

Doubly robust estimation and sensitivity analysis with outcomes truncated by death in multi-arm clinical trials

Jiaqi Tong^{1,2}, Chao Cheng^{1,2}, Guangyu Tong^{1,2,3}, Michael O. Harhay⁴ and Fan Li^{1,2,*}

¹Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

²Center for Methods in Implementation and Prevention Science, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

³Department of Internal Medicine, Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

⁴Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

**email:* fan.f.li@yale.edu

October 11, 2024

Abstract

In clinical trials, the observation of participant outcomes may frequently be hindered by death, leading to ambiguity in defining a scientifically meaningful final outcome for those who die. Principal stratification methods are valuable tools for addressing the average causal effect among always-survivors, i.e., the average treatment effect among a subpopulation in the principal strata of those who would survive regardless of treatment assignment. Although robust methods for the truncation-by-death problem in two-arm clinical trials have been previously studied, its expansion to multi-arm clinical trials remains unknown. In this article, we study the identification of a class of survivor average causal effect estimands with multiple treatments under monotonicity and principal ignorability, and first propose simple weighting and regression approaches. As a further improvement, we then derive the efficient influence function to motivate doubly robust estimators for the survivor average causal effects in multi-arm clinical trials. We also articulate sensitivity methods under violations of key causal assumptions. Extensive simulations are conducted to investigate the finite-sample performance of the proposed methods, and a real data example is used to illustrate how to operationalize the proposed estimators and the sensitivity methods in practice.

Keywords: Causal inference; multiple treatments; principal stratification; principal ignorability; sensitivity analysis; survivor average causal effect.

1 Introduction

Truncation-by-death refers to the occurrence of death as an intermediate outcome (or intercurrent event) in a study that, in effect, precludes complete or partial observation of the outcome of interest (Rubin, 2006). This issue is common in randomized trials and impacts either the estimand definition or the interpretation of non-mortality outcomes. As survival status can be affected by treatment assignment, naive adjustment conditioning on survivors does not ensure a valid causal effect estimate. For example, a direct comparison of quality of life outcomes between those who survive in the control versus those in the active treatment is prone to selection bias since treated survivors may not have survived had they been assigned to the control arm. Instead, a relevant causal estimand can be defined among those who would have survived regardless of the treatment assigned. Under the potential outcomes framework, Frangakis and Rubin (2002) developed the principal stratification approach to define the principal causal effects by treating the joint potential values of the intermediate outcomes as pre-treatment covariates. Using this framework, the survivor average causal effect (SACE) represents the average potential outcome contrasts among a principal strata consisting of those who would have survived irrespective of the treatment assignment, and is causally interpretable. More broadly, the ICH E9(R1) addendum for the analysis of clinical trials (European Medicines Agency, 2020) proposed principal stratification as one of the five strategies for dealing with intercurrent events with improved transparency in estimands.

Although principal stratification methods for a binary treatment have been developed, many randomized clinical trials include more than two arms. For example, a review of all randomized trials published in one month in 2012 found that 14% had 3 arms and 7% had 4 or more arms (Juszczak et al., 2019). Nevertheless, relatively fewer efforts have been devoted to principal stratification methods with multiple treatments with a few exceptions (Rubin, 2006). Under monotonicity, Elliott et al. (2006) proposed a Bayesian Gaussian mixture model to empirically identify SACEs with continuous outcomes, and Wang et al. (2017) constructed testing procedures for detecting clinically meaningful SACEs in trials with ordinal treatments and binary outcomes. Extending the work in Ding et al. (2011), Luo et al. (2023) investigated the use of an auxiliary variable in a linear structural model to point identify SACEs (details of this approach are given in Section 5), and developed

sharp bounds in the presence of covariates. A summary of the literature on principal stratification with multiple treatments is provided in Supplementary Material Table 1. For point identifying SACEs in multi-arm studies, a salient feature of the existing methods is that consistent estimation typically requires correctly specified models, whereas estimators that are more robust to model misspecification are sparse. With a binary treatment, [Ding and Lu \(2016\)](#) proposed the principal score weighting estimator under principal ignorability; [Jiang et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Cheng et al. \(2023\)](#) studied triply robust estimators that leverage multiple working models to provide more chances to consistently estimate the principal causal effects. These robust methods, while attractive, have not been generalized to accommodate multiple treatments.

In this article, we expand the work of [Ding and Lu \(2016\)](#) and [Jiang et al. \(2022\)](#) to derive doubly robust estimators for the SACE estimands with multiple treatments under principal ignorability, with a focus on randomized clinical trials. We first develop the principal score weighting and outcome regression estimators. These two estimators are motivated by moment conditions and are consistent if the associated working models are correctly specified, and hence only singly robust. To improve the model robustness, we further construct the efficient influence function to motivate doubly robust estimators, which are consistent if one set of working models is correctly specified, but not necessarily both. When all working models are correctly specified, the resulting estimators are semiparametrically efficient and achieve the variance lower bound among the class of regular and asymptotically linear estimators. Additionally, since the doubly robust estimators hinge on monotonicity and principal ignorability, we articulate a sensitivity function approach to assess the estimation results under their violations. In general, sensitivity methods for principal stratification analysis with multiple treatments are sparse, except for [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) for assessing monotonicity. However, their approach is restricted to partial deviation from monotonicity between adjacent strata. In contrast, we provide a more general approach that is not limited to partial deviation. Finally, we illustrate our proposed methods with a four-arm trial of chemical effects in biological systems conducted by the National Toxicology Program.

2 Notation, causal estimands, and assumptions

We consider a multi-arm randomized trial with n units. For each unit, we observe a vector of pre-treatment covariates \mathbf{X} , an ordinal treatment $Z \in \mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, J\}$ with $J \geq 2$ levels, an intermediate survival status S with $S = 1$ indicating survival and $S = 0$ indicating death, and a non-mortality outcome Y . We assume that Y is only well-defined among survivors with $S = 1$. We pursue the potential outcomes framework, and define $S(z) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Y(z)$ as the potential values of the survival status and final outcome that would have been observed under treatment condition z . The Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption allows us to connect S and Y with their potential values through $S = \sum_{z=1}^J \mathbf{1}(Z = z)S(z)$ and $Y = \sum_{z=1}^J \mathbf{1}(Z = z)Y(z)$ where $\mathbf{1}(\bullet)$ is the indicator function. Under the principal stratification framework (Frangakis and Rubin, 2002), the joint potential survival status under all treatment conditions can be considered as a pre-treatment covariate that defines subgroup causal effects. Specifically, we define the basic principal stratum as $G \in \mathcal{G} = \{(S(1), S(2), \dots, S(J)) : S(z) \in \{0, 1\}, z \in \mathcal{J}\}$. For simplicity, we relabel potential values of G as $S(1)S(2) \dots S(J)$. For example, with $J = 4$ arms, $G = 0111$ indicates the basic principal stratum with $S(1) = 0$ and $S(2) = S(3) = S(4) = 1$. We define $\mu_g(z) = E\{Y(z)|G = g\}$ as the mean of the potential outcome within stratum g . Importantly, $\mu_g(z)$ is well-defined if and only if the z -th coordinate of g equals 1 due to truncation by death. To enable simultaneous comparison among multiple treatments, our causal estimands are defined as the collection of pairwise SACEs:

$$\Delta_g(z, z') = \mu_g(z) - \mu_g(z') = E\{Y(z) - Y(z')|G = g\}, \quad z \neq z' \in \mathcal{J}, \quad (1)$$

where stratum g must satisfy $S(z) = S(z') = 1$ to ensure that both $\mu_g(z)$ and $\mu_g(z')$ are well-defined. A few remarks are in order for the class of estimands in Equation (1). First, the class of estimands is transitive such that $\Delta_g(z, z'') = \Delta_g(z, z') + \Delta_g(z', z'')$ if g satisfies $S(z) = S(z') = S(z'') = 1$, and reflexive such that $\Delta_g(z, z') = -\Delta_g(z', z)$. Second, accounting for all possible combinations of treatment and strata, the cardinality of the class of estimands is $J(J-1) \times 2^{J-2}$ because there are $J(J-1)$ pairs of distinct (z, z') in total and 2^{J-2} choices of stratum given the pair. Third, $\Delta_g(z, z')$ is identifiable if $\mu_g(z)$ is identifiable, and the cardinality of the class of estimands based on $\mu_g(z)$ is effectively reduced to $J \times 2^{J-1}$. In what follows, we focus on the identification and estimation of $\mu_g(z)$, $\forall z \in \mathcal{J}$, based on which all combinations of $\Delta_g(z, z')$ can be obtained. In a multi-arm randomized trial, we

assume randomization such that $Z \perp \{S(1), \dots, S(J), Y(1), \dots, Y(J), \mathbf{X}\}$. Besides, we require the following two additional assumptions in order to point identify $\mu_g(z)$.

Assumption 1 (Monotonicity). $S(z) \geq S(z')$ for $\forall z \geq z' \in \mathcal{J}$.

Assumption 1 is typically invoked for point identification of SACEs (Ding and Lu, 2016), and is likely plausible if the treatments are ordinal and a higher treatment dosage does not increase mortality. Under monotonicity, the number of principal strata is reduced from 2^J to $J + 1$ due to the removal of the harmed strata. Furthermore, under monotonicity, each element in \mathcal{G} takes the form of $0^{\otimes(J-k)}1^{\otimes k}$ ($k = 0, \dots, J$) and, without loss of clarity, we will equivalently use k to index each element in \mathcal{G} . The monotonicity assumption also implies that $\mu_g(z)$ is only defined within $g + z \geq J + 1$ and that the contrast estimands in Equation (1) are only defined when both $g + z$ and $g + z'$ are no smaller than $J + 1$.

Assumption 2 (Principal Ignorability). For any $z \in \mathcal{J}$, $E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\} = E\{Y(z)|G = g', \mathbf{X}\} \forall g, g' \in \{J - z + 1, \dots, J\}$.

Assumption 2 extends the principal ignorability assumption in Ding and Lu (2016) and Jiang et al. (2022) to multiple treatments with $J \geq 2$. It states that conditional on measured covariates, the expectation of the potential outcome does not vary across the principal strata of survivors. In other words, \mathbf{X} explains away all confounding relationships between the final non-mortality outcome and survival status, in expectation. In practice, both the monotonicity and principal ignorability assumptions are cross-world assumptions and are unverifiable from the observed data alone; therefore, in Section 4, we articulate a sensitivity function approach to assess the impact of departure from these assumptions in multi-arm trials.

3 Identification and estimation

3.1 Principal score weighting estimator

We first assess $\mu_g(z)$ based on principal score weighting (Ding and Lu, 2016). The principal score is defined as the probability of an individual belonging to the stratum g conditional on baseline covariates \mathbf{X} , $e_g(\mathbf{X}) = \Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X})$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$. We also define $e_g = E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})\}$ as the marginal principal score for the stratum g . Note that $\mu_g(z)$ is well-defined only if

$e_g > 0$. Since G is only partially observed, we utilize the information from the observed survival status and monotonicity to point identify the principal score. Under Assumption 1, we show in Supplementary Material that the principal score can be identified by using the probability of survival conditional on the treatment and covariates, given by the series of equations:

$$e_g(\mathbf{X}) = p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}), \quad g = 0, \dots, J, \quad (2)$$

where $p_z(\mathbf{X}) = \Pr(S = 1|Z = z, \mathbf{X})$ for $z \in \mathcal{J}$, and for completeness, we also define $p_0(\mathbf{X}) = 0$ and $p_{J+1}(\mathbf{X}) = 1$. Hereafter, we also refer to $p_z(\mathbf{X})$ as the principal score because (2) defines a bijection between $\{e_0(\mathbf{X}), \dots, e_J(\mathbf{X})\}$ and $\{p_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, p_{J+1}(\mathbf{X})\}$. We then define the following set of principal score weights

$$w_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{\sum_{g'=J-z+1}^J e_{g'}(\mathbf{X})} \times \frac{\sum_{g'=J-z+1}^J e_{g'}}{e_g}, \quad z \in \mathcal{J}, \quad g \geq J - z + 1.$$

Based on (2), one can write out $w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ as

$$w_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} \times \frac{p_z}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}},$$

where $p_z = E\{p_z(\mathbf{X})\}$. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $\mu_g(z)$ is then identified by

$$\mu_g(z) = E\{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})Y|Z = z, S = 1\}, \quad (3)$$

which is an expectation of the observed outcome conditional on treatment z and survivors, weighted by $w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$. The weights $w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ are functions of principal scores and more specifically, they are proportional to the ratio of the principal score for stratum g and the total principal score for a set of strata whose members will all survive under arm z or $S(z) = 1$. In fact, $w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ represents the importance sampling weights for the probability distribution of covariates conditional on the survivors, treatment, and principal stratum versus that conditional on the survivors and treatment only. The identification formulas (3) generalize the results under binary treatment proposed by Ding and Lu (2016) to $J \geq 2$.

The identification formulas (3) correspond to a collection of balancing conditions for the arbitrary vector-valued function of covariates $h(\mathbf{X})$. Intuitively, replacing the final outcome Y in (3) with an arbitrary $h(\mathbf{X})$ yields the balancing properties of the principal score weights. That is, under Assumptions 1 and 2, for $\forall g$ and $\forall z \geq J + 1 - g$, we have $E\{h(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} = E\{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})|Z = z, S = 1\}$. Then just as one could check

the adequacy of propensity score models in observational studies with multiple treatments (Li and Li, 2019), the empirical counterparts corresponding to the covariate balancing conditions motivate natural criteria to check if the estimated principal scores sufficiently balance the covariates and are thus adequate. Operationally, one can follow Section 5.2 in Cheng et al. (2023) to construct a set of weighted standardized mean difference metrics and consider an iterative checking-fitting process to arrive at a final principal score model without peeking at the final outcome.

