

Nonparametric Jackknife Instrumental Variable Estimation and Confounding Robust Surrogate Indices

Aurelien Bibaut*

Nathan Kallus†

Apoorva Lal‡

June 21, 2024

Abstract

Jackknife instrumental variable estimation (JIVE) is a classic method to leverage many weak instrumental variables (IVs) to estimate linear structural models, overcoming the bias of standard methods like two-stage least squares. In this paper, we extend the jackknife approach to nonparametric IV (NPIV) models with many weak IVs. Since NPIV characterizes the structural regression as having residuals projected onto the IV being zero, existing approaches minimize an estimate of the average squared projected residuals, but their estimates are biased under many weak IVs. We introduce an IV splitting device inspired by JIVE to remove this bias, and by carefully studying this split-IV empirical process we establish learning rates that depend on generic complexity measures of the nonparametric hypothesis class. We then turn to leveraging this for semiparametric inference on average treatment effects (ATEs) on unobserved long-term outcomes predicted from short-term surrogates, using historical experiments as IVs to learn this nonparametric predictive relationship even in the presence of confounding between short- and long-term observations. Using split-IV estimates of a debiasing nuisance, we develop asymptotically normal estimates for predicted ATEs, enabling inference.

1 Introduction

The non-parametric instrumental variable (NPIV) problem is, given N observations, $O_i = (A_i, S_i, Y_i)$ $i = 1, \dots, N$, on instrumental variables (IVs) A , interventions $S \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and outcomes $Y \in \mathbb{R}$, to find a function $h : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[Y - h(S) \mid A] = 0. \quad (1)$$

This can be motivated by a structural (*i.e.*, causal) model $Y = h^*(S) + \epsilon$, where S and ϵ can be endogenous due, *e.g.*, to the presence of common confounders (so that $h^*(S) \neq \mathbb{E}[Y \mid S]$), but A and ϵ are exogenous so that Eq. (1) holds for h^* . A variety of work studies the estimation of h^* and inference on functionals thereof under nonparametric restrictions on h^* as we receive additional observations N from a fixed $O = (A, S, Y)$ distribution [Ai and Chen, 2003, 2007, 2012, Bennett and Kallus, 2023, Bennett et al., 2019, 2023a,b,b, Chen and Pouzo, 2009, 2012, Darolles et al., 2011, Dikkala et al., 2020, Hartford et al., 2017, Kremer et al., 2022, 2023, Newey and Powell, 2003, Santos, 2011, Severini and Tripathi, 2006, 2012, Singh et al., 2019, Zhang et al., 2023].

In this paper, we tackle NPIV in the challenging many-weak-IV setting, where $A \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ is discrete and we only see so many of each value, namely for each $a \in [K]$, we have n i.i.d. observations of $(Y, S) \mid A = a$, forming $N = nK$ observations in total.

In the linear setting where $h^*(S) = S^\top \beta^*$, Eq. (1) reduces to solving $\mathbb{E}[Y \mid A] = \mathbb{E}[S \mid A]^\top \beta$ for β . This motivates the two-stage least squares (2SLS) approach of estimating β by ordinary least squares (OLS) of Y

*Netflix

†Netflix, Cornell

‡Netflix

on the “first-stage” OLS prediction of S given A (for discrete A this is simply the sample means of S for each A value). However, when $n \ll N$, even as $N \rightarrow \infty$ this can incur non-vanishing bias because the first-stage regression may not converge at all [Angrist et al., 1999, Bibaut et al., 2024, Peysakhovich and Eckles, 2018]. JIVE [Angrist et al., 1999] addresses this by regressing Y on a prediction of S given A based on OLS using all the data *except* the datapoint on which we make the prediction. This renders the errors from the first stage uncorrelated with the second stage so they average out to zero so that we regain consistency [Chao et al., 2012].

The NPIV analog, which we tackle, is, however, unresolved. It is also rather nuanced because when S is continuous but A is discrete, a nonparametric h^* is generally not uniquely identified by Eq. (1), which involves just K moments but a general function h . Nonetheless, certain *linear functionals* of h^* , meaning $\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[\alpha(S)h^*(S)]$ for some α , may still be uniquely identified, meaning $\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[\alpha(S)h(S)]$ for *any* h satisfying Eq. (1).

This problem setting is of particular interest in digital experimentation, where the rapid pace of innovation means we have many (K) historical randomized experiments (with serial numbers A), which can be used to instrument for the effect (h^*) of short-term surrogate observations (S) on long-term outcomes (Y) even in the presence of unobserved confounding between the two, but where each experiment has a certain sample size (n). If we know this effect, we can construct a surrogate index $h^*(S)$ such that average treatment effects (ATEs) on Y are the same as those on $h^*(S)$. Moreover, the ATEs on $h^*(S)$ is a linear functional thereof. Then, for novel experiments, predicting long-term ATEs before observing long-term outcomes can be phrased as inference on a linear functional of a solution to Eq. (1).

In this paper we also tackle the question how to reliably do this inference in the presence of underidentified and nonparametric h^* , which is another significant challenge, besides solving Eq. (1) in the many-weak-IV setting. We furthermore extend the simple instrumentation identification to account for the possibility that short-term surrogate observations do not fully mediate the treatment effects on long-term outcomes (that is, there is exclusion violation).

In this paper, we develop both a novel estimator for h^* in the nonparametric many-weak-IV setting and methods for debiased inference on surrogate-predicted ATEs. The contributions and organization of the paper are as follows

1. In Section 2, we propose a novel nonparametric jackknife IV estimator (npJIVE) based on estimating the average of squared moments using a split-IV device inspired by JIVE and then minimizing it over a generic nonparametric hypothesis class with Tikhonov regularization.
2. In Section 2.1, we prove that npJIVE is consistent to the minimum norm function satisfying Eq. (1) and that its average of squared moments converges at a rate governed by the functional complexity of the hypothesis. To our knowledge, these guarantees are the first of their kinds for NPIV in the many-weak-IV setting.
3. In Section 3, we study the above IV-surrogate-index approach to long-term causal inference and extend it to also tackle the setting where S does not fully mediate all of the effect on Y . We establish identification conditions where we can combine historical experiments with full long-term observations together with a new experiment with only short-term observations in order to identify the long-term causal effect in the new experiment, even in the presence of confounding and exclusion violations.
4. In Section 4, we develop methods for inference on the new experiment’s long-term causal effect. We devise a debiased estimator that involves a new debiasing nuisance related to the ratio of densities of short-term outcomes in the old and the new experiments. We develop an estimator for this debiasing nuisance with guarantees in the many-weak-IV setting. And, we show that when we combine npJIVE with this debiasing nuisance in the right way, we can obtain asymptotically normal estimates of the long-term causal effect in the new experiment, even when npJIVE and the debiasing nuisance are learned completely nonparametrically. This ensures fast estimation rates and implies simple Wald confidence intervals give asymptotically correct coverage.

Taken together, our methods and results provide new ways to conduct long-term causal inference in challenging, but practically very relevant, settings.

2 The npJIVE Estimator for NPIV with Many Weak IVs

We now motivate and define npJIVE. For function $f(A, S, Y)$ let us write $[\Pi f](A) = \mathbb{E}[f(A, S, Y) | A]$ and $\|f\|^2 = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{a=1}^K \|f\|_{(a)}^2$ with $\|f\|_{(a)}^2 = \mathbb{E}[f^2(a, S, Y) | A = a]$, and let $L_2(S) = \{h(S) : \|h\| < \infty\}$ be the square integrable functions of S . Let

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \{h \in L_2(S) : R_1(h) = 0\}, \quad \text{where } R_1(h) = \frac{1}{2} \|\Pi(h - Y)\|^2,$$

be the solutions to Eq. (1). Given a hypothesis class $\mathcal{H} \subseteq L_2(S)$, suppose \mathcal{H} contains a solution $h_0 \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{H}_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then $h_0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} R_1(h) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0$, meaning the solution must minimize the risk criterion $R_1(h)$ over \mathcal{H} and any such minimizer must solve Eq. (1).

Then, an approach to recover such a solution from data would be to estimate R_1 and minimize it. Perhaps the most natural empirical analog of R_1 is the empirical ‘‘plug-in’’ risk

$$\widehat{R}_1^{\text{plug-in}}(h) = \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{a=1}^K ([\widehat{\Pi}(Y - h)](a))^2, \quad \text{where } [\widehat{\Pi}f](a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:A_i=a} f(a, S_i, Y_i), \quad (2)$$

meaning $[\widehat{\Pi}f](a)$ is the sample average over the $A_i = a$ data. In fact, optimizing $\widehat{R}_1^{\text{plug-in}}(h)$ over linear functions $h(S) = S^\top \beta$ is *almost* 2SLS (aside from some A -dependent sample weights). And, optimizing it over a nonparametric hypothesis class \mathcal{H} (possibly with regularization) is *exactly* the adversarial NPIV estimators of [Bennett and Kallus, 2023, Bennett et al., 2019, 2023a,b, Dikkala et al., 2020] with an adversary function class that includes all functions of the discrete A .

