

# Locally robust semiparametric estimation of sample selection models without exclusion restrictions

Zhewen Pan<sup>1</sup>   Yifan Zhang<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Economics, Zhejiang University of Finance & Economics, Hangzhou 310018, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Business School, Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China*

December 3, 2024

**Abstract:** Existing identification and estimation methods for semiparametric sample selection models rely heavily on exclusion restrictions. However, it is difficult in practice to find a credible excluded variable that has a correlation with selection but no correlation with the outcome. In this paper, we establish a new identification result for a semiparametric sample selection model without the exclusion restriction. The key identifying assumptions are nonlinearity on the selection equation and linearity on the outcome equation. The difference in the functional form plays the role of an excluded variable and provides identification power. According to the identification result, we propose to estimate the model by a partially linear regression with a nonparametrically generated regressor. To accommodate modern machine learning methods in generating the regressor, we construct an orthogonalized moment by adding the first-step influence function and develop a locally robust estimator by solving the cross-fitted orthogonalized moment condition. We prove root-n-consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimator under mild regularity conditions. A Monte Carlo simulation shows the satisfactory performance of the estimator in finite samples, and an application to wage regression illustrates its usefulness in the absence of exclusion restrictions.

*Keywords:* identification by functional form; partially linear regression; generated regressor; double/debiased machine learning

*JEL codes:* C13, C14, C34

---

\*Corresponding to: Yifan Zhang, Business School, Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China.  
Email: zhangyf278@mail.sysu.edu.cn.

# 1 Introduction

Sample selection refers to the situation when we attempt to infer about population parameters from a special subpopulation. Potential causes of sample selection include nonrandom sampling, self-selectivity, nonresponse on survey questions, attrition from social programs, and so forth. In observational studies, sample selection is so frequently encountered that it seems to be the rule rather than the exception (Lee, 2010, p.253). Ordinary regression using only the selected sample may incur biased estimation and misleading inference for the population parameters of interest. A modeling strategy for correcting the sample selection bias is to specify an equation describing the selection mechanism in addition to the main outcome equation (Gronau, 1974; Heckman, 1974; Lewis, 1974):

$$D = 1 \{X'\gamma \geq \varepsilon\}, \quad (1a)$$

$$Y^* = X'\beta + U, \quad (1b)$$

$$Y = Y^* \cdot D, \quad (1c)$$

where  $D$  is the binary selection variable,  $Y^*$  is the latent outcome variable, and  $Y$  is the observed outcome variable.

The sample selection model (1) is conventionally identified via parameterizing the distribution of the error term  $(\varepsilon, U)$  and then estimated by the maximum likelihood or Heckman (1979)'s two-step methods. However, the parametric likelihood-based estimators have been found possessing evident bias when the error distribution is misspecified (e.g., Arabmazar and Schmidt, 1982). This finding motivates econometricians to relax parametric distributional assumptions and consider semiparametric identification and estimation of the sample selection model. An important development is gained by Chamberlain (1986), who shows that with a nonparametric specification on the error distribution,  $\beta$  in model (1) is not semiparametrically identified if no extra restriction is imposed. To regain identification of  $\beta$ , Chamberlain (1986) proposes a sufficient identifying assumption termed exclusion restriction, which requires some component of  $\beta$  to be zero. The exclusion restriction has been widely accepted by the sample selection literature and underlies the consistency of a considerable amount of semiparametric estimators for  $\beta$  (e.g., Gallant and Nychka, 1987; Chen and Lee, 1998; Powell, 2001; Chen and Khan, 2003; Newey, 2009; Escanciano and Zhu, 2015; Liu and Yu, 2022).

In empirical studies, it is usually difficult to find a credible excluded variable that has a correlation with selection but no correlation with the outcome (e.g., Krueger and Whitmore,

2001; Blundell et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2024). In particular, the exclusion restriction is hardly justified by economic theories (van den Berg, 2007; Jones, 2015) and may not hold exactly (Conley et al., 2012; Nevo and Rosen, 2012; van Kippersluis and Rietveld, 2018). If we attempt to waive the exclusion restriction, nonetheless, we will return to Chamberlain’s dilemma that  $\beta$  in model (1) is not (point) identified unless we impose parametric distributional assumptions on the model error. Another remedy for this dilemma is to settle for partial identification. For instance, Honoré and Hu (2020) construct the identified set for  $\beta$  in model (1) in the absence of the exclusion restriction or parametric distributional assumptions.

This paper provides an alternative approach to addressing the sample selection problem, by establishing a result of point identification but without imposing the exclusion restriction or parametric distributional assumptions. To resolve Chamberlain’s dilemma, we instead impose a mild functional form restriction on the selection equation, which will be proven sufficient for identification of coefficients in the outcome equation. Specifically, we consider a distribution-free sample selection model with a nonparametric selection mechanism:

$$D = 1 \{h(X) \geq \varepsilon\}, \quad (2a)$$

$$Y^* = X'\beta + U, \quad (2b)$$

$$Y = Y^* \cdot D, \quad (2c)$$

where the functional form restriction on  $h$  will be given in Section 2. Loosely speaking, the function  $h$  is assumed to be nonlinear when  $X$  includes at least two continuous covariates or be nonmonotone when  $X$  includes only one or even no continuous covariate. This functional form restriction is largely innocuous, as nonlinear or nonmonotone functions are more prevalent in the real world than their opposite counterparts. Moreover, the nonparametric nature of  $h$  has an additional advantage of reducing the risk of functional form misspecification over the linear setting (1a). Although the nonparametricity may reduce interpretability of the selection equation, it would not cause trouble in the context of sample selection models where the marginal effects of covariates on the latent outcome are of primary interest.

To illustrate the difference between our identification strategy and those based on the exclusion restriction or parametric distributional assumptions, we write the population regression function of model (2) for the selected sample:

$$E[Y|X, D = 1] = X'\beta + \lambda(h(X)), \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda(t) = E[U | \varepsilon \leq t]$  provided that  $X \perp (\varepsilon, U)$ . The key identifying assumption is that  $(X', \lambda(h(X)))$  must have full rank. In the case of  $h(X) = X'\gamma$ , a specific nonlinear functional form of  $\lambda$  as a result of the parametric distributional assumption on  $(\varepsilon, U)$  will suffice for the full rank condition. The identification power depends on the extent of nonlinearity of  $\lambda$ . For instance, the inverse Mill's ratio function implied by normal distribution is nearly piecewise linear; therefore, if the range of  $X'\gamma$  is small, then  $\lambda(X'\gamma)$  and  $X$  will be highly correlated and the identification power will be low (Leung and Yu, 1996). When  $\lambda$  is nonparametrically specified after relaxing the parametric distributional assumption, it does not preclude the special case of  $\lambda(t) = t$  in which  $(X', \lambda(X'\gamma))$  suffers from perfect multicollinearity. The exclusion restriction exploits a priori knowledge of zero value in some component of  $\beta$ . This ensures identification of the remaining coefficients because, after excluding some covariate, the full rank condition will still be met even when  $\lambda(t) = t$ . By contrast, we relax the linear specification on  $h$  and then rely on nonlinear or nonmonotone variations of  $h$  for point identification of  $\beta$ . The functional form restriction that differentiates  $h$  from linear or generalized linear functions validates the full rank condition of  $(X', \lambda(h(X)))$ , while leaving  $\lambda$  unspecified. Intuitively, the nonlinear part  $h(X) - X'\gamma$ , which is nonzero for any  $\gamma$ , serves as an excluded variable and provides identification power for  $\beta$ .

On the basis of identification,  $\beta$  in model (2) can be estimated semiparametrically via a partially linear regression that incorporates a generated regressor within the nonparametric function. The generated regressor is the propensity score of selection rather than  $h(X)$  as in the regression function (3), because the function  $h$  and the distribution function of  $\varepsilon$  cannot be separately identified when they are both specified nonparametrically (Horowitz, 2009, Section 2.1). After estimating the propensity score in the first step and plugging it into the nonparametric function, we can then employ the partialling-out method (Robinson, 1988) to construct a consistent estimator for  $\beta$ . This naive estimator may behave well when the propensity score is estimated by conventional nonparametric techniques that satisfy Donsker-type properties, such as kernel and sieve estimation. However, if we use the newly developed nonparametric techniques, the so-called machine learning (ML) methods, in the first-step estimation, the naive estimator for  $\beta$  will possess a heavy bias and fail to be  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent in general (Chernozhukov et al., 2018), where  $n$  is the sample size. To address this problem, we derive explicit form of the first-step influence function and accordingly construct an orthogonal moment function that is insensitive to the first-step estimation bias (Chernozhukov et al., 2022). By combining with cross-fitting, we propose a locally

robust semiparametric estimator for  $\beta$ , and establish its  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency and asymptotic normality under a first-step convergence rate condition which can hold for most machine learners under regularity conditions.

The paper is organized as follows. The rest of this section briefly reviews the related literature. Section 2 gives a rigorous treatment of point identification of  $\beta$  in model (2). Particularly, we discuss the functional form restriction on the selection equation (2a), which is the key identifying assumption of our method. Section 3 proposes an orthogonal moment condition and accordingly a locally robust estimator, and provides sufficient conditions for the asymptotic property of the estimator. Section 4 investigates the finite-sample property of the estimator through Monte Carlo simulations. Section 5 presents an empirical application to the wage data of Honoré and Hu (2020) and Section 6 concludes. The technical proofs and derivations are gathered in the Appendix.

## 1.1 Related Literature

There is a small but growing literature on relaxing the exclusion restriction in the semi-parametric sample selection model. In a seminal paper, Lee (2009) develops bounds for the coefficients in a sample selection model that leaves the selection mechanism totally unspecified. As Lee’s bounds are often too wide to be informative, Honoré and Hu (2020) impose a linear structure on the selection mechanism, namely, consider model (1), and show that the additional structure can significantly reduce the bounds for the parameters of interest. Honoré and Hu (2022) extend the analysis in Honoré and Hu (2020) by allowing for heteroskedasticity and parameter heterogeneity. Our considered model (2) is essentially the same as Lee’s model in the sense that the selection equation (2a) is completely nonparametric in nature. The difference lies only in the functional form restriction we impose on the selection equation, which strongly reduces Lee’s bounds to singletons. While the identified set derived by Honoré and Hu (2020) can be small enough, this gain in identification power stems from a linear structure that is quite restrictive and susceptible to misspecification. In comparison, our nonlinearity or nonmonotonicity restriction provides more identification power and, importantly, is arguably more realistic.

The second solution to the lack of the exclusion restriction is the so-called identification at infinity suggested by Chamberlain (1986) and Heckman (1990). This approach to identification is grounded in the observation that in model (1), the sample selection problem disappears for individuals whose values of  $X'\gamma$  go to infinity, because these individuals face

an arbitrarily large probability of selection and a zero-valued selectivity correction term. Accordingly, the coefficients in the outcome equation will be point identified if a component of  $X$ , often called a special regressor, exhibits infinite support. [Andrews and Schafgans \(1998\)](#) propose a semiparametric estimator for the intercept coefficient in equation (1b) based on identification at infinity. [Lewbel \(2007\)](#) generalizes this result by demonstrating that identification can be achieved as long as the special regressor has a large, not necessarily infinite, support that encompasses that of the error  $\varepsilon$ . Motivated by the possible inaccessibility of such a special regressor, [D’Haultfoeulle and Maurel \(2013\)](#) suggest another means of identification at infinity, under the condition that selection becomes independent of the covariates when the outcome takes arbitrarily large values. [D’Haultfoeulle et al. \(2018\)](#) build on the identification result of [D’Haultfoeulle and Maurel \(2013\)](#) and develop an extremal quantile regression estimator for the semiparametric sample selection model without the exclusion restriction or large support regressor. Although identification at infinity can lead to point identification, it is typically featured as irregular identification ([Khan and Tamer, 2010](#)). As a result, the derived estimators will converge at rates slower than  $1/\sqrt{n}$ . An alternative solution is to find additional conditions under which the regression coefficients subject to sample selection are point identified and  $\sqrt{n}$ -estimable. For instance, [Chen and Zhou \(2010\)](#) establish identification of  $\beta$  in both models (1) and (2) under a joint symmetric distribution assumption on the errors  $\varepsilon$  and  $U$ , and propose  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent estimators for  $\beta$ . We consider our paper as a useful supplement to this particular solution. We show that  $\beta$  in model (2) can be identified under a natural functional form restriction on the selection equation, thus obviating the need for relatively more binding assumptions such as joint symmetry.

The approach to identification based on functional form can be traced back to [Heckman \(1979\)](#), who exploits nonlinearity of the selectivity correction function to achieve identification and  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent estimation of the parametric sample selection model. Recently, [Escanciano et al. \(2016\)](#) extend [Heckman’s](#) approach to a general semiparametric model and establishes identification of the linear coefficients by exploiting nonlinearity elsewhere in the model. Nevertheless, when applied to model (2), their identification result implies that  $\beta$  can be identified only up to scale and only when  $X$  includes at least two continuous covariates. In this paper, we adapt the result of [Escanciano et al. \(2016\)](#) to the semiparametric sample selection model by establishing complete identification of  $\beta$ , irrespective of the number of continuous covariates and even in the absence of continuous covariates. Our result formalizes [Ahn and Powell \(1993, p.13\)](#)’s allegation that nonlinearity of the function

$h$  in equation (2a) will suffice for identification of  $\beta$ . Similar identification results based on functional form restrictions can be developed for a variety of semiparametric models that lack exclusion restrictions, such as the endogenous regressor binary choice model without instruments (Dong, 2010), the censored regression model subject to nonparametric sample selection (Pan et al., 2022), and the marginal treatment effect model without instruments (Pan et al., 2024). Our paper differs from this line of literature in that we allow the first-step nonparametric estimate to be generated by modern machine learners. Therefore, this paper also connects to the literature on double/debiased machine learning (DML) or locally robust estimation.

ML methods perform well by employing regularization to reduce variance and trading off regularization bias with overfitting in practice. However, ML estimators live in highly complex spaces which fail to meet Donsker-type conditions. Consequently, the classical asymptotic theories for semiparametric estimators (e.g., Newey and McFadden, 1994) are inapplicable to naive estimators that are obtained by simply plugging first-step ML estimates into moment functions for the parameters of interest. Actually, Chernozhukov et al. (2018) discover that the naive estimators generally have slower than  $1/\sqrt{n}$  rates of convergence due to the regularization bias in the first step. To obtain  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent estimators and simple procedures for inference, Chernozhukov et al. (2018) propose DML estimation methods by combining orthogonalized moment functions with cross-fitting procedures. Orthogonalization implies that moment functions are robust to local perturbations in the first-step estimates, and cross-fitting provides an efficient form of data splitting which removes the bias induced by overfitting while avoiding Donsker-type conditions. Chernozhukov et al. (2022) further propose a general method of orthogonalizing moment functions by adding the corresponding first-step influence functions. However, it is not so straightforward to derive first-step influence functions for sample selection models because of the presence of the propensity score of selection as a generated regressor. Bia et al. (2024) devise an elaborate cross-fitting procedure to circumvent the derivation of first-step influence functions when addressing sample selection in evaluating effects of discretely distributed treatments. Alternatively, we explicitly construct the first-step influence function and thus the orthogonalized moment function by employing Hahn and Ridder (2013)'s derivation of first-step influence functions for three-step estimators, and propose a DML/locally robust estimator for  $\beta$  in the semiparametric sample selection model (2). Our construction contributes to the emerging literature on adapting DML to models with generated regressors (e.g., Sasaki and Ura, 2023; Escanciano and Pérez-Izquierdo, 2023).