To implement the principal score weighting estimator, for any $z \in \mathcal{J}$, we can posit a parametric working model $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$ with a vector of unknown parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_z$ for $p_z(\mathbf{X})$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z$ is obtained by solving a maximum likelihood score equation $\mathbb{P}_n\{\kappa_z(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)\} = \mathbf{0}$. Here, $\kappa_z(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$ is the score function of a binary regression model and $\mathbb{P}_n\{V\} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n V_i$ defines the empirical mean. We consider the following plug-in estimator $\hat{p}_z(\mathbf{X}) = p_z(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)$. We note $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z) = p_z(\mathbf{X})$ when $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$ is correctly specified, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z$ is the probability limit of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z$. We then use a simple non-parametric estimator, $\hat{p}_z = \mathbb{P}_n\{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)S\}/\pi_z$, $z \in \mathcal{J}$, where $\pi_z = \Pr(Z = z)$ is the treatment probability and is known by the study design, to estimate the marginal principal score. Then (3) leads to the following weighting estimator, which is consistent when the principal score working model is correctly specified,

$$\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n\{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)S \times \hat{w}_{zg}(\mathbf{X})Y\}}{\mathbb{P}_n\{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)S\}}.$$

3.2 Outcome regression estimator

Alternatively, we can estimate $\mu_g(z)$ by postulating non-mortality outcome models. Define the mean of the observed final outcome conditional on treatment, survivors, and covariates as $m_z(\mathbf{X}) = E\{Y|Z = z, S = 1, \mathbf{X}\}$. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we show in Supplementary Material that the following identification formula for $\mu_g(z)$ holds for $g \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\mu_g(z) = E\left\{\frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)S/\pi_{J-g+1} - \mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)S/\pi_{J-g}m_z(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}}\right\}. \quad (4)$$

For completeness, we define $\mathbf{1}(Z = 0)/\pi_0 = 0$ when calculating $\mu_J(z)$. Similar to Section 3, (4) also motivates the balancing conditions by replacing $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ with arbitrary vector-valued random functions of covariates $h(\mathbf{X})$ (see Section 9 in Supplementary Material). To implement this estimator, we posit a parametric working model $m_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z)$ for $m_z(\mathbf{X})$,

where γ_z is a vector of unknown parameters. Analogously, $\hat{\gamma}_z$ can be obtained by solving a generalized estimating equation $\mathbb{P}_n\{\tau_z(\mathbf{V}; \gamma_z)\} = \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{V} = (Y, S, Z, \mathbf{X}^\top)^\top$ is the observed data vector and $\tau_z(\mathbf{V}; \gamma_z)$ are unbiased estimating functions determined by the outcome model specification. We define the probability limit for $\hat{\gamma}_z$ as $\tilde{\gamma}_z$, and under the true working model and suitable regularity conditions, $m_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\gamma}_z) = m_z(\mathbf{X})$. We then propose the following estimators based on the empirical counterparts of (4)

$$\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{OR}}(z) = \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)S/\pi_{J-g+1} - \mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)S/\pi_{J-g}}{\hat{p}_{J-g+1} - \hat{p}_{J-g}} \hat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) \right\},$$

for $g \in \mathcal{J}$, where $\hat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) = m_z(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\gamma}_z)$. It is clear that $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{OR}}(z)$ is a g-computation formula estimator that standardizes the outcome model estimate to the target principal strata subpopulation, and $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{OR}}(z)$ is consistent if $m_z(\mathbf{X}; \gamma_z)$ is correctly specified.

3.3 Doubly robust and locally efficient estimator

To further improve upon the weighting and regression estimators, we first derive the efficient influence function for $\mu_g(z)$ under the nonparametric model \mathcal{M}_{np} of the observed data \mathbf{V} in a sense that we place no restrictions on \mathcal{M}_{np} . Derivation of the efficient influence function follows the standard procedure established under the general semiparametric efficiency theory (Bickel et al., 1993), and generalizes the derivation from Jiang et al. (2022) from a binary treatment to multiple treatments. To proceed, for $z \in \mathcal{J}$, we first define the following quantity for any function $F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})$:

$$\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} = \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{\pi_z} \left\{ F(Y, S, \mathbf{X}) - E\{F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})|Z = z, \mathbf{X}\} \right\} + E\{F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})|Z = z, \mathbf{X}\}.$$

To facilitate exposition, we also define $\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),0} = 0$ and $\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),J+1} = 1$. In addition, we define two quantities that appear in the efficient influence function as

$$\psi_{S,z} = \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{\pi_z} \{S - p_z(\mathbf{X})\} + p_z(\mathbf{X}), \quad \psi_{YS,z} = \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{\pi_z} \{YS - m_z(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})\} + m_z(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X}).$$

With these expressions, Theorem 1 gives the form of the efficient influence function for $\mu_g(z)$.

Theorem 1. *For any $z \in \mathcal{J}$ and $g \geq J - z + 1$, the efficient influence function for $\mu_g(z)$ under the nonparametric model \mathcal{M}_{np} is $\Psi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}) = \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V})/(p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g})$, where*

$$\xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}) = \frac{\{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})\} \{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}\}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} + \{m_z(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_g(z)\} (\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g}).$$

Therefore, the semiparametric efficiency bound for estimating $\mu_g(z)$ is $E\{[\Psi_{zg}(\mathbf{V})]^2\}$.

Theorem 1 suggests a new estimator, $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$, by solving the efficient influence function based estimating equation in terms of $\mu_g(z)$, where the unknown nuisance functions, $\{p_z(\mathbf{X}), m_z(\mathbf{X})\}$ are estimated by parametric working models as in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. Because the denominator of the efficient influence function is a constant with respect to the estimand, $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ is the solution of $\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \mu_g(z), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z) \} = 0$ in $\mu_g(z)$, where $\xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \mu_g(z), \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z)$ is $\xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V})$ evaluated based on the parametric working models. After some algebraic simplifications, we obtain

$$\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\widehat{p}_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - \widehat{p}_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{\widehat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})} \left\{ \widehat{\psi}_{Y_{S,z}} - \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) \widehat{\psi}_{S,z} \right\} + \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) (\widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g}) \right\}}{\mathbb{P}_n \{ \widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g} \}},$$

where $\{\widehat{\psi}_{S,z}, \widehat{\psi}_{Y_{S,z}}\}$ are $\{\psi_{S,z}, \psi_{Y_{S,z}}\}$ evaluated based on $\widehat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})$ and $\widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X})$. Finally, as a further improvement, an augmented estimator, $\mathbb{P}_n \{ \widehat{\psi}_{S,z} \}$, is used in $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$, as it is always consistent for p_z even under arbitrary misspecifications of $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$. We summarize the large-sample properties of $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ in Theorem 2 below.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and $\{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z), p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)\}$ are uniformly bounded away from 0 and 1. Then, $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ is consistent and asymptotically normal if either $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$ or $m_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z)$ is correctly specified. If both models are correctly specified, the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ achieves the efficiency lower bound and is locally efficient.*

By Theorem 2, $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ is doubly robust in a sense that the bias is asymptotically negligible if either $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$ or $m_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z)$ is correct, but not necessarily both. When both are correctly specified, $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ is locally efficient in the sense that it achieves the semiparametric efficiency lower bound $E\{[\Psi_{zg}(\mathbf{V})]^2\}$ and is an optimal estimator among the class of regular and asymptotically linear estimators for the same target estimand $\mu_g(z)$.

3.4 Variance estimation

The SACEs are estimated by $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z, z') = \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z) - \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z')$, $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{OR}}(z, z') = \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{OR}}(z) - \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{OR}}(z')$, and $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z') = \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z) - \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z')$, if the principal score weighting, outcome regression, and doubly robust approach are used to estimate $\mu_g(z)$. We propose to use the sandwich variance approach to estimate their asymptotic variances, and construct a Wald confidence interval. Below, we describe the variance estimator for $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$, and

the remaining variance estimators follow a similar construction and are provided in Supplementary Material.

Define $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{DR}} = (\mu_g(z), \mu_g(z'), \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'}^\top, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z^\top, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}^\top)^\top$ that includes all parameters used to construct $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$. Thus, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}} = (\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z'), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}^\top, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g}^\top, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z^\top, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{z'}^\top, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z^\top, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{z'}^\top)^\top$ can be treated as the solution of the joint estimating equation $\mathbb{P}_n\{\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{DR}})\} = \mathbf{0}$ with

$$\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{DR}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \mu_g(z), \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z) \\ \xi_{z'g}(\mathbf{V}; \mu_g(z'), \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}) \\ \xi_{\text{nuisance}}(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\xi_{\text{nuisance}} \equiv (\kappa_{J-g+1}^\top(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}), \kappa_{J-g}^\top(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}), \kappa_z^\top(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z), \kappa_{z'}^\top(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'}), \tau_z^\top(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z), \tau_{z'}^\top(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}))^\top$ is the collection of score vectors of the nuisance parameters, and the first element in ξ_{nuisance} is excluded if $J - g + 1 = z$ or z' and the second element in ξ_{nuisance} is discarded if $g = J$. The doubly robust SACE estimator is therefore $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z') = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}}$ where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (1, -1, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top$ is a vector with the first element 1, second element -1 , and all other elements 0. Following regularity conditions in Theorem 5.41 in [Van der Vaart \(2000\)](#), $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}})$ converges to a mean-zero normal distribution with the variance consistently estimated by $\widehat{\mathbb{V}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}}) \equiv \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \Phi(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{DR}^\top} } \right\}^{-1} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \Phi(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}}) \Phi^\top(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}}) \right\} \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \Phi(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{DR}^\top} } \right\}^{-\top}$, where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}}$ is the unique solution to $E\{\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{DR}})\} = \mathbf{0}$. By the delta method, the sandwich variance estimator of $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$ is $n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{V}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{DR}}) \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The finite-sample performance of the proposed variance estimators is investigated in [Section 5](#).

4 Sensitivity analysis methods under violations of causal assumptions

Since the validity of the estimators in [Section 3](#) depends on [Assumptions 1](#) and [2](#), we further develop sensitivity analysis methods under violations of these two structural assumptions. To focus ideas, when we investigate sensitivity under departure from one assumption, we assume the other assumption holds.

4.1 Sensitivity analysis for principal ignorability

Let $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{J}$ be a reference stratum. We suppose that, $E\{Y(z)|G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\} \neq 0$ almost surely $\forall z \geq J - \tilde{g} + 1$. We then define the following set of sensitivity functions with respect to

the reference stratum $\tilde{g} = J$,

$$\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}}{E\{Y(z)|G = J, \mathbf{X}\}}, \quad g \geq J - z + 1, \quad z \in \mathcal{J}, \quad (5)$$

where $\delta_{zJ}(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ by construction, and the cardinality of the set of non-trivial sensitivity functions is $J \times (J - 1)/2$. Of note, the reference stratum can be user-defined; for example, one may pick any $\tilde{g} \geq J - z + 1$ as a reference group, and then define

$$\delta'_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}}{E\{Y(z)|G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\}}, \quad g \geq J - z + 1, \quad g \neq \tilde{g}, \quad z \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (6)$$

Then $\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ can be recovered from the quantities in (6) with $\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \delta'_{zg}(\mathbf{X})/\delta'_{zJ}(\mathbf{X})$. Therefore, we take $\tilde{g} = J$ as the reference stratum without loss of generality. Recall that Assumption 2 is equivalent to $\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ for $\forall z, g$. However, when Assumption 2 is violated, at least one sensitivity function $\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ deviates from unity. Define, for $z \in \mathcal{J}$ and $g \geq J - z + 1$,

$$\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X}) \{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X})\}}.$$

The factor $\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ can be computed only if a class of sensitivity functions consisting of $z - 1$ elements, i.e., $\{\delta_{z(J+1-z)}(\mathbf{X}), \dots, \delta_{z(J-1)}(\mathbf{X})\}$, are specified. Then the weights for the identification formulas based on principal score weighting become, for $z \in \mathcal{J}$ and $g \geq J - z + 1$,

$$w_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} \times \frac{p_z}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} \times \Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X}). \quad (7)$$

Similarly, the identification formulas based on outcome regression are also multiplied by $\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ within the expectation, which gives, for $g = 1, \dots, J - 1$,

$$\mu_g(z) = E \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)S/\pi_{J-g+1} - \mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)S/\pi_{J-g}}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} \Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

In practice, specifying particular functional forms in \mathbf{X} is subject to accurate domain knowledge, and a convenient choice is to specify each sensitivity function as a constant. As noted by Jiang et al. (2022) with a binary treatment, constant tilting functions correspond to a log-linear model for the potential outcome $Y(z)$ conditional on the latent stratum variable G and covariates \mathbf{X} . The constructions of principal score weighting estimators and outcome regression estimators are simply by replacing unknown parameters with plug-in

estimators in the empirical versions of (7) and (8). Furthermore, the efficient influence function without assuming principal ignorability is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{zg}^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V}) = & \frac{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})}{p_z} \left\{ \psi_{YS,z} - \frac{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})}{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})} m_z(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X}) (\psi_{S,J-g'+1} - \psi_{S,J-g'}) \right\} + \\ & \frac{\{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) m_z(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_g(z)\} (\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

This motivates a bias-corrected estimator under violation of the principal ignorability as $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-PI}}(z) = \mathbb{P}_n\{\hat{\Xi}^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V})\} / \mathbb{P}_n\{\hat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \hat{\psi}_{S,J-g}\}$, where $\hat{\Xi}^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\hat{\Omega}_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) (\hat{p}_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - \hat{p}_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))}{\hat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})} \left\{ \hat{\psi}_{YS,z} - \frac{\hat{\Omega}_{zg}(\mathbf{X})}{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})} \hat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X}) (\hat{\psi}_{S,J-g'+1} - \hat{\psi}_{S,J-g'}) \right\} \\ & + \hat{\Omega}_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) \hat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) (\hat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \hat{\psi}_{S,J-g}). \end{aligned}$$

Yet, different from $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$, the doubly robustness for $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-PI}}(z)$ no longer holds because the correction factor $\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$ in $\hat{\Xi}^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V})$ does not allow a factorization of the difference between the true principal score $p_z(\mathbf{X})$ and the estimated one $\hat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})$. Thus, with assumed knowledge of the sensitivity functions, $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-PI}}(z)$ is consistent and asymptotically normal if the principal score model is correctly specified, regardless of whether the outcome model is correctly specified.

4.2 Sensitivity analysis for monotonicity

Recall that the collection of all possible principal strata without monotonicity is defined as $\mathcal{G} = \{(S(1), \dots, S(J)) : S(z) \in \{0, 1\}, z \in \mathcal{J}\}$. We simply use k to denote an element in \mathcal{G} taking the form of $0^{\otimes(J-k)} 1^{\otimes k}$ under monotonicity and inherit it when the monotonicity assumption is violated. Equivalently, we say $g \in \mathcal{Q}$ if g satisfies Assumption 1 and $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ otherwise, where $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{J} \cup \{0\}$. We further define for $z \in \mathcal{J}$, $s \in \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{G}_{zs} = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : S(z) = s\}$, which contains all the elements in \mathcal{G} whose z -th coordinate is s . For a given user-defined reference group $r \in \mathcal{Q}$, we define the set of sensitivity functions

$$\rho_g(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{\Pr(G = g | \mathbf{X})}{\Pr(G = r | \mathbf{X})}, \text{ for } g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q},$$

provided that $\Pr(G = r | \mathbf{X}) > 0$ almost surely. The choice of the reference group should satisfy $r \geq J + 1 - \min\{z, z'\}$ when the target estimand is $\Delta_g(z, z')$ because the outcome is truncated by death for $r < J + 1 - \min\{z, z'\}$. In addition, $\rho_g(\mathbf{X})$ measures the deviation

from monotonicity for the stratum g . The monotonicity assumption is satisfied if $\rho_g(\mathbf{X}) = 0$ for $\forall g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$. Otherwise, monotonicity is violated if $\rho_g(\mathbf{X}) > 0$ for some of $g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$. Our framework is a generation of the sensitivity analysis of Jiang et al. (2022) from a binary treatment to multiple treatments, and an expansion of Luo et al. (2023) by allowing for more general non-monotonicity beyond violations only between adjacent strata.

