

The generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator by inverse probability of treatment weighting

Yuhao Deng ¹ and Rui Wang ²

¹ Department of Biostatistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

² Department of Biostatistics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.

Abstract

Inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) has been well applied in causal inference. For time-to-event outcomes, IPTW is performed by weighting the event counting process and at-risk process, resulting in a generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator for population-level hazards. In the presence of competing events, we adopt the counterfactual cumulative incidence of a primary event as the estimated. When the propensity score is estimated, we derive the influence function of the hazard estimator, and then establish the asymptotic property of the incidence estimator. We show that the uncertainty in the estimated propensity score contributes to an additional variation in the IPTW estimator of the cumulative incidence. However, through simulation and real-data application, we find that the additional variation is usually small.

Keywords: Causal inference; cumulative incidence; survival analysis; influence function; inverse probability of treatment weighting.

1 Introduction

Inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) has been well applied in causal inference ([Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983](#); [Robins et al., 2000](#)). An unbiased estimator of the average treatment effect is obtained by weighting the individuals in a trial by the inverse of the treatment probability. The propensity score summarizes the information of baseline covariates into a one-dimensional statistic, and conditioning on the propensity score yields individuals with balanced covariates distribution between the treated and control. However, inverse probability weighting has not been readily studied for time-to-event outcomes, where the estimand is time-varying, usually the survival function or incidence function. A key reason is that censoring renders some failure times unobserved. To maintain flexibility, the censoring probability is considered as a nuisance model which we do not want to specify. Therefore, the statistical analysis for time-to-event data usually proceeds on the scale of hazards.

In the presence of competing risks, the cumulative incidence function (CIF) of an event is usually adopted as the estimand. The cumulative incidence of an event can be expressed as a function of the hazards of competing events, so identifying the hazards is the central aim in survival analysis ([Lau et al., 2009](#)). Parametric and semiparametric estimation impose models on the cause-specific hazards or subdistribution hazards ([Fine and Gray, 1999](#); [Putter et al., 2020](#)). However, it is a challenging task to specify an appropriate model for the hazards when there is no information on how covariates and treatments influence the hazards ([Logan et al., 2008](#)). Therefore, nonparametric approaches are sometimes preferred since there is no model restriction on the hazards and survival time. Nonparametric estimation proceeds based on the counting processes of events, such as the Kaplan–Meier estimator targeting on the survival function and the Nelson–Aalen estimator targeting on the hazard function ([Kaplan and Meier, 1958](#); [Nelson, 1972](#); [Aalen, 1978](#)).

Both Kaplan–Meier and Nelson–Aalen approaches assume homogeneity of the survival

function or hazard function, in that all individuals share the same risk of failure events. To employ IPTW for time-to-event outcomes, the simplest idea is to weight the counting processes with the inverse of propensity score, leading to the weighted Kaplan–Meier estimator (Xie and Liu, 2005; Austin, 2014; Mao et al., 2018; Hu and Huffer, 2020). The variance of the resulting estimator can be derived using the martingale theory. Within the competing risks framework, it is more convenient to apply the Nelson–Aalen estimator than the product-limit Kaplan–Meier estimator, since the former targets on the cause-specific hazard function. The cause-specific hazard of an event is always well defined but the survival function is not (Prentice et al., 1978). The idea of weighting the counting processes still applies in the Nelson–Aalen estimation (Winnett and Sasieni, 2002; Hu and Huffer, 2020). However, existing work regarding IPTW in survival analysis does not consider the heterogeneity of hazards or the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score in the weighted estimator. Using the estimated propensity score in the IPTW estimator for continuous outcomes may lead to slight different variance of the estimator and super-efficiency (Hirano et al., 2003). It is unknown whether the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score will affect the efficiency of the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator.

In this article, we formalize the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator by inverse probability weighting. We show the identifiability of the counterfactual cumulative incidence function of a competing event. If the propensity score is known, we construct a martingale from the counting processes, and derive the unbiasedness and the finite-sample variance of the estimated cause-specific hazard function. If the propensity score is estimated with a regularly asymptotically linear estimated parameter, we derive the influence function of the estimated cause-specific hazard function. The asymptotic property of the estimated counterfactual cumulative incidence function is then established using the empirical process theory. We find that omitting the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score leads to a biased variance estimator, but the empirical bias is small.

2 Estimation

Let X be the baseline covariates. Let A be the treatment indicator, where $A = 1$ stands for the active treatment and $A = 0$ stands for the control (placebo). If there is only one terminal event, we let \tilde{T}^a be the potential time to the event under the treatment condition $A = a$. If the event does not happen at the end of study t^* , we can denote $\tilde{T} > t^*$ since we are not interested in the occurrence of events after t^* . With competing events, the time to an event may not be well defined and it is more convenient to introduce the counting processes. Under the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA), let T^a be the potential time to the first event under the treatment condition $A = a$ and let $\tilde{\Delta}^a \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ be the potential event indicator. We denote $\tilde{T}_j^a = \tilde{T}^a$ if $\tilde{\Delta}^a = j$ and $\tilde{T}_j^a = \infty$ otherwise. Let $\tilde{N}_j^a(t) = I\{\tilde{T}_j^a \leq t\}$ be the potential event counting process for the event j and $\tilde{Y}^a(t) = I\{\tilde{T}^a \geq t\}$ be the potential at-risk process. All competing events share the same at-risk process.

Subject to censoring, we cannot fully observe the event counting processes. Let \tilde{C}^a be the potential censoring time under the treatment condition $A = a$, then the potential event time is $T^a = \tilde{T}^a \wedge \tilde{C}^a$. Let $\Delta^a = \tilde{\Delta}^a I\{\tilde{C}^a \geq \tilde{T}^a\}$ be the event indicator, so that $\Delta^a = 0$ if censoring happens first and $\Delta^a = \tilde{\Delta}^a$ if a terminal event happens first. The event counting process for the event j with censoring is $N_j^a(t) = I\{\tilde{T}_j^a \leq t, \tilde{C}^a \geq t\} = I\{T^a \leq t, \Delta^a = j\}$ and the at-risk process is $Y^a(t) = I\{\tilde{T}^a \geq t, \tilde{C}^a \geq t\} = I\{T^a \geq t\}$. We adopt the ignorability assumption which is commonly used in causal inference literature.

Assumption 1 (Ignorability). $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (\tilde{T}^a, \tilde{\Delta}^a, \tilde{C}^a) \mid X$.

Ignorability means that the treatment assignment is independent of the potential event time and censoring time given the baseline covariates. We also assume that the censoring is completely random.

Assumption 2 (Completely random censoring). $\tilde{C}^a \perp\!\!\!\perp (\tilde{T}^a, \tilde{\Delta}^a)$.

Assumption 2 holds if the potential censoring time is independent of the potential event time and baseline covariates. This assumption also holds if the potential censoring time and the potential event time depend on uncorrelated baseline covariates. Define the propensity score $e(a; x) = P(A = a \mid X = x)$. We need positivity for the propensity score and censoring distribution.

Assumption 3 (Positivity). $0 < c < e(a; X) < 1 - c < 1$ and $P(Y^a(t^*) = 1 \mid A = a) > c$ for $a = 0, 1$ and a constant $0 < c < 1/2$.

The first part of positivity says that the propensity score is bounded between 0 and 1. The second part of positivity says that there are still individuals at risk at the end of study, which guarantees the hazard function can be well defined in $[0, t^*]$. It requires that the probability that censoring has not happened at time t^* be positive, so that there can be available data to estimate the hazards.

In the clinical trial, let T be the observed event time, and Δ be the observed event indicator. We assume consistency to link the potential values with observed values.

Assumption 4 (Consistency). $T = T^A, \Delta = \Delta^A$.