## 2 Identification

Recall that the function  $h$  in the selection equation (2a) cannot be identified in our setting where  $h$  and the distribution function of  $\varepsilon$  are both specified nonparametrically. To facilitate the identification of model (2), we normalize equation (2a) into a reduced form as

$$D = 1 \{ \pi(X) \geq V \}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\pi(x) \equiv F_{\varepsilon|X}(h(x)|x)$ ,  $V \equiv F_{\varepsilon|X}(\varepsilon|X)$ , and  $F_{\varepsilon|X}(\cdot|x)$  is the conditional distribution function of  $\varepsilon$  given  $X = x$ . We term equation (4) as “reduced form” because the normalized error term  $V$  is by definition statistically independent of  $X$  and uniformly distributed over the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ . Moreover, by the properties of  $V$ , we have

$$E[D|X = x] = \Pr(V \leq \pi(x)|X = x) = \Pr(V \leq \pi(x)) = \pi(x).$$

Namely,  $\pi(x)$  is the propensity score of selection given  $X = x$ , which is an identified quantity for any  $x$  in the support of  $X$ . Under the normalized or reduced-form selection equation (4), the functional form restriction can be imposed on the identified function  $\pi$  rather than on the unidentifiable function  $h$  in (2a).

To formalize the identifying assumptions, we need several additional notations. First, we denote  $g(v) \equiv E[U|V \leq v]$  as the selectivity correction function. Second, we let  $X$  be partitioned as  $(X^C, X^D)$ . In general,  $X^C$  and  $X^D$  consist of covariates that are continuously and discretely valued, respectively. In the special case of no continuous covariate,  $X^C$  can be any one discrete covariate that satisfies the following Assumption 2.(ii), and  $X^D$  consists of the remaining discrete covariates. Third, we denote  $X_k$ ,  $X_k^C$ , and  $X_k^D$  as the  $k$ -th coordinates of  $X$ ,  $X^C$ , and  $X^D$ , respectively. And we denote  $x^C$  as a generic element in the support of  $X^C$ ; likewise for  $x^D$ ,  $x_k^C$ , and  $x_k^D$ . The functional form restriction will entail setting a benchmark value of  $X^D$  within its support, under which  $\pi$  will be required to be nonlinear or nonmonotone in  $X^C$ . Without loss of generality, we suppose that the vector of zeros is in the support of  $X^D$  and is the benchmark value. Then, we denote  $\pi_0(x^C) = \pi(x^C, 0)$ , where the discrete covariates are equal to zero. If  $\pi_0$  is differentiable, we further denote  $\partial_k \pi_0(x^C) = \partial \pi_0(x^C) / \partial x_k^C$  as its partial derivative with respect to the  $k$ -th argument. Moreover, for any  $x_k^D \neq 0$ , we denote  $x^{Dk}$  as the  $\dim(X^D) \times 1$  vector with the  $k$ -th coordinate being equal to  $x_k^D$  and all the other coordinates being equal to zero.

**Assumption 1** (Model). Assume that (i)  $\{(Y_i, D_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  is a random sample of observations from the distribution of  $(Y, D, X)$  that satisfies model (2); and (ii)  $E[U|V, X] =$



$E[U|V]$  with probability one, where  $V \equiv F_{\varepsilon|X}(\varepsilon|X)$  is the normalized error term in the selection equation.

**Assumption 2** (Functional Form). Assume that (i) when  $\dim(X^C) \geq 2$ ,  $\pi_0(x^C)$  and  $g(v)$  are differentiable functions, and there exist two vectors  $x^C, \tilde{x}^C$  in the support of  $X^C$  and two elements  $k, j$  in set  $\{1, 2, \dots, \dim(X^C)\}$  such that  $\partial_k \pi_0(x^C) \neq 0$ ,  $\partial_j \pi_0(x^C) \neq 0$ ,  $\partial_k \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) \neq 0$ ,  $\partial_j \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) \neq 0$ , and  $\partial_k \pi_0(x^C) / \partial_j \pi_0(x^C) \neq \partial_k \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) / \partial_j \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C)$ ; or (ii) when  $\dim(X^C) = 1$ , there exist two constants  $x^C, \tilde{x}^C$  in the support of  $X^C$  such that  $\pi_0(x^C) \neq \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C)$ .

**Assumption 3** (Support). For each  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \dim(X^D)\}$ , assume for some  $x_k^D \neq 0$  in the support of  $X_k^D$  that there exists  $x^C(k)$  in the support of  $X^C$  such that  $\pi(x^C(k), x^{Dk})$  is in the support of  $\pi_0(X^C)$ .

Assumption 1 describes the model and data. The conditional mean independence assumption 1.(ii) is implied by and much weaker than the full independence assumption  $X \perp (\varepsilon, U)$  that is commonly imposed in the sample selection literature. In particular, throughout our analysis, we do not impose any constraints on the statistical relationship between  $X$  and the structural selection error  $\varepsilon$ . Instead, we exploit the independence between  $X$  and the reduced-form selection error  $V$ , given which Assumption 1.(ii) is essentially equivalent to the independence of the covariance of  $U$  and  $V$  from  $X$ . Under Assumption 1.(ii), the population regression function of model (2) on the selected sample is

$$E[Y|X, D = 1] = X'\beta + E[U|X, V \leq \pi(X)] = X'\beta + g(\pi(X)). \quad (5)$$

Our aim is to identify  $\beta$  from the regression function (5).

Assumption 2 imposes a functional form restriction that distinguishes the propensity score from a linear function, given a benchmark value of  $X^D$ . When  $\dim(X^C) \geq 2$ , where  $X^C$  must consist of continuous covariates, Assumption 2.(i) requires  $\pi_0$  to exhibit some nonlinear variations through a derivative formulation. Specifically, Assumption 2.(i) will not hold if  $\pi_0(x^C) = f(x^C \eta)$  for a smooth function  $f$ , because in this case  $\partial_k \pi_0(x^C) / \partial_j \pi_0(x^C) = \eta_k / \eta_j$  for any  $x^C$ . Otherwise, however, it is difficult to construct examples that violate Assumption 2.(i). When  $\dim(X^C) = 1$ ,  $X^C$  may be continuous or discrete by definition. Assumption 2.(ii) requires the univariate function  $\pi_0$  to be not one-to-one, but imposes no smoothness or continuity restriction on  $\pi_0$ . This assumption will hold if the probability of selection is unaffected by some change in  $X^C$ . A similar

local irrelevance assumption is imposed in nonseparable models to attain point identification (e.g., [Torgovitsky, 2015](#); [D’Haultfoeuille et al., 2021](#)). In the special case of  $X^C$  being a binary covariate, Assumption 2.(ii) implies the full irrelevance of  $X^C$  to the selection probability, which is a condition suggested by [Chamberlain \(1986\)](#) for identification of the linear selection model (1).

The combination of Assumptions 1 and 2 enables identification of the linear coefficients of  $X^C$  based on the functional form difference of  $\pi_0$ . In order to identify the linear coefficients of  $X^D$ , we further impose a support overlapping condition as Assumption 3. This condition holds if the support of  $\pi_0(X^C)$  is overlapped with that of  $\pi(X^C, x^D)$  for any  $x^D \neq 0$ , or if we can find an  $x_k^D \neq 0$  for each  $k$  such that the support of  $\pi_0(X^C)$  is overlapped with that of  $\pi(X^C, x^{Dk})$ . Under these assumptions, we can establish identification of the linear coefficients of interest via a construction method.

**Theorem 1.** *If Assumptions 1-3 hold, then  $\beta$  in the semiparametric sample selection model (2) is identified.*

The proof of Theorem 1 follows the method of [Pan et al. \(2024\)](#). Nonetheless, for completeness, we also provide the proof in Appendix A.1. It is worth mentioning that our identification strategy is characterized with overidentification in the sense that generally more than one pair of points in the support of  $X^C$  will satisfy Assumption 2. Moreover, there may be more than one benchmark value of  $X^D$  that satisfies Assumptions 2 and 3. Consequently, the identification can also be represented as an average over all pairs of points satisfying Assumption 2 and over all benchmark values satisfying Assumptions 2 and 3.

### 3 Estimation

On the basis of identification,  $\beta$  in the semiparametric sample selection model (2) can be estimated via the partially linear regression (5) that incorporates a generated regressor  $\pi(X)$  within the nonparametric selectivity correction function  $g$ . To this end, the unknown function  $\pi$  needs to be estimated in the first step to generate  $\pi(X)$ . Since  $\pi$  is specified nonparametrically, albeit subject to a nonbinding functional form restriction, we suggest to use modern ML methods in estimating  $\pi$ , which have shown desirable performance in the setting of highly complex  $\pi$  or high-dimensional  $X$ . Given the estimated  $\pi$ , we may employ standard partially linear regression techniques to estimate  $\beta$  by plugging in the generated

regressor. One popular choice could be the kernel-weighted pairwise difference estimator proposed by [Ahn and Powell \(1993\)](#):

$$\hat{\beta}^{AP} = \arg \min_b \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{h} k \left( \frac{\hat{\pi}(X_i) - \hat{\pi}(X_j)}{h} \right) D_i D_j [(Y_i - Y_j) - (X_i - X_j)' b]^2, \quad (6)$$

where  $k(\cdot)$  and  $h$  are the kernel function and bandwidth, respectively. However, as discussed before,  $\hat{\beta}^{AP}$  with plug-in machine learned  $\hat{\pi}$  will generally fail to be  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent due to the regularization bias of  $\hat{\pi}$ . Moreover, it is very difficult to deduce the first-step influence function of  $\hat{\pi}$  for  $\hat{\beta}^{AP}$ , which blocks the construction of a locally robust estimator that asymptotically eliminates the influence of  $\hat{\pi}$ . This difficulty arises because the generated regressor enters the definition of  $\hat{\beta}^{AP}$  in the kernel weights, which implies that the generated regressor will serve as a conditioning variable in the population moment function of (6). Therefore, we consider constructing a locally robust estimator for  $\beta$  from the partialling-out estimation ([Robinson, 1988](#)). The theoretical connection between the partialling-out estimation and the kernel-weighted pairwise difference estimation is explicated in, e.g., [Pagan and Ullah \(1999, p.307\)](#).

For notational convenience, we denote  $P \equiv \pi(X)$ ,  $P_i \equiv \pi(X_i)$ ,  $\hat{P} \equiv \hat{\pi}(X)$ , and  $\hat{P}_i \equiv \hat{\pi}(X_i)$ . And we denote  $\mu_Z(P) \equiv E[Z|P]$ , with  $Z$  being  $Y$  or  $X$ . We start with the partially linear regression for the whole sample:

$$E[Y|X] = E[(X'\beta + U)D|X] = PX'\beta + \eta(P), \quad (7)$$

where  $\eta(p) \equiv E[U \cdot 1\{V \leq p\}] = p \cdot g(p)$ . We consider the whole-sample regression (7) rather than the selected-sample regression (5) in the estimation mainly for two reasons. First, the whole-sample regression can utilize the information of covariates in the unselected sample, which may help increase the efficiency of estimation. Second, the probability space and  $\sigma$ -field pertaining to whole-sample conditional expectations keep consistent with those pertaining to the first-step propensity score, which facilitates the derivation of the first-step influence function. To set out the partialling-out estimation, we write the conditional expectation of  $Y$  given the generated regressor based on (7):

$$\mu_Y(P) = E[Y|P] = E[E[Y|X]|P] = P\mu_X(P)'\beta + \eta(P), \quad (8)$$

where the second equality follows from the law of iterated expectations. Subtracting equation (8) from equation (7) cancels out the unknown function  $\eta$  and yields

$$E[Y - \mu_Y(P)|X] = P(X - \mu_X(P))'\beta, \quad (9)$$

according to which the [Robinson](#)-type partialling-out estimator can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}^R &= \arg \min_b \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ Y_i - \hat{\mu}_Y(\hat{P}_i) - \hat{P}_i \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_X(\hat{P}_i) \right)' b \right]^2 \\ &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i^2 \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_X(\hat{P}_i) \right) \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_X(\hat{P}_i) \right)' \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{P}_i \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_X(\hat{P}_i) \right) \left( Y_i - \hat{\mu}_Y(\hat{P}_i) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_Y$  and  $\hat{\mu}_X$  are nonparametric estimates of  $\mu_Y$  and  $\mu_X$ , respectively.

In this section, we propose a locally robust estimator for  $\beta$  on the basis of  $\hat{\beta}^R$ . We derive the first-step influence function and construct the orthogonalized moment in [Subsection 3.1](#), develop the locally robust estimator in [Subsection 3.2](#), and investigate its asymptotic property in [Subsection 3.3](#).

### 3.1 Orthogonalization

The population moment condition corresponding to  $\hat{\beta}^R$  is

$$E \left[ P \left( X - \mu_X(P) \right) \left( Y - \mu_Y(P) - P \left( X - \mu_X(P) \right)' \beta \right) \right] = 0. \quad (10)$$

It is now well known that this [Robinson](#)-type moment function is Neyman orthogonal with respect to  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$  (e.g., [Chernozhukov et al., 2018](#), Theorem 4.1), and hence that the second-step estimates  $\hat{\mu}_X$  and  $\hat{\mu}_Y$  have no first-order effect on the asymptotic properties of  $\hat{\beta}^R$ . In consequence, we only need to consider the influence function of the first-step generated regressor  $\hat{P} = \hat{\pi}(X)$  in order to construct an orthogonal moment. Note that  $P$  enters the moment function not only in a direct manner, but also in an indirect manner as an argument of the unknown functions  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$ . The direct effect of  $\hat{\pi}$  is readily derived according to the approach of [Newey \(1994\)](#). In contrast, the indirect effect of  $\hat{\pi}$  is more complicated since  $P$  plays a dual role in the nonparametric regressions  $\mu_X(P) = E[X|P]$  and  $\mu_Y(P) = E[Y|P]$ , that is, that of conditioning variable and that of argument. Fortunately, in the present case where the influence functions of second-step regressions are equal to zero, it is sufficient to only account for the first-step generated regressor as an argument ([Hahn and Ridder, 2013](#), Remark 3), which simplifies the derivation of the first-step influence function. For example, the indirect effect of  $\hat{\pi}$  as an argument of  $\mu_Y$  on the moment [\(10\)](#) is

$$E \left[ \frac{\partial P \left( X - \mu_X(P) \right) \left( Y - \mu_Y(P) - P \left( X - \mu_X(P) \right)' \beta \right)}{\partial \mu_Y} \cdot \frac{d\mu_Y(\pi(X))}{d\pi} \Bigg| X \right] = -P \left( X - \mu_X(P) \right) \mu_Y^{(1)}(P),$$

where the term in the bracket is the naive derivative of the moment function with respect to  $\pi$ . The complete derivation of the first-step influence function is provided in [Appendix A.4](#).