Under violation of monotonicity, and provided that $e_g \geq 0, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}$, we show in Supplementary Material that the principal score $e_g(\mathbf{X})$ can be identified by the following series of equations,

$$\begin{aligned}
e_0(\mathbf{X}) &= 1 - p_J(\mathbf{X}) - \frac{q_{J+1}(\mathbf{X}) - 1}{q_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X})} \{p_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-r}(\mathbf{X})\}, \\
e_g(\mathbf{X}) &= p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}) - \frac{q_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - q_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{q_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X})} \{p_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-r}(\mathbf{X})\}, 1 \leq g \leq r-1, \\
e_r(\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{p_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-r}(\mathbf{X})}{q_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X})}, \\
e_g(\mathbf{X}) &= p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}), r+1 \leq g \leq J, \\
e_g(\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{\rho_g(\mathbf{X})}{q_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X})} \{p_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-r}(\mathbf{X})\}, g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q},
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $r \geq 1$, $q_0(\mathbf{X}) = 1$, $q_z(\mathbf{X}) = 1 + \sum_{g' \in \mathcal{G}_{z1} \cap \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \rho_{g'}(\mathbf{X})$ (summation taken over all the violating strata whose z -th coordinate is 1) for $z \in \mathcal{J}$, and $q_{J+1}(\mathbf{X}) = 1 + \sum_{g' \in \mathcal{G}_{J0} \cap \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \rho_{g'}(\mathbf{X})$ (summation taken over all the violating strata whose J -th coordinate is 0). We note that the identification formulas in Equations (10) are applicable if $r \geq 1$ and the case when $r = 0$ is given in Section 12.2 of the Supplementary Material. Given the identifiability of the principal score $e_g(\mathbf{X})$, we can identify $\mu_g(z)$ only if Assumption 2 is strengthened, as follows.

Assumption 3 (Extended Principal Ignorability). *For $z \in \mathcal{J}$, $E\{Y(z)|G = g', \mathbf{X}\} = E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}$ for $\forall g, g' \in \mathcal{G}_{z1}$.*

Assumption 2 and Assumption 3 share the same spirit in the sense that conditional on baseline covariates, the expected potential outcome remains the same across the collection of principal strata of survivors. Based on the sensitivity functions $\rho_g(\mathbf{X})$, the principal score weight now becomes $w_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \{e_g(\mathbf{X})/e_g\} \times p_z/p_z(\mathbf{X})$, with $e_g(\mathbf{X})$ given by (10) and $e_g = E[e_g(\mathbf{X})]$. Replacing $p_z(\mathbf{X})$ with $\mathbf{1}(Z = z)S/\pi_z$ in (10) and plugging into $\mu_g(z) = E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})/e_g \times m_z(\mathbf{X})\}$ yields the identification formulas based on outcome regression. Constructions of the estimators similar to $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z)$ and $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{OR}}(z)$ are straightforward by

using the empirical counterparts based on the identification formulas. Under Assumption 3 and assumed sensitivity functions $\rho_g(\mathbf{X})$, the efficient influence function for $\mu_g(z)$ is given by

$$\Psi_{zg}^{\text{MO}}(\mathbf{V}) = \frac{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})(\psi_{Y_{S,z}} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z})}{p_z} + \frac{(m_z(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_g(z))\psi_g^*}{e_g},$$

where ψ_g^* is the counterpart to Equations (10) with all $p_z(\mathbf{X})$ replacing with $\psi_{S,z}$; for example, $\psi_r^* = (\psi_{S,J-r+1} - \psi_{S,J-r})/q_{J-r+1}(\mathbf{X})$. Similarly, the efficient influence function induces a bias-correct estimator of $\mu_g(z)$,

$$\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-MO}}(z) = \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\hat{e}_g(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{1}(Z=z)S}{\hat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z} (Y - \hat{m}_z(\mathbf{X})) + \hat{m}_z(\mathbf{X})\hat{\psi}_g^* \right\} / \mathbb{P}_n \{\hat{\psi}_g^*\},$$

where $\hat{\psi}_g^*$ is the plug-in estimator for ψ_g^* . In the Supplementary Material, we show that, due to the construction of the sensitivity function, the bias-corrected estimator $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-MO}}(z)$ remains doubly robust; that is, it is consistent and asymptotically normal if either the principal score model or the outcome regression model is correctly specified, but not necessarily both.

5 A simulation study

We conduct a simulation study to assess the empirical performance of the proposed estimators with the following three objectives: (i) evaluating the validity and relative efficiency among $\hat{\Delta}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z, z')$, $\hat{\Delta}_g^{\text{OR}}(z, z')$, and $\hat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$, under correct and incorrect specifications of the principal score and outcome regression models; (ii) investigating the performance of the proposed sandwich variance estimator in finite samples; (iii) comparing our proposed estimators to an existing method by Luo et al. (2023) under different data generating processes. In particular, the existing estimator is based on a principal score model and a model for the mean of the observed outcome conditional on treatment, covariates, and latent principal stratum, i.e., $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}) \equiv E\{Y|Z=z, G=g, \mathbf{X}\}$. By the law of total expectation, $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ is a weighted sum of $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X})$, and under principal ignorability (Assumption 2), $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}) = m_z(\mathbf{X})$ for $\forall g \geq J - z + 1$. We elaborate on their approach in Section 13 of the Supplementary Material. In brief, they employed a generalized method of moments approach and an Expectation-Maximization algorithm to estimate unknown model coefficients for $e_g(\mathbf{X})$ and $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X})$ respectively, and their estimators are consistent only if both models are correctly specified.

We consider a three-arm randomized trial ($J = 3$) with a small or large sample size ($n = 500$ or 2000), with balanced assignment such that $\Pr(Z = 1) = \Pr(Z = 2) = \Pr(Z = 3) = 1/3$. Four baseline covariates $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)^\top$ are generated from $X_j = |\tilde{X}_j|$ with $\tilde{X}_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $X_4 \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$. We generate the principal strata membership $G \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ based on a categorical distribution with $e_0(\mathbf{X}) = 1 - \text{expit}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_3^\top \mathbf{X})$, $e_g(\mathbf{X}) = \text{expit}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{4-g}^\top \mathbf{X}) - \text{expit}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{3-g}^\top \mathbf{X})$, $g \in \{1, 2\}$, and $e_3(\mathbf{X}) = \text{expit}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1^\top \mathbf{X})$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_z = (-0.8 + 0.3z, -0.8 + 0.4z, -0.8 + 0.5z, -0.8 + 0.4z)$, for $z \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\text{expit}(x) = (1 + e^{-x})^{-1}$. Then the observed survival status is given by $S = \mathbf{1}(G + Z \geq J + 1)$. Given G and \mathbf{X} , the potential outcome $Y(z)$ is generated by $Y(1)|\{\mathbf{X}, G = 3\} \sim \mathcal{N}(X_1 + 3X_2 + 3X_3 + 3X_4 + 2, 1)$, $Y(2)|\{\mathbf{X}, G \in \{2, 3\}\} \sim \mathcal{N}(X_1 + 2X_2 + 2X_3 + 2X_4 + 2, 1)$, $Y(3)|\{\mathbf{X}, G \in \{1, 2, 3\}\} \sim \mathcal{N}(\sum_{i=1}^4 X_i + 3, 1)$, and $Y(z)$ within $G = g < J + 1 - z$ is excluded due to truncation by death. We consider all possible causal contrast parameters $\{\Delta_2(2, 3), \Delta_3(1, 2), \Delta_3(1, 3), \Delta_3(2, 3)\}$ that are well-defined. The observed outcome is $Y = \sum_{z=1}^3 Y(z)\mathbf{1}(Z = z)$. Of note, Assumptions 1 and 2 hold under the above data generation process, and by construction, the principal score $p_z(\mathbf{X}) = \text{expit}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_z^\top \mathbf{X})$ and the outcome model $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ is a linear function of \mathbf{X} .

For estimation, we specify a logistic regression for $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)$ with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_z^\top \mathbf{X}$ as linear predictors. For the outcome model $m_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z)$, we fit a linear regression adjusting for $\{Z, \mathbf{X}\}$ and their interaction. i.e., specifying $E(Y|Z, S = 1, \mathbf{X}) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1\mathbf{1}(Z = 1) + \gamma_2\mathbf{1}(Z = 2) + \sum_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{j+2}X_j + \sum_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{j+6}\mathbf{1}(Z = 1)X_j + \sum_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{j+10}\mathbf{1}(Z = 2)X_j$. We conduct 1,000 simulations and calculate the bias, Monte Carlo standard deviation, average standard error estimates based on the proposed variance estimators (500 bootstrap samples are used to obtain standard error estimates for Luo et al. (2023)), and empirical coverage of a 95% Wald confidence interval. The true value of $\mu_g(z)$ is approximated by the empirical mean of the potential outcome $Y(z)$ within subgroup g based on a sufficiently large super-population of size $n = 250,000$. We consider all combinations of correctly or incorrectly specified principal score and outcome models, where the misspecified model is obtained by ignoring X_2, X_3, X_4 , and fitting regression models only on $\cos(X_1)$.

Simulation results under sample size $n = 500$ are given in Table 1. First, the empirical bias of all estimators is minimal when both working models are correctly specified. The bias of $\hat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$ remains negligible when either the principal score model or outcome model is incorrectly specified, which empirically verifies the double robustness property in

Theorem 2. Second, the proposed sandwich variance estimator for $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z, z')$ tends to overestimate the true variance, but the variance estimators for $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{OR}}(z, z')$ and $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$ are centered around the empirical variance. Third, the coverage for $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z, z')$ does not deviate too much from the nominal level under model misspecification. We further explore this phenomenon in Supplementary Material Figure 1 by visualizing the empirical distribution of $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z, z')$ over 1,000 simulations. The figure shows that the shape of the empirical distribution of the standardized principal score weighting estimator (subtracting the truth and then dividing by the standard error) is more concentrated than a mean-shift standard normal distribution, implying the normal approximation may be conservative for the weighting estimator under a small sample size. Fourth, $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{OR}}(z, z')$ and $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{DR}}(z, z')$ are almost equally efficient for estimating most of the causal contrasts, and they are both substantially more efficient than $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{PSW}}(z, z')$ irrespective of model misspecification. Finally, we observe that consistency of the estimator in Luo et al. (2023) requires correct specifications of both models and it is nearly as efficient as $\widehat{\Delta}_g^{\text{OR}}(z, z')$; however, in contrast to the doubly robust estimator, we observe bias and substantial undercoverage of the approach in Luo et al. (2023) when either the principal score model or the outcome mean model is misspecified. Supplementary Material Table 3 presents the simulation results under a larger sample size of $n = 2,000$, where the patterns are qualitatively similar.

Finally, we include an additional set of simulations in Section 14.2 in the Supplementary Material where the principal ignorability is violated but the correct model for $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X})$ remains linear. Table 2 summarizes the results and demonstrates that the method in Luo et al. (2023) is unbiased under correct model specification, whereas the proposed doubly robust estimator is subject to bias due to violation of principal ignorability. In addition, Table 2 further shows that our proposed sensitivity method can effectively correct the bias due to violation of principal ignorability, restoring the validity of causal inference with minimal bias and nominal coverage. Interestingly, the proposed bias-corrected estimator based on the efficient influence function appears to substantially improve the efficiency over the estimator in Luo et al. (2023) for estimating all causal estimands regardless of sample size configurations.

Table 1: Bias, Monte Carlo standard deviations (‘MCSD’), average empirical standard errors (‘AESE’) based on robust sandwich variance estimators, and empirical coverage (‘CP’) using AESE for all possible contrasts $\Delta_g(z, z')$, based on the principal score weighting estimator (‘PSW’), outcome regression estimator (‘OR’), doubly robust estimators (‘DR’), and estimator in Luo et al. (2023) (‘Luo’) when the sample size is 500. For the column of ps (or om), we set \checkmark and \times to indicate the correct and incorrect specification of the principal score model (or outcome regression), respectively. The symbol “\” indicates that the principal score weighting estimator and the outcome regression estimator are independent of the outcome mean model and the principal score model, respectively.

g	z	z'	ps	om	BIAS				CP				MCSD				AESE			
					PSW	OR	DR	Luo	PSW	OR	DR	Luo	PSW	OR	DR	Luo	PSW	OR	DR	Luo
2	2	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.04	97.3	96.8	96.8	97.2	0.91	0.37	0.28	0.29	1.04	0.37	0.29	0.50
			\checkmark	\times	\	-0.36	0.00	-0.48	\	76.9	96.0	78.4	\	0.28	0.35	0.41	\	0.30	0.37	0.50
			\times	\checkmark	0.42	\	0.02	-0.32	97.0	\	95.1	51.1	0.82	\	0.29	0.16	0.77	\	0.29	0.19
			\times	\times	\	\	-0.37	-0.37	\	\	74.6	78.5	\	\	0.29	0.28	\	\	0.29	0.35
3	1	2	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.02	98.1	92.9	93.6	94.9	0.79	0.25	0.24	0.25	1.25	0.24	0.24	0.25
			\checkmark	\times	\	-0.55	0.00	-0.41	\	79.6	94.8	88.9	\	0.54	0.37	0.59	\	0.52	0.38	0.58
			\times	\checkmark	0.64	\	0.00	0.24	93.2	\	93.6	82.5	0.91	\	0.25	0.22	0.95	\	0.24	0.24
			\times	\times	\	\	-0.57	-0.55	\	\	78.9	80.0	\	\	0.52	0.54	\	\	0.52	0.53
1	3	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.03	-0.01	-0.01	0.04	98.4	94.0	93.3	95.6	0.71	0.34	0.33	0.33	1.22	0.34	0.32	0.34
			\checkmark	\times	\	-0.35	0.01	-0.38	\	85.4	94.2	86.5	\	0.48	0.40	0.51	\	0.47	0.39	0.50
			\times	\checkmark	0.41	\	0.00	0.50	94.9	\	94.5	43.6	0.79	\	0.33	0.23	0.82	\	0.32	0.24
			\times	\times	\	\	-0.36	-0.37	\	\	86.6	85.0	\	\	0.46	0.49	\	\	0.47	0.48
2	3	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	98.1	94.4	94.7	95.4	0.76	0.22	0.21	0.21	1.02	0.21	0.21	0.22
			\checkmark	\times	\	0.19	-0.01	0.07	\	90.4	96.0	94.2	\	0.28	0.28	0.42	\	0.28	0.29	0.41
			\times	\checkmark	0.22	\	0.01	0.25	95.4	\	94.4	66.4	0.77	\	0.21	0.16	0.79	\	0.21	0.16
			\times	\times	\	\	0.21	0.20	\	\	89.3	91.3	\	\	0.28	0.28	\	\	0.28	0.29

Table 2: Bias, Monte Carlo standard deviations (‘MCSD’), average empirical standard errors (‘AESE’) based on robust sandwich variance estimators, and empirical coverage (‘CP’) using AESE for all possible contrasts $\Delta_g(z, z')$, based on the principal score weighting estimator (‘PSW’), principal score weighting estimator with bias-correction (‘PSW-BC’), outcome regression estimator (‘OR’), outcome regression estimator with bias-correction (‘OR-BC’), doubly robust estimator (‘DR’), doubly robust estimator with bias-correction (‘DR-BC’), and estimator in [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) (‘Luo’) when the principal ignorability does not hold and both models are correctly specified. The bias-correction for principal ignorability is according to our sensitivity analysis.