The observed event counting process $N_j(t) = I\{T \leq t, \Delta = j\}$ for the event j and the observed at-risk process $Y(t) = I\{T \wedge C \geq t\}$. Suppose that we have a sample including n independent individuals, randomly drawn from a super-population. We use the subscript $i = 1, \dots, n$ to represent the individual index when necessary. The observed data can be written as either $\{(A_i, X_i, T_i, \Delta_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ or $\{(A_i, X_i, N_{ij}(s), Y_i(s), 0 < s < t^*) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

The counterfactual hazard of event j describes the instantaneous risk of the event j ,

$$\begin{aligned} d\Lambda_j^a(t) &= P(t \leq T_j^a < t + dt \mid T^a \geq t) \\ &= P(d\tilde{N}_j^a(t) = 1 \mid Y^a(t) = 1), \quad 0 < t < t^*, \end{aligned}$$

with $dt \rightarrow 0$. By transforming the hazards, the cumulative incidence function (CIF) of event j is given by

$$F_j^a(t) = \int_0^t \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_k^a(s) \right\} d\Lambda_j^a(s), \quad 0 < t < t^*.$$

We see that the hazards play the key role for time-to-event data analysis in that the CIF of any event can be derived from the hazards. The task is to identify and estimate the hazards. Inspired by causal inference, a natural idea is to use inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW). By weighting the individuals in the sample, a pseudo-population with baseline covariates distributed identically as the overall population is generated. Since the hazard function is a conditional probability, IPTW should be performed separately for the event probability and at-risk probability. Denote

$$w(a; A, X) = \frac{I\{A = a\}}{e(a; X)},$$

which is the inverse of the propensity score multiplied by the associated treatment indicator. We have the following identifiability result.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1–4, the hazard of event j is identifiable ($j = 1, \dots, J$),*

$$d\Lambda_j^a(t) = \frac{E\{w(a; A, X)dN_j(t)\}}{E\{w(a; A, X)Y(t)\}}.$$

Thus, the cumulative incidence function of event j is identifiable.

The generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator by IPTW is then

$$d\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i)dN_{ij}(t)}{\sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i)Y_i(t)} \quad (1)$$

if the propensity score is known, and is

$$d\hat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}(a; A_i, X_i)dN_{ij}(t)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}(a; A_i, X_i)Y_i(t)} \quad (2)$$

if the propensity score is unknown, where $\hat{e}(a; A_i, X_i)$ is the inverse of the estimated propensity score. The estimator of the cumulative hazard $\hat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) = \int_0^t d\hat{\Lambda}_j^a(s)ds$ is a step function with jumps at event times.

3 Asymptotic properties and inference

In this section, we derive the asymptotic variance of the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator. We consider the cumulative incidence function $F_j^a(t)$ for the event j under the treatment condition a as the estimand. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{1j}(t; a) &= P(T^a \leq t, \Delta^a = j) = E\{w(a; A, X)dN_j(t)\}, \\ \Psi_2(t; a) &= P(T^a \geq t) = E\{w(a; A, X)Y(t)\},\end{aligned}$$

then it follows from Theorem 1 that $\Lambda_j^a(t) = \int_0^t d\Psi_{1j}(s; a)/\Psi_{2j}(s; a)$. Let

$$\psi_{1j}(t; a) = w(a; A, X)N_j(t), \quad \psi_2(t; a) = w(a; A, X)Y(t).$$

We use $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ to denote the measure with respect to the true data-generating process and $\mathbb{P}_n(\cdot)$ to denote the empirical measure on the sample, so $\Psi_{1j}(t; a) = \mathbb{P}\{\psi_{1j}(t; a)\}$ and $\Psi_2(t; a) = \mathbb{P}\{\psi_2(t; a)\}$.

3.1 When the propensity score is known

We first assume that the propensity score is known. For example, in stratified randomized controlled trials, individuals are assigned to treatment arms with a known probability. The oracle generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator for the cumulative cause-specific hazard of event j is $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{P}_n\{d\psi_{1j}(s; a)\}/\mathbb{P}_n\{\psi_2(s; a)\}$. Let

$$M_j(t; a) = d\psi_{1j}(t; a) - \psi_2(t; a)d\Lambda_j^a(t)$$

and $\bar{M}_j(t; a) = \mathbb{P}_n\{M_j(t; a)\}$.

Lemma 1. $\bar{M}_j(t; a)$ is a martingale with respect to the filter $\mathcal{F}_j(t; a) = \{w(a; A_i, X_i), Y_i(s) : s \leq t, i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Using the martingale theory, we can show that the oracle generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator is unbiased and derive its variance.

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions 1–4 and that the propensity score is known,

$$E\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} = \Lambda_j^a(t), \quad \text{var}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} = \frac{1}{n} E \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n\{w(a; A, X)\psi_2(s; a)\}d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{[\mathbb{P}_n\{\psi_2(s; a)\}]^2} \right\}.$$

The influence function (IF) of $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$ is

$$\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} dM_j(s; a),$$

and thus

$$\sqrt{n}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t)\} \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, E[\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\}^2]\right).$$

The finite-sample variance of $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a$ can be unbiasedly estimated by the empirical counterpart of the variance formula. The asymptotic variance can be consistently estimated by the variance of the influence function.

3.2 When the propensity score is estimated

Suppose that the propensity score $e(a; x)$ is belong to a parametric model indexed by θ , that is $\{e(a; x; \theta), \theta \in \Theta\}$, where Θ is the parameter space. Furthermore, we assume $\{e(a; x; \theta), \theta \in \Theta\}$ is a Donsker class (Vaart and Wellner, 1996) and the estimate of θ is regularly asymptotically linear (RAL), with

$$\hat{\theta} - \theta = \mathbb{P}_n\phi + o_p(n^{-1/2}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(A_i, X_i; \theta) + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where ϕ is the influence function of $\hat{\theta}$. For example, the propensity score can be fitted by logistic regression $e(1; x; \theta) = \{1 + \exp(-x'\theta)\}^{-1}$ and θ is estimated by maximum likelihood, then $\phi = \mathbb{P}\{Xe(1; X; \theta)e(0; X; \theta)X'\}^{-1}\{A - e(1; X; \theta)\}X$. Plugging in the estimated propensity score $\hat{e}(a; x) = e(a; x; \hat{\theta})$, let

$$d\hat{\psi}_{1j}(t; a) = \frac{I\{A = a\}}{e(a; X; \hat{\theta})} dN_j(t), \quad \hat{\psi}_2(t; a) = \frac{I\{A = a\}}{e(a; X; \hat{\theta})} Y(t),$$

so the estimator of the cumulative cause-specific hazard of event j is

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{P}_n\{d\widehat{\psi}_{1j}(s)\}/\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\psi}_2(s)\}.$$

Theorem 3. *Under Assumptions 1–4 and that $\widehat{\theta}$ in the propensity score model is RAL, the influence function (IF) of $\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$ is*

$$\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} \left[dM_j(s; a) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ dM_j(s; a) \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)}{e(a; X; \theta)} \right\} \phi \right],$$

and thus

$$\sqrt{n}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t)\} \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\}^2]\right).$$

Compared with the influence function of the oracle estimator, there is an augmented term in the influence function of $\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$,

$$\nu_j(t; a) = - \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} \mathbb{P} \left\{ dM_j(s; a) \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)}{e(a; X; \theta)} \right\} \phi,$$

where $\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)$ is the derivative of $e(a; X; \theta)$ with respect to θ . The expectation of this augmented term is not zero. But by noticing that $M_j(t; a)$ is a martingale with mean zero, the expectation of this augmented term is generally small. The variance of $\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$ can be consistently estimated by plugging the estimates into the influence function,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{j,n}^2(t) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\int_0^t \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\psi}_2(s; a)\}} \left[d\widehat{M}_{ij}(s; a) - \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ d\widehat{M}_j(s; a) \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \widehat{\theta})}{e(a; X; \widehat{\theta})} \right\} \phi(A_i, X_i; \widehat{\theta}) \right] \right]^2,$$

where $\widehat{M}_{ij}(t; a) = d\widehat{\psi}_{1ij}(t; a) - \widehat{\psi}_{2i}(t; a)d\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$ is the martingale process with estimates plugged in. Although the variance estimate by ignoring the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_{j,n}^2(t) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\int_0^t \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\psi}_2(s; a)\}} d\widehat{M}_{ij}(s; a) \right]^2.$$

is asymptotically biased with respect to $E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\}^2]$, the bias is usually small because $dM_{ij}(s; a)$ has zero expectation so that the augmented term in $\widehat{\sigma}_{j,n}^2(t)$ is around zero.

On the risk scale, let

$$\widehat{F}_j^a(t) = \int_0^t \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^J \widehat{\Lambda}_k^a(s) \right\} d\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(s)$$

be the estimated CIF of event j . The influence function of $\widehat{F}_j^a(t)$ is derived by the functional delta method,

$$\text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(t)\} = \int_0^t \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_k^a(s) \right\} d\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(s)\} - \int_0^t \sum_{k=1}^J \text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_k^a(s)\} dF_j(s),$$

and thus

$$\sqrt{n}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(t) - F_j^a(t)\} \xrightarrow{d} N \left(0, E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(t)\}] \right).$$

The variance of $\widehat{F}_j^a(t)$ can be estimated by plug-in estimators.