Then we can construct the orthogonal moment function by adding the first-step influence function to the identifying moment function in (10) as

$$\psi(W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta) = r(W, \pi, \mu, \beta) + \alpha(X) \cdot (D - P),$$

where  $W = (Y, D, X)$ ,  $\mu = (\mu_X, \mu_Y)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} r(W, \pi, \mu, \beta) &= P(X - \mu_X(P)) [Y - \mu_Y(P) - D(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta], \\ \alpha(X) &= -P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) - P\mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with  $\mu_Y^{(1)}$  and  $\mu_X^{(1)}$  being the derivative functions of  $\mu_Y$  and  $\mu_X$ , respectively. Therefore, the orthogonalized moment condition for  $\beta$  derived from the Robinson-type moment (10) is

$$E[\psi(W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] = 0. \quad (12)$$

As revealed by Chernozhukov et al. (2022), the moment condition (12) has two key orthogonality properties. First, varying the additional nuisance function  $\alpha$  away from its true value has no effect, globally, on  $E[\psi(W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]$ , which is a direct consequence of the definition of  $\psi$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Denote  $\tilde{\alpha}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  as generic functions in the sets of possible values of  $\alpha$  and  $\mu$ , respectively, and  $\tilde{\beta}$  as a generic vector in the set of possible values of  $\beta$ . Then we have*

$$E\left[\psi\left(W, \pi, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}\right)\right] = E\left[\psi\left(W, \pi, \tilde{\mu}, \alpha, \tilde{\beta}\right)\right]$$

for any  $\tilde{\alpha}$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}$ , and  $\tilde{\beta}$ .

Second, varying the first-step nuisance function  $\pi$  away from its true value has no effect, locally, on  $E[\psi(W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]$ , which is an expected consequence of bringing in the first-step influence function.

**Lemma 2.** *(i) Suppose that  $\mu_Y$  and  $\mu_X$  are differentiable, and that the condition for interchangeability of the derivative and expectation holds. Then we have*

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial t} E[\psi(W, \pi + t\delta, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] \right|_{t=0} = 0$$

for any  $\delta$  as a possible direction of deviation of  $\pi$  from the true value, where  $t$  is a scalar representing the size of the deviation and the derivative is evaluated at  $t = 0$ .

(ii) Suppose that  $\mu_Y$  and  $\mu_X$  are second-order continuously differentiable, with their first and second derivatives bounded. Suppose that  $E[\|X\|^s] < \infty$  for a constant  $s > 1$ . Let  $q = 2s/(s-1) > 2$ . Then for any  $\tilde{\pi}$  in a small neighborhood of  $\pi$ , we have

$$\|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\| \leq C \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2$$

for a constant  $C$ , where  $\|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} = (E[|\tilde{\pi}(X) - \pi(X)|^q])^{1/q}$  denotes the  $L_q(F)$ -norm, with  $F$  representing the distribution law of  $X$ .

Lemma 2.(i) is a directional derivative characterization of orthogonality with respect to the generated regressor, while Lemma 2.(ii) bounds the departure from zero of the expected moment function as just  $\pi$  varies. The bound implies that the orthogonal moment shrinks to zero at a squared rate of convergence of the first-step estimation, which will be useful for establishing  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency of the estimation of  $\beta$ . Lemmas 1 and 2 follow from direct inspection of conditions in Theorems 2 and 3 of Chernozhukov et al. (2022). For completeness, we give an explicit derivation of these orthogonality properties in Appendix A.3. The following lemma extends the rate result in Lemma 2.(ii) to the case of varying  $\pi$  and  $\mu$  simultaneously.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that the conditions in Lemma 2.(ii) hold. Then for any  $\tilde{\pi}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  in small neighborhoods of  $\pi$  and  $\mu$ , respectively, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\mu}, \alpha, \beta)]\| &\leq C_1 \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2 + C_2 \|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{q,F}^2 \\ &\quad + C_3 \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{q,F} \\ &\quad + C_4 \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\tilde{\mu}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}\|_{q,F} \end{aligned}$$

for constants  $C_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ), where

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mu} - \mu\|_{q,F} &= (E[|\tilde{\mu}_Y(P) - \mu_Y(P)|^q])^{1/q} + (E[|\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P)|^q])^{1/q}, \\ \|\tilde{\mu}^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}\|_{q,F} &= \left(E\left[|\tilde{\mu}_Y^{(1)}(P) - \mu_Y^{(1)}(P)|^q\right]\right)^{1/q} + \left(E\left[|\tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(P) - \mu_X^{(1)}(P)|^q\right]\right)^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

## 3.2 Locally Robust Estimation

We follow the DML method that combines orthogonal moment functions with cross-fitting, to construct debiased sample moments and thus a locally robust estimator for the target parameter  $\beta$ . Cross-fitting means that the moment function  $\psi$  for each observation is evaluated at estimates of  $(\pi, \mu, \alpha)$  that only use other observations. Specifically, partition the

sample of observations  $\{W_i = (Y_i, D_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  into  $L$  subsamples  $\{W_i\}_{i \in I_\ell}$  ( $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$ ), such that  $\bigcup_{\ell=1}^L I_\ell = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $I_\ell \cap I_{\ell'} = \emptyset$ . Denote  $(\hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell)$  to be estimates of  $(\pi, \mu, \alpha)$  that are constructed using all observations not in  $I_\ell$ , and denote  $\hat{P}_{\ell i} = \hat{\pi}_\ell(X_i)$ . Then the debiased sample moment function is

$$\hat{\Psi}_n(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \psi(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \beta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left[ r(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \beta) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) (D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right],$$

and the locally robust estimator  $\hat{\beta}^{LR}$  is defined as a solution to the moment condition  $\hat{\Psi}_n(\beta) = 0$ , which has an explicit form:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}^{LR} &= \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} D_i \hat{P}_{\ell i} (X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i})) (X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}))' \right]^{-1} \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left[ \hat{P}_{\ell i} (X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i})) (Y_i - \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i})) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) (D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first-step estimation  $\hat{P}_{\ell i} = \hat{\pi}_\ell(X_i)$  for  $P_i = \pi(X_i) = E[D_i | X_i]$  can be generated by any of the ML methods, such as random forests, neural nets, lasso or post-lasso, boosted regression trees, and various hybrids and ensembles of these methods. The cross-fitting device eliminates the need for Donsker conditions for  $\hat{\pi}_\ell$ , which is important because most ML methods are not known to satisfy such conditions. The only requirement for  $\hat{\pi}_\ell$  is a convergence rate condition given by Assumption 4 in the following subsection. We will adopt an off-the-shelf random forest algorithm in the first step in subsequent simulation and application.

The second-step estimation  $\hat{\mu}_\ell = (\hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}, \hat{\mu}_{X\ell})$  for  $\mu_Y(p) = E[Y | P = p]$  and  $\mu_X(p) = E[X | P = p]$  can also be constructed by ML methods on account of the nonparametric nature of  $\mu = (\mu_Y, \mu_X)$ . However, since the regressions in this step are all univariate, we will adopt the kernel regression estimation for computational simplicity:

$$\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) = \left[ \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z} k\left(\frac{\hat{P}_{\ell' j} - p}{h_Z}\right) Z_j \right] / \left[ \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z} k\left(\frac{\hat{P}_{\ell' j} - p}{h_Z}\right) \right], \quad (13)$$

where  $Z$  represents  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ ,  $k(\cdot)$  and  $h_Z$  are the kernel function and regression-specific bandwidth, and  $\hat{P}_{\ell' j} = \hat{\pi}_{\ell'}(Z_j)$  with  $\hat{\pi}_{\ell'}$  being an ML estimate of  $\pi$  using all observations not in  $I_\ell$  and not in  $I_{\ell'}$ .



Lastly, the additional nuisance parameter  $\alpha$  can be estimated by plugging proper estimates of the unknown components into (11):

$$\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) = -\hat{P}_{\ell i} \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right) \left[ \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \hat{P}_{\ell i} \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{P}_{\ell i})' \hat{\beta}_\ell \right], \quad (14)$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_{X\ell}^{(1)}(p) = d\hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(p)/dp$ ,  $\hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}^{(1)}(p) = d\hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}(p)/dp$ , and  $\hat{\beta}_\ell$  is an initial estimate of  $\beta$  that is formed using all observations not in  $I_\ell$ . We adopt the cross-fitted partialling-out estimator as  $\hat{\beta}_\ell$ :

$$\hat{\beta}_\ell = \left[ \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}^2 \left( X_j - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) \right) \left( X_j - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) \right)' \right]^{-1} \cdot \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} \left( X_j - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) \right) \left( Y_j - \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) \right).$$

Under the specification (14) of  $\hat{\alpha}_\ell$ , the locally robust estimator can also be written as

$$\hat{\beta}^{LR} = \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} D_i \hat{P}_{\ell i} \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right) \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right)' \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{P}_{\ell i} \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right) \cdot \left[ Y_i - \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \left( D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i} \right) \left( \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \hat{P}_{\ell i} \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{P}_{\ell i})' \hat{\beta}_\ell \right) \right].$$

### 3.3 Asymptotic Property

To investigate the asymptotic property of the proposed estimator, we make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 4.** The matrix  $M = E \left[ P^2 (X - \mu_X(P)) (X - \mu_X(P))' \right]$  is positive definite, and  $E \left[ \|\psi(W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)\|^2 \right] < \infty$ .

**Assumption 5.** For each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/4} \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \\ n^{1/4} \|\hat{\mu}_\ell - \mu\|_{q,F} &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \\ n^{1/4} \left\| \hat{\mu}_\ell^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)} \right\|_{q,F} &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \\ n^{1/4} \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha\|_{q,F} &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{q,F}$  denotes the  $L_q(F)$ -norm with  $q > 2$  given in Lemma 2.(ii).

Assumption 4 is standard and it ensures nonsingularity of the asymptotic covariance matrix of the estimator. Assumption 5 requires an  $n^{-1/4}$ -rate of convergence for the first-step machine learner as is familiar from the DML literature. The difference resulting from the multi-step nature of our estimator lies in two aspects. First, we need a rate of  $L_q(F)$ -convergence that implies the usual mean-square convergence. Second, the construction of  $\hat{\mu}_\ell$  needs the first-step estimation of  $\pi$  as an input, such as in (13), which implicitly imposes additional restrictions on the first-step estimation. Sperlich (2009) and Mammen et al. (2012) derive the convergence rate of the kernel estimation with a generated regressor, under a bias-variance structure or a complexity restriction on the generated regressor, respectively. However, such structure or complexity restriction is tailored to the traditional kernel or sieve estimators and not known to hold for most ML estimators. In comparison, we employ the cross-fitting device in the construction of  $\hat{\mu}_\ell$  as in (13) and provide an alternative set of sufficient conditions for Assumption 5 that only require a faster rate of the first-step estimation but without requiring any structure or complexity restrictions.

**Assumption 6.** (i)  $\hat{\mu}_\ell$  and  $\hat{\alpha}_\ell$  are defined in (13) and (14), respectively, and  $\hat{\mu}_\ell^{(1)}(p) = d\hat{\mu}_\ell(p)/dp$ . (ii) For each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  and  $\ell' \neq \ell$ , we have  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  and  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} / h_Z^{1+1/q} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ , where  $h_Z$  is the bandwidth specific to  $Z$  that represents  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ . (iii) The probability density function of  $P$ ,  $f_P(p)$ , is bounded above and below from zero over  $p \in (0, 1)$ , and is differentiable with the derivative function satisfying the Lipschitz-continuity condition  $\left| f_P^{(1)}(p_1) - f_P^{(1)}(p_2) \right| \leq C |p_1 - p_2|$  for some  $C > 0$ . (iv) For  $Z$  being  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ ,  $\mu_Z(p)$  is twice differentiable with the derivative functions being Lipschitz-continuous, and  $E \left[ |Z|^{q/(q-1)} \mid P = p \right]$  is Lipschitz-continuous and bounded over  $p \in (0, 1)$ . (v) The kernel function  $k(\cdot)$  is symmetric, is twice differentiable with bounded derivatives, has compact support, and satisfies  $\left| |v_1|^l k(v_1) - |v_2|^l k(v_2) \right| \leq C |v_1 - v_2|$  for some  $C > 0$  for all  $0 \leq l \leq 3$ . (vi) For  $Z$  being  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ , the sequence of bandwidths  $h_Z = h_Z(n)$  satisfies  $n^{1/8} h_Z \rightarrow 0$ ,  $n^{1/4} h_Z^{1-2/q} \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $n^{1/2} h_Z / \ln n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n$  goes to infinity.

**Lemma 4.** *Assumption 6 implies Assumption 5.*

Along with regularity conditions that are standard in the kernel estimation, Assumption 6 requires a faster than  $n^{-1/4}$  rate for the preliminary machine learner  $\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}$ . Specifically, Assumption 6.(ii) and (vi) imply  $\|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} = o_p(n^{-3/8})$ . Under these assumptions, we can establish  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimator for the sample selection model without exclusion restrictions.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose that the conditions in Lemma 2.(ii) and Assumptions 1, 4, and 5 hold. Then the locally robust estimator  $\hat{\beta}^{LR}$  for  $\beta$  is  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent and asymptotically normal:*

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \hat{\beta}^{LR} - \beta \right) \longrightarrow N \left( 0, M^{-1} \Sigma M^{-1} \right),$$

where  $M$  is defined in Assumption 4 and  $\Sigma = E \left[ \psi \left( W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta \right) \psi \left( W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta \right)' \right]$ .

To conduct statistical inference, we need to construct a consistent estimator for  $M^{-1} \Sigma M^{-1}$ . A choice at hand is to estimate  $M$  and  $\Sigma$  separately by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{M}_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} D_i \hat{P}_{\ell i} \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X_\ell} \left( \hat{P}_{\ell i} \right) \right) \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X_\ell} \left( \hat{P}_{\ell i} \right) \right)', \\ \hat{\Sigma}_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \psi \left( W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\beta}^{LR} \right) \psi \left( W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \hat{\alpha}_\ell, \hat{\beta}^{LR} \right)'. \end{aligned}$$

The consistency of  $\hat{M}_n^{-1}$  for  $M^{-1}$  has been shown in the proof of Theorem 2. By the same logic, it is ready to show the consistency of  $\hat{\Sigma}_n$  for  $\Sigma$ . It follows that  $\hat{M}_n^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_n \hat{M}_n^{-1} \xrightarrow{p} M^{-1} \Sigma M^{-1}$ .