				BIAS							CP						
n	g	z	z'	PSW	PSW-BC	OR	OR-BC	DR	DR-BC	Luo	PSW	PSW-BC	OR	OR-BC	DR	DR-BC	Luo
500	2	2	3	0.03	-0.06	0.08	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.01	95.2	94.8	95.0	97.6	94.1	94.2	96.6
			3	1	2	-0.45	-0.10	-0.43	-0.03	-0.43	-0.03	-0.08	91.0	94.6	45.8	95.6	40.9
	2	3	3	-0.36	-0.06	-0.32	-0.02	-0.32	-0.01	-0.02	93.6	94.8	78.5	95.5	75.3	95.1	96.8
			3	0.06	0.00	0.11	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.07	95.4	95.2	90.5	95.1	89.4	96.6	96.9
2000	2	2	3	0.09	-0.02	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.06	94.7	95.2	89.0	94.9	86.7	94.9	98.1
			3	1	2	-0.43	-0.02	-0.43	-0.01	-0.43	-0.01	0.02	80.5	95.6	0.7	95.3	0.4
	2	3	3	-0.36	-0.01	-0.34	-0.01	-0.33	0.00	0.04	84.2	95.7	33.6	94.8	27.1	95.6	98.9
			3	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.03	94.8	95.6	81.6	95.4	79.7	94.9	98.1
				MCSD							AESE						
n	g	z	z'	PSW	PSW-BC	OR	OR-BC	DR	DR-BC	Luo	PSW	PSW-BC	OR	OR-BC	DR	DR-BC	Luo
500	2	2	3	0.86	0.93	0.35	0.44	0.24	0.25	0.90	0.96	1.01	0.35	0.42	0.24	0.25	1.20
			3	1	2	0.78	0.79	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.59	0.83	0.79	0.20	0.21	0.19
	2	3	3	0.82	0.75	0.28	0.29	0.25	0.27	0.55	0.82	0.77	0.29	0.29	0.26	0.26	0.68
			3	0.78	0.73	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.81	0.78	0.73	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.83
2000	2	2	3	0.37	0.41	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.48	0.38	0.42	0.16	0.16	0.11	0.12	0.63
			3	1	2	0.39	0.37	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.27	0.40	0.37	0.10	0.10	0.10
	2	3	3	0.39	0.37	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.26	0.39	0.37	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.37
			3	0.39	0.36	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.38	0.37	0.35	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.49

6 Data application

We apply the proposed methods to an animal antimony trioxide inhalation study conducted by the National Toxicology Program (NTP). The two-year antimony trioxide inhalation study randomized 800 Wistar Han rats and B6C3F1/N mice into four-level (0, 3, 10 or 30 mg/m^3) exposure to whole-body inhalation of antimony trioxide ([National Toxicology Program, 2017](#)). Since it was a toxicity study, we follow the convention to encode higher exposure levels into lower treatment values, i.e., $Z \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ represents the dosages $\{30, 10, 3, 0\}$ respectively. We consider the logarithmic transformed animal body weight after two years as the final outcome, which is truncated by death occurred before the end of the study. We consider four covariates in our analysis including the animal body weight in the first week, sex of rats or mice, species (i.e., rats or mice), and the interaction between sex and species. Similar to [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#), domain knowledge about toxicity studies and summary statistics of survival rates do not appear to conflict with the monotonicity assumption. We first estimate all possible SACE estimands under monotonicity and principal ignorability, but to focus ideas, only focus on the estimands defined for those who always survive irrespective of the treatment received, i.e., $\Delta_4(z, z')$, in the sensitivity analysis. This stratum is typically of most interest and as this always survivors stratum is also expected to be the largest stratum.

6.1 Main analysis under monotonicity and principal ignorability

We first estimate the marginal principal score e_g based on two approaches: (i) a simple nonparametric estimator $\hat{e}_g^{\text{NP}} = \hat{p}_{J-g+1} - \hat{p}_{J-g}$ with $\hat{p}_z = \mathbb{P}_n\{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)S\}/\pi_z$ and (ii) an augmented estimator $\hat{e}_g^{\text{AUG}} = \hat{p}_{J-g+1} - \hat{p}_{J-g}$ with $\hat{p}_z = \mathbb{P}_n\{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)\{S - \hat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})\}/\pi_z + \hat{p}_z(\mathbf{X})\}$. The estimated marginal principal scores and associated quantile-based 95% confidence intervals using 50,000 times non-parametric bootstrap are provided in [Table 3](#). Of note, the intervals based on augmented estimators are generally narrower than those based on simple proportions. Further, assuming principal ignorability, we obtain the point estimates and corresponding 95% Wald confidence intervals based on the proposed sandwich variance estimators using weighting, outcome regression, and doubly robust methods from a logistic principal score model and a linear conditional outcome mean model. The results are summarized in [Table 4](#). First, the principal score weighting estimator has a much wider

confidence interval than the other two estimators in general, which aligns with results in our simulation study. Thus, most intervals based on weighting alone fail to exclude the null, while the other two methods produce narrower intervals that exclude zero. Second, the point and interval estimates are close when using either the outcome regression or the doubly robust approach, suggesting that the conditional outcome mean model is likely adequately specified.

Table 3: Point estimates and associated quantile-based 95% confidence intervals using 50,000 times bootstrap for all marginal principal scores for the NTP data set based on augmented (‘AUG’) estimators or nonparametric (‘NP’) estimators.

	e_0	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_4
AUG	0.29 (0.22, 0.35)	0.07 (0.00, 0.16)	0.10 (0.01, 0.20)	0.20 (0.10, 0.29)	0.34 (0.28, 0.41)
NP	0.29 (0.18, 0.39)	0.07 (0.00, 0.23)	0.10 (0.00, 0.26)	0.20 (0.06, 0.32)	0.35 (0.27, 0.42)

Table 4: Point estimates and associated Wald 95% confidence intervals based on principal score weighting (‘PSW’), outcome regression (‘OR’), and doubly robust estimators (‘DR’) for estimating all possible SACEs on always survivors ($\Delta_4(z, z')$) for NTP data set.

g	z	z'		PSW		OR		DR
2	3	4	0.042	(-0.293, 0.377)	-0.100	(-0.174, -0.026)	-0.096	(-0.151, -0.041)
3	2	3	-0.039	(-0.255, 0.177)	-0.058	(-0.119, 0.003)	-0.056	(-0.109, -0.003)
		4	-0.142	(-0.393, 0.109)	-0.129	(-0.190, -0.068)	-0.130	(-0.183, -0.077)
	3	4	-0.103	(-0.334, 0.128)	-0.071	(-0.122, -0.020)	-0.074	(-0.117, -0.031)
4	1	2	-0.110	(-0.304, 0.084)	-0.127	(-0.178, -0.076)	-0.125	(-0.176, -0.074)
		3	-0.179	(-0.383, 0.025)	-0.187	(-0.236, -0.138)	-0.185	(-0.234, -0.136)
		4	-0.242	(-0.463, -0.021)	-0.268	(-0.315, -0.221)	-0.265	(-0.312, -0.218)
	2	3	-0.069	(-0.265, 0.127)	-0.059	(-0.102, -0.016)	-0.060	(-0.103, -0.017)
		4	-0.132	(-0.334, 0.070)	-0.140	(-0.181, -0.099)	-0.140	(-0.181, -0.099)
	3	4	-0.063	(-0.273, 0.147)	-0.081	(-0.118, -0.044)	-0.080	(-0.117, -0.043)

6.2 Sensitivity analysis for principal ignorability

We investigate the sensitivity of the results when principal ignorability is violated. For simplicity, we assume that $\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) = \delta_{zg}$ does not depend on \mathbf{X} . Recall that the estimation of $\mu_g(z)$ requires specification of the sensitivity parameters in each row of the following right matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} * & * & \mu_3(2) & \mu_4(2) \\ * & \mu_2(3) & \mu_3(3) & \mu_4(3) \\ \mu_1(4) & \mu_2(4) & \mu_3(4) & \mu_4(4) \end{pmatrix} \Leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} * & * & \delta_{23} \\ * & \delta_{32} & \delta_{33} \\ \delta_{41} & \delta_{42} & \delta_{43} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (11)$$

the estimation of $\mu_4(1)$ is unaffected due to the choice of the reference stratum. To focus ideas, we focus on assessing $\Delta_4(z, z')$ for the doubly robust estimator, and further assume that the sensitivity parameters are independent of the treatment assignment, i.e., $\delta_{41} = \delta_1$, $\delta_{32} = \delta_{42} = \delta_2$, and $\delta_{23} = \delta_{33} = \delta_{43} = \delta_3$; that is, elements in each column of the matrix in (11) equal. Under this simplification, the total sensitivity parameters become $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$. We consider 3 Scenarios; for Scenario $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we fix $\delta_k = 1$ and vary the other two sensitivity parameters between 0.5 and 2. For example, in Scenario 1, we set $\delta_1 = 1$ and vary δ_2 and δ_3 between 0.5 and 2. This corresponds to a setting where the expected potential body weights of the mice or rats in stratum $g = 1$ are the same as what would have been observed in stratum $g = 4$, whereas the expected potential body weights in strata $g = 2$ and $g = 3$ vary within a biologically plausible range between half and twice the body weights that would have been observed in stratum $g = 4$, adjusting for all measured covariates. Figure 1 presents the sensitivity results under Scenario 1 with $\delta_1 = 1$ and $\{\delta_2, \delta_3\} \in [0.5, 2]^{\otimes 2}$. Within the given ranges of δ_2 and δ_3 , the signs of the point estimates of $\Delta_4(1, 2)$, $\Delta_4(1, 3)$ and $\Delta_4(1, 4)$ are reversed only on a minor proportion of the sensitivity parameter space, suggesting that our SACE estimates are relatively robust to the violation of principal ignorability; this is especially so for $\Delta_4(2, 3)$, $\Delta_4(2, 4)$, $\Delta_4(1, 4)$. Similar patterns are observed in Supplementary Material Figures 2-3 under Scenarios 2 and 3, respectively.

6.3 Sensitivity analysis for monotonicity

We next assess the sensitivity of our conclusions under the departure from the monotonicity assumption. Without monotonicity, there may exist at most 11 additional principal strata and we define them with respect to the reference group $g = 0$ because \hat{e}_0 is estimated to be




Figure 1: The contour plots for the point estimates of SACEs within the stratum $g = 4$ in NTP study using the doubly robust estimator given equal conditional mean potential outcomes between the stratum $g = 1$ and the stratum $g = 4$, i.e., $\delta_1 = 1$, and the ratios of conditional mean potential outcome for the stratum $g = 2$ or $g = 3$ with respect to the stratum $g = 4$ varying from half to twice, i.e., $\delta_2, \delta_3 \in [0.50, 2.00]$.

the second largest principal stratum. To make the procedure operationalizable, we simplify by assuming that all 11 sensitivity parameters are equal, and denote them as ρ where $\rho \geq 0$ satisfies constraints $e_g \geq 0$ for $\forall g \in \mathcal{Q}$ based on \hat{e}_g^{AUG} in Table 3. For example, $\rho = 0$ implies that no harmed strata exist, while $\rho > 0$ implies the existence of all additional harmed principal strata by redistributing the members originally in strata $g = 0$ and $g = 4$. In addition, Equations (10) imply that the marginal principal scores for the unharmed strata, i.e., $g \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$, converge to $\{0, 0.11, 0.14, 0.24, 0.05\}$ when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. Figure 2 and Supplementary Material Figures 4–5 show the point estimates with 95% Wald confidence intervals based on the proposed sandwich variance estimators for all the contrasts within stratum $g = 4$ using the doubly robust estimator, principal score weighting estimator, and outcome regression estimator, respectively, under violation of monotonicity within the range $\rho \in [0, 10]$. First, the signs and the statistical significance remain unchanged when varying the sensitivity parameter, except for $\Delta_4(2, 3)$ under $\rho > 3$; this generally shows the robustness of the final estimates to the non-monotonicity with respect to harmed strata. Second, the interval estimates widen as the sensitivity parameter ρ increases; this is because the uncertainty increases with larger values of ρ . For instance, the interval estimate for the expected decrement in body weights of the mice or rats widens from $(-0.181, -0.099)$ to $(-0.350, -0.055)$ as the proportion of harmed strata increases, if the toxicity level increases from 0 to 10 mg/m^3 . Third, the doubly robust estimator and outcome regression estimator remain more efficient than weighting alone when monotonicity is violated, in alignment with findings under monotonicity. In Section 8 of the Supplementary Material, we also consider a more restricted scenario where a similar partial deviation from monotonicity only between adjacent strata may occur, i.e., only three additional harmed strata, $\{1011, 0101, 0010\}$, may exist. Results are reported in Supplementary Material Figures 6–8 and show that our methods remain robust to the partial violation between adjacent strata.

7 Discussion

In this article, we addressed the identification and estimation of SACEs in multi-arm randomized trials under truncation by death. We proposed the principal score weighting estimator and the outcome regression estimator based on simple moment conditions, and the doubly robust estimator based on the efficient influence function. The doubly robust




Figure 2: The point estimates and the associated 95% Wald confidence intervals for the doubly robust estimator for $\Delta_4(z, z')$ when the monotonicity is violated with sensitivity parameters $\rho \in [0, 10]$. ρ measures the magnitude of deviation from the monotonicity assumption. The blue dotted line indicates the null effect.

estimator is consistent if either the principal score model or the outcome mean model is correctly specified, and is locally efficient under correct specifications of both models. We also proposed the sandwich variance estimators for each estimator when the nuisance models are estimated by parametric regression. As the proposed estimators depend on the principal ignorability and monotonicity assumptions, we further articulated a sensitivity function approach to address violation of each assumption, and operationalized our methods in a four-arm toxicity study.

In the context of multi-arm trials, our method can be considered as a strong alternative to an existing approach by [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#). First, when principal ignorability holds, our doubly robust approach is more robust to working model misspecification, and in comparable scenarios, the estimator by [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) was inconsistent if either the principal score or the outcome model is misspecified. Through simulations, we find that our doubly robust estimator is at least as efficient as their estimator in most cases when the specifications of two models are both correct. Second, we provided a computationally efficient sandwich variance estimator that may be more scalable to larger data sets compared to their computationally intensive bootstrap variance calculation. Third, our sensitivity analysis is more complete compared to [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) by at least allowing for more general departure from the monotonicity assumption. In simulation studies under violation of principal ignorability, we also demonstrate that our bias-corrected estimator for SACEs have comparable bias to the [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) estimator, but can significantly improve the efficiency.