Unfortunately, this is not an unbiased estimate of $R_1(h)$, and it can be inconsistent when $n \not\rightarrow \infty$. Essentially, given n observations on some variables (Z, Z') , the expectation of the product of sample means of Z_i and of Z'_i is not the product of the expectations of Z and Z' – there’s also $1/n$ times the covariance of Z and Z' . This is the fundamental reason why 2SLS isn’t consistent under many weak IVs. One way to see the key trick in JIVE is that, partitioning observations in folds $1, \dots, L$ of equal size, with $V_i \in [L]$ the fold membership of observation i , an unbiased estimate of the product of expectations is the product of the empirical mean of Z_i over folds $1, \dots, L - 1$ with the empirical mean of Z'_i over fold L . (JIVE uses $L = n$, corresponding to ‘‘leave one out’’ sample means).

Drawing inspiration from this insight, we propose a 2-fold cross-fold risk estimator:

$$\widehat{R}_1(h) = \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{a=1}^K [\widehat{\Pi}_0(Y - h)](a) [\widehat{\Pi}_1(Y - h)](a),$$

where $[\widehat{\Pi}_v f](a) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i:A_i=a, V_i=v} f(a, S_i, Y_i),$

assuming n is even. Meaning $[\widehat{\Pi}_v f](a)$ takes the sample average over the observations for which $A_i = a$ belonging to fold v .

Our proposed npJIVE estimator is to minimize this risk plus a Tikhonov regularization penalty

$$\hat{h} = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \widehat{R}_1(h) + \lambda \|h\|_{2,N}^2, \quad (\text{npJIVE})$$

where $\|h\|_{2,N}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N h^2(S_i)$. In fact, optimizing $\widehat{R}_1(h)$ over linear functions $h(S) = S^\top \beta$ is *almost* JIVE (aside from leave-one-out instead of 2 folds and some A -dependent sample weights).

2.1 Analysis of npJIVE

We now give an analysis of the convergence of npJIVE, both in terms of violations of Eq. (1) and in terms of distance to a minimum norm solution.

First we need to assume some boundedness. Henceforth, let us assume throughout that $|Y| \leq 1$ and that $\|h\|_\infty \leq 1$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

Second we need to characterize the complexity of our function class \mathcal{H} . Let \mathcal{D}_v be the set of observations belonging to fold v , that is $\mathcal{D}_v = \{O_i : i \in [N], V_i = v\}$. Let $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_N$ be i.i.d. Rademacher random variables independent from O_1, \dots, O_N . For any function class \mathcal{F} , we introduce the following Rademacher complexities:

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, \delta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}: \|f\| \leq \delta} \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i: V_i=0} \epsilon_i f(S_i) \right], \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,a}(\mathcal{F}, \delta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}: \|f\|_{(a)} \leq \delta} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i: A_i=a, V_i=0} \epsilon_i f(S_i) \right], \quad (4)$$

$$\text{and } \mathcal{R}_N^{[0]}(\mathcal{F}, \delta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}: \|f\| \leq \delta} \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i: V_i=1} \epsilon_i f(S_i) \mid \mathcal{D}_0 \right]. \quad (5)$$

The relevant function classes for analyzing npJIVE are: $\mathcal{H}^0 = \mathcal{H} - h_0$, $\mathcal{G}^0 = \{g(S) - (\Pi g)(A) : g \in \mathcal{H}^0\}$, $\mathcal{G}^1 = \{g(S)(\Pi g)(A) : g \in \mathcal{H}^0\}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = \{g(S)(\widehat{\Pi}_0 g)(A) : g \in \mathcal{G}^0\}$.

Let $\text{star}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\gamma g : \gamma \in [0, 1], g \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Let $\widetilde{\delta}_N$, $\bar{\delta}_N$ and $\check{\delta}_N$ be solutions to $\mathcal{R}_N(\text{star}(\mathcal{F}), \delta) \leq \delta^2$ for $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}^0, \mathcal{G}^1, \Pi \mathcal{G}$, respectively, let $\widetilde{\delta}_n$ be a solution to $\mathcal{R}_{n,a}(\text{star}(\mathcal{G}^0), \delta) \leq \delta^2$ for every a , and let $\bar{\delta}_N$ be a solution to $\mathcal{R}_N^{[0]}(\text{star}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}), \delta) \leq \delta^2$. Let \widehat{r}_N^2 and \bar{r}_N^2 be bounds on $\mathcal{R}^{[0]}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}^1, \infty)$.

Here, $\widehat{r}_N^2, \bar{r}_N^2$ are (unlocalized) Rademacher complexity measures and $\widetilde{\delta}_n, \bar{\delta}_N, \widehat{\delta}_N, \bar{\delta}_N, \check{\delta}_N$ are critical radii, both of which are standard measures of generic functional complexity (see [Wainwright, 2019] which also gives bounds on these quantities for a variety of classes including linear, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, Hölder or Sobolev spaces, neural nets, *etc.*). Finally, let $\delta_N = \max(\widetilde{\delta}_N, \bar{\delta}_N, \widehat{\delta}_N, \check{\delta}_N)$ and $r_N^2 = \max(\widehat{r}_N^2, \bar{r}_N^2)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\zeta \in (0, 0.5)$ be given. Suppose that $\delta_N^2 = o(\lambda)$, $N^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log \log \widehat{\delta}_N} = o(\widehat{\delta}_N)$, $N^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log \log \bar{\delta}_N} = o(\bar{\delta}_N)$, $n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log \log \widetilde{\delta}_n} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$ and that $\sqrt{\log(K/\zeta)} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h_0)\|^2 &= O(\lambda + \delta_N \delta_n) \quad \text{with probability } 1 - O(\zeta), \text{ and} \\ \|\widehat{h} - h_0\| &= o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

3 Confounding Robust Surrogate Indices from Many Weak Experiments

We now turn to the problem of using many historical experiments to construct surrogate indices for long-term causal inference in a novel experiment. The long-term effect of interventions is often of primary concern in causal inference. Examples include the effect of early-childhood education on lifetime earnings [Chetty et al., 2011], of promotions on long-term value [Yang et al., 2020], and of digital platform design on long-term user retention [Hohnhold et al., 2015]. While the gold standard for causal inference is experimentation, the significant delay of long-term observations after assignment to treatment means that, even when we can randomize the intervention, we may not be able to measure the outcome of interest.

This presents significant challenges and may even alter incentives such that scientists prioritize interventions that can be evaluated with short-run outcomes, as documented by Budish et al. [2015] in the case of cancer drugs. Nevertheless, other relevant post-treatment outcomes are often available in the short-term. For example, in AIDS treatments we observe short-term viral loads or CD4 counts well before mortality outcomes

[Fleming et al., 1994]. Similarly, in digital experimentation, we observe short-term signals on user engagement well before retention or revenue shifts.

An appealing approach to leverage these short-term observations is in the construction of a surrogate index, whereby we impute unobserved long-term outcome using their prediction from multiple short-term surrogate observations.

3.1 Background: Statistical-Surrogate Indices

Possibly the most common approach assumes that short-term observations form a *statistical surrogate* [Prentice, 1989]. This assumes that the long-term outcome is conditionally independent of treatment given the short-term outcomes. This involves two key restrictions: that there are no unobserved confounding between short- and long-term outcomes (no U_1 in Fig. 1a) and that all of the treatment’s effect on long-term outcomes is mediated by the short term (no U_2 in Fig. 1a). As the latter restriction becomes more defensible as we include more short-term outcomes so as to mediate more of the treatment’s long-term effect, Athey et al. [2019] combine many short-term observations into a surrogate index, assuming they form a statistical surrogate and using historical data to regress long-term on short-term (or other ways of adjustment such as weighting). The proposal is simple, effective, and, as such, widely adopted.

However, even if short-term outcomes fully mediate the long-term effect, they may fail to satisfy statistical surrogacy. Consider the causal diagram in Fig. 1a, where S perfectly mediates A ’s effect on Y (*i.e.*, exclusion restriction), but S and Y share an unobserved confounder U , while treatment A is fully unconfounded. In this case, S is a collider so that conditioning on it induces a path from A to Y via U , violating surrogacy and imperiling analysis using such methods as Athey et al. [2019].

This scenario is actually exceedingly commonplace: for example, in streaming platforms with a subscription model, a user’s amount of free time both impacts their short-term engagement and their probability of subscription retention in the same direction. Failing to address this confounding leads to surrogate-based estimates that overestimate true effects on long-term outcomes. We might even have more extreme situations in which an intervention strongly increases short-term engagement of a subpopulation of users who are unlikely to unsubscribe while slightly decreasing engagement of a subpopulation of users very likely to unsubscribe. This might result in both an overall increase in short-term engagement and an overall decrease in long-term retention, a situation known as the surrogate paradox [Elliott et al., 2015].

3.2 Experiments as Instruments and Surrogates as Proxies

Athey et al. [2019] consider a setting where historical data prior to the present experiment contains only S and Y and some baseline covariates. In this context, all we can do is either worry about potential unobserved confounders, or hope the included covariates satisfy ignorability between S and Y . However, at organizations that routinely run many digital experiments, we can take historical data from past experiments where we also observe the randomized treatments A . In the setting of Fig. 1a, these treatments constitute an IV, which can help us identify the causal effect of S on Y and therefore infer the effect of a novel treatment on Y by considering only its effect on S .