## 4 Simulation

We examine the finite sample property of the locally robust estimator  $\hat{\beta}^{LR}$  by a Monte Carlo simulation. The simulation data are generated from the semiparametric sample selection model (2) without any exclusion restriction, which means that all covariates enter the outcome equation (1b) with nonzero coefficients. The vector of covariates consists of ten dimensions, that is,  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_{10})'$ , where every two adjacent covariates are statistically correlated with each other with a common correlation coefficient 0.5. To simulate the situation usually encountered in practice, we let the first two covariates to be continuously distributed and let the remaining ones to be discretely distributed. Specifically,  $X_1$  follows a standard normal distribution,  $X_2$  follows a uniform distribution over the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ , and  $X_k$ 's ( $k = 3, \dots, 10$ ) are  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued binary variables with  $\Pr(X_k = 1) = 0.5$ . The error term  $\varepsilon$  is generated from a standardized distribution with zero mean and unit variance, and  $U$  is generated by  $U = \rho\varepsilon + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}e$ , where  $e$  is a standard normal random variable independent of  $\varepsilon$ . Hence,  $E[U] = E[\varepsilon] = 0$  and  $Corr(U, \varepsilon) = \rho$ . The linear coefficients are all set to one, that is,  $\beta = \mathbf{1}_{10 \times 1}$ . The nonlinear function  $h(\cdot)$  in the selection equation (1a) is set to be  $h(x) = c + x_1 + x_1^2 - x_2 - x_2^2 + x_3x_4 - x_5x_6$ , where the

constant  $c$  is introduced to control for the censoring rate  $\Pr(D = 0) = \Pr(h(X) < \varepsilon)$ . In the benchmark setting,  $c$  is set to produce approximately 50% censoring,  $\varepsilon$  follows a standard normal distribution such that  $(\varepsilon, U)$  follows a bivariate normal distribution with the correlation coefficient being  $\rho$ , and  $\rho$  is set 0.5. Different designs are constructed by varying the censoring rate  $\Pr(D = 0)$ , the correlation coefficient  $\rho$ , the distribution of  $\varepsilon$ , as well as the functional form of  $h(\cdot)$ . The sample size is set  $n = 250, 500, 1000$ , and the simulation replicates 100 times for each design.

In every replication  $b = 1, \dots, 100$ , we compute the proposed estimator  $\hat{\beta}^{LR,b}$  by using a random forest as the first-step estimate of the propensity score of selection, using the kernel regression (13) as the second-step estimate of  $\mu = (\mu_X, \mu_Y)$ , and plugging in the corresponding estimates of unknown components of the first-step influence function as in (14). The random forest is an ensemble learning technique that estimates the propensity score by averaging predictions from multiple decision trees (Biau and Scornet, 2016). While various machine learners are available, the random forest stands out for the ability to capture complex relationships in data. This makes it well suited for estimating the regression relationship between the sample selection indicator and covariates, which is assumed to be nonlinear (Assumption 2). The random forest has gained popularity in recent years and is frequently applied in the DML literature, such as in Chernozhukov et al. (2018). We employ a cross-validation strategy to tune the hyperparameters of the random forest, such as the number of trees in the forest and the minimum number of observations required at each leaf node. The number of folds in the cross-fitting and cross-validation is set five. In the second-step kernel estimation, we choose the Gaussian kernel and rule-of-thumb bandwidths for simplicity. Along with  $\hat{\beta}^{LR,b}$ , we compute the Robinson-type partialling-out estimator  $\hat{\beta}^{R,b}$  as comparison, which is the naive (i.e., non-orthogonalized, non-cross-fitting) version of  $\hat{\beta}^{LR,b}$ . As in  $\hat{\beta}^{LR,b}$ , we compute  $\hat{\beta}^{R,b}$  by using the random forest as the first-step estimate and using the kernel regression as the second-step estimate, but without cross-fitting. As mentioned before,  $\hat{\beta}^{R,b}$  would likely fail to be  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent due to the first-order influence of the first-step learning bias.

For every component  $k = 1, \dots, 10$  of each estimator  $\hat{\beta}$ , we summarize simulation results by the absolute bias  $Bias(\hat{\beta}_k) = \sum_{b=1}^{100} |\hat{\beta}_k^b - 1| / 100$ , the standard deviation  $SD(\hat{\beta}_k) = \left( \sum_{b=1}^{100} \left[ \hat{\beta}_k^b - \left( \sum_{b=1}^{100} \hat{\beta}_k^b / 100 \right) \right]^2 / 100 \right)^{1/2}$ , and the coverage probability of an asymptotic 95% confidence interval defined as  $Coverage(\hat{\beta}_k) = \sum_{b=1}^{100} 1 \left\{ \left| \hat{\beta}_k^b - 1 \right| \leq 1.96 \times SE(\hat{\beta}_k) \right\} / 100$ ,

where  $SE(\hat{\beta}_k) = \left[ \left( \hat{M}_n^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_n \hat{M}_n^{-1} \right)_{k,k} / n \right]^{1/2}$ . Considering that the primary aim of the locally robust estimation procedure is to provide a valid method of conducting inference, we focus mainly on the estimators' performance in terms of the coverage probability. In Table 1, we report the average absolute bias  $\sum_{k=1}^{10} Bias(\hat{\beta}_k) / 10$ , the average standard deviation  $\sum_{k=1}^{10} SD(\hat{\beta}_k) / 10$ , the average coverage probability  $\sum_{k=1}^{10} Coverage(\hat{\beta}_k) / 10$ , the maximum coverage probability  $\max_k Coverage(\hat{\beta}_k)$ , and the minimum coverage probability  $\min_k Coverage(\hat{\beta}_k)$  of  $\hat{\beta}^{LR}$  and  $\hat{\beta}^R$  in Columns (1) and (2), respectively.

Table 1: Simulation results for the benchmark setting

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Locally Robust	Robinson	Robinson with Orthogonalization	Robinson with Cross-fitting
<b>Panel A: <math>n = 250</math></b>				
Average Bias	0.240	0.172	0.118	0.535
Average SD	0.257	0.170	0.140	0.435
Average Coverage	0.953	0.874	0.918	0.638
Max Coverage	0.990	0.960	0.990	0.870
Min Coverage	0.860	0.670	0.810	0.070
<b>Panel B: <math>n = 500</math></b>				
Average Bias	0.154	0.133	0.084	0.364
Average SD	0.151	0.117	0.098	0.265
Average Coverage	0.950	0.824	0.922	0.581
Max Coverage	1.000	0.970	0.960	0.900
Min Coverage	0.820	0.580	0.830	0.010
<b>Panel C: <math>n = 1000</math></b>				
Average Bias	0.099	0.106	0.060	0.248
Average SD	0.095	0.086	0.071	0.161
Average Coverage	0.948	0.760	0.907	0.525
Max Coverage	1.000	0.930	0.960	0.930
Min Coverage	0.880	0.260	0.810	0.020

As the sample size  $n$  increases, the bias and standard deviation of the locally robust

estimator decrease at a roughly root- $n$  rate as expected. Moreover, the locally robust estimator performs rather well in terms of the coverage probability regardless of  $n$ . In comparison, the Robinson-type estimator’s bias decreases at a rate that is evidently slower than  $n^{-1/2}$  as  $n$  increases, which is in accordance with the theoretical conjecture that the Robinson-type estimator with ML first-step cannot achieve  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistency. As a result, its coverage probability deviates from the nominal level even farther for larger  $n$ . This means that the naive Robinson-type estimator for the sample selection model will generally lead to misleading conclusions in inference and hypothesis testing. The locally robust approach corrects for the size distortion of hypothesis testing constructed by the Robinson-type estimator.

Nevertheless, the bias of the locally robust estimator seems a bit larger than it is supposed to be. In particular, when the sample size is small, the locally robust estimator is more biased than the naive Robinson-type estimator. To probe into the reason of this phenomenon, we separately consider orthogonalization and cross-fitting, the two ingredients of DML. Namely, we compute the Robinson estimator with orthogonalization (or, equivalently, the locally robust estimator without cross-fitting) and the Robinson estimator with cross-fitting (or the locally robust estimator without orthogonalization). The results of these two auxiliary estimators are reported in Columns (3) and (4) of Table 1.

By comparing Column (3) with Column (2), we can see that adding the first-step influence function effectively reduces the estimation bias of the target parameter, which is in agreement with the reduction of the influence of the first-step learning bias from first order to second order in theory. Additionally, the orthogonalization increases the convergence rate of the bias to an order of nearly  $n^{-1/2}$  by Column (3). However, from Column (3) to Column (1), we find that using cross-fitting remarkably enlarges the bias, which accounts for the large bias of the locally robust estimator. The negative impact of cross-fitting on estimation can also be found by comparing Columns (2) and (4). These results partly contradict with the theory where cross-fitting is the key to relaxing the Donsker condition and thus admitting the ML first-step. We conjecture that inaccurate out-of-sample prediction relative to in-sample prediction results in the discrepancy between theory and finite-sample performance in using cross-fitting.

To demonstrate this conjecture, we run a simulation for repeated samples such that every observation can find a copy of itself and thus the ML first-step actually carry out in-sample prediction even with cross-fitting. Specifically, we first generate a random sample of size  $n/2$  following the benchmark setting, and then make a copy of it to produce a sample

of size  $n$ . The results reported in Table 2 show that the negative impact of cross-fitting disappears under repeated samples, which supports the conjecture.

Table 2: Simulation results for repeated samples

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Locally Robust	Robinson	Robinson with Orthogonalization	Robinson with Cross-fitting
<b>Panel A: <math>n = 250</math></b>				
Average Bias	0.180	0.208	0.179	0.251
Average SD	0.221	0.242	0.220	0.275
Average Coverage	0.940	0.930	0.938	0.917
Max Coverage	0.970	0.970	0.980	0.970
Min Coverage	0.910	0.890	0.900	0.820
<b>Panel B: <math>n = 500</math></b>				
Average Bias	0.123	0.144	0.126	0.169
Average SD	0.146	0.160	0.146	0.177
Average Coverage	0.946	0.903	0.927	0.880
Max Coverage	0.980	0.960	0.970	0.950
Min Coverage	0.890	0.680	0.770	0.640
<b>Panel C: <math>n = 1000</math></b>				
Average Bias	0.084	0.104	0.088	0.126
Average SD	0.097	0.105	0.097	0.115
Average Coverage	0.938	0.873	0.899	0.840
Max Coverage	0.980	0.960	0.990	0.940
Min Coverage	0.870	0.570	0.650	0.720

To investigate the robustness of finite-sample performance of the locally robust estimator, we design several different settings and report the simulation results in Section A.5 of the Appendix. In Table A.1, we consider higher correlation of the errors,  $\rho = 0.75$ , and/or higher rate of censoring,  $\Pr(D = 0) = 0.75$ , to increase the model complexity pertaining to sample selection. Panel A shows that the estimators are fairly robust to different error correlation, while Panels B and C show that higher rate of censoring has more serious impact on the locally robust estimator than on the simpler Robinson estimator in terms



of the bias and standard deviation. Although large bias, the locally robust estimator still performs well in the coverage probability. Tables [A.2](#) and [A.3](#) further verify the robustness of the locally robust estimator, in terms of the coverage probability, to different error distributions and different functional forms of  $h(\cdot)$  in the selection equation.

## 5 Empirical Application

In this section, we apply the proposed estimator to [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#)'s data on wages that are extracted from Current Population Survey. In the survey, a considerable percentage of respondents do not participate in work, whose market wages are latent and unobserved. Specifically, the percentage working is only 67.7% for man and 61.6% for women in [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#)'s data, implying a potentially substantial problem of sample selection. Summary statistics and more details about the data and variables can be found in [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#). We define the selection variable as whether or not to participate in work and estimate the sample selection model on wages by using the same covariates as in [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#). No exclusion restriction is imposed; namely, all the covariates enter both the participation equation and the wage equation. We estimate the model by the locally robust and Robinson estimators, following the implementation details in [Section 4](#), and report the estimated coefficients of the wage equation in the first two data columns of [Table 3](#). The estimated bounds of [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#) and [Lee \(2009\)](#) in the last two data columns in each panel of [Table 3](#) are copied from [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#). The parameter of interest is the coefficient on being third-generation Mexican-American as opposed on non-Hispanic white.

From [Table 3](#), [Lee](#)'s bound is long enough to cover both [Honoré and Hu](#)'s bound and the implied confidence intervals based on the two point-estimates as expected, because [Lee](#)'s assumption on the model is most relaxed and uses the least amount of model information. The locally robust and Robinson estimators are close to each other, especially for men, and they reveal a significantly larger, in magnitude, effect of ethnicity on wages compared with [Honoré and Hu](#)'s bound. Note that both for women and men, the locally robust estimator is near the midpoint of [Lee](#)'s bound, and [Honoré and Hu](#)'s bound is located at the very upper part of [Lee](#)'s bound. This provides some support for the linear structure of the wage equation assumed by both the locally robust estimator and [Honoré and Hu](#)'s bound, while casting some doubt on the linear structure of the participation equation assumed by only [Honoré and Hu](#)'s bound.

Table 3: Estimated wage regression

	Women				Men			
	Locally Robust	Robinson	Honoré and Hu (2020)'s Bound	Lee (2009)'s Bound	Locally Robust	Robinson	Honoré and Hu (2020)'s Bound	Lee (2009)'s Bound
Mexican-American	-0.141 (0.010)	-0.114 (0.012)	[-0.086, -0.080]	[-0.210, -0.041]	-0.138 (0.009)	-0.127 (0.012)	[-0.109, -0.097]	[-0.249, -0.074]
Age	0.050 (0.012)	0.132 (0.015)	[0.096, 0.106]		0.047 (0.011)	0.082 (0.013)	[0.077, 0.091]	
Age squared	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	[-0.000, -0.000]		0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	[-0.001, -0.000]	
Experience	-0.057 (0.009)	-0.112 (0.012)	[-0.067, -0.062]		-0.026 (0.009)	-0.046 (0.011)	[-0.032, -0.023]	
Experience squared	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	[-0.000, -0.000]		-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	[-0.000, -0.000]	
Veteran	0.115 (0.018)	0.022 (0.023)	[0.029, 0.030]		0.012 (0.010)	0.017 (0.013)	[-0.001, 0.005]	
Married	0.199 (0.009)	0.126 (0.010)	[0.042, 0.052]		-0.008 (0.008)	0.050 (0.010)	[0.133, 0.154]	
Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Education dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
No. observations	127738	127738	127738	127738	118250	118250	118250	118250

Note. (1) The locally robust and Robinson estimators are computed as in the previous section of simulation. Their standard errors constructed from the estimated asymptotic variance-covariance matrix are given in parentheses. (2) Honoré and Hu (2020)'s bound assumes the selection equation to have a linear form, namely, assumes  $h(\cdot)$  to be a linear function, which is not imposed in the locally robust estimator, the Robinson estimator, and Lee (2009)'s bound. (3) Lee (2009)'s method only identifies the bound for the treatment effect (the coefficient of the treatment variable). (4) Estimates of both bounds come directly from Honoré and Hu (2020).

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we consider identification and estimation of a semiparametric sample selection model without the exclusion restriction. We establish identification of the model based on functional form. Specifically, we assume nonlinearity on the selection equation and linearity on the outcome equation, and utilize the nonlinear part of the selection equation to provide excluded variation to control for selection and identify coefficients of the outcome equation. We prove the identification by representing the coefficients as known functions of conditional means of observed variables.

According to the identification result, we propose to estimate the model by a partially linear regression with a nonparametrically generated regressor. To accommodate modern machine learning methods in generating the regressor, we construct an orthogonalized moment by adding the first-step influence function and develop a locally robust estimator by solving the cross-fitted orthogonalized moment condition. Our derivation of the first-step influence function differs from the current literature on double machine learning in the three-step nature of the sample selection corrected estimation. Due to the addition of an intermediate step, the first-step estimation bias has an indirect influence along with the direct influence on the estimation of target coefficients. We follow [Hahn and Ridder \(2013\)](#)'s method to address this problem and show the first-order orthogonalization of the constructed moment function with respect to the first-step estimation bias. Accordingly, we then establish root-n-consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed locally robust estimator under mild regularity conditions.