To test the treatment effect on the cumulative incidence

$$H_0 : F_j^1(t) = F_j^0(t), \forall t \in [0, t^*] \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : F_j^1(t) \neq F_j^0(t), \exists t \in [0, t^*],$$

we need to find testable implications under the null hypothesis. For example, we have

$$F_j^1(t^*) - F_j^0(t^*) = \int_0^{t^*} d\{F_j^1(s) - F_j^0(s)\} = 0,$$

which tests the difference of counterfactual cumulative incidences at the study end time. The test statistic is given by $U_j = \widehat{F}_j^1(t^*) - \widehat{F}_j^0(t^*)$, and the asymptotic variance is straightforward based on the influence functions $V_j = E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^1(t^*)\} - \text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^0(t^*)\}]^2$. To use the history information from 0 to t^* , alternative testing methods include the log-rank test and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The variance of test statistics can be calculated or simulated based on the influence functions.

4 Simulation

Suppose that there are three covariates $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ following the multivariate standard normal distribution. The potential failure times under the treated and under the

control are assumed to follow the proportional hazards model,

$$d\Lambda^1(t; x) = (t^2/5) \exp(x_2/5 + x_3/5)dt,$$

$$d\Lambda^0(t; a) = (t/3) \exp(x_2/3 - x_3/3)dt,$$

from which we generate T^1 and T^0 . We assume there are two competing events. The probabilities that the first type of event (which is the event of interest) occurs are

$$P(\Delta^1 = 1 \mid T^1 = t, X = x) = \text{expit}(-0.1 + 0.2x_1 + 0.2x_2 + 0.2x_3 + 0.03t),$$

$$P(\Delta^0 = 1 \mid T^0 = t, X = x) = \text{expit}(0.2x_1 - 0.1x_2 + 0.1x_3 + 0.05t)$$

under the treated and control, respectively. The censoring time is generated as a uniform distribution in $[6, 12]$. The propensity score

$$P(A = 1 \mid X = x) = \text{expit}(0.2 + 0.5x_1 - 0.5x_2).$$

To see the empirical bias, we compare three point estimates: (1) the oracle generalized Nelson–Aalen estimation that uses the true propensity score, (2) the generalized Nelson–Aalen (NA) estimator that uses the estimated propensity score, and (3) the weighted Kaplan–Meier (KM) estimate by imposing the inverse of propensity score as weights in the function `survfit` in R. The Kaplan–Meier so here we modify the Kaplan–Meier estimator such that the individuals experiencing competing events are maintained in the at-risk set. To make inference, we next consider five methods to obtain the standard error: (1) the oracle standard error that uses the true propensity score in Theorem 3, (2) the naive standard error $\tilde{\sigma}_n(t)$ that does not consider the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score, (3) the standard error $\hat{\sigma}_n(t)$ that corrects for the estimated propensity score in Theorem 3, (4) the standard error calculated from `survfit`, and (5) the bootstrap standard error. Nominal 95% confidence intervals are constructed using the point estimate, standard error based on asymptotic normality.

Table S1 and Table S2 show the empirical bias of the point estimates with standard deviation, mean standard error and coverage rate of the nominal 95% confidence intervals when the sample size $n = 500$. Table S3 and Table S4 show the results when the sample size $n = 2000$. We see that the bias of the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator is small. Even if we use the estimated propensity score, the standard deviation (and standard error) is similar with the oracle one, indicating that the efficiency loss due to estimating the propensity score is negligible. Considering the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score, the standard error based on the influence function in Theorem 3 is slightly larger than the naive one, and hence the coverage rate based on the corrected standard error is larger. The weighted Kaplan–Meier estimator from the function `survfit` gives a similar standard error to the naive generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator, and in fact these two estimators are asymptotically equivalent with slightly different finite-sample performances (Luo and Saunders, 1993; Colosimo et al., 2002). The most interesting finding is that omitting the variation of the estimated propensity score does not lead to much bias of the standard error. This is the merit of focusing on hazards, where the asymptotic bias is a weighted average of a martingale and hence is usually small.

To conduct a sensitivity analysis, now we suppose that the propensity score is misspecified. We consider two misspecified propensity scores: (1) the constant propensity score $e'(1; x) = 1/2$, and (2) the probit propensity score

$$e^*(1; x) = P(Z \leq \theta_0 + x'\theta),$$

where Z is a random variable following the standard normal distribution.

Table S5 and Table S6 shows the bias, standard deviation, standard error and coverage rate of nominal 95% confidence intervals when the propensity score model is misspecified. In this setting, the bias is still small, but the coverage rate of the confidence interval slightly deviate from 0.95.

Table 1: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^1(t)$ when the sample size $n = 500$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.002	-0.003
Generalized NA	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003
Weighted KM	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	-0.001	-0.007
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.029	0.030	0.030	0.032
Generalized NA	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.029	0.030	0.030	0.032
Weighted KM	0.013	0.020	0.026	0.029	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.031
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.027	0.030	0.031	0.031	0.032
Naive	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.032	0.032
Corrected	0.009	0.019	0.027	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.035
Weighted KM	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.032	0.032
Bootstrap	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.027	0.029	0.030	0.031	0.031
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.886	0.935	0.947	0.941	0.955	0.954	0.963	0.955
Naive	0.886	0.935	0.946	0.945	0.956	0.957	0.965	0.954
Corrected	0.889	0.943	0.957	0.961	0.968	0.968	0.974	0.967
Weighted KM	0.884	0.933	0.939	0.937	0.960	0.962	0.967	0.958
Bootstrap	0.880	0.934	0.942	0.933	0.953	0.953	0.960	0.949

Table 2: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^0(t)$ when the sample size $n = 500$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.005
Generalized NA	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.005
Weighted KM	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.006
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.025	0.031	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.037
Generalized NA	0.025	0.031	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.037	0.037
Weighted KM	0.028	0.036	0.040	0.040	0.042	0.043	0.045	0.045
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.024	0.030	0.033	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.035	0.035
Naive	0.025	0.030	0.033	0.034	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035
Corrected	0.025	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.036
Weighted KM	0.025	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.036
Bootstrap	0.024	0.030	0.032	0.033	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.035
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.936	0.940	0.931	0.944	0.937	0.941	0.937	0.940
Naive	0.933	0.944	0.931	0.942	0.944	0.945	0.934	0.939
Corrected	0.935	0.948	0.932	0.944	0.944	0.949	0.940	0.945
Weighted KM	0.931	0.938	0.931	0.943	0.944	0.943	0.939	0.941
Bootstrap	0.928	0.940	0.927	0.941	0.937	0.939	0.935	0.934

Table 3: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^1(t)$ when the sample size $n = 2000$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Generalized NA	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Weighted KM	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	-0.002	-0.008
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017
Generalized NA	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017
Weighted KM	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016
Naive	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016
Corrected	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.017
Weighted KM	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016
Bootstrap	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.015	0.016	0.016
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.935	0.943	0.937	0.935	0.935	0.939	0.939	0.953
Naive	0.933	0.945	0.940	0.941	0.940	0.938	0.944	0.947
Corrected	0.937	0.951	0.944	0.949	0.944	0.943	0.950	0.956
Weighted KM	0.934	0.949	0.941	0.944	0.939	0.938	0.941	0.910
Bootstrap	0.932	0.941	0.935	0.935	0.934	0.941	0.944	0.941

Table 4: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^0(t)$ when the sample size $n = 2000$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Generalized NA	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Weighted KM	-0.008	-0.013	-0.018	-0.020	-0.022	-0.024	-0.027	-0.031
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.013	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.019
Generalized NA	0.013	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.019
Weighted KM	0.037	0.060	0.077	0.089	0.097	0.104	0.108	0.112
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.012	0.015	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018
Naive	0.012	0.015	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018
Corrected	0.013	0.015	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018
Weighted KM	0.012	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.017
Bootstrap	0.012	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.949	0.952	0.961	0.952	0.939	0.943	0.935	0.937
Naive	0.949	0.955	0.961	0.951	0.945	0.943	0.939	0.940
Corrected	0.952	0.955	0.961	0.952	0.946	0.945	0.944	0.944
Weighted KM	0.895	0.896	0.902	0.896	0.888	0.892	0.886	0.886
Bootstrap	0.943	0.953	0.958	0.943	0.941	0.940	0.935	0.939