Going beyond this, we can even account for some exclusion violations (a long-term effect unmediated by short-term observations) under additional structure. In the following we show that some parts of S can serve as effect mediators, while other parts of S can serve as negative controls (also known as proxies) that can adjust for effects unmediated by the first part, so long as we get a rich enough view onto them.

In the following, we first present the corresponding causal model (summarized in Fig. 1b). Then, we present an identification result showing how the long-term outcome of a novel treatment can be identified without observations on long-term outcomes under the novel treatment by leveraging historical experiments where we observe both short- and long-term outcomes. This identification result is written as a function of NPIV solutions, which may be estimated slowly in this nonparametric setting, imperiling rates on causal effect estimation if we were to simply plug-in an estimated solution. Therefore, we finally present a debiased formulation of the identification result that, under a strong identification condition, enjoys a mixed-bias property, which means we can multiply estimation rates and make them insignificant to first order. Together

with estimation results for a nuisance in this new debiased formulation, we obtain asymptotic normal estimates for long-term causal effects of the novel treatment, enabling inference.

3.3 Causal Model

Up until now we worked only with an observed-data distribution and posed Eq. (1) as a statistical problem. We now introduce a causal model for the surrogate setting we study, for which we will show how the NPIV problem Eq. (1) helps identify a causal effect.

Potential outcomes. We state our causal model in general terms using potential outcomes. The model is summarized in Fig. 1b, which represents a causal diagram that is consistent with these assumptions. We assume the existence of variables $\tilde{A}, U_1, S_1(a), U_2(a), S_2(u_2), Y(s_1, s_2, u_2)$, and we abbreviate $S_2(a) = S_2(U_2(a))$, $Y(a) = Y(S_1(a), S_2(a), U_2(a))$.

Here we let $\tilde{A} \in \{1, \dots, K + 1\}$, where $\tilde{A} \leq K$ denotes the historical experimental data and $\tilde{A} = K + 1$ denotes the novel treatment (we will return to data generation after the causal model). We are interested in inference on the average outcome under the novel treatment:

$$\theta_0 = \mathbb{E}[Y(K + 1)].$$

Our key assumptions characterizing the causal model are:

Assumption 1 (Unmeasured confounder and potential outcomes independence). $U_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp S_2(u_2)$, and $S_1(a), U_2(a), Y(s_1, s_2, u_2)$ are mutually independent given U_1

Assumption 2 (Randomization). A is independent of all potential outcomes and of U_1 .

Assumption 3 (Existence of bridge function). There exists h^* such that, for every $a \in [K]$, $\mathbb{E}[Y(a) - h^*(S(a))] = 0$.

Assumption 4 (Extrapolability). For any $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$(\mathbb{E}[Y(a) - h(S(a))] \forall a \in [K]) \implies \mathbb{E}[Y(K + 1) - h(S(K + 1))] = 0. \quad (6)$$

Assumption 1 captures the presence of confounding between short- and long-term outcomes. Assumption 2 captures that experiments are randomized so treatment assignment can be used as an IV.

Figure 1: Causal diagrams for surrogate settings with unobserved confounders. Dashed circles (U) indicate unobserved variables. Dotted circles (Y) indicate variables observed historically, but unobserved for novel treatments.



(a) A setting with unconfounded treatment (A) but confounded surrogate (S) and outcome (Y).

(b) The general setting we tackle with two kinds of possible short-term observations $S = (S_1, S_2)$. The identity of the components S_1 and S_2 within S need not be known.

Example. It is straightforward to check that our causal assumptions hold under the following nonparametric structural causal model (SCM)

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= f_Y(S_1, S_2, U_2, \epsilon_Y) + g_Y(U_1, S_2, U_2, \epsilon_Y) \\ S_2 &= f_{S_2}(U_2, \epsilon_{S_2}) \\ S_1 &= f_{S_1}(A, U_1, \epsilon_{S_1}) \\ U_2 &= f_{U_2}(A, \epsilon_{U_2}) \\ U_1 &= f_{U_1}(\epsilon_{U_1}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_Y, \epsilon_{S_2}, \epsilon_{S_1}, \epsilon_{U_2}, \epsilon_{U_1}$ are independent. The key for assumption 3 to hold is that U_1 and S_1 enter the outcome equation in an additively separable manner. Aside from this additive restriction, this particular SCM is depicted in Fig. 1b.

3.4 Data

Let $\tilde{S} = (S_1(\tilde{A}), S_2(\tilde{A}))$ and $\tilde{Y} = Y(\tilde{A})$ be the factually observed outcomes.

Historical data set. Let A be uniformly distributed over $[K]$, let Y, S be such that $(Y, S) \mid A = a \sim (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{S}) \mid \tilde{A} = a$. Let $O = (A, S, Y)$. We have N historical units for which we have observations $O_i = (A_i, S_i, Y_i), i = 1, \dots, N$ such that $O_i \sim O$. The treatment assignments A_1, \dots, A_N of the historical units $i = 1, \dots, N$ is drawn following a completely randomized design such that each cell has exactly n units. Any two $i \neq j, (S_i, Y_i), (S_j, Y_j)$ are independent conditional on A_i, A_j .

Novel data set. Let $S^{(K+1)} \sim \tilde{S} \mid \tilde{A} = K + 1$. We observe n' independent copies $S_1^{(K+1)}, \dots, S_{n'}^{(K+1)}$ of $S^{(K+1)}$.

We now turn to the question of identification. Note that had we observed $Y^{(K+1)} \sim \tilde{Y} \mid \tilde{A} = K + 1$ from the novel treatment, we would have trivially identified θ_0 as $\mathbb{E}[Y^{(K+1)}]$ under Assumption 2. So, in the absence of outcome observations for the novel treatment, our goal is to combine the N and n' datasets to identify θ_0 .

3.5 Surrogacy and set identification

It is immediate that under assumptions 3 and 4, h^* is a valid surrogate function in the sense that $E[Y(K+1)] = E[h^*(S(K+1))]$.

That is, h^* connects causal effects on Y to causal effects on S : if we could access h^* , we would be able to know the average potential outcome of Y under any treatment from the distribution of the average potential outcome of S under that same intervention. We thus define the causal parameter of interest as $\theta^* = \theta(h^*)$ where $\theta(h) = \mathbb{E}[h(S(a'))]$ for the novel intervention a' .

Set identification of h^* and point identification of θ_0 . For any function $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $[\Pi h](a) = \mathbb{E}[h(S) \mid A = a]$. The following lemma characterizes h^* in terms of the data distribution in the historical cells.

Lemma 2 (Set identification of h^*). *Under the causal assumptions 1-3, it holds that $h^* \in \mathcal{H}_0$ where \mathcal{H}_0 is the set of functions $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy the conditional moment restriction (CMR) $[\Pi h](a) = \mathbb{E}[Y \mid A = a]$ for every $a \in [K]$.*

3.6 Point identification and strong identification

While h^* is not point identified a priori, it is not our parameter of interest: $\theta(h^*)$ is. We now present some assumptions under which $\theta(h^*)$ is point identified.

Definition 1 (Identification). We say that $\theta(h^*)$ is point identified if for any solution h of the CMR, that is for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_0$, $\theta(h) = \theta(h^*)$.

Let α be the importance sampling ratio between the distribution of S in the target treatment arm ($A = a'$) and in the historical experiments ($A \in [K]$), that is

$$\alpha(s) = \frac{p_{S^{(K+1)}}(s)}{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{a=1}^K p_{S^{(a)}}(s)} = \frac{p_{S^{(K+1)}}(s)}{p_S(s)}. \quad (7)$$

For any h we can rewrite $\theta(h)$ as an expectation under the historical data experiment in terms of the importance sampling ratio:

$$\theta(h) = \mathbb{E}[\alpha(S)h(S)]. \quad (8)$$

The function α is then the Riesz representer of the functional θ . It is then immediate that $\theta(h^*)$ is point identified if, and only if, $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}(\Pi)^\perp = \overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)}$.

Definition 2 (Strong identification). We say that $\theta(h^*)$ is strongly identified if $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(\Pi^*\Pi)$.

Note that strong identification trivially implies identification. Let Ξ_0 be the set of functions $\xi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha = \Pi^*\Pi\xi$. Strong identification is equivalent to $\Xi_0 \neq \emptyset$. Under strong identification, $\theta(h^*)$ admits an additional representation, as we make explicit in the next lemma.

Lemma 3 (Double robustness, mixed bias). *Let S' be such that $S' \perp (S, Y) \mid A$ and $S' \mid A \sim S \mid A$. Suppose that $\theta(h^*)$ is strongly identified. Let h, ξ be two $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ functions and let $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\xi_0 \in \Xi_0$ (the latter exists from strong identification). Let*

$$\psi(h, \xi) = h(S^{(K+1)}) + \xi(S')(Y - h(S)). \quad (9)$$

Then it holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\psi(h, \xi)] - \theta^*| \leq \|\Pi(\xi - \xi_0)\| \times \|\Pi(h - h_0)\|, \quad (10)$$

where for any $f : [K] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\|f\|^2 = \mathbb{E}[f(A, S, Y)^2]$, that is $\|\cdot\|$ is L2 norm induced by the historical data distribution.

Remark 1. The requirement that S' is an independent copy of S will be easily satisfied at estimation time by splitting treatment arms in non-overlapping folds and drawing S' for the same cell as (S, Y) but from a different fold.