By a simulation, we show that the locally robust estimator performs desirably in terms of the coverage probability of an asymptotic 95% confidence interval, implying an effective correction for the size distortion of hypothesis testing based on the naive Robinson-type estimator. Moreover, the coverage probability of the locally robust estimator is quite robust to various simulation designs. Finally, we provide an application to [Honoré and Hu \(2020\)](#)' wage data to illustrate the usefulness of the proposed method in sample selection models without exclusion restrictions.

## References

Ahn, H. and J. L. Powell (1993). Semiparametric estimation of censored selection models with a nonparametric selection mechanism. *Journal of Econometrics* 58(1-2), 3–29.

- Andrews, D. W. and M. M. Schafgans (1998). Semiparametric estimation of the intercept of a sample selection model. *The Review of Economic Studies* 65(3), 497–517.
- Arabmazar, A. and P. Schmidt (1982). An investigation of the robustness of the Tobit estimator to non-normality. *Econometrica* 50(4), 1055–1063.
- Bia, M., M. Huber, and L. Laffers (2024). Double machine learning for sample selection models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 42(3), 958–969.
- Biau, G. and E. Scornet (2016). A random forest guided tour. *Test* 25, 197–227.
- Blundell, R., A. Gosling, H. Ichimura, and C. Meghir (2007). Changes in the distribution of male and female wages accounting for employment composition using bounds. *Econometrica* 75(2), 323–363.
- Chamberlain, G. (1986). Asymptotic efficiency in semi-parametric models with censoring. *Journal of Econometrics* 32(2), 189–218.
- Chen, S. and S. Khan (2003). Semiparametric estimation of a heteroskedastic sample selection model. *Econometric Theory* 19(6), 1040–1064.
- Chen, S. and L.-f. Lee (1998). Efficient semiparametric scoring estimation of sample selection models. *Econometric Theory* 14, 423–462.
- Chen, S., N. Liu, H. Zhang, and Y. Zhou (2024). Estimation of wage inequality in the UK by quantile regression with censored selection. *Journal of Econometrics* (in press), 105733. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.09.012>.
- Chen, S. and Y. Zhou (2010). Semiparametric and nonparametric estimation of sample selection models under symmetry. *Journal of Econometrics* 157(1), 143–150.
- Chernozhukov, V., D. Chetverikov, M. Demirer, E. Duflo, C. Hansen, W. K. Newey, and J. M. Robins (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal* 21(1), C1–C68.
- Chernozhukov, V., J. C. Escanciano, H. Ichimura, W. K. Newey, and J. M. Robins (2022). Locally robust semiparametric estimation. *Econometrica* 90(4), 1501–1535.
- Conley, T. G., C. B. Hansen, and P. E. Rossi (2012). Plausibly exogenous. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94(1), 260–272.

- D'Haultfœuille, X., S. Hoderlein, and Y. Sasaki (2021). Testing and relaxing the exclusion restriction in the control function approach. *Journal of Econometrics* (in press). Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.09.012>.
- D'Haultfœuille, X. and A. Maurel (2013). Another look at the identification at infinity of sample selection models. *Econometric Theory* 29(1), 213–224.
- D'Haultfœuille, X., A. Maurel, and Y. Zhang (2018). Extremal quantile regressions for selection models and the black-white wage gap. *Journal of Econometrics* 203(1), 129–142.
- Dong, Y. (2010). Endogenous regressor binary choice models without instruments, with an application to migration. *Economics Letters* 107(1), 33–35.
- Escanciano, J. C., D. Jacho-Chávez, and A. Lewbel (2016). Identification and estimation of semiparametric two-step models. *Quantitative Economics* 7(2), 561–589.
- Escanciano, J. C. and T. Pérez-Izquierdo (2023). Automatic locally robust estimation with generated regressors. *arXiv preprint* (arXiv:2301.10643v2). Available at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.10643>.
- Escanciano, J. C. and L. Zhu (2015). A simple data-driven estimator for the semiparametric sample selection model. *Econometric Reviews* 34(6-10), 734–762.
- Gallant, A. R. and D. W. Nychka (1987). Semi-nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation. *Econometrica* 55, 363–390.
- Gronau, R. (1974). Wage comparisons: A selectivity bias. *Journal of Political Economy* 82(6), 1119–1143.
- Hahn, J. and G. Ridder (2013). Asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators with generated regressors. *Econometrica* 81(1), 315–340.
- Heckman, J. (1974). Shadow prices, market wages, and labor supply. *Econometrica* 42(4), 679–694.
- Heckman, J. (1979). Sample specification bias as a selection error. *Econometrica* 47(1), 153–162.

- Heckman, J. (1990). Varieties of selection bias. *The American Economic Review* 80(2), 313–318.
- Honoré, B. E. and L. Hu (2020). Selection without exclusion. *Econometrica* 88(3), 1007–1029.
- Honoré, B. E. and L. Hu (2022). Sample selection models without exclusion restrictions: Parameter heterogeneity and partial identification. *Journal of Econometrics* (in press). Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.07.017>.
- Horowitz, J. L. (2009). *Semiparametric and Nonparametric Methods in Econometrics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Jones, D. (2015). The economics of exclusion restrictions in IV models. *NBER Working Paper* (No. 21391). Available at <https://doi.org/10.3386/w21391>.
- Khan, S. and E. Tamer (2010). Irregular identification, support conditions, and inverse weight estimation. *Econometrica* 78(6), 2021–2042.
- Krueger, A. B. and D. M. Whitmore (2001). The effect of attending a small class in the early grades on college-test taking and middle school test results: Evidence from Project STAR. *The Economic Journal* 111(468), 1–28.
- Lee, D. S. (2009). Training, wages, and sample selection: Estimating sharp bounds on treatment effects. *Review of Economic Studies* 76(3), 1071–1102.
- Lee, M.-j. (2010). *Micro-Econometrics: Methods of Moments and Limited Dependent Variables* (second ed.). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Leung, S. F. and S. Yu (1996). On the choice between sample selection and two-part models. *Journal of Econometrics* 72(1-2), 197–229.
- Lewbel, A. (2007). Endogenous selection or treatment model estimation. *Journal of Econometrics* 141(2), 777–806.
- Lewis, H. G. (1974). Comments on selectivity biases in wage comparisons. *Journal of Political Economy* 82(6), 1145–1155.
- Li, Q. and J. S. Racine (2007). *Nonparametric Econometrics: Theory and Practice*. Princeton University Press.

- Liu, R. and Z. Yu (2022). Sample selection models with monotone control functions. *Journal of Econometrics* 226(2), 321–342.
- Mammen, E., C. Rothe, and M. Schienle (2012). Nonparametric regression with nonparametrically generated covariates. *The Annals of Statistics* 40(2), 1132–1170.
- Nevo, A. and A. M. Rosen (2012). Identification with imperfect instruments. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94(3), 659–671.
- Newey, W. K. (1994). The asymptotic variance of semiparametric estimators. *Econometrica* 62(6), 1349–1382.
- Newey, W. K. (2009). Two-step series estimation of sample selection models. *The Econometrics Journal* 12, S217–S229.
- Newey, W. K. and D. L. McFadden (1994). Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. In R. F. Engle and D. L. McFadden (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, Volume 4, Chapter 36, pp. 2111–2245. Amsterdam: North-Holland: Elsevier.
- Pagan, A. and A. Ullah (1999). *Nonparametric Econometrics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pan, Z., Z. Wang, J. Zhang, and Y. Zhou (2024). Marginal treatment effects in the absence of instrumental variables. *arXiv preprint* (arXiv:2401.17595v1). Available at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.17595>.
- Pan, Z., X. Zhou, and Y. Zhou (2022). Semiparametric estimation of a censored regression model subject to nonparametric sample selection. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40(1), 141–151.
- Powell, J. L. (2001). Semiparametric estimation of censored selection models. In C. Hsiao, K. Morimune, and J. L. Powell (Eds.), *Nonlinear Statistical Modeling*, Chapter 13, pp. 165–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (1988). Root-n-consistent semiparametric regression. *Econometrica* 56(4), 931–954.
- Sasaki, Y. and T. Ura (2023). Estimation and inference for policy relevant treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 234(2), 394–450.
- Shao, J. (2003). *Mathematical Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York.



- Sperlich, S. (2009). A note on non-parametric estimation with predicted variables. *The Econometrics Journal* 12(2), 382–395.
- Torgovitsky, A. (2015). Identification of nonseparable models using instruments with small support. *Econometrica* 83(3), 1185–1197.
- van den Berg, G. J. (2007). An economic analysis of exclusion restrictions for instrumental variable estimation. *IZA Discussion Paper* (No. 2585). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=964965> or <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.964965>.
- van Kippersluis, H. and C. A. Rietveld (2018). Beyond plausibly exogenous. *The Econometrics Journal* 21(3), 316–331.

# Appendix

## A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Denote  $m(x) = E[Y | X, D = 1]$  and  $m_0(x^C) = m(x^C, 0) = E[Y | X^C = x^C, X^D = 0, D = 1]$ . Note that  $\pi(x)$  and  $m(x)$ , and thus  $\pi_0(x^C)$  and  $m_0(x^C)$ , are identified functions because they are conditional expectations of observed variables. We first consider identifying  $\beta^C$ , the coefficients of continuous covariates, from  $\pi_0(x^C)$  and  $m_0(x^C)$ . By equation (5), we have

$$m_0(x^C) = x^C \beta^C + g(\pi_0(x^C)). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

When  $\dim(X^C) = 1$ , Assumption 2.(ii) implies that

$$m_0(x^C) - x^C \beta^C = g(\pi_0(x^C)) = g(\pi_0(\tilde{x}^C)) = m_0(\tilde{x}^C) - \tilde{x}^C \beta^C.$$

Hence,  $\beta^C$  is identified by

$$\beta^C = \frac{m_0(x^C) - m_0(\tilde{x}^C)}{x^C - \tilde{x}^C}.$$

When  $\dim(X^C) \geq 2$ , for  $k, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \dim(X^C)\}$  satisfying Assumption 2.(i), taking the partial derivatives of  $m_0(x^C)$  with respect to  $x_k^C$  and  $x_j^C$  yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k m_0(x^C) &= \beta_k^C + g^{(1)}(\pi_0(x^C)) \partial_k \pi_0(x^C), \\ \partial_j m_0(x^C) &= \beta_j^C + g^{(1)}(\pi_0(x^C)) \partial_j \pi_0(x^C), \end{aligned}$$

where  $g^{(1)}$  denotes the derivative function of  $g$ . It follows from  $\partial_k \pi_0(x^C) \neq 0$  and  $\partial_j \pi_0(x^C) \neq 0$  in Assumption 2.(i) that

$$\frac{\partial_k m_0(x^C) - \beta_k^C}{\partial_k \pi_0(x^C)} = g^{(1)}(\pi_0(x^C)) = \frac{\partial_j m_0(x^C) - \beta_j^C}{\partial_j \pi_0(x^C)},$$

so that

$$\partial_k m_0(x^C) \partial_j \pi_0(x^C) - \partial_j m_0(x^C) \partial_k \pi_0(x^C) = \partial_j \pi_0(x^C) \beta_k^C - \partial_k \pi_0(x^C) \beta_j^C, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which is linear in  $\beta_k^C$  and  $\beta_j^C$ . The same equation is obtained if we evaluate the expression at another point  $\tilde{x}^C$  that satisfies Assumption 2.(i), which gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_k m_0(x^C) \partial_j \pi_0(x^C) - \partial_j m_0(x^C) \partial_k \pi_0(x^C) \\ \partial_k m_0(\tilde{x}^C) \partial_j \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) - \partial_j m_0(\tilde{x}^C) \partial_k \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) \end{pmatrix} = \Upsilon \begin{pmatrix} \beta_k^C \\ \beta_j^C \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where

$$\Upsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_j \pi_0(x^C) & -\partial_k \pi_0(x^C) \\ \partial_j \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) & -\partial_k \pi_0(\tilde{x}^C) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The inequality of Assumption 2.(i) ensures that the determinant of  $\Upsilon$  is nonzero, which implies that  $\Upsilon$  is nonsingular. Therefore, equation (A.3) can be solved for  $\beta_k^C$  and  $\beta_j^C$  by inverting  $\Upsilon$ , thereby identifying  $\beta_k^C$  and  $\beta_j^C$ . Given identification of  $\beta_k^C$ , we can then identify all other coefficient  $\beta_l^C$  in  $\beta^C$  by solving (A.2) with the subscript  $j$  replaced by  $l$ , which gives

$$\beta_l^C = \frac{\partial_l m_0(x^C) \partial_k \pi_0(x^C) - \partial_k m_0(x^C) \partial_l \pi_0(x^C) + \partial_l \pi_0(x^C) \beta_k^C}{\partial_k \pi_0(x^C)}.$$

Given the identification of  $\beta^C$ , the function  $g$  is identified on the support of  $\pi_0(X^C)$  by

$$g(p) = E[m_0(X^C) - X^{C'} \beta^C | \pi_0(X^C) = p].$$

Next, we consider identifying  $\beta^D$ , the coefficients of discrete covariates. For each  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \dim(X^D)\}$ , we have

$$m(x^C, x^{Dk}) = x^{C'} \beta^C + x_k^D \beta_k^D + g(\pi(x^C, x^{Dk}))$$

for any  $x^C$  in the support of  $X^C$ . By Assumption 3, there exists  $x^C(k)$  in the support of  $X^C$  such that  $\pi(x^C(k), x^{Dk})$  is in the support of  $\pi_0(X^C)$ . It follows from the above identification result that  $g(\pi(x^C(k), x^{Dk}))$  is identified. Consequently,  $\beta_k^D$  is identified by

$$\beta_k^D = \frac{m(x^C(k), x^{Dk}) - x^C(k)' \beta^C - g(\pi(x^C(k), x^{Dk}))}{x_k^D}.$$

This argument holds for each  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \dim(X^D)\}$ , thereby identifying  $\beta^D$ . Hence,  $\beta = (\beta^C, \beta^D)$  is identified. Additionally, given the identification of  $\beta$ , it follows from equation (5) that the selectivity correction function  $g$  is identified on the support of  $\pi(X)$  by

$$g(p) = E[m(X) - X' \beta | \pi(X) = p].$$

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Denote

$$\hat{M}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} D_i \hat{P}_{\ell i} \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right) \left( X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right)'.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n} \left( \hat{\beta}^{LR} - \beta \right) &= \hat{M}_n^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left[ r(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \beta) + \hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) (D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right] \\
&= \hat{M}_n^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left[ \psi(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \alpha, \beta) + (\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i)) (D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i}) \right] \\
&= \hat{M}_n^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left[ \psi(W_i, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta) + \hat{R}_{1\ell i} + \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \right], \tag{A.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{R}_{1\ell i} &= \psi(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \alpha, \beta) - \psi(W_i, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta), \\
\hat{R}_{2\ell i} &= (\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i)) (D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{W}_\ell^c = \{W_i : i \notin I_\ell\}$  denote the observations not in  $I_\ell$ , so that  $\hat{\pi}_\ell$ ,  $\hat{\mu}_\ell$ , and  $\hat{\alpha}_\ell$  depend only on  $\mathcal{W}_\ell^c$ . Therefore, by equation (12) and Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| E \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \right\| &= \frac{n_\ell}{\sqrt{n}} \|E[\psi(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \alpha, \beta) | \mathcal{W}_\ell^c]\| \\
&\leq \sqrt{n} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F}^2 + C_2 \|\hat{\mu}_\ell - \mu\|_{q,F}^2 \\ + C_3 \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\hat{\mu}_\ell - \mu\|_{q,F} \\ + C_4 \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\hat{\mu}_\ell^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}\|_{q,F} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows from Assumption 5 that for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ ,

$$E \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \xrightarrow{p} 0. \tag{A.5}$$

