rJ}(R_t)^\top \\ -p_2 p_1 f_{r2}(R_t) f_{r1}(R_t)^\top & p_2(1 - p_2) f_{r2}(R_t) f_{r2}(R_t)^\top & \dots & -p_2 p_J f_{r2}(R_t) f_{rJ}(R_t)^\top \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -p_J p_1 f_{rJ}(R_t) f_{r1}(R_t)^\top & -p_J p_2 f_{rJ}(R_t) f_{r2}(R_t)^\top & \dots & p_J(1 - p_J) f_{rJ}(R_t) f_{rJ}(R_t)^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

$$v = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{R_t} \begin{bmatrix} f_{r1}(R_t) p_1 \left\{ (1 - p_1) \beta_{r1}(R_t, t) - \sum_{j \in [J] - \{1\}} p_j \beta_{rj}(R_t, t) \right\} \\ f_{r2}(R_t) p_2 \left\{ (1 - p_2) \beta_{r2}(R_t, t) - \sum_{j \in [J] - \{2\}} p_j \beta_{rj}(R_t, t) \right\} \\ \vdots \\ f_{rJ}(R_t) p_J \left\{ (1 - p_J) \beta_{rJ}(R_t, t) - \sum_{j \in [J] - \{J\}} p_j \beta_{rj}(R_t, t) \right\} \end{bmatrix}$$

where to save space we have used p_j for $p_r(j | R_t)$. Now, under Assumption 4, we can write $\beta_{rj}(R_t, t) = f_{rj}(R_t)^\top \beta_{rj}$. Substituting these values into v , we see that $v = \mathbf{Q} \beta_r$. Consequently, we have $\beta_r^* = \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{Q} \beta_r = \beta_r$, as desired.

We now discuss how to extend our proposed methods to the setting of multiple treatments.

A-WCLS. This extension requires us to modify the WCLS procedure to estimate β_s as described above. Estimates of β_{rj} are then formed as $\hat{\beta}_{rj} = \hat{\Gamma}\beta_{sj}$, and the Delta method is modified accordingly.

P-WCLS. Two modifications are necessary. First, we modify the estimation of β_s as described above. Second, we include an estimating equation similar to Equation (5) for each subcomponent of β_s and β_r .

ET-WCLS. The only required change is to include multiple treatment indicators in the density-ratio-weighted WCLS estimating equation.

Meta-Estimator. The meta-estimator requires no additional modifications. We recommend applying it to the full vector of estimates (i.e., the estimates for all $j \in [J]$) for maximal asymptotic efficiency. However, it can also be applied to each subcomponent separately.

DR-WCLS. Both the internal- and external-study estimators require the same modifications as P-WCLS: (1) include multiple centered treatment indicators to estimate β_s and (2) perform a separate regression for each subcomponent of β_s and β_r . For the internal-study estimator, these regressions solve Equation (6); for the external-study estimator, they solve Equation (7).

PET-WCLS. Apply the modifications detailed above to the WCLS, P-WCLS, and ET-WCLS estimators.

E Simulation Details

To effectively evaluate our method, we need three levels of dependent covariates. To fit this need, we construct the covariates as follows within the internal study:

- $X_t = (X_{t1}, X_{t2}, X_{t3})^\top$
- $R_t = X_{t1} \sim \text{AR}(1, 0.5)$
- $S_t = (X_{t1}, X_{t2})$
- $X_{t2} \sim \text{Student-t}(1 - X_{t1}, 3^2, 10)$
- $X_{t3} \sim \text{Student-t}(-1 + 0.5X_{t1} - 0.8X_{t2}, 1^2, 10)$

We simulate $A_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_h)$ with $p_h = 1/[1 + \exp(0.2 + 0.3I + 0.05X_{t1} - 0.03X_{t2} + 0.06X_{t3})]$. We then set $Y_t = 4 + 2X_{t1} - 1.5X_{t1}X_{t2} + 0.4X_{t3}^3 + A \cdot (1 + 2X_{t1} - 3X_{t2}) + \epsilon_t$, where $\epsilon_t \sim \text{AR}(1, 0.5)$. The S_t -moderated causal excursion effects are then $\beta_s(t, S_t) = 1 + 2X_{t1} - 3X_{t2}$. Marginalizing to the level of R_t , the R_t -moderated causal excursion effects are $\beta_s(t, S_t) = -2 + 5X_{t1}$.

In harmony with the generative model given above, we set $g_r(R_t) = (1, X_{t1})^\top$ and $g_s(S_t) = (1, X_{t1}, X_{t2})^\top$. We set $g_h(H_t) = (1, X_{t1}, X_{t2}, X_{t3})^\top$, which is misspecified for $E(Y_t | H_t)$. However, because our model is robust to misspecification of g_h , we still obtain consistent estimates of the causal excursion effects.