Table 5: Estimation for $F_1^1(t)$ when the propensity score is misspecified

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Constant	-0.001	-0.003	-0.006	-0.008	-0.008	-0.008	-0.007	-0.007
Probit	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003
Standard deviation (SD)								
Constant	0.008	0.016	0.022	0.026	0.027	0.028	0.029	0.030
Probit	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.029	0.029	0.030	0.032
Standard error (SE)								
Constant	0.008	0.016	0.021	0.025	0.028	0.029	0.030	0.030
Probit (Naive)	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.032	0.032
Probit (Corrected)	0.010	0.020	0.029	0.033	0.036	0.037	0.037	0.037
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.027	0.029	0.030	0.031	0.031
Coverage rate								
Constant	0.884	0.921	0.917	0.919	0.935	0.952	0.952	0.953
Probit (Naive)	0.887	0.930	0.948	0.951	0.959	0.959	0.966	0.956
Probit (Corrected)	0.889	0.942	0.957	0.959	0.968	0.972	0.974	0.971
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.883	0.929	0.943	0.936	0.952	0.952	0.961	0.948

Table 6: Estimation for $F_1^0(t)$ when the propensity score is misspecified

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Constant	0.004	0.003	0.000	-0.002	-0.005	-0.008	-0.011	-0.013
Probit	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.005
Standard deviation (SD)								
Constant	0.023	0.029	0.031	0.030	0.032	0.032	0.033	0.033
Probit	0.025	0.031	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.037	0.037
Standard error (SE)								
Constant	0.024	0.028	0.031	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.033
Probit (Naive)	0.025	0.030	0.033	0.034	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035
Probit (Corrected)	0.038	0.052	0.060	0.066	0.071	0.074	0.075	0.077
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.024	0.030	0.032	0.033	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.035
Coverage rate								
Constant	0.952	0.947	0.941	0.953	0.943	0.938	0.930	0.929
Probit (Naive)	0.934	0.943	0.934	0.942	0.946	0.942	0.934	0.938
Probit (Corrected)	0.965	0.980	0.976	0.977	0.979	0.984	0.981	0.981
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.933	0.939	0.927	0.937	0.938	0.938	0.936	0.935

5 Discussion

Inverse probability weighting has been well applied in causal inference due to its simplicity and interpretability. However, for time-to-event outcomes, the estimand (cumulative incidence function) is time-varying. The cumulative incidence is always well defined in the presence of competing risks and is collapsible. However, how to apply inverse probability of treatment weighting to estimate the CIF and how to investigate the asymptotic properties of the IPTW estimator are left unstudied. We may have two approaches to employ IPTW: the first is to directly estimate the incidence by weighting the observed event counting process by the inverse of propensity score and uncensored probability, and the second is through estimating the population-level hazard by weighting both the observed event counting process and at-risk process.

In this article, we follow the second approach. There are three advantages of estimating on the hazard scale over the incidence scale. First, only one model (the propensity score model) is required. We do not need to estimate the censoring probability as long as the censoring is completely non-informative. Second, the additional variance resulted by the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score is small since the additional term in the influence function of $\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$ is a weighted martingale, although the expectation may not be exact zero. Third, estimating the hazard is potentially useful for mediation analysis, where we assume the cause-specific hazards can be manipulated ([Martinussen and Stensrud, 2023](#)). Therefore, we suggest the estimand should be defined on the incidence scale and the estimation should be performed on the hazard scale. Although we show that the asymptotic variance of the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator is affected by estimating of propensity score, the empirical difference is relatively small.

The proposed method has some potential extensions. First, the competing risks framework can be extended to multi-state models. Typical assumptions in multi-state models are Markovness and semi-Markovness ([Hougaard, 1999](#); [Commenges et al., 2007](#); [Asanjarani](#)

et al., 2022). The former says that the transition hazard from one state to another state only relies on the time since the original rather than the history, while the latter says that the transition hazard only relies on how long it passed since the last state. With completely random censoring, the transition hazards can be estimated by IPTW and the cumulative incidence of any state can then be estimated using the g -formula. The asymptotic property of the estimated incidence can be established using the functional delta method.

Second, the assumptions in our framework may be relaxed. If the censoring is not completely random but only depends on observed covariates, the hazard is still identifiable. In estimation, the counting processes should be additionally weighted by the conditional uncensored probability, which introduces another source of variance. If the estimated conditional uncensored probability is RAL (for example, by Cox regression), we can imitate the same strategy considered in this article to derive the asymptotic variance of the estimated CIF. However, there will be biased selection problem when extending to multi-state models, where the origins of transitions are not aligned.

Third, there are alternatives on the estimation of the propensity score. Different parametric models like logistic regression and probit regression can be used. Since IPTW essentially uses the balancing property of the propensity score, we can adapt the loss functions to obtain the covariates balancing propensity score (Imai and Ratkovic, 2014). As long as the estimated propensity score has a known form of influence functions, the asymptotic variance of the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator can be corrected.

Fourth, the efficiency can be improved by incorporating models for the failure times. We can derive the efficient influence function for the CIF under conditionally random censoring, which involves the propensity score, censoring probability and cause-specific hazards for all events (Zhang and Schaubel, 2012; Martinussen and Stensrud, 2023). In practice, the propensity score is fitted at baseline whereas the censoring probability and cause-specific hazards are fitted using post-treatment data. Modeling the univariate propensity score is

easier than modeling the hazards of events. It is almost impossible to correctly specify the hazards if the dependence of events is complex. Misspecification of working models may lead to bias and inconsistent variance estimation.

Acknowledgement

Supplementary material

Supplementary material includes proofs of theoretical results, simulation studies, application to stem cell transplantation data. The supplementary material that supports this article is available online at Oxford.

References

- Aalen, O. (1978). Nonparametric inference for a family of counting processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(4):701–726.
- Asanjarani, A., Liquet, B., and Nazarathy, Y. (2022). Estimation of semi-markov multi-state models: a comparison of the sojourn times and transition intensities approaches. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 18(1):243–262.
- Austin, P. C. (2014). The use of propensity score methods with survival or time-to-event outcomes: reporting measures of effect similar to those used in randomized experiments. *Statistics in Medicine*, 33(7):1242–1258.
- Chang, Y.-J., Wang, Y., Xu, L.-P., Zhang, X.-H., Chen, H., Chen, Y.-H., Wang, F.-R., Sun, Y.-Q., Yan, C.-H., Tang, F.-F., et al. (2020). Haploidentical donor is preferred over matched sibling donor for pre-transplantation MRD positive ALL: a phase 3 genetically randomized study. *Journal of Hematology & Oncology*, 13(1):1–13.
- Colosimo, E., Ferreira, F. v., Oliveira, M., and Sousa, C. (2002). Empirical comparisons between Kaplan–Meier and Nelson–Aalen survival function estimators. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 72(4):299–308.

- Commenges, D., Joly, P., Gégout-Petit, A., and Liqueur, B. (2007). Choice between semi-parametric estimators of markov and non-markov multi-state models from coarsened observations. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 34(1):33–52.
- Fine, J. P. and Gray, R. J. (1999). A proportional hazards model for the subdistribution of a competing risk. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(446):496–509.
- Hirano, K., Imbens, G. W., and Ridder, G. (2003). Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189.
- Hougaard, P. (1999). Multi-state models: a review. *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 5:239–264.
- Hu, G. and Huffer, F. (2020). Modified Kaplan–Meier estimator and Nelson–Aalen estimator with geographical weighting for survival data. *Geographical Analysis*, 52(1):28–48.
- Imai, K. and Ratkovic, M. (2014). Covariate balancing propensity score. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1):243–263.
- Kalbfleisch, J. D. and Prentice, R. L. (2011). *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kanakry, C. G., Fuchs, E. J., and Luznik, L. (2016). Modern approaches to HLA-haploidentical blood or marrow transplantation. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology*, 13(1):10–24.
- Kaplan, E. L. and Meier, P. (1958). Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 53(282):457–481.
- Lau, B., Cole, S. R., and Gange, S. J. (2009). Competing risk regression models for epidemiologic data. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 170(2):244–256.
- Logan, B. R., Klein, J. P., and Zhang, M.-J. (2008). Comparing treatments in the presence of crossing survival curves: an application to bone marrow transplantation. *Biometrics*, 64(3):733–740.
- Luo, D. and Saunders, S. C. (1993). Bias and mean-square error for the Kaplan–Meier and Nelson–Aalen estimators. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 3(1):37–51.
- Mao, H., Li, L., Yang, W., and Shen, Y. (2018). On the propensity score weighting analysis with survival outcome: Estimands, estimation, and inference. *Statistics in Medicine*, 37(26):3745–3763.
- Martinussen, T. and Stensrud, M. J. (2023). Estimation of separable direct and indirect effects in continuous time. *Biometrics*, 79(1):127–139.