Also, by observations in  $I_\ell$  mutually independent conditional on  $\mathcal{W}_\ell^c$ ,

$$Var \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right) = \frac{n_\ell}{n} Var \left( \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right) \leq E \left[ \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \hat{R}'_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right].$$

It follows from Assumption 5 and the continuity of  $\psi(W_i, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)$  in  $\pi$  and  $\mu$  that

$$\left\| Var \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right) \right\| \leq E \left[ \|\psi(W_i, \hat{\pi}_\ell, \hat{\mu}_\ell, \alpha, \beta) - \psi(W_i, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

By the conditional Markov inequality,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left( \hat{R}_{1\ell i} - E \left[ \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

It then follows from (A.5) that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , and that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{1\ell i} \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

For the second term  $\hat{R}_{2\ell i}$ , since by the law of iterated expectations

$$E [(\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i))(D_i - P_i) | \mathcal{W}_\ell^c] = E [(\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i)) E [D_i - P_i | X_i] | \mathcal{W}_\ell^c] = 0,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| E \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \right\| &= \frac{n_\ell}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| E \left[ (\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i)) (\hat{P}_{\ell i} - P_i) \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \right\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha\|_F \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha\|_{q,F} \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} \\ &\xrightarrow{p} 0, \end{aligned}$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the  $L_2(F)$ -norm and the second inequality follows from  $q > 2$  and Hölder's inequality. Similarly, for the variance, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right) \right\| &\leq \frac{n_\ell}{n} \left\| E \left[ \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \hat{R}'_{2\ell i} \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \right\| \leq E \left[ \left\| \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \\ &= E \left[ \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i)\|^2 (D_i - \hat{P}_{\ell i})^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \\ &\leq E \left[ \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell(X_i) - \alpha(X_i)\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \\ &\leq \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha\|_{q,F}^2 \xrightarrow{p} 0. \end{aligned}$$

In combination, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \hat{R}_{2\ell i} \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Substituting (A.6) and (A.7) into (A.4) yields

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \hat{\beta}^{LR} - \beta \right) = \hat{M}_n^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(W_i, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta) + o_p(1) \right]. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Next we prove  $\hat{M}_n \xrightarrow{p} M$ , where  $M$  is defined in Assumption 4. To this end, we first show that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) &= \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(P_i) + \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(P_i) - \mu_X(P_i) \\ &= \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}^*) (\hat{P}_{\ell i} - P_i) + \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(P_i) - \mu_X(P_i), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \leq 2 \left[ \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\|^2 \left| \hat{P}_{\ell i} - P_i \right|^2 + \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(P_i) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \right].$$

It follows that

$$E \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \leq 2 \left[ \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\|^2 \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_F^2 + \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell} - \mu_X \right\|_F^2 \right] \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

and that

$$\text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right) \leq \frac{1}{n} E \left[ \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^4 \middle| \mathcal{W}_\ell^c \right] \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ . Therefore, by the conditional Markov inequality,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , and thus (A.9) holds.

Denote

$$M_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i P_i (X_i - \mu_X(P_i)) (X_i - \mu_X(P_i))'.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{M}_n - M_n \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \begin{array}{c} \hat{P}_{\ell i} (X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i})) (X_i - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}))' \\ - P_i (X_i - \mu_X(P_i)) (X_i - \mu_X(P_i))' \end{array} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \left| \hat{P}_{\ell i} \right| \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2 \\ + 2 \left| \hat{P}_{\ell i} \right| \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\| \|X_i - \mu_X(P_i)\| \\ + \left| \hat{P}_{\ell i} - P_i \right| \|X_i - \mu_X(P_i)\|^2 \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By  $|\hat{P}_{\ell i}| \leq 1$  and (A.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{M}_n - M_n\| &\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\| \|X_i - \mu_X(P_i)\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} |\hat{P}_{\ell i} - P_i| \|X_i - \mu_X(P_i)\|^2 + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

For the first term of the right-hand side above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\| \|X_i - \mu_X(P_i)\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \left\| \hat{\mu}_{X\ell}(\hat{P}_{\ell i}) - \mu_X(P_i) \right\|^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{i \in I_\ell} \|X_i - \mu_X(P_i)\|^2} \\ &\xrightarrow{p} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show the convergence in probability of the second term to zero. Consequently,  $\hat{M}_n \xrightarrow{p} M_n$ . We also have

$$M_n \xrightarrow{p} E \left[ D_i P_i (X_i - \mu_X(P_i)) (X_i - \mu_X(P_i))' \right] = M$$

by Khintchine's law of large numbers, so  $\hat{M}_n \xrightarrow{p} M$  follows. By Assumption 4, we have  $\hat{M}_n^{-1} \xrightarrow{p} M^{-1}$ , which in combination of (A.8) yields

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \hat{\beta}^{LR} - \beta \right) = M^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(W_i, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta) + o_p(1).$$

The conclusion follows from the central limit theorem and  $E[\|\psi(W, \pi, \mu, \alpha, \beta)\|^2] < \infty$  in Assumption 4.

### A.3 Proofs of the Lemmas

**Proof of Lemma 1.** It follows from the law of iterated expectations that

$$E[\tilde{\alpha}(X)(D - P)] = E[\tilde{\alpha}(X)(E[D|X] - P)] = 0$$

for any  $\tilde{\alpha}$ . Therefore,

$$E\left[\psi\left(W, \pi, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}\right)\right] = E\left[r\left(W, \pi, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\beta}\right)\right] + E[\tilde{\alpha}(X)(D - P)] = E\left[r\left(W, \pi, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\beta}\right)\right],$$

which is invariant with respect to  $\tilde{\alpha}$  for any  $\tilde{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}$ .  $\square$



**Proof of Lemma 2.** (i) By definition of the function  $\psi$ , we have

$$E[\psi(W, \pi + t\delta, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] = E \left[ \begin{aligned} & (P + t\delta(X)) [X - \mu_X(P + t\delta(X))] \\ & \cdot [Y - \mu_Y(P + t\delta(X)) - D(X - \mu_X(P + t\delta(X)))' \beta] \end{aligned} \right] \\ + E[\alpha(X)(D - P - t\delta(X))].$$

Using the product rule of calculus results in that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} E[\psi(W, \pi + t\delta, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] \Big|_{t=0} &= E[\delta(X)(X - \mu_X(P)) [Y - \mu_Y(P) - D(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\ &\quad - E \left[ P \mu_X^{(1)}(P) \delta(X) [Y - \mu_Y(P) - D(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta] \right] \\ &\quad - E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) \delta(X) \right] \\ &\quad + E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) D \mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta \delta(X) \right] \\ &\quad - E[\alpha(X) \delta(X)]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the law of iterated expectations that the first and second terms on the right-hand side will vanish, considering that by the equation (9)

$$E[Y - \mu_Y(P) - D(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta | X] = E[Y - \mu_Y(P) | X] - P(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} E[\psi(W, \pi + t\delta, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] \Big|_{t=0} &= -E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y^{(1)}(P) - D \mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta] \delta(X) \right] \\ &\quad - E[\alpha(X) \delta(X)] \\ &= -E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y^{(1)}(P) - P \mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta] \delta(X) \right] \\ &\quad - E[\alpha(X) \delta(X)] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Standard calculations yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & E[r(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \beta)] \\ &= E[\tilde{\pi}(X)(X - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X))) [Y - \mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - D(X - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)))' \beta]] \\ &= -E[\tilde{\pi}(X)(X - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X))) [\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\ &= E[\tilde{\pi}(X)(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\ &\quad - E[(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\ &\quad - E[P(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the law of iterated expectations and (9). Through Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] = E[r(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \beta)] + E[\alpha(X)(D - \tilde{\pi}(X))] \\
& = E[\tilde{\pi}(X)(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\
& \quad - E[(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\
& \quad - E\left[P(X - \mu_X(P)) \begin{bmatrix} \mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - \mu_Y^{(1)}(P)(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) \\ -P[\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P) - \mu_X^{(1)}(P)(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)]' \beta \end{bmatrix}\right] \\
& = E\left[\tilde{\pi}(X) \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) [\mu_Y^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - P\mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))' \beta] (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2\right] \\
& \quad - E\left[(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - P\mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))' \beta] (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2\right] \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} E\left[P(X - \mu_X(P)) [\mu_Y^{(2)}(\pi^*(X)) - P\mu_X^{(2)}(\pi^*(X))' \beta] (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\pi^*$  represents an intermediate value between  $\tilde{\pi}$  and  $\pi$ , which may have different values at each appearance. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\| & \leq \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \left( \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\beta\| \right) E[(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2] \\
& \quad + \left( \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\beta\| + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\mu}_Y^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(2)} \right\| \|\beta\| \right) \\
& \quad \cdot E[\|X - \mu_X(P)\| (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\mu}_X^{(d)}$  and  $\bar{\mu}_Y^{(d)}$  denote the bounds of the  $d$ -th derivatives of  $\mu_X$  and  $\mu_Y$ , respectively. By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\|X - \mu_X(P)\| (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2] & \leq \left( E[\|X - \mu_X(P)\|^{q/(q-2)}] \right)^{(q-2)/q} \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2 \\
E[(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2] & \leq \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $E[\|X\|^{q/(q-2)}] = E[\|X\|^s] < \infty$ , it follows from the  $C_r$ -inequality (Shao, 2003, p.80) that

$$E[\|X - \mu_X(P)\|^{q/(q-2)}] = E[\|X - \mu_X(P)\|^s] \leq 2^{s-1} (E\|X\|^s + \|\bar{\mu}_X\|^s) < \infty.$$

Consequently,

$$\|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\| \leq C \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2$$

where

$$C = \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \left( \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\beta\| \right) + \left[ \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\mu}_Y^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(2)} \right\| \right) \|\beta\| \right] \|X - \mu_X(P)\|_{s,F}$$

□

**Proof of Lemma 3.** Since the bound for  $\|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\|$  has been developed in Lemma 2.(ii), it is sufficient to establish the bound for  $\|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\mu}, \alpha, \beta)] - E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\|$ . To this end, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\mu}, \alpha, \beta)] - E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)] \\
&= -E[\tilde{\pi}(X)[X - \tilde{\mu}_X(\tilde{\pi}(X))][\tilde{\mu}_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\tilde{\mu}_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\
&\quad + E[\tilde{\pi}(X)[X - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X))][\mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\
&= E[\tilde{\pi}(X)[\tilde{\mu}_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X))][\tilde{\mu}_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(P) - P(\tilde{\mu}_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P))' \beta]] \\
&\quad + E[\tilde{\pi}(X)[\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P)][\tilde{\mu}_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - P(\tilde{\mu}_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)))' \beta]] \\
&\quad - E[\tilde{\pi}(X)(X - \mu_X(P))[\tilde{\mu}_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - P(\tilde{\mu}_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)))' \beta]] \\
&\doteq \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} - \text{(III)}. \tag{A.10}
\end{aligned}$$

By Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu(P) &= [\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \tilde{\mu}(P)] + [\tilde{\mu}(P) - \mu(P)] \\
&= \tilde{\mu}^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) + [\tilde{\mu}(P) - \mu(P)], \tag{A.11}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu(\tilde{\pi}(X)) \\
&= [\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \tilde{\mu}(P)] - [\mu(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu(P)] + [\tilde{\mu}(P) - \mu(P)] \\
&= [\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) + [\tilde{\mu}(P) - \mu(P)] \tag{A.12}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= [\tilde{\mu}^{(1)}(P) - \mu^{(1)}(P)](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) + \frac{1}{2}[\tilde{\mu}^{(2)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu^{(2)}(\pi^*(X))](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2 \\
&\quad + [\tilde{\mu}(P) - \mu(P)]. \tag{A.13}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\pi^*$  represents an intermediate value between  $\tilde{\pi}$  and  $\pi$ , which may have different values at each appearance.

Substituting (A.11) and (A.12) into the first term of (A.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(I)} &= E\left[\tilde{\pi}(X)\left[\tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))\right]\left[\tilde{\mu}_Y^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - P\tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))' \beta\right](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2\right] \\
&\quad + E\left[\tilde{\pi}(X)\left[\tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))\right](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)[\tilde{\mu}_Y(P) - \mu_Y(P)]\right] \\
&\quad - E\left[\tilde{\pi}(X)\left[\tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))\right](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)P[\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P)]' \beta\right] \\
&\quad + E\left[\left[\tilde{\mu}_Y^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - P\tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))' \beta\right](\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)[\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P)]\right] \\
&\quad + E\left[(\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P))(\tilde{\mu}_Y(P) - \mu_Y(P))\right] - E\left[(\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P))P(\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P))' \beta\right].
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\text{I})\| &\leq \left( \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \right) \left( \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\beta\| \right) \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F^2 \\
&\quad + \left( \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \right) \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F \|\tilde{\mu}_Y - \mu_Y\|_F \\
&\quad + \left[ \left( \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \right) \|\beta\| + \left( \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\beta\| \right) \right] \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F \|\tilde{\mu}_X - \mu_X\|_F \\
&\quad + \|\tilde{\mu}_X - \mu_X\|_F \|\tilde{\mu}_Y - \mu_Y\|_F + \|\beta\| \|\tilde{\mu}_X - \mu_X\|_F^2
\end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the  $L_2(F)$ -norm.