There are several directions for future research. First, our methods can be expanded to accommodate multi-treatment observational studies with ignorable treatment assignment ([Li and Li, 2019](#)). In that case, one would need to additionally estimate the generalized propensity score for the unknown treatment assignment mechanism and arrive at a multiply robust estimator for SACEs. Second, more flexible modeling strategies, such as data-adaptive machine learning methods, may have an advantage for estimating the principal score and conditional outcome functions, especially if baseline covariates are high-dimensional or include several continuous components. Because flexible modeling strategies often converge to the true model at a rate slower than \sqrt{n} , they are best combined with our doubly robust estimators to arrive at a double machine learning estimator; see, for example, the developments in [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018\)](#) for general theory, and [Jiang et al.](#)

(2022) and Cheng and Li (2023) for machine-learning based principal stratification with a binary treatment. It would be useful to explore this development in the multiple treatments setting in future work.

Supporting Information

Web Appendices, Figures, and Tables referenced in Sections 3-6 are available with this article at the *Biometrics* website on Oxford Academic. The dataset analyzed in Section 6 of this article can be accessed at <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/publications/reports/tr/500s/tr590>. Additionally, sample R code for implementing the proposed methods is available at <https://github.com/deckardt98/MultiarmSACE/tree/main>.

Acknowledgements

Research in this article was supported by the United States National Institutes of Health (NIH), National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI, grant number R01-HL168202). All statements in this report, including its findings and conclusions, are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the NIH. The authors thank Dr. Laura Forastiere for helpful comments and discussions based on earlier versions of this article.

Data Availability Statement

The data set analyzed in Section 6 of this article is publicly available at <https://cebs.niehs.nih.gov/cebs/publication/TR-590>.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

8 Summary

This supplementary material is organized as follows. Section 9 formally states the balancing properties of principal scores. Section 10 provides the proof of the main results

under monotonicity and principal ignorability. Sections 11 and 12 prove the results when principal ignorability and monotonicity are violated, respectively. Section 13 shows the connections and differences between our methods and the methods in Luo et al. (2023), and provides details on implementation of their methods in our simulation study. Section 14 contains an additional simulation studies under departure from principal ignorability assumption. Section 15 includes an additional sensitivity study for the partial deviation from monotonicity between adjacent strata. We attach Supplementary Material tables and figures in Section 16.

9 Balancing properties of principal scores

The below proposition characterizes a class of balancing properties motivated by the identification formulas in the main manuscript.

Proposition 1. *Under randomization but without Assumptions 1–2, for $\forall z \in \mathcal{J}$ and arbitrary vector-valued random functions of covariates, $h(\mathbf{X})$, we have that*

$$E \{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})|Z = z, S = 1\} = E \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)S/\pi_{J-g+1} - \mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)S/\pi_{J-g}}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} h(\mathbf{X}) \right\} = E \left\{ \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} h(\mathbf{X}) \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if Assumption 1 holds, they also equal to

$$E \{h(\mathbf{X})|G = g\},$$

provided $E \{h(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} < \infty$.

The proof is given in Section 10. Proposition 1 is a direct generalization of balancing properties in Jiang et al. (2022) (see Supplementary Material S1) to multiple treatments and it is parallel to the classic covariates balancing property of propensity score in Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983). Proposition 1 says that the principal-score-weighted functions of covariates are balanced in expectation across each treatment arm even without monotonicity and PI, and this weighted expectation can be further characterized by its conditional mean within the stratum g if monotonicity holds.

10 Proof of the main results under monotonicity and principal ignorability

10.1 Proof of the identification formulas for principal scores

According to Table 6, the observed stratum $S = 1|Z = z$ is a mixture of latent strata $G = J - z + 1, \dots, J$, which shows that the event $S = 1|Z = z$ is a union of events $\bigcup_{g=J-z+1, \dots, J} G = g|Z = z$. As a result,

$$p_z(\mathbf{X}) = \Pr(S = 1|Z = z, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{g=J-z+1}^J \Pr(G = g|Z = z, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{g=J-z+1}^J \Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X}), \quad (12)$$

where the last equality is due to randomization. Noting that the system of Equations in (12) is linear, solving (12) by Gaussian eliminations yields the characterizations of principal scores with respect to estimable quantity $p_z(\mathbf{X})$ in Equation (2) in the main manuscript.

10.2 Proof of the identification formulas for $\mu_g(z)$ using principal score weighting and outcome regression

Our proof relies on the following 4 lemmas.

Lemma 1 (Importance Sampling). *Assume $X \sim f_X$ and $Y \sim f_Y$ are random variables (possibly random vectors) with $P_X \ll P_Y$. Then for arbitrary scalar function h such that $E\{h(X)\} < \infty$,*

$$E\{h(X)\} = E\left\{\frac{f_X(Y)}{f_Y(Y)}h(Y)\right\}.$$

Proof. We assume the underlying probability measures for X, Y are both dominated by the Lebesgue measure P . Then

$$E\{h(X)\} = \int h(x)f_X(x)dP = \int h(y)\frac{f_X(y)}{f_Y(y)}f_Y(y)dP = E\left\{\frac{f_X(Y)}{f_Y(Y)}h(Y)\right\},$$

where $f_X(y)/f_Y(y)$ is well-defined on the support of X because $P_X \ll P_Y$. □

Lemma 2. *For $g \in \{0, \dots, J\}$ and arbitrary vector-valued function h ,*

$$E\{h(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} = E\left\{\frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{e_g}h(\mathbf{X})\right\} = E\left\{\frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}}h(\mathbf{X})\right\}.$$

Proof. By Bayes' theorem, we have that

$$f_{\mathbf{X}|G=g} = \frac{\Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X})f_{\mathbf{X}}}{\Pr(G = g)} = \frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{e_g} f_{\mathbf{X}},$$

where $f_{\mathbf{X}|G=g}$ is the conditional density of covariates given stratum $G = g$ and $f_{\mathbf{X}}$ is the marginal density of covariates. Applying Lemma 1 and Equation (2) in the main manuscript completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3. For $\forall z \in \mathcal{J}$ and arbitrary vector-valued function h ,

$$E\{p_z(\mathbf{X}) \times h(\mathbf{X})\} = E\left\{\frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{\pi_z} \times h(\mathbf{X})\right\}.$$

Proof. By the law of total expectation (LOTE) and randomization,

$$E\left\{\frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{\pi_z} \times h(\mathbf{X})\right\} = E\{\Pr(S = 1, Z = z|\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})/\pi_z\} = E\{p_z(\mathbf{X}) \times h(\mathbf{X})\}.$$

\square

Lemma 4. For arbitrary vector-valued function h ,

$$E\{h(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} = E\left\{\left(\frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)}{\pi_{J-g+1}} - \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)}{\pi_{J-g}}\right) \frac{h(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}}\right\}.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2 and Lemma 3. \square

For $z \in \mathcal{J}$, we define $U_z = \{J - z + 1, \dots, J\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g(z) &= E\{Y(z)|G = g\} = E\{E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}|G = g\} \quad (\text{by LOTE}) \\ &= E\{E\{Y(z)|G \in U_z, \mathbf{X}\}|G = g\} \quad (\text{by principal ignorability}) \\ &= E\{E\{Y|Z = z, G \in U_z, \mathbf{X}\}|G = g\} \quad (\text{by randomization and SUTVA}) \\ &= E\{m_z(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} \quad (\text{Table 6}) \\ &= E\left\{\frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} m_z(\mathbf{X})\right\} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Then, we apply Lemma 4 to the previous equation leading to identification formula (4) in main manuscript. Next, we show the identification formulas using the principal score weighting. By LOTE, we induce that

$$\begin{aligned} E\{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)Y|\mathbf{X}\} &= E\{E\{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)Y|S\mathbf{1}(Z = z), \mathbf{X}\}|\mathbf{X}\} \\ &= E\{\Pr(S = 1, Z = z|\mathbf{X})E\{Y|Z = z, S = 1, \mathbf{X}\}|\mathbf{X}\} \\ &= p_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z m_z(\mathbf{X}). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

By LOTE and randomization, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
E\{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})Y|Z = z, S = 1\} &= E\left\{\frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z} Y\right\} \\
&= E\left\{E\left\{\frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z} Y|\mathbf{X}\right\}\right\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} \frac{E\{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)Y|\mathbf{X}\}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z}\right\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} m_z(\mathbf{X})\right\} \quad (\text{by Equation (14)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

This concludes the identification formula for the principal score weighting approach.

10.3 Proof of Proposition 1

It follows from the proof of identification formulas given in Section 10.2 by replacing Y with $h(\mathbf{X})$ provided $E\{h(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} < \infty$.

10.4 Proof of Theorem 1

Our proof is based on Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 in [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#). According to the identification formulas, we can derive the efficient influence function (EIF) based on the joint density of observed data vector \mathbf{V} . We derive EIF in the non-parametric sense, i.e., we impose no restrictions on the joint density of observed vector \mathbf{V} . Denote $f(\mathbf{V})$ as the joint density function of \mathbf{V} . Consider the following factorization

$$f(\mathbf{V}) = f(\mathbf{X})f(Z|\mathbf{X})f(S|Z, \mathbf{X})f(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X}).$$

By Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5 in [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#), the tangent space \mathcal{F} is the entire Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , i.e., the collection of all 1 dimensional random functions of \mathbf{V} with mean zero and finite variance, and furthermore,

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \oplus \mathcal{F}_2 \oplus \mathcal{F}_3 \oplus \mathcal{F}_4,$$

where $\{\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_3, \mathcal{F}_4\}$ are mutually orthogonal with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_1 &= \{h(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{H} : E\{h(\mathbf{X})\} = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_2 &= \{h(Z, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{H} : E\{h(Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_3 &= \{h(S, Z, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{H} : E\{h(S, Z, \mathbf{X})|Z, \mathbf{X}\} = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_4 &= \{h(\mathbf{V}) \in \mathcal{H} : E\{h(\mathbf{V})|S, Z, \mathbf{X}\} = 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Consider an arbitrary parametric sub-model with Euclidean parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and the density $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{V})$. Assume $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{V})$ attains the truth at $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and we write $f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = f$ and $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = E$ for ease of notation. Consider the following orthogonal decomposition of the score vector

$$S(\mathbf{V}) = S(\mathbf{X}) + S(Z|\mathbf{X}) + S(S|Z, \mathbf{X}) + S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}S(\mathbf{V}) &= \partial \log f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{V}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} |_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}, \quad S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X}) = \partial \log f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} |_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}, \\ S(Z|\mathbf{X}) &= \partial \log f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(Z|\mathbf{X}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} |_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}, \quad S(\mathbf{X}) = \partial \log f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} |_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}.\end{aligned}$$

We define $\beta(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \mu_g^{(\boldsymbol{\theta})}(z)$ as the value of $\mu_g(z)$ in the sub-model and the truth $\mu_g(z) = \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \beta$. By Theorem 3.2 in [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#), the influence function $\Psi_{z_g}(\mathbf{V}) \in \mathcal{H}$ for the sub-model can be characterized by

$$E\{\Psi_{z_g}(\mathbf{V})S(\mathbf{V})\} = \frac{\partial \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} |_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}. \quad (16)$$

Hereafter, we shall use $\dot{\beta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ to denote $\frac{\partial \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ and apply it to all pathwise partial derivatives with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. [Kennedy \(2023\)](#) showed that there is at most one solution to the differential equation (16) under \mathcal{M}_{np} . By Theorem 4.3 in [Tsiatis \(2006\)](#), the EIF is indeed $\Psi_{z_g}(\mathbf{V})$ because the tangent space is the entire Hilbert space. As a result, EIF is given by the solution to Equation (16). By Equation (15), $\beta = N \times D^{-1}$ with

$$N = E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X})\}, \quad D = p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}.$$

Let $\Psi_N(\mathbf{V})$ and $\Psi_D(\mathbf{V})$ be the influence function of N and D , respectively. By [Kennedy \(2023\)](#) or Lemma S2 in the Supplementary Material of [Jiang et al. \(2022\)](#), if both $\Psi_N(\mathbf{V})$ and $\Psi_D(\mathbf{V})$ are known, the influence function of $\mu_g(z)$ can be explicitly given by

$$\Psi_{z_g}(\mathbf{V}) = \frac{1}{D}\Psi_N(\mathbf{V}) - \frac{N}{D^2}\Psi_D(\mathbf{V}),$$

where $E\{\Psi_N(\mathbf{V})S(\mathbf{V})\} = \dot{N}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ and $E\{\Psi_D(\mathbf{V})S(\mathbf{V})\} = \dot{D}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$. This is called the **quotient rule** for influence function operator (similar to the quotient rule for calculus). Therefore, $\Psi_{zg}(\mathbf{V})$ is obtained once we know $\Psi_N(\mathbf{V})$ and $\Psi_D(\mathbf{V})$. Below, we present three lemmas to facilitate our proof.

Lemma 5. *Suppose $F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})$ is any integrable random function of (Y, S, \mathbf{X}) . Define $\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X}) = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}[F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})|Z = z, \mathbf{X}]$. Then, we have that*

$$\dot{\mu}_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = E\{(\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}))S(Y, S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\},$$

where $\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}) = \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\mathbf{X})$.