- Nelson, W. (1972). Theory and applications of hazard plotting for censored failure data. *Technometrics*, 14(4):945–966.
- Prentice, R. L., Kalbfleisch, J. D., Peterson Jr, A., Flournoy, N., Farewell, V., and Breslow, N. (1978). The analysis of failure times in the presence of competing risks. *Biometrics*, 34(4):541–554.
- Putter, H., Schumacher, M., and van Houwelingen, H. C. (2020). On the relation between the cause-specific hazard and the subdistribution rate for competing risks data: The fine-gray model revisited. *Biometrical Journal*, 62(3):790–807.
- Robins, J. M., Hernan, M. A., and Brumback, B. (2000). Marginal structural models and causal inference in epidemiology. *Epidemiology*, 11(5):550–560.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1):41–55.
- Vaart, A. W. v. d. and Wellner, J. A. (2000 - 1996). Weak convergence and empirical processes : with applications to statistics.
- Winnett, A. and Sasieni, P. (2002). Adjusted nelson–aalen estimates with retrospective matching. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457):245–256.
- Xie, J. and Liu, C. (2005). Adjusted kaplan–meier estimator and log-rank test with inverse probability of treatment weighting for survival data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 24(20):3089–3110.
- Zhang, M. and Schaubel, D. E. (2012). Contrasting treatment-specific survival using double-robust estimators. *Statistics in Medicine*, 31(30):4255–4268.

Supplementary Material for “The generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator by inverse probability weighting”

Yuhao Deng and Rui Wang

A Proofs

A.1 Theorem 1 (Identification)

The cause-specific hazard of event j

$$\begin{aligned} d\Lambda_j^a(t) &= \frac{P(t \leq \tilde{T}^a < t + dt, \tilde{\Delta}^a = j)}{P(\tilde{T}^a \geq t)} \\ &= \frac{P(t \leq \tilde{T}^a < t + dt, \tilde{\Delta}^a = j, \tilde{C}^a \geq t)}{P(\tilde{T}^a \geq t, \tilde{C}^a \geq t)} = \frac{P(dN_j^a(t) = 1)}{P(Y^a(t) = 1)} \end{aligned}$$

under Assumption 2 (completely random censoring). We first look at the numerator,

$$\begin{aligned} &E\{w(a; A, X)dN_j(t)\} \\ &= E\left\{\frac{I(A = a)}{e(a; X)}I(t \leq T < t + dt, \Delta = j)\right\} \\ &= E\left[E\left\{\frac{I(A = a)}{e(a; X)}I(t \leq T < t + dt, \Delta = j) \mid X\right\}\right] \\ &= E\left[E\left\{\frac{e(a; X)}{e(a; X)}I(t \leq T < t + dt, \Delta = j) \mid X, A = a\right\}\right] \\ &= E[E\{I(t \leq T^a < t + dt, \Delta^a = j) \mid X, A = a\}] \\ &= E[E\{I(t \leq \tilde{T}^a < t + dt, \tilde{\Delta}^a = j, \tilde{C}^a \geq t) \mid X, A = a\}] \\ &= E[E\{I(t \leq \tilde{T}^a < t + dt, \tilde{\Delta}^a = j, \tilde{C}^a \geq t) \mid X\}] \\ &= E\{I(t \leq \tilde{T}^a < t + dt, \tilde{\Delta}^a = j, \tilde{C}^a \geq t)\} \\ &= P(t \leq \tilde{T}^a < t + dt, \tilde{\Delta}^a = j, \tilde{C}^a \geq t). \end{aligned}$$

The second equation is by iterated expectation, the third equation is by the full probability formula, the fourth equation is by Assumption 4 (consistency), the fifth equation is by definition, and the sixth equation is by Assumption 1 (ignorability). Similarly, we can show that

$$E\{w(a; A, X)Y(t)\} = P(\tilde{T}^a \geq t, \tilde{C}^a \geq t).$$

Therefore,

$$d\Lambda_j^a(t) = \frac{E\{w(a; A, X)dN_j(t)\}}{E\{w(a; A, X)Y(t)\}}.$$

A.2 Lemma 1 (Martingale)

Let \mathcal{X} be the support of X . Without loss of generality, we assume that X is discrete.

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{d\bar{M}_j(t; a) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)\} \\ &= E[\mathbb{P}_n d\{\psi_{1j}(t; a) - \psi_2(t; a)d\Lambda_j^a(t)\} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)] \\ &= E[E\{\mathbb{P}_n d\{\psi_{1j}(t; a) - \psi_2(t; a)d\Lambda_j^a(t)\} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a), X_1, \dots, X_n\} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)] \\ &= E\left[E\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) \{dN_{ij}(t) - Y_i(t)d\Lambda_j^a(t)\} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a), X_1, \dots, X_n\right\} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) \{Y_i(t)d\Lambda_j^a(t; X_i) - Y_i(t)d\Lambda_j^a(t)\} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) E\{d\Lambda_j^a(t; X_i) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)\} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) \int_{\mathcal{X}} P(X_i = x \mid Y_i(t), w(a; A_i, X_i)) d\Lambda_j^a(t; x) dx \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t). \end{aligned}$$

We only need to care about the case $Y_i(t) = 1$.

$$E\{d\bar{M}_j(t; a) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) \int_{\mathcal{X}} P(X_i = x \mid Y_i(t) = 1, w(a; A_i, X_i)) d\Lambda_j^a(t; x) dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) \int_{\mathcal{X}} P(X_i = x \mid Y_i(t) = 1, w(a; A_i, X_i)) \frac{P(dN_{ij}^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x)}{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x)} dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t).
\end{aligned}$$

When $A_i = a$ under which $w(a; A_i, X_i) \neq 0$, we have that $Y_i^a(t) = Y_i(t)$, $N_{ij}^a(t) = N_{ij}(t)$ and $w(a; A_i, X_i) = 1/e(a; X_i)$ is a function of X_i ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(X_i = x \mid Y_i(t) = 1, w(a; A_i, X_i)) \\
&= \frac{P(Y_i(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x, w(a; A_i, X_i)) P(X_i = x, w(a; A_i, X_i))}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} P(Y_i(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x, w(a; A_i, X_i)) P(X_i = x, w(a; A_i, X_i)) dx} \\
&= \frac{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x, e(X_i)) P(X_i = x, e(X_i))}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} P(Y_i^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x, e(X_i)) P(X_i = x, e(X_i)) dx} \\
&= \frac{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x) P(X_i = x)}{\int_{\mathcal{X}} P(Y_i^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x) P(X_i = x) dx} \\
&= \frac{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x) P(X_i = x)}{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\{d\bar{M}_j(t; a) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(t; a)\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{P(dN_{ij}^a(t) = 1 \mid X_i = x) P(X_i = x)}{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1)} dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) \frac{P(dN_{ij}^a(t) = 1)}{P(Y_i^a(t) = 1)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w(a; A_i, X_i) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(a) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(a) Y_i(t) d\Lambda_j^a(t)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= 0.$$

This proves that $\bar{M}_j(t; a)$ is a martingale.

A.3 Theorem 2 (IF with known propensity score)

Note that $\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(t)$ is a predictable process. To see the unbiasedness of $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} &= E\left\{\int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n d\psi_{1j}(s; a)}{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)}\right\} \\ &= E\left[E\left\{\int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n d\psi_{1j}(s; a)}{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)} \mid \mathcal{F}_j(s; a)\right\}\right] \\ &= E\left[\left\{\int_0^t \frac{E\{\mathbb{P}_n d\psi_{1j}(s; a) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(s; a)\}}{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)}\right\}\right] \\ &= E\left\{\int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_{1j}(s; a)d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)}\right\} \\ &= E\left\{\int_0^t d\Lambda_j^a(s)\right\} = \Lambda_j^a(t). \end{aligned}$$

The fourth equation is because that $\bar{M}_j(t; a)$ is a martingale.