The distribution of the external study is identical except for the distribution of X_{t2} , which we set to $\text{Student-t}(0, 2.7^2, 10)$. The result of this change is that the R_t -moderated causal excursion effects differ between the internal and external studies. Specifically, in the external study, the true value of β_r is $(1, 2)^\top$ instead of $(-2, 5)^\top$. Consequently, we would expect a method that naively pools across the two data sets to produce biased estimates of β_r .

To improve the finite-sample coverage of our methods, we included a degrees-of-freedom correction in the sandwich estimator. We multiplied it by $n/(n-p)$, where $n = n_0 + n_1$ and p is the total number of estimated parameters.

The code for the simulation is publicly available at <https://github.com/eastonhuch/mrt-data-integration.git>.

F Additional Simulation Results

We test ten methods in total, including each method discussed in Sections 3, 4, and 5. We implement pooled and unpooled versions of WCLS and P-WCLS to isolate the statistical impact of pooling. For P-WCLS, we also implement a method that estimates p_h (P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs). For ET-WCLS, we test three different pooling strategies:

- ET-WCLS-Equal: Equal weights for the naive and ET-WCLS estimate
- ET-WCLS-Kron: Our meta-estimator assuming a Kronecker covariance structure
- ET-WCLS: Our meta-estimator making no structural assumptions about Σ

Web Figure 1 displays box plots of the estimation error for each method (except ET-WCLS-Equal, which we omit for readability), setting $n_1 = n_0 = 400$. The box plots for our proposed methods center around zero, indicating minimal bias. Visual comparison of the interquartile ranges confirms our findings from Table 2 regarding the relative efficiency and rMSE of these estimators.

We also investigated how the efficiency of our estimators varies with the sample size. We ran two experiments. In the first, we fixed $n_1 = 100$ and varied n_0 from 25 to 6,400 in multiples of four. The second is similar but with the roles of n_0 and n_1 reversed. Aside from the sample sizes, the setup is the same as that of Section 6.2.

Web Figure 2 displays the empirical standard errors as a function of the sample size. We include our four primary methods and WCLS-Internal for comparison. The first experiment corresponds to panels (a) and (b), and the second, to panels (c) and (d).


In panels (a) and (b), we observe that our methods benefit from the external study data, achieving lower standard errors as n_0 increases; P-WCLS-Pooled and PET-WCLS perform especially well when n_0 is large. In contrast, the standard errors for WCLS-Internal are generally larger and do not depend on n_0 .

Similarly, panels (c) and (d) indicate that our methods substantially outperform WCLS-Internal when n_1 is small. However, as n_1 increases, we see that the standard errors approach each other until they are almost indistinguishable at $n_1 = 6,400$.


These results suggest that our proposed methods are especially advantageous when n_0 is *large* relative to n_1 . Conversely, when n_0 is *small* relative to n_1 , our methods perform similarly to WCLS-Internal—at least when the underlying assumptions are satisfied.

Web Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 provide results similar to those displayed in Table 2, except these tables include all ten method variations and utilize 25, 100, 400, 1,600, and 6,400 participants, respectively, in each study. With larger sample sizes, we observe that the finite-sample bias diminishes. PET-WCLS performs best for all sample sizes except 6,400. Many of the coverage rates are higher than expected with 25 participants because our degrees-of-freedom adjustment is overly conservative.

One interesting finding is that the methods based on density ratios perform worse than WCLS-Internal with 6,400 participants; however, P-WCLS-Pooled does not. We suspect the poor performance for the density ratio methods is caused by high variance of the density ratios (which are not quite correctly specified) and could be lessened by increasing the complexity of the density ratio model as the sample size increases. DR-WCLS manages to perform about as well as WCLS-Internal with 6,400 participants, which is likely an artifact of its being robust to misspecification of the density ratio model.



Web Figure 1: Box plots displaying estimation error of β_r by method across repetitions. Similar to Table 2, we fix both the internal and external sample sizes to 400. We see that all methods deliver approximately unbiased estimates of β_r (i.e., have an average near zero in the figure), except the naive estimator, WCLS-Pooled. We also observe differences in efficiency with PET-WCLS performing the best, as evidenced by its small variation across repetitions.



Web Figure 2: Empirical standard errors for five methods as a function of the sample size. Panels (a) and (b) fix the internal sample size (n_1) at 100 and vary the external sample size (n_0) from 25 to 6,400 in multiples of four; panel (a) displays empirical standard errors for the intercept term in β_r , and panel (b), for the slope term. Panels (c) and (d) are similar with the roles of n_1 and n_0 reversed.