Substituting  $\mu_X(\tilde{\pi}(X)) - \mu_X(P) = \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X))(\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)$  and (A.12) into the second term of (A.10), we obtain

$$(\text{II}) = E \left[ \tilde{\pi}(X) \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left[ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\mu}_Y^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_Y^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) \\ -P \left[ \tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_X^{(1)}(\pi^*(X)) \right]' \beta \end{array} \right] (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) \\ + [\tilde{\mu}_Y(P) - \mu_Y(P)] - P [\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P)]' \beta \end{array} \right\} \right].$$

It follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\text{II})\| &\leq \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \left[ \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \bar{\mu}_Y^{(1)} + \left( \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \right) \|\beta\| \right] \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F^2 \\
&\quad + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F \|\tilde{\mu}_Y - \mu_Y\|_F \\
&\quad + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(1)} \right\| \|\beta\| \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F \|\tilde{\mu}_X - \mu_X\|_F
\end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

Substituting (A.13) into the third term of (A.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{III}) &= E \left[ \tilde{\pi}(X) (X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \tilde{\mu}_Y^{(1)}(P) - \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) \right] (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) \right] \\
&\quad - E \left[ \tilde{\pi}(X) (X - \mu_X(P)) P \left[ \tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)}(P) - \mu_X^{(1)}(P) \right]' \beta (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} E \left[ \tilde{\pi}(X) (X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\mu}_Y^{(2)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_Y^{(2)}(\pi^*(X)) \\ -P \left[ \tilde{\mu}_X^{(2)}(\pi^*(X)) - \mu_X^{(2)}(\pi^*(X)) \right]' \beta \end{array} \right]' (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P)^2 \right] \\
&\quad + E \left[ (\tilde{\pi}(X) - P) (X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \tilde{\mu}_Y(P) - \mu_Y(P) - P (\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P))' \beta \right] \right] \\
&\quad + E \left[ P (X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \tilde{\mu}_Y(P) - \mu_Y(P) - P (\tilde{\mu}_X(P) - \mu_X(P))' \beta \right] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the law of iterated expectations, we can show that the last term on the right-hand side above equals to zero. Therefore, if we denote  $c = \|X - \mu_X(P)\|_{s,F} < \infty$ , it will follow from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\text{III})\| &\leq c \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} \left\| \tilde{\mu}_Y^{(1)} - \mu_Y^{(1)} \right\|_{q,F} + c \|\beta\| \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} \left\| \tilde{\mu}_X^{(1)} - \mu_X^{(1)} \right\|_{q,F} \\
&\quad + \frac{c}{2} \left[ \bar{\mu}_Y^{(2)} + \bar{\mu}_Y^{(2)} + \left( \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(2)} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\mu}_X^{(2)} \right\| \right) \|\beta\| \right] \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2 \\
&\quad + c \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\tilde{\mu}_Y - \mu_Y\|_{q,F} + c \|\beta\| \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\tilde{\mu}_X - \mu_X\|_{q,F}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.16}$$

By the decomposition (A.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\mu}, \alpha, \beta)]\| &\leq \|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \tilde{\mu}, \alpha, \beta)] - E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\| + \|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\| \\ &\leq \|(I)\| + \|(II)\| + \|(III)\| + \|E[\psi(W, \tilde{\pi}, \mu, \alpha, \beta)]\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since by Hölder's inequality

$$\|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_F \leq \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi\|_{q,F}, \quad \|\tilde{\mu}_Y - \mu_Y\|_F \leq \|\tilde{\mu}_Y - \mu_Y\|_{q,F},$$

the desired result follows from combining (A.14), (A.15), (A.16), and Lemma 2.(ii).  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4.** We first prove  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\mu}_\ell - \mu\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ , which is implied by  $\sup_p |\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) - \mu_Z(p)| = o_p(n^{-1/4})$  for  $Z$  being  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ . Denote

$$\mu_{Z\ell n}(p) = \left[ \sum_{j \in I_\ell^c} \frac{1}{h_Z} k\left(\frac{P_j - p}{h_Z}\right) Z_j \right] / \left[ \sum_{j \in I_\ell^c} \frac{1}{h_Z} k\left(\frac{P_j - p}{h_Z}\right) \right].$$

It follows from Li and Racine (2007, Theorem 2.6) and Assumption 6 that

$$\sup_p |\mu_{Z\ell n}(p) - \mu_Z(p)| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{nh_Z}} + h_Z^2\right) = o_p(n^{-1/4}). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

To prove  $\sup_p |\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) - \mu_{Z\ell n}(p)| = o_p(n^{-1/4})$ , we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) &= \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z} k\left(\frac{\hat{P}_{\ell'j} - p}{h_Z}\right) Z_j \\ A_{Z\ell n}(p) &= \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_\ell^c} \frac{1}{h_Z} k\left(\frac{P_j - p}{h_Z}\right) Z_j \end{aligned}$$

for  $Z$  being 1,  $Y$ , or any element of  $X$ . Then  $\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) = \hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) / \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p)$ ,  $\mu_{Z\ell n}(p) = A_{Z\ell n}(p) / A_{1\ell n}(p)$ , and

$$\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell} - \mu_{Z\ell n} = \frac{(\hat{A}_{Z\ell} - A_{Z\ell n}) - (\hat{A}_{1\ell} - A_{1\ell n}) \mu_{Z\ell n}}{\hat{A}_{1\ell}}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

So we need to show that  $\sup_p |\hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) - A_{Z\ell n}(p)| = o_p(n^{-1/4})$  for  $Z$  being 1,  $Y$ , or any element of  $X$ .

By Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) - A_{Z\ell n}(p) &= \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^2} k^{(1)}\left(\frac{P_j - p}{h_Z}\right) Z_j (\hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2(n - n_\ell)} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^3} k^{(2)}\left(\frac{P_{\ell'j}^* - p}{h_Z}\right) Z_j (\hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where  $P_{\ell\ell'j}^*$  is an intermediate value between  $\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}$  and  $P_j$ . Let  $\mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c = \{W_i : i \notin I_\ell, i \notin I_{\ell'}\}$  denote the observations not in  $I_\ell$  and not in  $I_{\ell'}$ . For the first term, by Hölder's inequality and standard arguments in the kernel estimation,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^2} k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right| \\
&= \frac{n_{\ell'}}{(n - n_\ell) h_Z^2} \left| E \left[ k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{h_Z^2} \left( E \left[ \left| k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \right|^{q/(q-1)} \right] \right)^{1-1/q} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} \\
&= \frac{1}{h_Z^2} \left( E \left[ \left| k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) \right|^{\tilde{s}} \sigma_{\tilde{s}}(P_j) \right] \right)^{1/\tilde{s}} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} \\
&= \frac{1}{h_Z^2} \left( \int_0^1 \left| k^{(1)} \left( \frac{p_j - p}{h_Z} \right) \right|^{\tilde{s}} \sigma_{\tilde{s}}(p_j) f_P(p_j) dp_j \right)^{1/\tilde{s}} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} \\
&= \frac{1}{h_Z^2} \left( h_Z \int_0^1 |k^{(1)}(v)|^{\tilde{s}} \sigma_{\tilde{s}}(p + vh_Z) f_P(p + vh_Z) dv \right)^{1/\tilde{s}} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} \\
&= \frac{1}{h_Z^{1+1/q}} \left[ \sigma_{\tilde{s}}(p) f_P(p) \int_0^1 |k^{(1)}(v)|^{\tilde{s}} dv + O(h_Z) \right]^{1/\tilde{s}} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{s} = q/(q-1)$  and  $\sigma_{\tilde{s}}(p) = E[|Z|^{\tilde{s}} | P = p]$ . It follows from Assumption 6.(iii), (iv), and (v) that  $f_P(p)$  and  $\sigma_{\tilde{s}}(p)$  are bounded over  $p \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\int_0^1 |k^{(1)}(v)|^{\tilde{s}} dv \leq \left(\overline{k^{(1)}}\right)^{\tilde{s}} < \infty$ . Therefore,

$$\sup_p \left| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^2} k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right| = O \left( \frac{\|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}}{h_Z^{1+1/q}} \right) = o_p(n^{-1/4}),$$

where the second equality follows from Assumption 6.(ii). On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^2} k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} E \left[ \frac{1}{h_Z^4} k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right)^2 Z_j^2 \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \\
&\leq \frac{\left(\overline{k^{(1)}}\right)^2}{(n - n_\ell) h_Z^4} \left( E[|Z_j|^{2s}] \right)^{1/s} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2 \\
&= O \left( \frac{\|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2}{n h_Z^4} \right) = o_p \left( \frac{h_Z^{2/q}}{n^{3/2} h_Z^2} \right) = o_p(n^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $p \in (0, 1)$ , where the last equality follows from  $h_Z \rightarrow 0$  and  $nh_Z^2 \rightarrow \infty$ . In combination, we have

$$\sup_p \left| \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^2} k^{(1)} \left( \frac{P_j - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j \right) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/4}) \quad (\text{A.20})$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  and  $\ell' \neq \ell$ .

For the second term of  $\hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) - A_{Z\ell n}(p)$ , it follows from Assumption 6.(v) and (vi) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_p \left| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^3} k^{(2)} \left( \frac{P_{\ell'j}^* - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right| &\leq \frac{\overline{k^{(2)}}}{h_Z^3} E \left[ |Z_j| \left( \hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\overline{k^{(2)}}}{h_Z^3} (E |Z_j|^s)^{1/s} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2 \\ &= O \left( \frac{\|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}^2}{h_Z^3} \right) \\ &= o_p \left( \frac{1}{n^{1/2} h_Z^{1-2/q}} \right) \\ &= o_p(n^{-1/4}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &Var \left( \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^3} k^{(2)} \left( \frac{P_{\ell'j}^* - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} E \left[ \frac{1}{h_Z^6} k^{(2)} \left( \frac{P_{\ell'j}^* - p}{h_Z} \right)^2 Z_j^2 \left( \hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j \right)^4 \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\overline{k^{(2)}}}{(n - n_\ell) h_Z^6} \left( E [|Z_j|^{2s/(2-s)}] \right)^{(2-s)/s} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}^4 \\ &= O \left( \frac{\|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}^4}{nh_Z^6} \right) = o_p \left( \frac{h_Z^{4/q}}{n^2 h_Z^2} \right) = o_p \left( \frac{1}{n} \right) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over  $p \in (0, 1)$ . In combination, we have

$$\sup_p \left| \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \frac{1}{h_Z^3} k^{(2)} \left( \frac{P_{\ell'j}^* - p}{h_Z} \right) Z_j \left( \hat{P}_{\ell'j} - P_j \right)^2 \right| = o_p(n^{-1/4}) \quad (\text{A.21})$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  and  $\ell' \neq \ell$ .

By (A.19), (A.20), (A.21), and the triangle inequality,

$$\sup_p \left| \hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) - A_{Z\ell n}(p) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/4})$$

for  $Z$  being 1,  $Y$ , or any element of  $X$ . Substituting into (A.18) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_p |\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) - \mu_{Z\ell n}(p)| &= \frac{\sup_p \left| \hat{A}_{Z\ell}(p) - A_{Z\ell n}(p) \right| + \sup_p \left| \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p) - A_{1\ell n}(p) \right| \sup_p |\mu_{Z\ell n}(p)|}{\inf_p \left| \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p) \right|} \\ &= o_p(n^{-1/4}) \frac{1 + \sup_p |\mu_{Z\ell n}(p)|}{\inf_p \left| \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p) \right|}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sup_p |\mu_{Z\ell n}(p)| \leq \sup_p |\mu_Z(p)| + \sup_p |\mu_{Z\ell n}(p) - \mu_Z(p)| = O(1) + o_p(n^{-1/4}) = O_p(1)$$

and

$$\inf_p \left| \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p) \right| \geq \inf_p |f_P(p)| - \sup_p |A_{1\ell n}(p) - f_P(p)| - \sup_p \left| \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p) - A_{1\ell n}(p) \right|.$$

It follows from Assumption 6.(iii) that  $\inf_p |f_P(p)| \geq \epsilon$  for an  $\epsilon > 0$ , and from Li and Racine (2007, Theorem 1.4) that

$$\sup_p |A_{1\ell n}(p) - f_P(p)| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{nh_Z}} + h_Z^2 \right) = o_p(n^{-1/4}),$$

so that  $\inf_p \left| \hat{A}_{1\ell}(p) \right| \geq \tilde{\epsilon} > 0$  holds with probability approaching to one for any  $\tilde{\epsilon} < \epsilon$ . Hence, we have

$$\sup_p |\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) - \mu_{Z\ell n}(p)| = o_p(n^{-1/4}) \cdot O_p(1) = o_p(n^{-1/4})$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  and each  $Z$  being  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ , which in combination with (A.17) implies  $\sup_p |\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) - \mu_Z(p)| = o_p(n^{-1/4})$  and thus  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\mu}_\ell - \mu\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ . Analogously, we can show that  $\sup_p \left| \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}^{(1)}(p) - \mu_Z^{(1)}(p) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/4})$  and  $n^{1/4} \left\| \hat{\mu}_\ell^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)} \right\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ .

It remains to show that  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ . By definition of  $\hat{\alpha}_\ell$  in (14), it is sufficient to show that  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\mu}_\ell(\hat{\pi}_\ell) - \mu(\pi)\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ ,  $n^{1/4} \left\| \hat{\mu}_\ell^{(1)}(\hat{\pi}_\ell) - \mu^{(1)}(\pi) \right\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ , and  $n^{1/4} \left\| \hat{\beta}_\ell - \beta \right\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(\hat{\pi}_\ell(x)) - \mu_Z(\pi(x)) &= \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(\hat{\pi}_\ell(x)) - \mu_Z(\hat{\pi}_\ell(x)) + \mu_Z^{(1)}(\pi_\ell^*(x)) [\hat{\pi}_\ell(x) - \pi(x)] \\ \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{\pi}_\ell(x)) - \mu_Z^{(1)}(\pi(x)) &= \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{\pi}_\ell(x)) - \mu_Z^{(1)}(\hat{\pi}_\ell(x)) + \mu_Z^{(2)}(\pi_\ell^*(x)) [\hat{\pi}_\ell(x) - \pi(x)] \end{aligned}$$



where  $\pi_\ell^*$  represents an intermediate value between  $\hat{\pi}_\ell$  and  $\pi$  which may have different values at each appearance, we have

$$\|\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(\hat{\pi}_\ell) - \mu_Z(\pi)\|_{q,F} \leq \sup_p |\hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}(p) - \mu_Z(p)| + \overline{\mu_Z^{(1)}} \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} = o_p(n^{-1/4}) \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$\left\| \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}^{(1)}(\hat{\pi}_\ell) - \mu_Z^{(1)}(\pi) \right\|_{q,F} \leq \sup_p \left| \hat{\mu}_{Z\ell}^{(1)}(p) - \mu_Z^{(1)}(p) \right| + \overline{\mu_Z^{(2)}} \|\hat{\pi}_\ell - \pi\|_{q,F} = o_p(n^{-1/4}) \quad (\text{A.23})$$

for  $Z$  being  $Y$  or any element of  $X$ . As to  $\hat{\beta}_\ell$ , we denote

$$\hat{M}_\ell = \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}^2 \left( X_j - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) \right) \left( X_j - \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) \right)',$$

$$r_0(W, \pi, \mu, \beta) = P(X - \mu_X(P)) [Y - \mu_Y(P) - P(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta],$$

then

$$\hat{\beta}_\ell - \beta = \hat{M}_\ell^{-1} \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} r_0(W_j, \hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}, \hat{\mu}_{\ell\ell'}, \beta).$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2, we can show that

$$\hat{M}_\ell \xrightarrow{p} E [P_j^2 (X_j - \mu_X(P_j)) (X_j - \mu_X(P_j))'] = M$$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ . For the term  $r_0$ , we have

$$r_0(W_j, \hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}, \hat{\mu}_{\ell\ell'}, \beta) - r_0(W_j, \pi, \mu, \beta) = \hat{Q}_{1\ell\ell'j} + \hat{Q}_{2\ell\ell'j} + \hat{Q}_{3\ell\ell'j} + \hat{Q}_{4\ell\ell'j}, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where

$$\hat{Q}_{1\ell\ell'j} = \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} \left( \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) - \mu_X(P_j) \right) \left[ \begin{array}{l} \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) - \mu_Y(P_j) - \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} \left( \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) - \mu_X(P_j) \right)' \beta \\ + \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) (X_j - \mu_X(P_j))' \beta \end{array} \right],$$

$$\hat{Q}_{2\ell\ell'j} = -\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} (X_j - \mu_X(P_j)) \left[ \begin{array}{l} \hat{\mu}_{Y\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) - \mu_Y(P_j) - \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} \left( \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) - \mu_X(P_j) \right)' \beta \\ + \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) (X_j - \mu_X(P_j))' \beta \end{array} \right],$$

$$\hat{Q}_{3\ell\ell'j} = -\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} \left( \hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j}) - \mu_X(P_j) \right) [Y_j - \mu_Y(P_j) - P_j (X_j - \mu_X(P_j))' \beta],$$

$$\hat{Q}_{4\ell\ell'j} = \left( \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'j} - P_j \right) (X_j - \mu_X(P_j)) [Y_j - \mu_Y(P_j) - P_j (X_j - \mu_X(P_j))' \beta].$$