Remark 2. Unlike previous works, we get a mixed bias property in terms of weak norms of both h and ξ . This is very specific to our setting though, as the key to this property is that we can easily draw an independent copy S' of S , which we can do here due to (i) the fact that we can group observations by value of A (that is in treatment arms) and split these groups in folds, and (ii) the non-overlapping nature of the variables A, S, Y .

We now turn to the key result of this section.

Theorem 4 (Identification implies strong identification). *In the setting we consider in this section, identification and strong identification are equivalent, that is*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)} = \mathcal{R}(\Pi^*) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi^*\Pi). \quad (11)$$

4 Estimation of the debiasing nuisance function

Risk for debiasing nuisance. Observe that $\xi \in \Xi_0$, that is $\Pi^* \Pi \xi = \alpha$, is the first order condition in the minimization w.r.t. functions $L_2(\mathcal{S})$ of the risk

$$R_2(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Pi \xi(A)^2] - \mathbb{E} [\alpha(S) \xi(S)] \quad (12)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\Pi \xi(A)^2] - \mathbb{E} [\xi(S^{(K+1)})]. \quad (13)$$

Similarly to the case of the primary nuisance function h , we introduce a penalized cross-fold empirical analog of the population debiasing risk. Specifically, we let

$$\widehat{R}_{2,\mu}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{a=1}^K [\widehat{\Pi}_0 \xi](a) [\widehat{\Pi}_1 \xi](a) - \frac{1}{n'} \sum_{A_i=a'} \xi(S_i^{(K+1)}) + \mu \|\xi\|_{2,N}^2 \quad (14)$$

Let $\widehat{\xi}$ be a minimizer of $\widehat{R}_{2,\mu}(\xi)$, and let ξ_0 be the minimum norm element of $\Xi_0 \cap \mathcal{H}$. Our convergence rate results require the following condition.

Assumption 5 (Realizability for ξ). It holds that $\Xi_0 \cap \mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$.

Slow rate. Let $\mathcal{R}'_{n'}(\mathcal{H}, \delta) = E[\sup_{\xi \in \mathcal{H}: \|\xi\|_{(K+1)} \leq \delta} \frac{1}{n'} \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \epsilon_i \xi(S'_i)]$ be the localized Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{H} on the new dataset ($A = K + 1$). Let $(r'_{n'})^2$ be an upper bound on $\mathcal{R}'_{n'}(\mathcal{H}, 1)$.

Without any further assumptions, we obtain the following slow rate result.

Theorem 5 (Slow rate for ξ). *Let $\zeta > 0$. Suppose that assumption 5 holds. Suppose that $\sqrt{\log(K/\zeta)} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$, and $\sqrt{\log \log \delta_N/N} = o(\delta_N)$. Then it holds with probability $1 - O(\zeta)$ that*

$$\|\Pi(\xi - \xi_0)\| = \widetilde{O}(\delta_N^{1/2} + r'_{n'}). \quad (15)$$

Fast rate. Let $\delta'_{n'}$ be a solution to $\mathcal{R}'_{n'}(\mathcal{H}, \delta') \leq (\delta'_{n'})^2$. We can obtain a fast rate under the following so-called source condition on the Riesz representer α .

Definition 3 (Source condition). We say that the source condition with parameter β holds for α if $\alpha = (\Pi^* \Pi)^\beta w_0$ for some $w_0 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 6 (Fast rate). *Let $\zeta > 0$. Suppose that assumption 5 holds. Suppose that $\sqrt{\log(K/\zeta)} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$, and $\sqrt{\log \log \delta_N/N} = o(\delta_N)$. Further suppose that the source condition holds with parameter $\beta \in (1, 2]$ and that w_0 in the source condition is such that $\sup_K \|w_0\| < \infty$. Set $\lambda = \delta_{n'}^{\frac{2}{2+\beta}}$. Then it holds with probability $1 - O(\zeta)$ that*

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{\xi} - \xi_0)\| = \widetilde{O}((\delta'_{n'})^{-\frac{1+\beta}{2+\beta}}). \quad (16)$$

and

$$\|\xi - \xi_0\| = \widetilde{O}((\delta'_{n'})^{-\frac{\beta}{2+\beta}}). \quad (17)$$

Note that the convergence rates above are in terms of the norm induced by historical data distribution.

5 Semiparametric cross-fold estimator

Divide the historical data set in 4 folds $v = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Estimate \hat{h} on the first two folds and $\hat{\xi}$ on the first two folds and the new treatment arm. For every index i in fold 2, let $j(i)$ be a corresponding observation index in fold 3, such that $i \mapsto j(i)$ is a one-to-one mapping, and let $(S'_i, Y'_i) = (S_{j(i)}, Y_{j(i)})^1$.

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{n'} \sum_{i=1}^{n'} \hat{h}(S_i^{(K+1)}) + \frac{4}{N} \sum_i \xi(S_i)(Y'_i - \hat{h}(S'_i)). \quad (18)$$

Theorem 7. *Suppose that $\|\Pi(\hat{h} - h_0)\| \|\Pi(\hat{\xi} - \xi_0)\| = o_P((n' \wedge N)^{-1/2})$ and that $\|\hat{h} - h_0\| = o_P(1)$ and $\|\hat{\xi} - \xi_0\| = o_P(1)$. Then*

$$\sqrt{n' \wedge (N/4)}(\hat{\theta} - \theta(h_0)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma), \quad \sigma = \begin{cases} \sigma_1^2 & \text{if } n'/N \rightarrow 0, \\ \sigma_1^2 + c\sigma_2^2 & \text{if } 4n'/N \rightarrow c \in (0, \infty), \\ \sigma_2^2 & \text{if } n'/N \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma_1^2 = \text{Var}(h_0(S) \mid A = a')$ and $\sigma_2^2 = \text{Var}(\xi_0(S) \mid A \in [K]) \times \text{Var}(Y - h_0(S)) \mid A \in [K]$.

6 Numerical Experiments

We perform simulation experiments to study the behavior of cross-fold npJIVE. To begin, we fix a data-generating process with treatment effects μ_a generated from a normal distribution with variance σ_a , where the latter choice controls the strength of the instruments. The short-term outcome S is discrete and generated from a multinomial distribution with probability vector drawn Dirichlet($\mathbf{1} \cdot \exp(\mu_a)$). The long-term outcome Y is generated as a combination of non-linear function $h(S) = S + 5 \times (S > 3)$, an unobserved confounder $U \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and standard normal noise. In the ‘historical experiments’ dataset \mathfrak{H} , we have $A = [1, \dots, k]$ experiments that contain $n = 50$ observations each that follows the above DGP. In a ‘target experiments’ dataset \mathfrak{T} , we have $n = 100$ observations from the same DGP.

To begin, we compare the performance of a kernel-ridge implementation of $\hat{h}(S)$ trained on the historical data \mathfrak{H} in recovering the true $h_0(S)$ in the target data \mathfrak{T} using the weak norm $\frac{1}{K} \sum_a \hat{\mathbb{E}}(Y - \hat{h}(S) \mid A = a)^2 / \sigma_a^2$ varying instrument strength σ_a and number of instruments k . We report this weak norm in figure 2, and find that the cross-fold moments estimator empirically converges in the weak norm, with faster convergence when instruments are stronger.

Next, we perform a simulation experiments to compare the performance of NPJIVE with its non-cross-fold counterpart, the sieve minimum distance (SMD) estimator [Ai and Chen, 2003]. Both estimators of $\hat{h}(S)$ involve fitting a kernel-ridge regression of the form $\hat{\beta}_h = (\Phi Q \Phi + \lambda I_n)^{-1} \Phi Q Y$ on the historical experiments data, where Φ is the Gram matrix of the short-term outcomes S , and Q is sparse selector matrix of dimensions $nK \times nK$ (where n is the sample size in each experiment and K is the number of instruments). The sparsity of Q distinguishes our estimator from 2SLS/SMD: without cross-folds, Q is block-diagonal with $n \times n$ matrices of ones on the diagonal, while the use of cross-folds introduces zeros to compute held-out averages (with maximal sparsity with two folds and minimal with $n - 1$ folds, which is the conventional leave-one-out jackknife), as illustrated in fig 3.

Similar to above, we fix a DGP with treatment effects μ_a drawn from a normal distribution with variance σ_a , which governs instrument strength, and the short term outcome is generated from a uniform distribution $\text{Unif}[\mu_a - 0.5, \mu_a + 0.5]$, and the long-term outcome is generated as a combination of a non-linear function $h(S) = S + 0.5(S > 0.25) - \sin(S)$ and an unobserved confounder U . In the ‘historical experiments’ dataset \mathfrak{H} , we have $A = [1, \dots, K = 5000]$ experiments, each with n observations each, where we shall vary n to ‘very small’ and ‘moderate’ values. We compare the performance of SMD and npJIVE in recovering \hat{S} in the weak

¹this requires that the two fold have the same number of observations




Figure 2: Weak norm normalized by instrument strength, that is $\frac{1}{K} \sum_a \hat{\mathbb{E}}(Y - \hat{h}(S) | A = a)^2 / \sigma_a^2$ varying instrument strength σ_a and number of instruments evaluated on target experiments

norm. We report results for two levels of instrument strength σ_a , and experiment size n , in figure 4, where the x-axis reports the bandwidth of the kernel (with the optimal value denoted by a dotted line). We find that a tuned npJIVE consistently weakly outperforms SMD, with large gaps with small weak experiments.