To calculate the finite-sample variance, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}\{d\psi_{1j}(s; a) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(s; a)\} &= \text{var}\left\{\frac{I(A = a)}{e(a; X)}dN_j(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(s; a)\right\} \\ &= \frac{I(A = a)}{e(a; X)^2}\text{var}\{dN_j(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(s; a)\} \\ &= \frac{I(A = a)}{e(a; X)^2}Y(s)d\Lambda_j^a(s) \\ &= w(a; A, X)\psi_2(s; a)d\Lambda_j^a(s). \end{aligned}$$

by the property of martingales. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} &= \text{var}\left\{\int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n d\psi_{1j}(s; a)}{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)}\right\} \\ &= \text{var}\left\{\int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n d\psi_{1j}(s; a) - \mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{\mathbb{P}_n\psi_2(s; a)}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{var} \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{d\bar{M}_j(s; a)}{\mathbb{P}_n(s; a)} \right\} \\
&= E \left[\int_0^t \frac{\text{var}\{\mathbb{P}_n d\psi_{1j}(s; a) \mid \mathcal{F}_j(s; a)\}}{\{\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(s; a)\}^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n} E \left[\int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{P}_n \{w(a; A, X) \psi_2(s; a)\} d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{\{\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(s; a)\}^2} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we derive the influence function (IF) of $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$. Since

$$\Lambda_j^a(t) = \int_0^t \frac{d\Psi_{1j}(s; a)}{\Psi_2(s; a)}$$

is Hadamard derivable with respect to $\Psi_{1j}(s; a)$ and $\Psi_2(s; a)$, so we can apply the functional delta method,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} &= \int_0^t \frac{d\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a)\}\Psi_2(s; a) - d\Psi_{1j}(s; a)\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Psi}_2(s; a)\}}{\Psi_2(s; a)^2} \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{\psi_{1j}(s; a)\Psi_2(s; a) - d\Psi_{1j}(s; a)\psi_2(s; a)}{\Psi_2(s; a)^2} \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{\psi_{1j}(s; a) - \psi_2(s; a)d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{\Psi_2(s; a)} \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} dM_j(s; a).
\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t) = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} \right] + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

By the central limit theory (CLT),

$$\sqrt{n}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t)\} \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, E[\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\}^2]\right).$$

According to the martingale central limit theorem, $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(\cdot) - \Lambda_j^a(\cdot)$ weakly converges to a Gaussian process $G_j^a(\cdot)$ whose variance is $E[\text{IF}\{\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(\cdot)\}]$. Furthermore, we can show the uniform convergence of $\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(\cdot)$. By the inequality of Lengart ([Kalbfleisch and Prentice](#),

2011), for any positive η and δ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t^*]} |G_j^a(t)| > \sqrt{\eta} \right] &\leq \frac{\delta}{\eta} + P \left[\int_0^{t^*} \frac{1}{\{n\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(s; a)\}^2} d\langle \bar{M}_j \rangle (s; a) > \delta \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{\eta} + P \left[\int_0^{t^*} \frac{n\mathbb{P}_n \{w(a; A, X)^2 Y(s)\} d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{\{n\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(s; a)\}^2} > \delta \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{\eta} + P \left[\int_0^{t^*} \frac{d\Lambda_j^a(s)}{nc^2 \{\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(t^*; a)\}^2} > \delta \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{\eta} + P \left[\frac{1}{nc^2 \{\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(t^*; a)\}^2} \Lambda_j^a(s) > \delta \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\delta}{\eta} + P \left[\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(t^*; a) < \frac{\Lambda_j^a(t^*)}{nc^2 \delta} \right] \\
&\rightarrow \frac{\delta}{\eta}
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $\mathbb{P}_n \psi_2(t^*; a) = \Psi_2(t^*; a) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and $\Psi_2(t^*; a) > c$ by positivity. Since η and δ are arbitrary, it follows that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t^*]} |\tilde{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t)| \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

A.4 Theorem 3 (IF with estimated propensity score)

We first consider $\Psi_{1j}(s; a)$. Let $\widehat{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a)$ be $\Psi_{1j}(s; a)$ with the propensity score with the parameter substituted by its estimate. We decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a) - \Psi_{1j}(s; a) &= \mathbb{P}_n \widehat{\psi}_{1j}(s; a) - \mathbb{P} \psi_{1j}(s; a) \\
&= (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) \psi_{1j}(s; a) + (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(\widehat{\psi}_{1j} - \psi_{1j})(s; a) + \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\psi}_{1j} - \psi_{1j})(s; a) \\
&= R_1 + R_2 + R_3.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term

$$R_1 = (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) \psi_{1j}(s; a) = \mathbb{P}_n(\psi_{1j} - \Psi_{1j})(s; a).$$

The second term

$$R_2 = (\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(\widehat{\psi}_{1j} - \psi_{1j})(s; a) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

because $\psi_{1j}(s; a)$, a weighted indicator function by inverse of propensity score (Donsker), belongs to a Donsker class (Vaart and Wellner, 1996). The third term

$$R_3 = \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\psi}_{1j} - \psi_{1j})(s; a)$$

represents the additional variation due to the estimated propensity score.

Assume that $\widehat{\theta}$ in the propensity score is regularly asymptotic linear (RAL),

$$\widehat{\theta} - \theta = \mathbb{P}_n \phi + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} R_3 &= \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\psi}_{1j} - \psi_{1j})(s; a) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[I(A = a, T \leq s, \Delta = j) \left\{ \frac{1}{e(a; X; \widehat{\theta})} - \frac{1}{e(a; X; \theta)} \right\} \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{P} \left[I(A = a, T \leq s, \Delta = j) \left\{ \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)}{e(a; X; \theta)^2} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta) + o_p(\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta\|) \right\} \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{P} \left\{ I(A = a, T \leq s, \Delta = j) \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)}{e(a; X; \theta)^2} \right\} \mathbb{P}_n \phi + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ &= B_{1j}(s; a) \mathbb{P}_n \phi + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_{1j}(s; a) = -\mathbb{P} \left\{ I(A = a, T \leq s, \Delta = j) \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)}{e(a; X; \theta)^2} \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\widehat{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a) - \Psi_{1j}(s; a) = \mathbb{P}_n(\psi_{1j} - \Psi_{1j})(s; a) + B_{1j}(s; a) \mathbb{P}_n \phi + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

In the same manner,

$$\widehat{\Psi}_2(s; a) - \Psi_2(s; a) = \mathbb{P}_n(\psi_2 - \Psi_2)(s; a) + B_2(s; a) \mathbb{P}_n \phi + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where

$$B_2(s; a) = -\mathbb{P} \left\{ I(A = a, T \geq s) \frac{\dot{e}(a; X; \theta)}{e(a; X; \theta)^2} \right\}.$$

So we have the influence functions for $\Psi_{1j}(s; a)$ and $\Psi_2(s; a)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a)\} &= \psi_{1j}(s; a) + B_1\phi - \Psi_1(s; a), \\ \text{IF}\{\widehat{\Psi}_2(s; a)\} &= \psi_2(s; a) + B_2\phi - \Psi_2(s; a).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Lambda_j^a(t)$ is Hadamard derivable with respect to $\Psi_{1j}(t; a)$ and $\Psi_2(t; a)$, so we can apply functional delta method,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} &= \int_0^t \frac{d\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a)\}\Psi_2(s; a) - d\Psi_{1j}(s; a)\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Psi}_2(s; a)\}}{\Psi_2(s; a)^2} \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} \left[d\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Psi}_{1j}(s; a)\} - \text{IF}\{\widehat{\Psi}_2(s; a)\}d\Lambda_j^a(s) \right] \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} \left[dM_j(s; a) + (dB_{1j} - B_2)(s; a)d\Lambda_j^a(s)\phi \right].\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can simplify the augmented term

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_j(t; a) &= \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} (dB_{1j} - B_2)(s; a)d\Lambda_j^a(s) \\ &= - \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Psi_2(s; a)} \mathbb{P} \left\{ dM_j(s; a) \frac{\dot{e}(a, X; \theta)}{e(a, X; \theta)^2} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{M}_j(s; a)$ is not a martingale with respect to the filter $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_j(t; a) = \{Y_i(s), w(a; A_i, X_i), X_i : s \leq t, i = 1, \dots, n\}$, there is no guarantee that $\nu_j(t; a) = 0$.