Proof. We define $S(Y, S|Z = z, \mathbf{X}) = \partial \log f_{Y,S|Z=z,\mathbf{X},\boldsymbol{\theta}} / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ as the score vector with respect to conditional density $f_{Y,S|Z=z,\mathbf{X}}$ evaluated at the truth, and hereafter, we will use similar notations with respect to other conditional densities. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mu}_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} &= E\{F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})S(Y, S|Z = z, \mathbf{X})|Z = z, \mathbf{X}\} \\ &= E\{F(Y, S, \mathbf{X}) - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X})S(Y, S|Z = z, \mathbf{X})|Z = z, \mathbf{X}\} \\ &= E\left\{\frac{\mathbf{1}(Z = z)\{F(Y, S, \mathbf{X}) - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X})\}}{\Pr(Z = z|\mathbf{X})}S(Y, S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\right\} \\ &= E\{(\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}))S(Y, S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds because the score function has mean zero, the third equality follows from the LOTE, and the last equality follows from the definition of $\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z}$. \square

Lemma 6. *Suppose $F(Y, S, \mathbf{X})$ is any integrable random function in (Y, S, \mathbf{X}) . Define $\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\{\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})\}$. Then*

$$\dot{\mu}_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = E\{(\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{V}))S(\mathbf{V})\},$$

where $\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})} = \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ and $\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})} \in \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. Note

$$\begin{aligned} E\{(\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}))S(Z, \mathbf{X})\} &= E\{(E\{\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z}|Z, \mathbf{X}\} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}))S(Z, \mathbf{X})\} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the first equality follows by LOTE and the second equality follows by the definition of $\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z}$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{m}_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= E\{\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X})S(\mathbf{V})\} + E\{\dot{\mu}_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0}\} \\ &= E\{\mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X})S(\mathbf{V})\} + E\{(\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}))S(Y,S|Z,\mathbf{X})\} \\ &= E\{\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z}S(\mathbf{V})\} \quad (\text{Equation (17)}) \\ &= E\{(\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})})S(\mathbf{V})\},\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by the chain rule, the second equality follows by Lemma 5, the third equality follows by Equation (17), the last equality holds because $E\{S(\mathbf{V})\} = 0$. Moreover, $E\{\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z}\} = \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})}$ implies that $\psi_{F(Y,S,\mathbf{X}),z} - \mu_{z,F(Y,S,\mathbf{X})} \in \mathcal{H}$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 7.

$$\dot{m}_{z,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\left\{\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}S(Y,S,Z,\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\right\}$$

Proof. Note $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ can be written as a ratio:

$$m_z(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{E\{YS|Z=z,\mathbf{X}\}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} \equiv \frac{N'}{D'}.$$

By Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{N}'_{\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= E\{(\psi_{YS,z} - D'm_z(\mathbf{X}))S(Y,S|Z,\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}, \\ \dot{p}_{z,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= E\{(\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X}))S(Y,S|Z,\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the quotient rule of influence function implies that

$$\dot{m}_{z,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\left\{\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}S(Y,S|Z,\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\right\}.$$

We then conclude the proof by observing

$$E\{(\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X}))\psi_{S,z}S(S|Z,\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} = E\{E\{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}|S,Z,\mathbf{X}\}S(S|Z,\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} = 0.$$

\square

We now begin the proof of EIF. Specifically, Lemma 6 implies that

$$\dot{p}_{J-g,\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{(\psi_{S,J-g} - p_{J-g})S(\mathbf{V})\}, \quad \dot{p}_{J-g+1,\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{(\psi_{S,J-g+1} - p_{J-g+1})S(\mathbf{V})\},$$

which concludes

$$\Psi_D(\mathbf{V}) = (\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g}) - D.$$

By the chain rule, we further obtain

$$\dot{N}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X})S(\mathbf{X})\} \quad (18)$$

$$+ E\{(\dot{p}_{J-g+1,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} - \dot{p}_{J-g,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0})m_z(\mathbf{X})\} \quad (19)$$

$$+ E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\dot{m}_{z,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}\}. \quad (20)$$

Because $E\{NS(\mathbf{X})\} = 0$, we conclude that

$$(18) = E\{[(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N]S(\mathbf{X})\}.$$

In addition, by Lemma 5 and observing that $E\{(\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X}))S(Y|Z, S, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} = 0$, we can show that

$$\dot{p}_{z,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X})|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = E\{(\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X}))S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}. \quad (21)$$

This further indicates that

$$(19) = E\{[\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g} - (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))]m_z(\mathbf{X})S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})\}.$$

Moreover, Lemma 7 suggests that

$$(20) = E\left\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X})\right\}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N &\in \mathcal{F}_1, \\ [\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g} - (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))]m_z(\mathbf{X}) &\in \mathcal{F}_3, \\ (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} &\in \mathcal{F}_4. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\{\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_4\}$ are mutually orthogonal, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{N}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} = E\left\{ \left\{ (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N + [\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g} - (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))]m_z(\mathbf{X}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} \right\} S(\mathbf{V}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the EIF of N is

$$\Psi_N(\mathbf{V}) = \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}\psi_{YS,z} - N + m_z(\mathbf{X}) \left\{ \psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g} - \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}\psi_{S,z} \right\}.$$

This, together with the quotient rule of influence function, concludes the expression of the EIF shown in Theorem 1.

10.5 Proof of Theorem 2

We first show the double robustness property of $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$. Consider the ratio representation

$$\mu_g(z) = \frac{E\{Y(z)\mathbf{1}(G = g)\}}{E\{S(J - g + 1) - S(J - g)\}}.$$

Following the standard arguments on doubly robust estimation of average treatment effect (see, for example, [Bang and Robins \(2005\)](#)), one can show that the denominator of $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$, $\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g}\}$, is always consistent to $p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g} = E\{S(J - g + 1) - S(J - g)\}$ because the propensity score π_z is known and free of misspecification in randomized control trials. Next, we show consistency of the numerator of $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$, $\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\xi}_{zg}(\mathbf{V})\}$, with $\widehat{\xi}_{zg}(\mathbf{V})$ defined as

$$\widehat{\xi}_{zg}(\mathbf{V}) = (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g})) \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)\pi_z} (Y - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)) + m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z) (\widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g}),$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\xi}_{zg}(\mathbf{V})\}$ converges in probability to

$$E\left\{ (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g})) \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)\pi_z} (Y - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)) + m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z) (\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g}) \right\}.$$

By LOTE, we have that

$$E\left\{ (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g})) \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)\pi_z} (Y - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)) \right\} = E\left\{ (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g})) \frac{p_z(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)} (m_z(\mathbf{X}) - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)) \right\}, \quad (22)$$

$$E\{m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)\psi_{S,J-g+1}\} = E\{m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X})\}, \quad (23)$$

$$E\{m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)\psi_{S,J-g}\} = E\{m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})\}, \quad (24)$$

$$E\{Y(z)\mathbf{1}(G = g)\} = \mu_g(z) \Pr(G = g) = E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X})\}, \quad (25)$$

where Equation (25) follows from Equation (13). Since $p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)$ are uniformly bounded away from 0 and 1, we conclude from that (22) + (23) + (24) = (25) if either the principal score or the outcome regression is correctly specified. This conclude that $\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\xi}_{zg}(\mathbf{V})\}$ converges to $E\{Y(z)\mathbf{1}(G = g)\}$. Combining the above discussions, we obtain that

$$\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\xi}_{zg}(\mathbf{V})\}}{\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g+1} - \widehat{\psi}_{S,J-g}\}} = \frac{E\{Y(z)\mathbf{1}(G = g)\}}{E\{S(J - g + 1) - S(J - g)\}} + o_p(1) = \mu_g(z) + o_p(1)$$

if either the principal score or the outcome regression is correctly specified. This concludes the double robustness property.

Lemma 8. Define $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z^\top, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z^\top)^\top$, which contains all nuisance parameters in the principal score models and outcome models to construct $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$. Also let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g+1}^\top, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{J-g}^\top, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z^\top, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z^\top)$ be the true value of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$. Assume that expectation and derivative are exchangeable. If the principal score and the outcome regression are both correctly specified, then

$$E \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top} \right\} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. It follows from Equations (22)-(24). \square

Consider a M-estimator $\widehat{\mu}_g(z)'$ defined by the below estimating equation

$$\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g(z)', \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \} = 0, \quad (26)$$

where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$ is the convergent value of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$. Recall that we use MLE or GEE to obtain $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$, which implies that $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}})$ is a tight sequence, i.e., $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) = O_p(1)$. By construction, our doubly robust estimator $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ is defined by the estimating equation

$$\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \} = 0, \quad (27)$$

where the only difference between (26) and (27) is that the truth and the plug-in estimator of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ are used respectively. Applying the first-order Taylor's theorem to (27) with respect to $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$ gives

$$\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \} = \mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \} + \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}')}{\partial \boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top} \right\} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}), \quad (28)$$

where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}'$ lies between $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$. Similarly, applying the first-order Taylor's theorem to $\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \}$ with respect to $\widehat{\mu}_g(z)'$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \} = \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g(z)', \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}})}{\partial (\mu_g(z))} \right\} (\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z) - \widehat{\mu}_g(z)'), \quad (29)$$

where $\widehat{\mu}_g(z)^*$ lies between $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ and $\widehat{\mu}_g(z)'$ and $\mathbb{P}_n \{ \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g(z)', \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}) \} = 0$ by construction. Combining (28) and (29) gives

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z) - \widehat{\mu}_g(z)') = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}')}{\partial \boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top} \right\} \times \sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}})}{-\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \widehat{\mu}_g(z)', \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}})}{\partial (\mu_g(z))} \right\}}.$$

Notice that $\frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \hat{\mu}_g(z)^*, \tilde{\zeta})}{\partial (\mu_g(z))} = -(\psi_{S, J-g+1} - \psi_{S, J-g})$, $-\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \hat{\mu}_g(z)^*, \tilde{\zeta})}{\partial (\mu_g(z))} \right\} = e_g + o_p(1)$. Then, based on Lemma 8 and consistency of $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ and $\hat{\zeta}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \xi_{zg}(\mathbf{V}; \hat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z), \hat{\zeta}')}{\partial \zeta^\top} \right\} = o_p(1).$$

Eventually, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z) - \hat{\mu}_g(z)') = o_p(1)O_p(1) = o_p(1)$, which further implies that the influence functions of $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{DR}}(z)$ and $\hat{\mu}_g(z)'$ are identical. By Equation (3.6) in Tsiatis (2006), the influence function of M-estimator $\hat{\mu}_g(z)'$ is $\Psi_{zg}(\mathbf{V})$, which completes the proof.

10.6 Characterizations of the robust sandwich variance estimators

In this section, we present the remaining robust sandwich variance estimators. We write out the forms of joint estimating equations and the remaining procedures are the same as the one given in the main manuscript.

10.6.1 Principal score weighting estimator

Define $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{PSW}} = (\mu_g(z), \mu_g(z'), \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'}^\top, p_{J-g+1}, p_{J-g})^\top$. Then, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{PSW}}$ can be seen as the solution of the following the joint estimating equations $\mathbb{P}_n \{ \Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{PSW}}) \} = \mathbf{0}$ with

$$\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{PSW}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g})}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z)} \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z=z)S}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} Y_i - \pi_z \mu_g(z) \\ \frac{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g})}{p_{z'}(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'})} \frac{\mathbf{1}(Z=z')S}{p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}} Y_i - \pi_z \mu_g(z') \\ \kappa_{J-g+1}(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g+1}) \\ \kappa_{J-g}(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{J-g}) \\ \kappa_z(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_z) \\ \kappa_{z'}(S, Z, \mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{z'}) \\ S\mathbf{1}(Z = J-g+1)/\pi_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g+1} \\ S\mathbf{1}(Z = J-g)/\pi_{J-g} - p_{J-g} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

Remove the third row in $\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{PSW}})$ when $J-g+1 = z$ or z' , and remove the fourth and last row when $g = J$.

10.6.2 Outcome regression estimator

Define $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{OR}} = (\mu_g(z), \mu_g(z'), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z^\top, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}^\top, p_{J-g+1}, p_{J-g})^\top$. Then $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{OR}}$ can be viewed as the solution of the following joint estimating equations $\mathbb{P}_n\{\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{OR}})\} = \mathbf{0}$ with

$$\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{OR}}) = \begin{pmatrix} \left\{ \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)}{\pi_{J-g+1}} - \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)}{\pi_{J-g}} \right\} m_z(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z) - (p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g})\mu_g(z) \\ \left\{ \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)}{\pi_{J-g+1}} - \frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)}{\pi_{J-g}} \right\} m_{z'}(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}) - (p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g})\mu_g(z') \\ \tau_z(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_z) \\ \tau_{z'}(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{z'}) \\ S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g + 1)/\pi_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g+1} \\ S\mathbf{1}(Z = J - g)/\pi_{J-g} - p_{J-g} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

Remove the last row in $\Phi(\mathbf{V}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\text{OR}})$ when $g = J$.

11 Proof of the results without principal ignorability

11.1 Proof of the identification formulas

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} m_z(\mathbf{X}) &= \sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} E\{Y|Z = z, S = 1, G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\} \Pr(G = \tilde{g}|Z = z, S = 1, \mathbf{X}) \quad (\text{LOTE}) \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} E\{Y(z)|G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\} \Pr(G = \tilde{g}|Z = z, S = 1, \mathbf{X}) \quad (\text{SUTVA and monotonicity}) \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} E\{Y(z)|G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\} \frac{\Pr(G = \tilde{g}, Z = z|\mathbf{X})}{\Pr(Z = z, S = 1|\mathbf{X})} \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} E\{Y(z)|G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\} \frac{\Pr(G = \tilde{g}|\mathbf{X})}{\Pr(S(z) = 1|\mathbf{X})} \quad (\text{SUTVA and randomization}) \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} E\{Y(z)|G = \tilde{g}, \mathbf{X}\} \frac{e_{\tilde{g}}(\mathbf{X})}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} e_{g'}(\mathbf{X})} \quad (\text{LOTE and monotonicity}) \\ &= \{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})\}^{-1} E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mu_g(z) = E\{E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}|G = g\} = E\{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})|G = g\}$. We conclude from the proof in Section 10.2.

11.2 Derivation of the EIF

We inherit all the preliminaries in the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 10.4. We first show the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *We have that*

$$\dot{\Omega}_{zg,\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{\eta_{zg}(\mathbf{V})S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\},$$

where

$$\eta_{zg}(\mathbf{V}) = \frac{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} - \frac{\Omega_{zg}^2(\mathbf{X}) \sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} \delta_{z\tilde{g}}(\mathbf{X})(\psi_{S,J-\tilde{g}+1} - \psi_{S,J-\tilde{g}})}{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})}.$$

Proof. Define $N = \delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})$ and $D = N/\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})$. By Equation (21), we conclude that

$$\dot{N}_{\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\left\{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})(\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X}))S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\right\}.$$

Similarly, one can show

$$\dot{D}_{\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\left\{\left[\sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} \delta_{z\tilde{g}}(\mathbf{X})\{(\psi_{S,J-\tilde{g}+1} - \psi_{S,J-\tilde{g}}) - (p_{J-\tilde{g}+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-\tilde{g}}(\mathbf{X}))\}\right] S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\right\}.$$

We then conclude $\dot{\Omega}_{zg,\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{\eta_{zg}(\mathbf{V})S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}$ based on the quotient rule of influence function. \square

By the identification formula without principal ignorability, we have $\mu_g(z) = N^{\text{PI}}/D^{\text{PI}}$, where $N^{\text{PI}} = E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})\}$ and $D^{\text{PI}} = p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g}$. For the denominator D^{PI} , we have already showed that

$$\Psi_D^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V}) = \Psi_D(\mathbf{V}) = (\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g}) - D^{\text{PI}},$$

because $D = D^{\text{PI}}$. It is left to derive the EIF of the numerator N^{PI} , denoted by $\Psi_N^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V})$.

By the chain rule,

$$\dot{N}_{\theta}^{\text{PI}}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})S(\mathbf{X})\} \quad (32)$$

$$+ E\{(\dot{p}_{J-g+1,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} - \dot{p}_{J-g,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0})\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})\} \quad (33)$$

$$+ E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\dot{\Omega}_{zg,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0}m_z(\mathbf{X})\} \quad (34)$$

$$+ E\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})\dot{m}_{z,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0}\}. \quad (35)$$

Because $E\{NS(\mathbf{X})\} = 0$, (32) can be mean-centered as

$$E\{[(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N]S(\mathbf{X})\}.$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, (33) and (35) can be written as

$$E\{(\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g} - p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) + p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})\},$$

$$E\left\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X})\right\},$$

respectively. By Lemma 9, (34) reduces to

$$E\{\eta_{zg}(\mathbf{V})(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X})S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})\}.$$

Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that

$$(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N \in \mathcal{F}_1,$$

$$(\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g} - p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) + p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{F}_3,$$

$$\eta_{zg}(\mathbf{V})(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{F}_3,$$

$$(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathcal{F}_4,$$

which implies that

$$\Psi_N^{\text{PI}}(\mathbf{V}) = (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))\frac{\psi_{YS,z}\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} - N + (\psi_{S,J-g+1} - \psi_{S,J-g})\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})$$

$$- (p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X})\Omega_{zg}^2(\mathbf{X})\frac{\sum_{\tilde{g} \geq J+1-z} \delta_{z\tilde{g}}(\mathbf{X})(\psi_{S,J-\tilde{g}+1} - \psi_{S,J-\tilde{g}})}{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})}.$$

We then conclude the proof by the quotient rule of influence function.