7 Concluding remarks

The proliferation of experimentation on digital platforms provides a bountiful source of instruments [Peysakhovich and Eckles, 2018]. This holds great potential to learn much more than what each such experiment taught us about the treatment that was experimented with. In particular, using it to understand the relationship between short- and long-term metrics [Bibaut et al., 2024], we may even be able to predict the effects of new experiments before observing any long-term outcome, even when the perfect surrogacy needed for observational surrogate index methods [Athey et al., 2019, Chen and Ritzwoller, 2023] fails. A key challenge is that, while we have many experiments, each experiment only tells us so little. Here we tackled the combined challenges of NPIV, many weak IVs, *and* inference on low dimensional functionals, our solution thereto newly enables statistical inference on long-term causal effects with nonparametric surrogate indices learned from many weak historical experiments.

Beyond digital experimentation, our results may also be applicable to so-called “judge-IV” or “examiners” designs, where researchers use (conditional) random assignment of judges to defendants to estimate the effect of an endogenous treatment S (for example, incarceration) on an economic outcome Y (for example, lifetime wages) [Frandsen et al., 2023, Kling, 2006]. Each judge processes a relatively small number of cases (n), but there are many judges (K). Applications generally assume a linear structure and employ JIVE and related methods [Angrist et al., 1999, Kolesár, 2018]. However, if S is real valued we may instead want to estimate the best linear projection of $h^*(S)$, which is also a linear functional thereof. In this case, npJIVE might be used to learn $h^*(S)$ and our inference results may be extended to this alternative linear functional.





Figure 3: Q matrices for KRR implementation of SMD and npJIVE. Each matrix is $nK \times nK$, with black cells corresponding with zeroes and light cells corresponding with ones.



1

Figure 4: Weak norm of npJIVE and SMD, varying RBF kernel (inverse)bandwidth γ , instrument strength σ_a (column) and sample size in each experiment (rows), with total number of instruments fixed at 5000. We see that a tuned (i.e. optimal bandwidth) npJIVE consistently outperforms SMD, with gaps being largest when instruments are weak and experiments are small

References

- C. Ai and X. Chen. Efficient estimation of models with conditional moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Econometrica*, 71(6):1795–1843, 2003.
- C. Ai and X. Chen. Estimation of possibly misspecified semiparametric conditional moment restriction models

- with different conditioning variables. *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(1):5–43, 2007.
- C. Ai and X. Chen. The semiparametric efficiency bound for models of sequential moment restrictions containing unknown functions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2):442–457, 2012.
- J. D. Angrist, G. W. Imbens, and A. B. Krueger. Jackknife instrumental variables estimation. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 14(1):57–67, 1999.
- S. Athey, R. Chetty, G. W. Imbens, and H. Kang. The surrogate index: Combining short-term proxies to estimate long-term treatment effects more rapidly and precisely. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019.
- A. Bennett and N. Kallus. The variational method of moments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(3):810–841, 2023.
- A. Bennett, N. Kallus, and T. Schnabel. Deep generalized method of moments for instrumental variable analysis. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- A. Bennett, N. Kallus, X. Mao, W. Newey, V. Syrgkanis, and M. Uehara. Inference on strongly identified functionals of weakly identified functions, 2023a.
- A. Bennett, N. Kallus, X. Mao, W. Newey, V. Syrgkanis, and M. Uehara. Source condition double robust inference on functionals of inverse problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13793*, 2023b.
- A. Bibaut, W. Chou, S. Ejdemyr, and N. Kallus. Learning the covariance of treatment effects across many weak experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17637*, 2024.
- E. Budish, B. N. Roin, and H. Williams. Do firms underinvest in long-term research? evidence from cancer clinical trials. *American Economic Review*, 105(7):2044–2085, 2015.
- J. C. Chao, N. R. Swanson, J. A. Hausman, W. K. Newey, and T. Woutersen. Asymptotic distribution of jive in a heteroskedastic iv regression with many instruments. *Econometric Theory*, 28(1):42–86, 2012.
- J. Chen and D. M. Ritzwoller. Semiparametric estimation of long-term treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 237(2):105545, 2023.
- X. Chen and D. Pouzo. Efficient estimation of semiparametric conditional moment models with possibly nonsmooth residuals. *Journal of Econometrics*, 152(1):46–60, 2009.
- X. Chen and D. Pouzo. Estimation of nonparametric conditional moment models with possibly nonsmooth generalized residuals. *Econometrica*, 80(1):277–321, 2012.
- R. Chetty, J. N. Friedman, N. Hilger, E. Saez, D. W. Schanzenbach, and D. Yagan. How does your kindergarten classroom affect your earnings? evidence from project star. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 126(4):1593–1660, 2011.
- S. Darolles, Y. Fan, J.-P. Florens, and E. Renault. Nonparametric instrumental regression. *Econometrica*, 79(5):1541–1565, 2011.
- N. Dikkala, G. Lewis, L. Mackey, and V. Syrgkanis. Minimax estimation of conditional moment models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12248–12262, 2020.
- M. R. Elliott, A. S. Conlon, Y. Li, N. Kaciroti, and J. M. Taylor. Surrogacy marker paradox measures in meta-analytic settings. *Biostatistics*, 16(2):400–412, 2015.
- T. R. Fleming, R. L. Prentice, M. S. Pepe, and D. Glidden. Surrogate and auxiliary endpoints in clinical trials, with potential applications in cancer and aids research. *Statistics in medicine*, 13(9):955–968, 1994.

- B. Frandsen, L. Lefgren, and E. Leslie. Judging judge fixed effects. *American Economic Review*, 113(1): 253–277, 2023.
- J. Hartford, G. Lewis, K. Leyton-Brown, and M. Taddy. Deep iv: A flexible approach for counterfactual prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1414–1423. PMLR, 2017.
- H. Hohnhold, D. O’Brien, and D. Tang. Focusing on the long-term: It’s good for users and business. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1849–1858, 2015.
- J. R. Kling. Incarceration length, employment, and earnings. *American Economic Review*, 96(3):863–876, 2006.
- M. Kolesár. Minimum distance approach to inference with many instruments. *Journal of Econometrics*, 204(1):86–100, 2018.
- H. Kremer, J.-J. Zhu, K. Muandet, and B. Schölkopf. Functional generalized empirical likelihood estimation for conditional moment restrictions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11665–11682. PMLR, 2022.
- H. Kremer, Y. Nemmour, B. Schölkopf, and J.-J. Zhu. Estimation beyond data reweighting: Kernel method of moments. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17745–17783. PMLR, 2023.
- W. K. Newey and J. L. Powell. Instrumental variable estimation of nonparametric models. *Econometrica*, 71(5):1565–1578, 2003.
- A. Peysakhovich and D. Eckles. Learning causal effects from many randomized experiments using regularized instrumental variables. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference*, pages 699–707, 2018.
- R. L. Prentice. Surrogate endpoints in clinical trials: definition and operational criteria. *Statistics in medicine*, 8(4):431–440, 1989.
- A. Santos. Instrumental variable methods for recovering continuous linear functionals. *Journal of Econometrics*, 161(2):129–146, 2011.
- T. A. Severini and G. Tripathi. Some identification issues in nonparametric linear models with endogenous regressors. *Econometric Theory*, 22(2):258–278, 2006.
- T. A. Severini and G. Tripathi. Efficiency bounds for estimating linear functionals of nonparametric regression models with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 170(2):491–498, 2012.
- R. Singh, M. Sahani, and A. Gretton. Kernel instrumental variable regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- J. Yang, D. Eckles, P. Dhillon, and S. Aral. Targeting for long-term outcomes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15835*, 2020.
- R. Zhang, M. Imaizumi, B. Schölkopf, and K. Muandet. Instrumental variable regression via kernel maximum moment loss. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 11(1):20220073, 2023.

A Proof of theorem 4

Proof. That $\overline{\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)} = \mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)$ directly follows from the fact that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)$ is a finite dimensional linear subspace, and therefore equals its closure.

Let $\phi_a : s \mapsto p[s \mid a]$. Let $r = \text{rank}(\{\phi_a : a \in [K]\})$. There exists a_1, \dots, a_r such that $\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \phi_{a_r}$ are linearly independent.

From now on, we proceed in four steps.

Step 1: $\Pi\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \Pi\phi_{a_r}$ are linearly independent. Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi\phi_{a_i} = 0$. In particular must have that, for every $j = 1, \dots, r$, $\sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi\phi_{a_i}(a_j) = 0$, and therefore, by summation, $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} \gamma_i \gamma_j \Pi\phi_{a_i}(a_j) = 0$, that is, by definition of Π ,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} \gamma_i \gamma_j \langle \phi_{a_i}, \phi_{a_j} \rangle_{L_2(\mathcal{S})} = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \phi_{a_i}, \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \phi_{a_i} \right\rangle_{L_2(\mathcal{S})} = 0. \quad (20)$$

Therefore, from positive definiteness, $\sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \phi_{a_i}$, which implies that $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_r = 0$, since $\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \phi_{a_r}$ are linearly independent. We have thus shown that $\Pi\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \Pi\phi_{a_r}$ are linearly independent.