Finally, we have

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t) = \mathbb{P}_n \left[\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\} \right] + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

By the central limit theory,

$$\sqrt{n}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t)\} \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)\}^2]\right).$$

In fact, $\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(\cdot) - \Lambda_j^a(\cdot)$ weakly converges to a Gaussian process whose variance is $E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(\cdot)\}]$ and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t^*]} |\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t) - \Lambda_j^a(t)| \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

The proof of uniform convergence is similar to that in the proceeding section, as long as $c < \widehat{e}(a; X) < 1 - c$ with probability 1.

A.5 From hazards to incidences

Hereafter we assume the cause-specific hazard $\Lambda_j^a(t)$ is estimated by $\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(t)$. The cumulative incidence function (CIF) of event j

$$F_j^a(t) = \int_0^t \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_k^a(s) \right\} d\Lambda_j^a(s)$$

is Hadamard derivable with respect to the cause-specific hazards $\{\Lambda_k^a(t) : k = 1, \dots, J\}$. So we apply the functional delta method,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(t)\} &= \int_0^t \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_k^a(s) \right\} d\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(s)\} \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^J \Lambda_k^a(s) \right\} \sum_{k=1}^J \text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_k^a(s)\} d\Lambda_j^a(s) \\ &= \int_0^t \overline{F}^a(s) d\text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_j^a(s)\} - \sum_{k=1}^J \int_0^t \text{IF}\{\widehat{\Lambda}_k^a(s)\} dF_j^a(s), \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{F}^a(s) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^J F_k^a(s)$ is the overall survival function. By the central limit theory,

$$\sqrt{n}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(t) - F_j^a(t)\} \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(t)\}^2]\right).$$

In fact, $\widehat{F}_j^a(\cdot) - F_j^a(\cdot)$ weakly converges to a Gaussian process with variance $E[\text{IF}\{\widehat{F}_j^a(\cdot)\}^2]$.

B Simulation

Suppose that there are three covariates $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ following the multivariate standard normal distribution. The potential failure times under the treated and under the control are assumed to follow the proportional hazards model,

$$\begin{aligned} d\Lambda^1(t; x) &= (t^2/5) \exp(x_2/5 + x_3/5) dt, \\ d\Lambda^0(t; a) &= (t/3) \exp(x_2/3 - x_3/3) dt, \end{aligned}$$

from which we generate T^1 and T^0 . We assume there are two competing events. The probabilities that the first type of event (which is the event of interest) occurs are

$$P(\Delta^1 = 1 \mid T^1 = t, X = x) = \text{expit}(-0.1 + 0.2x_1 + 0.2x_2 + 0.2x_3 + 0.03t),$$

$$P(\Delta^0 = 1 \mid T^0 = t, X = x) = \text{expit}(0.2x_1 - 0.1x_2 + 0.1x_3 + 0.05t)$$

under the treated and control, respectively. The censoring time is generated as a uniform distribution in $[6, 12]$. The propensity score

$$P(A = 1 \mid X = x) = \text{expit}(0.2 + 0.5x_1 - 0.5x_2).$$

To see the empirical bias, we compare three point estimates: (1) the oracle generalized Nelson–Aalen estimation that uses the true propensity score, (2) the generalized Nelson–Aalen (NA) estimator that uses the estimated propensity score, and (3) the weighted Kaplan–Meier (KM) estimate by imposing the inverse of propensity score as weights in the function `survfit` in R. The Kaplan–Meier so here we modify the Kaplan–Meier estimator such that the individuals experiencing competing events are maintained in the at-risk set. To make inference, we next consider five methods to obtain the standard error: (1) the oracle standard error that uses the true propensity score in Theorem 3, (2) the naive standard error $\tilde{\sigma}_n(t)$ that does not consider the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score, (3) the standard error $\hat{\sigma}_n(t)$ that corrects for the estimated propensity score in Theorem 3, (4) the standard error calculated from `survfit`, and (5) the bootstrap standard error. Nominal 95% confidence intervals are constructed using the point estimate, standard error based on asymptotic normality.

Table S1 and Table S2 show the empirical bias of the point estimates with standard deviation, mean standard error and coverage rate of the nominal 95% confidence intervals when the sample size $n = 500$. Table S3 and Table S4 show the results when the sample size $n = 2000$. We see that the bias of the generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator is small. Even if we use the estimated propensity score, the standard deviation (and standard error)

is similar with the oracle one, indicating that the efficiency loss due to estimating the propensity score is negligible. Considering the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score, the standard error based on the influence function in Theorem 3 is slightly larger than the naive one, and hence the coverage rate based on the corrected standard error is larger. The weighted Kaplan–Meier estimator from the function `survfit` gives a similar standard error to the naive generalized Nelson–Aalen estimator, and in fact these two estimators are asymptotically equivalent with slightly different finite-sample performances (Luo and Saunders, 1993; Colosimo et al., 2002). The most interesting finding is that omitting the variation of the estimated propensity score does not lead to much bias of the standard error. This is the merit of focusing on hazards, where the asymptotic bias is a weighted average of a martingale and hence is usually small.

To conduct a sensitivity analysis, now we suppose that the propensity score is misspecified. We consider two misspecified propensity scores: (1) the constant propensity score $e'(1; x) = 1/2$, and (2) the probit propensity score

$$e^*(1; x) = P(Z \leq \theta_0 + x'\theta),$$

where Z is a random variable following the standard normal distribution.

Table S5 and Table S6 shows the bias, standard deviation, standard error and coverage rate of nominal 95% confidence intervals when the propensity score model is misspecified. In this setting, the bias is still small, but the coverage rate of the confidence interval slightly deviate from 0.95.

C Application to allogeneic stem cell transplantation data

Allogeneic stem cell transplantation is a widely applied therapy to treat acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL), including two sorts of transplant modalities: human leukocyte antigens

Table S1: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^1(t)$ when the sample size $n = 500$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.002	-0.003
Generalized NA	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003
Weighted KM	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	-0.001	-0.007
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.029	0.030	0.030	0.032
Generalized NA	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.029	0.030	0.030	0.032
Weighted KM	0.013	0.020	0.026	0.029	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.031
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.027	0.030	0.031	0.031	0.032
Naive	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.032	0.032
Corrected	0.009	0.019	0.027	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.035
Weighted KM	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.032	0.032
Bootstrap	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.027	0.029	0.030	0.031	0.031
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.886	0.935	0.947	0.941	0.955	0.954	0.963	0.955
Naive	0.886	0.935	0.946	0.945	0.956	0.957	0.965	0.954
Corrected	0.889	0.943	0.957	0.961	0.968	0.968	0.974	0.967
Weighted KM	0.884	0.933	0.939	0.937	0.960	0.962	0.967	0.958
Bootstrap	0.880	0.934	0.942	0.933	0.953	0.953	0.960	0.949

Table S2: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^0(t)$ when the sample size $n = 500$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.005
Generalized NA	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.005
Weighted KM	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.003	-0.006
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.025	0.031	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.037
Generalized NA	0.025	0.031	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.037	0.037
Weighted KM	0.028	0.036	0.040	0.040	0.042	0.043	0.045	0.045
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.024	0.030	0.033	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.035	0.035
Naive	0.025	0.030	0.033	0.034	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035
Corrected	0.025	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.036
Weighted KM	0.025	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.035	0.036	0.036	0.036
Bootstrap	0.024	0.030	0.032	0.033	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.035
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.936	0.940	0.931	0.944	0.937	0.941	0.937	0.940
Naive	0.933	0.944	0.931	0.942	0.944	0.945	0.934	0.939
Corrected	0.935	0.948	0.932	0.944	0.944	0.949	0.940	0.945
Weighted KM	0.931	0.938	0.931	0.943	0.944	0.943	0.939	0.941
Bootstrap	0.928	0.940	0.927	0.941	0.937	0.939	0.935	0.934