11.3 Proof of the robustness and efficiency properties

We first show that $\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-PI}}(z)$ is singly robust, i.e., it is consistent when the principal score model is correctly specified. The proof in Section 11.1 implies

$$\mu_g(z) = \frac{E\{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})\mathbf{1}(G = g)\}}{\Pr(G = g)} = \frac{E\{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})e_g(\mathbf{X})\}}{e_g},$$

where the last equality is due to the LOTE. It is clear that $\mathbb{P}_n\{\hat{\psi}_{J-g+1} - \hat{\psi}_{J-g}\}$ converges in probability to e_g as shown in Section 10.5. It is left to show that $\mathbb{P}_n\{\hat{\Xi}^{\text{PI}}\}$ converges in

probability to $E\{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})e_g(\mathbf{X})\}$. By construction, $\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\Xi}^{\text{PI}}\}$ converges in probability to

$$E\left\{\frac{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g}))}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g'+1}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g'})\}} \times \right. \\ \left. \left\{m_z(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X}) - \frac{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_z)m_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\gamma}_z) \sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X})\}}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g'+1}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g'})\}} \right\} + \right. \\ \left. \frac{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_z)m_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\gamma}_z)(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g'+1}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\alpha}_{J-g'})\}} \right\}.$$

If the principal score model is correctly specified so that $p_z(\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\alpha}_z) = p_z(\mathbf{X})$, this can be simplified to

$$E\left\{\frac{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X})\}} \{m_z(\mathbf{X}) - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\gamma}_z)\} + \right. \\ \left. \frac{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}; \tilde{\gamma}_z)(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X})\}} \right\} \\ = E\left\{\frac{\delta_{zg}(\mathbf{X})p_z(\mathbf{X})(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}))m_z(\mathbf{X})}{\sum_{g' \geq J+1-z} \delta_{zg'}(\mathbf{X})\{p_{J-g'+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g'}(\mathbf{X})\}} \right\} \\ = E\{\Omega_{zg}(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})e_g(\mathbf{X})\}.$$

This concludes that $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-PI}}(z)$ converges to $\mu_g(z)$ if the principal score model is correctly specified, regardless of whether the outcome model is correctly specified or not. The proof of the semiparametric efficiency in Theorem 2 applies as long as Lemma 8 holds with $\xi_{zg}^{\text{PI}} = \Psi_{zg}^{\text{PI}}(p_{J-g+1} - p_{J-g})$. One can check the validity of Lemma 8 similarly. Then $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-PI}}(z)$ achieves the semiparametric variance lower bound when both models are correctly specified.

12 Proof of the results without monotonicity

12.1 Identification formulas for the principal score without monotonicity when $r > 0$

The observed stratum $S = 1|Z = z$ is a mixture of \mathcal{G}_{z1} , which indicates

$$\begin{aligned} p_z(\mathbf{X}) &= \sum_{g=J-z+1}^J \Pr(G = g|Z = z, \mathbf{X}) + \sum_{\bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}_{z1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \Pr(G = \bar{g}|Z = z, \mathbf{X}) \\ &= \sum_{g=J-z+1, g \neq r}^J \Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X}) + \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}_{z1} \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \rho_{\bar{g}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\} \Pr(G = r|\mathbf{X}) \quad (\text{Randomization}). \end{aligned}$$

By Gaussian elimination, one can easily solve the above system of equations (for $z \in \mathcal{J}$) to obtain the identification formulas for the principal score in (10) of the main manuscript.

12.2 Identification formulas for the principal score without monotonicity when $r = 0$

We provide an additional set of identification formulas for the principal score if the monotonicity is violated and $r = 0$ is chosen as the reference group (Section 4.2 in the main manuscript):

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{p_{J+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_J(\mathbf{X})}{q_{J+1}(\mathbf{X})}, \\ e_g(\mathbf{X}) &= p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}) - \frac{q_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - q_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})}{q_{J+1}(\mathbf{X})} \{p_{J+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_J(\mathbf{X})\}, \quad g \in \mathcal{J}, \\ e_g(\mathbf{X}) &= \frac{\rho_g(\mathbf{X})}{q_{J+1}(\mathbf{X})} \{p_{J+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_J(\mathbf{X})\}, \quad g \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{Q}. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

12.3 Proof of the identification formulas

We prove the identification formulas using principal score weighting and outcome regression under violation of monotonicity. For all $g \in \mathcal{G}_{z1}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\} &= E\{Y(z)|G \in \mathcal{G}_{z1}, \mathbf{X}\} \quad (\text{by Assumption 3}) \\ &= E\{Y(z)|S = 1, Z = z, \mathbf{X}\} = m_z(\mathbf{X}) \quad (\text{by randomization}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
E\{Y(z)|G = g\} &= E\{E\{Y(z)|G = g, \mathbf{X}\}|G = g\} \quad (\text{due to LOTE}) \\
&= E\{m_z(\mathbf{X})|G = g\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{e_g}m_z(\mathbf{X})\right\} \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}). \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

The identification formula using outcome regression follows from Lemma 3 and Equation (37). By LOTE, we further have

$$\begin{aligned}
E\{w_{zg}(\mathbf{X})Y|S = 1, Z = z\} &= E\left\{\frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{e_g}\frac{S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z}Y\right\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{e_g}\frac{m_z(\mathbf{X})\Pr(S = 1, Z = z|\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X})\pi_z}\right\} \\
&= E\left\{\frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{e_g}m_z(\mathbf{X})\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the identification formula using the principal score weighting.

12.4 Derivation of the EIF

We inherit all the preliminaries in the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 10.4. By Equation (37),

$$\mu_g(z) = \frac{N^{\text{MO}}}{D^{\text{MO}}},$$

where $N^{\text{MO}} \equiv E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})\}$, $D^{\text{MO}} \equiv E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})\}$. The identification formulas for the principal score without monotonicity imply that $e_g(\mathbf{X})$ is a summation of the building blocks $E\{S \times h(\mathbf{X})|Z = z, \mathbf{X}\}$ ($h(\mathbf{X})$ depends on the sensitivity parameters). By Lemma 6 with $F(Y, S, \mathbf{X}) = S \times h(\mathbf{X})$, the EIF for each building block is $h(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z} - E\{p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})\}$ by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mu}_{z,Sh(\mathbf{X}),\theta}|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= E\{(\psi_{Sh(\mathbf{X}),z} - E\{p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})\})S(\mathbf{V})\} \\
&= E\{(h(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z} - E\{p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X})\})S(\mathbf{V})\},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the influence function for D^{MO} is given by $\Psi_D^{\text{MO}} = \psi_g^* - e_g$ by linearity of expectation. By the chain rule,

$$\dot{N}_{\theta}^{\text{MO}}|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})S(\mathbf{X})\} + E\{\dot{e}_{g,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0}m_z(\mathbf{X})\} + E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})\dot{m}_{z,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0}\}.$$

Because $E\{N^{\text{MO}}S(\mathbf{X})\} = 0$,

$$E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})S(\mathbf{X})\} = E\{(e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N^{\text{MO}})S(\mathbf{X})\}.$$

Furthermore, applying Lemma 5 with $F(Y, S, \mathbf{X}) = S \times h(\mathbf{X})$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mu}_{z,Sh(\mathbf{X}),\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= E\{(\psi_{Sh(\mathbf{X}),z} - p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X}))S(Y, S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} \\ &= E\{(h(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X}))S(Y, S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} \\ &= E\{(h(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X}))S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds due to the fact that

$$E\{(h(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z} - p_z(\mathbf{X})h(\mathbf{X}))S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\} = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\dot{e}_{g,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0} = E\{(\psi_g^* - e_g(\mathbf{X}))S(S|Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\}. \quad (38)$$

One can verify that Lemma 7 still holds without monotonicity, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})\dot{m}_{z,\theta}(\mathbf{X})|_{\theta=\theta_0}\} &= E\left\{E\left\{e_g(\mathbf{X})\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{X}\right\}\right\} \\ &= E\left\{e_g(\mathbf{X})\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}S(Y|S, Z, \mathbf{X})\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N^{\text{MO}} &\in \mathcal{F}_1, \\ m_z(\mathbf{X})(\psi_g^* - e_g(\mathbf{X})) &\in \mathcal{F}_3, \\ e_g(\mathbf{X})\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})} &\in \mathcal{F}_4, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the influence function for N^{MO} , $\Psi_N^{\text{MO}}(\mathbf{V})$, is given by

$$\Psi_N^{\text{MO}}(\mathbf{V}) = e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X}) - N^{\text{MO}} + m_z(\mathbf{X})(\psi_g^* - e_g(\mathbf{X})) + e_g(\mathbf{X})\frac{\psi_{YS,z} - m_z(\mathbf{X})\psi_{S,z}}{p_z(\mathbf{X})}.$$

We then conclude the EIF based on the quotient rule of influence function.

12.5 Double robustness and semiparametric efficiency

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2. $\mathbb{P}_n\{\widehat{\psi}_g^*\}$ always converges in probability to e_g follows from the standard arguments for the doubly robust estimator on estimating

average treatment effect of intermediate outcome. It is left to show that the numerator of $\widehat{\mu}_g^{\text{BC-MO}}(z)$, $\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \widehat{e}_g(\mathbf{X}) S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)(Y - \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X})) / \widehat{p}_z(\mathbf{X}) / \pi_z + \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) \widehat{\psi}_g^* \right\}$, converges in probability to $E\{Y(z)\mathbf{1}(G = g)\}$ if either the principal score model or the outcome mean model is correctly specified. By Equation (37),

$$E\{Y(z)\mathbf{1}(G = g)\} = \mu_g(z) \Pr(G = g) = E\{e_g(\mathbf{X})m_z(\mathbf{X})\}. \quad (39)$$

The probability limit for $\mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \widehat{e}_g(\mathbf{X}) S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)(Y - \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X})) / \widehat{p}_z(\mathbf{X}) / \pi_z + \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) \widehat{\psi}_g^* \right\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_n \left\{ \frac{\widehat{e}_g(\mathbf{X}) S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{\widehat{p}_z(\mathbf{X}) \pi_z} (Y - \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X})) + \widehat{m}_z(\mathbf{X}) \widehat{\psi}_g^* \right\} \\ &= E \left\{ \frac{e_g(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) S\mathbf{1}(Z = z)}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z) \pi_z} (Y - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)) + m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z) e_g(\mathbf{X}) \right\} + o_p(1) \\ &= E \left\{ \frac{e_g(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) p_z(\mathbf{X})}{p_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_z)} (m_z(\mathbf{X}) - m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z)) + m_z(\mathbf{X}; \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_z) e_g(\mathbf{X}) \right\} + o_p(1) \quad (\text{LOTE}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is the probability limit for a vector of all the model parameters specified for estimating $e_g(\mathbf{X})$. The double robustness follows from the above immediately. The proof of semiparametric efficiency when both models are correctly specified follows from the proof of Theorem 2 because one can verify that Lemma 8 holds with $\xi_{zg}^{\text{MO}} = \Psi_{zg}^{\text{MO}} e_g$.

13 Connection and comparison with Luo et al. (2023)

Luo et al. (2023) proposed an estimator

$$\widehat{\mu}_g(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n \{e_g(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_g^*) m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{zg}^*)\}}{\mathbb{P}_n \{e_g(\mathbf{X}; \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_g^*)\}}, \quad (40)$$

where $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{zg}^*)$ is the parametric working model for $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}) = E\{Y|Z = z, G = g, \mathbf{X}\}$ with unknown parameters $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{zg}^*$ and $e_g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}_g^*)$ is the parametric working model for the principal score with unknown parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_g^*$. On the one hand, they propose a parametric working model for the principal score directly and estimate the unknown parameters using Expectation-Maximization algorithm, which is a direct generalization of methods used in Ding and Lu (2016). In contrast, our methods posit parametric working models for $p_z(\mathbf{X})$ and the principal score satisfies $e_g(\mathbf{X}) = p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})$ under monotonicity. On the other hand, their outcome regression $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X})$ is conditional on the latent strata variable

instead of the observed survival status and the parameters γ_{zg}^* are additionally indexed by principal stratum value. $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X})$ and $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ can be connected through

$$m_z(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{g=J-z+1}^J \frac{e_g(\mathbf{X})}{\sum_{g'=J-z+1}^J e_{g'}(\mathbf{X})} m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}). \quad (41)$$

Luo et al. (2023) employed the generalized method of moments (GMM) to estimate γ_{zg}^* based on Equation (41). Under monotonicity but without principal ignorability, the estimator (40) is valid if two working models, $e_g(\mathbf{X}; \alpha_g^*)$ and $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}; \gamma_{zg}^*)$, are both correctly specified. Further assuming principal ignorability, Equation (41) implies $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}) = m_z(\mathbf{X})$ and $\gamma_{zg}^* = \gamma_z$ for $\forall g \geq J - z + 1$.

To facilitate a fair comparison in our simulation studies, we plug-in $e_g(\mathbf{X})$ using $p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X})$ and the estimator (40) becomes

$$\hat{\mu}_g^{\text{Luo}}(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n\{(p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\alpha}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\alpha}_{J-g}))m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\gamma}_{zg}^*)\}}{\mathbb{P}_n\{p_{J-g+1}(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\alpha}_{J-g+1}) - p_{J-g}(\mathbf{X}; \hat{\alpha}_{J-g})\}},$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{J-g}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_{J-g+1}$ are estimated using our approaches. In addition, we assume the implication of principal ignorability, $\gamma_{zg}^* = \gamma_z$ for $\forall g \geq J - z + 1$, is known. Indeed, we will use a slightly modified GMM approach (as compared to Luo et al. (2023)) to estimate γ_{zg}^* , where the total number of estimating equations or unknown parameters is reduced under principal ignorability.