Step 2: $\Pi^*\Pi\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \Pi^*\Pi\phi_{a_r}$ are linearly independent. Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi^*\Pi\phi_{a_i} = 0$. We must then have for every $j = 1, \dots, r$, that

$$\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi^*\Pi\phi_{a_i}, \phi_{a_j} \right\rangle_{L_2(\mathcal{S})} = 0, \quad (21)$$

and therefore, by summation, that

$$\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi^*\Pi\phi_{a_i}, \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \phi_{a_j} \right\rangle_{L_2(\mathcal{S})} = 0, \quad (22)$$

and thus, by definition of the adjoint, that

$$\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi\phi_{a_i}, \sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi\phi_{a_i} \right\rangle = 0. \quad (23)$$

By positive definiteness, $\sum_{i=1}^r \gamma_i \Pi\phi_{a_i} = 0$, which implies that $\gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_r = 0$ since $\Pi\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \Pi\phi_{a_r}$ are linearly independent.

Step 3: $\text{rank}(\Pi^*) \leq r$. We have that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*) = \text{Span}(s \mapsto p[a \mid s] : a \in [K])$. From Bayes formula,

$$\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*) = \text{Span} \left(s \mapsto \frac{\phi_a(s)}{Kp(s)} : a \in [K] \right) \subseteq \text{Span} \left(s \mapsto \frac{\phi_{a_i}(s)}{Kp(s)} : i = 1, \dots, r \right), \quad (24)$$

since $\phi_{a_1}, \dots, \phi_{a_r}$ is a basis of $\text{Span}(\phi_a : a \in [K])$.

Concluding. We have that $\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*\Pi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)$. From step 2, $\text{rank}(\Pi^*Pi) \geq r$, and from step 3, $\text{rank}(\Pi^*) \leq r$. Therefore, we must have $\mathcal{R}(\Pi^*\Pi) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi^*)$, which concludes the proof. \square

B Primary nuisance estimation proofs

For any two functions $f_1, f_2 : [K] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{a=1}^K f_1(a) f_2(a). \quad (25)$$

B.1 Local maximal inequality

Let $O_1, \dots, O_N \in \mathcal{O}$ be N independent random variables. For any function $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let

$$\|f\| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)^2]}. \quad (26)$$

Lemma 8 (Local maximal inequality). *Let \mathcal{F} be a star-shaped class of functions such that $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|f\| \leq r$. Suppose that $N^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log \log \delta_N} = o(\delta_N)$. Let b_1, \dots, b_N be fixed real numbers such that $\max_{i=1, \dots, N} |b_i| \leq B$. Then, for any $u > 0$, it holds with probability $1 - e^{-u^2}$ that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b_i (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \lesssim B \left(\delta_N \|f\| + \delta_N^2 + \frac{u \|f\|}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{u^2}{N} \right). \quad (27)$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}_m = \{f : \|f\| \leq r_m\}$ where $r_m = 2^m \delta_N$. From Talagrand's or alternatively Bousquet's inequality, it holds with probability $1 - e^{-u^2}$ that for every $f \in \mathcal{S}_m$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b_i (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{S}_m} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i b_i f(O_i) \right] + B \left(\frac{u r_m}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{u^2}{N} \right). \quad (28)$$

From the contraction lemma for Rademacher processes,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{S}_m} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i b_i f(O_i) \right] \lesssim B \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, r_m). \quad (29)$$

Let $m(f) = \min\{m \geq 0 : f \in \mathcal{S}_m\}$. From a union bound, with probability $1 - e^{-u^2}$, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b_i (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \lesssim B \left(\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, r_{m(f)}) + (u + \sqrt{\log \log_2 \delta_N}) \frac{r_{m(f)}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{u^2 \log \log_2 \delta_N}{N} \right). \quad (30)$$

If $m(f) = 0$, $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, r_{m(f)}) = \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, \delta_N) \leq \delta_N^2$ by definition of the critical radius. If $m(f) \geq 1$,

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, r_{m(f)})}{r_{m(f)}} \leq \delta_N, \quad (31)$$

therefore $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}, r_{m(f)}) \leq \delta_N \|f\|$. Therefore, with probability $1 - e^{-u^2}$, it holds that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b_i (f(O_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(O_i)]) \lesssim B \left(\delta_N \|f\| + \delta_N^2 + \frac{u \|f\|}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{u^2}{N} \right). \quad (32)$$

□

B.2 Decomposition of the difference between population and empirical risk

We have that

$$2(\widehat{R}_{1,0}(h) - R_1(h)) \tag{33}$$

$$= \langle \widehat{\Pi}_0(h_0 - h + \eta), \widehat{\Pi}_1(h_0 - h + \eta) \rangle - \langle \Pi(h_0 - h), \Pi(h_0 - h) \rangle \tag{34}$$

$$= \langle (\widehat{\Pi}_0 - \Pi)(h - h_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_1 - \Pi)(h - h_0) \rangle \tag{35}$$

$$+ \sum_{v=0,1} \langle \Pi(h - h_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)(h - h_0) \rangle \tag{36}$$

$$+ \sum_{v=0,1} \langle \Pi(h - h_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)\eta \rangle \tag{37}$$

$$+ \sum_{v=0,1} \langle (\widehat{\Pi}_{1-v} - \Pi)(h - h_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)\eta \rangle \tag{38}$$

$$+ \langle (\widehat{\Pi}_0 - \Pi)\eta, (\widehat{\Pi}_1 - \Pi)\eta \rangle \tag{39}$$

B.3 U-process terms

Denote $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{H} - h_0$. For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, let $g^0 = g - \Pi g$, and let $\mathcal{G}^0 = \{g - \Pi g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$. For any such g^0 , let

$$Z_{N,1}^0(g) = \langle \widehat{\Pi}_0 g^0, \widehat{\Pi}_1 g^0 \rangle. \tag{40}$$

For any $a \in [K]$, $\delta > 0$ let

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,a}(\mathcal{G}^0, \delta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{g^0 \in \mathcal{G}^0: \|g^0\|_{2,a} \leq \delta} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i: A_i=a, V_i=0} \epsilon_i g^0(S_i) \right]. \tag{41}$$

Lemma 9. *Suppose that the classes \mathcal{G}^0 and $(\widehat{\Pi}_0 \mathcal{G}^0) \times \mathcal{G}^0$ are star-shaped. Let $\widetilde{\delta}_n$ be any solution to $\mathcal{R}_{n,a}(\mathcal{G}^0, \delta) \leq \delta^2$ for every $a \in [K]$, let $\widehat{\delta}_N$ be the $\|\cdot\|$ critical radius of $(\widehat{\Pi}_0 \mathcal{G}^0) \times \mathcal{G}^0$ conditional on \mathcal{D}_0 , and let \widehat{r}_N^2 be an upper bound on the Rademacher complexity of $(\widehat{\Pi}_0 \mathcal{G}^0) \times \mathcal{G}^0$ conditional on \mathcal{D}_0 . Let $\zeta > 0$. Suppose that $\sqrt{\log(K/\zeta)/n} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$, $\sqrt{\log \log \widetilde{\delta}_n/n} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$, $\widehat{\delta}_N = o(\sqrt{\log \log \widehat{\delta}_N/N})$. Then, with probability $1 - 3\zeta$, it holds for every $g^0 \in \mathcal{G}^0$ that*

$$Z_N^0(g) = O \left(\left(\widehat{\delta}_N \widetilde{\delta}_n \|g^0\|^2 + \widehat{\delta}_N \widetilde{\delta}_n^2 \|g^0\| + \widehat{\delta}_N^2 \right) \wedge \widehat{r}_N^2 \right), \tag{42}$$

where the constant in $O(\cdot)$ is uniform over \mathcal{G}^0 .

Proof. From lemma 8, a union bound and the condition $\sqrt{\log(\zeta/K)/n} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$, it holds with probability $1 - \zeta$ that, for every $a \in [K]$,

$$[\widehat{\Pi}_0 g^0](a) = O(\widetilde{\delta}_n \|g^0\|_{2,a} + \widetilde{\delta}_n^2). \tag{43}$$

Let \mathcal{E} be the event that the above display holds. Conditional on \mathcal{D}_0 , under the assumption that $\sqrt{\log \log \widetilde{\delta}_n/n} = o(\widetilde{\delta}_n)$ and $\widehat{\delta}_N = o(\sqrt{\log \log \widehat{\delta}_N/N})$, from lemma 8, it holds that with probability $1 - \zeta$ that, for any $g^0 \in \mathcal{G}^0$,

$$Z_{N,1}(g^0) \leq \widehat{\delta}_N \|\widehat{\Pi}_0 g^0 \times g\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} + \widehat{\delta}_N^2. \tag{44}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}_0}$ is the $\|\cdot\|$ norm conditional on \mathcal{D}_0 .