Table S3: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^1(t)$ when the sample size $n = 2000$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Generalized NA	-0.000	-0.001	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Weighted KM	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	-0.002	-0.008
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017
Generalized NA	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017
Weighted KM	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016
Naive	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016
Corrected	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.017
Weighted KM	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016
Bootstrap	0.005	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.015	0.015	0.016	0.016
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.935	0.943	0.937	0.935	0.935	0.939	0.939	0.953
Naive	0.933	0.945	0.940	0.941	0.940	0.938	0.944	0.947
Corrected	0.937	0.951	0.944	0.949	0.944	0.943	0.950	0.956
Weighted KM	0.934	0.949	0.941	0.944	0.939	0.938	0.941	0.910
Bootstrap	0.932	0.941	0.935	0.935	0.934	0.941	0.944	0.941

Table S4: Bias, standard deviation, standard error and confidence interval coverage rate of some estimators for the cumulative incidence function $F_1^0(t)$ when the sample size $n = 2000$

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Oracle	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Generalized NA	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
Weighted KM	-0.008	-0.013	-0.018	-0.020	-0.022	-0.024	-0.027	-0.031
Standard deviation (SD)								
Oracle	0.013	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.019
Generalized NA	0.013	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.019
Weighted KM	0.037	0.060	0.077	0.089	0.097	0.104	0.108	0.112
Standard error (SE)								
Oracle	0.012	0.015	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018
Naive	0.012	0.015	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018
Corrected	0.013	0.015	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018
Weighted KM	0.012	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.017	0.017	0.017	0.017
Bootstrap	0.012	0.015	0.016	0.017	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018
Coverage rate								
Oracle	0.949	0.952	0.961	0.952	0.939	0.943	0.935	0.937
Naive	0.949	0.955	0.961	0.951	0.945	0.943	0.939	0.940
Corrected	0.952	0.955	0.961	0.952	0.946	0.945	0.944	0.944
Weighted KM	0.895	0.896	0.902	0.896	0.888	0.892	0.886	0.886
Bootstrap	0.943	0.953	0.958	0.943	0.941	0.940	0.935	0.939

Table S5: Estimation for $F_1^1(t)$ when the propensity score is misspecified

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Constant	-0.001	-0.003	-0.006	-0.008	-0.008	-0.008	-0.007	-0.007
Probit	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003
Standard deviation (SD)								
Constant	0.008	0.016	0.022	0.026	0.027	0.028	0.029	0.030
Probit	0.009	0.017	0.024	0.028	0.029	0.029	0.030	0.032
Standard error (SE)								
Constant	0.008	0.016	0.021	0.025	0.028	0.029	0.030	0.030
Probit (Naive)	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.028	0.030	0.031	0.032	0.032
Probit (Corrected)	0.010	0.020	0.029	0.033	0.036	0.037	0.037	0.037
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.009	0.017	0.023	0.027	0.029	0.030	0.031	0.031
Coverage rate								
Constant	0.884	0.921	0.917	0.919	0.935	0.952	0.952	0.953
Probit (Naive)	0.887	0.930	0.948	0.951	0.959	0.959	0.966	0.956
Probit (Corrected)	0.889	0.942	0.957	0.959	0.968	0.972	0.974	0.971
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.883	0.929	0.943	0.936	0.952	0.952	0.961	0.948

Table S6: Estimation for $F_1^0(t)$ when the propensity score is misspecified

Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Bias								
Constant	0.004	0.003	0.000	-0.002	-0.005	-0.008	-0.011	-0.013
Probit	-0.001	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.005	-0.005
Standard deviation (SD)								
Constant	0.023	0.029	0.031	0.030	0.032	0.032	0.033	0.033
Probit	0.025	0.031	0.034	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.037	0.037
Standard error (SE)								
Constant	0.024	0.028	0.031	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032	0.033
Probit (Naive)	0.025	0.030	0.033	0.034	0.035	0.035	0.035	0.035
Probit (Corrected)	0.038	0.052	0.060	0.066	0.071	0.074	0.075	0.077
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.024	0.030	0.032	0.033	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.035
Coverage rate								
Constant	0.952	0.947	0.941	0.953	0.943	0.938	0.930	0.929
Probit (Naive)	0.934	0.943	0.934	0.942	0.946	0.942	0.934	0.938
Probit (Corrected)	0.965	0.980	0.976	0.977	0.979	0.984	0.981	0.981
Probit (Bootstrap)	0.933	0.939	0.927	0.937	0.938	0.938	0.936	0.935

(HLA) matched sibling donor transplantation (MSDT) and haploidentical stem cell transplantation from family (Haplo-SCT). MSDT has long been regarded as the first choice of transplantation because MSDT leads to lower transplant-related mortality (TRM), also known as non-relapse mortality (NRM) (Kanakry et al., 2016). In recent years, some benefits of Haplo-SCT have been noticed that patients with positive pre-transplantation minimum residual disease (MRD) undergoing Haplo-SCT have better prognosis in relapse, and hence lower relapse-related mortality (Chang et al., 2020). We adopt the relapse as the primary event and non-relapse mortality as the competing event.

A total of $n = 303$ patients with positive MRD undergoing allogeneic stem cell transplantation are included in our study. Among these patients, 65 received MSDT ($A = 1$) and 238 received Haplo-SCT ($A = 0$). The transplantation type is “genetically randomized” in that there is no specific consideration to prefer Haplo-SCT over MSDT whenever MSDT is accessible (Chang et al., 2020). Therefore, we expect ignorability. Four baseline covariates are considered: age, sex (male or female), diagnosis (T-ALL or B-ALL) and complete remission status (CR1 or CR>1). These covariates are risk factors associated with relapse and mortality indicated in previous literature. The mean follow-up time is 1336 days. In the MSDT group, 47.7% patients were observed to encounter relapse and 53.8% mortality. In the Haplo-SCT group, 30.0% patients were observed to encounter relapse and 36.6% mortality. Summary statistics are presented in Table S7.

The propensity score is fitted by logistic regression. The upper-left panel in Figure 1 shows the estimated counterfactual cumulative incidence function of relapse. The relapse rate is higher in the MSDT group than in the Haplo-SCT group. The 95% confidence intervals are displayed in dashed lines. We plot the confidence interval that ignores the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score and the the confidence interval that corrects for the estimated propensity score. The numerical values of these two types of confidence intervals are very similar. The upper-right panel of Figure 1 presents the treatment effect of

Table S7: Summary statistics in the data application, stratified the treatment groups. We list the mean and standard deviation (SD) of baseline covariates in each group. We also list the proportion of observing each event (relapse, mortality) and time to the observed event in each group.

	Haplo-SCT ($A = 1$)		MSDT ($A = 0$)	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
Baseline covariates				
Age	26.697	(12.232)	35.000	(13.077)
Sex (Male 1; Female 0)	0.374	(0.485)	0.415	(0.497)
Complete Remission (CR1 1; CR>1 0)	0.227	(0.420)	0.154	(0.364)
Diagnosis (T-ALL 1; B-ALL 0)	0.160	(0.367)	0.046	(0.211)
Observed events				
Relapse	0.290	(0.455)	0.477	(0.503)
Time to relapse	371.667	(406.247)	420.774	(369.805)
Mortality	0.366	(0.483)	0.538	(0.502)
Time to mortality	393.264	(346.752)	528.257	(410.212)

Haplo-SCT on the relapse rate compared to MSDT. Negative values indicate that Haplo-SCT leads to a lower relapse rate than MSDT. The 95% confidence interval calculated based on the influence functions of the estimated CIFs is displayed in dashed lines. In most region, the 95% confidence interval is lower than zero, indicating that the treatment effect is significant. The bottom-left panel shows the estimated cumulative incidence function of non-relapse mortality (NRM) and the bottom-right panel shows the estimated average treatment effect. The NRM rate is slightly higher in the Haplo-SCT group than in the MSDT group, but the confidence interval covers zero, indicating that the difference is not significant.

In summary, we find that Haplo-SCT significantly reduces the risk of relapse compared to MSDT. Haplo-SCT can be used as the better transplant modality for MRD positive patients.




Figure 1: Left: The estimated counterfactual cumulative incidence functions of relapse and non-relapse mortality (NRM). The brown line is MSDT and the blue line is Haplo-SCT. The brown and blue dashed lines are the 95% confidence intervals by correcting for the estimated propensity score; the orange and cyan lines are the 95% confidence intervals ignoring the uncertainty of the estimated propensity score. Right: the average treatment effect (ATE) on the incidence scale. Negative values indicate that Haplo-SCT leads to a lower relapse (NRM) rate than MSDT. 21