Coefficient name	True value	Method	Avg estimate	Relative efficiency	rMSE	Coverage
Intercept	-2	WCLS-Internal	-2.26	100.0%	5.18	95.8%
	-2	WCLS-Pooled	-0.55	N/A	3.43	94.3%
	-2	P-WCLS-Internal	-2.27	99.6%	5.21	97.3%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled	-2.19	122.7%	4.22	96.8%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	-2.18	121.1%	4.28	98.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Equal	-2.59	108.2%	4.82	98.3%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Kron	-2.82	117.8%	4.47	97.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS	-2.93	129.1%	4.12	97.0%
	-2	DR-WCLS	-2.66	130.3%	4.03	98.8%
	-2	PET-WCLS	-2.95	154.4%	3.49	99.0%
Slope	5	WCLS-Internal	4.96	100.0%	6.58	95.3%
	5	WCLS-Pooled	3.50	N/A	3.97	94.5%
	5	P-WCLS-Internal	4.96	100.4%	6.55	97.3%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled	5.11	138.3%	4.75	95.8%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	5.14	133.5%	4.93	99.0%
	5	ET-WCLS-Equal	5.52	125.2%	5.28	98.5%
	5	ET-WCLS-Kron	5.54	128.5%	5.15	98.5%
	5	ET-WCLS	5.67	153.3%	4.34	96.8%
	5	DR-WCLS	5.82	156.8%	4.27	98.8%
	5	PET-WCLS	5.63	194.1%	3.45	98.8%

Web Table 2: Results from the simulation with 25 individuals in both the internal and external studies. For the “Avg estimate” and “Coverage” columns, the boldface indicates values within Monte Carlo error (3σ) of the truth. For the “Relative efficiency” and “rMSE” columns, the boldface indicates the best performance for each coefficient (PET-WCLS in both cases).

Coefficient name	True value	Method	Avg estimate	Relative efficiency	rMSE	Coverage
Intercept	-2	WCLS-Internal	-2.22	100.0%	2.98	93.5%
	-2	WCLS-Pooled	-0.58	N/A	2.28	89.0%
	-2	P-WCLS-Internal	-2.24	101.4%	2.95	94.8%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled	-2.20	127.7%	2.34	94.5%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	-2.21	126.9%	2.35	95.3%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Equal	-2.20	79.6%	3.75	93.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Kron	-2.53	109.3%	2.78	93.2%
	-2	ET-WCLS	-2.72	128.1%	2.43	92.2%
	-2	DR-WCLS	-2.59	120.7%	2.54	92.5%
	-2	PET-WCLS	-2.68	140.2%	2.23	90.7%
Slope	5	WCLS-Internal	5.07	100.0%	3.56	94.3%
	5	WCLS-Pooled	3.54	N/A	2.52	85.0%
	5	P-WCLS-Internal	5.05	101.1%	3.52	94.5%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled	5.15	124.3%	2.87	93.5%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	5.15	125.6%	2.84	94.8%
	5	ET-WCLS-Equal	4.96	81.0%	4.40	93.0%
	5	ET-WCLS-Kron	5.09	104.9%	3.40	93.8%
	5	ET-WCLS	5.20	139.1%	2.57	94.0%
	5	DR-WCLS	5.32	137.8%	2.60	96.0%
	5	PET-WCLS	5.39	169.4%	2.14	92.2%

Web Table 3: Results from the simulation with 100 individuals in both the internal and external studies. For the “Avg estimate” and “Coverage” columns, the boldface indicates values within Monte Carlo error (3σ) of the truth. For the “Relative efficiency” and “rMSE” columns, the boldface indicates the best performance for each coefficient (PET-WCLS in both cases).

Coefficient name	True value	Method	Avg estimate	Relative efficiency	rMSE	Coverage
Intercept	-2	WCLS-Internal	-1.94	100.0%	1.57	94.5%
	-2	WCLS-Pooled	-0.48	N/A	1.77	61.0%
	-2	P-WCLS-Internal	-1.94	99.9%	1.57	95.3%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled	-1.96	119.0%	1.31	95.8%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	-1.97	119.2%	1.31	95.8%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Equal	-2.70	33.9%	4.66	90.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Kron	-2.24	90.2%	1.75	93.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS	-2.32	113.1%	1.42	92.5%
	-2	DR-WCLS	-2.27	116.6%	1.37	95.3%
	-2	PET-WCLS	-2.27	136.3%	1.18	94.3%
Slope	5	WCLS-Internal	4.86	100.0%	1.77	96.0%
	5	WCLS-Pooled	3.44	N/A	1.86	58.8%
	5	P-WCLS-Internal	4.86	99.9%	1.77	96.0%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled	4.92	130.9%	1.35	95.8%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	4.95	131.7%	1.34	96.8%
	5	ET-WCLS-Equal	5.13	45.2%	3.91	93.2%
	5	ET-WCLS-Kron	4.92	81.9%	2.16	94.0%
	5	ET-WCLS	5.02	116.7%	1.51	93.8%
	5	DR-WCLS	5.10	124.9%	1.42	96.3%
	5	PET-WCLS	5.14	153.9%	1.16	94.0%