Under the event \mathcal{E} , for any $g^0 \in \mathcal{G}^0$,

$$\|\widehat{\Pi}_0 g^0 \times g\|_{\mathcal{D}_0} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N} \sum_{i:V_i=1} \left| \widehat{\Pi}_0 g^0(A_i) \right|^2 \mathbb{E}[(g^0(S_i))^2]} \quad (45)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{N} \sum_{i:V_i=1} (\tilde{\delta}_n \|g^0\|_{2,A_i} + \tilde{\delta}_n^2) \|g^0\|_{2,A_i}^2} \quad (46)$$

$$\lesssim \tilde{\delta}_n \sqrt{\frac{2}{N} \sum_{i:V_i=1} \|g^0\|_{2,A_i}^4 + \tilde{\delta}_n^2 \|g^0\|} \quad (47)$$

$$\lesssim \tilde{\delta}_n \|g^0\|^2 + \tilde{\delta}_n^2 \|g^0\|. \quad (48)$$

A $(1 - \zeta)$ -probability $O(\tilde{r}_N^2)$ bound directly follows from applying Talagrand's or Bousquet's inequality conditionally on \mathcal{D}_0 . The claim then follows from a union bound. \square

Now, let

$$Z_{N,2}^0(g) = \langle \widehat{\Pi}_0 \eta, \widehat{\Pi}_1 g^0 \rangle \quad (49)$$

Lemma 10. *Let $\tilde{\delta}_N$ be an upper bound on the critical radius of \mathcal{G}^0 . Let $\zeta \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that $\log(1/\zeta) = o(\log K)$, $\sqrt{\log(1/\zeta)/N} = o(\tilde{\delta}_N)$ and $\sqrt{\log \log \tilde{\delta}_N/N} = o(\tilde{\delta}_N)$. Then, with probability $1 - O(\zeta)$, for every $g \in \mathcal{G}$,*

$$Z_{N,2}^0(g) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log K}{n}} (\tilde{\delta}_N \|g^0\| + \tilde{\delta}_N^2)\right). \quad (50)$$

Proof. From Hoeffding, a union bound, and that $\log(1/\zeta) = o(\log K)$, it holds with probability $1 - \zeta$ that

$$\max_{a \in [K]} |[\widehat{\Pi}_0 \eta](a)| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log K}{n}}\right). \quad (51)$$

Observe that

$$Z_{N,2}^0(g) = \frac{1}{N/2} \sum_{i:V_i=1} [\widehat{\Pi}_0 \eta](A_i) g^0(S_i). \quad (52)$$

The conclusion then follows by applying lemma 8 conditional on \mathcal{D}_0 , on the event that the above display holds, with $b_i = [\widehat{\Pi}_0 \eta](A_i)$. \square

B.4 Empirical process terms

B.4.1 First empirical process term

We have that

$$\langle \Pi(h - h_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_1 - \Pi)(h - h_0) \rangle \quad (53)$$

$$= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i:V_i=1} [\Pi(h - h_0)](A_i)(h - h_0)(S_i) - E[[\Pi(h - h_0)](A_i)(h - h_0)(S_i)], \quad (54)$$

Therefore, from a direct application of lemma 8, we have that, as long as $\sqrt{\log(1/\zeta)/N} = o(\bar{\delta}_N)$ and $\sqrt{\log \log(\bar{\delta}_N)/N} = o(\bar{\delta}_N)$, it holds with probability $1 - 2\zeta$ that for every $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\langle \Pi(h - h_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_1 - \Pi)(h - h_0) \rangle \quad (55)$$

$$\leq \|[\Pi(h - h_0)] \times (h - h_0)\| \bar{\delta}_N + \bar{\delta}_N^2 \quad (56)$$

$$\leq \|[\Pi(h - h_0)]\| \bar{\delta}_N + \bar{\delta}_N^2. \quad (57)$$

B.4.2 Second empirical process term

Let $\check{\delta}_N$ be an upper bound on the critical radius of $\Pi\mathcal{G}$.

We have that

$$\langle \Pi g, \widehat{\Pi}_0 \eta \rangle = \frac{1}{N/2} \sum_{i:V_i=0} [\Pi g](A_i) \eta_i - \mathbb{E}[\Pi g](A_i) \eta_i, \quad (58)$$

Since the η_i 's are 1-subGaussian, it holds with probability $1 - \zeta$ that

$$\max_{i \in [N]} |\eta_i| = O(\sqrt{\log(N/\zeta)}). \quad (59)$$

Therefore, from lemma 8 applied conditional on \mathcal{D}_0 , on the event that the above display holds, it holds with probability $1 - O(\zeta)$ that, provided the lemma's conditions on ζ and $\log \log \check{\delta}_N$ hold,

$$\langle \Pi g, \widehat{\Pi}_0 \eta \rangle = O\left(\sqrt{\log N} \left(\check{\delta}_N \|\Pi g\| + \check{\delta}_N^2\right)\right). \quad (60)$$

B.5 Empirical and population risk difference for the primary nuisance

Term	CR notation	CR classes	Rate (up to log terms)
$\langle (\widehat{\Pi}_0 - \Pi)g, (\widehat{\Pi}_1 - \Pi)g \rangle$	$\tilde{\delta}_n, \widehat{\delta}_N$	$\mathcal{G}^0, (\widehat{\Pi}_0 \mathcal{G}^0) \times \mathcal{G}^0$	$\widehat{\delta}_N \tilde{\delta}_n \ g^0\ ^2 + \widehat{\delta}_N \tilde{\delta}_n^2 \ g^0\ + \widehat{\delta}_N^2$
$\langle \Pi g, (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)g \rangle$	$\bar{\delta}_N$	$(\Pi\mathcal{G}) \times \mathcal{G}$	$\bar{\delta}_N \ \Pi g\ + \bar{\delta}_N^2$
$\langle \Pi g, \widehat{\Pi}_v \eta \rangle$	$\check{\delta}_N$	$\Pi\mathcal{G}$	$\check{\delta}_N \ \Pi g\ + \check{\delta}_N^2$
$\langle (\widehat{\Pi}_{1-v} - \Pi)g, (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)\eta \rangle$	$\tilde{\delta}_N$	\mathcal{G}^0	$n^{-1/2}(\tilde{\delta}_N \ g^0\ + \tilde{\delta}_N^2)$

Table 1: Summary of localized rates for the terms in the equicontinuity difference

Lemma 11. *Suppose the assumptions of the above lemmas hold. Suppose that $\tilde{\delta}_n^2 = O(n^{-1/2})$ and that $n^{-1/2} = O(\tilde{\delta}_n)$. Let $\delta_N = \max(\tilde{\delta}_N, \check{\delta}_N, \widehat{\delta}_N)$. Then it holds with probability at least $1 - O(\zeta)$ that for every h in \mathcal{H} ,*

$$\widehat{R}_{1,0}(h) - R_1(h) = O\left(\delta_N \|\Pi(h - h_0)\| + \delta_N \tilde{\delta}_n \|h - h_0\|^2 + \delta_N n^{-1/2} \|h - h_0\| + \delta_N^2\right). \quad (61)$$

B.6 Weak norm convergence rate for the primary nuisance

Lemma 12 (Convergence primary nuisance). *Suppose the assumptions of 11 hold, and that $\delta_N \tilde{\delta}_n = O(\lambda)$. Then it holds with probability $1 - O(\zeta)$ that*

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h_0)\|^2 = O(\lambda + \delta_N \delta_n). \quad (62)$$

Proof. All the statements in this proof hold with probability $1 - ce^{-\delta}$. From lemma 11, optimality of \widehat{h} for

the empirical risk, and a another application of lemma 11,

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h_0)\|^2 \tag{63}$$

$$\leq \|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\|^2 \tag{64}$$

$$+ O\left(\delta_N(\|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^*)\| + \|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\|)\right) \tag{65}$$

$$+ \delta_N \delta_n (\|\widehat{h} - h^*\|^2 + \|h^* - h_0\|^2) \tag{66}$$

$$+ \delta_N n^{-1/2} (\|\widehat{h} - h^*\| + \|h^* - h_0\|) \tag{67}$$

$$+ \delta_N^2) \tag{68}$$

$$+ \lambda(\|h^*\|_{2,N}^2 - \|\widehat{h}\|_{2,N}^2) \tag{69}$$

$$\leq 2\|\Pi(h_0 - h^*)\|^2 \tag{70}$$

$$+ O(\delta_N \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^*)\| + \delta_N \delta_n \|\widehat{h} - h^*\|^2 + \delta_N n^{-1/2} \|\widehat{h} - h^*\| + \delta_N \delta_n) \tag{71}$$

$$+ \lambda(\|h^*\|_{2,N}^2 - \|\widehat{h}\|_{2,N}^2). \tag{72}$$

From an analysis of the second-order polynomial $t \mapsto \|\Pi(h^* + t(\widehat{h} - h^*) - h_0)\|^2 + \|h^* + t(\widehat{h} - h^*) - h_0\|^2$,

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^*)\|^2 + \lambda\|\widehat{h} - h^*\|^2 \leq \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h_0)\|^2 - \|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\|^2 - \lambda(\|h^*\|^2 - \|\widehat{h}\|^2). \tag{73}$$

Combining this with the preceding display and the fact that $\|h^*\|^2 - \|\widehat{h}\|^2 - \|h^*\|_{2,N}^2 - \|\widehat{h}\|_{2,N}^2 = O(\|\widehat{h} - h^*\| \delta_N + \delta_N^2)$ from lemma 8 yields that