14 Supplementary Material for the simulation study

14.1 Specification of the outcome mean model $m_z(\mathbf{X})$

We show that the outcome model $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ is a linear function of \mathbf{X} . By LOTE, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{Y(z)|S = 1, Z = z, \mathbf{X}\} \\ &= E\{E\{Y(z)|S = 1, Z = z, \mathbf{X}, G\}|S = 1, Z = z, \mathbf{X}\} \\ &= \sum_{g \geq J-z+1} \Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X}, Z = z, S = 1)E\{Y(z)|\mathbf{X}, G = g\} \\ &= \sum_{g \geq J-z+1} \Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X}, Z = z)E\{Y(z)|\mathbf{X}, G = g\} \quad (\text{Monotonicity}) \\ &= \sum_{g \geq J-z+1} \Pr(G = g|\mathbf{X})E\{Y(z)|\mathbf{X}, G = g\} \quad (\text{Randomization}) \\ &= E\{Y(z)|\mathbf{X}, G \in U_z\}. \end{aligned}$$

14.2 Data generating process without principal ignorability

We conducted an additional simulation study when the principal ignorability does not hold. Theoretically, our estimators are expected to be biased due to the violation of principal ignorability. The data generating process follows our simulation study in Section 5 of the main manuscript, with the modification that the principal strata variable now follows $\Pr(G = g) = 0.1 + 0.1 \times g$, $g = 1, 2, 3$, and the potential non-mortality outcome follows $Y(2)|\{\mathbf{X}, G = 2\} \sim \mathcal{N}(X_1 + 2X_2 + 2X_3 + 2X_4 + 2, 1)$, $Y(2)|\{\mathbf{X}, G = 3\} \sim \mathcal{N}(X_1 + 2X_2 + 2X_3 + 2X_4 + 1, 1)$, $Y(3)|\{\mathbf{X}, G \in \{1, 3\}\} \sim \mathcal{N}(\sum_{i=1}^4 X_i + 3, 1)$, $Y(3)|\{\mathbf{X}, G = 2\} \sim \mathcal{N}(\sum_{i=1}^4 X_i + 4, 1)$. Under this data generating process, principal ignorability does not hold. However, logistic regression remains the correct model for $p_z(\mathbf{X})$, and linear regressions are still the correct models for $m_z(\mathbf{X})$ and $m_{zg}^*(\mathbf{X})$. We then consider applying our proposed sensitivity analysis for principal ignorability in Section 4.1 of the main manuscript to correct the bias due to violation of principal ignorability. By construction, the true sensitivity functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{22}(\mathbf{X}) &= 1 + \frac{1}{X_1 + 2X_2 + 2X_3 + 2X_4 + 1}, \\ \delta_{31}(\mathbf{X}) &= 1, \\ \delta_{32}(\mathbf{X}) &= 1 + \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^4 X_i + 3}.\end{aligned}$$

15 Additional sensitivity analysis for monotonicity for the NTP data set

We consider a similar partial deviation from monotonicity only between adjacent strata (Luo et al., 2023); i.e., only three additional harmed strata, 1011, 0101, 0010, may exist. Similarly, we define them with respect to the reference group $g = 0$ because \hat{e}_0 is estimated to be the second largest principal stratum. For ease of representation, we further assume three sensitivity parameters equal, and denote them as $\rho_{1011} = \rho_{0101} = \rho_{0010} = \rho$ where ρ can only take values in $[0, 0.526]$ due to the constraints $e_g \geq 0$ for $\forall g \in \mathcal{Q}$ based on \hat{e}_g^{AUG} in Table 2 of the main manuscript.

16 Supplementary material tables and figures

We attach supplementary material tables and figures below.

Table 5: Summary of literature on SACEs with multiple treatments. We summarize the following features: i) applicable to randomized trials or observation studies; ii) number of treatments; iii) structural causal assumptions; iv) type of outcome; v) with or without covariates; vi) statistical methods; vii) whether sensitivity analysis is provided.

Literature	Elliott et al. (2006)	Wang et al. (2017)	Luo et al. (2023)
Study design	Randomized	Randomized	Observational & Randomized
Number of treatments	Multiple	Multiple	Multiple
Assumptions	Monoconicity	Monotonicity	Auxiliary & monotonicity
Outcome	Continuous	Binary	Continuous
Covariates	With	Without	With
Methods	Mixture model	Hypothesis testing	Model-based & bounds
Sensitivity analysis	No	No	Partial

References

- Bang, H. and J. M. Robins (2005). Doubly robust estimation in missing data and causal inference models. *Biometrics* 61(4), 962–973.
- Bickel, P. J., C. A. Klaassen, P. J. Bickel, Y. Ritov, J. Klaassen, J. A. Wellner, and Y. Ritov (1993). *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*. New York: Springer.
- Cheng, C., Y. Guo, B. Liu, L. Wruck, F. Li, and F. Li (2023). Multiply robust estimation for causal survival analysis with treatment noncompliance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13443*.
- Cheng, C. and F. Li (2023). Identification and multiply robust estimation in causal mediation analysis across principal strata. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10025*.
- Chernozhukov, V., D. Chetverikov, M. Demirer, E. Duflo, C. Hansen, W. Newey, and

Table 6: Correspondence between latent principal strata $G = g, g \in \mathcal{Q}$ and survivors conditional on treatment arms, $S = 1|Z = z, z \in \mathcal{J}$, under monotonicity. Y (yes) and N (no) denote whether the survivors in arm z are a mixture of the principal strata g .

	$Z = 1$	$Z = 2$...	$Z = J - 1$	$Z = J$
$G = 0$	$S(1) = 0$	$S(2) = 0$...	$S(J - 1) = 0$	$S(J) = 0$
$G = 1$	$S(1) = 0$	$S(2) = 0$...	$S(J - 1) = 0$	$S(J) = 1$
$G = 2$	$S(1) = 0$	$S(2) = 0$...	$S(J - 1) = 1$	$S(J) = 1$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$G = J - 1$	$S(1) = 0$	$S(2) = 1$...	$S(J - 1) = 1$	$S(J) = 1$
$G = J$	$S(1) = 1$	$S(2) = 1$...	$S(J - 1) = 1$	$S(J) = 1$
	$G = 0$	$G = 1$...	$G = J - 1$	$G = J$
$S = 1 Z = 1$	N	N	...	N	Y
$S = 1 Z = 2$	N	N	...	Y	Y
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$S = 1 Z = J - 1$	N	N	...	Y	Y
$S = 1 Z = J$	N	Y	...	Y	Y

Table 7: Bias, Monte Carlo standard deviations (‘MCSD’), average empirical standard errors (‘AESE’) based on robust sandwich variance estimators, and empirical coverage (‘CP’) using AESE for all possible contrasts $\Delta_g(z, z')$, based on the principal score weighting estimator (‘PSW’), outcome regression estimator (‘OR’), doubly robust estimators (‘DR’), and estimator in [Luo et al. \(2023\)](#) (‘Luo’) when the sample size is 2000. For the column of ps (or om), we set \checkmark and \times to indicate correct and incorrect specification of the principal score model (or outcome regression), respectively. \backslash indicates that the principal score weighting estimator and the outcome regression estimator are independent of the outcome mean model and the principal score model, respectively.

g	z	z'	ps	om	BIAS				CP				MCSD				AESE			
					PSW	OR	DR	Luo	PSW	OR	DR	Luo	PSW	OR	DR	Luo	PSW	OR	DR	Luo
2	2	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	91.9	96.5	95.7	97.1	0.43	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.38	0.16	0.13	0.14
			\checkmark	\times	\backslash	-0.36	0.01	-0.50	\backslash	28.6	96.4	41.3	\backslash	0.14	0.17	0.23	\backslash	0.14	0.17	0.23
			\times	\checkmark	-0.36	\backslash	0.00	-0.32	86.2	\backslash	96.4	1.20	0.35	\backslash	0.13	0.08	0.35	\backslash	0.13	0.08
			\times	\times	\backslash	\backslash	-0.36	-0.36	\backslash	\backslash	27.6	27.0	\backslash	\backslash	0.14	0.14	\backslash	\backslash	0.14	0.14
3	1	2	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	99.1	95.3	94.8	94.7	0.38	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.57	0.12	0.12	0.13
			\checkmark	\times	\backslash	-0.57	0.01	-0.37	\backslash	41.2	95.3	80.8	\backslash	0.26	0.18	0.31	\backslash	0.26	0.18	0.31
			\times	\checkmark	-0.57	\backslash	-0.01	0.25	78.9	\backslash	95.1	37.9	0.46	\backslash	0.12	0.11	0.47	\backslash	0.12	0.11
			\times	\times	\backslash	\backslash	-0.57	-0.57	\backslash	\backslash	40.2	40.6	\backslash	\backslash	0.26	0.26	\backslash	\backslash	0.26	0.26
1	3	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	99.2	95.5	94.7	94.5	0.35	0.17	0.16	0.17	0.55	0.17	0.16	0.17
			\checkmark	\times	\backslash	-0.37	0.00	-0.34	\backslash	63.9	95.3	71.4	\backslash	0.24	0.19	0.25	\backslash	0.24	0.19	0.25
			\times	\checkmark	-0.36	\backslash	0.01	0.49	88.1	\backslash	94.5	0.90	0.40	\backslash	0.16	0.11	0.40	\backslash	0.16	0.11
			\times	\times	\backslash	\backslash	-0.35	-0.37	\backslash	\backslash	68.3	66.1	\backslash	\backslash	0.24	0.24	\backslash	\backslash	0.24	0.24
2	3	3	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	98.2	96.2	95.3	95.1	0.36	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.47	0.10	0.10	0.10
			\checkmark	\times	\backslash	0.20	0.00	0.00	\backslash	69.6	95.2	94.4	\backslash	0.14	0.14	0.23	\backslash	0.14	0.14	0.22
			\times	\checkmark	0.20	\backslash	0.00	0.25	93.4	\backslash	93.3	10.1	0.38	\backslash	0.10	0.08	0.39	\backslash	0.10	0.08
			\times	\times	\backslash	\backslash	0.21	0.19	\backslash	\backslash	69.0	72.3	\backslash	\backslash	0.14	0.14	\backslash	\backslash	0.14	0.14




Figure 3: A comparison between the empirical distribution of the standardized (with respect to the truth and robust sandwich variance estimate) principal score weighting estimator (blue curve) and the standard normal distribution (black curve) when the sample size is small ($n = 500$) and the principal score model is incorrectly specified. The orange vertical line indicates the mean of empirical distribution and the red dashed vertical line indicates the normal CI margins $[-1.96, 1.96]$. The blue curve is expected to be a mean-shift from the black curve if the asymptotic normal approximation is accurate. The empirical coverage probability is the area under the blue curve bounded by two red dashed lines.




Figure 4: The contour plots for the point estimates of SACEs within the stratum $g = 4$ in NTP study using the doubly robust estimator given equal conditional mean potential outcomes between the stratum $g = 2$ and the stratum $g = 4$, i.e., $\delta_2 = 1$, and the ratios of conditional mean potential outcome for the stratum $g = 1$ or $g = 3$ with respect to the stratum $g = 4$ varying from half to twice, i.e., $\delta_1, \delta_3 \in [0.50, 2.00]$.




Figure 5: The contour plots for the point estimates of SACEs within the stratum $g = 4$ in NTP study using the doubly robust estimator given equal conditional mean potential outcomes between the stratum $g = 3$ and the stratum $g = 4$, i.e., $\delta_3 = 1$, and the ratios of conditional mean potential outcome for the stratum $g = 1$ or $g = 2$ with respect to the stratum $g = 4$ varying from half to twice, i.e., $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0.50, 2.00]$. In particular, $\widehat{\Delta}_4^{\text{BC-PI}}(1, 2) = \widehat{\Delta}_4^{\text{DR}}(1, 2)$, i.e., the estimates of $\Delta_4(1, 2)$ remain the same as those under the principal ignorability assumption, if $\delta_{2,3} = \delta_3 = 1$, regardless of the values of δ_1 and δ_2 .




Figure 6: The point estimates and the associated 95% Wald confidence intervals for the principal score weighting estimator for $\Delta_4(z, z')$ when the monotonicity is violated with sensitivity parameters $\rho \in [0, 10]$. ρ measures the magnitude of deviation from the monotonicity assumption. The blue dotted line indicates the null effect.




Figure 7: The point estimates and the associated 95% Wald confidence intervals for the outcome regression estimator for $\Delta_4(z, z')$ when the monotonicity is violated with sensitivity parameters $\rho \in [0, 10]$. ρ measures the magnitude of deviation from the monotonicity assumption. The blue dotted line indicates the null effect.




Figure 8: The point estimates and the associated 95% Wald confidence intervals for the principal score weighting estimator for $\Delta_4(z, z')$ when the monotonicity is violated with sensitivity parameters $\rho \in [0, 0.52]$. ρ measures the magnitude of partial deviation from the monotonicity assumption. The blue dotted line indicates the null effect.




Figure 9: The point estimates and the associated 95% Wald confidence intervals for the outcome regression estimator for $\Delta_4(z, z')$ when the monotonicity is violated with sensitivity parameters $\rho \in [0, 0.52]$. ρ measures the magnitude of partial deviation from the monotonicity assumption. The blue dotted line indicates the null effect.




Figure 10: The point estimates and the associated 95% Wald confidence intervals for the doubly robust estimator for $\Delta_4(z, z')$ when the monotonicity is violated with sensitivity parameters $\rho \in [0, 0.52]$. ρ measures the magnitude of partial deviation from the monotonicity assumption. The blue dotted line indicates the null effect.

- J. Robins (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal* 21(1), 1–68.
- Ding, P., Z. Geng, W. Yan, and X.-H. Zhou (2011). Identifiability and estimation of causal effects by principal stratification with outcomes truncated by death. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(496), 1578–1591.
- Ding, P. and J. Lu (2016, 06). Principal stratification analysis using principal scores. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 79(3), 757–777.
- Elliott, M. R., M. M. Joffe, and Z. Chen (2006). A potential outcomes approach to developmental toxicity analyses. *Biometrics* 62(2), 352–360.
- European Medicines Agency (2020). ICH E9 (R1) addendum on estimands and sensitivity analysis in clinical trials to the guideline on statistical principles for clinical trials. <https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-e9-r1-addendum-estima>
- Frangakis, C. E. and D. B. Rubin (2002). Principal stratification in causal inference. *Biometrics* 58(1), 21–29.
- Jiang, Z., S. Yang, and P. Ding (2022). Multiply robust estimation of causal effects under principal ignorability. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 84(4), 1423–1445.
- Juszczak, E., D. G. Altman, S. Hopewell, and K. Schulz (2019). Reporting of multi-arm parallel-group randomized trials: extension of the consort 2010 statement. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 321(16), 1610–1620.
- Kennedy, E. H. (2023). Semiparametric doubly robust targeted double machine learning: a review.
- Li, F. and F. Li (2019). Propensity score weighting for causal inference with multiple treatments. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 13(4), 2389–2415.
- Luo, S., W. Li, and Y. He (2023). Causal inference with outcomes truncated by death in multiarm studies. *Biometrics* 79(1), 502–513.

- National Toxicology Program (2017, December). Toxicology and carcinogenesis studies of antimony trioxide in wistar han [CrI:WI (han)] rats and B6C3F1/N mice (inhalation studies). *National Toxicology Program Technical Report Series* (590).
- Rosenbaum, P. R. and D. B. Rubin (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* 70(1), 41–55.
- Rubin, D. B. (2006). Causal inference through potential outcomes and principal stratification: application to studies with “censoring” due to death. *Statistical Science* 21(3), 299–309.
- Tsiatis, A. A. (2006). *Semiparametric Theory and Missing Data*. New York: Springer.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic Statistics*, Volume 3. Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, L., T. S. Richardson, and X.-H. Zhou (2017). Causal analysis of ordinal treatments and binary outcomes under truncation by death. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 79(3), 719–735.