Web Table 4: Results from the simulation with 400 individuals in both the internal and external studies. For the “Avg estimate” and “Coverage” columns, the boldface indicates values within Monte Carlo error (3σ) of the truth. For the “Relative efficiency” and “rMSE” columns, the boldface indicates the best performance for each coefficient (PET-WCLS in both cases).

Coefficient name	True value	Method	Avg estimate	Relative efficiency	rMSE	Coverage
Intercept	-2	WCLS-Internal	-1.99	100.0%	0.93	96.0%
	-2	WCLS-Pooled	-0.49	N/A	1.60	5.5%
	-2	P-WCLS-Internal	-2.00	102.9%	0.90	95.8%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled	-2.02	124.5%	0.75	94.3%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	-2.03	127.6%	0.73	94.8%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Equal	-2.79	11.7%	7.96	89.5%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Kron	-2.13	93.9%	1.00	93.8%
	-2	ET-WCLS	-2.18	119.9%	0.80	93.5%
	-2	DR-WCLS	-2.14	122.6%	0.77	94.3%
	-2	PET-WCLS	-2.11	155.6%	0.61	93.5%
Slope	5	WCLS-Internal	5.05	100.0%	1.11	94.5%
	5	WCLS-Pooled	3.51	N/A	1.61	15.0%
	5	P-WCLS-Internal	5.05	102.7%	1.08	94.3%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled	5.05	149.6%	0.74	94.5%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	5.05	152.0%	0.73	95.5%
	5	ET-WCLS-Equal	5.40	16.6%	6.66	89.7%
	5	ET-WCLS-Kron	5.09	81.4%	1.36	94.0%
	5	ET-WCLS	5.12	129.0%	0.86	93.8%
	5	DR-WCLS	5.07	149.9%	0.74	96.0%
	5	PET-WCLS	5.07	176.4%	0.63	93.2%

Web Table 5: Results from the simulation with 1600 individuals in both the internal and external studies. For the “Avg estimate” and “Coverage” columns, the boldface indicates values within Monte Carlo error (3σ) of the truth. For the “Relative efficiency” and “rMSE” columns, the boldface indicates the best performance for each coefficient (PET-WCLS in both cases).

Coefficient name	True value	Method	Avg estimate	Relative efficiency	rMSE	Coverage
Intercept	-2	WCLS-Internal	-2.01	100.0%	0.36	96.3%
	-2	WCLS-Pooled	-0.50	N/A	1.51	0.0%
	-2	P-WCLS-Internal	-2.01	99.2%	0.37	95.8%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled	-1.99	114.8%	0.32	96.0%
	-2	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	-2.00	114.1%	0.32	96.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Equal	-4.75	3.0%	12.32	80.7%
	-2	ET-WCLS-Kron	-2.11	74.1%	0.50	93.0%
	-2	ET-WCLS	-2.09	90.1%	0.41	94.3%
	-2	DR-WCLS	-2.04	112.6%	0.33	97.5%
Slope	-2	PET-WCLS	-2.06	89.2%	0.41	93.8%
	5	WCLS-Internal	4.98	100.0%	0.38	98.5%
	5	WCLS-Pooled	3.48	N/A	1.54	0.0%
	5	P-WCLS-Internal	4.98	99.7%	0.38	98.0%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled	4.97	116.4%	0.33	97.5%
	5	P-WCLS-Pooled-Obs	4.98	115.0%	0.33	97.3%
	5	ET-WCLS-Equal	5.64	3.0%	12.52	84.0%
	5	ET-WCLS-Kron	5.03	59.5%	0.64	94.3%
	5	ET-WCLS	5.02	77.3%	0.49	96.5%
	5	DR-WCLS	4.99	112.6%	0.34	98.0%
	5	PET-WCLS	5.03	95.6%	0.40	94.8%

Web Table 6: Results from the simulation with 6400 individuals in both the internal and external studies. For the “Avg estimate” and “Coverage” columns, the boldface indicates values within Monte Carlo error (3σ) of the truth. For the “Relative efficiency” and “rMSE” columns, the boldface indicates the best performance for each coefficient (P-WCLS-Pooled in both cases).