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^*)\|^2 + \lambda\|\widehat{h} - h^*\|^2 \tag{74}$$

$$\leq \|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\|^2 \tag{75}$$

$$+ O(\delta_N \|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\| + \delta_N \delta_n \|\widehat{h} - h^*\|^2 + \delta_N \delta_n^2 \|\widehat{h} - h^*\| + \delta_N \delta_n + \lambda \delta_N \|\widehat{h} - h^*\|). \tag{76}$$

Applying the AM-GM inequality to $\delta_N \|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\|$ and using that $\delta_N \delta_n = O(\lambda)$ and that $\|\Pi(h^* - h_0)\|^2 = O(\lambda)$ yields that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^*)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\widehat{h} - h^*\|^2 = O(\lambda + \delta_N \delta_n), \tag{77}$$

which yields the claim. \square

B.7 Consistency in strong norm of the primary nuisance estimator

We have that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^\dagger)\|^2 \leq R_1(\widehat{h}) - R_1(h^\dagger) \tag{78}$$

$$\leq \widehat{R}_{1,0}(\widehat{h}) - \widehat{R}_1(h^\dagger) + O(\delta_N \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^\dagger)\| + \delta_N \widetilde{\delta}_n) \tag{79}$$

$$\leq O(\delta_N \|\Pi(\widehat{h} - h^\dagger)\| + \delta_N \widetilde{\delta}_n) - \lambda(\|\widehat{h}\|_{2,N}^2 - \|h^\dagger\|_{2,N}^2). \tag{80}$$

Therefore, from AM-GM,

$$\|\widehat{h}\|_{2,N}^2 - \|h^\dagger\|_{2,N}^2 = O\left(\frac{\delta_N \widetilde{\delta}_n}{\lambda}\right). \tag{81}$$

Therefore, from the definition of h^\dagger , which implies the limit of the LHS is lower bounded by zero, we have that $\lim \|\widehat{h}\| = \|h^\dagger\|$, which implies the conclusion.

C Convergence of the debiasing nuisance

C.1 Regularization bias under source

Lemma 13. *Under the source condition for α with parameter β , we have that*

$$\|\xi - \xi_0\| = O(\|w_0\|^2 \lambda^\beta) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Pi(\xi - \xi_0)\|^2 = O(\|w_0\|^2 \lambda^{1+\beta}). \quad (82)$$

The proof is identical to that of lemma 5 in Bennett et al. [2023b].

C.2 Decomposition of the equicontinuity term

The equicontinuity term decomposes as the sum of quadratic term and of a linear term as follows:

$$(R(\xi) - R(\xi_0)) - (\widehat{R}(\xi) - \widehat{R}(\xi_0)) \quad (83)$$

$$= Q(\xi, \xi_0) + L(\xi, \xi_0), \quad (84)$$

where

$$Q(\xi, \xi_0) \quad (85)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \langle (\widehat{\Pi}_0 - \Pi)(\xi - \xi_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_1 - \Pi)(\xi - \xi_0) \rangle \quad (86)$$

$$+ \sum_{v=0,1} \left\{ \langle \Pi(\xi - \xi_0), (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)(\xi - \xi_0) \rangle \quad (87)$$

$$+ \langle (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)\xi_0, (\widehat{\Pi}_{1-v} - \Pi)(\xi - \xi_0) \rangle \quad (88)$$

$$+ \langle \Pi\xi_0, (\widehat{\Pi}_v - \Pi)(\xi - \xi_0) \rangle \left. \right\}. \quad (89)$$

and

$$L(\xi, \xi_0) = E[\xi(S') - \xi_0(S')]. \quad (90)$$

C.3 Bounding the equicontinuity term

Following the same arguments as for the primary nuisance, we obtain that

$$Q(\xi, \xi_0) = \widetilde{O} \left(\widehat{\delta}_N \delta_n \|\xi - \xi_0\|^2 + \widehat{\delta}_N \widetilde{\delta}_n^2 \|\xi - \xi_0\| + \widehat{\delta}_N^2 \quad (91)$$

$$+ \bar{\delta}_N \|\Pi(\xi - \xi_0)\| + \bar{\delta}_N^2 \quad (92)$$

$$+ n^{-1/2} \widetilde{\delta}_N \|\xi - \xi_0\| + \widetilde{\delta}_N^2 \quad (93)$$

$$+ \widetilde{\delta}_N \|\xi - \xi_0\| + \widetilde{\delta}_N^2 \quad (94)$$

$$= \widetilde{O} \left(\delta_N \|\xi - \xi_0\| + \delta_N \widetilde{\delta}_n \|\xi - \xi_0\|^2 + \delta_N^2 \right). \quad (95)$$

From lemma 8,

$$L(\xi, \xi_0) = \widetilde{O} \left(\delta'_{n'} \|\xi - \xi_0\| + (\delta'_{n'})^2 \right). \quad (96)$$

Therefore, since $n' = o(N)$, we have that

$$(R(\xi) - R(\xi_0)) - (\widehat{R}(\xi) - \widehat{R}(\xi_0)) = \widetilde{O} \left(\delta'_{n'} \|\xi - \xi_0\| + (\delta'_{n'})^2 \right). \quad (97)$$

C.4 Weak norm bound

From an analysis of $t \mapsto \|\Pi(t(\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*) + (\xi^* - \xi_0))\|^2 + \lambda\|(t(\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*) + \xi^*)\|^2$, it holds that

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*)\|^2 + \lambda\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\| \leq \|\Pi(\widehat{\xi} - \xi_0)\|^2 - \|\Pi(\xi^* - \xi_0)\|^2 + \lambda\{\|\widehat{\xi}\|^2 - \|\xi^*\|^2\}. \quad (98)$$

From the equicontinuity term bound applied twice and optimality of $\widehat{\xi}$ for the penalized empirical risk, we have

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*)\|^2 + \lambda\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\|^2 \leq \|\Pi(\xi^* - \xi_0)\|^2 + \widetilde{O}\left(\delta'_{n'}\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi_0\| + (\delta'_{n'})^2\right) \quad (99)$$

$$+ \lambda\{(\|\widehat{\xi}\|^2 - \|\widehat{\xi}\|_{2,N}^2) - (\|\xi^*\|^2 - \|\xi^*\|_{2,N}^2)\} \quad (100)$$

$$\leq \lambda^{1+\beta} + \widetilde{O}\left(\delta'_{n'}\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\| + \delta'_{n'}\|\xi^* - \xi_0\| + (\delta'_{n'})^2\right) \quad (101)$$

$$\leq \lambda^{1+\beta} + \widetilde{O}\left(\delta'_{n'}\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\| + \delta'_{n'}\lambda^{\beta/2} + (\delta'_{n'})^2\right), \quad (102)$$

where we have used in the second inequality that $\|\Pi(\xi^* - \xi_0)\|^2 \leq \lambda^{1+\beta}$ from lemma 13, and that $(\|\widehat{\xi}\|^2 - \|\widehat{\xi}\|_{2,N}^2) - (\|\xi^*\|^2 - \|\xi^*\|_{2,N}^2) = O(\delta_N\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\| + \delta_N^2)$ (see proof of theorem 4 in Bennett et al. [2023b]), and in the third inequality that $\|\xi^* - \xi_0\|^2 \leq \lambda^\beta$, from lemma 13.

Therefore,

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*)\|^2 = \widetilde{O}\left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} -\lambda x^2 + \delta'_{n'}x + \lambda^{1+\beta} + \delta'_{n'}\lambda^{\beta/2} + (\delta'_{n'})^2\right) \quad (103)$$

$$= \widetilde{O}\left(\lambda^{-1}(\delta'_{n'})^2 + \lambda^{1+\beta} + \delta'_{n'}\lambda^{\beta/2}\right), \quad (104)$$

and then, for $\lambda = (\delta'_{n'})^{\frac{2}{2+\beta}}$, we have

$$\|\Pi(\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*)\| = \widetilde{O}\left((\delta'_{n'})^{\frac{1+\beta}{2+\beta}}\right), \quad (105)$$

and since from lemma 13, we have $\|\Pi(\xi^* - \xi_0)\| = O(\lambda^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}}) = O((\delta'_{n'})^{\frac{1+\beta}{2+\beta}})$, the triangle inequality implies the claim.

C.5 Strong norm bound

From (102),

$$\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\|^2 = \widetilde{O}\left(\lambda^\beta + \frac{\delta'_{n'}}{\lambda}\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\| + \delta'_{n'}\lambda^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}\right). \quad (106)$$

From the AM-GM inequality,

$$\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\|^2 = \widetilde{O}\left(\lambda^\beta + \lambda^{-2}(\delta'_{n'})^2 + \delta'_{n'}\lambda^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}\right). \quad (107)$$

For $\lambda = (\delta'_{n'})^{\frac{2}{2+\beta}}$, we then have that

$$\|\widehat{\xi} - \xi^*\|^2 = \widetilde{O}\left((\delta'_{n'})^{\frac{2\beta}{2+\beta}}\right), \quad (108)$$

and since $\|\xi^* - \xi_0\|^2 = O(\lambda^\beta) = O((\delta'_{n'})^{\frac{2\beta}{2+\beta}})$, the triangle inequality implies the claim.