Similar to (A.22) and (A.23), it is ready to show that  $\|\hat{\mu}_{\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu(\pi)\|_{q,F} = o_p(n^{-1/4})$

for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  and  $\ell' \neq \ell$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{1\ell\ell'j} \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right\| &\leq \|\hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_X(\pi)\|_F \cdot \|\hat{\mu}_{Y\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_Y(\pi)\|_F \\ &\quad + \|\hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_X(\pi)\|_F^2 \cdot \|\beta\| + \|\hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_X(\pi)\|_{q,F} \\ &\quad \cdot \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} \cdot (E |X_j - \mu_X(P_j)|^s)^{1/s} \cdot \|\beta\| \\ &= o_p(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{2\ell\ell'j} \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right\| &\leq \left( E |X_j - \mu_X(P_j)|^{\bar{s}} \right)^{1/\bar{s}} \left[ \begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\mu}_{Y\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_Y(\pi)\|_{q,F} \\ &+ \|\hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_X(\pi)\|_{q,F} \|\beta\| \end{aligned} \right] \\
&+ \left( E |X_j - \mu_X(P_j)|^{2\bar{s}} \right)^{1/(2\bar{s})} \|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F} \|\beta\| \\
&= o_p(n^{-1/4}), \\
\left\| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{3\ell\ell'j} \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right\| &\leq O\left(\|\hat{\mu}_{X\ell\ell'}(\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}) - \mu_X(\pi)\|_{q,F}\right) = o_p(n^{-1/4}), \\
\left\| E \left[ \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{4\ell\ell'j} \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \right\| &\leq O\left(\|\hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'} - \pi\|_{q,F}\right) = o_p(n^{-1/4}).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we can show that

$$\left\| \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{k\ell\ell'j} \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right) \right\| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

for each  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . In consequence,

$$\frac{n^{1/4}}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{k\ell\ell'j} \xrightarrow{p} E \left[ \frac{n^{1/4}}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{k\ell\ell'j} \middle| \mathcal{W}_{\ell\ell'}^c \right] \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad (\text{A.25})$$

for each  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . By (A.24) and (A.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} r_0(W_j, \hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}, \hat{\mu}_{\ell\ell'}, \beta) &= \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \notin I_\ell} r_0(W_j, \pi, \mu, \beta) + \sum_{k=1}^4 \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \left( \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} \hat{Q}_{k\ell\ell'j} \right) \\
&= O_p(n^{-1/2}) + o_p(n^{-1/4}) = o_p(n^{-1/4}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}_\ell - \beta &= (M^{-1} + o_p(1)) \frac{1}{n - n_\ell} \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} \sum_{j \in I_{\ell'}} r_0(W_j, \hat{\pi}_{\ell\ell'}, \hat{\mu}_{\ell\ell'}, \beta) \\
&= O_p(1) \cdot o_p(n^{-1/4}) = o_p(n^{-1/4}).
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

The conclusion  $n^{1/4} \|\hat{\alpha}_\ell - \alpha\|_{q,F} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  follows from (A.22), (A.23), (A.26), and arguments similar to Lemmas 2.(ii) and 3, which completes the proof.  $\square$

## A.4 Derivation of the First-Step Influence Function

Denote the [Robinson](#)-type moment function in (10) as

$$r_0(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3, \pi_4, \pi_5, \beta) = \pi_1(X) [X - \mu_{X_1}(\pi_2(X))] \{Y - \mu_Y(\pi_3(X)) - \pi_4(X) [X - \mu_{X_2}(\pi_5(X))]'\beta\},$$

where the dependences on the data  $W = (Y, D, X)$  and the second-step estimand  $\mu = (\mu_{X1}, \mu_{X2}, \mu_Y)$  are suppressed for simplicity. The notations  $\pi_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, 5$ ) and  $\mu_{Xj}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) are just an expositional device, since  $\pi_j = \pi$  and  $\mu_{Xj} = \mu_X$ .

Note that estimation of  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_4$  has only direct effect on  $r_0$ , which is

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1(\pi, \beta) &= E \left[ \frac{\partial r_0(\pi, \beta)}{\partial \pi_1} \middle| X \right] \\ &= E \left[ (X - \mu_X(P)) (Y - \mu_Y(P) - P(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta) \middle| X \right] \\ &= (X - \mu_X(P)) [E(Y|X) - \mu_Y(P) - P(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta] \\ &= 0, \\ \alpha_4(\pi, \beta) &= E \left[ \frac{\partial r_0(\pi, \beta)}{\partial \pi_4} \middle| X \right] \\ &= E \left[ -P(X - \mu_X(P)) (X - \mu_X(P))' \beta \middle| X \right] \\ &= -P(X - \mu_X(P)) (X - \mu_X(P))' \beta,\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows from (9). By Proposition 4 of [Newey \(1994\)](#), the influence function corresponding to the direct effect is

$$\phi_D(\beta) = \alpha_4(\pi, \beta) \cdot (D - P) = -P(X - \mu_X(P)) (X - \mu_X(P))' \beta (D - P).$$

In comparison, estimation of  $\pi_2$ ,  $\pi_3$ , and  $\pi_5$  affects  $r_0$  indirectly through  $\mu$ . Due to the influence function of  $\mu$  is zero, the indirect effect of first-step estimation is merely the naive derivative of  $r_0$  that only accounts for first-step estimation as an argument ([Hahn and Ridder, 2013](#), Remark 3). Specifically, it follows from [Hahn and Ridder \(2013, Theorem 5\)](#) that the indirect effect is

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_2(\pi, \beta) &= E \left[ \frac{\partial r_0}{\partial \mu_{X1}} \frac{d\mu_{X1}}{d\pi_2} \middle| X \right] \\ &= E \left[ -P(Y - \mu_Y(P) - P(X - \mu_X(P))' \beta) \mu_X^{(1)}(P) \middle| X \right] \\ &= 0, \\ \alpha_3(\pi) &= E \left[ \frac{\partial r_0}{\partial \mu_Y} \frac{d\mu_Y}{d\pi_3} \middle| X \right] = -P(X - \mu_X(P)) \mu_Y^{(1)}(P), \\ \alpha_5(\pi, \beta) &= E \left[ \frac{\partial r_0}{\partial \mu_{X2}} \frac{d\mu_{X2}}{d\pi_5} \middle| X \right] = P^2(X - \mu_X(P)) \mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta,\end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding influence function is

$$\phi_I(\beta) = [\alpha_3(\pi) + \alpha_5(\pi, \beta)] \cdot (D - P) = -P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) - P \mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta \right] (D - P).$$

In summary, the first-step influence function is

$$\phi_D(\beta) + \phi_I(\beta) = -P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) - P\mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \beta + (X - \mu_X(P))' \beta \right] (D - P),$$

and the orthogonalized moment function is constructed as

$$\psi(\beta) = r_0(\pi, \beta) + \phi_D(\beta) + \phi_I(\beta).$$

Since  $E[D - P | X] = 0$ , it follows from the law of iterated expectations that  $E[\phi_D(\tilde{\beta}) + \phi_I(\tilde{\beta})] = 0$  for any  $\tilde{\beta}$ . As a consequence, we have four ways of formulating a consistent estimator for  $\beta$  according to the orthogonalized moment function  $\psi(\beta)$ .

**Formulation 1.** Regard  $\beta$  as a solution to the moment condition  $E[\psi(\beta)] = 0$ :

$$\beta = \left\{ E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ D(X - \mu_X(P)) - P(D - P)\mu_X^{(1)}(P) \right]' \right] \right\}^{-1} \cdot E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left( Y - \mu_Y(P) - (D - P)\mu_Y^{(1)}(P) \right) \right],$$

and substitute the unknown functions with their estimates and the expectations with their sample analogs.

**Formulation 2.** Regard  $\beta$  as a solution to the moment condition  $E[r_0(\beta) + \phi_D(\tilde{\beta}) + \phi_I(\beta)] = 0$  for a predetermined  $\tilde{\beta}$ :

$$\beta = \left\{ E \left[ P^2(X - \mu_X(P)) \left( X - \mu_X(P) - (D - P)\mu_X^{(1)}(P) \right)' \right] \right\}^{-1} \cdot E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ Y - \mu_Y(P) - (D - P) \left( \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) + (X - \mu_X(P))' \tilde{\beta} \right) \right] \right],$$

and substitute the unknowns with their estimates.

**Formulation 3.** Regard  $\beta$  as a solution to the moment condition  $E[r_0(\beta) + \phi_D(\beta) + \phi_I(\tilde{\beta})] = 0$  for a predetermined  $\tilde{\beta}$ :

$$\beta = \left\{ E \left[ PD(X - \mu_X(P)) (X - \mu_X(P))' \right] \right\}^{-1} \cdot E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ Y - \mu_Y(P) - (D - P) \left( \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) - P\mu_X^{(1)}(P)' \tilde{\beta} \right) \right] \right],$$

and substitute the unknowns with their estimates.

**Formulation 4.** Regard  $\beta$  as a solution to the moment condition  $E[r_0(\beta) + \phi_D(\tilde{\beta}) + \phi_I(\tilde{\beta})] = 0$  for a predetermined  $\tilde{\beta}$ :

$$\beta = \left\{ E \left[ P^2(X - \mu_X(P)) (X - \mu_X(P))' \right] \right\}^{-1} \cdot E \left[ P(X - \mu_X(P)) \left[ Y - \mu_Y(P) - (D - P) \left( \mu_Y^{(1)}(P) + (X - \mu_X(P) - P\mu_X^{(1)}(P))' \tilde{\beta} \right) \right] \right],$$

and substitute the unknowns with their estimates.

The estimators derived from the above four formulations have identical asymptotics if the predetermined  $\tilde{\beta}$  is a well-defined consistent estimate of  $\beta$ . However, these estimators may differ substantially in finite-sample performance. For example, the estimators in Formulations 1 and 2 are expected to behave badly in finite samples, because the “Jacobian” matrices are not symmetric and thus difficult to find the inverse. On the other side, Formulation 4 relies heavily on the predetermined  $\tilde{\beta}$ , which may induce more bias in the estimation of  $\beta$  than necessary. Overall, we think of Formulation 3 as the best compromise and adopt it when constructing the locally robust estimator for  $\beta$  in Section 3, where we set  $r = r_0 + \phi_D$  and  $\alpha = \alpha_3 + \alpha_5$ .

## A.5 Additional Results of the Simulation

Table A.1: Simulation results for higher error correlation and censoring rate

$n = 1000$	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Locally Robust	Robinson	Robinson with Orthogonalization	Robinson with Cross-fitting
<b>Panel A:</b> $Cov(U, \varepsilon) = 0.75, \Pr(D = 0) = 0.5$				
Average Bias	0.108	0.114	0.074	0.254
Average SD	0.103	0.097	0.083	0.160
Average Coverage	0.938	0.773	0.900	0.549
Max Coverage	0.990	0.960	0.980	0.940
Min Coverage	0.820	0.340	0.770	0.020
<b>Panel B:</b> $Cov(U, \varepsilon) = 0.5, \Pr(D = 0) = 0.75$				
Average Bias	0.229	0.149	0.082	0.469
Average SD	0.232	0.129	0.099	0.324
Average Coverage	0.945	0.797	0.921	0.627
Max Coverage	0.990	0.950	0.970	0.960
Min Coverage	0.830	0.590	0.870	0.110
<b>Panel C:</b> $Cov(U, \varepsilon) = 0.75, \Pr(D = 0) = 0.75$				
Average Bias	0.217	0.159	0.100	0.460
Average SD	0.224	0.150	0.120	0.326
Average Coverage	0.957	0.827	0.933	0.640
Max Coverage	1.000	0.960	0.960	0.940
Min Coverage	0.870	0.660	0.880	0.130

Table A.2: Simulation results for different error distributions

$n = 1000$	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Locally Robust	Robinson	Robinson with Orthogonalization	Robinson with Cross-fitting
<b>Panel A:</b> $\varepsilon \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 1)$				
Average Bias	0.135	0.140	0.103	0.274
Average SD	0.133	0.130	0.111	0.190
Average Coverage	0.926	0.832	0.880	0.618
Max Coverage	0.990	0.960	0.960	0.940
Min Coverage	0.770	0.620	0.650	0.090
<b>Panel B:</b> $\varepsilon \sim t(3)$				
Average Bias	0.147	0.147	0.112	0.283
Average SD	0.215	0.190	0.169	0.254
Average Coverage	0.934	0.843	0.898	0.590
Max Coverage	0.980	0.960	0.970	0.910
Min Coverage	0.850	0.660	0.730	0.090
<b>Panel C:</b> $\varepsilon \sim t(2)$				
Average Bias	0.171	0.192	0.166	0.286
Average SD	0.191	0.231	0.209	0.226
Average Coverage	0.935	0.899	0.917	0.695
Max Coverage	0.980	0.950	0.970	0.980
Min Coverage	0.850	0.760	0.780	0.090

Table A.3: Simulation results for different selection mechanisms

$n = 1000$	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Locally Robust	Robinson	Robinson with Orthogonalization	Robinson with Cross-fitting
<b>Panel A:</b> $h(x) = x_1 + \log(x_1^2) - x_2 - \log(x_2^2) + x_3x_4 - x_5x_6$				
Average Bias	0.090	0.102	0.059	0.211
Average SD	0.092	0.086	0.074	0.147
Average Coverage	0.944	0.787	0.939	0.568
Max Coverage	0.990	0.960	0.960	0.950
Min Coverage	0.870	0.070	0.910	0.060
<b>Panel B:</b> $h(x) = x_1 + \exp(x_1) - x_2 - \exp(x_2) + x_3x_4 - x_5x_6$				
Average Bias	0.093	0.103	0.064	0.178
Average SD	0.101	0.091	0.079	0.150
Average Coverage	0.946	0.773	0.923	0.688
Max Coverage	0.980	0.940	0.950	0.900
Min Coverage	0.830	0.250	0.890	0.110
<b>Panel C:</b> $h(x) = x_1 + \exp(x_1) + \log(x_1^2) - x_2 - \exp(x_2) - \log(x_2^2) + x_3x_4 - x_5x_6$				
Average Bias	0.079	0.089	0.061	0.154
Average SD	0.093	0.084	0.077	0.138
Average Coverage	0.954	0.849	0.946	0.720
Max Coverage	0.980	0.970	0.980	0.940
Min Coverage	0.920	0.390	0.920	0.090